**Budget Committee of Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

Brad Yates, Presiding

December 7, 2016

1. Call to Order (9:05 a.m.)
2. November 10, 2016 Minutes tabled until next meeting
3. Old Business: Update on Post-tenure Review Incentive program for Full Professors
	1. Report and follow-up comments regarding the BOR policy on monetary incentives
		1. J. Sutherland reported that he spoke with John Fuchko, USG vice chancellor for internal audit & compliance, and BOR policy prohibits a PRT bonus/supplement to an individual. In other words, there can be no incentive pay given on a one-time basis to an individual (J. Sutherland commented that PTR is not part of an on-going review like annual evaluations; thus, PTR is subject to different regulations)
		2. K. Marrero added to J. Sutherland’s report that we can allocated additional monies to departments for incentives to be used by individuals, not the department at large
		3. K. Marrero and J. Sutherland noted that a meritorious, permanent base salary increase is allowed, according to BOR policy, but budget constraints keep us from doing so
		4. K. Marrero proposed a monetary award to departments to reward those individuals who have a successful PTR, with the caveat that the monies will be designated for research, travel, or other work that the department chair and faculty member agree upon within spending guidelines
		5. K. Marrero reiterated that it is a one-time dollar amount to the departments for successful PTR applicants, and reinforced it is doable in terms of the budget
		6. Several caveats and points of clarifications followed
			1. K. Marrero noted that the PTR process must be reviewed to develop standards across colleges/SON and departments
			2. K. Marrero, with J. Sutherland and L. Baker concurring, stated that departments will receive the allocation of dollars on July 1st of each FY, and the monies must be spent within the FY in which they are awarded (according to BOR and UWG spending guidelines and deadlines); otherwise, the funds will lapse
			3. B. Yates noted that he was the recipient of an incentive (as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook regarding PTR) from COSS and was subject to the FY spending deadline
			4. A. Gaquere asked if the incentive money could be used for summer salary, and K. Marrero responded that the money cannot be used for salary, but, as an example, it can be part of a study abroad experience or a research project
			5. M. Crafton noted the incentive award related to PTR is not remuneration for work done/to be done; rather it is for past performance
	2. K. Marrero asked if the Committee supports the proposal of incentive allocations to the departments for successful PTRs
		1. K. Marrero noted that we are not proposing a change in PTR
			1. There will not be an administrative final approval instituted (e.g., PTR documentation will never come K. Marrero’s desk; his only involvement will be sign off on the monies allocated to the departments for the PTR applicants who are deemed successful)
			2. PTR will continue to be housed in the departments or Colleges (e.g., RCOB)/SON as the case may be. Deans will receive a recommendation from departments or College/SON committees about PTR applicants so there is a level of consistency when determining “stellar” (Faculty Handbook language) performance
			3. K. Marrero referenced an article shared by M. Crafton about University of Wisconsin’s model of top-down governance, and K. Marrero said we are not moving toward that type of model
			4. M. Crafton remarked that what we are asking for is more transparency and leveling standards
		2. Discussion turned toward defining “stellar”
			1. T. Gainey noted he and Leanne DeFoor are working on finding language to develop best practices for annual reviews, which will help with developing the nomenclature to level the standards of PTR
			2. T. Gainey suggested we move in deliberate fashion and collect more data from across departments/Colleges/SON before we attempt to define “stellar”
			3. K. Marrero affirmed T. Gainey’s viewpoint and remarked it will take about two years to get the nomenclature in place
			4. M. Pearson asked who would be defining the nomenclature.
				1. K. Marrero emphasized that the nomenclature will be defined via shared governance. The departments and those on the front lines will begin to develop/define/refine the nomenclature with College level governing bodies sharing input and feedback and, ultimately, Faculty Senate review will take place
				2. K. Marrero suggested that P&T and merit nomenclature is a sound starting point
				3. K. Marrero shared an example from his previous institution about defining nomenclature

There were five categories of faculty performance: 1) distinguished, 2) excellent, 3) satisfactory, 4) fair, and 5) poor

Meritorious performance was achieved based on the number of distinguished and excellent reviews one earned (e.g., 1-distinguished and 2-excellent = meritorious)

* 1. Discussion turned toward timeline
		1. K. Marrero said he is comfortable with starting this incentive allocation program July 1, 2017 for all successful PTR applicants FY17
		2. Allocations for successful PTRs will go to the departments for the successful applicants to use in FY18.
		3. K. Marrero commented the PTR process review will come later once nomenclature is settled
	2. Discussion turned toward dollar amounts
		1. K. Marrero expressed a desire to provide $2,000 for each successful applicant, and this new incentive program would begin for the current group of PTR applicants
		2. M. Gantner said there are 120 Full Professors at present. If all were awarded $2,000, then budget needs for the incentive program would total $240,000
		3. K. Marrero commented that the proposed model can also cover associate professors who achieve successful PTR
		4. O. Cooper asked how the proposal deals with faculty who have achieved multiple PTRs and are not going through review this year
			1. K. Marrero remarked that this year is the launch of the incentive program and we will refine it moving forward; T. Gainey echoed that such programs must have a launch date and other details are worked out moving forward
			2. M. Crafton noted there is a slight restructuring to the reporting details of PTR for the future, but this year’s applicants have already submitted and will be eligible for an incentive
			3. K. Marrero asked for a sign off from the Dean for this year’s applicants
			4. M. Crafton remarked that one update to the PTR process could be that all applications are due at the same time
		5. L. Baker clarified that PTR happens after 5 full years of service are complete; faculty make application in their 6th year; thus, it is in the 7th year since the last PAR change that an individual would receive the incentive dollars
		6. H. Zot asked if the process will change next year, and K. Marrero said the process (allocation of dollars to the departments) will be the same with refinement
	3. Attempts to summarize the discussion ensued
		1. B. Yates shared his understanding that monies are to be spent by the successful PTR applicant not the department
		2. K. Marrero noted the discussion also yielded the desire for a uniform standard for PTR review that will go through normal faculty governance processes
		3. K. Marrero reiterated that the Deans recommended a one-time increase, not a base salary increase because the base salary increase is not sustainable
		4. K. Marrero noted that both full and associate professors who achieve a successful PTR are eligible
		5. M. Crafton asked how someone who is deemed stellar in a PTR at the associate level is not promoted to full professor
			1. K. Marrero reminded the Committee of an earlier Committee discussion of how a teaching track could be beneficial in terms of M. Crafton’s scenario (e.g., opportunity to reward great performance even though it is not part of the P&T criteria)
			2. T. Gainey noted such a scenario speaks to the importance of the annual evaluation process (e.g., an associate could receive a stellar performance evaluation for PTR, but not receive a promotion for poor performance)
			3. K. Marrero reinforced the need for continuous accountability for performance
			4. K. Marrero remarked that expectations should be laid out from day one for any employee; it is all about clarity
			5. B. Yates remarked that he was aware of past limited-term positions that only indicated duties of teaching and office hours; no service or professional growth and development requirements were expected, which speaks to the notion that someone could receive an outstanding performance rating but not meet P&T criteria (though, limited-term positions typically don’t have the opportunity for promotion)
		6. H. Zot asked if the current PTR guidelines would be modified to involve chairs in the process. His understanding of the guidelines, unless there has been a change, is that only faculty review committees make recommendations regarding PTR and chairs get involved if there is a need for an action plan
			1. T. Gainey reported that as a chair he does not review PTR applications only the RCOB committee does
			2. M. Pearson reported that she, as chair, writes a letter of support for PTR candidates and this is common practice in COAH
		7. B. Yates noted that his interpretation of the PTR guidelines is that a review should be a broader look at a candidate’s performance than the criteria for P&T for associate to full professor; there should be flexibility in PTR
		8. The following proposal was presented to the Committee:
			1. Proposal: A one-time $2,000 strategic allocation will be made to respective departments and earmarked for associate and full professors who earn a stellar post-tenure review in FY17, effective July 1, 2017, not retroactive. The monies must be spent in the fiscal year (FY18) it is funded and follow all E&G (Educational and General) guidelines and lapsable fund policies. Additionally, the request beyond this implementation is that through the Faculty Senate governance process a review of PTR processes will begin over the next academic year.
			2. M. Pearson, motioned for approval; T. Jennings, seconded; motion carries unanimously
			3. K. Marrero remarked that the question will likely arise about whether a faculty member may appeal to have the monies used in a different fiscal year, and the answer is that we must adhere to BOR and UWG policies and guidelines
1. Budget updates from new Chancellor
	1. BOR Requests will fall within Governor’s requests, except for the health benefit requests
	2. Budget is looking good and solid from funding formula-$68 million for USG
	3. Tuition cap bill will be back as will campus carry
		1. Tuition cap bill allows for CPI (Consumer Price Index) increase (close to 2%), which could be a positive, but it signifies more legislative authority over the BOR
		2. There is a small chance that there will be a tuition increase at the CPI rate (2-2.5%, which means $62-63 per student; no fee increases), and this is within market elasticity and generates $1.2 million recurring revenue
		3. K. Marrero discussed UWG needs with the Chancellor and expressed a desire for either a tuition increase or additional allocation; graduate tuition may be increased by 6%, which is only $300-350K recurring because of tuition waivers granted
		4. We are 10th in the state in terms of tuition costs, less than GA Southern, Valdosta, and Kennesaw, and the same cost as Columbus State
		5. From a graduate tuition standpoint we are also 10th; but we do not receive equitable dollars with other graduate institutions and we need more
		6. In terms of e-tuition, an affordability audit will be completed soon, and it may not be favorable
		7. Dining Services audit is also in process and other institutions are using their dining monies to allow top administrators to eat free and have parties, among other uses; UWG does not allow such spending
		8. UWG uses our in-kind monies for orientation, Best of the West, faculty meetings and student scholarships
		9. E-tuition is our Achilles heel; UWG is in the middle of the pack for e-tuition cost
			1. K. Marrero may get a sector evaluation of maximum cost and lobby for each sector and hope for some responsiveness from the legislature. If there is a cut, that could mean $5 million in personnel and $1 million in operational. As of now there are no limits on how e-tuition may be spent
		10. J. Sutherland reiterated there will be no increase in mandatory fees, but dining and housing fees may see a slight increase but those are voluntary
	4. J. Sutherland K. Marrero reported on the P3-referendum that allows capital firms to invest in housing or parking infrastructure on university campuses with the University operating the spaces
		1. Phase 1 was implemented for $300 million and feedback has been positive; a need-based scholarship is offered from the income
		2. Phase 2 is in progress and because we are at 99% occupancy and in the black, we will benefit with more housing
			1. With this opportunity of more housing, Gunn and Strozier Halls will be taken offline for renovation and conversion to administrative offices
			2. Tyus would be torn down and a residence area like the Oaks would be constructed on that space and just to the north; the capital firm would pay for it the construction and UWG would manage it; it would be a two year building and set up process, and likely we won’t see it in place for three years
			3. The facility would legally belong to USG, but there is no debt associated with it; capital firm negotiated the right to be the concessionaire for 75 years
		3. Student satisfaction for these P3 housing structures is very high
		4. A. Gaquere asked if the capital firm could build a parking deck, and J. Sutherland said yes. However, we would have to charge for parking deck and increase parking and transportation fee for students
		5. J. Sutherland said BOR won’t allow us to build a parking deck, but noted that the new residence space will get surface space parking
		6. K. Marrero said more spaces will come when the sub-station and tennis courts are moved
2. Next Meeting: January
3. Adjournment (10:24 a.m.)