

**Middle Georgia State University
Faculty Affairs Committee
February 24, 2023**

(1) Call to Order

The Faculty Affairs Committee (“the Committee”) was called to order at 9:00am on Friday, February 24, 2023 on Microsoft Teams.

(2) Roll Call

Present

Not Present

Tina Ashford noted that two in-office hours for each face-

Cole concluded that he will proceed to encourage nominations and check with the deans. Last year, the timeline was longer; if we need more of a buffer, that is a possibility.

- **Ashford** noted that a briefer timeline can actually push people to take action; sometimes a long timeline encourages stagnation or failure to act.

Ashford moved to accept the new, streamlined wording for nomination forms.

- **Ervin Briones** seconded the motion.
- The motion **passed unanimously**.

(6) Old Business

(A) Carl Vinson Salary Increase Discussion

Rebecca Lanning spoke with the Provost in November, who noted that there are often inequities that emerge in salary adjustment processes. At the time, he asked us to wait to act until he had more staff in his office.

On most campuses, there is a common standard for salary adjustments as faculty members move through the ranks. That has not been the case on our campus. For faculty coming from Macon State, for example, there has not been a salary compression adjustment in 30 years (if ever). Thus, the assumption that all faculty members have been receiving salary adjustments as they moved through the ranks is simply not true.

Lanning highlighted that Jennifer Jones has been extremely helpful to the research process on this issue and expressed her appreciation. The earliest document that Jones could find for salary adjustments during promotion and tenure was from April 2014.

For most faculty members with 25+ years of service, the assumed salary compression adjustment is 7.5 percent. Some, however, have had as little as 1.6 percent. At least one faculty member here for more than 20 years and a few with 19 years of service have potentially received no compression adjustment at all.

Lanning proposed that since we're looking at a relatively small number of faculty members, all faculty members who meet the service length requirements receive the compression adjustments, regardless of rank/tenure. The Provost suggested that this could be a retroactive change, so that individuals who did not receive the adjustment in the last round could have that amount added to their paychecks in the next.

Luke Buffenmyer asked for clarification on the adjustment process.

- **Lanning** clarified the first part was matching salaries with disciplines at similar institutions. The second part is accounting for salary compression over time. The compression adjustments were based on years in rank, rather than years in service (at any

James Hagler

Ashford withdrew her motion.

Hagler moved that the Committee propose that compression adjustments be based on years of service, not years of rank.

- **Briones** seconded the motion.

Hornung noted that Hagler's motion would not address the concerns already mentioned that the adjustment is not continuous.

Lanning moved that for faculty hired prior to 2006, at which time salary adjustments for movement through the ranks was universally applied, the salary compression adjustment shall be calculated by a .25 per year of service, not to exceed 7.5%, and shall not be lower than their current CVIG adjustment.

Ashford suggested that the Committee should make two separate motions, one for considering years of service and one for the new formula (since there is more agreement on the consideration for length of service).

Cole asked if the language should be clarified.

- **Funches** responded that she thought the motion was detailed enough.
- **Whiddon** expressed that the motion should be qualified.
- **Funches** suggested that the Committee request that the Provost's office consider the cost of the proposed changes.

To reiterate, moved that the Committee propose that compression adjustments be based on years of service, not years of rank.

- *seconded the motion.*
- The motion **failed** (2-6).

Wallace moved that we create a subcommittee whose purpose is to write a letter to send to the Provost's office that addresses the salary compression issues. The Committee can review this letter via email between now and the March meeting.

- **Hagler** seconded the motion.
- The motion **passed** (8-2).

Cole called for volunteers for the subcommittee.

- **Wallace** volunteered to serve.
- **Lanning** volunteered to chair.
- **Hornung** volunteered to serve.

(B) Report on Contract Timing after Meeting with Jennifer Jones

Gary Cole reported on his meeting with Jennifer Jones. There are a couple of problems slowing the contract process down. They have to wait on the Board of Regents to approve the budget, and some years this takes longer. The crucial form (Personnel Action Request Form, PARF) requires seven different signatures to complete, which are time-intensive to collect. HR then makes the offer letter. The time to sign and return the offer letter varies. Then Jennifer and her office complete the contract. If the person is already in the USG system, the system flags them and will halt the contract process until the other institution removes them. Hiring out of cycle can also cause problems.

The previous preference of the committee was to propose that contracts be provided in 30 days. Based on conversations with Jennifer and Pam (in HR), this does not seem possible. They're already doing the best they can.

Everything is also changing in the fall, at which point we switch to an automated system with tracking (with regards to the stage of the contract process). That system should be much more timely and streamlined.

(C) Faculty Handbook Review: Sections 7-8 and the Appendices

~~/P #P~~ AMCID 32 BD3 12 0 0 12 72 263.76181.08

The handbook review was shifted to happen externally (through the provided Google Doc).

(7) Next Meeting

The Committee's next meeting will be Friday, March 31, 2023 at 9:00am on Microsoft Teams.

(8) Adjourning
