

10-24-2018

# GS Libraries Department Heads Meetings Essence Notes

Lizette Cruz

*University Libraries, Georgia Southern University, lcruz@georgiasouthern.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/lib-dept-minutes>

---

## Recommended Citation

Cruz, Lizette, "GS Libraries Department Heads Meetings Essence Notes" (2018). *GS Libraries Department Heads Meetings Essence Notes*. 63.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/lib-dept-minutes/63>

This essence notes (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Department Heads Meetings at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in GS Libraries Department Heads Meetings Essence Notes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

## GS Libraries Department Heads Meeting

October 24, 2018

Essence Notes

Attending:

Henderson Library: Bede Mitchell, Debra Skinner, David Lowder, Leslie Haas, Jessica Garner, Lizette Cruz.

Lane Library: Doug Frazier, Judith Garrison, Ann Fuller, Aimee Reist.

Visitor: Dr. Michael Toma from the Center for Business Analytics and Economic Research.

### ***GSU Faculty Salary Study Overview Department Presentation with Dr. Michael Toma from CBAER:***

Bede introduced Dr. Michael Toma from the Center for Business Analytics and Economic Research. CBAER is conducting a Faculty Salary study. Dr. Toma is going around to all the academic units and discussing the study with them. Dr. Toma stated that at this point they are taking the time to listen to each of the academic unit administrators and faculty. They want to make sure that they do not miss anything that they should be taking into account. There is a general framework for the analytical process that they want to pursue. This is the fifth time that they have done this and each time they become better at the process. They want to make sure they listen to and adjust their methodology to fully address the institutional issues now that the university has consolidated with three different campuses.

Dr. Toma then went through the PowerPoint with the accompanying handout given to everyone at the beginning of the meeting.

#### 1. Stakeholder Input:

They have already finished talking to the administrative (executive) level and have begun to talk to the deans of the colleges. They have met with the deans as a group and are offering individual meetings with the deans and their department heads. He would like to extend that offer to the department heads and their faculty. They are talking to faculty, meeting with the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate, and are almost done putting together the Faculty Advisory Committee. They are in the process of scheduling town hall meetings, one in Statesboro and one in Savannah. They are also developing a survey to be distributed to the faculty.

#### 2. Database Development:

They are looking at the base contracted salaries prior to any supplements to that base pay. They are looking into the ranks as well. They want to make sure that this database is updateable in the future, so they are working closely with Human Resources and the Provost Office.

#### 3. Salary Analytics: Internal

Unit of Analysis: They will be analyzing positions, not people. They want to get a sense of what each rank/discipline group is being compensated at compared to peer and aspirational institutions. They will be looking at these various cross tabulations by rank, campus location, department and discipline, as well as inversions and compressions of salary.

Doug asked if they would be able to identify among the same rank/discipline if there is a flat salary distribution or if there is a large spread out of salary distribution. Dr. Toma stated that they will be able to identify those cases by looking at the standard deviation. They will have minimum and maximum data and will be able to look at what the brackets are for the salary range.

4. Salary Analytics: External

They will be using these rank/discipline groups to compare to same rank/ discipline groups at peer and aspirational institutions that have been identified for Georgia Southern University. Presently 15 peer institutions and 9 aspirational institutions have been identified. This list was updated in June of 2018. There might be another more appropriate list for various colleges or units of analysis. If there is a different list of peer and aspirational institutions for the Library unit, that is something to be taken under consideration. If there is something seriously wrong with the default list, deeming it inappropriate for the Library unit, that is something they will need to think about addressing.

Bede stated that he would like the committee to consider adding to the list, from the perspective of the Library, the University of West Georgia. It is within the same Board of Regents classification as Georgia Southern University even though it is not on the list of peer institutions. Bede is aware of what the salaries for library faculty are and Georgia Southern cannot compete with them. He feels this really needs to be looked at because they are a sister institution with the same classification and yet their library faculty is much better compensated than library faculty at Georgia Southern. Leslie noted that the list lacked any peer institutions from the state of Georgia. Bede stated that the Board of Regents did not offer any as a choice.

Dr. Toma stated that if there are institutions that ought to be considered then he suggests writing up a rationale as to why they are diverging from the default list so that the committee can consider adding those institutions to the list, but to be mindful to not appear in the rationale as cherry picking institutions. As long as there is a solid rationale put in the recommendation to add that peer institution, they will consider it.

5. Salary Data: The default data set that they will be using is the College & University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) data set. If there is another data set that should be considered then the same rules apply, it came be turned in for consideration but with a proper rationale as to why it should be considered. Leslie asked if one of the data sets that could be considered is the ARL. Bede clarified that the problem with ARL is that it only reflects the salaries of member institutions and GS does not qualify as an ARL member institution. It would not be an appropriate comparison. Bede has not been able to identify any other additional source apart from CUPA but if he does he will let them know.

Doug noted that one issue with CUPA is that the rankings and classifications do not truly match between the CUPA and the actual positions in the two GS libraries. You could have a ranking under Library science and in the CUPA that is someone who actually teaches library science at

the graduate level. Or you could have a listing of faculty but the description of a staff member under cataloger more closely resembles what a faculty member does at GS, but then is not considered faculty under CUPA. Another issue could be, for example, that no one in Lane Library is above assistant professor because in the past no one was allowed to enter a higher rank. Dr. Toma stated that in this case they will need to work together to figure out how to best portray this in the context of the GS University. Dr. Toma noted that it sounded like the positions Doug mentioned resembled more professional academic positions as opposed to staff rank positions. Bede noted that a lot of the GS Libraries' positions are faculty but not tenure track. Almost all of the librarians at Lane Library are not on the tenure track. Dr. Toma is not sure how robust CUPA is in regards to positions and tenure track. He noted that if external comparisons cannot be made then they will make internal comparisons to try and define the positions as appropriately as possible. Their goal is to handle this in a way that makes sense for the GS Libraries and not try to force the Libraries into a model that doesn't fit, or is biased or places people at a disadvantage. He will want to sit with Bede and Doug later on in the process to go over the positions and salary comparison to make sure they fit.

#### 6. Salary Analytics: External – Examples of Output

The three tables in the handout under this category is an example of what the comparisons will look like. These are from the Armstrong study from 2016. There will be some more data because the GS study will include both peer and aspirational institutions. The study will also include the dollar amount needed to move salaries up to the threshold. For example, what is the dollar amount needed to move everyone who is at 82% up to 85%. In this example the target is 85%. Right now Dr. Toma does not know what the target is. Whatever the target is they will be able to show how much it would cost the university in terms of resources to move salaries up to the target. They are looking at two ways to display the data, by department and/or by college. They will also be providing to the provost office a spreadsheet listing each individual faculty member, where they are, and what percentage of the CUPA mean they are at, in comparison to peer and aspirational institutions. Appendix D shows a sample spreadsheet listing positions by discipline and rank with the average, median, minimums and maximums for each position type.

#### 7. Timeline:

They hope to have the report out by January. Dr. Toma invites everyone to ask questions or if anyone thinks there is something that the research teams needs to be looking at to feel free to contact them and make them aware of any questions or concerns. Dr. Toma wants the report to be as transparent as possible.

Dr. Toma stated that the report is being timed strategically so that funding for changes can come forward in the next fiscal year. They wanted to make sure they did not release the report in April or May when it was too late to make modifications for the coming fiscal year. His understanding is that there is a serious intent to do something about the market based inequities as revealed in the report. It is wise to consider that this will be a multi-year strategy. He does not know how much it will cost but he believes it will be a very expensive endeavor to try and get Georgia Southern salaries closer to their peers. The administration wants to do something about it but it will have to be a controlled multi-year process. Doug asked if Dr. Toma

had heard anything about leveling. Dr. Toma has not heard anything about leveling, but he doubts that the administration would do that.

Dr. Toma received the SIP codes from the provost office yesterday. He will be sending those out to the deans so they could confirm that their faculty members are in the SIP codes that most accurately reflect the positions that they are in.

### ***Deans Council Report:***

A large portion of the Deans Council meeting was spent discussing the background of the university's enrollment issues which is leading the president to direct the units to look at how they could meet a 10% budget reduction if necessary. Vice President for Enrollment Management Amy Ballagh gave a projection report to the president's cabinet. Dr. Reiber is hoping to get the slide show to share it out. The trends here at the university are: a gradual declining number of seniors, two years of freshman enrollment decline that are unrelated to consolidation, and concerns of lack of brand identity. Institutions like Kennesaw State and University of West Georgia are making very deep inroads in recruiting students who used to be more inclined to come to Statesboro and Savannah. As UGA, Georgia State and Georgia Tech continue to accept as many students as they are, the rest of the colleges and universities are competing more and more for a smaller pool, especially the lower income students who increasingly are staying closer to home. And those who do not go to Kennesaw or West Georgia are more inclined to go to Middle Georgia or East Georgia because for the first two years it is so much cheaper. GS is also lagging in transfers. Some of this is related to Georgia Perimeter College now becoming part of Georgia State. Whereas before we received many students from GPC, presently we receive almost no students since they now transfer to Georgia State.

There are also state and national trends that are affecting all universities across the board not just GS. There is an increasing social cynicism about the value of a four year college degree. There are a lot of institutions from out of state who are much more aggressively recruiting students from the state of Georgia. The mid-western states are losing population at a fairly rapid pace compared to states like Georgia. In order for them to keep their numbers up they have started offering in-state tuition to anyone willing to go to their institutions.

A longer term concern is the decline of high school graduates starting in 2025 statewide. Even if GS could reverse current enrollment trends, all Georgia statewide campuses will see difficult recruitment trends starting 2025 and beyond. All of these trends are playing a part in the redoubling of GS University's efforts to work on efficiency, identify low producing programs, and reallocating to areas that are mission critical but underfunded. Dr. Reiber stated that Academic Affairs will be focusing on providing more fully online programs. While there are many classes offered online the amount of degrees offered fully online is small. They will be appealing to more adult learners. They will also concentrate their efforts to identifying low producing programs and redirecting resources to strong programs. This is one of the things that will help us prioritize our budget and bring it in line with the priorities of the University.

The units of the university have been asked to assess their budgets and produce a report to cut as much as 10% from each units' budget. We have received a series of questions stemming from the comprehensive administrative review; these questions are appropriate for addressing what the libraries priorities are. Bede has suggested having an extended meeting where the heads of the department can dive into the details of the budget and report. A possible date for this meeting could be Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>. Since this is Thanksgiving break week, the libraries hours will be reduced and so will traffic. The Lane Library team would be able to come to the Statesboro campus for a half day meeting. They could review the data of the CAR report if they receive it by then, and this allows time to put together a budget summary information report to review that day. Things to address in the meeting would be: what is mission critical, what are things that can be done differently and reduce cost, what funds can be redirected for a short period of time, until enrollment increases. The meeting will be 9 to 1, on Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>.

Debra has already prepared a report about the state of the materials budget that Bede wants to share with the provost. He asked Debra to take a look at it in light of the slightly different audience to see if she wants to add or further explain in that report. Lizette has started on a report of the budget from Business Objects. It will be a fairly detailed report showing the allocation of the monies in the different lines and comparing it with expenditures from the previous years. Bede asked Doug to do the same for Lane Library. Roughly speaking the combined budgets are about 6 million dollars. 10% is 600,000.00. Dr. Reiber doesn't think that the institution is going to do an across the board 10% budget because that is not strategic. Some units contribute more to student success than others and student success is a top priority for GS. Bede thinks there is a fair chance that the libraries will not have to cut 10% because most of the libraries' budget contributes directly to student success. Leslie asked about the questions on the list in regards to vacancies and supervisory positions. Bede doesn't think we need to list and answer every single question on the list. The purpose of the questions is simply to help units show how they are being responsible and efficient.

This is one of the reasons that it is becoming increasingly difficult to fill vacant positions. Every time a vacancy opens, they are going through those kinds of questions before allowing recruitment for those vacancies. They are sweeping back the monies for positions that remain vacant. This has caused units to have to stretch thin their present staff and faculty. Ann asks that since the bulk of the questions refer to staff and faculty as opposed to the materials and operational part of the budget, she was wondering if there was any indication that they would stipulate that some of the cuts would have to come from personnel. Bede stated that no other criteria had be shared so far. As the budget information is shared in preparation for the meeting on Nov. 19, Bede might share some further information that he would consider important, however Bede does not want to even suggest any reduction in personnel in the libraries. But it may not be up to the library. Bede stated there are three pieces of the "pie": personnel, materials, and operating budget. The personnel budget for the most part will be taken off the table.

Debra Skinner asked if the budget meeting will be solely be to discuss the 10% reduction or if it will be discussing the entire budget. Bede explained that it is not just the about the 10%, they

will be discussing priorities and the over extension of the budget itself. So her report should reflect all the information she has.

***Merit Increase:***

Bede stated that he has not received any direction in regards to the 1%/2% merit raise, but instructions will be forthcoming and we need to be prepared to submit our recommendations on very short notice. Leslie asked when the raises are supposed to start. They are to be in effect by the beginning of January.

***Old and New Business***

***Lime Scooters and Bikes***

Leslie would like to come up with a process of reporting Lime scooters and bikes that have been brought into the Library. Jessica stated that she heard from Public Safety that they are keeping a record of all the incidents involving the scooters and bikes. They would like the Library to report to them when scooters and bikes are found where they are not supposed to be. Leslie wanted to try to streamline the process: for example, if someone in another department finds the scooter they should write down the information, and then inform Access Services and have Access Services be the one to make the call to report it. Jessica agreed with that process. Leslie then asked if the scooters need to be moved over to Access Services and then removed from the building or stay at Access Services until they are picked up. Bede stated that if the scooters are moved the alarm will go off, so they should not be moved at all. If the scooter has not been checked out by the person who rode it into the library, anyone else who tries to take it will trigger the alarm. Jessica and Leslie will work together to come up with a general procedure for dealing with the scooters and bikes in the Library and send out a general email. In reality this should not be a great problem, since anyone who comes in with a scooter would have to pass by the Access Services desk and should be stopped at that time.

***Announcements***

There being no more announcement or questions the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 PM