

## **Appendix 2**

### **RFP – Potential areas of focus**

#### **January 20, 2004**

The University is committed to pursuing initiatives that will implement our current vision as described in our 2000-2005 Strategic Plan and in the refinement of a new vision; in particular what should be our vision for 2013, our Centennial Vision? One answer is to focus on quality – to improve our national reputation by earning a position in the top 100 American Research Universities in *The Center* [<http://thecenter.ufl.edu>] and also by being recognized as a Tier 2 university in *US News & World Report*. While our vision should not be solely defined by national reputation, nevertheless *US News* and *The Center* are influential annual publications. *The Center* report advocates that the primary focus in a research university should be on internal quality to support success of academic guilds. This focus should lead to quality graduates, economic development, and serving the public interest.

One major element of internal quality is tenure track faculty and increasing the number of tenure track faculty should be a significant feature of any tactical strategy used to invest redirected or new resources, while recognizing that clinical faculty play an important role in some professional schools.

We need to create a clear and coherent vision of the future that includes identification of areas of focus for programs of distinction as well as identification of central undergraduate and masters programs and central activities. Through a review by the colleges in consultation with the provost, the university is engaged in identifying central undergraduate and masters programs and central administrative and support unit activities and personnel devoted to each activity. We have a list of undergraduate and masters programs. We are in the process of determining a list of the various activities in the university.

In accordance with the 2004 Action Plan, the University is committed to seeking funding to enhance development of areas of focus. This involves developing select graduate programs of distinction and attracting high quality graduate students and faculty to these programs.

As part of this goal, we announce a new mechanism to provide funding for such areas of focus, by issuing this Call for Proposals. Proposals can be intra- and/or inter-college. Awards, that would be part of the continuing budget, are expected to be in the range of \$500K-4M. Pre-proposals should first be submitted to the College or Colleges for their review and recommendation, and then forwarded to the Provost. Your pre-proposal for an area of focus is due to the Provost's office by **March 5, 2004**.

We recognize that it is a new experience for many faculty to work inter-department or inter-college. Thus, in this first year of a Call for Proposals for areas of focus, there might be a number of pre-proposals that suggest compelling ideas but are probably not sufficiently developed to be recommended for submission of a proposal this year. We anticipate that pre-proposals will be recommended in three categories: 1) develop proposal this year; 2) continue to develop proposal for subsequent years; 3) not ready for development of proposal. Pre-proposals and proposals will be reviewed through a process established by FACP. Lead units whose pre-proposals are selected for further consideration will be notified by **March 26, 2004**. Full proposals will be due **April 30, 2004**. Proposals should be submitted to the College or Colleges for their review and recommendation and then forwarded to the Provost who will direct the final evaluation and funding decision using the established processes of university budgetary allocation.

As we move forward towards our Centennial vision, we need to continue to enhance the quality of our programs, departments and centers, and support activities, through balanced investment in Areas of Focus, Action Plans from APR and ASUR, NTT to TT position conversion, graduate student support, maintenance of credit hours, and strengthened infrastructure.

The following factors will be considered in evaluation of the proposals:

1. Does the proposal support programs of strategic importance?
2. What are the existing strengths of the program? (Quality and number of faculty and students, leadership, national reputation, record of productivity, record of acquiring extramural support)

3. What resources are currently available for the program? (Quality and size of space and facilities, library holdings)
4. What new resources will be required for further development of the program?
5. What is the potential for extramural support to further the development of the program – federal, state, business, development?
6. What is the level of support for the program from its college/colleges?
7. How well does the program connect with partners and collaborators in the Atlanta region and beyond Georgia, or with economic development in the region and state?
8. How does the program leverage comparative advantages of being in Atlanta?
9. What are the external demand indicators, both quantitative and qualitative?

Summary of time line:

March 5	Pre-proposals due
March 8-23	Evaluation committee reviews pre-proposals and recommends some for further development
March 24-26	Lead units notified of selection [or not] for further development of proposals
April 30	Proposals due
May 3-14	Evaluation committee reviews proposals and recommends some to FACP for funding
May 19	FACP considers recommendations of Evaluation committee
June 30	

Evaluation committee:

Deans will appoint one faculty member per college except for A&S dean who shall appoint one for each of the areas humanities & fine and performing arts, science & mathematics, and social sciences. In addition, the University Librarian or her designate will represent the University Library. Faculty members should be recognized academic scholars and have a university perspective. No members of FACP are to be appointed to the Evaluation committee. After it has forwarded its recommendations for funding for programs to FACP, the Evaluation committee will prepare a written report for FACP and SPSC that details its reasoning for categorizing proposals for funding in FY '05 and for development as funding proposals in future years.