ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
Minutes of
October 8, 2003

Attendees: Lauren Adamson, Shelia Bradley, Mary Jane Casto, Ron Colarusso, Bill Fritz, Janice Griffith, Sid Harris, Ron Henry, Charlene Hurt, Susan Kelley, Greg Manning, John Marshall, Robert Moore, Carl Patton, Mike Perry, Nancy Peterman, Jerry Rackliffe, Sterling Roth, Hazel Scott, Edgar Torbert, Carol Winkler

Minutes of September 3 were approved with one correction of a name spelling (Shelia Bradley).

Gwinnett Basketball Doubleheader

Dr. Patton introduced Mr. Manning and Mr. Perry, who solicited assistance in filling the Gwinnett Civic Center arena for a December 1 basketball doubleheader with Mercer (women) and Tulsa (men). Mr. Perry stated Georgia State would have a competitive men’s team to play against the nationally ranked Tulsa team. He commented that the vision for a big-time basketball program remained even after the departure of “Lefty” Driesell. Mr. Manning noted the difficulty in drawing fans to come downtown for games, and the success of the soccer team in attracting fans to matches played in South Forsyth. He suggested the colleges could have booths at the Gwinnett doubleheader in the manner of those at the legislative events in the past. He observed the Gwinnett Civic Center arena is a first-class facility, comparable to Phillips Arena. He cited site costs of $25K, which would be covered by corporate sponsorships. Mr. Manning reminded that the women’s team had also had great success in recent years. Dr. Adamson asked about directions to the arena and availability of buses. Mr. Manning indicated plans were developing for shuttle buses from several points. He added that maps would be available as well for the Sugarloaf Parkway facility. Ms. Hurt asked about outlets for tickets. Mr. Manning replied that TicketMaster and the athletics department would be selling tickets. Dr. Torbert asked about inclusion of these games in the season ticket packages. Mr. Manning responded that a block of tickets had been reserved for season ticket holders as part of the package. Dr. Scott asked about the location of those tickets. Mr. Manning replied these would be in the middle section at center court. Dr. Patton noted Gwinnett County was a prime source of students for Georgia State, and this was an excellent opportunity to establish the Georgia State-brand in an area with many talented high school students. Dr. Fritz confirmed Gwinnett County as the home of top-five feeder high schools. Dr. Patton emphasized the importance of offsetting the University of Georgia presence in Gwinnett County at the Gwinnett Center.

President’s Remarks

Dr. Patton commented, “These were the best times; these were the worst of times.” He reported he was spending a lot of time with legislators and regents, whose decisions would strongly affect the future of Georgia State. He noted some long-range optimism, but general pessimism about the year ahead. He pointed to job growth and accuracy of projections as particular concerns. He noted legislators are more likely to direct funds to prisons and welfare than higher education, which is seen as a target for redirection. He cautioned that preserving the funding formula funds would be a challenge, since these funds would substantially address shortfalls in the rest of state government. On a positive note, Dr. Patton mentioned likely support of Governor Perdue for
capital projects in order to generate jobs. He reported the Board of Regents would be forwarding
10 projects with the Georgia State science teaching lab building at the 11th position. He
expressed hope that design funds would be allocated to the Georgia State project in order to
expedite construction, when the funds for construction are approved the following year. Dr.
Patton noted Chancellor Meredith had strongly urged funding for FY2005 salary increases, and
the K-12 sector was also applying pressure on Governor Perdue for raises in FY2005. Dr.
Patton stated these budgetary conditions warrant greater focus on core activities. He urged
efforts to get faculty and staff engaged in the life of the university by attending athletic and Rialto
events, etc. He observed the Miller and Haverty lecture series could have been better attended
by persons outside the host colleges. He reiterated the budget problems would be multi-year
and that Georgia State was in a better position than some other institutions in the University
System to deal with the challenges.

Dr. Griffith asked about the nature of the problems for other institutions. Dr. Patton responded
that those institutions lacked flexibility to avoid layoffs. Dr. Griffith asked how politicians would
respond to layoffs. Dr. Patton replied that some wanted “to see blood”. Dr. Griffith asked if any
of the institutions in this shape were other research universities. Dr. Patton responded none
were research universities.

Dr. Hurt encouraged attendance at the 90th anniversary celebration for Georgia State in Archives.

Dr. Adamson cited morale as a growing issue. She pointed to increased costs to employees for
recreation, parking, insurance, etc. while receiving no raises. Dr. Henry responded that emphasis
should be on the good fortune of having a job in tough economic times. Dr. Patton observed
students have a better understanding of fees than faculty and staff, with some thinking the state
pays for parking decks rather than revenue bonds. He added that the old recreation facility was
so simple that free use was reasonable, but newer faculty and staff only hear “the recreation
center” used to be free. Dr. Adamson reiterated concern about the concurrence of fee increases
and no raises, and called for creative support for staff.

Dr. Henry cautioned that health insurance would go up again January 1, 2004. He commented
that if the added cost is totally absorbed by the university, then the legislature will perceive the
current budget as fat and capable of also absorbing raises for the following year. He observed
higher education was riding the coattails of K-12 in pursuit of raise funding and not on its own a
priority with legislators.

Ms. Bradley urged sending out information to employees about the reasons for the increase in
parking rates. Dr. Patton pointed to repairs of several decks in the last year. Mr. Rackliffe
answered that rates had been set years in advance in order to cover debt payments,
administration, etc. and were discussed with various university committees. Dr. Patton added
that discounted MARTA cards were an option for employees. Mr. Rackliffe reported 9,000
MARTA cards were sold annually to faculty and staff. Ms. Bradley commented that the message
needed to be sent in a variety of ways because many faculty and staff delete GroupWise
Postmaster e-mails without reading them. Dr. Patton responded that college and vice
presidential area administrators should assist with this effort.

Dr. Adamson called for staff education programs to deal with the issues and referred to rational
reasons why morale was down. Ms. Casto recommended an article in the Villager. Dr. Winkler
suggested shifting focus to another topic since more money cannot be given. She mentioned dealing with how students treat staff.

**Budget and Enrollment Update**

Dr. Henry reported little new regarding the budget. He noted the record enrollment for fall 2003, and its concurrence with the 2.5% budget cut for FY2004 and an additional 5% for FY2005. He stated Chancellor Meredith had indicated to the State Office of Planning & Budget (OPB) that the 2.5% cut was passed through to the institutions because of the timing, but the 5% cut would be administered strategically with Special Funding Initiatives and the “B” budget as the first targets. He characterized this approach as sheltering a fair amount of the potential burden on the institutions and voiced optimism that there would be workload funds on the positive side of the ledger.

Dr. Griffith asked about the source of the 5% figure. Dr. Henry replied that the figure was based on revenue projections and was smaller in FY2004 than FY2005 because of a plan to delay funding for the last FY2004 payroll (June 30, 2004) until July 1, 2004, which would be in FY2005. Dr. Patton asked about the actual pay date for employees. Dr. Henry replied employees would be paid on time, but the university would not get the funds from the state for that payroll until July. Mr. Rackliffe commented that the state of Kansas had considered this gimmick last year and elected not to do it because of serious accounting issues. He expressed hope that Georgia would do likewise, although it might mean mean shifting the 5% cut to FY2004.

Dr. Patton observed the consensus in state government was that revenue was not rebounding to the pre-9/11 level. Dr. Moore agreed the consensus was no turnaround in sight. Mr. Rackliffe injected that the 2.5% cut in FY2004 might also reflect a willingness to draw from the state rainy day fund to some degree.

Ms. Bradley reported a statement had been made at the University System staff council to the effect that there would be no raises through FY2006. Dr. Henry responded this was just a rumor. Dr. Patton added there would likely be raises, but it was unclear how much.

Dr. Henry commented on a strategy of focusing on core programs and activities as the university enters the last decade of its first 100 years and introduced discussion of a draft “Process for establishing core programs and activities”. He indicated the concept had been discussed with the Senate strategic planning subcommittee with a reasonable criticism that there was no process defined. He noted the draft document was intended to lay out the process. Dr. Henry summarized the intent to define core programs and activities and then focus redirected or new funds accordingly. He spoke of a vision for the future for the university and the need to step back and look at the whole budget after a number of years of driving marginal increases on the basis of the strategic plan and enrollments. He announced the vice presidents and deans had already been asked to detail activities funded by state funds, indirect costs and student fees and to indicate how many staff are engaged in each of those activities. He said these responses would be the starting point for determining what is core and non-core. Dr. Henry reminded that for the 5% redirection in the 1990s, FACP set up task forces to look at target areas. He stated that this time the process would be more extensive with a bubbling-up flow. He pointed out the strategy of having non-core activities justified from a zero-funding level and core activities justified from an 85% funding level with decision packages beyond that. FACP would again set up task forces.
Dr. Patton asked about the timetable. Dr. Henry replied that the vice presidents and deans would be responding by October 17 and discussions would start shortly thereafter. He projected discussion with Administrative Council in November regarding core activities and with the Deans Group about core programs. Dr. Adamson asked about the separation of core activities from core programs. Dr. Henry acknowledged there would be linkages to consider. Dr. Adamson voiced concern about the workload with most staff involved in both academic programs and activities. Dr. Henry reacted that it would be a less complicated approach than perceived. He suggested comparisons of staff to faculty ratios for staff supporting instruction and research. Dr. Adamson asked how convergent decisions would be reached with different lenses on the same data. Dr. Henry responded that the primary focus would be on other support activities. Dr. Kelley asked about the timeline for determining core programs. Dr. Henry responded that this would be taken up at Deans Group as soon as possible. Dr. Kelley urged time for faculty input. Dr. Henry replied that there would be rapid determination of core and non-core programs and then more time for review of non-core with lots of input. Dr. Winkler asked if doctoral programs would be exempt. Dr. Henry confirmed.

Dr. Winkler questioned how units would be defined for this purpose. Dr. Henry responded that initially it would be by individual departments, but later effects on other departments would be examined. He noted interesting findings already among some Provost area departments as begin to get a handle on what they do.

Ms. Hurt pointed out a resolution for the next Senate meeting pertained to the evaluation of deans and the Provost regarding mandates of the action plans. Dr. Henry commented that resource allocations have been consistent with the action plans agreed upon with the Provost, but cannot always do these items with available resources. He noted some conflict with the Senate Committee on Budget principles of enrollment trends, leveraging external funds and research. He pointed out some colleges had action plans waiting in line and others not completed. Dr. Griffith observed that the common reaction would be no funding was the fault of the dean. Dr. Adamson commented that the resolution stemmed from the amount of work done by the departments to do the action plans and the decisions in good fiscal years. Dr. Henry stated each dean had the action plans as a top priority and had honored them accordingly. Dr. Adamson noted a sense among some of other budget processes at work, which sometimes wash over the action plans. She added that action plans were important to departments, but there were issues of whether the time was well spent. Ms. Hurt commented this requirement might make recruitment of deans more difficult.

Ms. Hurt made a motion to endorse the core activities and programs process proposed by Dr. Henry. Dr. Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Announcements

Dr. Henry announced the Student Government Association had recommended approval of a $35 library fee to fund renovations. Ms. Hurt called attention to an article in the Signal about the plans to transform the library and a gift from Dr. and Mrs. Patton for the children’s collection.

Dr. Henry announced Dr. Harris would be stepping down as dean of the Robinson College of