Minutes of meeting of August 27, 2003
The minutes of August 27, 2003 meeting were approved as distributed.

Quick Review of the Petition Process
George reviewed the petition process passed by the Senate a couple years ago. When a student petitions Admissions and Standards, the chair of the committee selects a subcommittee of himself and two other faculty members. One of the other members must be from the college of the student who is petitioning and the other must be from a different college. The chair sends out an e-mail asking if they want to serve on the subcommittee. Then the chair writes a memo with his vote on the issue. This memo and the petition documents are sent to the members of the subcommittee by the committee recorder. The members read the materials and send their votes to the chair. If all three members vote the same way, then the subcommittee does not meet. If there are differing votes or any member of the subcommittee wants to meet, then the subcommittee meets to discuss the petition. The subcommittee's decision on the petition cannot be appealed to the full committee but can be appealed to the Provost.

After the subcommittee makes its decision, the chair writes a memo to the full committee informing everyone of the subcommittee's decision. This memo is just an information item and no further action is required. However, if a committee member wants to discuss the subcommittee's decision, George will add it to the agenda of the next Admissions & Standards meeting.

EMC is the Enrollment Management Committee chaired by the Provost and composed of various faculty members, senate chairs and other seats by titles. This committee can raise enrollment requirements above the Senate minimum.

EMG is the Enrollment Management Group chaired by the Associate Provost and composed of directors of the enrollment services units, Chairs of Faculty Affairs and Admissions and Standards and others who work together as a group coordinating student activities. This group does not make academic policy, however, about 1/3 of issues come from EMG to Admissions and Standards.

Announcement on Policy on Declaring a Major
As an information item, the policy on declaring a major, passed by the Senate in Fall 2001, was left out of the catalog. It will be in the next catalog and will be enforced Fall 2004. Briefly, the policy requires all students with 60 or more hours to have declared a major.

Motion on the Composition and Duties of Admissions and Standards
The Committee approved the motion, as a recommendation to the Committee on Statutes and Bylaws, to change the composition and duties of the Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards as indicated below. The title of the Director of Admissions will be researched to clarify the correct title (Director of Admissions vs. Director of Undergraduate Admissions) and recorded accordingly.

Motion: The composition and duties of the Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards is changed as indicated below. Additions Deletions

Composition
The Committee on Admissions and Standards shall be composed of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies; the Vice President for Student Services; the Dean of Students; the Director of Admissions; the Registrar; the Director of Financial Aid; the Director of the Student Advisement Center; one staff member who is an elected staff member of the Senate; one student who is a member of the Senate; and at least eighteen (18) faculty members, as follows: three (3) members each from the College of Arts and Sciences, the J. Mack Robinson College of Business, and the College of Education; one (1) member each from the College of Health and Human Sciences, the College of Law, the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies; with the remainder elected at large.

Duties
The duties of this committee shall include responsibility for reviewing the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and of other relevant accrediting agencies; for reviewing the curriculum in comparison with requirements in other institutions of the Southern Association; for reviewing the standing of the University in the educational world.

The committee shall review and recommend to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the University Senate (1) changes in requirements and standards for admission to the university's undergraduate degree programs, (2) policies regarding enrollment management, (3) requirements for undergraduate graduation; (4) quality of instruction, (5) instructor load, (6) grades and the grading system, and (7) academic calendar.

Data:
The current composition is 18 faculty, 4 staff, 1 student.
The proposed composition is 18 faculty, 8 staff, 1 student.

Rationale for Composition Changes:
The proposed additions bring the composition stated in the Bylaws more in line with the actual attendance at the meetings. The Provost has only attended once in the past five years. The Associate Provost and the other staff additions proposed always attend.

Rationale for Duties Change:
This brings the Bylaws in line with long-standing practice.

Motion on GSU 1010 and the 120 Hour Requirement
The motion to allow GSU 1010 to count towards the 120 hours required for graduation was passed with a divided vote among the committee members. Consensus was not reached that an orientation course should be allowed to count toward a degree program. Unless subsequent research requires Area F proposals be approved by the Board of Regents, if the Senate approves the recommendation, it will be effective immediately and grandfathered in for any student who took GSU 1010.

Motion: Section 1370.20 of the Catalog, Semester Hours Requirement, is amended as indicated:
The curriculum for a baccalaureate degree at Georgia State University requires a minimum of 120 semester hours. [...] The semester hours for graduation are calculated as follows:

Semester hours included:
- Academic credit (transfer and Georgia State) in which grades A, B, C, D, S, or P are earned (except as excluded below) and
- Credit earned through the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP), Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB) and any other approved credit-by-examination.

Semester hours excluded:
- All hours earned in courses that are repeated except the final attempt.
- Learning Support Program credit below the 1000 level (previously Developmental Studies; course prefix DS).
- New Student Orientation Academic Success courses: GSU 1010, GSU 1050, and GSU 1060.
- English-as-a-Second Language credit below the 1000 level.
- Physical education A-skills@ courses KH 1010, 1020, 1030 (previous course prefixes: HPRD, HPRS, PE).
- Military science courses at the 1000 and 2000 level
- All hours earned in courses which are required of a student to meet College Preparatory Curriculum deficiencies.

Rationale:
The effect of the motion is to allow GSU 1010 to count towards the 120 hours required for graduation. It would also allow departments to give credit for GSU 1010 in Area F of their major programs. Current university policy does not allow departments to count GSU 1010 in Area F. Note that this change would have no practical effect for students in those programs of study which have no free electives.

This change would have two beneficial effects:
- it would validate GSU 1010 in the eyes of students because it would be a "real" course which, depending on their major, could count towards graduation.
- it would allow departments to count GSU 1010 in Area F. It seems reasonable to allow departments to do this when, in the judgment of the department, GSU 1010 is related to their major(s).

Budget issues
As feedback to the Budget Priorities Subcommittee of the Budget Committee regarding the process for establishing core programs and activities as approved by Administrative Council, a motion was approved to support the APACE resolution expressing concern about how fast the process is going and the extent of faculty involvement and requesting more time and deliberation. John Newman will wordsmith the resolution and send to George for redistribution to the committee to make sure wording is as understood and approved.

Process for establishing core programs and activities
Approved by Administrative Council October 8, 2003

The University is engaged in a refinement of its vision; in particular what should be our vision for 2013, our Centennial Vision? One answer is to focus on quality B 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.

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 core undergraduate and masters programs and core activities. Programs of distinction will focus primarily on research and doctoral programs. A solicitation of ideas for areas of focus that have potential for excellence and that build on the advantages of being in Atlanta will be made separately.

The university is engaged in identifying core undergraduate and masters programs and core 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.

One task is to determine which academic programs are core B are essential to our existence. Do most universities offer such a major in an academic program, how many students elect it here, how essential is it to our basic freshman/sophomore education program, is it necessary to accomplish the goals of other Acoren areas, is it necessary to support our main Aemphasis, etc.? In addition, at least three basic elements distinguish a college from a university: Research faculty, research degrees and graduate programs of distinction, and professional degrees at the graduate and undergraduate level. Also, does the program take advantage of our Atlanta location?

A second task will be to determine our core activities. How is the activity related to the core mission of the institution B student learning (transmitting knowledge to students), generation of new knowledge (generating knowledge), economic development for the state, community engagement or public good (packaging and supplying knowledge to the community)?

As we refine our ideas of core programs and activities, we need to be aware of the Budget Management Principles issued the Chancellor on August 21, 2003. They include, in part:

1. The University System must focus its resources and energy on its core mission. The University System cannot things to all people=; an institution cannot be >all things to all people<.
2. Given limited resources, it is imperative to find ways to shift more resources to instruction to serve students and create a more educated Georgia. At the research universities, high quality instruction and research take precedence over all other activities.
3. Institutions exist first and foremost to serve students. Direct academic and student support services take precedence over other institutional functions.
4. Within an institution and across instructional programs, high-enrollment, high-graduation programs usually take precedence over low-demand, low-graduation programs.
5. Broad teaching, research, and service activities that serve larger numbers of students and residents take precedence over more targeted teaching, research, and service activities that serve fewer numbers of students and residents.
6. Selected enrollment limits are preferable to a reduction in the quality of classroom instruction.
7. There is a point at which programmatic reductions are preferable to across-the-board austerity measures. Reductions that eliminate costs are preferable to those that merely shift or defer them.

In addition to the Chancellor’s Principles, in the past several years our Action Plan has included the following principle setting budget priorities:

- For academic units, enrollment trends, program quality, external support, and research productivity should be considered.
- For non-academic cost centers in support areas, reduced support should be given to those areas with higher comparable institutions and to those less effective/efficient or central to the strategic plan.
- For auxiliary units where revenues exceed projections, state funds may be shifted away from their support, depending on auxiliary fund balances.

Some processes or activities directly support the academic enterprise or ADirect academic and student support services from the Chancellor’s list; for example: research administration support or support of student learning
outcomes. Other processes enable the institution to operate; they include activities such as paying employees, purchasing and paying for goods, and providing technology infrastructure. Processes that provide direct support or background operational support could be either core or non-core activities.

Process for determining core academic programs:
   The deans, in conjunction with their department chairs and faculty, will propose a draft list of core and non-core undergraduate and masters programs for their colleges.
   Deans Group will refine the draft list of core and non-core academic programs.
   Using the Chancellor’s principles, high-enrollment, high-graduation programs will have a higher priority over low demand, low-graduation programs.

Process for determining core activities:
   The deans and vice presidents, in conjunction with their unit heads, will propose a draft list of direct support, background support, and other activities for their divisions. This list will be further classified into core and non-core activities for their divisions.
   Administrative Council will refine the draft list of core and non-core activities.
   Using the Chancellor’s principles, direct academic and student support should have the highest priority. Further, those activities that serve a large number of students and residents should be given preference.

Process for examining budgets:
   All non-core programs and activities will undergo zero-based budgeting (ZBB). B budgets will have to be justified from scratch. All core programs and activities will start with budget assumed at a skeletal level of 85% of current budget (SBB).
   Decision packages will be developed for activities or programs beyond the minimum included for a unit under or SBB. A decision package is a document that identifies and describes a specific activity or program that, when isolated, has minimum impact on other components within a unit.
   Units will rank decision packages in order of importance for current as well as proposed activities or programs.
   Deans and vice presidents will evaluate decision packages, rank them against other activities and programs for limited resources within the college or division, and recommend approval or disapproval.
   FACP will establish task forces to make recommendations to FACP on decision packages. Each task force will include members of FACP, a senior administrator for areas under review, a senior administrator not immediately responsible for areas under review, and faculty and staff from appropriate Senate committees. Note that FACP has formal representation from Deans Group, vice presidents, Senate budget committee, Senate planning & development committee, staff council, and SGA as well as two senators elected by the Senate council of chairs. Examples of task forces with Senate committee involvement include:
      Academic programs B APACE, Research
      Student services B Student Life & Development
      Finance & Administration B P&D, Budget
      Faculty and staff support B Faculty Affairs, Staff Council

Feedback to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of Planning and Development
The Committee agreed to follow P&D directive requesting clarification before providing feedback.

RFP B Potential areas of focus, October 2003

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 B 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.

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 core undergraduate and masters programs and core activities. The university is engaged in identifying core undergraduate and masters programs and core 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.

The University is committed to providing funding to enhance development of programs of distinction in areas identified as strategically important. This involves developing select graduate programs of true distinction and attracting 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 are expected to be in the range of $2-4M. Proposals should first 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. Your proposal for an area of focus is due to the Provost’s office by XXX.

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

8. Does the proposal support programs of strategic importance?
9. 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)
10. What resources are currently available for the program? (Quality and size of space and facilities, library holdings)
11. What new resources will be required for further development of the program?
12. What is the potential for extramural support to further the development of the program's federal, state, business, development?
13. What is the level of support for the program from its college/colleges?
14. How well does the program connect with partners and collaborators in the Atlanta region and beyond Georgia, or v economic development in the region and state?
15. How does the program leverage comparative advantages of being in Atlanta?
16. What are the external demand indicators, both quantitative and qualitative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>LAW</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1984</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1985</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1986</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1987</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1988</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1989</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1990</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1991</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1992</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1993</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1994</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 1995</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on and feedback to the Core Web project, a project to redesign GSU’s web pages
Discussion on the Core Web team’s selected modified version of ACampus: Atlanta@ was tabled until the next meeting.