Minutes of December 8, 2000 were approved as distributed.

Presentation to Board of Regents Staff

Dr. Henry opened discussion of the draft of “Budget Issues and Priorities to System, Georgia State University, January 11, 2001”, which would be presented to Board of Regents staff. He explained the document was structured to match as closely as possible with Board of Regents budget requests to the Governor and legislature.

Dr. Henry indicated that new funding prospects for FY2002 were difficult to ascertain at this point, but information had been received about the FY2001 supplemental budget under consideration by the legislature. He noted the supplemental budget proposed by the Governor included $3.16M to match the FY2000 carryforward related to health plan costs, $15M for University System-wide health plan costs, and funds for the Pullen Library brick facade remediation. Mr. Lewis added that the supplemental budget included an additional $2M for the Wachovia Building project, which would be transferred directly to the Georgia Building Authority rather than through the University System or university. Dr. de Castro asked about the status of the Fairlie-Poplar parking deck payback bond request. Mr. Lewis replied this item had not appeared in the materials he had seen, and he assumed because of the economy, there was increased resistance to incurring more bond indebtedness at the state level. He stated he would make follow-up inquiries about the parking deck request.

Dr. Henry pointed out the acronym, TEEMS, in the section on teacher preparation initiatives stood for: Teacher Education Environment in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. He elaborated that this initiative in the Board of Regents budget request targeted funds for four senior faculty positions at Georgia State in mathematics, science and languages.

Dr. Huss asked about the role of Georgia College & State University (GC&SU) as singled out in the Board of Regents budget requests. Dr. Henry replied that GC&SU was seeking recognition as the liberal arts institution of the University System.

Dr. Henry outlined sections of the document pertaining to the University Strategic Plan and Action...
Plan, the $7M structural deficit, updated student credit hour counts, the Biomedical Services Network, and P-16 initiatives.

Dr. de Castro suggested changing the statement about major thrusts in research and scholarship to be parallel with respect to areas mentioned (e.g., not to list biological sciences and then all of business). Dr. Henry stated the reference to business was intended to focus on e-commerce and the reference to policy initiatives to be university-wide. Dr. de Castro offered language such as: “...support areas of strength within Arts and Sciences, including biological sciences; within Business, including e-commerce,...” Ms. Williams added: “...support university-wide policy and P-16 initiatives and college areas of strength within Arts and Sciences,....”

Dr. Huss raised a question about potential involvement in ICAPP funding as related to promoting partnerships with companies in the Alpharetta corridor. Dr. Henry responded the funds had been historically targeted for specific companies and partnerships with University System institutions outside metropolitan Atlanta.

Dr. Henry continued outlining sections of the document pertaining to student learning, recruitment goals, and continuation and expansion of Advanced Learning Communities. Dr. Jacobs asked about the reference to gatekeeper courses. Dr. Henry replied these were courses with high rates of grades of D, F or W, and initial strategies were applied to mathematics, with others such as accounting to follow.

Dr. Henry again continued outlining sections of the document pertaining to academic program review, ISAT, accountability and the data warehouse concept, facilities including OMP for the new recreation center and 10 Park Place non-tenure track faculty offices, and student fees including the graduated fee concept. Mr. Rackliffe advised the graduated fee scale had been determined as a base of $165 plus $18 per hour, up to 12 hours, which would set the plateau at $381. Mr. Rackliffe added that implementation of the request would be contingent upon patching the student billing software for this purpose. Ms. Dennis suggested mentioning the MARTA discount program in the student fee section. Dr. Henry responded that the MARTA program would be part of the oral presentation.

Dr. de Castro questioned whether the presentation might infer new funds were not needed, because initiatives would be funded internally. He suggested adding Action Plan cost figures. He also suggested adding a statement about graduate student support relating to breakout sections for large enrollment classes in order to improve retention.

Dr. Huss asked about the perceptions of the Board of Regents regarding progress in improving student quality, given the newspaper article showing SATs slightly down this fall. Dr. Henry replied this would be addressed orally and with reference to a chart showing strong progress toward meeting the new Freshman Index minimum.

Dr. de Castro asked about tying academic program review to requests for new faculty positions. Dr. Henry responded that this meeting with the Board of Regents staff was a more general budget discussion, not just budget requests. He noted the new dollars were not available as in prior years and any new dollars were more likely to be directed to system-level initiatives and kept at the system level rather than allocated to individual campuses in the original budget. He added that the
budget was more and more enrollment driven with fewer extra dollars for specific campus initiatives. He noted an overriding problem was the failure to recover credit hours system-wide after three years. Mr. Lewis echoed these points.

Dr. Jacobs asked what was expected out the meeting with Board of Regents staff. Dr. Henry stated the primary objective of providing the new people at the Board of Regents with information about progress being made, program quality, and internal planning processes and budget linkages. He noted the need to impress upon them the importance of dealing with the $7M structural deficit in the current budget. Mr. Rackcliffe urged making the $900K request for OMP for the new recreation center since it was not tied to credit hours. Dr. de Castro spoke for using the Strategic Plan, Action Plan, etc. as the framework for the presentation since target initiatives were no longer the winning formula. Dr. Henry added that Georgia Research Alliance and Yamacraw were other elements of funding which would be addressed.

Ms. Williams corrected the years listed in the appendix with decreasing numbers of PTIs.

**VP and Dean Budget Discussions**

Dr. Henry announced budget discussions with the vice presidents and deans would be held February 7-9. He indicated guidance would be given regarding the presentations on the basis of any clues obtained through the meeting with Board of Regents staff and from the budget submitted by the Governor.

Dr. Jacobs asked about concerns in state government over an economic downturn. Mr. Lewis responded that there had been an alarming number of layoffs across the state, and state budget officials were bracing for revenue impacts. He projected a smaller supplemental budget next year and some reduction in capital project funding. Dr. de Castro pointed out the upside of increased enrollments in economic down times. Dr. Jacobs commented on the swift descent of revenues in such circumstances. Dr. de Castro asked about internal redirection. Dr. Henry replied it was generally a healthy approach, but after several years of redirection the flexibility had been exhausted.
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