Minutes of June 11 & 13, 2003

Members Attending: John de Castro, Sid Harris, Ron Henry, Fenwick Huss, Fred Jacobs, Susan Kelley, Tom Lewis, Phillip Mitchem, Jerry Rackliffe, P.C. Tai

Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, Gwen Benson, Ron Colarusso, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Steve Kaminshine, Robert Moore, Chris Taylor, Edgar Torbert

Minutes of May 22 were approved as presented.

Dr. Henry opened discussion by presenting his recommendations for the “allocation” of the $2.1M in new funding placed in a holding account pending possible budget cuts in September. Dr. Henry prefaced his remarks by characterizing the $2.2M in new funding already distributed to the colleges for unmet demand as a proxy for new workload funds. He pointed out that of the 128.8K credit hours added over the last 3 years, only 4.7K were attributable to tenure track faculty. He also noted this as an indicator of the serious shortage of tenure track faculty positions.

Dr. Henry remarked that his recommendations for allocating the $2.1M holding account were driven by the strategic plan and action plans. He observed that in the 1990s when new funds were plentiful, allocations had been driven by the strategic plan and action plans, not credit hours. He added that he had not looked at percentages of new funding by college when making his recommendations. He emphasized that $2.1M was woefully short of the amount needed to address the needs of the colleges and vice presidential areas.

Dr. Harris asked for a summary of the unmet demand allocations to the colleges. Dr. Henry listed the amounts as $1.53M for Arts and Sciences, $355K for Business, $118K for Health and Human Sciences, $154K for Policy Studies and $41K for Law. Dr. de Castro asserted these amounts did not cover the full cost to the colleges of the additional teaching capacity. Dr. Tai agreed that producing the additional credit hours had also taxed staff and non-personnel budgets.

Dr. Henry noted the decrease in the number of tenure track faculty in Business. Dr. Harris commented on the generational shift in the faculty with retirements of faculty who carried heavier than average teaching loads. Dr. Huss elaborated that dollars freed by retirements covered on a fraction of the replacements.

Dr. de Castro presented his recommendations for the $2.1M holding account. He explained his recommendations were based on the split between increased revenues due to enrollment increases ($9.3M) and tuition increases ($9.7M) with the colleges sharing the enrollment increase proportion of the $2.1M ($1.03M) by percentage of the enrollment increase and all units sharing the tuition increase proportion of the $2.1M ($1.07M) by percentage of budget. He noted his decision to allocate the amounts as lump sums to the colleges and vice presidential areas given the requests were reasonable and in order not to second-guess the unit heads.

Dr. Tai presented his recommendations for the $2.1M holding account. He observed his approach was very similar to that of Dr. de Castro although he used a straight 50-50 split of the new funds and used total credit hours rather than increased credit hours as the basis for allocating funds.
among the colleges. He added that he boosted the share of new funds for Research, which had lagged behind other units in new funding in recent years in spite of increasing sponsored program activity. He recommended targeting these funds to enhance the internal grant program.

Mr. Rackliffe commented that he liked the lump sum approach, and asked how Dr. Tai had derived his recommended funding amounts for specific items. Dr. Tai indicated he generally funded first requests at 100%, and second and third requests at 75% and 50%, until the unit allocations were exhausted.

Dr. Huss presented his recommendations for the $2.1M holding account. He noted the unmet demand allocations had at least partially taken into account enrollment gains, and he focused on allocations to enhance the research university mission. Dr. Harris seconded the recommendations of Dr. Huss.

Dr. Jacobs presented his recommendations for the $2.1M holding account. He emphasized addition of tenure track faculty positions and pointed out the need was universal.

Dr. Kelley presented her recommendations for the $2.1M holding account as reflective of discussions by 5 of the 6 deans about the allocations. She pointed to a dual approach of rewarding enrollment growth and addressing action plans. She noted similarities to the approach of Dr. de Castro, but with $500K distributed for enrollment growth rather than $1.03M. Dr. Kelley also recommended additional funding for the libraries. Dr. de Castro stated he had copied the deans with the exception of deriving the $1.03M figure rationally rather than using an arbitrary figure of $500K.

Mr. Mitchem presented his recommendations for the $2.1M holding account. He spoke in favor of the lump sum approach. He explained his allocation scheme based on allocations toward all first priorities at 75% level to stay within $2.1M and to give each of the colleges at least two tenure track faculty positions.

Mr. Rackliffe presented his recommendations for the $2.1M holding account based on a 2:1 distribution of new funds to colleges (1.04%) and vice presidential areas (0.52%) applying the 2:1 percentages to current budgets including fringe benefits. He made adjustments to the straight calculations based on natural cutoffs for items requested and the premise that end-of-year funding was appropriate for the libraries. He noted the 1:2 approach had been used for budget reductions in recent years and advocated use of its inverse for budget additions. He commented that credit hour increases should be addressed long-term while using unmet demand funds for that purpose this year.

Dr. Adamson commented that the unmet demand amounts had gradually built up with little new money for the coming year. Dr. Henry replied that the new funds totaled $500K.

Dr. Adamson expressed concern about funding patterns, which diminished opportunities to hire tenure track faculty. She mentioned in particular moving off-budget items to on-budget. Dr. Henry countered that the off-budget approach was also a slippery slope. He added that investing in tenure track faculty positions was clearly the consensus. Dr. Henry noted the need to decide how to split new funds between the colleges and the rest of the university. He reminded that the
headcount increase of 5,000 students was a factor as well as the credit hour increase.

Dr. Colarusso injected that enrollment (headcount) increase, as opposed to credit hour increase, was the case for Education. He cited an enrollment increase of 17%, while credit hours had slipped due to credit hour caps on program sizes and the shift of content courses to Arts & Sciences. He added that field courses required more faculty time, as did new requirements from the Board of Regents and outside agencies.

Dr. Kaminshine commended the method proposed by Mr. Rackliffe to divide funds between academic and non-academic units taking into account academic support. Dr. de Castro acknowledged the Rackliffe approach was similar to his own in giving weight to credit hours.

Dr. Henry commented that the shift away from tenure track faculty taught credit hours would likely worsen in the next two years in Business, Health and Human Sciences, Law, and Arts and Sciences. He cautioned against being driven completely by enrollment and credit hours, which would make the mission only to enroll more students. He urged attention to the future well-being of the university.

Dr. Henry noted Law had accomplished increased credit hours with the same number of tenure track faculty as 3 years ago. He credited Policy Studies with the same in spite of a very small faculty. Dr. Harris commented that Business tenure track faculty had also been asked to teach more. Dr. Henry reiterated the need for more tenure track faculty positions across the university and the connection between ratcheting up quality and adding tenure track faculty.

Dr. de Castro agreed with the points made about tenure track faculty, but pointed out the great change in enrollments had created stress which needed to be addressed before moving to strategically based allocations. Dr. Henry suggested adding additional credit hours taught by non-tenure track faculty to his table showing additional credit hours taught by tenure track faculty.

Dr. Tai spoke for looking at 50-50 split for enrollment versus other factors and considering total enrollments, not just increases. He noted difficulties for the lab sciences caused by overall enrollment, not just recent increases.

Dr. Adamson commented that the recommendations from all except Dr. Henry and Mr. Mitchem were fairly similar in funding amounts at the college and vice presidential levels even with different approaches. She suggested working toward consensus on those similar amounts and not questioning rationale of unit heads about how to spend specifically. She noted the range of recommendations for tenure track faculty positions for Arts and Sciences was from 2 to 12.

Dr. Harris observed unmet demand funding created capacity, and he suggested other allocations to increase capacity could be offset by reductions in unmet demand funding. He posed the issue of how fast conversion from non-tenure track faculty positions to tenure track faculty positions could be programmed without losing capacity. Dr. Henry noted colleges could convert positions with current funds at their discretion.

Dr. Adamson stated Arts and Sciences was caught in the middle because of the number of visiting faculty. Dr. Henry identified the action plans as a confounding piece since action plans do not
address conversion. Dr. Adamson pointed out the History action plan as an exception. Dr. Henry clarified that most action plans entail new positions. Dr. Harris commented that the budgetary environment had changed considerably since many action plans were developed. He predicted a consistent budgetary situation for the next 3-5 years.

Dr. de Castro voiced concern that while action plans are important, enrollment increases had created budgetary problems for many units, which if not addressed would punish those units. He called for adjustments to level the playing field.

Dr. Kamrinshine asked about the average salary for visiting faculty. Dr. Adamson quoted $33.5K for fulltime visiting lecturers. Dr. Henry added that while the salaries were in the range of 70-75% of entry-level new faculty for those departments, the teaching loads were double for the visiting lecturers, so that it took 8-9 non-tenure track positions to fund 3 tenure track positions.

Dr. Kamrinshine commented that the scarcity of new funds ($2.1M) against the magnitude of the backfill associated with enrollment growth commended using the new funds for strategic initiatives, which would have immediate impact. He recommended waiting until significant new dollars were available to address such backfill. Dr. Huss observed all the colleges shared the goal of increasing coverage of instruction by tenure track faculty. He pointed out Business was using PTIs heavily rather than visiting lecturers.

Dr. de Castro stated there was a great deal of consensus among the members, and that the discussion had reached “quibbling over crumbs.” Dr. Adamson reacted that the crumbs were also symbols, and that the academic community was in need of morale builders. She added that without the enrollment surge, the discussion would have been about how to cut.

Dr. de Castro made a motion to allocate the $2.1M based on $750K for enrollment growth and the remainder on unit share of budget. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion.

Dr. Kamrinshine questioned $750K as the enrollment growth component, stating the deans had arrived at $500K as a healthy balance. Dr. Henry suggested postponing action for a few days in order to have exact allocation figures and look at the impact on college priorities. Dr. de Castro withdrew his motion.

[end of July 11 portion of meeting]

Dr. Henry presented (1) an allocation methodology using a $500K enrollment growth component in the de Castro model and averaging with the Rackliffe model and (2) revised funding recommendations based fitting top priorities of the units to the figures from the hybrid model. He also proposed increasing the end-of-year allocations for library acquisitions to $1.3M for Pullen and $156K for Law.

Dr. de Castro presented an allocation methodology using a $750K enrollment growth component in his model and averaging with the Rackliffe model. He advocated this approach to replace more of the money spent by units, which generated the additional credit hours.

Dr. Henry stated the $500K enrollment growth component was the figure recommended by the
Deans’ Group. Dr. de Castro responded that the figure was arbitrary. Dr. Kaminshine replied that the deans wanted to include factors other than credit hours. Dr. Huss emphasized the need to take a step toward increasing the number of tenure track faculty positions.

Dr. Adamson noted other means of increasing credit hours such as increasing class section sizes.

Dr. Henry cited the commonality of increasing tenure track faculty positions and the percentage of instruction by tenure track faculty. He noted higher teaching loads on tenure track faculty than 4 years ago. He pointed out the difference with the $750K model was Arts and Sciences got more and everyone else less. He observed the $500K model would funds the top two priorities for Arts and Sciences and most of the top priorities for the other units.

Dr. de Castro reiterated that Arts and Sciences had produced 70% of the new credit hours and by so doing was protecting all other units from cuts. Dr. Huss observed Arts and Sciences had received $2M in unmet demand plus over $3M in other new funds. Dr. Tai noted he had also used the $1M enrollment growth component, and that $750K should be viewed as the compromise figure.

Ms. Hurt explained the library paid more for data bases because of the increase in the number of students. She projected the same was true for some ISAT software licenses, and for enrollment services. Dr. de Castro voiced support for the recommendation from Dr. Henry for increasing the library acquisition shares from end-of-year funds.

Dr. Harris stated his comfort with either the $500K or $750K model, saying either would spread dollars across the campus.

Dr. Kaminshine commented that the portion of the distribution based on share of budget also reflected credit hour production to some extent. Dr. Adamson countered that it was unclear what this portion would mean with so much history in prior allocations and the large off-budget segment of overall spending.

Dr. de Castro suggested a look at the proportion of the budget by college versus credit hour production by college. He cited figures of 40% and 60% respectively for Arts and Sciences.

Mr. Mitchem commented that the Rackliffe model of allocating 2:1 to academic versus non-academic units would eventually eliminate non-academic units in tandem with the history of cutting 2:1 non-academic versus academic units.

Dr. de Castro made a motion to use the $750K model averaged with the Rackliffe model. Dr. Tai seconded the motion. The motion failed.

Dr. Harris made a motion to use the $500K model averaged with the Rackliffe model. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry invited discussion of recommendations for allocating the funds against specific requests from the colleges and vice presidential areas. He proposed his recommendations as a starting point for discussion.
Dr. Tai offered that unit heads might be given discretion instead of specifying items for funding. Dr. Henry replied that in past funding had been on a line item basis. Dr. Tai noted funding needs for research support. He pointed to Research as a revenue-producing unit and deserving of special consideration. Dr. Henry agreed noting this was an example of a negative of using formula based on past history. He added that indirect costs were up like credit hours.

Dr. Kelley spoke in favor of leaving allocations to unit heads since funds would likely not be realized until FY2005. She commented that priorities could change in the course of the year. Dr. Henry suggested this might be a time to initiate discussion of zero-based budgeting.

Dr. Kaminshine observed that line item allocations were helpful in tracking progress on action plans.

Dr. Adamson recommended the deans be allowed flexibility to target funds for tenure track faculty since it was uncertain which searches would yield results. She commented that there were different strategies among the deans for doing this. Dr. Henry echoed this point.

Dr. Tai asked if the Provost budget could assist Research. Dr. Henry replied that the money was in the colleges. He noted help with compliance oversight. Dr. Tai urged funds for the internal grant programs. Dr. Henry pointed out that GSU Research Foundation was helping with some new positions in Research.

Dr. Harris supported Dr. Adamson regarding flexibility for deans to address tenure track faculty positions.

Dr. Tai made a motion to accept the recommendations by Dr. Henry with the proviso of flexibility for deans in filling tenure track faculty positions. Dr. Huss seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry reminded that this new money was not available for spending in FY2004.

Dr. Harris made a motion to accept the recommendation of Dr. Henry for increasing end-of-year allocations for library acquisitions. Dr. Huss seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Rackliffe for information about the FY2003 end-of-year sweep. Mr. Rackliffe responded that it was too early to ascertain. He noted $4M in flip-flops for various units. Dr. Henry recommended maximizing the flip-flop in order to provide a cushion against cuts in FY2004.
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