Minutes of December 10 were approved as presented.

Dr. Henry presented the document, “Budget Plan for FY 2005, Georgia State University, January 15, 2004 – Draft 1”. He explained this was an annual requirement (due January 15), along with a meeting (in February) with Board of Regents staff to discuss the contents. He highlighted the paragraph under “Opportunities and challenges faced by Georgia State” pertaining to the need for more tenure-track faculty. He noted fall semester 2003 saw the first growth in 5 years in the percentage of credit hours taught by tenure-track faculty. Dr. Henry pointed out the paragraph under “Formula Earnings” stating the 80% pass-through of workload funds would offset the 2.5% and 5% budget reductions. He reminded that the first two priorities for strategic allocations (strengthening undergraduate programs and enhancements to academic programs) were the same as the previous year, but with the added linkage to areas of focus initiatives. He called attention to new third and fourth priorities concerning libraries and internal grants/research infrastructure support.

Dr. Hudson questioned combining credit hours taught by PTIs and GTAs in the paragraph about the need for tenure-track faculty. He cited the use of GTAs as part of the mission as a graduate institution. Dr. Adamson echoed this point with respect to wanting more tenure-track faculty, but not at the expense of GTAs. She observed this reference to GTAs might appear counter to the request for funds for graduate student support. Dr. Henry commented that the graduate student support would be primarily for GRAs. Dr. Hudson asked about separating credit hours taught by visiting faculty. Dr. Henry responded that course data was not cut by this descriptor. Dr. Henry added that the impact of full-time, non-tenure track faculty should be positive. Dr. Fritz suggested adding an explicit statement regarding GTAs and the institutional mission and then split the percentages of credit hours taught between PTIs and GTAs.

Dr. Adamson suggested adding more to the first paragraph of the document regarding the distinctiveness of Georgia State.

Dr. Henry agreed to split out the percentages of credit hours taught by PTIs and GTAs. Mr. Rackliffe asked about the value of showing only 10% taught by PTIs. Dr. Hudson replied that 10% was high for a research university and would be much higher than the University of Georgia. Dr. Adamson added that the number of core courses taught by PTIs was even more disturbing. Dr. Hudson reiterated the importance of the focus on increasing the number of tenure-track faculty.

Dr. Henry indicated the third and fourth priorities for strategic allocations (libraries, internal grants/research infrastructure support) would be fleshed out from the text of the document, “Subcommittee on Budget Principles and Priorities Report: December 16, 2003” from the Senate
Dr. Henry presented the document, “Guidelines for evaluation of academic programs and centers, December, 2003 – Draft 2”. Dr. Kaminshine commented that the positioning of the criterion pertaining to diversity seemed odd. Dr. Adamson suggested the statement on diversity be moved to the section on centrality along with a statement concerning internationalization.

Dr. Colarusso asked how the points for quality, centrality, etc. would work. Dr. Henry replied that these would be used to normalize results among the evaluation teams (not as cutoffs for program eliminations) and to provide some weighting of the criteria. Dr. Colarusso commented that the fifth factor, available resources, would be difficult to break out from departmental budgets. Dr. Henry responded that the questions in this section were intended to tease out the details, in particular for human capital and facilities.

Dr. Henry presented the document, “Guidelines for Area of Focus pre-proposals and proposals, December 2003 - Draft 5”. He noted the item pertaining to budget had been changed to call for comments rather than a point total. Dr. Adamson commented that it would be impossible to cover all the items in only three pages. She suggested deleting the item concerning the management plan from the pre-proposal. Dr. Henry accepted this change.

Dr. Jacobs suggested evaluating the pre-proposals on strategic vision and newness, rather than followship, with attention to enhancing the reputation of the university with big, bold new ideas, rather than striving to become like “XYZ University”. Dr. Jacobs proposed adding a question about innovativeness to place the burden on the writers, not the readers, to substantiate this quality of the pre-proposal.

Dr. Kaminshine expressed uneasiness about the limit of three pages and having enough information to distinguish pre-proposals. He suggested allowing four pages. Dr. Fritz observed that FIPSE allowed proposals without pre-proposals. Dr. Henry reacted that in the first year of this process all proposals should be initiated as pre-proposals, and he noted the three-page limit had only been a reflection of the common requests of foundations for three-page letters of intent.

Dr. Adamson observed that building on what is already in place was also important. She also suggested changing the pre-proposal format to a letter of intent or else redrafting the instructions to be more specific. Dr. Henry agreed free-form might be better for the first round, and indicated he would add an innovativeness factor to the guidelines.

Dr. Harris raised the issue of the weight given to existing strengths. He commented that it would be risky building in areas not already strong.

Dr. Jacobs added that it would be helpful to know the strength of the competition; e.g., 20 universities already doing what is proposed well versus 5 universities. He noted the amount of competition would have a bearing on the likelihood of gaining recognition for Georgia State. Dr. Henry responded that this consideration could be part of the comparative advantage section.

Dr. Kelley asked about the period of time for the requested funds. Dr. Henry replied the period could be 1-to-3 years.
Dr. Henry reported on the response to the voluntary incentive (5% reduction) option for administrative and support unit programs. He noted $4.3M offered up by all but six units [since the meeting, now $4.5M by all but five units]. He also distributed a list of the six units identifying 10% of their budgets subject to justification. He explained that the acquisition budgets of the libraries had been spared the reductions, and that the Alpharetta Center and Child Development Center had been split out of the Robinson College of Business and the College of Education for separate action. Dr. Henry asked for comment on combining review teams for the remaining six units. It was agreed to appoint six separate teams with one member of FACP, one representative named by the unit but not from the unit, and one member at-large. Dr. Henry asked for volunteers to serve on these teams.

Dr. Henry distributed the document, “Academic programs to be evaluated in FY ’04, January 2004”. He noted the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the Senate Planning & Development Committee would appoint teams for these reviews. He added that the programs on the list were there by virtue of centrality or viability issues.
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