Members Attending: Shelia Bradley, Sid Harris, Ron Henry, Hugh Hudson, Susan Kelley, Charles Louis, Jerry Rackliffe, P.C. Tai

Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, J.L. Albert, Roy Bahl, Mary Jane Casto, Don Edwards, Bill Fritz, Janice Griffith, Charlene Hurt, Steve Kaminshine, Michael Metzler, Robert Moore, Bill Prigge, Mary Ann Romski, Hazel Scott, Edgar Torbert

Minutes of March 3 were approved as presented.

Areas of Focus Pre-Proposal Recommendations

Dr. Hudson voiced strong objection to proceeding with review of the recommendations from the areas of focus evaluation team having not received the report in time to study the recommendations prior to the meeting.

Ms. Hurt stated the evaluation team had agreed not to distribute their recommendations prior to this FACP meeting so those submitting pre-proposals would not learn the preliminary outcomes of their pre-proposals prior to FACP action on the recommendations from the evaluation team. She added that the evaluation team was very careful about process, including steps to avoid conflicts of interest. She noted the evaluation team used the seven criteria in the guidelines for pre-proposals but grouped the pre-proposals in three categories (A-go forward, B-go forward after further development, C-need further development beyond those in category B) rather than assigning scores.

Dr. Hudson questioned the decision of the evaluation team to group rather than score the pre-proposals given the guidelines adopted by FACP. Ms. Hurt replied that the evaluation team wanted to look at the pre-proposals in a more holistic way. She noted the evaluation team recognized themes relating to vision and goals, going beyond what already doing, and partnerships beyond current relationships. Dr. Hudson observed the going-beyond theme could be seen as penalizing existing good work. Ms. Hurt responded that this theme also pertained to enhancement of institutional reputation.

Ms. Hurt presented each of the pre-proposals by category:

Category A (go forward)

Research on the Acquisition of Language and Literacy

Dr. Adamson pointed out the College of Education (Educational Psychology & Special Education) would also be involved in this area of focus.

Brains and Behavior

Dr. Tai reiterated it would have been helpful to read reviews by the evaluation team prior to the
meeting. Ms. Hurt replied that the evaluation team met all day the preceding Sunday, wrote
reviews that evening, devoted Monday to compiling the reviews, and delivered the report to the
Provost only the day before this meeting.

*International Excellence in Public Finance: Policy and Management*

*Metropolitan Growth in the Physical Environment*

Dr. Hudson asked if all of the requested faculty positions would be in the College of Law. Ms. Hurt
responded that these would be joint appointments, but with the primary appointment in the College
of Law.

*Molecular Basis of Disease*

*Risk and Its Management*

Dr. Hudson commented that timelines for faculty hires were needed.

*Urban Health Research*

  Category B (go forward after further development)

*Global Commerce in the Global Marketplace*

*Health Justice: Law and Ethics in Health*

Dr. Kaminshine remarked that development of this pre-proposal had already proven beneficial in
terms of cross-pollination with departments outside the College of Law.

*Urban South*

  Category C (need further development beyond those in Category B)

*Collaborative Arts and Research*

Drs. Hudson and Adamson requested rewording of the review to ensure acknowledgment of art
activities as scholarly work and reflection of the interdisciplinary nature of the pre-proposal. Dr.
Romski responded that discussion of the pre-proposal within the evaluation team addressed the
scholarly and interdisciplinary aspects of the arts. Dr. Edwards added that there was specific
mention of the collaborations discovered by the authors of the pre-proposal. Dr. Romski cited
sensitivity to these issues also raised in the University Senate Committee on Research.

*Entrepreneurship at Georgia State University*

*Global Atlanta: Transnational Processes, Local Contexts*
Dr. Metzler commented that the urban education initiative continued current centers, but with an emphasis on new collaborations.

Dr. Henry advised FACP would at this point determine which pre-proposals should go forward to the proposal round. He pointed out that the seven pre-proposals in category A totaled $19M, which would be 3-4 times the amount available. He expressed concern about expanding invitations to write full proposals too far given the amount of time required of faculty to write them.

Dr. Kelley asked if the evaluation team had in any manner rank ordered the pre-proposals within the three categories. Ms. Hurt replied the pre-proposals were presented only in alphabetical order within the categories.

Dr. Tai asked for further clarification of the difference between category A and category B. Ms. Hurt explained that the evaluation team heard all of the reviews by the members assigned as primary and secondary reviewers, assigned tentative placements within categories A, B and C, and then discussed at large the assignments with participation by all members. She summarized category A as the areas of focus deemed “ready to go”.

Dr. Henry commented that with the limited amount of funds, lesser amounts could be allocated to all seven areas of focus in category A or larger amounts could be allocated to only three or four areas which would be done really well. Ms. Hurt reacted that the evaluation team had assumed not all would be funded, but did not want to shut out too many at the beginning. She added that at this stage the issue was not funding, but which would be developed as full proposals.

Dr. Tai expressed concern that there would be little to spend at this time of the year on new faculty positions, which would limit immediate rewards for time spent on the proposals. Dr. Hudson suggested having the pre-proposal authors come to FACP to present their areas of focus rather than requiring full proposals.

Dr. Harris stated his satisfaction with the way the process had unfolded and his comfort with the outcome as presented.

Dr. Kaminshine asked about the multi-year aspect of the funding for the selected areas of focus. Dr. Henry confirmed funding would be multi-year given the limited amount of funding available for FY2005. Dr. Kaminshine cautioned that a backlog could develop as with the action plans if the initial group of funded areas tied up nearly all funds in subsequent years. He suggested funding 3-4 areas in a major way and the rest to a lesser extent to maintain momentum.

Dr. Adamson spoke of the morale issue and the balance between effort and reward. She agreed that a lot of good momentum had been generated through pre-proposal development. Ms. Bradley commented that this would suggest benefit by funding as many areas as possible rather than a small number.

Dr. Fritz reiterated concern about the gap between the collective areas in category A and the funds
available. He raised the question of the range of quality within category A. Ms. Hurt again stated the evaluation team had not been able to arrive at a strongest to weakest ordering.

Dr. Tai questioned how full proposals would be evaluated, in particular if a point system would be employed. Dr. Edwards replied that more specific guidelines would be needed and acknowledged the need for validation for the community at large.

Dr. Henry asked for discussion of the option of proceeding with the recommended seven areas of focus for development of full proposals. Dr. Harris stated his support for this approach. Dr. Hudson commented that seven was a modest number of areas of focus for a university as large as Georgia State. Drs. Kelley and Tai expressed their support.

Ms. Bradley made a motion to accept the recommendations of the evaluation team. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry advised that the full proposals should be specific as to how the budgets would ramp up. Dr. Tai added that there should be advice regarding being realistic in requests. Dr. Hudson spoke in favor of using a points system. Dr. Adamson urged that FACP be clear in its charge to the evaluation team and not be tied by ideas of three months ago now that the proposed areas are known. Dr. Henry responded that FACP would address the charge at its next meeting.

Prepared by Edgar Torbert
Approved March 31, 2004