FISCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT
Minutes of April 7, 2004

Members Attending: Shelia Bradley, Sid Harris, Ron Henry, Hugh Hudson, Fenwick Huss, Fred Jacobs, Susan Kelley, Jerry Rackliffe, P.C. Tai

Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, Roy Bahl, Ron Colarusso, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Philo Hutcheson, John Neel, Jeff Rupp, Edgar Torbert

Minutes of March 31 were approved as presented.

Criteria for Evaluating Areas of Focus Proposals

Ms. Hurt presented the revised “Review Criteria for Areas of Focus Proposals, 4/5/04”. The budget component was separated from the other criteria. Letters of commitment from participating units were added to the required appendices. A 5-year implementation plan with a timeline and a statement of first-year requirements were added to criterion #3 (management plan). A linkage to the 2000-2005 Strategic Plan and specifics regarding achievement of greater reputation were added to criterion #4 (strategic importance). Vision and goal statements and indication of movement beyond the present were added to criterion #6. Ms. Hurt advised that an additional bullet under criterion #9 (external need and demand) had been inadvertently omitted: What is the potential for funding from external sources?

FACP discussion of the stipulation that the 2-page biographical sketches of participating faculty could contain lists of up to 5 publications closely related to their areas of focus resulted in removal of this stipulation to allow discretion of submitters within the 2-page overall limit.

FACP discussion of the items added to criterion #3 (management plan) resulted in elimination of the statement of first-year requirements with this information already provided in the 5-year implementation plan.

FACP discussion of the references to supplementary documents (appendices) in the main body of the “Guidelines for Area of Focus Proposals, January 21, 2004” resulted in elimination of these references in the sections, “Vision, Goals and Outcomes”, “Action Plan”, “Partnership Management/Governance Plan” and “Evaluation Plan” with the understanding that baseline data, benchmarks, etc. would be addressed in the 12-page proposals.

Academic Program Evaluation Committee Recommendations

Dr. Henry reminded that in fall 2003 the Deans’ Group had agreed to a list of 11 academic programs for evaluation, based on one or more issues of quality, centrality, viability and comparative advantage. The viability criterion was adapted from the Board of Regents viability standards for average number of graduates over a 3-year period for undergraduate, master’s and doctoral programs. The criteria were not applied in a way to drop programs automatically if they fell short on a single criterion (approximately one half of all doctoral programs at the university would not meet the viability criterion). The initial recommendations from the academic program evaluation committee targeted four programs for termination: (1) BS in Human Resources & Policy
Development, (2) BS in Recreation & Leisure Services, (3) MEd in Health & Physical Education, and (4) PhD in Educational Policy Studies (Higher Education concentration). The strategic planning subcommittee modified the list for termination to recommend that the MEd in Health & Physical Education be granted a 3-year extension and to await the results of the regular academic program review for the PhD program in Higher Education.

Dr. Bahl concurred with the recommendation to terminate the BS in Human Resources & Policy Development noting issues of student quality and number of full-time faculty. The program presently has 170 students.

Dr. Rupp noted the two faculty members involved understood the BS in Recreation & Leisure Services program would likely be terminated, and he strongly urged relocating the two faculty members in other areas of the department or college where they could be highly productive, as recommended by the Strategic Planning Committee. He pointed out the need for an additional faculty position in order for the current program to be accredited.

Dr. Rupp addressed the MEd in Health & Physical Education decision noting changes which would likely increase enrollments, unique availability in the immediate metro area, and centrality to the College of Education mission of preparing K-12 teachers.

Dr. Hutcheson spoke to the review of the PhD program in Higher Education noting disagreement with enrollment and student quality data used by the academic program evaluation committee and tracing the development of the program. The majority of students are currently employed in public and private colleges and universities across North Georgia. There are 48 students and 2 tenure-track faculty. The program is young and consequently is still seeking a national reputation, which would facilitate its graduates pursuing teaching careers in the field. There are currently no graduates teaching in colleges of education. The Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia had stated its support for the continuation of the PhD program at Georgia State. Two current students in the program spoke to their support for continuation, the quality of students, and their experiences in the program.

Dr. Bahl questioned that only two-to-four programs in the university would be singled out for possible termination. Dr. Hudson questioned proceeding with the recommendations of the academic program evaluation committee and the strategic planning subcommittee with only their 2-page critiques and summary notes on which to make a decision. Dr. Henry indicated no action was to be taken at this meeting and that more detailed information would be made available to FACP prior to making decisions about any of the programs.

Prepared by Edgar Torbert
Approved April 21, 2003