The minutes of October 13 were approved.

Dr. Henry announced the projected share of the FY2005 budget cut for Georgia State had increased from $3.1M to $3.3M.

Dr. Henry noted previous discussion of ways to deal with the FY2005 cut, including a central administration cut, a tax on units at the dean and vice presidential level, and shifts from the moves and renovations budget to the one-time infrastructure improvement fund.

Dr. Henry cautioned that the state Office of Budget and Planning would be examining how the infrastructure funds were used relative to the purposes stated in the request for those funds. He noted that moves and renovations projects could still be delayed to accomplish FY2005 savings. Mr. Rackliffe remarked that the Senate committee discussions had identified projects to take off the infrastructure fund list, but none which could be moved onto the list from moves and renovations.

Dr. Kaminshine urged inclusion of the deans in any conversations about delaying capital projects since there may be accreditation issues. Dr. Henry responded that CBSAC would hear any proposals to delay projects and affected parties would be invited to participate in those discussions as customary.

Dr. Tai asked about the status of the tuition increase proposals. Dr. Henry responded that the Board of Regents had decided against a mid-year tuition increase, but had not commented on an increase for next year. He added that a tuition task force would be reporting to the Board of Regents in January and March about various options for structuring tuition, and the Board of Regents would act on tuition rates for FY2006 at either the April or May meeting. Dr. Henry noted that tuition has increased every year, but there is no information on the magnitude of the increase for FY2006. He pointed out that any increase for FY2006 would be effective fall semester, the FY2005 increase would apply to summer semester, and under these circumstances a 10% increase for FY2006 would yield approximately $8M for Georgia State.

Dr. Henry returned to options for dealing with the FY2005 cut and recommended a 2/3% tax on units at the dean and vice presidential level and the balance in the amount of approximately $1.6M from the central administration.

Dr. Huss made a motion to recommend the 2/3% tax and $1.6M central administration cut. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry invited general discussion of strategies to deal with the $7.3M payroll shift-related cut for
FY2006 and the concurrent need to fund action plans, areas of focus, the science research lab building, and other commitments. He pointed out that a 10% tuition increase and full funding of the funding formula would offset the cut, but leave relatively little funding to address the needs listed above. He proposed examination of activities and programs, both academic and administrative/support, for the purpose of identifying sources for reallocation. Dr. Henry noted FACP would make final recommendations to the President about sources for reallocation, but there was the question of how to proceed with input to FACP from the Senate, Deans Group, etc.

Dr. Alberto reported discussion in a Senate joint committee to recommend shifting program evaluation for the purposes of reallocation from the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of P&D to APACE, which has dealt with program review. He added that the Committee of Chairs would also be taking up this discussion at its next meeting. Dr. Alberto pointed out that the Deans Group would still identify the programs to be evaluated. He indicated that the path from APACE to FACP was still to be discussed (eg Executive Committee, full Senate).

Dr. Kelley asked for clarification of the difference between program evaluation and program review. Dr. Alberto replied that program review was long-term in scope, and program evaluation was a quick examination. He noted that Dr. Renick, the new chair of APACE, had been a part of the above discussions.

Dr. Kelley reported strong support in Deans Group to use existing program reviews even though some were dated and not to redo these. Dr. Alberto responded that use of existing program reviews by program evaluation committees had been assumed. Dr. Henry asked if it was implied programs in process of program reviews would be given a bye. Dr. Alberto replied this was not the intent.

Dr. Kaminshine commented he was sensitive to efficiencies and did not want to see effort duplicated, but felt questions about vulnerable programs were different from those of other programs. He added that data collected for program reviews were clearly relevant to the task, but there was a need for simultaneous university and comparative perspectives. He expressed concern about faculty as reviewers if not particularly knowledgeable about the departments under evaluation. He spoke for limiting the role of the evaluation committees to fact-finding rather than making recommendations.

Dr. Alberto reiterated that program reviews and program evaluations were different. He observed that program reviews had historically been geared toward seeking new funds. He noted the persons serving on the program evaluation teams would collectively have experience in evaluating programs, knowing budgets, serving as department chairs, running programs, etc.

Dr. Hudson spoke of the importance of the appearance of legitimacy. He urged having faith in accomplished faculty undertaking these tasks. He noted the outcomes would likely be contentious in any case, and no group was more qualified than faculty to be conducting the evaluations. Dr. Henry commented that the Deans Group members were faculty and closer to the responsibility for making such decisions about programs. Dr. Hudson responded that it was essential to gain support from colleagues. Dr. Henry replied that their support could still be gained if the program evaluation committees were fact-finding. Dr. Hudson reacted that facts are not neutral. Dr. Kaminshine responded that facts are more neutral, and recommendations more subjective. He
repeated his concern about how faculty are appointed to APACE and which ones would be doing the evaluations.

Dr. Huss stated that identifying a dollar target and timetable at the outset would be very helpful. He commented that the Deans Group had agreed it was important to have a number of parties advising as to how the process would operate. He also noted the need to articulate criteria, data types, etc. at the outset, and added that the facts were located at the dean level, so that any evaluation committee would be coming to the deans for the data. Dr. Huss remarked that he was comfortable with program evaluations being made at the dean level, but not in evaluating programs in other colleges. He observed that the university level evaluation relative to the whole portfolio of programs should be at the provost level.

Dr. Adamson agreed a dollar target was needed. She added that it was important to understand the objective of program evaluations: viability, how to get the most money the quickest, etc. She commented that academic program review was a very productive way to make decisions, but would not work for quick answers. She cautioned that programs under two different review processes could get different results. She advocated a coordinated review process.

Ms. Hurt commented on similarities to the areas of focus review process. She observed that the faculty on that committee were very strong scholars and able to view the proposals from the university perspective. She added that the committee had found all of the proposals to be deserving, but in the long run FACP had to decide which to fund and how much.

Dr. Hudson stated he was in agreement that ultimate responsibility would be with the provost, but the concern was about input and from whom. He recalled that Clark Atlanta University had dealt with budget cuts by involving only the provost and deans, and the results had been very bad. He warned that even if the right decisions were made, it would be more difficult to sell the faculty and unite them against the real adversaries in state government. Dr. Henry emphasized he was not advocating marginalizing Senate involvement.

Dr. Kaminshine agreed buy-in was crucial. He explained he was seeking to match potential targets with what participants could bring to the table. He asserted that the Senate was well-suited for setting policies, standards, fleshing out concepts, etc., but was not as suited as administrators or executors. He repeated he was not against Senate involvement, but wanted it more carefully matched with the task.

Dr. Alberto disagreed pointing out that many faculty become administrators. He urged the broadest input while acknowledging that the decisions ultimately reside with the provost.

Dr. Kaminshine reiterated concern about parity and consistency with different groups of faculty looking at different programs. Dr. Hudson replied that this was the human condition and the same applied to the Deans Group and FACP.

Dr. Huss stressed care in structuring faculty input noting that if the process did not include experts, there would not be faculty buy-in. He expressed discomfort with a process that involved faculty unfamiliar with the area being evaluated. Dr. Tai replied that the evaluations would go through APACE before coming to FACP so there would be a check at that point. Dr. Alberto responded he
did not disagree on the need for expertise.

Dr. Kaminshine concurred there should not be a straight handoff from the Deans Group to FACP, but repeated his preference for use of smaller groups to find facts. Dr. Kelley added that while the Deans Group discussed what would be the best way to involve the Senate, there was agreement input from the Senate was crucial.

Ms. Hurt commented that there were workload and timing issues to consider. Dr. Henry concurred. He stated he had looked at every program at the university, and there were none which jumped off the page as targets to cut. He outlined various choices such as: continue at quality of what now exists and not have funds for areas of focus or action plans; determine which programs are not at the university level of quality and decide which to invest in and which to terminate; tax everybody; etc.

Dr. Alberto spoke in favor of asking the deans to begin discussions immediately within their colleges toward generating lists of programs to be evaluated.

Dr. Adamson observed there was more that could be done than just deactivating programs. She called for attention to ways to be more efficient, and noted these would differ by department.

Dr. Huss suggested thinking in terms of return on investment. He observed we did not have units bleeding, but we should still look at what return was desired in terms of viability, quality, etc. He pointed out that sometimes profitable units are sold off in order to make even better investments.

Ms. Hurt urged consideration of investments in undergraduate programs.

Dr. Kelley asked about a rough sense of the amount to be reallocated. Dr. Henry replied that last year $4.4M was identified, but it would be harder to do again. Dr. Kaminshine asked if all would be from academic sources. Dr. Henry replied that administrative/support activities would also be evaluated.

Ms. Hurt commented on the obligation to impressive new faculty to keep getting better. Dr. Henry agreed noting that quality of faculty and students had risen, and now it was time to improve programs. He noted that graduate credit hours are weighted in the funding formula and offered opportunity for growth provided the students could be supported. Dr. Adamson suggested opening new PhD programs would expand opportunities for graduate teaching assistants.
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