
Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, Carol Clark, Ron Colarusso, Dean Dabney, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Beth Jones, Ralph Kahlan, Steve Kaminshine, Robert Moore, Tim Renick, Anthony Roberts, Edgar Torbert, Marilyn Tyus

The minutes of November 3 were approved. Dr. Henry advised that the FY2005 tuition revenue shortfall stated as $2.8M at the November 3 meeting was instead $2.2M.

Fee Requests

Dr. Kahlan presented the proposed Class of FY2006-FY2007 Executive MBA fee of $52.5K (two-year fee, up $1K per year). He stated there had been no increases since FY2002. He indicated the proposed increase was intended to avoid devaluing the program by charging less than the fair market price.

Dr. Hudson asked about charging the same as the University of Georgia ($54K). Dr. Kahlan replied that this differential was not out of line given the perception of the UGA name.

Dr. Tai made a motion to recommend the Executive MBA fee as proposed. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Kelley presented the proposed Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) tuition differential of $180 in-state fulltime, $702 out-of-state fulltime, $15 in-state part-time per credit hour, and $60 out-of-state part-time per credit hour. She noted the DPT program was new, replacing the MPT program as was happening nationwide.

Dr. Tai made a motion to recommend the DPT tuition differential as proposed. Dr. Hudson seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Ms. Tyus presented the proposed increases in GSU Village room charges, from $5,130 to $5,380 for the academic year, from $560 to $568 for May Term, and from $1,340 to $1,640 for Summer Term. She also presented proposed increases in GSU Village parking charges, from $656 to $672 for the academic year, from $69 to $71 for May Term, and from $166 to $170 for Summer Term.

Dr. Tai asked about the rates for the Lofts. Ms. Tyus replied that those rates were higher than the GSU Village because they were set at apartment market rates. Dr. Fritz asked about comparison with GSU Village rates with respect to costs for Community of Scholars students. Ms. Tyus replied that the rates were close factoring in that the Lofts had shared rooms.

Dr. Tai made a motion to recommend the GSU Village charges as presented. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.
**Academic Program Evaluation**

Dr. Henry noted revision of the document “Process for academic program evaluation” to mesh with the document “Senate review of proposals for academic program evaluation in the context of possible deactivation and termination”.

Dr. Renick noted revision of the Senate review document to allow one member of the review team to be a non-Senate faculty member and the addition of a section to allow expedited review in non-controversial cases. He pointed out the document now reflected a two-stage process with the initial stage being the reporting of data and indicators as established by the joint subcommittee of Budget and APACE and the second stage following a recommendation from FACP that a program be deactivated or terminated.

Dr. Tai voiced appreciation for the title change of the Senate review document. Dr. Kaminshine suggested changing “will be considered by APACE as a whole committee before being sent to subcommittee” to “will be considered by APACE as a whole committee in lieu of being sent to subcommittee” in the paragraph on expedited review.

Dr. Alberto reminded that the Senate review document still needed approval by APACE on November 11. Dr. Henry echoed that this document did not require action by FACP.

Dr. Henry pointed out the addition of the last paragraph in the process document regarding APACE review and recommendations. Dr. Renick suggested making reference to the APACE policy in the process document.

Dr. Tai made a motion to approve the process document. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**Administrative Program Evaluation**

Dr. Henry distributed a document “Process for administrative program evaluation”. He noted the administrative program process was modeled after the one for academic program evaluation, with the Administrative and Support Unit Review (ASUR) committee filling the role of APACE. He commented on the experience gained by ASUR during its first cycle of reviews and in particular the experience gained last year with the $4.4M redirection to areas of focus.

Dr. Kaminshine asked about ASUR reviews of administrative units within departments. Dr. Henry replied that the reviews were at the university level. Mr. Simpson asked for examples of such units. Dr. Henry cited enrollment services, IS&T, library, vice presidential areas, colleges, etc.

Dr. Adamson commented that it was difficult to separate administrative components in the colleges. Dr. Henry responded that the approach was the same as last year. Dr. Adamson pointed out that last year there were not actual evaluations. She asked if the deans would be expected to conduct the evaluations. Dr. Henry replied that deans, vice presidents and other major unit heads would be expected to conduct these evaluations.

Mr. Simpson asked about the membership of ASUR. Dr. Tai replied that are 13 members. He
added that ASUR had not reviewed college units. Dr. Hudson commented that there were university and college level administrative units of similar types such as public relations. Dr. Henry added graduate admissions and academic advising as other examples.

Dr. Kaminsky asked about extending the process to departments given the shrinking of sources after the $4.4M redirection. Dr. Henry responded such an approach would mean a very heavy workload for the deans. Dr. Kaminsky commented that distribution of administrative functions to departments varied by college. Dr. Renick added that academic program review included costs of running the entire program.

Dr. Henry pointed to potential economies of scale by clustering departments for some forms of administrative support. He indicated the deans were aware of these possibilities, all the more so because of no increases in supply budgets over the years.

Dr. Tai suggested using the Board of Regents funding formula to examine administrative support costs. Dr. Henry replied that the funding formula would yield departmental level figures. He added that the funding formula put academic administrative costs at 17%. Dr. Colarusso observed that the funding formula was antiquated. Dr. Henry responded the formula dated to 1982. Dr. Tai commented that the information could still be useful. Dr. Hudson suggested using the funding formula to identify extreme outliers.

Dr. Hudson asked about the target figure for redirected funding sources. Dr. Henry cited $2.5-3.0M as an annual target. Dr. Hudson asked how this could be reached if not from administration. Dr. Henry replied that after estimating cashflow with enrollment models, costs of action plans, etc., a return of approximately 1% per year appeared to be in the range. He noted the option of a flat tax to accomplish this objective. Dr. Alberto added that the outcome of the Board of Regents tuition task force could also have an impact.

Mr. Simpson asked about the priority of maintaining quality of programs and services. Dr. Henry replied that the objective was to find internal funding to maintain and enhance quality given the increasingly limited new funding.

Dr. Adamson asked about timelines and defining “unit”. Dr. Henry answered that he would email the deans a proposed list of units for discussion. Dr. Alberto pointed out that the committee looking at similar questions for academic program evaluation had settled on the major as the unit for review with the program defined by content or degree level. Dr. Henry observed that departments with more than one major should still be considered as one unit, otherwise the College of Arts and Sciences could have 80 or more units to be reviewed. He added that the review could still focus on one degree such as the PhD and not the BA and MA. Dr. Dabney commented that it would be difficult to isolate review by degree level since some indicators crossed all. He gave the example of separating papers done at the PhD level.

Ms. Rupp asked if there would be targets for redirection. Dr. Henry responded there would be, but not announced at this point.

Dr. Henry invited suggestions of how to proceed with the administrative evaluation document. Dr. Tai recommended forwarding it to P&D and ASUR.