Members Attending: Paul Alberto, Ron Henry, Hugh Hudson, Fenwick Huss, Susan Kelley, Jerry Rackliffe, Debbie Rupp, P.C. Tai

Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, Roy Bahl, Carol Clark, Ron Colarusso, Bill Fritz, Beth Jones, Steve Kaminshine, Scott Levin, John Medlock, Robert Moore, Avani Raval, Anthony Roberts, Rebecca Stout, Edgar Torbert, Jeff Walker

The minutes of February 15 were approved with deletion of Hugh Hudson from members attending.

Dr. Henry reported the meeting with the Board of Regents staff about the FY2007 budget had gone well. He indicated the case for hold harmless for $4.2M in workload dollars had been made on the basis of anticipated recovery of credit hours within a year. He cautioned that the Board of Regents might not have the flexibility to hold harmless 100% given a shortage of new workload dollars to reward institutions with credit hour gains. He stated the Board of Regents staff expressed pleasure with the proposal to prorate mandatory fees for part-time graduate students. He noted the Board of Regents had inked a contract for health insurance for graduate assistants with full tuition waivers and for international students, but would not provide additional funding to institutions for this purpose. He added that institutions could pass the costs on to the students, and students would have the option of adding coverage for spouses and children.

Budget Presentation – Student Services

Dr. Scott presented an overview of mandatory fees in Student Services and tables showing the shift of personnel costs (and EFTs) from state funds to mandatory fees from 1997 to 2006. She showed a net shift of $777K from state funds to mandatory fees and a net cut in state funds of $1.1M.

Dr. Huss asked about benchmarking for Student Services. Dr. Scott replied that it was difficult to get benchmarking data because of the variety of units included in Student Services at different institutions. Dr. Henry pointed out that Enrollment Services was included at many institutions. Dr. Huss asked about internal assessments. Dr. Scott responded that surveys about staffing patterns for specific program areas within Student Services were used, but these generally did not include cost data.

Dr. Tai asked about non-personal services budgets for Student Services. Dr. Rackliffe handed out a spreadsheet showing personnel and non-personal services budgets by department across the university.

Dr. Tai asked how Student Services would absorb a 2% cut against the total state budget of $5.2M shown on the spreadsheet distributed by Dr. Rackliffe. Dr. Scott replied that cuts would be made strategically rather than across-the-board. Dr. Rackliffe pointed out that all state funding for the Georgia Career Information System had already been cut out by the legislature.
Dr. Alberto asked about savings associated with shifts to web-based services in University Career Services. Dr. Scott responded that positions had not been eliminated, and that the unit was understaffed. Dr. Huss commented there were additional staff in the colleges providing career services and funded by the colleges.

Dr. Hudson asked about the TRIO programs. Dr. Scott responded these were federally funded Equal Opportunity programs, and the state funds shown on the spreadsheet represented the required institutional matching funds.

Budget Presentation – Andrew Young School of Policy Studies

Dr. Bahl presented slides relating to faculty productivity, credit hour generation, quality of students, external funding, graduate student support, and instructional capacity for the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. He noted AYSPS had relied on non-tenure track faculty to increase instructional capacity at lower costs and would continue the strategy if there were cuts.

Dr. Huss asked about the relative numbers of non-tenure track faculty between full-time and part-time. Dr. Bahl replied that only three were full-time, with the vast majority being PTIs and graduate students.

Dr. Tai asked about state funds for the centers in AYSPS. Dr. Bahl replied that the Health Policy Center was a self-financed, public service unit, and the other two centers were tied to departments and provided external funds to fund graduate students. He characterized the centers as the centerpiece of what AYSPS does, and as critical to the academic program by funding graduate assistants appointed by the academic departments. Dr. Henry added that there was direct funding of centers from the legislature.

Dr. Tai asked if cuts would mean reducing instruction instead of non-academic costs. Dr. Bahl responded that the cuts would sacrifice quality improvement.

Budget Presentation – Health & Human Sciences

Dr. Kelley presented slides relating to credit hour generation, external funding, and budget history showing increases in credit hours and external funding from 1999 to 2006 for the College of Health & Human Sciences and percentage changes in credit hours and budget relative to changes for the whole university.

Dr. Tai asked about potential sources for cuts. Dr. Kelley cited as an example administrative costs for Project Healthy Grandparents. She noted concerns about the possibility of resulting loss of external dollars.

Budget Presentation – Arts & Sciences

Dr. Adamson presented slides showing formula dollars and budget dollars for the College of Arts & Sciences relative to credit hours generated, increases in research dollars and numbers of doctoral students, projected impacts of budget cuts on credit hour generation and unmet demand.
Dr. Huss asked about the percentage of classes taught by PTIs. Dr. Adamson replied that the shift to visiting lecturers and instructors had reduced reliance on PTIs to a very small percentage. Dr. Huss revised his question to tenure track versus non-tenure track. Dr. Henry cited the numbers of faculty as 432 tenure track and 250 non-tenure track. Dr. Adamson pointed out that the Arts & Sciences had experienced success with the lecturer-senior lecturer track and that visiting lines were being converted to tenure track lines, lecturers and GTAs as funds allowed.

Dr. Hudson observed that Georgia State was a “cash cow” for the University System of Georgia and that similarly Arts & Sciences was a cash cow for Georgia State. Dr. Adamson reiterated that Arts & Sciences was $13M underfunded relative to dollars generated by the funding formula. She singled out infrastructure, graduate student funding, number of tenure track faculty, and low faculty salaries as sacrifices incurred as a result. She cautioned there was not a “pot of gold” to tap to endure cuts.

Dr. Henry commented that while Arts & Sciences remained underfunded relative to the funding formula, it had made progress from 65% to 82% of formula funded during his tenure at Georgia State. He noted that the funding formula was not intended for prescribing allocations to individual institutions or to units within institutions and that funding patterns across the University System and within the institution reflected historical bases, which could not be shifted quickly.

Dr. Adamson commented on the impact of the underfunding situation on faculty morale. Dr. Tai added that history did not necessarily make allocations right and suggested a zero-based approach might be needed. He reminded that in several very good funding years credit hours were not used to distribute funds.

Dr. Hudson stated that every lens showed Arts & Sciences as a cash cow. He added that politics rather than history explained the current state of the budget.

Dr. Rackliffe pointed out the doubling of rents shown on the departmental budgets spreadsheet he had distributed. Dr. Alberto added that new buildings would eventually allow a reduction in leased space. Dr. Henry noted for example that if the J. Mack Robinson College of Business/College of Law project was realized there would be substantial space available for other units.
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