System budget request for FY 2008

Dr. Henry distributed draft #4 of the system budget request document. He explained that the request was capped at 5% of the existing state appropriation ($9.4M) with allowance for an additional compelling request ($1M for research development). He noted that another item, RPG ($750K), was included as a reminder for continuation funding. He added that the requests for online and off-site instruction had been blended as one request for quality outreach ($1.5M).

Dr. Morris asked if an allocation of workload funds would count against the $9.4M cap. Dr. Henry answered that in effect this would be case; e.g., with 60% workload pass-through of $3.1M. Dr. Adamson asked if workload funds would be restricted to the listed initiatives in the system request. Dr. Henry replied the funds could go to other items such as faculty positions. Dr. Adamson suggested adding faculty positions to the stated, projected uses for any workload funds.

Dr. Huss suggested more general wording of the system requests in order to increase flexibility of use. Dr. Rackliffe cautioned that the Board of Regents liked to see specific uses like increased capacity for educating nurses. Dr. Henry added that nurses and teachers were high priorities for the Chancellor.

Dr. Huss asked about the degree of commitment of dollar amounts as stated in the requests to actual budget allocations in particular as requests were blended. Dr. Hudson commented that there was an on-going understanding that FACP would work through these issues once actual funding was known.

Dr. Tai suggested “equity” as a better title for the request listed as “special allocation”. Dr. Henry agreed “excellence through equity” would be more persuasive.

Dr. Henry directed discussion toward cutting the requests in order to not to exceed the $9.4M cap.

Dr. Morris recommended cutting the more generic requests. Dr. Tai suggested moving some of the request for equity funds to the compelling request category.

Dr. Rackliffe asked how the equity dollars would be used. Dr. Huss responded that hiring more faculty should be the top priority. Dr. Hudson urged emphasis on conversion of non-tenure track positions to tenure track positions in order to move closer to the percentage of tenure track faculty at the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech. Dr. Rackliffe commented that the University of Georgia was going to make a similar request for reducing dependence on PTIs and GTAs. He
recommended following suit with tenure track faculty as the top priority and linked to quality enhancement. Dr. Farnham added that an argument for more tenure track faculty would be a more positive approach than pointing out underfunding in the past.

Dr. Adamson suggested including comparisons of student-faculty ratios with other research universities. Dr. Henry warned that these figures would not be convincing since the move to visiting faculty had resulted in a lower ratio of approximately 17:1. He added that the percentage of part-time students had changed dramatically during his tenure at Georgia State from over 65% when he arrived to under 40% now.

Dr. Huss asked about clues as to the vision of the Chancellor for the University System and what he was seeking to accomplish. Dr. Rackliffe answered that these were highlighted on the first page of the draft document. Dr. Morris noted the strong theme of customer service.

Dr. Hudson asked about citing external funding as metrics for the quality enhancement request. Dr. Rackliffe advised that external funding figures not be used until completion of the research building. Dr. Henry countered that such figures were expected from a research university. Dr. Morris added that the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech were down in external funding.

Dr. Fritz suggested strengthening the statement about student satisfaction in the special allocation section by using terminology of customer service. He noted the ratio of students per support staff was close to double that of the competition. Dr. Henry commented that this was referenced in the workload allocation request. Dr. Fritz reiterated the need to state that customer service costs money and does not just happen. Mr. Mitchem recommended a consolidated request for customer service rather than scattered mention among the requests. Dr. Henry agreed it would be better to make the request explicit.

Dr. Tai asked for further discussion as to what should be packaged as the compelling request. He noted the research-and-development background of the Chancellor as a reason to ask for more for research development. Dr. Henry concurred that this request could be increased to $1.75M.

Dr. Kelley spoke for inclusion of infrastructure in support of research given the increases in extramural funding. Dr. Morris added this was another example of customer service. Dr. Henry also noted the budgetary impact of regulatory requirements.

Dr. Farnham asked if the decisions on funding for compelling requests would be interwoven with those for the basic requests subject to the cap. Dr. Henry responded that the total amount of money available to the Chancellor would be the same. Dr. Hudson commented that the Chancellor had emphasized doing more with less and targeted funding in his meeting with the system AAUP representatives.

Dr. Henry stated he would send FACP members an updated draft by close of business on November 3 and invited verbiage, comments, etc. Dr. Rackliffe indicated he would inquire about the requests being made by the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech.
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