Members Attending: Paul Alberto, Jim Alm (for Fenwick Huss), Al Baumstark (for P.C. Tai), Paul Farnham, Ron Henry, Hugh Hudson, Steve Kaminshine (for Susan Kelley), Jerry Rackliffe, Shelly Williams

Others Attending: Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Beth Jones, Randy Kamphaus, Bill Nelson, Tammy Sugarman, Edgar Torbert

The minutes of December 12, 2007 were approved as presented.

University Library

Ms. Hurt distributed handouts showing budget requests, costs, etc. for the University Library for FY2008 and FY2009. She explained the budgetary impact of bundled journals, databases, collections, etc. which are essentially rented materials rather than directly owned by the institution and for which fees to retain increase annually. She indicated the University Library had prioritized journals for which it directly pays based on usage statistics and feedback from departments. She pointed out shrinking numbers of publishers had resulted in fewer hard copy books being printed and fewer opportunities for faculty to get their books published. She added that on the other hand electronic books were on the rise. She characterized the budgetary situation as an issue of university commitment to support researchers. Ms. Hurt noted the goal for the University Library of attaining membership in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), which was dependent upon shifting the acquisitions budget from reliance on one-time funds to budgeted, continuing funds. She stated that the completion of the library transformation project had entailed filling a number of vacant library staff positions, which had formerly been sources of salary savings which were applied to acquisitions.

Dr. Kaminshine commented that the College of Law library faced very similar issues on a smaller scale. Dr. Henry added that inflation was a more serious problem for the libraries than for many areas of the university. Dr. Hudson reported that the recent external reviewers of the History Department had cited serious deficiencies with the University Library as a resource for faculty and student research and had deemed membership in ARL as unlikely to happen. He observed that the process of funding the libraries through end-of-year dollars had reached an endpoint and urged budgeting with continuing funds like the colleges. Dr. Kaminshine echoed the comments by Dr. Hudson, but suggested there were some purchases which could still be handled through end-of-year funding.

Dr. Henry pointed out that the libraries currently receive $1.2M annually in one-time funds. He advised that a multi-year approach would be necessary in order to invest continuing funds in a like amount plus cover annual inflation. He suggested investing $250K per year as one approach to perpetuate the $1.2M base amount with continuing dollars. He reminded that IS&T and rents/utilities were other areas, which had substantial inflationary costs.

Dr. Alm reiterated the importance of providing essential resources for researchers. Dr. Alberto asked for Dr. Rackliffe to prepare a budget model for funding the libraries with continuing dollars.
Dr. Rackliffe answered that the $250K per year infusion suggested by Dr. Henry would require an additional $400K per year to offset inflation.

Dr. Baumstark commented that science faculty had found Georgia Tech and Emory to be good back-ups for library resources. Ms. Hurt responded that database license agreements were curtailing inter-institutional use of such resources.

Dr. Alm called attention to a recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* concerning inflationary costs of journals in Economics.

Dr. Fritz asked about what was specifically needed in order to achieve membership in ARL. Ms. Hurt replied ARL was looking for institutional commitment to support the University Library.

Dr. Hudson cited the situation as a serious problem for recruiting outstanding faculty. Dr. Farnham asked if the other research universities in the University System were ARL members. Ms. Hurt answered that they are. Dr. Kaminshine asked if this was an issue in recruiting librarians. Ms. Hurt responded that it could affect the search for the Dean of Libraries.

Dr. Henry stated library support would be on the table when FACP discusses FY2009 new funding allocations.

**Budget Request Cap**

Dr. Henry opened discussion of the percentage cap to be given deans and vice presidents for their FY2009 new funding requests. He noted in prior years the cap had been set to approximate twice the anticipated new funds. He offered $7M as his best guesstimate of total new funding for FY2009, but reminded there were commitments for some of these funds, including $1M for salary compression, $1M for graduate student stipends, $1M for areas of focus, $400K for QEP (of $1.3M over 4-5 years), and approximately $1M in various commitments made during the year. He noted the balance of approximately $2M would be less than 1% of the current budget, which would make a cap on requests of 2% generous.

Dr. Nelson asked about action plan-related funding requests. Dr. Henry replied that the deans would need to include action plan requests in their 2% total requests. Dr. Baumstark urged giving high priority to action plan items within the 2%.

Dr. Hudson urged consideration of additional funding from the $2M balance for faculty salary compression and graduate student support given the likelihood of only 2.5-3% merit raises and tough competition for graduate students. Dr. Henry added that these items along with the action plans would heighten the tension of the allocations. Dr. Kaminshine observed that the action plan items were more related to maintenance versus the areas of focus items as points of excellence.

Dr. Hudson asked about the guesstimate for tuition increases. Dr. Henry answered that the increase would likely be 6% with a portion going to cover the 25% institutional share of the merit raise pool. He reminded that the Board of Regents would also be funding strategic initiatives, and that Georgia State would be in position to receive some of these targeted funds.
Dr. Alm asked about the magnitude of the needs for salary compression and graduate student stipends. Dr. Henry cited a range of the salary compression need from $7M to $12M and the graduate student stipend need of $3.4M. Dr. Alm commended a multi-year approach as a “second best” solution given the amount of funds likely to be available.

Dr. Kaminshine suggested viewing the areas of focus as an aspirational program and funding the colleges first. Dr. Henry responded that the suggested $1.5M for areas of focus was not a hard figure.

Dr. Rackliffe reminded the two addition floors of 34 Peachtree Building was another obligation against the FY2009 funding.

Dr. Kaminshine made a motion to set the cap for FY2009 budget requests at 2%. Dr. Alm seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Crosswalk Countdown Proposal

Dr. Baumstark presented a proposal from the University Senate Committee on Planning and Development to fund crosswalk countdown devices at major crosswalks on the campus at a cost of $67K.

Dr. Alberto made a motion to recommend the expenditure for crosswalk countdown devices. Dr. Hudson seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Prepared by Edgar Torbert
Approved February 13, 2008