Members Attending: Paul Alberto, Paul Farnham, Ron Henry, Fenwick Huss, Susan Kelley, Robin Morris, Jerry Rackliffe, P.C. Tai, Frank Whittington (for Hugh Hudson), Shelly Williams

Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, J.L. Albert, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Beth Jones, Steve Kaminshine, Bob Moore, Bill Prigge, Edgar Torbert

The minutes of February 13, 2008 were approved as presented.

Update on FY2008 and FY2009 budgets

Dr. Henry shared communications from the Office of Budget and Planning (OPB) and the Board of Regents (BoR) directing only essential positions to be filled and spending to be curtailed where possible for the remainder of FY2008. Dr. Henry indicated the university would likely be asked to demonstrate some savings by the end of the year.

Dr. Henry commented on changes recommended by the Governor to the proposed University System appropriation for FY2009 including reduction of the average raise from 2.5% to 2% and shifting of MRR funding from the state appropriation to bonds. Dr. Henry observed that the MRR change could negatively impact capacity to sell bonds for capital projects, including the 12th ranked Alpharetta Center project.

Dr. Tai asked about impact on workload funds. Dr. Henry replied that the Governor did not recommend reducing the University System appropriation for workload; however, he cautioned that any worsening of the state revenue situation could result in a cut after appropriations are made.

J. Mack Robinson College of Business FY2009 budget request

Dr. Huss distributed a handout of background information pertaining to the budget request from the J. Mack Robinson College of Business and summarized the request for tenure track faculty positions.

Dr. Henry asked about implications for AACSB accreditation. Dr. Huss stated AACSB would examine the composition of the faculty as of fall 2009 for its next review. Dr. Huss added the review would focus both on the number of PhDs, currency of research, and coverage of courses by “participating” faculty.

Dr. Tai asked about MBA enrollments. Dr. Huss replied total active enrollment was approximately 1,500 with the numbers admitted and graduating each year in the range of 300-400.

Dr. Moore asked about faculty coverage at sites other than the main campus. Dr. Huss answered that such sites were covered by regular faculty to a greater extent than the main campus.

Dr. Henry commented that accounting faculty salaries are a particular challenge in the current market.
College of Law FY2009 budget requests

Dr. Kaminshine summarized the requests from the College of Law for faculty positions. He noted thinness in coverage of core areas, intellectual property, international law, and conflict resolution, which had been noted in ABA and program reviews.

Dr. Henry asked about flexibility resulting from retirements and changing program emphases. Dr. Kaminshine answered that most of the retirements would impact core areas, which have to be backfilled, and that the curriculum had not been examined in the context of areas, which might receive less emphasis.

Dr. Alberto asked about the quickness of payoffs for investments in areas of focus. Dr. Kaminshine cited “top ten” recognition already by *U.S. News & World Report* of the health law component.

Dr. Tai commented on the immediate need to expand the intellectual property area.

Information Systems & Technology FY2009 budget requests

Mr. Albert summarized the requests from Information Systems & Technology, including two joint requests with the Vice President for Research. Mr. Albert noted the increase in the number of technology-supported classrooms in Classroom South and Sparks Hall, support for the new IBM Linux cluster machine for research computing, support for the new PeopleSoft grants management module, and double-digit inflation in maintenance contracts for software and hardware.

Dr. Moore asked for clarification on the two joint positions with Research. Mr. Albert explained IS&T and Research were each requesting one half of each position.

Dr. Adamson asked about repercussions if not funded. Mr. Albert responded that salary savings would be used until depleted, and then reductions in services would be the recourse. Dr. Henry commented that a project was underway to determine costs of various services offered by IS&T. Mr. Albert explained that services were being cataloged as a first step in this analysis, with completion of the costing study in February-March 2009.

Dr. Tai asked about IP telephony savings and the telephone charges continued for departments across the university. Mr. Albert reminded these funds were going to network and service upgrades. Dr. Henry noted the funds were being used to wire Citizens Trust Building. Mr. Albert pointed out that long distance rates had gone down, and departments were realizing significant savings in those expenditures over prior years.

Enrollment Services FY2009 budget request

Dr. Fritz outlined the request from Enrollment Services to increase efficiency in financial aid processing. He noted benchmarks showing staffing at approximately one half of comparable institutions and annual workload figures of 44K financial aid packages awarded from 100K applications. Dr. Fritz added that Georgia State was among the highest in student loans, with approximately $100M per year [Dr. Fritz clarified March 19 that the amount was $124M]. Dr. Fritz
stated the request focused on financial aid processing for incoming freshmen in order to achieve 70-80% success in awarding financial aid packages concurrent with acceptances for admission. He indicated the current delivery time was 103 days from completion of federal forms to awards.

Dr. Henry advised that this request was tied to one of the University System targeted enhancement areas for which Georgia State could seek $100K.

Dr. Fritz commented that in one sense the low staffing numbers and low default rates on student loans pointed to good stewardship in this area. Dr. Farnham asked if Georgia State was losing students because of slow processing. Dr. Henry responded that student complaints were an issue. Dr. Fritz added that there were indications some applicants were choosing institutions, which awarded financial aid more quickly, and attrition studies showed some departing students felt they had gotten “the run-around” in financial aid.

Dr. Tai asked about an application fee for financial aid. Dr. Henry answered this would be bad public relations. Dr. Alberto asked if the admission application fee was still $50. Dr. Fritz replied this was the case, and that the fee was generally $75-100 at competing institutions [Dr. Fritz clarified March 19 that the higher fees were for out-of-state institutions].

Provost FY2009 budget requests

Dr. Henry presented the requests from the Provost area, including the University Honors Program and International Programs. He noted the Honors Program had moved from the College of Arts and Sciences to the Provost in order to broaden participation. He pointed to the need for funds to encourage departments to develop standalone honors courses. Dr. Henry cited growth of Study Abroad for the requests for two staff positions in International Programs.

College of Arts and Sciences FY2009 budget requests

Dr. Adamson reviewed the budget requests from the College of Arts Sciences, emphasizing Action Plan-related tenure track and non-tenure track faculty positions, initiatives to be more competitive in the market for faculty, support positions in three departments, and internationalization. She commented on challenges of filling faculty positions without benefit of faculty development funds for faculty approaching pre-tenure review, release time after successful pre-tenure review, etc. when competing institutions are offering such.

Dr. Alberto asked about scalability of pre-tenure review related packages as applied to the other colleges. He cautioned that although the idea of such support was excellent, university-wide costs could be major, and urged a university-wide examination of such. Dr. Tai commented that the $550K cost for the College of Arts and Sciences would probably be one half of the university-wide cost given the proportion of university faculty in the college. Dr. Adamson observed such initiatives would give teeth to pre-tenure review, and should be considered in the context of what would be lost, if not provided.

Dr. Whittington commented that while it was customary to brag about top rankings, being a best bargain was not always a positive. He pointed to corners cut in order to achieve such recognition, and cited loss of an alarming number of good candidates for faculty positions.
Dr. Morris stated that this situation had been on-going for many years, and departments had used indirect cost funds to address these challenges, but these funds were more and more insufficient.

Dr. Alberto reiterated that his concern was about the piecemeal approach. Dr. Adamson answered that the College of Arts and Sciences request was for a pilot program.

**Finance & Administration FY2009 budget requests**

Dr. Rackliffe presented the Finance & Administration requests for reserve funds for the incoming President and for contingency in the event of budget cuts. He withdrew the budget cut-related request given the recent action by the Governor to address revenue shortfalls in advance. Dr. Henry pointed to existing flexibility in the budget as sufficient reserve. Dr. Morris cautioned that unallocated funds are an easy target. Dr. Morris expressed concern about further cuts. Dr. Rackliffe noted full-year funding of OMP for new space not on-line at the beginning of the year as a cushion against additional cuts.

Dr. Morris asked about other needs explicitly in Finance & Administration. Dr. Rackliffe noted application of technology to facilities, for example bathroom cleaning machines.

Prepared by Edgar Torbert
Approved March 19, 2007