Members Attending: Greg Abt, Paul Alberto, Pam Barr, David Caudill, Hugh Hudson, Steve Kaminshine, Susan Kelley, Risa Palm, P.C. Tai

Others Attending: Bart Hildreth, Beth Jones, Randy Kamphaus, Bill Nelson, Tim Renick, Nan Seamans, Edgar Torbert

The minutes of September 16, 2009, were approved.

College of Law Differential Tuition

Dr. Kaminshine presented a proposed increase in differential tuition for College of Law students from $429 to $449 per credit hour for in-state students and a proposed decrease from $1,305 to $1,186 per credit hour for out-of-state students. Dr. Kaminshine noted the increase for in-state students was the fourth in a series of five annual increases tied to the College of Law building project.

Dr. Hudson asked about comparisons with tuitions at other law schools such as the University of Georgia. Dr. Kaminshine replied Georgia State remained lower than the University of Georgia, but was no longer the second lowest in the US ahead of only the University of Wyoming. He added Georgia State remained in the lowest quartile of law schools by tuition.

Dr. Kaminshine noted the substantial increases in base tuition charged to all graduate students had impacted law students as well as the differential tuition increases, but Georgia State tuition remained a great deal for law students.

Mr. Caudill asked about the reason for a concurrent decrease in tuition for out-of-state students. Dr. Kaminshine answered that the even larger increases in base tuition for out-of-state students threatened to price Georgia State out of the market. Dr. Palm asked about the percentage of students, who are out-of-state. Dr. Kaminshine responded approximately 10% are out-of-state. Dr. Alberto commented the Princeton Review ranking of the Georgia State law school would have a positive impact on out-of-state student recruitment.

Dr. Kelley made a motion to recommend the proposed tuition changes as presented. Dr. Alberto seconded the motion. The motion passed.

2nd Century Initiative (2CI)

Dr. Palm invited discussion of the draft document, 2nd Century Initiative 2009-2010, circulated prior to the meeting, outlining a competitive program to hire clusters of two or more faculty scholars of national prominence to expand and enrich existing areas of strength toward the goal of increased federal funding and heightened national competitiveness of those academic units. Dr. Palm indicated the draft document had been prepared by Dr. Morris and shared with the Deans Group and department chairs in different versions at different times.
Dr. Tai raised questions about the timeline for the first cycle of 2CI proposals and requested earlier deadlines for the proposals in order to enable hiring by Fall 2010. Dr. Alberto responded that eminent scholar hires usually take longer than six months, and suggested later deadlines in order to have time for collaboration. Dr. Palm observed the request for proposals needed to be out in August 2009 for hires for September 2010. Dr. Kaminshine agreed a later deadline was needed for collaboration since winter break would limit most of the time for such activity to November.

Dr. Tai suggested a dual cycle of proposals the first year in order to proceed with ideas for eminent scholar hires already in progress. Dr. Kaminshine cautioned a dual cycle of proposals could potentially result in inordinately valuing the first set of proposals on the basis of being the first under consideration.

Dr. Palm requested a straw poll on the proposal due date among December 15, January 15, and February 15, with February 15 being the most popular choice.

Dr. Tai asked if there would be annual requests for proposals. Dr. Palm replied it was anticipated the best ideas would be submitted in the first round with opportunities to fine tune unfunded proposals in subsequent rounds. Dr. Hudson asked about the amount of funds available for 2CI. Dr. Palm responded that the amount had not been determined, but she was seeking a preliminary figure from Dr. Becker and Dr. Rackliffe.

Dr. Kaminshine asked about any limit on number of proposals from each college. Dr. Palm answered multiple proposals were likely, and asked if low probability of funding would deter proposals. Dr. Kaminshine replied that proposals would more likely be pursued because of the possibility of funding in a future cycle. Dr. Alberto commented on the importance of the collaborative efforts across colleges and departments in spite of the low probability of funding.

Dr. Tai asked about the proposed dual committees to review proposals, one comprised of the deans and the other of faculty. Dr. Palm answered the deans wanted a process similar to the Areas of Focus process, but smaller and with an independent component. Dr. Hudson asked if the recommended proposals would be ranked by the two committees. Dr. Palm stated ranked recommendations were preferred.

Dr. Tai pointed to the need to prescribe how rankings for proposals crossing colleges would be done since the deans were asked to rank their own college proposals. Dr. Kaminshine noted deans in some colleges were not experienced with the type of proposal scoring approaches employed in the sciences.
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