Planning & Development Committee Meeting  
November 15, 2004

Present: J. L. Albert, Michael Binford, Greg Brack, Joan Carson, Timothy Crimmins, Martin Fraser, Christine Gallant, Sandra Garber, John K. Lee, Robin Morris, Siva Nathan, Marcia Pearl, Jerry Rackliffe, George Rainbolt, Hazel Scott, Tarianna Stewart, Phang C. Tai, Ellen Taylor, William L. Waugh, Carol Winkler.


Others Attending: Laura Burtle (for Charlene S. Hurt).

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of Minutes 10/26/04

2. ASUR Reports  
   a. GSU Library  
   b. Grad. Admissions

3. Admin. Supp. Unit Review PROCESS (draft)

4. APACE Program Review (draft)

5. Subcommittee Reports  
   a. Budget Priorities  
   b. Other Subcommittee Reports

Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx. 1:03pm. The October 26th minutes were seconded & approved.

Joan Carson began the meeting by reporting in for the 10-25-04 ASUR Library; covering issues pertaining to its budget. Jerry Rackliffe responded by explaining the way the budgets with the libraries (including the law library) were handled toward the end of the fiscal year.

In that report Tim Crimmins questioned area D.1. Leadership - mentioning that “The leadership and management are strong, consistent, and visionary” vs. area E. Work Environment - where he explained the recommendations under that area were contrary to D.1. and expressed that management issues were not being adequately addressed. Joan Carson responded that, that area of the report may not have been up to date, but that it would be corrected before the Action Plan was produced.

The committee then motioned & accepted the ASUR Library Report without further comment.
Siva Nathan reported on the ASUR Graduate Admissions Report dated 8/23/04. He started off by explaining that the Director of the RCB Doctorate Programs didn’t receive initial information in regards to the ASUR process and was in the process of correcting the oversight. He mentioned the incident was explained on page 11 at the end of the report.

The next items discussed were sections 2 & 5 of the report.

2. Develop a larger number of centralized processing functions.
While the model of each college having its own graduate admissions office is highly atypical nationally, it is well entrenched at Georgia State. While leaving the control of substantive admissions decisions to the colleges (which feel they have a better grasp of the needs of their students and disciplines), the university could assume some of the tasks in receiving and processing basic admissions data. (The University of Denver's and other like models might be studied more closely.) Such a step has been initiated since the completion of the self studies with regard to GRE and GMAT scores; the university, through IS & T, just has purchased a service which uploads incoming scores onto Banner where the various graduate admissions offices then can access them. A centralized approach may also be warranted with regard to the processing and evaluation of international credentials, currently performed by the director of the AYSPS office for several of the six colleges, and a number of other areas. The Admissions Working Group should make concrete recommendations to the Provost's Office and the Deans within 6 months concerning which, if any, other graduate admissions functions might better be centralized than handled by each office individually.

5. Assess appropriate staffing and budget
The graduate admissions offices and the Provost's Office should compile and review data about staffing, budget, and recruitment efforts of an adequate sample of truly "comparable" offices at peer and aspirational institutions. This data should then inform staffing and budget decisions in the future. If truly comparable national models cannot be found even beyond the Urban 13+ universities, further and serious analysis and justification of the Georgia State model would then be warranted. The Council of Graduate Schools (www.cgsnet.org) offers a consulting service that may help in this analysis.

Tim Crimmins questioned who page 10, section 5 of the report was referring to within the Office of the Provost.

Joan Carson “Not sure, maybe me. I think the main outcome is there needs to be more coordination in the graduate admissions offices.”

Tim mentioned that there had been some intentions to get the VP of Research involved . . . “Maybe it should be suggested by this committee.”

George Rainbolt - I think we need a crucial distinction with two different things. One, is the substantive admissions decisions, and I think those should remain where they are: in some colleges they’re at the college level & in some colleges they’re at the dept. level. The substantive decisions need to stay there; 100% there.

On the other hand, there is the clerical functions. I would suggest we need a two-pronged strategy: 1) decentralize substantive decision making and 2) centralize clerical processing. In my department we don’t want anyone helping us making admissions decisions, but we would love to have someone helping us with the clerical tasks.
George mentioned that he thought the work might be better served through the Office of Enrollment Services rather than Research Office (mentioned above). Robin Morris agreed.

Tim Crimmins recommended that further discussion on the matter be taken. Referring to pages 9-10 - “I move that we accept the report and that we add a recommendation that the Provost respond in a timely manner on that recommendation. I’m suggesting that the Provost appoint some administrator to serve & coordinate the function that is outlined in recommendations 2 & 5.”

RESPONSE BY THE COMMITTEE

George Rainbolt suggested a re-review of the committee in apx. 2yrs; stating the major importance of maintaining stability in the graduate programs. Tim Crimmins preferred having a responsible party over the programs rather than a re-review and also sited the enormous amount of time it took to prepare such a review. Carol Winkler agreed w/ Tim, but placed importance on processing needs (siting cases where graduate students weren’t accepted due to the processing time of there applications taking 2-3 months to process).

Joan Carson recommended that P&D ask for a follow up report from the Provost Office in apx. 1 year. The group accepted the report with Joan’s recommendation as a “friendly amendment”.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Marty Fraser - “I’ve noticed in here the comparison against Urban 13, and I’m wondering why the Board of Regents’ peer institutions were not included in this.” If you’re gonna collect data in section 5, I’d like to have something about the Board of Regents’ peer institutions for Georgia State. Joan Carson - “Okay”

Siva Nathan explained the B.O.R. Peer Institutions were used for academic comparisons while the Urban 13 were used for administrative comparisons.

Tim Crimmins mentioned that the Urban 13 didn’t have Graduate Programs as big as GSU’s programs.

THE GROUP ACCEPTED THE REPORT WITH MARTY’S RECOMMENDATION.

The committee moved on to items 3 & 4 on the agenda. The two reports discussed were:

1) Draft 11/10/04 - Senate Review of Proposals for Academic Program Evaluation in the Context of Possible Deactivation & Termination

and

2) Draft 11/10/04 - Process for Administrative Program Evaluation November 2004
Phang Tai introduced and gave an overview of the documents. He mentioned that the ASUR committee was going to finalize the criteria needed. Joan Carson that it would be difficult to find criteria that would characterize all the Administrative Support Units. She explained that this would be easy in the case of an academic programs, but not in the case of an administrative unit; especially when referring to quality & centrality.

George Rainbolt suggested maybe using a comparison to Peer Institutions. He also explained how some units would sometimes entertain ending/changing certain administrative functions/units based on RUMORS that the function/unit may be dissolved anyway.

J. L. Albert affirmed that the situation George was referring to took place in the IS&T division, and that they were now in the process of figuring out which services they wanted to start eliminating.

Jerry Rackliffe recapped on the budget issues that affected the issue last within past years and what may take place to handle the issue in the future.

Greg Brack - “There’s no checkpoints to say what it takes to go forward. Who decides what it takes to go forward, and based on what criteria? I’m not opposed to budget planning, but if we’re going to accelerate it, we also need to plan when to step on the brakes!”

George Rainbolt agreed with Greg and suggested that P&D request that “By November 1st of each year the provost shall announce whether the following process shall be initiated and why it is being initiated. Marty Fraser said there should be hard evidence that there was a reason to go through with the process.

Phang Tai & Robin Morris expressed concern that it was better to always be prepared, and stressed that if it was decided in November (or at some other point) that the process was not needed, and later found out that it was needed (usually found out in April/May), there would not be enough time to prepare for the event.

Robin Morris - “I understand the issue, but I’m trying to figure out reality. This year we didn’t get the budget until May and we didn’t know we were going to get cut. If we had to wait until what we knew was going to happen in the budget, we would basically have to do all of this in about a 2 week process, and it’s just not realistic. It will put us in a position of having to make decisions without a systematic process being involved. I’m a little concerned with the idea of waiting until we know, because we don’t know until the last minute what is going to happen. I agree that we don’t have to do everything, but we at least need a precursor work to make sure we have some data in place to make decisions.”

Tim Crimmins warned that once a unit was identified as a potential area to be cut, people start “jumping ship”. Therefore there needs to be a process that can handle budget cuts or redirection.
Eventually, after other input from various members on the issue, George Rainbolt suggested the following as a possible amendment to the document entitled *Process for Administrative Program Evaluation Nov. 2004*.

**Provost**
- Announces that the process below is necessary.
- Provides reasons why the process is necessary.
- This announcement will be provided to VPs, Deans, and major unit heads by November 1st.

George stated that instead of spending a lot of time and effort on something that may not happen, he preferred a process that identified “We’ve had a BAD year” and then that triggered a process that had been worked out in advance to respond to the bad year.

Phang Tai made the final suggestion on this issue that an *P&D/ASU Evaluation Subcommittee* be formed to discuss and work on the issue and its criteria more in depth. Greg Brack, Sandra Garber, and Siva Nathan agreed to serve on the committee, with Siva as Chair.

Afterwards, the group moved on to item #5 on the Agenda the Subcommittee Reports.

Christine Gallant reported in for the Budget Priorities Subcommittee. She discussed the draft proposal from that committee and explained to the group that from the larger report entitled *Subcommittee on Budget Principles and Priorities Report: December 16, 2003*, this draft highlighted (from the larger report) the priorities that needed to be focused on. It was a one paged report, and after a brief discussion it was **motioned & accepted to remove the following explanatory sentences from the 2nd bulleted item in the last paragraph on the page.**

*These programs and areas must be determined quickly, for three other ranking priorities--#2. funding of Academic Program Review Action Plans, #3. the Libraries, and #6. Attracting Quality Graduate Students—depend upon these decisions.*

Tim Crimmins & others suggested that the item #8 from *Subcommittee on Budget Principles and Priorities Report: December 16, 2003* also (in some capacity) be added to the Subcommittee draft.

8. **Action Plans Developed Through Administrative Support Unit Program Review:** The University goal of improving quality depends in significant part on the effectiveness of its administrative support units both at the university and college level. The newly developed program of administrative support unit program review is an important means of achieving this administrative effectiveness. Thus, support for action plans developed through administrative support unit program review should be a priority.

Christine agreed to work on the addition.
Phang Tai briefly announced some updates in regards to the MRRF List, and the meeting adjourned at apx. 2:24pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator