The minutes of November 12 were approved as presented.

**Vista migration**: The first item of business was a presentation on Vista migration, a BOR initiative. M.J. Casto introduced Carolyn Gard as lead on the migration project. Casto also informed of the VISTA website: http://vista.gsu.edu and that Gard’s team will be available for college and departmental presentations.

Providing a handout on WebCT Vista migration, Gard informed that the move to Vista would allow faculty to create a content module with all WebCT tools available in the module, and with content also available from the USG, GSU, college, and department level. Faculty will have to migrate no earlier than the end of fall semester. Currently Georgia State has 82 faculty members and 110 courses ready to use Vista in the spring semester. Faculty will have at least three semesters to migrate to Vista. [Note added subsequent to meeting: There are technical issues encountered with Vista. The deadline for migration has not been established yet, but it will be no earlier than spring semester 2005.] For convenience during this time period, UETS will cross-link WebCT and Vista websites to help students find their course materials. Faculty who would like assistance migrating or redesigning their courses should email uets-is@gsu.edu

The Vista team will organize and look over the courses and UETS will look at them from a constructional design standpoint. The integration of Vista with Banner is now in test and is scheduled to be ready the 1st quarter of 2004 to test pilot over the summer. When integrated, Banner transactions will be sent to Vista in real time.

Vista videos will be available on the web for student viewing. The videos will give instructions on how to log in, change a password, navigate a course, and check for grades. Casto will look into the option of auto forwarding student e-mail from outside addresses to their GSU a/c by setting a default that would auto to an outside address. Fritz advised that the Banner Faculty Team’s #1 priority is integration of WebCT and Banner. It will facilitate adding, dropping and verifying class rolls.

Hurt informed that Librarians could now populate web pages with information that people are scanning into. The web pages can populate at every level and they are getting that word out to faculty. Griffith informed of an electronic reserve system in the Law Library and of faculty being asked to collect in advance, articles they want put on reserve. The system also has e-mailing capability. Hurt advised of a comparable system in the Library.

Gard notified of a plan to train college representatives on Vista migration and to have either an entire course for faculty, or a visualization web page. Hurt recommended that the representatives on the college teams be content as well as technically oriented.

**Classroom capacity**: Not on the agenda, but an item brought to the attention of the administration by the GSU Fire Marshall and the Chair of the Safety Committee, Henry informed of a problem with classroom over-population. Fritz provided a printout delineating classroom buildings, room numbers, Banner capacity, actual seats, and a Fire Marshall occupant load. The FM load was calculated on 20 sq.ft. per student. Footage Fritz was informed can change with classroom size. According to Fire Marshall guidelines we are exceeding occupant load and putting more students in class than Banner capacity. Permission was given by the Fire Marshall to proceed as is for spring semester, with adjustments to be made in the fall. Henry pointed out that capacity is available, but that talks need to be held on redistribution of sections, and more use of less populated time slots. He advised that the Registrar has been asked to close off registration if classes exceed classroom loads. Fritz recommended investigation of rooms that appear to be unavailable on the classroom schedule, but are not being used. Henry questioned max. capacity for rooms with 1 exit. Fritz informed that he had not seen guidelines addressing that issue, but that he would investigate with the Fire Marshall. Colaruso noted that space per student needs to be resolved, and suggested checking with UGA & Tech to see what they are doing. Derby advised looking at max. load over more than 1 semester pointing out that 1 section might be over max. only for the semester reviewed.

**Areas of Focus RFP**: Henry advised of recommendations from the Strategic Planning subcommittee to add as appendices to the Action Plan, the RFP – with slight changes, and the centrality document with two changes to the review process. Copies of both documents were e-mailed in advance of the meeting. The change in the RFP was in
the timeline, and in the centrality document, was that the Strategic Planning Subcommittee in parallel with FACP would get information on academic programs and centers. Administrative and support unit evaluations will remain under the purview of FACP. The argument being that programs and centers are part of the Strategic Plan of the university so should come through the Strategic Planning committee, before both going to FACP. This potentially would provide for wider participation in discussion of programs and centers. Henry also noted that the SPSC rather than FACP would establish the faculty and administrator teams to evaluate programs and centers requiring additional examination.

Henry informed that FACP would meet in the afternoon and part of their discussion would be to devise the mechanism for evaluation of areas of focus. One way would be to put together a blue ribbon committee consisting of one member from each college, or in the case of A&S a combination. The committee would then establish the guidelines for evaluation. It was suggested that pre-proposals for initial screening might be an option to pare down the number of proposals for review and since only a few will be funded, would reduce faculty time involvement. Pre-proposals might also allow for matching-up some proposals with the consideration that timing becomes an issue when evaluating full proposals. As a way of reducing the length of the proposals, Kelley suggested that the pre-proposals drop the bio sketches. Colarusso recommended staying with vision, goals, outcomes and budget to identify whether they are truly areas of focus, and dropping the evaluation and support section.

Henry noted an original timeline of 2/13 for review of proposals. This would necessitate setting aside money without knowing who would be funded. Informing that FACP works on the budget in April when the university gets its allocation from the Regents, he commented that FACP would need to have knowledge of funding by mid-April at the latest for the budget to be ready to submit to the BOR in May. Noting that the review team has to have time to review and to pass their evaluations on to FACP, he proposed a date of February 6 for receipt of pre-proposals, and allowing three weeks for review prior to advising units of selection for full proposals.

Derby was of the opinion that the guidelines should request that units expand on and be specific with respect to required resources. Hurt asked that the guidelines also address faculty needs from the Library. Casto seconded that request with respect to IT needs.

**Lecturers:** Henry informed that proposed policy on lecturers agenda item was off the table. The Executive Committee had issues with the policy and had returned it to Faculty Affairs for further discussion. Hurt asked that Faculty Affairs be asked to also look at policy on other NTT appointments.

**RACAA meeting:** Henry reported on the Regents meeting of Academic Vice President’s. He reported that there was nothing new on budget still a 2-1/2% cut followed by the 5%. Papp had advised that the Governor was supportive for return of workload money to the institutions. During breakout sessions, had discussion with his counterparts at UGA, Tech. & the Medical College regarding their processes for managing the budget cuts. They are requiring that all areas detail how they will absorb the 2-1/2% cut by fall, and also the 5%. They have a process in place, similar to what we are doing for rating programs. Programs with a rating of High (no cuts), Medium (medium cuts), and Low (major cuts). At UGA they are looking at elimination of non-essential programs and support units. They are taking this opportunity to evaluate all areas. At Tech., EFT is generated in departments that also receive the grant indirect costs. They will look at viability of courses from the standpoint of numbers of student graduates and at the number of courses faculty teach. They will back up programs with quantitative data and come up with 7-1/2% in cuts. Academic and non-academic areas will go through equivalent review.

**Miscellaneous:** Griffith informed that using UPS over FedEx has resulted in significant savings. Hurt informed that the UGA Librarian is speculating that the legislature will propose a 5% cut, but implement a 2%. Henry informed that there will be no money in ETACT, and that by the Governor’s direction the 1.3M matching from the lottery will be used for replacement funds for Galileo. Lottery money also supports the GRA so what impact that will have we don't know.