Henry opened with discussion on the modified Areas of Focus document. He advised of revisions to Appendices 1 & 2 as a result of recommendations from the 12/16 meeting of the P&D Committee. Appendix 1, guidelines for evaluation of programs and centers, #3 added "coordination among evaluation teams to ensure consistency in the review process," and to the last two bullets on p.4, ......to inform budget allocation process for FY05, added "and future years." Appendix 2, the major changes were: extending due date of proposals from 2/13 to 3/5, and assigning pre-proposals into three categories: 1) go forward with proposals for FY05; 2) go ahead with proposals but not likely ready for FY05 funding; 3) not ready at this time, establish areas of focus for future years. He advised that once the budget allocation was available in April, funding could be set aside for development of areas of focus this year. A step he saw as critical to ramp up the quality of the university.

Adamson queried the Provost on his sense of the number of pre-proposals that would be submitted. His guess was 15-20, of which it was unlikely that more than 5 would be funded. With respect to proposing that there would be budget allocations for proposals beyond '05, she questioned the proportion of money that would go to proposals and whether there would be some overlap with action plans. Henry responded that it would depend on how much money was available, but informed that NTT needs and salary needs identified in action plans were a different process. He advised of little control over money added to the budget at the last minute, and that NTT to TT positions could not be considered at this time.

Colarusso noted that many programs under review will cross departments and colleges, he asked about responsibility for responding to the question on potential impact on other programs if an academic program was discontinued. Henry advised that if the units involved were unable to make that decision, it would go back to SPSC and FACP for resolution.

Bahl asked what the charge to the Areas of Focus evaluation committee would be. Henry advised that the committee will look at programs of distinction to the university in areas that cut across campus and will assign them to one of 3 categories: 1) fund now, 2) future funding, 3) will not consider.

Referring to Draft 3 of the Guidelines for pre-proposals doc. Henry informed that he would like to distribute the guidelines in early January. It was agreed that the document should include explicit instructions on attachments, and limit faculty bio's and publications. It was further agreed that the full proposal should be no more than 12 pages with attachments. Adamson interjected that the guidelines should have some mention of budgetary implications with a scale statement based on the size of the area of focus. She reasoned that the information would be an additional stimulus for faculty to work together. She commented that 1) faculty have better synergy by working together on areas of focus, 2) the size of the focus areas will make GSU better known for certain programs given that to be included in NRC rankings requires that a large number of faculty be involved in the same area. Fritz responded that there would be a minimum of dollars available, so only a small number of proposals can be funded. Kelly asked about the input the deans will have in evaluating pre-proposals. Henry responded that the deans would see the pre-proposals as they go through the colleges, which is the rationale behind FACP not evaluating the proposals, simply making the allocations.

Issues raised on Review Criteria, #6 - budget. Referencing library holdings issues, Hurt asked if the budget was large enough to cover all the issues presented. Colarusso asked if it was additional money that was being requested. Henry responded yes to new money over a period of years. Bahl advised that the key is the dean – the document implies that the dean knows what the budget implications are and will talk to the faculty as part of their proposal review. Louis asked if involvement in the proposal included more than one college, was each dean to sign off. Henry informed that each dean would sign off, but any one dean could veto the proposal. He added, however, that the idea is for cooperation across colleges. Stating that the implication is for proposals to be cross-college partnerships, Bahl asked if a cross-department partnership would be a deal breaker. Henry informed that it would not be an issue.

Harris pointed out that in the charge to review committees, the group is articulating the guidelines but he perceived them as not being clear as to what the administration is looking for with regard to improving national rankings. Noting
that NRC does not rank professional schools he questioned what guidelines the review committees will use in evaluating programs whose reputations pertain to the Atlanta area.

Henry noted that many professional programs have alliances with the CDC, the GRA, or have strong community business partnerships, all of which could be capitalized on to show their contribution to where they are in an urban, international city. Bahl recommended changing the description of Georgia State from an urban research university, to a university in an urban setting.

Henry informed that to be a top NRC research university entails having at least $20M in federal research expenditures per year. He noted that Georgia State is not there yet but that it is something to be cognizant of, although not the only thing being looked at in improving the quality of the institution. Following-up, Adamson suggested that it would be helpful to know what the 5-6 indicators would be to move up in the ratings. Fritz advised of enhancement in 3 categories: 1) increasing the number of doctoral students; 2) increased research dollars; 3) increasing the number of tenure track faculty. Henry added that GSU is in the top 200 research universities, but not at the $20M threshold in total research dollars. The university is in the top 100 in number of doctoral degrees, and in the number of post docs.

Returning to revisions to the proposal document, it was agreed to add a limit to the attachments and appendices, and to include a $500K minimum limit. Bahl suggested that the charge to the committee on the notion of partnerships could be broadened to include that partnerships could be with the business community.

Draft 1 – Guidelines:
With regard to criteria of "Quality," Colarusso asked that there be consideration for the possibility of potential for some programs that have just re-focused, and as a result have future potential for quality and viability. Henry advised that (3) Viability, would be the appropriate criteria under which to demonstrate the possibility of future potential for a program that is not doing well but has been modified. In that CHHS has NTT research faculty, Kelley requested that NTT be added to the "Resources" criteria. It was also suggested that #6 "Other," be replaced with "Additional Factors."

Moving to elimination of programs, Henry asked the deans for their thoughts on programs for possible elimination following college review.
Bahl recommended elimination of the MS & BS in HRD; and a possible phase-out of centers on external funding. In particular the Rehabilitation Leadership Program that trains state government managers in rehabilitation issues. It receives $4M in external funding but doesn’t fit and doesn’t play into the academic programs of the School.
Kelley informed that the MS in Health Sciences has 3 tracks, Nutrition, Physical Therapy, & Respiratory Therapy. The college is looking to change these to: a concentration in PT, they will retain the Masters in PT; and a concentration in RT - currently on hold because of the small number of students. They are looking at combining PT & RT and may convert Nutrition to a MPH concentration. The PHD students in nursing are older with GRE scores below 1,000. Nursing requires a score of 900, while the national average is 955. There is a nursing shortage so it would hurt to make changes to this program.
Colarusso advised that COE programs stipulate a GRE score of 1,000, but also allow for MAT scores in some programs, and that every PhD application comes through the Dean’s office.
Harris advised of 2 areas the college is looking at: undergraduate degrees, and the DBA in HR they have already eliminated. At the master’s level the focus is on reducing the number of MS options, there are 8 programs that will likely be combined. The MS program in financial services is being consolidating into a smaller career centered program. Concentrations in 8 programs are also being looked at with the objective of linking or eliminating, although linking may create a new program. The CIS doctoral program over 5 years has averaged 10 students. They take a core set of courses, then functional courses by discipline. The lack of graduate student support limits increasing doctoral programs.
Colarusso advised that the chairs and faculty, then the chairs and the dean evaluated the COE programs. Programs selected for elimination are the bachelors in middle-childhood education and the middle-childhood education concentration in teaching and learning. The middle-secondary undergraduate math education program is housed in A&S; only small sections of the program are in the COE, will A&S review? In EPS the ed. research & social foundations of education program should go through review for viability. The Kinesiology & Health recreation program should go through review. Rehabilitation counseling is associated with the skills training for counselors to work with people with disabilities it is central to the mission of teacher education and to health and social agencies. Professional counseling is central to the health field. The master’s in school psychology is strong. The counseling psychology doctoral program connects less to school counseling than school psychology.
Henry looking at EPS tracks noted that the indicators are not as strong in higher ed. Colarusso will look at the HE
program. The social foundations PhD has had 18 PhD students over the last 3 years – it covers research methods and statistics, has strong students and real potential.

Henry asked about the quality of the educational leadership program. Colarusso informed that it is the best in the state and the region and has further potential for being a stronger program. He then asked about the K&H sports sciences PhD program. Colarusso advised that graduates do well in the field, but it is small program developed with that intention. He had no problem with it being looked at. The sports medicine and sports administrations programs from a centrality standpoint, sports medicine could fit with the health program that addresses societal issues such as obesity, in cooperation with the PT program; sports administration graduates work in P16 areas which provide administrators for the metro area and nationally. Henry questioned the ed. psych. program. Colarusso informed of 29 active PhD students, which has brought the program up. COE programs for review: middle childhood BS & PhD – eliminate; EPS review ed. research; social foundations review the MS & PhD; K&H review health and P.E.

Adamson questioning viability, suggested the BA & MA in math be eliminated; eliminate the MA in theatre, the BA has 75 students; is undergoing program review, may fall under film & video; questioned centrality of music management, it is doing well and important to Atlanta; the BS in Geography is central to anthropology; geology doing very well, a high quality program; college wants to keep German; physics the BS is necessary. Centers are up for review.

Henry asked that the deans have everything finalized by the January 5 for review the 3rd or 4th week in January.

Enrollment: Fritz informed that fee review would take place the 1st week in January and may drop enrollment by 1K, but that the late registration yield is generally 6-7K. He reminded the group that spring would be the first semester since the GPA was raised to 2.50, and anticipated that it will result in enrollment being down 600-700 transfers. He also noted a possible tuition increase affect.