Minutes of October 6 were approved.

President’s remarks

Dr. Patton commented on the success of the $127M Results Campaign as a turning point for Georgia State. He also urged encouragement of participation in the State Charitable Contributions Campaign as that participation registers with donor prospects for Georgia State.

Dr. Patton called attention to an article in the AJC on Governor Perdue and his behind-the-scenes approach to directing state government. Dr. Patton noted a new equation for funding higher education with increases in tuition resulting in lower appropriations from the state. He cautioned that planning should not assume large increases in tuition revenues.

Budget Update

Dr. Henry reported summer and fall tuition revenues this year were $2.2 million short with the possibility of the shortfall reaching $4M with spring. He noted a $3.1M shortfall had been projected, but unanticipated larger shortfalls in paid graduate credit hours in the Robinson College of Business and the College of Education were responsible for the higher figure. Dr. Patton asked if fewer undergraduate transfers were also a problem. Dr. Fritz replied that growth in freshmen offset the drop in transfers. Dr. Huss cited the 25% drop in MBA admissions worldwide and a change in the MBA curriculum for the RCB shortfall. He projected a recovery from the curriculum change within one year. Dr. Colarusso pointed out the College of Education had seen enrollments up in fall 2003 and down in fall 2004. He commented on competition with programs offered within school systems and by fly-by-night operations. He also noted a letter from Chancellor Meredith calling for the doubling of teacher output from colleges of education. He indicated a proposal was in development to seek Board of Regents funding for this purpose.

Enrollment Targets

Dr. Henry called attention to the item in the Board of Regents strategic plan pertaining to enrollment growth, which forecasted 200K more students in the University System by 2015. He added that the majority of this growth would be students from the Atlanta metropolitan area. Dr. Henry commented on potential enrollments at Alpharetta Center and south of Atlanta, the increase in student housing beds to 4,450 by fall 2007, the possibility of increasing freshman enrollments to 3,000, and focusing on upper division students.

Dr. Patton spoke to the need to fill residence halls and possibly requiring freshmen to live in
residence halls. He noted the success of students living in residence halls. Dr. Fritz commented on the demand for students wanting to stay in the Lofts beyond the freshman year. He also pointed out that the slow decrease in transfer students leads to a better quality student profile. Mr. Simpson added that freshmen and students in residence halls were more likely to get involved in student activities.

Dr. Winkler observed that classrooms are already tightly scheduled and faculty resources stretched so that growth would be difficult to absorb. She suggested leveraging with the Board of Regents to add floors to the science teaching lab and humanities building projects. Dr. Patton replied that while this made sense, the two projects were already twice the normal cost of capital projects for the University System, and the Board of Regents and legislature preferred to spread the wealth. Mr. Sheheane echoed this point relative to the position of the Governor on spreading capital projects among institutions. Dr. Patton noted this bias had already affected positioning of the science teaching lab project on the capital projects list.

Dr. Henry commented that the $4B estimate by the Board of Regents of the cost to absorb the additional 200K students would not be funded. He offered that it would be necessary to look at other ways to deliver instruction, including blended courses with a combination of face-to-face and on-line instruction.

Dr. Patton pointed out that there was considerable capacity at Alpharetta Center for additional students. Dr. Huss responded that filling Alpharetta Center would be dependent on offering complete undergraduate programs there.

Dr. Adamson spoke of the need to build the freshman cohort and to focus transfer admissions on specific majors. Dr. Henry referred to the University of Georgia web site which lists openings for transfers. He added that such an approach would require a change in the policy on changes of major. Dr. Fritz noted there was no intention of relying entirely on new freshmen given partnerships with feeder institutions such as Georgia Perimeter College. He added that the University System tuition task force was discussing differential lower and upper division tuition rates.

Ms. Hurt asked about possible changes to the policy on changes of major. Dr. Henry gave examples of restricting changes of major to registration periods only and instituting handoffs of transfers between colleges. Dr. Huss asked about the University of Georgia policy relative to transfers. Dr. Henry replied that transfer applicants must declare a major and are not allowed to switch.

Dr. Huss suggested controlling transfer admissions at the college level. Dr. Fritz responded that currently the colleges handle articulation, but the admissions office reviews transcripts. Dr. Henry suggested further review of this approach. Dr. Moore asked about transfers between the first and second years. Dr. Fritz answered that the University of Georgia did not accept transfers with fewer than 30 credit hours. He added that Georgia State had also had better results with that group of transfers. Dr. Henry noted students were more likely to stay the second year at Georgia Perimeter College because of the lower cost.

Dr. Adamson asked about summer school given reliance of credit hours generated in the summers, but often using different faculty from regular academic year. Dr. Patton pointed to
summer school as a way to generate significant net income, and noted a proposal to have summer school at select University System institutions only.

Dr. Huss raised the issue of low classroom utilization on Fridays. He advocated more flexibility with clock hours in order to increase use. Dr. Henry responded that such variations could be a problem for undergraduate students taking Monday-Wednesday-Friday courses across colleges. Dr. Fritz added that Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes were less popular when other options were available. He suggested more attention to the early morning and late afternoon time slots and scheduling on Fridays and Saturdays. Dr. Henry commented that with 31% of students being part-time and in many cases working, they needed classes at particular times. Dr. Patton commented that students living in residence halls would be more agreeable to the Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedule.

Dr. Dabney noted holes in the clock schedule which lead to under-utilization such as having 9:00-11:30 a.m. classes on Fridays, but not on Mondays and Fridays. Dr. Henry pointed to the difficulty of blending in 2 and 4 credit hour courses. Dr. Fritz spoke of Monday-Wednesday-Friday and Tuesday-Thursday as a better scheme for classroom utilization purposes.

Dr. Morris commented that Psychology had tried Saturday classes with some success, but the lack of services such as the bookstore was a problem. He projected that Friday-Saturday would work. Dr. Henry noted that Kennesaw State has had success with Friday-Saturday scheduling. Mr. Simpson agreed Friday-Saturday would be attractive for many working students.

Dr. Patton spoke to the factor of efficiency in scheduling. Dr. Moore commented that many students work four days and go to school two days. Ms. Hurt stated that having library and auxiliary services for Friday-Saturday scheduling would be essential. Dr. Patton responded that enough traffic would justify the added expense for those operations.

Dr. Kaminshine asked about the history of not requiring freshmen to enroll full-time. Dr. Henry replied the history centered on being open to non-traditional students. Dr. Fritz added that students want to take fewer credit hours in order to protect grade point averages for HOPE.

Dr. Adamson recommended a selective slate of Saturday offerings, all scheduled in Aderhold, with a catchy name for the initiative. Mr. Simpson pointed out that the Aderhold location would be more convenient because of the eating establishments in the vicinity. He expressed concern about parking since the shuttles would not be running on Saturdays.

Dr. Winkler stated that since core curriculum classes are currently packed, an increase in the number of freshmen would necessitate additional sections, which could be taught by graduate assistants, but would still require faculty for supervision.

Dr. Patton asked about support in the Board of Regents tuition task force for differential peak-hour pricing. Dr. Fritz replied that there was not much support, mainly because of the difficulty of explaining the approach to students and automating such tuition calculations in Student Accounts. Mr. Rackliffe commented that the University of Oregon had implemented differential pricing of this type successfully. He questioned whether there were sufficient openings other than Fridays to justify the scheme. Mr. Simpson questioned any plan which would charge traditional students more than others. Dr. Patton responded that the off-peak hours would be
discounted rather than charging more for the peak hours.

Dr. Adamson commented that fees were also an issue, which should be considered for those taking only Friday-Saturday classes. Dr. Patton noted that previous attempts to implement differential fees under a revenue neutral plan had been blocked by the Board of Regents staff. Mr. Rackliffe added that facility fees such as the Recreation Center fee were particularly dependent upon the revenue neutral stipulation. Dr. Adamson suggested there might be a need for additional fees related to the undergraduate experience. Dr. Patton responded that such fees might be considered if tuition increases were blocked, but any new fees would not be covered by HOPE.

Ms. Hurt asked about enrollment targets for graduate and professional students. Dr. Henry replied that the strategic plan called for 30%, but actual graduate enrollments had fallen to 27% because of growth in undergraduate enrollments. He spoke to the need to grow master’s and doctoral enrollments, while increasing the quality of research and doctoral programs.

Dr. Kaminshine commented on the need to exploit all we have as a large university such as expanding joint degree programs.

Dr. Huss noted competition from Emory and the University of Georgia for MBA students. He pointed out students were selecting on quality of facilities, technology, reputation, etc. rather than price. He added that in the case of the EMBA, the competition was worldwide.

Mr. Simpson agreed students are looking for quality and services. He observed that students were generally unaware of or did not understand the research focus. Dr. Henry commented on the benefit of the research focus in terms of ranking by peers and perception of the university. Dr. Patton added that there had been strong efforts to inform supporters and alumni about research, but not incoming students. Dr. Fritz responded that the new university web site featured vignettes about research. Dr. Adamson commented on the incongruity of renowned research efforts in a building like Kell Hall, and what the new science teaching lab and research buildings would mean in terms of public perception.

Dr. Winkler asked about the drop in new graduate students. Dr. Henry replied that this was due in part to the drop in international students related to SEVIS measures. He added that with all the attention given to undergraduate recruitment and retention, there had not been a central focus on graduate recruitment and retention. Dr. Fritz stated that 50% of the 300 graduate student decline was international students. Dr. Moore added that nationally the drop in international students was 25-30%.

Dr. Adamson commented that the graduate application fee of $50 was a problem for many international graduate students. She suggested consideration of some change in fees for international graduate students in order to be more open and friendly. Dr. Henry asked how reliant departments were on international students. Dr. Adamson replied that the natural sciences and computer science were especially dependent on international students.

Mr. Simpson asked about efforts to encourage Georgia State undergraduate students to continue at Georgia State in graduate programs. Dr. Henry answered that efforts differed by college. Dr. Moore indicated the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies pursued the very best Georgia State
students, but also wanted to diversify. Dr. Kaminshine replied that the College of Law did not target Georgia State students. Dr. Huss stated that the Robinson College of Business varied by department in this regard. Dr. Adamson noted the issue of too much overlap with honors students in some cases.

**Announcements**

Dr. Huss announced the *Financial Times* (London) had ranked the Georgia State EMBA program in the top 50 worldwide, top 25 in the United States, and top 3 in the Southeast behind Emory and Duke.

Ms. Peterman thanked everyone for participation in the highly successful Results Campaign and outlined the schedule for the campaign conclusion celebration on November 5. She stated that the silent phase of the next campaign would begin shortly.

Dr. Moore announced the celebration of the opening of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies building would be April 13 with Mr. Young and former President Carter attending.

Dr. Huss announced the Robinson College of Business alumni awards celebration would be November 16 at the Atlanta History Center.