ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
Minutes of
May 2, 2007

Attendees: Lauren Adamson, Roy Bahl, Joan Carson, Mary Jane Casto, Ron Colarusso, Doug Covey, Dean Dabney, Dabney Dixon, Mary Finn, Sandra Garber, Ron Henry, Kerry Heyward, Charlene Hurt, Feniwck Huss, Steve Kaminshine, Susan Kelley, Tom Lewis, Mary McElroy, Robin Morris, Carlton Mullis, Carl Patton, Nancy Peterman, Jerry Rackliffe, Don Reitzes, Sterling Roth, Connie Sampson, Edgar Torbert, Shelly Williams

Minutes of February 7 were approved.

Dr. Patton welcomed new members Sandra Garber, Kerry Heyward, and Shelly Williams.

President’s remarks

Dr. Patton announced funds in the FY2008 budget awaiting the signature of the Governor for the science lab exhaust stacks ($4.8M) and ADA improvements in the Sports Arena ($1M). Mr. Lewis added that the special session would deal with the FY2007 supplemental budget, which did not include any Georgia State projects, but cautioned that compromises forged for approval of that budget could affect line item vetoes of the FY2008 budget [the Governor later signed the FY2007 supplemental budget in order to avoid calling the special session; however, he also vetoed the funding for the ADA improvements in the Sports Arena].

Dr. Patton announced a $5M pledge for construction of an auditorium for the Professional Education Center to house the Robinson College of Business and the College of Law.

Dr. Patton announced a table top exercise on May 16 pertaining to campus security as a follow-up to the shootings at Virginia Tech.

Unit name changes

Dr. Covey made a motion to change the name of the Student Services vice presidential area to Student Affairs. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Ms. Casto made a motion to change the name of University Computing and Communications Services (UCCS) to Technology Infrastructure and the Network Operations Center to Technology Operations Center. Dr. Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Policy advisory group

Dr. Carson presented a proposal to establish a policy advisory group to build a university wide policy library/web site, to call attention to the need for policies where there are none, to work toward elimination of conflicting policies, etc. Dr. Finn handed out a flow chart showing how the advisory group would work with various units, governance organizations, etc.

Dr. Adamson asked for discussion of the composition and leadership of the advisory group and to whom the advisory group would report. Dr. Carson indicated that Ms. Bannerman as Director of Administrative and Support Unit Planning and Assessment would serve as chair of the advisory group.

Dr. Finn stated that the advisory group would not develop policies, but would serve as a conduit for communicating need for policies, facilitating reviews for consistency, etc. She noted the particular shortcoming of existing policies without owners. Dr. Carson echoed this point with respect to needing an office or department specified as responsible for enforcement of each policy.

Dr. Adamson questioned the breadth of the purview of the advisory group given the very large number of college policies, including college-specific promotion and tenure policies and workload policies. Dr. Finn answered that the primary focus of the advisory group would be on university level policies, but the advisory group would also look for...
incongruencies between college policies and university policies.

Dr. Huss commented that it was unclear whether the advisory group would be purely advisory or would also have a policing role with respect to the colleges. Dr. Henry replied that the advisory group would only ensure that college policies were consistent with university policies. Dr. Heyward added that while university policy ultimately trumps college policy in the event of inconsistencies, ensuring consistency up front would avert unnecessary petitions. She stated the goal of creating a standard format for policies so that all policies would include such elements as purpose statements. She assured that the intent was not to take away college authority.

Dr. Colarusso observed that the direction of the arrows on the flow chart did not convey clearly the advisory role in the same way as the discussion.

Dr. Adamson again expressed concern about the scope of the advisory group. She pointed out that there were so many documents called policies that the advisory group would face a log jam. She suggested making the scope more specific by function. Ms. Casto remarked that many of the documents called policies were actually procedures. Dr. Carson added that matters were further complicated by policy statements, which included procedures.

Dr. Dabney suggested that the faculty representatives on the advisory group should be appointed by either the Senate Executive Committee or the Committee of Chairs rather than by the deans. Dr. Carson responded that the appointments by the deans were intended to facilitate the three-year cycle of membership, whereas the Senate worked on an annual basis. She pointed to the need to have committee members experienced with the task of getting to know policies. Dr. Dabney commended the FACP model of appointments by the Committee of Chairs, and urged involvement of the Senate early on.

Ms. Hurt asked about the portion of the policies overall, which would actually require Senate approval. Dr. Carson noted the four directions from which policies would come to the advisory group, and cited academic policies as an example of policies, which would go to the Senate for approval.

Dr. Dabney asked about the logic of the three-year terms for membership given that some colleges would have to wait six years for representation. Drs. Carson and Finn reiterated the need for experience gained through multiple year service on the advisory group and referred to success with staggered terms for ASUR committee service.

Dr. Kelley suggested expanding the advisory group to include one representative from each college. She also suggested a phased-in approach with initial implementation concentrating on university policies. Dr. Finn concurred that a phased-in approach would be more manageable. Dr. Carson added that the annual workload for new policies would be far less than the initial workload associated with compiling all existing policies.

Dr. Kaminshine observed that an initial focus on university policies would lead to more effective voluntary compliance by the colleges as they checked their policies against the compiled university policies.

Ms. Hurt suggested that the policy advisory group document include definitions of “policy” and “procedure”.

Dr. Adamson suggested an ad hoc committee to initiate the compilation of university policies, etc. rather than a formalized committee like CBSAC or FACP.

Dr. Huss voiced reservations about having non-experts review policies drafted by the colleges. He suggested that draft policies be sent to Legal Affairs for review rather than an advisory group. Dr. Patton responded that the issues were not always legal. Dr. Heyward added that a major goal was to have consistency across the university and to have standard elements such as to whom does the policy apply and where is the policy published.

Dr. Carson stated that the policy advisory group proposal had originated out of the SACS review. She again pointed to the need for designating ownership of policies.

Dr. Bahl commented that the proposed policy review plan did not seem to be a big problem, given that policies should be broad, so long as the colleges were allowed flexibility in implementation of policies. He observed that the colleges would not be compromised, if allowed to implement policies their own ways.
Dr. Reitzes suggested representation on the advisory group from both the colleges and the Senate.

Ms. Garber spoke to staff/administrator concerns about gaps in policies, and noted the benefits for old and new employees of having a compilation of policies.

Dr. Patton requested that those working on the advisory group proposal resubmit to the Administrative Council with attention to the points raised in this meeting, including definitions of “policy” and “procedure”, purpose, membership, etc.

**Campus security**

Ms. Sampson reported on on-going reviews of campus security following the shootings at Virginia Tech. She stated that an urban location like that of Georgia State made the challenge of security all the more daunting, but also had the advantage of other law enforcement agencies close at hand for assistance.

Ms. Hurt commented that the lack of quick communications seemed to be the biggest problem at Virginia Tech. Ms. Sampson replied that communications was a major item in the review at Georgia State, and that a meeting would be held on May 4 with Dr. Heyward, Ms. Hines, and others to look specifically at communications issues. She added that it was important to have many different means of communication for reaching as many members of the campus community as possible with “breaking news” type of messages. She listed e-mail, texting, cell phones, and loud speakers as examples of ways to communicate such messages. She also noted the difficulty of knowing what and how widely to communicate as in the case of Virginia Tech, when the first conclusion was that the incident was limited to student housing.

Dr. Patton emphasized the need to be systematic. He noted privacy concerns among students about texting as a means of university communication. Dr. Patton added that knowing what to communicate was another problem in the case of Virginia Tech. He commented on the difficulty of collecting sufficient information quickly to make a decision. He observed that decisions about locking doors have to be made locally.

Ms. Hurt reported that the construction company had disconnected all speakers in the Library while doing renovations. She asked about university wide speakers or squawkers. Ms. Sampson responded that there are speakers, but many do not work. Dr. Patton replied that Virginia Tech found loudspeakers to be the most effective method of getting the attention of students, faculty and staff, who are more apt to ignore e-mail broadcasts.

Dr. Adamson suggested a proactive approach such as issuing a statement about guns on campus. Ms. Sampson replied that persons determined to use a gun will do so regardless of policy statements. Dr. Adamson noted some concerns voiced by students about fellow students who are law enforcement personnel and wear guns to classes. Ms. Sampson answered that state law prohibits guns on campuses except for officers on duty. Dr. Patton pointed out an example of a student who was arrested for having a hunting rifle stored in his truck parked on campus. Dr. Bahl asked what was meant by “on campus”. Dr. Henry responded that the situation was more complicated for Georgia State because most of the sidewalks and streets on campus were city sidewalks and streets subject to city ordinances, which allow guns with permits.

Ms. Casto suggested that the LCD message boards around campus would be an additional means of broadcasting messages in an emergency.

Ms. Williams asked about the method of reporting situations in which students may be in danger. Dr. Covey replied that imminent threats should be first reported to the police and other situations to the Dean of Students.

Dr. Dixon commented on the high level of rights of privacy as observed in dealing with the Counseling Center on issues about immigration. Dr. Adamson responded that the Dean of Students would react differently and commented on a copycat incident after the Virginia Tech events, which was effectively handled by the Dean of Students and the police. Dr. Dixon urged communication to faculty regarding the services of the Dean of Students in such cases. Dr. Covey indicated the Dean of Students would be willing to present information at new faculty orientation and departmental or college faculty meetings, as requested.

Dr. Henry pointed out that the new IP telephone system would be able to push messages to all or selected sets of telephones in the event of an emergency.
Football study

Ms. McElroy reported on follow-up activities to the football feasibility study. She announced formation of a steering committee to look more closely at specifics relating to start-up of football. She stated that Colonial Athletic Association Commissioner Yeager would be on campus on May 4 to talk with the steering committee about CAA perspectives on football. Ms. McElroy added that the town hall meetings had attracted representatives both pro and con which led to healthy debate. She announced that former Atlanta Falcons head coach Dan Reeves had been hired as a consultant to help determine whether or not there was financial support in the community for football at Georgia State. She added that a pledge of $50K had already been received prior to launching a pledge campaign.

Dr. Henry reported that the financial pro forma prepared by Dr. Rackliffe had been shared with FACP, Deans Group, and department chairs. He noted concerns voiced in those sessions about the $8M needed for practice facilities, marching band, etc. and the timing of a student athletic fee increase with attainment of specific fund raising goals toward covering the $8M in start-up costs. He noted the proposed initial athletic fee increase was $85 per semester plus an additional $12 each year thereafter. He cautioned about the impact on graduate student recruitment. He urged a stipulation of pledge amounts prior to implementing an increase in the athletics fee for football.

Dr. Henry acknowledged the need to build community as the reason for the exploration of football. He suggested there might be other programs to achieve this objective with lower increases in fees. He cited new student housing closer to campus and playing fields closer to campus for intramurals and varsity sports as examples of other hooks for new students.

Ms. McElroy commented that basketball has historically not drawn students, in part because of the quality of product. Dr. Henry responded that University Commons might result in improved attendance.

Dr. Patton stated the issue as where does Georgia State seek to be in 20-25 years. He pointed to the importance of engaging students early in the fall semester, meeting the challenge of competitors who are looking to start football, and fitting into the South where football is an expectation of those looking at universities. Dr. Henry noted that some of the other Urban 13 universities do not have football, but they were not located in the South.

Dr. Covey spoke to the importance of broadening support for student activities by reinvesting in campus life, but not to the exclusion of football.

Dr. Patton stated that it was well known he had never been a fan of football, but he saw football as a way to engage students, meet the challenge of competitors for those students, and attract interest of donors who are football fans. He observed that Georgia State could not attain its goal of becoming the leading urban research university, if it could not attract students in increasing numbers.

Dr. Huss commented that Robinson College of Business students talk about the national credibility of their degrees and how despite the quality of faculty and programs they find their degree-granting institution not recognized far away. He added that the progressively more global nature of the job market accentuated the need for national recognition of Georgia State. He stated that students were being lost because of this current shortcoming.

Dr. Adamson questioned whether participation in Division I-AA would have the same effect. She suggested focusing on ways of energizing all student activities. She urged that any investment in football be part of a multi-faceted campaign to build community, not a separate initiative, which would leave Georgia State looking for something else to do to build community, if it failed. Dr. Patton added that new housing, the science park, etc. were already creating a different university.

Dr. Kaminshine agreed that looking to where Georgia State would be in 20-25 years was the right approach. He also questioned whether Division I-AA football would resonate in distant places. He suggested Georgia State had a better chance of building a nationally recognized basketball program.

Dr. Huss responded that football was only part of a broader vision. He emphasized the need to become a major research university without modifiers such as “urban”.
Ms. McElroy stated that the hiring alone of Coach Reeves had brought national press attention. She indicated Coach Reeves had been approached by a number of people stating their pride in being Georgia State alumni.

Dr. Dabney questioned whether there were competing institutions ready to pursue football. Dr. Patton answered that Kennesaw State was launching a feasibility study. Dr. Dabney stressed that football was a very high risk and very expensive. Ms. McElroy replied that football would be discontinued if it did not work.

Dr. Dabney also questioned the value of participation in Division I-AA rather than Division I-A. Dr. Patton responded that Division I-AA had brought national recognition to Georgia Southern. Dr. Rackliffe noted that Georgia Southern now had the second largest freshman classes in the University System. Dr. Torbert commented that the Ivy League was Division I-AA.

Dr. Dabney commented that Division I-AA football programs nearly all lost money. Ms. McElroy replied that this was also the case for many Division I-A programs.

Dr. Dabney cited concerns about other mandatory fees not having an opportunity for needed increases because of a prior commitment to increase the athletics fee. Dr. Rackliffe replied that Chancellor Davis was taking a new approach to mandatory fees, which would allow for other increases. He cited increases granted Kennesaw State this year.

Mr. Lewis expressed appreciation for the passion which had been invoked both for and against football. He commented that he had not seen such for anything else at Georgia State. He pointed out that Rod Barnes had received a lot of press upon his appointment as basketball coach, and that the AJC had featured the football story for 4-5 days following the hiring of Coach Reeves. He noted Georgia State did not have funds for advertising to equal the coverage provided by just the AJC.