The minutes of October 10 were approved as distributed.

**Athletics Fee**
Ms. Hughes presented a proposal to raise the athletics fee from $41.50 quarterly to $46.00 for summer quarter 1997 and $69.00 for fall semester 1997 and spring semester 1998. She commented on some of the considerations prompting the request to raise the fee, including Title IX issues relating to increased funding of women's sports other than basketball to equalize expenditures by gender and additional athletic scholarships for women to narrow the gap between the percentage of athletes who are women (40%) and the percentage of students overall who are women (60%).

Dr. Deitz inquired about external funding for athletics. Ms. Hughes stated the goal of raising $500K beyond the normal goal of $150K per year. Dr. Deitz inquired about the PASS program. Ms. Hughes stated PASS is the academic advisement program for athletes and explained the need for a separate advisement program in part to track eligibility of athletes under NCAA "satisfactory academic progress" rules which are more stringent and complicated than those of the university. She noted the athletics fee increase would fund conversion of a part-time advisor position to a full-time position for a total of two full-time advisors to serve 190-200 student-athletes. Dr. Deitz inquired about the possibility of a cooperative agreement with the Counseling Center to provide the additional advisement for athletes. Ms. Hughes stated the Counseling Center did not provide academic advisement as offered through PASS. Dr. Deitz inquired about the inclusion of one-time expenditures in the justification for the athletics fee increase. Ms. Hughes acknowledged the van purchases would not be repeated yearly, but pointed out the funds used for one-time expenditures in the first year could be applied in subsequent years to inflationary costs of scholarships due to increases in university charges for tuition, housing, etc. She pointed out inflation in scholarship costs had eroded operational funds in years when the athletics fee was not increased.

Dr. Jacobs inquired about the drug testing program to be initiated with the athletics fee increase. Ms. Hughes stated this was a new program and there had been no drug testing of student-athletes to date. Dr. Jacobs inquired about the technology upgrades planned with the athletics fee increase. Ms. Hughes stated the need to provide laptops for student-athletes to use on road trips for
homework assignments and the need to replace the 286-generation computers in the athletic
department computer lab which would not run software other than wordprocessing, including the
TEMPO registration system. Ms. Hughes reiterated the objective of providing student-athletes a
sound education in return for their contributions to university visibility through the athletics program.

Dr. Deitz inquired about the graduation rate of athletes. Ms. Hughes stated a six-year rate of 49%,
which she indicated was 4 percentage points above the university rate. Dr. Henry noted the fifth-
year scholarship support for athletes making satisfactory progress toward a degree. Ms. Hughes
explained the NCAA allowed 5 years of scholarship support for an athlete within a 6-year period
versus 4 years of athletic participation.

Dr. Gaines inquired about the nature of the drug testing program. Ms. Hughes stated the
expenditures would be for random testing by a lab. She added that the NCAA conducted drug
testing at championships, but did not currently require institutional testing programs. Dr. Gaines
asked if there was known drug use among the athletes. Ms. Hughes stated absent a testing
program, there was no evidence of drug use by athletes. Dr. de Castro inquired about efforts to
obtain quotes for lab testing costs. Ms. Hughes stated quotes had been obtained and were the
basis for the projected expenditure for the drug testing program.

Dr. Deitz inquired about the frequency of athletics fee increases. Ms. Hughes stated the
increase for FY98 was the first in six years, and that the athletics department from a student relations
standpoint would prefer small increases annually to large single year increases. Dr. de Castro
questioned the number of fee incidents for the year cited in the proposal. Mr. Rackliffe confirmed
the proposal was consistent with the 1997 calendar year basis adopted by FACP for projecting
enrollments, but did not take into account fee refunds.

Dr. Jacobs inquired about the ultimate athletics fee to reach a level of success in athletics. Ms.
Hughes stated she was not sure how the amount of the fee could be determined in that regard. Dr.
Henry stated the key to a successful program was fund raising by the GSU Athletics Association.
Dr. Decatur inquired about the additional scholarships and whether these would be directed to new
sports. Ms. Hughes stated there were no plans to add sports, and noted the current number of
scholarships did not equal the number allowed per sport by the NCAA and very few of the current
scholarships were full scholarships. She added this gap placed the athletic program at a
disadvantage in competition with programs fully funded for scholarships.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the proposal to hire a facilities manager. Ms. Hughes stated a coach
currently served as a part-time manager, and that there was no one to look after equipment and do
set-ups for events.

Dr. Henry inquired about the number of sports required by the NCAA for Division I classification.
Ms. Hughes stated the NCAA required Division I universities to have either 7 men's and 7 women's
sports or 6 men's and 8 women's. Dr. Decatur inquired about the budgetary implications of moving
to another athletic conference such as Conference USA. Ms. Hughes stated the budget as
proposed with the athletics fee would not be competitive in Conference USA, but would be
competitive overall in the Trans America Athletic Conference, although not in every sport. She
pointed out the budget would be one of the major considerations in the review of an application for
membership in another conference. She also pointed out the need to look more like a Division I
university, such as lighting the soccer field.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the dollar figure for individual athletic scholarships. Ms. Hughes
explained the scholarships by NCAA regulations covered tuition, fees, housing, meals, books, etc. and were $13K for in-state students and $16K for out-of-state students.

**University Housing Fee**

Dr. Scott introduced Dr. Trinklein, the new director of housing. Dr. Scott pointed out housing fees were not increased in FY98 in order to compete in the Atlanta student housing market and advance toward full occupancy. He commented that the proposed academic year fee increase of $200, from (effectively) $1,895 to $1,995 per semester, was very modest.

Dr. Trinklein stated it was very unusual to hold housing fees flat from year to year, and that increases were ordinarily 3-10%. She added that Georgia Tech was anticipating a 4% increase in FY99 and the University of Georgia 6%, versus the proposed 5% increase for Georgia State. Dr. Trinklein commented that projections of expenses were difficult without a legacy of student housing and in the unusual situation of having traditional students in apartment-style suites. She stated additional maintenance personnel were needed to maintain the quality of the accommodations and their attractiveness to new students. She noted the special discount rate for MARTA TransCards would not be available in FY99, but MARTA transportation as a part of the housing package was essential given the limited number of parking spaces at the GSU Village.

Dr. Marvin inquired why a larger increase was not proposed. Dr. Trinklein noted on-going concerns about what the market would bear in conjunction with the goal of full occupancy. Dr. Scott reiterated the desire to be cautious in raising fees given the lack of a track record and the overall theme of maintaining the quality of the facilities.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the relatively large increases in expenditures for maintenance and travel. Dr. Trinklein stated the maintenance increases were for new personnel positions, and the travel costs were for staff training. Dr. Decatur requested a list of the proposed new positions and information concerning level of maintenance standards for the square footage and number of staff. Dr. Trinklein agreed to provide the information.

Dr. Deitz inquired about the use of the housing fees collected in excess of operating expenses. Dr. Trinklein stated the excess would be earmarked for replacement costs. Dr. Decatur added the excess would also apply toward repayment of loans from the student activity fee and parking fund balances to cover window coverings, carpet upgrades, landscape, etc. costs not covered by the Olympics. He noted issues raised by the auditors about these loans.

Dr. Deitz inquired about the number of housing staff paid from state (FC10) funds. Dr. Scott stated the only personnel on FC10 funds were one-fourth of the police force, which he projected would increase to the whole force. Dr. Henry stated it was more likely all of the police would be charged to housing. Dr. Decatur added this was unusual, but a necessary component of the university redirection strategy.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the replacement strategy of 7 years for housing versus 10 years for the student center. Dr. Trinklein stated the type of appliances in the suites and the greater wear-and-tear of student housing dictated this approach. Mr. Rackliffe pointed out the 7-year replacement cycle was consistent with replacement cycles for condos.

Dr. Arrington inquired about the one-year doubling of the reserve indicated on the pro forma. Mr. Rackliffe stated this was a cash flow anomaly and that the reserve would not be fully funded until FY05. Dr. de Castro inquired about how the excess funds would be accumulated from year to year.
Mr. Rackliffe stated these would be collected as FC82 for carryover purposes. Dr. Decatur commented the accumulations would not be enormous since there would in fact be considerable replacement expenses paid out of these funds. Dr. de Castro inquired if these funds would earn interest. Mr. Rackliffe affirmed interest would be earned, but there would also be inflation in replacement costs.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the sub-100% occupancy rate assumed in the revenue projections. Ms. Trinklein stated the current occupants were not all GSU students due to contractual arrangements with other institutions, which would not be the case next year, and that some housing staff had rooms included in their compensation packages. She also noted the usual drop-off between fall and spring semesters, and that the occupancy rate was an average. Dr. Trinklein reiterated the uncertainty associated with a new housing operation, and pointed out any excess would be applied to the loan debt and reserve rather than spent at will. Dr. Henry commented 92% occupancy was a good target. Dr. Deitz noted budgeting in this manner with the excess going toward the debt was a good deal for the university.

Dr. Decatur inquired about the status of computer connections which had been projected to cost $750-800K. Dr. Scott responded several options were under review, including establishing a computer lab or installing computer connections in certain buildings. Dr. Deitz inquired about the number of telephone lines in each suite or room. Mr. Christenberry cited one telephone jack and one data jack per room.

**Technology Fee**

Mr. Christenberry presented a proposal for a new technology fee of either $70 per semester with dial-up Internet service or $36 per semester without dial-up Internet service. He pointed out the Board of Regents had opened the door for technology fees briefly, and approval at the University System level was uncertain. He emphasized the benefit of establishing a 3-year replacement cycle for computers in the open labs and classrooms. Mr. Christenberry stated support from students contacted about the proposed technology fee was 100% without the dial-up Internet service.

Dr. de Castro inquired if the dial-up Internet service could be made an optional add-on. Mr. Christenberry responded in that case the HOPE Scholarship would not cover the optional fee. Dr. Deitz inquired if the technology fee would count against the allocation of state funds to the university. Dr. Henry stated technology fees were exempt from this penalty. Dr. Marvin inquired if there could be a differential technology fee by college; e.g., to fund access to legal software restricted to law students and faculty. Mr. Christenberry noted a potential license for law students to access the legal software from any connected or dial-up computer with password authorization. Mr. Rackliffe suggested a differential technology fee for law students could be subsumed in the existing law student activity fee.

Mr. Christenberry noted while students were supportive of the technology fee, there were questions about shifting costs from the university to students and whether there would be some university matching of the technology fee revenues.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the need for an additional open lab and expanded hours of open lab operations. Mr. Christenberry stated the new open lab in the Arts and Humanities Building was in full use from its first day of operation. Ms. Hasan stated the lab in the College of Education Building was often fully occupied, and the peak-use period was definitely widening.

Dr. Decatur inquired if Mr. Christenberry was prepared to make a recommendation regarding the
$36 versus $70 fee. Mr. Christenberry stated he would recommend the $36 technology fee without dial-up Internet service. Dr. Henry advised the 5-year restriction on fee increases should be removed from the proposal.

Dr. Deitz inquired about the scope of the 3-year replacement cycle for open labs in colleges and schools; i.e., whether labs limited to departments or units within departments would be included. Mr. Christenberry indicated all were included.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the redeployment of computers replaced in the open labs and classrooms. Mr. Christenberry stated these by state law could not be resold by the university, but could be shifted to units with older equipment. Dr. Deitz pointed out this equipment could be transferred to school systems, and the existence of a program for this purpose. Dr. Torbert noted the testimony earlier by Ms. Hughes regarding the computers in the athletics department.

Dr. Arrington inquired about the software costs to be covered by the fee. Mr. Christenberry stated the fee would cover software upgrades for the workstations funded by the fee.

Ms. Harper inquired about the student assistant positions to be funded by the fee. Mr. Christenberry stated the student assistantships would be new student jobs with training to assist faculty and staff with technical support.

Dr. de Castro inquired about hidden costs associated with the proposal; e.g., need for additional server capacity. Mr. Christenberry acknowledged there would be additional costs, but incremental.

Other Business

Dr. Henry introduced a request from the College of Law for expenditure of $7,093 from the law student activity fee fund balance for travel to moot court competitions, cleaning student lounge furniture, and a holiday party. Dr. de Castro made a motion to recommend approval of the request. Ms. Hasan seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry introduced a request from the College of Law for contingency funds in the amount of $22,500 to fund unmet demand for the second-year litigation course. Dr. de Castro made a motion to recommend approval of the request. Ms. Hasan seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry introduced a request from the College of Business Administration for contingency funds in the amount of $70,000 to fund unmet demand for graduate courses in Computer Information Systems and Finance. Dr. de Castro made a motion to recommend approval of the request. Dr. Marvin seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry distributed a corrected spreadsheet of FY96-98 budgets by major units. Mr. Rackliffe distributed a spreadsheet of FY94-98 general fund only budgets.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.
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