Minutes of October 18, 2000 were approved as distributed.

Athletics

Mr. Manning and Mr. Hartwell presented the proposal from Intercollegiate Athletics to increase the athletics fee from $75.00 to $80.43 (7.24%).

Mr. Manning stated the objective of increasing external funding instead of increasing the athletics fee in future years. He observed the proposed fee was needed to keep scholarships and operating budgets at minimal levels compared to most NCAA Division I universities. He explained the increase in scholarships was based on a projected 5% increase in tuition, housing, etc. costs and would not fund additional scholarships. He noted the current number of scholarships across all sports was approximately 40 less than the number allowed by NCAA, which was a handicap in competition with universities with a full quota of scholarships. He pointed to the following external funding sources: gifts from individuals and corporations, NCAA and conference revenue sharing, TV contracts, and event ticket sales. He stated that athletics was making progress in fund raising.

Mr. Hartwell pointed out the total scholarship cost was dependent on the mix of in-state/out-of-state and international students as well as the rate increases in tuition, housing, etc. He added the three items cited for increased funding were from a long list of requests, and the requests had been pared down to essential items. He commented that the requests related to dual goals of athletic and academic success. He emphasized the need to keep salaries competitive because the success of our program was drawing attention of other universities to our coaches.

Dr. Huss questioned the need for additional funds for academic support given the already high graduation rate of athletes. Mr. Manning acknowledged success in graduating athletes as recently reported by the NCAA to be 92%. He cited current needs for computers, graduate assistants, and a full-time staff position. He pointed out the academic support unit was open 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., which was costly in personnel. Mr. Hartwell added that the fifth-year program (for athletes their completing four years of eligibility) contributed to the high graduation rate. Mr. Lewis asked about graduation rates for other universities as computed by the NCAA. Mr. Manning stated the NCAA had only sent the figure for Georgia State. Dr. Huss urged publicity about the graduation rate success.
Dr. Jacobs asked if athletics had a strategic plan. Mr. Manning responded a plan was under development and would be presented within six months.

Dr. de Castro inquired about the fund raising outlook. Mr. Manning stated the combined sources (see above) contributed approximately $750K in FY2000 with approximately half of that amount from private giving. He stated fund raising efforts for FY2001 looked promising.

Mr. Edwards asked about the percentage of the fee request targeted for one-time costs. Mr. Manning responded that the scholarships, softball Title IX-related upgrade, and personnel costs were continuing costs, but the laptops were a one-time cost.

Dr. Crimmins cited the University Strategic Plan goal of a move-up in athletic conferences. Mr. Manning replied that the best option currently was the Atlantic 10 (some of the members are Temple, Massachusetts, Xavier, and George Washington). He cautioned that such a move would be expensive both from buy-out and buy-in costs of $500K and a doubling of the current sport budgets largely due to more travel costs for competitions. He said the overall budget would go from $5M to $10M. Mr. Lewis asked about a timetable for a conference move. Mr. Manning responded it would take 3-5 years. Mr. Hartwell commented that a cost offset with a conference move would be more ticket revenue because of more appealing games.

Dr. de Castro called attention to complaints from students about the athletics fee. Mr. Manning replied that athletics should be a vibrant part of the university and that the primary problem at Georgia State with student support was a lack of tradition on which to build enthusiasm. He noted good attendance at a pep rally held at the GSU Village. He stated it was time to quit giving excuses about lack of fan support. He characterized athletes as ambassadors for the university. Mr. Lewis reiterated these remarks.

Recreation

Mr. Levin presented the proposal from Recreation to establish a recreation operations fee of $7.90.

Mr. Levin also presented a proposal for FY2002 continuing funds to annualize the OMP related budget, which was funded for a partial year (3 months) of operation in FY2001. Mr. Levin indicated the new recreation facility would open in June or July 2001. He reviewed the business plan in the handout provided to FACP.

Dr. de Castro asked for clarification of the difference between the proposal from Recreation and the $9.00 recommendation by the Student Fee Committee (plus $12 recreation programming component of the current student activity fee for total of $21). Mr. Levin answered that the Student Fee Committee had built in salary increases for a 2-3 year period on the assumption that the recreation fee would not be increased annually.

Mr. Edwards spoke to the commitment of Recreation to get students involved in its programming. He noted the new facility would be state-of-the-art and would be a student recruitment tool. He assured that students would use the facility.
Dr. Keppler reiterated the philosophy of the Student Fee Committee not to seek annual fee increases, but instead work on a 2-3 year cycle. He noted that in keeping with this pattern, the Student Center and the Health Clinic had not sought increases for FY2002.

Dr. de Castro questioned the request for additional personnel. Mr. Levin explained that there were three positions: (1) a maintenance supervisor to be shared with Physical Plant; (2) a fitness coordinator to conduct the larger fitness program including the testing component; and (3) a marketing/membership coordinator to promote the facility internally and externally.

Dr. de Castro expressed concern about the proposed fees for faculty, staff and alumni use of the new facility. Mr. Levin responded the intent was not to have the students subsidize use by non-students. He stated that the fees had been set on 1.5x basis for faculty, staff and recent graduates and a 1.8x for other graduates. He noted these rates were very competitive with the membership fees for commercial health clubs. Dr. de Castro acknowledged the rates were reasonable, but voiced concern about the impact on use by lowest-paid staff. Dr. Henry asked that discussion of usage fees be postponed until the next meeting when consideration could also be given to a fringe benefit approach to the issue.

Student Activity

Mr. Edwards presented a proposal from the Student Fee Committee to increase the student activity fee from $34 (after removal of the $12 recreation component) to $38 (11.8%).

Mr. Edwards commented on the importance to recruitment and retention of engaging students outside the classroom. He noted the student activity fee had not been increased in three years although the Student Fee Committee, FACP and the President had recommended a $3 fee increase for FY2000. He pointed out the flat fee was eroded by year-to-year increases in fixed costs, including staff salaries, so there were no funds for expanding programs and services. He also pointed out the need to increase programs and services to meet the needs of a changing student body. He stated the number of chartered organizations eligible for student activity fee support had increased significantly from about 90 to over 160. He commended the proposed $4 increase as a reasonable increase with maximum benefit to students.

Dr. Keppler characterized the shift of the recreation component as a clean-up matter from an internal standpoint, but observed the Board of Regents would still look at the grand total of the student-activity fees.

Dr. Huss recalled Mr. Young had spoken of waste in the expenditure of student activity fee funds during the fee discussions last year. Dr. Huss asked if the issue of waste had been pursued and if there were fee-assisted programs and services for part-time students. Mr. Edwards replied part-time students were welcome to participate in the general organizations, but there were no organizations specifically for part-time students. He stated that a subcommittee of the Student Fee Committee was reviewing use of fee revenues in order to maximize the benefits to students. Dr. Keppler added that the Student Fee Committee and the various fee councils were receiving reports annually on expenditures by funded organizations. He noted difficulty in balancing autonomy and monitoring. He also noted issues of quality (programmatic) versus quantity (number of students served). Dr. Jacobs asked if the expenditure reports were used to make subsequent allocations.
Dr. Keppler indicated this was the case.

Dr. Henry inquired about the split between fixed costs and new programming for use of the proposed $4 increase in the fee. Dr. Keppler replied that approximately one half of the increased revenue would go to fixed costs.

Dr. de Castro called attention to significant increases in funding for the Student Government Association, student media, and social and entertainment programming. Mr. Edwards responded that contracted artists were increasingly expensive, the addition of the Alpharetta Center and the GSU Village as distribution points required more copies of *The Signal*, and the Student Government Association was providing services to a larger number of students. Dr. Keppler pointed out that the WRAS budget had been reduced since 1994, and that the station was in need of additional funds to keep up with broadcast technology, such as Internet streaming.

Housing

Dr. Trinklein presented a proposal from Housing to increase the semester room rate at the GSU Village from $2,170 to $2,250 (3.69%), the Maymester room rate from $510 to $540 (5.88%), and the summer room rate from $1,020 to $1,080 (5.88%).

Dr. Trinklein reminded that the FY2001 budget had included a $300K structured deficit due to the increase in bond service payments. She noted the budget had been subsequently balanced by not buying the telephone switch for the Village. She pointed to increased costs of MARTA cards for all residents, annual salary increases, increased cable TV fees, budgeting of overtime to cover holiday periods, and maintenance costs as reasons for the proposed fee increase.

Dr. de Castro asked for clarification regarding the telecommunications component of the budget. Dr. Trinklein stated the objective was to install a telephone in each student room rather than one per suite. She cited shared telephones as the cause of many disputes. Dr. Henry added that the university still did not have DOAS approval to proceed with the purchase of the campus telephone switch.

Dr. de Castro asked about plans to increase summer occupancy. Dr. Trinklein responded that it was difficult to increase university student occupancy in the summer. She noted efforts to increase summer use by third party groups including interns at CNN. She indicated that use as a conference facility was limited because of the lack of meeting rooms and the lack of food service. Dr. Henry added that downtime was also needed for building maintenance. Dr. Keppler pointed out the opportunity for encouraging freshmen to get a head start in summer school and the possibility of having a Freshmen Learning Community for such students.

Law Student

Dr. Kaminshine presented a proposal from the College of Law to increase the law student fee from $47 to $57 (21.3%).

Dr. Kaminshine explained the law student fee was a College of Law dedicated student activity fee in addition to the regular student activity fee which law students also pay. He added that the law
student fee had not been increased since its inception in 1996. He pointed to increased travel costs for the moot court teams as well as other increased program and services costs for the Student Bar Association. He noted the College of Law share of the regular student activity fee had decreased during the same period.

Orientation

Drs. Keppler and Fritz presented a proposal from Student Life and Undergraduate Studies to increase orientation fees as follows: freshman full-day program from $40 to $50 (25%), transfer and freshman half-day program from $30 to $40 (33.3%), and parents from $30 to $40 for first parent (33.3%) and $25 for second parent.

Dr. Keppler cited the need for better compensation for the student orientation leaders in order to get higher quality leaders. He stated that approximately 77% of freshmen participate in orientation, and that a proposal was in development to require participation starting 2002. He pointed out that increasing numbers of students and parents are attending orientation at more than one university to finalize their choice of institution. Dr. Fritz added the college deans were also being approached about cost-sharing expenses for orientation.

Mr. Edwards spoke in favor of providing housing for the student orientation leaders as an incentive to attract better leaders. He voiced concern that the fees for parents might impact participation rates. Dr. Jacobs reacted that if the parents were shopping@ institutions, they would likely not find this cost an issue. Mr. Lewis asked how the fees compared with other universities. Dr. Fritz replied that the fees were on the high end among one-day programs.

Dr. Crimmins noted meeting room rental fees charged by the Student Center were a major cost for orientation such as $350 for one-day use of the Speaker=s Auditorium. He pointed out that the Student Center otherwise lost all revenue for the days the facility was used by orientation.

Dr. de Castro expressed concern about increasing fees for parents if the objective was to encourage their participation. Dr. Keppler responded the parents were sharing the costs of the overall program and that the lesser second-parent fee was intended to encourage participation. He noted that separate programming for parents was essential in order to free the students from their parents for the advisement sessions. Dr. de Castro suggested increasing the application fee to offset the costs of orientation. Dr. Crimmins suggested funding the Student Center to cover the room rentals.

Ms. Williams asked about plans for two-day orientations. Dr. Fritz replied that parents and students do not want the two-day programs. He noted the GSU Village provided a two-hour program on the evenings before orientations. Dr. Henry commented that placement testing would lead to a two-day program. Dr. Fritz agreed that beyond mathematics placement which can be accommodated within a one-day program, further placement testing would necessitate a second day of orientation.
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