Members Attending: Paul Alberto, Ron Henry, Hugh Hudson, Steve Kaminshine (for Fenwick Huss), Susan Kelley, Russ Mildner, Robin Morris, Debbie Rupp, P.C. Tai, Cherian Thachenkary

Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, Irene Duhaime, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Beth Jones, Scott Levin, Robert Moore, Hazel Scott, Edgar Torbert

The minutes of April 27 were approved with addition of Dr. Thachenkary as attending.

Dr. Henry welcomed new members for 2005-2006, Dr. Morris and Mr. Mildner.

**Indian Creek Lodge User Fees**

Dr. Scott and Mr. Levin presented proposed fees for use of the Indian Creek Lodge. Dr. Scott noted Dr. Patton had requested a look at areas of Student Services which could be self-supporting. She pointed out Recreation had assumed responsibility for upkeep without additional funding, and that the proposal was to pass along to users costs for outsourced upkeep ($50 for student groups, $100 for faculty/staff groups).

Dr. Kelley asked about alternative sources such as swimming pool fees. Mr. Levin replied that Recreation Center membership included pool privileges at Indian Creek and fees were already charged for others who used the pool, either per visit or by a pool membership fee. He added that consideration of renting Indian Creek facilities to outside groups had been dropped because of liability and other issues.

Dr. Kelley commented that some users would feel $100 was too high, because they still had to do set-up and clean-up themselves. She suggested $35/$70 fees instead. Dr. Tai commented that free use was very attractive to campus groups. Dr. Morris responded that $100 was cheap for a facility fee.

Dr. Alberto commented that the proposal did not appear to reach the self-supporting objective stated by Dr. Patton. Dr. Scott confirmed the proposed fee would reduce costs rather than cover fully.

Dr. Morris asked about the value of the property at Indian Creek and whether some of the property could be sold to a developer. Mr. Levin replied that the church on the adjacent property had offered to sell its similarly sized property to the university for $450K. He added that dividing the property with adequate access and frontage would be difficult because of the placement of the existing facilities.

Dr. Kelley made a motion to recommend user fees of $35 for student groups and $70 for faculty/staff groups. Dr. Morris voiced concern that the lower fees would not cover actual costs. Dr. Kaminshine observed that reaction from users would be virtually the same for $70 or $100. Dr. Henry spoke for fees that would cover costs. Dr. Kelley withdrew the motion.
Dr. Tai made a motion to recommend user fees of $50 for student groups and $100 for faculty/staff groups. Ms. Rupp seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**Promotion Raises for Senior Lecturers**

Dr. Henry presented a proposal to fund promotion raises centrally for lecturers promoted to senior lecturers in the higher amount of $1,500 or 3% salary and to allow equal matching funds from the colleges. Dr. Henry stated 14 such promotions were effective FY2006 and 9 more for FY2007. He noted the proposal followed the pattern established for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor.

Dr. Alberto questioned using the assistant professor to associate professor model rather than instructor to assistant professor. Dr. Henry replied that these were highly qualified lecturers with outstanding records of teaching and service and with a minimum of 6 years of experience. Dr. Adamson added that those promoted in many cases had much more than 6 years of experience and had undergone rigorous “third-year” reviews. Dr. Hudson pointed out senior lecturers did not have an opportunity for another promotion and hence these were once-in-a-lifetime increases for them.

Dr. Kelley commented that lecturers were generally paid at low rates. Dr. Adamson cited salaries from mid-30s to low-50s. Dr. Hudson added that very few would benefit from the “or 3%” clause.

Dr. Kelley made a motion to recommend promotion raises for senior lecturers as proposed. Dr. Tai seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**RCB Proposal for PMBA Fees**

Ms. Jones presented a proposal from Robinson College of Business for in-state and out-of-state total program fees of $29,750 and $49,950 respectively for a new Professional MBA (PMBA) program class of December 2007. Ms. Jones explained the new program would supplement the existing portfolio of MBA programs by offering a program geared for professionals with less experience than those targeted for the Executive MBA program (EMBA) and structured with a more lock-step curriculum than the flexible MBA (FMBA) program to shorten the time to degree.

Dr. Hudson asked about comparable programs at the University of Georgia or other local institutions. Dr. Duhaime confirmed there were no comparable programs in Georgia.

Dr. Kaminshine asked if the PMBA was a tweaking of the FMBA. Dr. Duhaime replied that the PMBA would have fewer electives than the FMBA and was truly positioned between the FMBA and EMBA. She added that the PMBA would start new cohorts each semester and there might be slight mixing of cohorts in a few classes.

Dr. Alberto asked about Senate approval of the new program. Dr. Henry responded that the MBA degree program had been approved, and that the PMBA was a repackaging of the same degree program as was the case with the FMBA when it was initiated. He added that only the new fee structure required approval prior to sending to the Board of Regents.
Dr. Henry asked about information needed to make a recommendation. Dr. Morris cited the question of cost to the university if the PMBA did not succeed. Dr. Alberto noted this kind of information was required for a new program proposal. Dr. Duhaime responded that marketing of the EMBA had revealed a sizeable target of persons with less experience, but monetary support from their companies, particularly in the Alpharetta area.

Dr. Kelley asked about the time sensitivity of the request. Ms. Jones replied that special approval from Board of Regents was needed to launch the PMBA program in January 2006. Dr. Kelley voiced support for the proposal given time constraints and the need to recoup credit hours.

Dr. Thachenkary spoke for getting additional information before voting; e.g., number of students per cohort, number of students needed to break even.

Dr. Henry suggested a vote by e-mail upon receipt of additional information from Robinson College of Business, including a pro forma. Consensus was to proceed in this way. [The e-mail vote was unanimous to recommend as proposed.]

Budget Outlook

Dr. Henry reported the budget outlook was uncertain. He noted summer credit hours were under 100K against a budgeted total of 112K, and that it had been hoped fall and spring credit hours would offset this shortfall. He announced that state audit findings had required a change in procedures for students who did not pay tuition and fees by deadlines, so that non-payors would be dropped from class rolls. He indicated that the first stage of implementation had resulted in 4,700 students being dropped the night of August 16. He added that registration had been reopened to allow these students to register again and pay tuition and fees without a late registration fee, but any student owing even $1 at the end of business August 29 would be dropped without recourse in order to comply with the state audit.

Dr. Hudson asked about avenues of appeal of the state audit. Dr. Fritz replied that it was a state audit, not Board of Regents audit, so that an appeal would have to be to a state official such as the Governor or Attorney General. He added that the difficulty for Georgia State was that all other institutions in the University System already complied. Dr. Henry added that by allowing students to stay registered without paying in full until the census date (for calculating credit hours for formula funding), the bad debt suffered by the university was in the range of $1.5M-2M last year.

Dr. Henry noted some recovery would occur as new students registered as part of INCEPT. Dr. Fritz added that the latest figures showed new freshmen approximately even with last year, but transfers up. Dr. Morris commented that getting graduate students to register and pay in advance of the semester was an on-going problem.

Dr. Adamson questioned the fairness of the approach of re-opening registration for all students and how this would affect the balance of students re-registering and those on wait lists for high demand courses. Dr. Fritz answered that the Help Center had sent a message to all students eligible to register that registration was again open. He added that he had understood from an e-mail that the College of Arts & Sciences supported reopening registration. He noted that this approach was more in line with the way registration was conducted prior to Banner.
Dr. Kaminshine observed that dropping the non-payors in this way when they could in turn re-register had created a massive PR problem, but acknowledged there was a revenue issue as well.

Dr. Henry projected 280K credit hours rather than 300K when the final deadline passes. Dr. Thachenkary asked about the fate of the 4,700 students dropped automatically. Dr. Fritz replied that it was likely at least one-half would re-register, with additional new students registering as well. He added that the strictest application of the automatic drop policy would have resulted in 6,400 students being dropped. Dr. Thachenkary asked if those dropped for failing to pay by August 29 would have any opportunity to re-register. Dr. Fritz responded that the August 29 drops would be final.

Dr. Adamson stated concern about the mixed message of dropping students for not paying and then allowing them to re-register without paying until August 29. Dr. Alberto suggested a letter from Dr. Patton to the students explaining the decision to drop unpaid registrations. Mr. Mildner advised that the Signal would be running an article explaining the decision. Dr. Morris suggested a letter from the Student Government Association on the university web site. Dr. Dabney recommended framing the message in terms of something done wrong before and placing blame on the accountants.
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