Deans’ Group Minutes 10/31/01


I. Minutes of 10/10/01 were approved.

II. Discussion of Continuing Education Units Study Recommendations
Eva Trussell described the recommendations of a System committee charged to examine CEU generation on campuses and their relation to the changes in the funding formula ratio as proposed by the Chancellor. These changes will not go into place until after a two-year phase in period (which may result in a three to four year delay in implementation.) Currently, $47-48 allotted per CEU, and although all institutions are funded at the same level, these funds do not flow back to the institution directly because of discretionary decision-making at the System level. Many institutions do not consider indirect costs when planning for these CE programs, nor are accurate reporting procedures in place System-wide.

The committee recommended the following:
1.) Increased funds based on generation at a 90/10 ratio should be distributed to the sponsoring institutions. The 10% distribution to the Office of the Registrar is designed to defray the costs of record maintenance and transcript generation. 2.) The division of the funds should be proportional based on the generation of funds from the previous year. 3.) The University should see that all units that generate CEUs report their credits to the Office of the Registrar.

Fenwick Huss asked about allocation of the funding to the Registrar. Charles Gilbreath explained that funds were necessary to maintain records and produce transcripts. Ron Henry asked about the use of social security numbers to track students. Eva Trussell explained the Comptroller stated recording these numbers are not necessary, but if students do not use their social security number (or some identifier) consistently, it will not be possible to provide cumulative records. It is still possible for students to use the social security numbers if they so choose.

Ron Colarusso asked if the qualifiers and procedures for CE approval had changed. Eva Trussell explained that these procedures had not changed but would change when the new software is adopted. Steve Kaminshine asked if a comprehensive web package for Continuing Education might be produced given that CE is now decentralized on campus. He also asked that information should be distributed about nontraditional programs which could generate CEUs (even if costs) are not charged.

Ron Colarusso noted that COE is losing some CEU generation, especially for large conferences, because facilities on campus are limited and costly. In addition, it is difficult to finalize dates for annual conferences in advance for planning. Susan Kelley asked if co-sponsoring conferences with other organizations allowed the university to claim the CEU credit. Eva Trussell affirmed that this was possible and that the college should provide approval. Ron Henry asked where the funds for such co-sponsored meetings go. Eva Trussell explained that the funds go back to the department.

Susan Kelley asked about the financial incentive for the academic units. Ron Henry said there is no direct financial incentive for the units, but for the good of the university. He noted that the question of generation of CEUs in excess of a baseline, which is yet to be determined, might be considered for financial incentive to the unit.
Ahmed Abdelal noted faculty could be compensated for generating CEU if these duties are beyond their normal duties. Eva Trussell noted that additional revenue that is generated by programs would flow back to the sponsoring unit.

Ron Henry indicated that policy should be developed to require all units to report accurate CEU generation and a system should be in place to do this recording, that information regarding generating CEUs should be distributed and that the distribution of funds on campus should be examined. Mike Moore noted that scorecards (or “report cards”) have been proposed for each individual institution and CEU generation will be considered for reporting from the System level.

III. Web Registration Administered Survey
Mike Moore distributed the results of the Web Registration-administered survey given this fall. There were 22,500 respondents to this survey performed in a stratified manner during the registration process. He also noted the identity of these students can be provided down to the department level. He explained that self-declaration of majors may be an underlying issue to examine.

Ron Henry suggested the group should examine the results and discuss them in several weeks. Mike Moore indicated Deans might want to examine questions such as how students get information, advisement (quality and source), as well as courses and scheduling preferences. His office will be merging many of these data to determine even more information from the survey and asked the Deans to consider what types of information they would like individually for their units. Mike Moore also indicated a high level of students who plan to be graduated from GSU and that UG levels of satisfaction are much greater than that for graduate students.

Charlene Hurt noted that the identity with which students recognize the library (both Pullen and Law) may need to be investigated since many students use the library virtual capabilities to a very high degree, but may not physically visit the libraries frequently.

IV. Regents Teaching Excellence and Excellence in Research in UG Education Awards
Ron Henry encouraged the Deans to make nominations for both individual and departmental awards for these honors by December 3rd. Ron Henry will send the information electronically regarding the details of the nominations.

V. Budget
Last Monday, System presidents were asked to choose between plan A and plan B distributed by the chancellor. Ron Henry analyzed the impact of the proposed plans and GSU decided to support the plan calling for a cut of $6.2M base, with additional cuts in special funding initiatives. [Plan A required a cut of $8.3M].

VI. GA Appointments
Ron Henry distributed a copy of the GA Assistantship document last modified 07/20/98. Mike Moore indicated that it has been mentioned that GA positions have been used as financial aid programs as compared to research opportunities. Ahmed Abdelal noted that the three types of GA positions differ greatly in their responsibilities and activities. He also asked if that in the past it had not been policy that deans could approve GA appointment salary levels in excess of the minimum GSU pay rates. Ron Henry suggested that local authority should be responsible for deciding both the value of the unit of employment as well as the meaning of the hourly requirement. Therefore, the document will be revised for discussion with HR and then the Deans’ Group.

VII. Credit Across Colleges for Grants/Credit Across Departments for SCHs
Ron Henry noted that a database problem limited the splitting of credit for grants in the Research office. Ron Colarusso also indicated that problems exist concerning recognition of individual faculty member’s contributions. Ron Henry suggested that the discussion be suspended until Charles Louis is present.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, November 14, 9:00 – 11:00 am, Room 200, Golden Key Board Room, Student Center.

Submitted by Lisa Beck 10/31/01