I. Minutes of June 20, 2001 were approved.

II. Housing Policies
Hazel Scott described the facilities of the “University Lofts” construction project. The housing is planned to be open by Fall 2002 and be planned with graduate, married, and international students in mind. Marketing plans are currently being designed. Hazel Scott indicated her appreciation for input from the deans and their assistance in providing information to the University Lofts with prospe students.

Janice Griffith encouraged that the business practices associated with the University Lofts be flexible to accommodate students. Ahmed Abdelal questioned the need for a requirement of a minimum of six credit hours for leasing a unit. Roy Bahl asked if that after an initial annual contract the terms be flexible. Susan Kelley asked if the terminology “per room” might be reworded to read “per person.” Hazel Scott indicated that policies would be developed and distributed in the near future. Charlene Hurt asked about the computer lab. Janice Griffith asked what plans were in place concerned staffing the computer lab. Ron Henry indicated similar arrangements are needed regarding the exercise room.

III. Banner Implementation and Enrollment Management
Bill Fritz described an ongoing review process organized by Cornelius & Associates in the Financial Aid Office. He also explained that the least modifications to the Banner system as possible should be made. He indicated that registration and grade submission procedures. Using Web CT will have automatic uploading of grades through the Grade Book function. He also indicated the teams are getting the schedule, particularly the Admissions team. It appears the team leaders are doing the majority of the work because the members do not have time from their other duties to complete their tasks. He asks that the deans support these efforts.

In addition, Bill Fritz explained that the least modifications to the Banner system as possible should be made. He indicated that restrictions pose problems because extensive programming is needed to manage these restrictions. Security and access in Banner is authorized by college as is now in practice by GSU, but rather by function. Unmet demand is also not as easily accessed in Banner as is large.

Bill Fritz believes the Banner system will be up for Fall 2002. This will include all registration and grade submission procedures. Using Web CT will have automatic uploading of grades through the Grade Book function. He also indicated the teams are getting the schedule, particularly the Admissions team. It appears the team leaders are doing the majority of the work because the members do not have time from their other duties to complete their tasks. He asks that the deans support these efforts.

In addition, Bill Fritz explained that the least modifications to the Banner system as possible should be made. He indicated that reg restrictions pose problems because extensive programming is needed to manage these restrictions. Security and access in Banner is authorized by college as is now in practice by GSU, but rather by function. Unmet demand is also not as easily accessed in Banner now presented. Bill Fritz asked that deans for their input.

Ahmed Abdelal expressed concern for the need of a good management system to provide information regarding unmet demand and subsequent arrangement for additional overflow sections. He also indicated security is a major concern, and encouraged the system managed as it is now by department. Sid Harris expressed concern about unmet demand in core or required courses as well as electives. Mike Moore explained that Banner allows unmet demand to be captured as the amount of time required to fill sections. Roy Bahl reminded that the group the window for registration will be much larger with Banner than the current system, allowing the colleges time to make plans to meet unmet demand. Sid Harris asked if a pre-registration process is available in Banner. This process is available in Banner. Ron Henry encouraged the group to implement the Banner security and access system and develop policy restrictions to constrain and give repercussions to persons who do not follow the policy. Ahmed Abdelal cautioned that opportunity for sabotage is considered. Roy Bahl asked if a person performing a policing or monitoring function might be employed. Edie Guyton asked if a centralized college level authorization could be put into place. Charlene Hurt suggested that if these changes are not only costly but time-consuming, delaying Banner implementation because of these changes might not be wise.

III. Visiting Faculty
Ron Henry reminded the group that the designation “visiting” describes an individual who is working at another institution and is on-going appointments. “Temporary” designations are terminated annually and used for individuals who fill short-term needs. He said policy should be established to limit the terms of these appointments. The group agreed that the designation “visiting” should be used in favor of the term “temporary” on an indefinite basis, if no BOR policy imposes problems with its usage, with the understanding that
above definition of visiting does not apply.

IV. Budget
Ron Henry informed the group that data concerning the supplemental budget would not be known until the fall at the earliest. He said a 1% hold would be placed on non-instructional expenditures until that time. (Academic units will be responsible for less than 1% as calculated previously.) If supplemental monies are made available these funds will be released. [Subsequently, this hold was discussed and approved by FACP on August 1].

Next meeting: Wednesday, August 15, 9:00 to 11:00 Golden Key Board Room, Room 200, Student Center.

Submitted 07/11/01 by Lisa Beck.