Deans’ Group Minutes 01/23/02

In attendance: Reid Christenberry, Ron Colarusso, Sid Harris, Charlene Hurt, Charles Louis, Mike Moore, and Robert Moore. Chaired by Ron Henry. Also in attendance: Alice Demi, Hugh Hudson, Steve Kaminshine, and Diane Weber.

I. Minutes of 01/23/02 were approved with modifications as submitted by Ahmed Abdelal.

II. Panther Preview
Diane Weber presented information on Panther Preview and other campus recruitment activities. She explained that a visit to campus is an important aspect in student choice regarding college selection and university-wide participation is key. She encouraged faculty and staff to participate in the events of Panther Preview (Saturday, March 16th, 9-11 am.) The Presidential Scholarship Selection Luncheon will be held shortly. Competition for the ten scholarships was very high. An Acceptance Luncheon for high ability level students will also be held.

Sid Harris asked about the first round yield on Presidential Scholarships. Diane Weber replied that it is very high (last year 10 of 12 who accepted chose to attend GSU.) Charles Louis asked if high ability students (including Presidential Scholars) are tracked. Diane Weber suggested efforts to track these students have been instituted but will be broadened in the future. Diane Weber again asked for the full participation of the faculty and encouraged involvement by student academic groups.

III. Budget
Ron Henry reviewed the current budget picture as pertains to the governor’s recommendations. He described adjustments to base budget including workload money of $25.4 M for the System ($3 M for GSU, however the figure might be based on enrollment growth and then GSU would receive more proportionately.) GSU will not receive any funds for additional space, and MRR funds will be significantly lower than in the past. Health insurance funds will cover anticipated costs. Retirement (TRS and ORP) is decreased because there is less matching money from the System (the System will allot $7.8 M less.) An ERS rate reduction of $30 K will occur and fringe benefits will be increased. A decrease of $3.8 M (GSU’s share is $413 K) from TRS rate reduction will result in internal revenue being returned to the state. The adjustment for hold harmless is $9.7 M for the System.

An enhancement package for selected group of students has been increased as well as for the ICAPP Advantage. The Accountability Plus program has been increased slightly and GSU might benefit since we are involved with development of a data warehouse for the System. Funding for SREB doctoral students is being recommended, but the governor has not recommended funding for graduate student health insurance.

Budget reductions include an across the board 5% reduction, in addition to a 22% reduction ($7.5 M) in special funding initiatives. Ron Henry explained that Yamacraw produced salaries will be left in the budget but funding based on credit hour generation will be returned to the System.

Overall, GSU might receive $3.5 to $4 M new funds but this would be more than offset by reductions of $8.5 to $9 M. The net reduction probable is $5 M from the state. With a carryover of $5.6 M for budgeted expenditures in excess of anticipated revenue for FY02, we will continue to be budget challenged for FY03. We did generate an excess of 4 M in tuition revenue from this year’s enrollment increases and we might experience additional increases of 15,000 SCHs in FY03. In summary, the budget picture will not be clear until much later in the legislative session. We need to remember that the Governor’s recommendations might not be accepted by the legislature. Stay tuned!!
IV. Graduate Program Measures
Charles Louis has proposed several criteria for measuring graduate programs. Hugh Hudson asked whether the Deans Group is the appropriate body to begin this conversation. Ron Henry suggested the questions generated at this level could be used to drive conversations at college and department level as well as various university governance bodies. Hugh Hudson suggested detailed information regarding the measures would be best generated at the college/department level and suggested the discussion be held after this information has been gathered.

Alice Demi agreed that although central data collection is important, questions remain regarding recommendations for the management of graduate education on campus. Mike Moore suggested this process is similar to that which the university has assembled for data collection for undergraduate programs and subsequent policy formulation. Sid Harris suggested these data were being collected for NRC reports to be prepared in the near future. Bob Moore supported the central collection of data. Steve Kaminshine suggested that the conversation needs to be started and will continue back and forth between the various constituencies.

Charles Louis explained that GSU peer institutions all [except one] have graduate schools that collect data centrally. He also shared information concerning issues PEW has found in recent surveys. He has found that groups on campus may not informed on the significance of the data that is needed to report to external agencies and that overall, much of these data are not actively collected. Hugh Hudson suggested the proposed measures being discussed should be simultaneously shared with APACE. Ron Henry also indicated the Research Committee should be sent these discussion points as well as with the chairs. Mike Moore suggested that a subset of questions should not be sent, but instead, these groups should not be constrained, but encouraged to generate their own set of measures appropriate to their needs.

Next meeting: Wednesday, February 13, 9:00 to 11:00 am, Room 200, Golden Key Boardroom, Student Center.

Submitted by Lisa Beck 01/23/02