Deans= Group Minutes 11/13/02

In attendance: Lauren Adamson, Roy Bahl, Reid Christenberry, Ron Colarusso, Janice Griffith, Sid Harris, Charlene Hurt, Charles Louis, and Susan Kelley. Chaired by Ron Henry. Also in attendance: Kerry Heyward, David Coe, and Art Vandenburg.

I. Minutes of 10/30/02 were approved.

II. Budget Request Update and ACAA meeting
Ron Henry reported on the budget situation following an update given at ACAA meeting on November 5. Only formula-driven increases are likely, if tax revenues are supportive. There is a strong probability of an additional 1-3% cut now for FY03. Raises do not appear to be promising.

The Regents are looking for a statement of the “breadth” of faculty activity. As a follow up to an earlier email request, he requested the deans submit this information.

Plus/minus grading was also discussed at the ACAA meeting. There is considerable opposition to it from the non-research institutions, although the opposition softened somewhat when it became apparent that the request was for an institutional option, not a requirement of all system institutions. A second reading will occur at the spring ACAA meeting.

Ron Henry also noted the Regents will no longer approve emeritus faculty status. This designation may now be established through individual institutions. He will be circulating a request to determine the criteria currently employed by the colleges/schools for this designation.

Ron Henry noted the degree of specificity that will be required for requests of USG funding in the future (particularly of the 15% pool of funds.) He also cautioned that the university should remain mindful of the goals of the USG when making budgetary requests.

Charlene Hurt indicated the USG goal concerning the focus on library usage and retention. Ron Henry also noted USG emphasis on increasing African-American male enrollment and retention and on doubling the number of students involved in Study Abroad, bringing the GSU goal to approximately 700 students. However, USG funds to support students for Study Abroad are being reduced [they were from private foundations].

III. Intellectual Property Policy
Charles Louis presented a draft of the IP policy. He noted it has been examined by most university committees and bodies, but will be reviewed again before presentation to the University Senate. Sid Harris noted the policy will be addressed in his college Executive Committee next week and Charles Louis volunteered to appear at this meeting. Charlene Hurt asked if other universities had addressed additional plans for dealing with the licensing of scholarly work. Charles Louis indicated that this was the case particularly with regard to distance learning materials held by the institution. As the current policy is written, GSU will have nonexclusive rights to continue the use of distance learning materials for one year after a faculty member leaves the university.

Lauren Adamson asked about what appears to be the limiting language around the “significant usage of university resources”. Kerry Heyward noted that among current policies from many other institutions, no clearer definitions are used. She also noted the policy allows the flexibility to revisit the question for provisional applications. Lauren Adamson noted the policy does not indicate a definition of normal usage, so the policy, left in ambiguous language, may in itself be limiting. Sid Harris questioned the specific vehicle by which such questions can be answered. Charles Louis noted procedures are in place within the policy to deal with such problems in practice.

Reid Christenberry noted within the document, course work developed with a team (using web technology for instance) would be dealt with by the confines of the one-year. He is concerned that this will limit the enthusiasm to
be involved in cooperative work due to concerns over control of licensing. Roy Bahl asked if the policy allowed individual colleges the flexibility to negotiate their own terms with faculty concerning the development of college curriculum. Charles Louis and Kerry Heyward assented that these contracts would be free standing under the terms of this policy. Charlene Hurt noted the eCORE project specifically called for the rights to developed curriculum to be forfeited for curriculum materials.

IV. Indirect Cost Recovery Policy
Ron Henry discussed a proposal by the Research Committee of the University Senate, to share the funds from indirect cost recovery evenly between the college/school and the university unless a stipulation exists within the arrangement with the funding source. This is implementation of the policy as it was originally established in 1979. Ron Henry indicated this policy would result in a loss of $400,000 in central funding, and would need to be replenished from other sources. He also suggested an established threshold value at $1,000 ICR to the department for this policy, to reduce overhead costs of administering the terms of the policy. Lauren Adamson spoke positively regarding the sharing policy, as she believes these funds have in the past served to encourage research and securing external funding.

Roy Bahl noted during a previous Deans’ Group meeting, a discussion was held concerning the methodology applied to determine costs and wondered if these methods could be presented to the Group. He also cautioned care with defining what funds are to be cost-shared as some of these items are sometimes specified within external contracts with funding agencies. He supported the idea of a threshold level but also suggested the implementation of a ceiling level.

V. Policy for Extra Compensation for Staff
Lauren Adamson noted she would submit some specific suggestions regarding administrative concerns to implement the new policy. Susan Kelley asked if extra compensation could be given to staff serving at commencement. Ron Henry indicated this is not the intention of the policy. Janice Griffith also stated the policy may not make clear that it applies to staff members only.

VI. Targeted Email Groups
Art Vandenburg and David Coe presented a procedure being developed to provide mailing lists for mailings to groups defined by the Banner system. These lists include groups such as ‘all students by major’ and “all students by level and/or college.” These lists are dynamically populated and won’t require maintenance by users. The procedures would include provisions to prevent ‘reply to all’ from those on the recipient lists. Reid Christenberry explained the technological group needs input to further define these populations and requested the establishment of advisory groups representing the needs of colleges/schools.

Janice Griffith asked if students could ask if these messages could be forwarded to private delivery accounts. Art Vandenburg stated this was possible. Reid Christenberry noted it is university policy that students must make arrangements to forward these accounts. He also noted large attachments may not be forwarded successfully. Lauren Adamson voiced concern about the definition and authorization of the ‘senders.’ Advisory groups would be discussing these types of concerns. Reid Christenberry indicated lists would have designated moderator/s.

Charles Louis asked if faculty group lists would be established. Art Vandenburg and Reid Christenberry suggested these functions would be established in the future (December 2002/January 2003.) Reid Christenberry indicated the faculty and staff would be given the opportunity to register their email address for this process. Ron Colarusso asked if these lists would be updated everyday. Art Vandenburg indicated that Banner would update student information daily, but could not be currently done instantly. Ron Henry asked that advisory committee member nominations be sent to Reid Christenberry.

VII. Deans’ Retreat Topics (Encouraging Graduate Groups)
Lauren Adamson indicated efforts in interdisciplinary areas have been slow although much discussion is taking place. Ron Henry asked if central support could be helpful. Janice Griffith noted some cynicism exists among the
faculty about central planning. Lauren Adamson brought up a concern that occurs in departments that offer only masters’ degree programs in determining the source of the support for GA positions. Janice Griffith asked if the current form for the annual report for faculty might limit the reward for such interdisciplinary activities. Charlene Hurt thought the annual individual scholarly activity reports were no longer required centrally.

Roy Bahl suggested making it a prestigious opportunity to establish successful graduate groups. He suggested inviting proposals for prominent plans and for establishing incentives. Lauren Adamson cautioned that these proposals should not interfere with or detract from extant, productive graduate groups. Sid Harris suggested that departments develop more partnerships with other universities, particularly international institutions. He notes these academic partnerships would require central support, financial and administrative. Lauren Adamson noted these partnerships might be particularly beneficial between other metropolitan institutions.

Charles Louis noted recent efforts to develop cooperative projects with the CDC, and emphasized the need for central support. He also stressed that other institutions that excel in these areas have firmly established internal support structures.

Next meeting: Wednesday, December 11, 9:30 -11:30 am, Golden Key Board Room, Room 200 Student Center.

Submitted 11/15/02 by Lisa Beck.