Deans’ Group Minutes 02/13/02


I. Minutes of 01/23/02 were approved without modifications.

II. Graduate Assistant Policy
Ron Henry presented a draft of the graduate assistant policy. He asked if the pay ranges could be established for various levels to facilitate the activities of Human Resources. Ron Colarusso suggested the COE would cut back the number of GTAs based on the minimum levels suggested in the proposal. Robert Moore asked if a unit of appointment is the same for both GTAs and GRAs. Ron Henry responded that this was true but up to the discretion of the unit to establish the actual appointment assignment (percent effort). Ahmed Abdelal suggested that there could be overlap in the salaries between the levels of GAs. Ron Henry suggested the illustrative minimum values in the proposal might be too high. Ahmed Abdelal also noted that summer assignments should not be prorated as students are expected to work on a more concentrated schedule. Robert Moore asked if the proposal should be worded in terms of “courses” instead of in terms of hours due to the compression of summer and Maymester courses.

Ahmed Abdelal has encouraged the use of annual appointment, and suggested that the Maymester and summer be combined. He indicated that pay rates for GRAs (and GLAs) and GTAs might need to be differentiated. Robert Moore agreed that these rates should be separated and that the upper and lower rate levels should be expanded. Henry asked that each dean respond on the actual pay ranges granted in each college. Charlene Hurt asked whether it would be responsible for tracking students with assignments in multiple colleges and at both student assistants as GAs. Bill Fritz suggested that the 20% assignments seem to encompass more flexibility to allow colleges to GAs as GTAs as well as GRAs. Ron Henry summarized the discussion of the group by saying colleges then make appointments based on the fractional appointment allotted to each individual GA. Ahmed Abdelal asked the proposal read “with the dean’s signature or that of his/her designee.”

III. Enrollment Trends
Bill Fritz reviewed the current enrollment numbers. He noted the number of applications for Fall is continuing increase, usually by this time the number is usually down. There are currently 450 more freshmen accepted than Fall. He emphasized planning appropriately in the core curriculum and hopes appropriate advisement will ease problems. (For example he noted that courses in “Area A” do not need to be completed first.) Ahmed Abdelal agreed that student registration behaviors bear this out. Ron Henry cautioned that too large a period between high school experiences in math and English might be detrimental to student success in these courses. Bill Fritz also noted that students in the AIP program performed better when they visited with counselors rather than when participating in organized classes. He also indicated earlier intervention would be in place before students are excluded at GSU to transfer to other System institutions that possess resources for remediation. Robert Moore asked about transfer student admissions. Bill Fritz explained it was probably too early to tell about these trends as these students generally apply later in the academic year.

IV. Budget
Ron Henry summarized five areas for the state budget formula as proposed by a Strategic Allocation committee. Enrollment growth increases (probably a total of $25.5M. GSU would receive approximately $3M on a proportionate basis, as compared to what would be received on credit hour growth (Fall 1999-2000) and then would receive $4.4M. He also noted that the Regents would look at cost per student as well in the distribution of funds in the future. GSU will not receive funds from Operations and Maintenance portion, as these fund be allotted only to institutions with new facilities. A Technology factor may be present in the future to account the amount of reliance campuses have on the technology of the System. Ron Henry estimates that GSU’s propor
of the Hold Harmless funding due to loss of credit hours to be approximately $1.2M. Also in the future a part of the funding formula may reflect the production of Continuing Education credits. He then expects approximately $5.6M from the System in additional funding.

However, GSU will lose $8.3M due to the 5% state reduction. An additional $410,000 from TRS reductions and an estimated loss of 300,000 due to a 22% reduction in Special Funding Initiatives has been predicted. Yamacraw budget reductions will result in a loss of about $300,000. These values will then result in a net loss of approximately $5 to $3.8M. Internal revenues from increases in tuition have resulted in internal GSU increases of about $4M. Ron Henry indicates a budget reduction will need to be prepared of $3-4 M from the original budget to cover these effects. The administration will be preparing a strategy to accommodate these freezes.

Sid Harris asked if the academic areas would be impacted. Ron Henry suggested those programs would need to support their share of the reductions. Charlene Hurt asked what type of percent these reductions would reflect in the budget. Ron Henry suggested this might result in cuts of approximately 2%. The group agreed Instructional Technology could be sacrificed for this budget year. They did not support freezing QIF funds. Bill Fritz suggested expenditures for the general Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS) should be postponed until next year (this cost is approximately $0.75M.)

Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 27, 9:00 to 11:00 am, Room 200, Golden Key Boardroom, Student Center.
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