Deans’ Group Minutes 01/29/03

In attendance: Lauren Adamson, Roy Bahl, Reid Christenberry, Ron Colarusso, Janice Griffith, Charlene Hurt, Charles Louis, Susan Kelley, Mike Moore, Chaired by Ron Henry. Also in attendance: Wayne Reed, Chris Ta;

I. The minutes of Deans’ Group Meeting of 01/15/03 were approved with amendment.

II. Auxiliary and Support Services
Wayne Reed presented an overview of the functions of the Auxiliary and Support Services. Included in these services are the following areas: the university bookstore, dining services, Panther Card ID program, university services, copier and print services, security, safety and risk management, banking and ATM, parking, traveling vending, photography (commencement), and the Rialto Center.

Wayne Reed clarified that the market share of the university bookstore of 40% includes the e-commerce portion. Susan Kelley stated the first day of classes many books were not available. In addition professors are not allowed to order more books, rather students are required to order the books individually. She asked if excess books could be returned, but Wayne Reed noted returns incur a cost. He also indicated he would be willing to meet with individual colleges and schools to improve communication as had been done recently with the CAS. Susan Kelley also noted the bookstore has not made faculty aware of the publication of new editions.

Lauren Adamson noted faculty members were not comfortable encouraging students to go to a single bookstore to obtain their texts, as no one store orders enough texts to cover an entire class. Wayne Reed indicated although university bookstore shares information with other bookstores concerning orders, the others do not share there ordering activities. He also added that records of orders could be shared with departments. Lauren Adamson indicated if one particular model was employed to determine ordering levels. Ron Henry asked if the areas of excess books are ordered have been examined. Wayne Reed also indicated the bookstore has determined that some of the upper level classes with small enrollments, the competitive bookstores have not ordered any books; sufficient quantities have not available.

Roy Bahl asked if the university subsidizes the university bookstore. Wayne Reed indicated the bookstore provides a commission to the university. He also noted Follett has reported a loss over the previous years. Charlene Hurt asked what advantage students have in using the university bookstore. Wayne Reed suggested central location and competitive pricing would provide incentive to students.

On other issues with Auxiliary Services, Janice Griffith indicated the COL has not been consulted in some recent decision-making. In particular she noted the changes in the B Lot access. Another example is the termination of evening food services. She did note pizza is now available although this may not be a satisfactory solution. Wayne Reed acknowledged the lack of consultation has been a continued concern of the university community. He noted the level of local competition of other restaurants and the amount of loss these contracted vendors may have exacerbated these concerns. Ron Henry noted on most campuses these vendors break even, but at Georgia State have historically incurred deficits and the university is not currently willing/able to subsidize these services. Charles Louis noted since last October the quality of the catering services has improved and he plans to increase his usage of these services.

Janice Griffith asked if the university might be able to report the presence of potholes on Collins. Wayne Reed indicated he would look into it.

III. Performance Indicators
Joan Carson presented a draft of proposed performance indicators for the university. She noted the need for data is great at the university and the new criteria for SACS focus outcomes linked to more of these types of data. In addition, Joan Carson and Mike Moore are attempting to determine the key indicators necessary to promote action plans of the university.

She particularly wanted to address those performance indicators the colleges and schools might find most helpful. Lauren Adamson asked about the rationale behind the classification of indicators into the categories of “descriptive” and “quality.” “Quality” indicators show the value of a program. “Descriptive” may not have those types of implications. Lauren Adamson noted some items may not be exclusively in one category and suggested the categories could be collapsed. It was agreed to combine the two categories.

Charlene Hurt suggested there was not a category for “academic support” such as services supplied by the libraries. Ron Colarusso asked if data regarding individual courses could be examined through this set of indicators. Mike Moore noted Oracle advisors might be able to build these comparisons at these lower levels of detail. Ron Henry noted this level of evaluation might not be done since costs of design and of input must also be considered. Ron Colarusso also asked if the various data sets would be connected across the various sources on campus.

Joan Carson also noted she will contact each of the deans to determine more individual needs and priorities concerning the performance indicators. Mike Moore also indicated these data will be available on-line and act as are those in STATWARE. Lauren Adamson asked if levels of access would be established for some levels of the database. Mike Moore suggested this could be done. Charles Louis indicated some of the data are already being collected in databases in Research and Sponsored Programs. Joan Carson stressed the need for connectivity between academic areas in the university. Roy Bahl supported the importance of the data being collected on students.

Joan Carson noted data regarding teaching is more easily collected than are those regarding the areas of research and service. Mike Moore stressed indicators regarding financial concerns and space are notably absent from the current draft.

IV. Announcements
Nominations for System awards for teaching are due at the end of this week as are those of internal campus faculty awards.

Ron Henry encouraged participation in the Foundation Retreat and described the focus as being on interaction, not formal presentations by participants.

V. Budget Issues
The university is above the estimate for spring semester enrollment. Currently Ron Henry estimates the university may be nearer a budget shortfall of $3M for FY03. Increases in health care costs may not be funded. Since procedures have changed regarding student payment, the full effect of student payments is not currently known.

Projections for FY04 include a reduction of 5% in State appropriations resulting in a loss of $8.3M, and total loss of State appropriations of $13.2M. The Governor has recommended workload money be allocated pending legislature approval. For this year, unmet demand is projected at an additional 20,000 credit hours resulting in potential of $1.8M in increased funding. For next year, the new freshman class will be limited to 2400 and tuition increases have not been determined.

No salary increases will be funded for the next year, nor will annualization of salary increases for staff be provided (approximately $910,000). Faculty promotional increases will be internally funded for increases in faculty salary as a result of promotion. ($50-60,000).
Ron Colarusso asked if college budgets would have to be reduced. Ron Henry replied no and that some additional monies might be available for requests. Funds to be returned to the university from the colleges this fiscal year being considered as a “one time” event.

Ron Henry cautioned deans to be conservative with hires until mid-March. He advised that deans could consider filling positions within current budgeted lines, but advised the deans to be cautious in general with hiring practices.

Ron Henry suggested the group view the budget from a constant dollar approach. He noted the bulk of the revenue from tuition and State dollars. He compared revenues to the HEPI (Higher Education Price Index of approximately 3-4% per year) for the years Fall FY98 through Fall FY02. When comparing recent State appropriation plus tuition dollars, a gradual decrease in the spending power of the university has occurred.

The percentage of undergraduate hours taught by tenure track faculty has decreased while that of “full time” faculty (tenure track plus non tenure track) has increased. The situation in graduate level courses is similarly changing, while the number of tenure track faculty has remained relatively constant, a large increase in non-tenure track faculty has occurred.

Ron Henry noted the fiscal challenges faced by the university are therefore structural and long-term. These challenges are only partially due to the economy. In addition, there is an eroding tax base and increasing health and other social programs costs. Endowments are down nation-wide and this decrease has affected spending. For example, Georgia state law demands only interest and earning may be spent if the endowment falls below the initial corpus.

Ron Henry asked the group to consider how to maintain the quality of the educational community for students, staff, and faculty with fewer financial resources. In particular, how do we maintain the quality of the faculty work-life, the quality of the student learning and faculty scholarship environment with decreasing resources? Lauren Adamson asked for advice concerning the short-term message to the university community. Ron Henry responded that all programs and services should be examined. Ron Henry noted that higher education nation-wide has historical considered these problems to be short term, but, in reality, they are probably long-term.

Roy Bahl suggested the university should consider hiring younger faculty, refocusing university programs, especially for graduate students, and reconsidering the incentive structure and accountability, especially when innovation is considered.

Lauren Adamson suggested the budget might not be a point for the beginning of the discussion. She indicated fundamental consideration should be given to determining the focus of the university especially concerning quality programs and students, given the composition of the entering students.

VI. Other items
Charles Louis asked the group if institutional level signatures (those not required by federal requirements) were important to the deans to be applied to the current form structure. Lauren Adamson, Susan Kelley, and Ron Colarusso agreed these signatures were needed, and Charles Louis decided to retain the requirement of these signatures.

Next Deans’ Group Meeting: Wednesday, February 12, 9:30 to 11:30 am, Room 200, Golden Key Board Room, Student Center.

Submitted 01/31/03 by Lisa Beck.