MINUTES OF DEANS’ GROUP
Wednesday, October 15, 2003

Attendees: Ron Henry, Chair
Adamson, Bahl, Casto, Colarusso, Fritz, Griffith, Hurt, Kee (for Kelley), Louis, Moore

Guests: Burtle, Roth

Auditing & Advisory Services: Providing a hard-copy handout, Sterling Roth presented on Auditing & Advisory Services, functions & purpose. He advised of the BOR taking auditing seriously; of the System universities being rated on their audit risk, particularly the major research universities with the larger budgets; of a USG directive that all major findings be resolved within 30 days; and of his intent to meet with units and to put together in the spring, next year’s audit plan. He informed of some fraud cases that were followed-up on, of the university’s auditing processes being reviewed positively, and of the format of university reports being complimented on by the System. He advised that the role of internal auditing is to assure compliance and to protect GSU from external auditing review. He offered to share reports that might be helpful to units, and asked the group for their buy in and feedback.

In response to a question by Griffith on process to look at risks and priorities, Roth reported that auditors meet with VP’s and Deans to review standard issues and new legislation, dollar and reputation risks of units, discuss management changes where there are issues, all of which are part of a process of review. He further advised that resources are not available to review all risk areas of departments and colleges, but that he planned to do 2 audits a year.

Electronic Dissertations: Laura Burtle sought consensus from the group for implementation of an electronic dissertation repository. She advised of the availability of two different models, the Proquest/UMI with free, off-site management of a server, not OAI compliant, and NDLTD/Va Tech with server and software management at GSU, that is OAI compliant, and will be used by Ga. Tech & UGA. The library is looking at how they can partner to use this technology and is looking for widespread participation. Both services have a network digital library of theses and dissertations. Being OAI compliant allows for looking across universities, to open archive initiatives, and the ability to microfilm for presentations, and to digitize. Burtle did not see cost to students being a factor as they now pay for dissertation abstracts. She informed that currently 600 institutions have signed-on to the electronic process.

Adamson: cost to students?
Burtle: there will be charges for binding, and other hard copy associated expenses.
Colarusso: proposed a move to electronic and questioned the impact of elimination of hard copy.
Burtle: currently the Library requires two hard copies, 1 is archived, and 1 filed on the shelf, which she believed could be done away with.
Adamson: mindful of sloppy material submission by students, inquired as to who would have responsibility for policing format of materials. She questioned whether a move to electronic dissertations would not also be a way to address that issue.
Hurt: the better work would be moved to the front of the process, and there will be dissertation preparation training available to students to assure format compliance.
Henry: are the 600 institutions that have gone electronic, electronic only?
Burtle: it varies among institutions, Tech will.
Louis: fine arts, computer science & engineering are already submitting on CD’s that is a much better way of presenting material and providing better accessibility.
Henry: requested that the Deans provide the name of a faculty member from each college to serve on a committee to address the issues.
Henry: cost to the university to move to electronic?
Burtle: the cost of a server, a support person for students, and possible bandwidth concerns.
Casto: IT could build support in the colleges.
Burtle: would like to get a committee together before the end of the semester, and requested contact names in the next few weeks.
Hurt: asked that it be someone involved with doctoral programs in the college.

Enrollment: Fritz advised that October 17 would be mid-point of the semester and of no major admission of students
to classes after that date. He informed that students admitted after census date would not count in the credit hour formula for workload numbers.

Henry: why would students be admitted mid-point in the semester?
Fritz: most are exceptional cases.

Adamson: requested she be alerted if A&S students were being added.

Fritz: advised that spring registration would begin October 27; of a large number of students with holds - 3,900 who have not satisfied immunization requirements so can't register; and of a significant number who have not paid. He advised that students go to GOSOLAR to see what their holds are.

Colarusso: in some cases it is the system that is at fault for holds, not students. For example, some students who were required to have verification of immunization when they entered are now being asked to verify again.

Fritz: there were instances of students who were able to register but couldn't take classes this semester. There are now new procedures in place so that the problem will not re-occur.

Henry: immunization is an area of high risk to the university. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the university to see that all students have immunization verification.

Review of Office of the Registrar forms: The objective to eliminate unnecessary forms and reduce faculty workload commitment for multiple signature requirements.

Cancellation of Withdrawal: used for re-instatement after withdrawal – will be replaced by a letter from the instructor.

Post-Registration: used to add students to a course after the 1st week of class during drop/add.

Henry: the consequences of not allowing students in after the drop/add period?
Fritz: entry after drop/add is given only for hard luck cases, or upon faculty request.

Colarusso: many students "shop around" the 1st week or 2 then want to switch instructors, or in some cases faculty are not checking class rolls and find they have to add students.

Moore: stressed the importance of faculty verification of immunization when they entered are now being asked to verify again.

Fritz: there were instances of students who were able to register but couldn't take classes this semester. There are now new procedures in place so that the problem will not re-occur.

Henry: immunization is an area of high risk to the university. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the university to see that all students have immunization verification.

Grade Adjustment Form: Fritz informed that this is the most commonly forged form. There was agreement on the need for this form in order to have documentation of legitimate grade changes. Signature permission from the faculty member and the chair is required for a grade change.

Fritz: the form was used for Banner grades not submitted on time or submitted in error while faculty were learning the system.

Henry: what is the need for paper files?
Fritz: currently, paper files are being retained until installation of an imaging system.

Adamson: there has to be a way to batch grade adjustment forms, it is very time-consuming to have to sign multiple forms when there are large numbers of students with Incompletes.

Henry: why include "Degree Candidate" on the form?
Fritz: if checked the form is processed through in time to meet graduation deadlines.

Caso: questioned if there would not be a process available to systematically work grade changes through Banner. She also suggested e-mail submission in that a GroupWise message can't be forged. Fritz: there would have to be a sequence of e-mails to provide the 2 levels of approval.

Application for Matriculated Audit: can now be handled in Banner. Recommended discontinuation.

Course Withdrawal Form: used by students to withdraw, or by faculty to withdraw a student. Adamson: combining a form for either student or instructor approval can be confusing. The onus is on the student to withdraw, but there are various reasons other than disruptive behavior for withdrawal of a student by an instructor. In some cases it is not clear who then should sign the form, the student or the instructor.

Application for Matriculated Audit: the function can be done in Banner - discontinue.

Change of Undergraduate Change of College Form:

Moore: declaration and change of major is a department and dean issue with Registrar involvement. Departments have accountability for their students and students are making an obligation to a major. Departments should known when majors leave, so I would think they would want faculty approval.

Colarusso: do we know how often or why students are changing majors?
Adamson: it could be because there has not been consistent identification of students with a class. The normative pattern by freshmen is to declare at the end of the 3rd semester - there should be a process for identifying students with a class.
Fritz: with a few program exceptions, students must declare at 40-42 hours.

Budget - Henry: revenues down 12%; the state budget balanced on 6.4% growth in revenues, moved to 7.5% and now to 11.2% for the remaining 9-months, to be balanced. There are strong indications of a further 2.5% cut. Talks were held with the Chancellor and his staff on GSU proposed assimilation of further cuts; the Chancellor responded to OPB for the System on the effect of no workload money, no tuition increases, and advised that the 2.5% cut would be passed on to the institutions. An additional 5% cut next year would represent $80M to the System and have a heavy impact. The Chancellor is trying to shield the instructional part of the budget. If the 5% cut materializes, the System will take $43M from the B budget, public service institutes, and special initiatives. $37M will be passed on to the campuses – about 2.7%. Clarification on additional cuts will not come until some time during the legislative session. The deans, VP’s and other units are going through activity based budgeting. We will continue discussion on core/non-core programs and activities and it will be something FACP will be looking at, when it next meets. Task forces are also being set up to look at these issues. At the point of recommending cuts, the process will be an open one.

Charity Scott will attend the next meeting to present on Blue Ribbon Committee recommendations.

Hurt: If there is no faculty inclusion in what is being looked at as non-core, we have only students and support staff functions that can be looked at in the Library.

Henry: we have the data and can look at credit hour costs in disciplines, so we do take those things into account. The question really is what is our core, what do we want to be known as? We will deliberate on rationale for keeping non-core.

Adamson: A&S encourages accomplished faculty to serve as academic administrators. In this difficult budget crunch there are not a lot of wasted resources, but not all are doing what they signed up for.

Colarusso: there continue to be faculty concerns over core and non-core, we have not really defined what they are. We might first look at programs that are not viable to retain, but then we may not get comparable data across colleges.

Bahl: if activity disaggregates enough, I think it will be comparable. There is a lot of activity when looking at staff.

Julie Turman