Deans’ Group Minutes 04/16/03

In attendance: Lauren Adamson, Roy Bahl, Gwen Benson, Mary Jane Casto, Bill Fritz, Janice Griffith, Sid Harris, Charles Hurt, Charles Louis, Mike Moore and Christine Rosenbloom. Chaired by Ron Henry. Also in attendance: Randy Paraska, and John Peterson.

I. Minutes of 03/19/03 were approved without modifications.

II. Video Desktop Conferencing
Bill Paraska provided an introduction to the production capabilities of the current systems. Randy Palmer presented a program regarding video desktop conferencing capabilities available at GSU. He described the mechanisms of interacting with video conferencing technology, the types of conferencing available, the advantages of such technology and the physical requirements necessary for its implementation. Randy Palmer then gave a live videoconference demonstration to the group.

Charles Louis asked about the use of this technology off campus. Randy Palmer responded that this technology is widely available by many institutions and industries. Ron Henry asked if all members of the conference would be seen on the video portion. Randy Palmer stated only one group could be viewed at a time. Bill Fritz asked if a less expensive USB camera could be added for computers with built-in speakers and microphone capabilities. Randy Palmer agreed with this assertion. Charlene Hurt asked if adoption of this technology is being considered throughout the USG. Mary Jane Casto indicated she felt the majority of the USG is considering such plans. Mary Jane Casto emphasized Randy Palmer available to give individual colleges and schools small group demonstrations.

Lauren Adamson asked if there was a plan of adoption of video desktop conferencing in place for GSU. Mary Jane Casto emphasized the use of this technology for communicating internationally. Lauren Adamson asked if there were models of implementation considered best practice. Randy Palmer indicated the technology he presented would most likely be in use for a lengthy period of time. Sid Harris asked about classroom implementation. Ron Henry suggested this technology might not be useful to replace current technology.

III. Email Directory Policy
Mary Jane Casto presented draft policies regarding the proposed Email Directory Policy. The policy suggests one authoritative repository would exist for the directory. The standards discussed in the policy indicated individuals must set up their target mailboxes to make appropriate linkages.

Ron Henry asked about current WebCT addresses and some concerns that had been raised. Mary Jane Casto indicated email addresses are the same for both WebCT and the student account. Bill Fritz noted students using WebCT might need to check two addresses to receive internal email when enrolled in WebCT courses. Ron Henry suggested arrangements should be made so that these messages could be sent to the same point of destination. Bill Fritz noted several students appeared in the roster of WebCT but not on the Registrar’s roster.

Charles Louis asked if there is a delay for new employee addresses to appear in the university directory. Mary Jane Casto pointed out HR does not incorporate these individuals’ names until they have been paid the first time. Lauren Adamson noted some faculty do not use GroupWise and asked if a reminder could be sent for individuals to make appropriate regarding this centralized directory. Mary Jane Casto indicated IS&T would make efforts to communicate this to the general population.

IV. Network Camera and Recording Device Policy
Mary Jane Casto also presented a proposed policy indicating that camera or recording devices that are connected to the network should be reviewed by Bill Paraska’s IS&T unit to consider technical aspects of the technical equipment, but issues such as access and privacy etc. Sid Harris asked if a better method of communicating these policies could be developed. Ron Henry indicated a yearly reminder of these policies could be distributed to the campus. Mary Jane Casto suggested college/school technology representatives would be knowledgeable about these policies. She also suggested...
alliances could be made with the Purchasing unit to ensure the registration of these types of equipment as purchases made. Ron Henry asked if these types of equipment could be located through “sniffing” by the security offices. Bill Paraska indicated this was possible.

V. Budget Update
Ron Henry noted the last date of the current legislative session would be next Thursday. Workload dollars are proposed in the budgets of both legislative arms as well as that of the Governor. MRR funding from the House and Senate is proposed at $20M as compared to the Governor’s recommendation of $32M.

The Regents will meet to approve the budget on May 20 & 21. The USG Presidents will be given their budgets on May 21st and the institutions will have to submit their budgets back to the Regents by June 5th. Tuition increases have been suggested as well as a differential assessment for students attending research institutions. This summer a commission will be evaluating the future of HOPE.

Bill Fritz suggested middle-income students would be most affected by increases in tuition. These students are using loans for school and would not be able to borrow more money. Lower income students would probably have these funds in Pell grant funds. Ron Henry indicated to Lauren Adamson that plan for hiring visiting professors for fall semester should be implemented.

VI. Enrollment Update
Bill Fritz projects enrollment will be 28,000 for Fall 2003. He noted 46% of the freshman applicants have been accepted for a projected yield of 2000 freshman as of today’s date. He asked if processing should proceed to accept an expected approximate additional 250 freshman students to be accepted for fall. Lauren Adamson encouraged the continued acceptance of students. She also asked if the demographics were known of the current accepted students. Bill Fritz indicated this group does not appreciably differ from the previous student profiles.

Roy Bahl suggested budgetary constraints might influence the decision. Bill Fritz noted there has been a decrease in number of transfer applications processed due to the emphasis on freshman application processing. Ron Henry suggested the transfer students should be notified by mail that a final deadline would be established. He suggested this deadline should be made with regard to the information these applications are missing. Bill Fritz also noted the summer application numbers are strong and he predicts this summer will be as strong as last summer.

Ron Henry asked if students are justified in their assertion that fewer evening courses are being offered for this summer. Lauren Adamson suggested evening courses are the least requested during summer.

VII. Proposed Federal Department of Labor Policy
Ron Henry explained new guidelines suggest a minimum of $450 per week will have to be paid to graduate assistant to qualify for the exempt status. He indicated the minimum appointment for a term might be $1250 to qualify. Mike Moore indicated that the tuition remission might be considered as income.

VIII. GSU Vehicle Tags
The privilege of obtaining a low number GSU tag has been extended to include associate deans. Those interested should contact Dean Sheehan in the External Affairs Office.

IX. Senior Lecturer Title
According to proposed Senate policy, after six years, an individual with the title of “lecturer” could be considered for promotion to the title of “senior lecturer.”

X. Commencement Reception
Lauren Adamson suggests that supplemental funds provided by the university to the colleges/schools for commencement should not be restricted solely for use for commencement receptions, but be extended for other activities such as Honors Day etc. Roy Bahl supported this suggestion.
XI. Minority Faculty Mentoring Program
John Peterson presented a proposed pilot program for mentoring minority faculty. The program provides for an ad
group of senior faculty to identify potential mentors for junior faculty. He noted initially these mentors would be drawn
from minority senior faculty. An additional monitoring committee would be established. The purpose of the mentor
program is to emphasize formal mentoring relationships to assist the junior faculty member attaining tenure and to in
retention. A university sponsored social occasion would also be planned. The Deans’ Group will discuss this prop:
the next meeting. Roy Bahl asked if college/school mentoring programs currently in place were adequate to fulfill the
of this proposed minority mentoring program. Both Ron Henry and John Peterson indicated that such programs wou
qualify. Lauren Adamson suggested this pilot be a “resource rich” program, with alternative rewards and incentives
considered other than course releases. She noted especially the effective manner in which the Research Mentoring is
organized.

Next meeting: Wednesday, April 23, 9:30 to 11:30 am, Room 200, Golden Key Boardroom, Student Center.

Submitted 04/23/03 by Lisa Beck