The minutes of the June 11 meeting were approved with one modification. To give context to the discussion on allocating the $2.1M, it was requested that the Provost's allocation recommendations be appended to the minutes.

The Provost informed of several issues discussed at a recent meeting of the University System Academic Vice President:

1. Guskin presented on the affect of long-term structural deficits in higher education funding and the current budget crisis, which he argues, will not be alleviated without changes in the delivery of instruction. He placed importance on continuing with strategic planning despite budgetary constraints and emphasized recognition and protection of faculty vitality in strategic planning.

2. Review of Centers & Institutes: The Chancellor has initiated a review of Centers & Institutes with the objective of identifying those that may have outlived their purpose. They account for over $6 million of Georgia State's budget.

3. Zero Based Budgeting: OPB is initiating an approach to ZBB for all state agencies including the University System. As a preliminary step, OPB has asked the System for a breakdown of the budgets of institutional learning support areas. These include: undergraduate instruction; graduate instruction; research; and, service. The System has selected 14-15 institutions for review and will respond to OPB with a description of the learning support areas reviewed and performance measures in place. Georgia State is not one of the institutions being reviewed, but eventually will have to go through the process. Discussion on implementation of ZBB, relevance of our learning support areas, and performance measures, will begin in time in August.

4. Budget: we do not yet have a feel for the magnitude of a mid-year cut but know that the revenue picture is still not good.

5. Initiation of a faculty workload study: The System has formed a committee of selected VPAAs to work on this study. GSU VP is not a member. The results of the study will aid in development of a comprehensive workload policy descriptor enough for public understanding, descriptive enough that it will provide targeted guidance, and comprehensive enough to address the scope of faculty commitments. In preparing the policy document, the committee will look at the workload policies of selected peer institutions. The committee findings will be reported internally, but a position paper will be prepared from the report for the Chancellor's presentation at the Legislative meeting in January.

Draft Course Redesign Project – Request for Proposals. The impetus for this proposal comes from a Pew Foundation project that funded institutions involved in course redesign to enhance faculty vitality and increase student learning while reducing costs. Specifically, courses selected for redesign were introductory courses with high enrollments. Departments with high DFW rates, as well as those that funded institutions involved in course redesign to enhance faculty vitality and increase student learning while reducing costs. Specifically, courses selected for redesign were introductory courses with high enrollments. Departments with high DFW rates, as well as those that would benefit from redesign, were asked to look at their curriculum, refine their learning objectives, and identify areas for assessment of student learning. Selected proposals will receive development funds for course redesign.

It was requested that the Library be added to the support units identified in the document.

Discussion then ensued on DFW rates, what the high number of W's signifies, how to distinguish a drop versus a withdrawal, and whether DFWs are the result of failure of resources to deliver, or a lack of engagement by students.

Henry requested feedback on 1) whether the deans think the project a good idea; and, 2) whether departments will take it seriously.

Adamson suggested looking at the data to determine whether the high number of Ws might lie with placement of students and whether students are receiving adequate advisement. Given that curriculum design is a faculty responsibility, she did not perceive that faculty would be resistant to help with course redesign. If given a course release for curriculum redesign, they could manage time within the workload policy.

Colarusso’s reaction to the document was that individual faculty might feel they are being shut out of the redesign process and that in preference to one faculty representative being involved in redesign of a course, there should be a complete focus of expertise of faculty across courses and programs. Henry asked what the solution would be if course redesign of a high DFW rate course impacted a lot of students. Colarusso again expressed the importance of having faculty with expertise in the course on the redesign team.

Moore questioned whether we know what the expectations and goals should be for redesigning a high DFW course.

Henry responded that a DFW rate of 15% would be very satisfactory. Referring to the grade distribution page of the redesign document, he indicated that English with a DFW rate of 17% is about what our goal should be. On the other hand, if Math with DFW rate of 47% that he regarded a systematic problem of the high school experience not being aligned with college expectations could be lowered to 20-25% we would be doing a superb job.

Henry questioned whether up to half of the DWF rates might be withdrawals. Moore responded that it varies across disciplines and that faculty will have to set goals and expectations for their data to be useful.

Colarusso advised that it would be hard to set goals for some courses. In the COE because of the interest in exporting distance learning courses, there are some courses that are tied in with community colleges.
Bahl offered that with all data there may be some offsetting circumstances, but overall the data reflect not what you teach but how you teach it. He noted that heavy use of PTI’s and GTA’s in the smaller labs and the use of regular TT faculty in larger sections is costly. He questioned whether the effort to decrease the cost of instruction through course redesign and increased engagement of TT faculty, would in fact run contrary to reducing the cost of instruction. Henry responded that technology has helped with repetitive instruction and along with team teaching has helped reduced the cost of using full-time faculty. It was noted that documentation has shown that GTA’s who serve as undergraduate peer leaders, fare better in their disciplines because they teach.

Moore was of the opinion that the cost of using FT faculty can be justified by more success.

Bahl advised that 40% of the Economics sections are taught by regular faculty, and asked if it would be possible to look at the DFW rates and relate them to courses not taught by TT faculty.

Adamson informed that most large courses are taught or graded by NTT faculty. If they are gateway courses, or courses of special importance, then the students registered for and didn’t like, they drop and take something else which makes it difficult to get accurate data on DFW rates. She noted that in English with a low DFW rate, there are more graduate students teaching than FT visiting instructors.

Henry advised that retention rates went up with the move from PTI’s to full-time NTT faculty and questioned whether the high DFW rates hold up when looking at student evaluations of GTA’s compared with PTI’s or visiting instructors.

Colarusso responded that the hypothesis is that the teaching evaluations of TT faculty are better than those of NTT faculty. He and Henry are not sure that holds up and are looking at the issue across COE departments and other colleges.

Adamson stated that part of the problem in getting accurate data lies in getting adequate return rates from on-line evaluations.

Bahl questioned the availability of data on the difference between the DFW rate and who taught the class. Moore advised that the Enrollment Management group is currently looking at that data and also sequence rates. Bahl then asked if there are variations within and across math courses. Adamson responded that time of day is factor and that night students I proven to be more serious students.

Kelley suggested that some data are flawed because initially students are not directed to the right courses. Adamson explained that it often occurs in the languages where students either extend themselves too high or place themselves too low in language knowledge. An example of where placement test results and matching skill sets are critical for appropriate resource allocation. Henry concurred that it also happens with math where many students are not prepared and are not advised that they will need remedial work for college level math. He further suggested that either placement exams need to be enforced, or if they are being enforced, they are flawed. Kelley questioned the role student advisement plays in placement, to which Henry responded that advisement does not place students. He further stated that for students to be better prepared, high schools have to offer a quality curriculum and study skills. Moore noted that students, who take gateway course, have more success in other courses. Referring to students with a pattern of taking electives, Henry queried whether when they take a particular set, they have been appropriately advised so that what they are taking is everything they need to later be successful in their programs.

Colarusso theorized that the high negative correlation between the A and the DFW for some of the courses on the graduation list might have something to do with grading.

Kelley asked how well SAT scores predict GPA, and with Georgia being ranked 50th in the country whether that score is distributed across the state and if it includes rural areas. Henry responded that only the GRE score is predicted by SAT that the SAT ranking does include rural areas. He informed of a 150-point gap between rural vs. non-rural SAT scores, noted that although the Atlanta Public School System is not good, it is better than rural schools. He admitted moving everything up is a big issue.

Follow-up discussion on a vision for community engagement. Henry questioned whether the university is taking the best advantage of what Atlanta has to offer and what community engagement has to offer. He and asked for further input important aspects of the community where the university could be engaged beyond current cooperative partnerships.

Responses were:
Bahl: expand upon one of the best features of Atlanta that is its diversity.
Moore: a strength on which we have not optimized.
Bahl: how do we determine if our scholarship is community based, how do we map it and how does it fit?

Henry proposed that new knowledge can be generated within scholarship and held that a minimum definition of scholarship is not enough to be engaged. He suggested the college write about its land policy theory and how it relates to the city of Atlanta: the peculiar characteristics of Atlanta have to be looked at. Atlanta is growing at twice the national rate and it produces problems. We could engage with the city and metropolitan area on issues of land, transportation, and the environment. Engage our scholarship and teaching with community partnerships on the issues of growth and its legal constraints, public health, the international community (we would like more foreign students in the law school, 80% of students are from GA) and, collaboration with foreign institutions. She saw all of these issues as being strong choices...
engagement, with a probability of generating resources for faculty support.

Colarusso: there are also PR issues that could be expanded upon. As an example, he advised of a $5M grant to the Criminal Justice Department to deal with crime. To which Kelley informed that although the crime issues are focused on Atlanta, the project would also be looking at crime numbers as a national issue.

Bahl: we have bought into being an Atlanta university, we now have to get departments to buy into it, tie resources to put incentives in place. Our physical environment must be a programmatic focus that cuts across colleges and departments. Adamson: some departments that are core to the university would not contribute to a themed community focus. The not to have a singular theme but points of intellectual scholarship.

Bahl: there are problematic areas in the community. The reputation of a department is developed on scholarship. You take any areas, pull resources together, identify strengths, and establish a programmatic area. Griffith: scholarship and energy could be focused on 2 or 3 issues.

Adamson: we need to emphasize our intellectual vitality addressing community issues across the university with focus on downsizing without giving up the core of the university.

Henry: there are ways to combine programs without giving anything up, just as there are ways to engage faculty in doctoral education without a department necessarily having a PhD program. That's why we have so many centers, and faculty working across department boundaries. Adamson: how much do we need to downsize?

Henry: how we spend new resources is strategic plan based. If we don't have the resources then we have to downsize.

Louis: we need objective data before we can assess programmatic areas. There are risks and rewards to assessment. Griffith: we need to develop ways to work across programmatic areas and we need to look at our joint degree programs. There is no integration in the program between GSU and Tech. It is not customer oriented. If we are to proceed with idea of combining programs, we need to look at our process for joint degree programs as a starting point.