MINUTES OF DEANS’ GROUP
February 11, 2004

Attendees: Ron Henry, Chair
Adamson, Bagley (for Hurt), Bahl, Casto, Colarusso, Diaz (for Harris), Fritz, Griffith, Kelley, Moore

Guests: Yezdi Bhada, Lorene Pilcher, Terry Ward

Minutes: 12/19/03 approved with the addition of Mike Moore to attendees.
01/21/04 approved with the following revisions: add “BOR” to stewardship policy on warehousing; student
data “….. Fritz expressed concern with that some campus Crystal users are accessing student data from production
without going through the committee. He supposed that they are hitting on production environment rather than
reporting environment, and as a result are pulling dated information from the system. Casto will evaluate the integrity
of the technology problem that allows the users access to the data;” extra compensation policy “…..that permits
payment from indirect costs money but does not allow payment if there is no external indirect cost funding, or if there
is no excess included in the indirect costs.”

Emeriti Association Update: Advising of very little contact between the university and retired faculty, Bhada informed
of creation of the Emeriti Association to improve that relationship by creating a culture where emeriti are a part of
the university. He noted low attendance of deans at emeriti receptions and remarking that there is good potential for
emeriti funding of scholarships or endowed chairs, he encouraged either the attendance of the deans, or a
representative. He advised that many faculty do not know the procedure for appointment to emeritus status and
requested college emeriti policies. Informed that only faculty with distinguished service are eligible for appointment,
he was advised that the process is initiated in the department, passed to the college P&T committee to confirm that
criteria have been met, to the provost, then to the BOR for final approval. In that departments initiate
the process and may have different requirement sets, he was asked to refer retirees with questions about emeritus
status to their former department chairs. With regard to a question on continuation of e-mail privileges, Casto
informed that retirees can continue to access through their department area container, or can move into the retiree
container, using the same e-mail address. To remain in the e-mail system, she promoted use of the address
“name”@gsu.edu. Bhada advised that he would include the deans on the emeriti association listserv so they could be
apprised of upcoming events. Suggesting their assistance in the development of emeriti as prospective donors,
service as mentors, or consultants on research, he asked the deans to notify him if there was anything along those
lines that association members could do for the colleges.

Enrollment: Fritz informed that spring enrollment was 1,500 below projected. Partly to blame for the drop in new
student numbers was the switch from the old student system to Banner. Initially, Banner inflated the numbers
because it had recognized as new students, those students who either had switched programs or enrolled in more
than one program. A glitch in the system that was later discovered and corrected. Also contributing to the decline
was the drop in international students as a result of added federal regulations for entry into the country, and
increased recruitment by Britain and Australia. A trend Fritz predicted would continue.

Online student evaluations: Providing a handout of total student evaluation responses by college, on-line vs. paper,
Fritz noted a positive response to the on-line process and recommended doing away with paper.

Fee-based service for international scholars: Fritz presented a proposal for a fee-based service for international
scholars that would move fees for these services from International Services to the hosting department/college.
Adamson questioned the strategy behind moving what is now a central service to the colleges, and asked about cost.
Henry responded that processing of international scholars is an individualized service that should be handled by the
sponsor. Adamson further commented that if the logic behind having the scholars on campus is to enhance the
international profile of the university, then the colleges should not be penalized by being asked to bear the cost for
something the university wants to do. Kelley inquired as to why when the colleges all took a voluntary 5% cut
something that was currently a central cost would be moved to them. She asked if the cost could not be covered
from the international student fee. Fritz informed that that fee was initiated to support SEVIS, the federal government
fee imposed for processing of international students. The Provost requested that discussion be deferred for a future
agenda

Student Survey Results: Presentation by Terry Ward, Office of Institutional Research, on the Survey of Recent
Informing of the NSSE survey of 185K students from 649 participating institutions, including 53 doctoral/research extensive universities, and a response rate of 43%, Ward advised of breaking the FLC’s out of the NSSE population to see how well Georgia State did, and found that we compared favorably except in the areas of reading, writing, problem sets, and homework. She followed up with a randomized sample survey of FLC and non-FLC freshmen enrolled during spring semester 2003. The survey of 401 freshmen had a response rate of 38%. Pointing out that FLC’s have lower FI scores coming in, and come out with higher GPA’s than non-FLC’s, Ward specified significant differences as detailed in the survey handout. FLC’s rated support of campus higher, student/faculty interaction higher, but academic challenge lower. The NSSE breakout of FLC’s correlates well with the SPS study that shows that FLC students do better. She noted that the summer survey of graduates was a pilot study and that the fall survey is now being mailed. Without benefit of entrance and exit exams, she reported that students feel they are coming out with higher skills, but that they fall behind in involvement in activities and service. She suggested the survey be incorporated into the graduation process as a data-gathering tool.

Fritz: In the NSSE survey of seniors, they ranked low in level of academic challenge, but academic preparation and level and quality of courses and faculty ranked high. In that the survey was for one semester only, he projected a better feel for the rankings after the fall survey.

Henry informed that the NSSE includes specific items that correlate with academic rigor, the results of which indicated that students are not challenged enough at Georgia State.

Referring to the survey of recent graduates, Adamson commenting that undergraduates are basically full-time day students, questioned whether the survey results were more reflective of that population than the graduate student population that is more likely to be part-time. She also inquired as to whether the graduate population included doctoral and professional summer students. Ward informed that the survey was disseminated to all graduates, that over half of the survey respondents attended night classes, and that most of the survey respondents considered themselves full-time students.

Moore offered that IR would build a comprehensive database of graduates by college, by major, and by masters or doctorate, and also pull in transfer students.

Henry sought the group’s input on arriving at a set of priorities for improvement of graduation rates and for identifying greatest leverage points. He advised of his appointment to a Regents committee to look at System-wide graduation rates, and informed that with the exception of UGA & Tech, the graduation rates for all other institutions are low. UGA & Tech compare well in the highly selective range while the other institutions are 1% behind after the 1st year, and continue to lose students years 2-6. Comparing GSU data from 1996, there was a loss of 28% the 1st year, 16% the 2nd year, and 10-11% beyond that. National averages show a loss of 21% in the 1st year, 10% in the 2nd year, and 9% beyond that. He speculated that the year 2 and beyond losses of freshman cohort students probably also applies to transfer students. Thus, we need to craft solutions to increase retention that focus on students beyond the freshman year. He also stated that the percentage of part-time students factored into lower graduation rates.

Informing that level of faculty involvement in FLC makes a difference, the Provost pointed out that with lessened involvement by TT faculty there had been a drop in the number of continuing FLC students. He encouraged their participation. Fritz supported ramping up the level of faculty teaching the orientation course, and of taking advantage of the offer of help from retirees to teach the course.

Addressing the push for use of TT faculty as a select criterion to ratchet up program quality, Bahl questioned whether that might not reduce retention rates. He suggested a better option would be to weed out low-end students. He recommended that the program either up the bar so students have to show more in the first two years or to let them be driven out of the program early. He noted that if some measures were not taken, statistics would show students dropping by the wayside.

Henry proposed that because retention rates are not improving as much as those of our counterparts, the better solution would be to increase the academic challenge in the first two years so that students are motivated to be successful. They will then either be engaged or will drop out.

Acknowledging that quality is defined by students while academic challenge is what the institution must provide students, Adamson expressed concern that it would entail taking TT faculty away from other programs to meet FLC needs.

As is done in the college, by interviewing individual students on characteristics as they exit programs, Bahl asked if there could not be the same kind of analysis done to determine why many of the best students are leaving the university. Henry confirming that there is concern that the university is losing good students, speculated that if it was know up front how well connected students are in high school, that might be an indicator of how well they will do in college.
At the request of VP Peterman, the Provost distributed a proposed “Prospect Management Policy.” He asked that the group review the policy and hold for future discussion.