MINUTES OF DEANS’ GROUP

March 17, 2004

Attendees: Ron Henry, Chair
            Adamson, Albert, Bahl, Casto, Colarusso, Harris, Fritz, Griffith, Hurt, Kelley, Louis

Guests: Joe Amador, Carolyn Gard, Nancy Peterman

Minutes: 02/25/04 approved.

Prospect Management policy: Reviewing with the group a draft of the Prospect Management Policy, Peterman advised
that the purpose of the proposed policy is to establish a process that addresses identification, cultivation, solicitation,
and stewardship of donors. She informed of good success with cultivation of EMBA’s, but noted that the Development
Office has a list of 4,000 prospective donors they would like to solicit for interest in supporting the university. She
requested the assistance of the colleges in cultivating these individuals. Once contacted and interest expressed,
prospective donors will be assigned to a prospect manager, either the college dean or the college development officer,
to define gift capacity, inclination and interests. Prospect assignment meetings to include the Development Office
administration and the college development officers will take place monthly to ensure appropriate assignment of
prospect managers and to resolve team issues. The proposal was accepted as presented.

Applications: Fritz distributed updated graduate and undergraduate application counts. Advising that maintaining an
up-to-date applicant count has a broader impact than just tracking student numbers he informed that graduate
students often apply to multiple colleges for the same term. This in the past resulted in their being double-counted in
the system. They are now assigned to their active participatory program, while the new imaging system will make it
much easier to track them. Advised that the number of applications for fall has not fallen off as much as was
thought. In FY03-04 there was a significant decrease of somewhere between 300-400 students, mostly attributed to
the decrease in international students due to difficulties with visa renewal and other security related issues. He further
advised of implementation of a fee to stop frivolous applications.

Griffith: As a result of the new tracking system, law students who are in joint degree programs are having
difficult registering for law classes.

Fritz: We can look into the problem.

VClass demonstration: Gard/Amador: Instructions for accessing follow.

This morning’s ElluminateLive! (VClass) demo may be viewed by visiting this URL:

When you log in, you may be prompted to download Sun Microsystem's Java Web Start (or OpenJNLP for Mac), a
pre requisite to Elluminate Live!. The download will take 2–20 minutes depending on your connection speed but is
only required the first time you use Elluminate Live!.

The minimum PC requirements are a Pentium II 266 MHz with 64MB of memory and a sound card. The minimum Mac
requirements are a g3 233 MHz with 64MB of memory when using OS 9.0 9.2 or 128MB of memory when using OS
X.

To begin the play back of the recorded session, click on "File/Play".

If you have any difficulty downloading the software or viewing the session, please call Elluminate Tech Support for
assistance. Additional documentation is available at:
www.gsu.edu/uets, click on Instructional Support, vClass.

Fritz: Would it be difficult to use the software for meetings – how would participants at the other end connect, is
there a URL to log in on?
Gard: It is URL enabled. We find it best to communicate using headsets.

We are testing the software in several classes. There are class limitations. We have a site license for 150 simultaneous users, but we are asking for 200 this year. The software includes first line support from the vendor. Students have free download of software, they don’t have to purchase the software, they can access with a network card or modem. Headphones enhance the voice especially with laptop use.

Hurt: Is it similar to the statewide distance learning education program software?

Gard: E-Core is WebCT. vClass can be used to supplement WebCT. It could be used when the instructor wants to meet on-line with the students.

Henry: Why the need to move forward with on-line courses? The issue of student numbers by 2020, was raised at a System meeting. Currently there are 247,000 students in the University System, if enrollment growth continues, it is projected that that number will increase to 345,000 students by the year 2020. Nationally, Georgia is 49th in students who graduate from high school with a graduation rate of 51%. If we were to improve high school graduation rates, projections are that there could be as many as 486,000 students enrolled in the University System by 2020. We looked at the shift in demographics and there are 52% currently enrolled in the Atlanta area - including West Georgia & Athens. By 2020, it is predicted to be 60% in the Atlanta area. If current enrollment trends continue, 345K students in the System would translate to a Georgia State enrollment of 40K students. At 486K we would have an enrollment of 45-50K students. Kennesaw has aggressive plans to grow to an enrollment of 40K, with offerings at the Cobb Galleria – which is closer to Georgia State then to Kennesaw. This fall the Terry School at UGA is expanding into Buckhead. To stop them we have to be prepared to provide the courses ourselves. We need a long-term strategy for expansion. Will that include satellite campuses – perhaps at/with Perimeter College? 95% of the budget is enrollment driven. We will have to be prepared to offer on-line courses to be competitive. It is unlikely that we can accommodate growth without significant on-line course offerings.

Hurt: We ran an environmental scan that verified that four times as many courses nationally are now being taken on-line.

Harris: Do we have territorial rights? It is increasingly becoming a free-for-all. Can we request that UGA pay a residency rate for their infringement into Buckhead? We need some guidance.

Henry: Eventually such guidance will come from the USG.

Harris: I propose that in the current environment we will have to force a rational conclusion.

Griffith: There should be parameters – there are none at this point.

Colarusso: Out-of-state enrollment is a bigger problem. Working on this type technology will help us compete.

Henry: We need a combination of satellite campuses and technology.

Griffith: The key is to educate faculty to use the technology.

Gard: 70% of faculty are using technology in some capacity.

Hurt: Do we know the level of use and will maintenance of the technology be an issue?

Gard: We will be glad to do a level of use survey - if faculty would respond.

Adamson: There are several different issues here. If we are considering becoming uniformly more expansive as a university, and we need to meet the technology markets to expand the size of our offerings, we have to know the size of the market for budgetary needs.

Henry: The COE & RCB have more need in these areas than the sciences. We have to consider both notions.
Casto: It would be good to see this technology included in course re-design.

Griffith: This would be an opportunity to define ourselves as the Atlanta metro umbrella institution. Emory thinks of itself as Atlanta, as does UGA as it becomes more of an Atlanta presence.

Harris: How does our student profile match up vs. Kennesaw in terms of SAT scores – are they close to ours?

Henry: Kennesaw only requires a minimum FI of 2140 [compared with our 2500].

Bahl: When we compare ourselves with the competition, we need to look at why we should win. What could we offer that is better than what our competitors are offering. If they are offering watered down degree programs, we can sell our higher quality programs, even though they may be more costly.

Hurt: This is where our areas of focus proposals could play in – we have to rise to the top in program quality and offerings.

Henry: Clayton is a possible partner for us. They are not competitive. They don’t have the faculty in COE or BUS to compete with us.

Colarusso: COE has been approached by the University System to partner with them.

Fritz: We need to enhance our admissions and recruitment strategies. We haven’t spent a lot of time on undergraduate recruitment of top students. We need a more aggressive recruitment campaign.

Henry: The quality of our freshman class has to improve significantly for us to move up in the rankings. The 6-year graduation rate has also kept us down. It will improve once we get to the ‘99 freshman cohort.

Kelley: What is the status of housing? Has village housing with on-line capability improved quality?

Henry: Admissions standards have increased and that has improved quality. The lofts and the village are filled. We are now looking at how many beds to build at the Beaudry Ford site.

Kelley: Is there a strategy to improve the 6-year graduate rates?

Henry: Nationally, the average 1st year attrition rate is 21%, in the 2nd year it is a further 10% and in subsequent years an additional 9%. For GSU the 1st year attrition rate is now 19%. For years 2-6 we have done much more poorly than the national average. NSSE survey identified a need for an improved campus environment. FLC has had a big impact on improving graduation rates.

Hurt: Current strategies are focused on support for upper-classmen and graduates. It might be more beneficial to us to do more for students in the first 2-years.

Henry: There has to be balance between the two.

Louis: What are badly needed are fellowships to recruit national merit scholars. Endowment for this is crucial.

Hurt: The areas of focus proposals have little impact on undergraduate programs. They focus more on graduate programs. That is something we could ask be incorporated into final proposals.

J.L: Support of scholarship on the front end gets you a rebate on the back end with 4-year graduates.

Bahl: We were coming together on vision, now the market for on-line has introduced a new consideration. To what extent are we driven to capture that market, or should we stick to our strategy? How can we find out if UGA & KSU will get unmet demand? It is an issue.

Harris: Is there a big unmet demand – it may be more of a positioning move.

Bahl: It is our physical environment that attracts we have to build ourselves up. Our center is where it needs to be
Budget: Henry: We know only what we read about in the paper. The session ends on 4/2. The USG will have the budget for the 4/20 & 21 BOR meeting. They will also at that meeting look at tuition increase recommendations. The 1% cut we were expecting now appears to be a ½% cut – that is an additional cut beyond the 2% we know about. The House members recommended raises of 2% with a cap of $1,600 will go into effect January 1 rather than October 1. The workload money is still in the budget. The $5M for infrastructure maintenance is still in the budget. [Subsequent to the meeting, the budget picture continues to change. Potential additional cut for FY ’04 is back to 1%. The Senate members eliminated the infrastructure maintenance and changed the raise cap to $1,000 with an effective date of October 1. The Senate did agree to the workload money.]