In Attendance: JL Albert, Jim Alm, Charles Derby (in for Lauren Adamson), Mary Finn, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Fenwick Huss, Steve Kaminshine, Randy Kamphaus, Susan Kelley, Robin Morris, Bob Sattelmeyer, Ron Henry, Chair

Visitors: Douglass Covey

Welcome Randy Kamphaus, the new Dean of College of Education.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of July 25, 2007 were approved.

Building Community
Ron Henry stated that the NSSE surveys pointed out that we don’t do a good job in building community. Doug Covey, VP of Student Affairs, will begin the conversation on the surrounding discussion of increasing student fees to provide a lot more services and activities for the students, to resolve this issue. Dr. Covey has had a lot of discussion with the students over the summer semester, particularly the Student Government Association, over their ideas of increasing the student fees. Ron turned the floor over to Doug Covey to further elaborate.

Building community has been a major topic for a while, and one of the ways discussed is starting a football team. The discussion of football comes around the same time as we’ve had other changes in student life. For instance, the opening of the new student housing, which we expect will allow more students to linger on campus more in the evening/weekend hours. This has spurred a lot of thinking in terms of building community across the board. As far as dining goes, the Commons will have a coffee shop, Jittery Joes, a Landmark diner, and an ice cream shop. The dining facilities on campus are undergoing some changes with a few of the areas staying open until 9:00pm and on the weekends. The carpeting and furniture will be replaced in the University centers dining area as well.

The student activity fee committee last year voted that they would like the administration to propose an increase in activity fee for the coming year. Students will be considering a couple of fee increases this year. One includes football, an $85 increase in athletics fee, which is actually more than just football. It would, of course, support the football program, but it will also include developing funds for women’s sports opportunities, such as a Lacrosse team, and in addition having a marching band, which can also be viewed as a mighty recruitment approach. The fee on the activity side will support a broad array of interests. It’s not sure what the fee amount will be, or what the distribution will look like because the students have not yet addressed the issue, but it’s expected to probably be around a $30 increase in activity fee. At this point in the fee process, the students have appointed an activity fee committee. Once the committee has made a recommendation, the mandatory fee committee will have to approve it. In addition to football and lacrosse, students can also expect to find a major concert series, an ongoing lecture series, and great improvements and supplements to those programs that we’re already familiar with. We hope to see money for the fine arts program, college affiliated student clubs and organizations.

Next fall we expect to open up Greek housing for fraternities and sororities, and the year after we hope to open up community living/residence hall type facility. There has also been some consideration of creating graduate student housing as a portion of the Research Park complex.

Currently were putting $30-35 into student activities. We would like to double that. We hope to provide ongoing programming that they will be able to enjoy. The fee for athletics is estimated at $85, and won’t be seen for probably 3-4 years. To add football, it will be an increase of $85 a semester, including raising $8
million dollars, and an ongoing alumni giving of approximately $2 million a year. Even with the $85 a semester, there is an assumption that there will be a 5% increase, which is calculated to about $12, forever.

Some ideas to make a mark on the students’ first few weeks include: having our athletes help the students move into the Common, have a few classes take place in the Commons (preferably freshman 1010 courses), and maybe have a Dean’s group pizza dinner at the Commons.

**SACS Notification Process**
Ron turned the floor over to Mary Finn. Mary passed out draft response to SACS reaffirmation which includes a summary of what the accreditation reporting requirements are, as well as the recent BOR policy which asks all institutions in the system to submit an instructional delivery plan. We’ve received notice that there was a couple of degree programs offered at off-site locations that SACS had not been notified about. So we’ve had to craft a response informing them about these programs as well as developing a process by which in the future such an oversight will not occur. This might be a good time to review the changes that occur in courses and programs that require notice to the BOR/SACS so that we can tackle these issues more comprehensively.

Within the instructional delivery plan required by the BOR, there are a number of areas that the actual concern is regarded to what we offer both on/off-campus and thru any type of external delivery of courses (internet-based courses). There were at least three areas related to curriculum instructional delivery that needs to be reported to SACS that we didn’t have recorded in our instructional delivery plan. Those areas are: addition of an off-campus site which students can earn more than 25%, but less than 50%, of credit towards a degree program. The BOR is only interested when we reach that threshold of 50% +, whereas SACS is interested in all of it; the other is the initiation of distance learning where students can earn more than 25% and less than 50%; and the initiation of significant changes in existing technology based delivery systems in distance learning on off-campus programs. We need to have some way in which the Provost office is notified so that we can report to SACS that these changes have occurred. The process we have outlined is really the assumption that the academic Deans would be aware of changes in programs and that they would simply notify, via memo, what the perspective changes are and the effective date of the change- most of these changes simply require notification. Most of them require six months prior notice before we implement the change. That’s what we’re proposing- to have this as a notice to the Deans that this information needs to come forward. The BOR definition is that they are really only interested in modification of courses, if its above the threshold of 50% of the content delivered either off-campus when it was delivered on-campus, or being delivered online.

Dean’s Group members were given an opportunity to give feedback to Mary Finn, otherwise the draft will be sent in next week.

**NSSE Data Implications**
NASULGC is asking institutions to report on their NSSE data, in addition we have learned that NSSE themselves would like to release the results to USA Today, if we give them permission to do so. If NSSE were to release the results it would most likely be our 2007 results. We expect to get this year’s NSSE results in the coming months. Ron turned the floor over to Mary.

Mary further elaborated that USA Today is not going to rank the results; instead they’ll just display each of the colleges/universities results. If we want we can send out our detailed reports from 2001, 2003, 2005, and the changes. In some areas we are performing significantly below our comparisons groups, particularly related to building community. In some areas we are above average, especially with the results from freshmen, but not so much with the seniors. This might be a reflection of our efforts toward freshman programs.
Over the last year or so we have begun to make efforts beyond the freshman year. For example, over a year ago, we’ve had the departments deliver retention plans; because of the RPG initiative, we’ve improved the educational experience for a lot of our students. We’re not required to release our data to USA Today, but in a year or so, NASULGC institutions will be expected to publish the data on our websites. We want to make sure that we target the areas that need improvement.

**USG Strategic Plan**

The Regents have come out with six strategic goal areas, and they are as follows: the first goal is a look at general education. Bill Fritz has been asked to serve on a system committee that will be re-vamping the general education curriculum. Rather than it be a course-based transfer system, the system would like to move to a more performance-based system on learning outcomes. On the Strategic Goals handout there is a copy of Georgia State’s response. Our concern is looking at the emphasis on Retention, Progression, and Graduation; internationalization, the reward of faculty, undergraduate research, improve teacher-learning outcomes and so on. The second goal is to create the increased enrollment capacity that has mainly been targeted at the axis institutions, which are the two-year state colleges. They do want to see an increase in the joint-use of facilities, and we do have plans to expand in Alpharetta and we’ll also be working with GPC there. They would also like to increase online course, especially in the summer term. Universities are significantly increasing there enrollment by allowing students to do their courses online. Goal three is increasing the systems participation in research and economic development. We are increasing our federal research and our health professional graduates. The next goal is strengthening partnerships with other educational agencies. It would be a major thrust is our STEM area (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) in the College of Education and Arts & Sciences. Goal five is increasing the amount of need-based financial aid available. The Chancellor is very interested in increasing the amount of needs-based scholarships. As we try to increase our development areas, there would be a need for scholarships for students, both merit-based and needs-based. Were really vulnerable where a student has lost HOPE, and is generally still a pretty good student (2.8/2.9), but they can no longer afford the tuition, and unfortunately instead enroll at a cheaper institution. We do have a high percentage of students on the Pell grant, somewhere around the 30% level. Roughly 40% of our students are continuing to graduate with the HOPE scholarship. Finally goal six is increase efficiency, and we are trying to do this. Our main objective is that we are aware of these goals. We will discuss these areas more in depth as we brainstorm ways in which we can make a difference.

**Pre-doc and Post-doc Salaries**

There is good news on preliminary data. The following information has been sent to department business managers to look over. We’ve had 876 new proposals submitted this year, which is about a 10% increase over last year; the number of awards went up by 30, which is about a 7% increase; and our total dollar amount of awards received this year is right at about $60 million, which is $4.5 million above last year. The other good news is that our indirect cost recovery is $9.4 million—which is about what we projected last year. It looks like in general 50% of our proposals are funded. So the more proposals we submit the more chance we get at being funded.

We’ve received a letter from the inspector general and they’ve done an audit of about 10 universities, luckily we weren’t one of them. Basically the issue is whether colleges/universities limit the graduate student compensation charts to NIH grants to the amount paid to first year post-docs. There is this 2001 regulation that says that the maximum amount of awards by the NIH for its support of graduate students supported on the research grant is tied to the minimum dollar national research NRSA stipend for pos-docs. One of the questions we have is whether this applies to other agencies. The issue is it’s not just the stipends were paying our students but the total compensation package, which includes tuition waivers. We’re not sure if they will be looking at the FTE issue, or just the total compensation package. We’re interpreting it, however, as total compensation. We’ve never really looked at post-docs salaries and in the future we probably need to do that before the federal government sends their audit notices. We might need to structure our pre-doc and post-docs...
graduate students stipends in ways that are different than traditionally. You can’t have a different model for funded grants versus non-funded grants.

We did get an audit notice from the department of defense and they are looking at the cost-basis of all our government contracts. When we submit contracts to the feds, we put in the salary by hourly rate, with fully loaded, etc. We’re supposed to have the standard model for all federal contracts, but we don’t have a standard model that we can defend. They have notified us that they want a document to talk about how we’ve done this. So they will come in and audit all our federal grants that have any contract base. We might get hit on this, and were going to have to address it. We’ve hired a cost-analyst to help with our indirect cost proposal. They will be helping with how we can cost services that the university is charging to the federal government, and other groups, in a consistent way that we can justify. Currently, anybody who submits a grant gets to do a justification, and it’s not systematic, and that’s what we’re going to have to fix.

**Enrollment update**

Our enrollment has been in flux because we’ve done a major fee cancellation this past weekend. Fortunately, half the credit hours we’ve cancelled have been reinstated and we’re currently at 293,000 credit hours. We expect to meet the 315,000 credit hour target. Things look strong with the new freshman. We have 2,358 enrolled and they’re still orientations going on for the remainder of the week. We expect to be above our 2,550 enrollment mark.

Bill Fritz passed out a memo related to our building community. One of the best community activities we have is our Undergraduate Research Conference. The conference ties students to their academic discipline and faculty members. We’ve had our first undergraduate research conference last year, and this year we plan to have ours a few weeks earlier- which is great timing for students to go on to the National conference. This information will be sent to the faculty members.

**Any other business**

New faculty orientation is this Thursday, August 21. Robin will be emailing the Deans about regulatory committee memberships, which is a part of our community service. He would prefer getting tenure track faculty members.

Next Meeting: September 12, 2007 from 9:30-11:30 a.m. in the Golden Key Board Room, 2nd Floor Student Center.