MINUTES
FISCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO PRESIDENT (FACP)
February 6, 1998

Members Attending: Cleon Arrington, John de Castro, Sherry Gaines, Ramona Hasan, Ron Henry (chair), Fred Jacobs, Charles Marvin

Members Absent: Bill Decatur, Sam Deitz, Tameka Harper

Others Attending: Evelyn Babey, Carol Clark, Tim Crimmins, Sid Harris (for Deitz), Larry Kelley (for Decatur), Tom Lewis, Bob McGinnis, Jerry Rackliffe, Jim Scott, Dene Sheheane, Edgar Torbert (secretary), McRae Williams

The minutes of January 23 were approved as distributed.

External Affairs
Mr. Lewis presented a brief overview of the budget requests from the External Affairs vice presidential area. He highlighted the reorganization of Creative Services, the need for External Affairs to be funded for Creative Services chargebacks for university projects, the problem of rising postage expenditures, the competition for talented personnel in University Relations and Creative Services, and the recognitions received for Creative Services publications and AlumNET.

Dr. Marvin raised the issue of long-term prospects for the chargeback plan for Creative Services. Dr. Henry responded that FACP after looking at the chargeback plan for two years had recommended a phase-in approach toward the original objective of Creative Services becoming self-supporting. He pointed out the President, External Affairs, Development, and Admissions were among the heaviest users of their services, primarily for projects of university-wide benefit. He acknowledged "the jury was still out" with respect to the viability of Creative Services as a chargeback-funded operation.

Dr. Crimmins asked about the volume of work undertaken by Creative Services in FY97 relative to projected income from chargebacks. Mr. Williams indicated the FY97 level was $50K. Mr. Rackliffe added that over and above the cost of materials, Creative Services needed to generate 5,000 hours of work per year at $20 per hour. Mr. Williams reiterated the need to maintain the volume of work for Creative Services to succeed under the chargeback plan.

Dr. Jacobs suggested the chargeback plan should take a "transfer price" approach rather than striving to be cheaper. Mr. Lewis expressed the opinion that equalizing on market prices would cost business because of perceived superiority of outside vendors. Dr. Jacobs responded some companies deal with this issue by mandating use of internal services at market prices unless demand exceeds capacity for timely delivery. Dr. Henry commented Creative Services was well respected among local professionals, and university clients did not always take into account the cost of change orders, which would be charged by outside vendors, but in many cases not by Creative Services. Mr. Lewis added significant improvements had been made by Creative Services in scheduling jobs to ensure on-time deliveries.

Student Life & Enrollment Services
Dr. Scott outlined the budget requests from the Student Life & Enrollment Services vice presidential
area. He highlighted the need for temporary staff in Financial Aid during peak processing periods, the impact of increased interest in GSU on budgets for admission materials and postage, the need for ISAT support services for the division, plans to track applicants more closely to reduce wasted follow-up on those who have decided to go elsewhere, the need for PCs in Disability Services and continuing funds for readers in Student Support Services to better serve disabled students, consolidation of career services and creation of a student employment office, and waiver of One Park Place rent for Educational Opportunity Office as done for other TRIO programs.

Dr. Babey emphasized the need for a systems-technical support manager in Enrollment Services with the implementation of a new SIS to work with ISAT but be stationed in Enrollment Services. Dr. Henry noted $60K in system redirection from Enrollment Services had been withdrawn and replaced by positions in the Student Life area shifted to the Student Activity Fee. Dr. Crimmins inquired about the determination of ISAT charges for ISAT support to various units. Dr. Henry responded ISAT was working with people in the units to implement a distributive model, which would further develop career paths for computer personnel and increase market competitiveness. Dr. Jacobs reacted that this approach muddied analysis of the ISAT budget. Dr. Henry noted similar issues with the development officers in various units. Dr. Scott commented that the distributive model had worked well in the School of Policy Studies with efficiencies realized.

Dr. Henry inquired about the nature of the post-secondary information role of Educational Opportunity Office. Dr. Scott replied the information provided secondary students complemented efforts of the Admissions Office, and was not duplicative.

Dr. Jacobs inquired about the anticipated savings from the improved tracking of applicants. Dr. Scott responded the primary savings would be in stopping mailings to applicants no longer interested, but that no dollar estimate had been made. Dr. Jacobs asked about other benefits. Dr. Scott stated the improved tracking would lead to more timely communication of information to interested applicants. He noted this would involve contacting students earlier to check on those who have not responded to initial contacts.

Dr. de Castro asked about the qualifications of temporary personnel for Financial Aid. Dr. Scott responded these were financial aid personnel at other institutions who worked evenings and weekends for GSU so that they were well-qualified and up-to-date on financial aid regulations. Dr. de Castro asked about the impact of semester conversion on demand for such help. Dr. Babey responded there would still be the major rush in fall because financial aid was awarded for the entire academic year rather than each term.

Dr. Jacobs questioned the price of the PCs for Disability Services. Dr. Henry indicated the higher price was due to specialized equipment and software for persons with disabilities. Dr. Gaines reported a unit in Health & Human Sciences had purchased such computers for approximately the price quoted.

Dr. Marvin noted on most campuses students worked in the cafeterias, but not at GSU, and asked if the new student center would employ students. Dr. Scott stated there would be 50-80 new jobs for students.

Dr. Crimmins asked about cooperation between the Counseling Center and the college academic
assistance offices in offering career guidance. Dr. Scott responded a committee with college academic assistance representation was addressing consolidation of career services. Dr. de Castro asked about the use of websites to provide career information more efficiently. Dr. Scott responded surveys indicated students wanted to talk with someone about career matters.

Development
Dr. McGinnis reviewed the budget requests from the Development vice presidential area. He highlighted the focus on the capital campaign, the significant increase in annual cash receipts since FY93, the need for a corporate-foundation-international development officer position, the need to provide basic secretarial support in the central office and to college development offices and planning giving, the need for office staff training, and the funding of one-half of a development position in Arts and Sciences.

Dr. de Castro asked about current international efforts. Dr. McGinnis indicated there were some ad hoc efforts, such as those by Mr. McBath in visiting alumni while on overseas trips for the International Student Services Office. Dr. de Castro asked about prospects for international support. Dr. McGinnis responded this was an unknown, but the focus would also be on US citizens in businesses overseas.

Dr. Henry inquired about GSU Foundation cost sharing for Development. Dr. McGinnis responded the share was growing, but was not close to 1-to-1. He indicated a potential Foundation contribution would be in providing funds for backfill in order to complete software migration during the campaign.

Dr. de Castro asked for a breakdown of sources for the Development budget. Dr. McGinnis responded the budget was $2.2M with $0.5M from the Foundation. Dr. de Castro asked about the status of the campaign. Dr. McGinnis responded gifts to date amounted to $28.7M in face value and $26.5M in present value. He emphasized the need to have sufficient staff to make all major calls within 6 weeks of announcing the public phase of the campaign.

Research & Sponsored Programs
Dr. Arrington presented an overview of the budget requests from the Research and Sponsored Programs vice presidential area. He highlighted the three Enhanced Program Support programs noting the 12.2-to-1 return ratio, the prospects of terminating support for teams which had had poor returns, the magnitude of potential equipment matching requirements ($585K pending), and the need to revisit the university share of indirect costs.

Dr. Harris asked about coordination with Dr. McGinnis in matching corporate grants. Dr. Arrington replied this would be a new use of the indirect cost funds, but was not impossible. Dr. Henry noted examples of using portions of faculty salaries as matching funds.

Dr. de Castro questioned whether the new funds for Research Program Enhancement would allow additional groups to be funded or would increase funding for currently funded groups. Dr. Arrington replied the funds would allow addition of two new groups with funding primarily for GRAs and maintenance contracts.
The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.
Prepared by Edgar Torbert

Please send questions or comments to Mary Nell Stone