Members Attending: Ron Henry, Hugh Hudson, Fenwick Huss, Susan Kelley, Phillip Mitchem, Robin Morris, Jerry Rackliffe, P.C. Tai

Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, Dean Dabney, Anne Emanuel, Beth Jones, Carmen Newton, Edgar Torbert

Dr. Henry opened discussion of activity based budgeting (ABB) with a handout outlining a framework for reviewing the administrative support components of the university budget. He called for reviews to culminate in reports by Thanksgiving break.

Dr. Henry recommended focusing on the following goals: 1) ensure effective enrollment services system; 2) ensure integrated and effective advising system; 3) ensure effective student co-curricular support; 4) ensure cradle to grave support for faculty involved with research grants and contracts; 5) ensure effective administrative and business processes; 6) ensure ongoing and effective internal and external communication; 7) ensure effective and efficient infrastructure; 8) ensure ongoing and effective friend-raising and fund-raising; and 9) support teaching and learning.

Dr. Huss suggested as a follow-up to discussion in Administrative Council, concentrating on areas associated with customer service. Dr. Henry agreed, but cautioned that these were not areas from which to take funds. Dr. Huss responded that the issue might be how to spend the current level of funding more wisely.

Dr. Henry noted the calls for zero-based budgeting made by Dr. Hudson at prior meetings. Dr. Henry stated he had already asked Dr. Fritz to look at practices and costs in admissions, financial aid, registrar, etc. with the goal of putting students first. Dr. Hudson spoke of the need to do triage and of not being able to continue everything being done now.

Dr. Henry commented that a transfer from the University of Georgia had talked about how much better advisement was there. Dr. Henry pointed out that the University of Georgia had twice the budget of Georgia State for only 6,000 more students. He commented that funding issues were not only central, but also at the college level such as in the College of Arts and Sciences Academic Assistance Office.

Dr. Huss commented on the need to make the community aware of resources available through technology. Dr. Henry agreed noting he had located degree requirement information for the University of Georgia transfer on-line and through the Student Advisement Center, but while various mechanisms were available to students, they are in many cases unaware.

Dr. Morris asked about responsibility at the university level for such communication. Dr. Henry answered that Enrollment Services was responsible for undergraduate students, but responsibility for graduate students was decentralized. He noted that the Admissions Office had added information about graduate programs to its web site since prospective graduate students used the undergraduate admissions web site as a gateway to university web resources.
Dr. Morris cited the example of distributing information about DS-2. He observed that many units had their own newsletters. Dr. Henry commented that general GroupWise broadcasts were not effective for such purposes.

Dr. Hudson pointed to the lack of appreciation of what Georgia State is accomplishing as a research university as another communication issue, with Georgia State being overshadowed to too great an extent by the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech in this regard.

Dr. Henry pointed to multiple ways of communicating with students, including INCEPT, student peer advisors, majors fair, etc. He indicated that major business processes were being reviewed; for example, the appointment of graduate assistants. He noted the graduate assistant appointment review was linked to identifying those eligible for the health insurance package. He reiterated reviews needed to be completed by Thanksgiving in order to be ready for FY2008 budget considerations.

Dr. Tai asked about the scope of the administrative support reviews and how time-consuming the process might be. Dr. Henry responded that there would be piggybacking with the on-going ASUR process to be as efficient and broad as possible.

Dr. Morris commented that the true cost of Human Resources (HR) processes for example extended beyond the HR Office to various units across the university. Dr. Henry replied that this was understood and that the faculty information system re-engineering reflected this reality as steps for appointing faculty were considered.

Dr. Adamson suggested focusing on a few areas which had significant revenue generation potential, such as registration and student accounts, and on areas linked to customer service to curb the loss of students. She noted at the same time frustration with HR.

Dr. Morris observed that if the focus was on students, Enrollment Services and Student Services should be the first areas studied. He added that communication should also be high on the list.

Dr. Henry suggested members reflect on the task and continue discussion at the next meeting in July.
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