

# **Department of Management Budget Recommendations January 16, 2011**

We are complying with the request to examine the six questions from the Senate Budget Committee. However, we believe that requesting a 10% proportional cut from each department is inappropriate. This approach assumes that each department (or unit) within UWG also generates proportional revenues and has proportional strategic value to the University.

If the goal of this exercise is to also maintain the highest revenues possible, the revenues generated by each department (or unit) must be considered. Within our department, we have over 600 majors. And, based on the number of majors, the Management and MIS programs are two of the top 18 undergraduate programs at UWG.

Thus, while we appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback, we do not believe that proportional cuts are in the best long-term interests of this institution. It seems much more practical to look within departments that have relatively few students as a starting point. It may be possible to consolidate resources in these departments and, therefore, reduce the number of cuts within UWG programs that are actually generating more revenue.

## **1. What three core functions (e.g., programs, units, positions, or activities) do you consider to be the most critical to the mission of your department?**

- ***All Full-Time Existing Positions (including dedicated administrative support):*** We simply do not have any “slack” resources within our department. Most of our classes are full and we have not experienced any significant decrease in majors. Additionally, with increasing assessment requirements and our continuing problems with UWG support functions, a dedicated, experienced administrative assistant is vital.
- ***Departmental Programs (Management and MIS):*** While current data was not available, an analysis from 2009/2010 showed that both programs were two of the top eighteen undergraduate programs at UWG. Thus, we believe that we effectively attract and serve a significant number of UWG students.
- ***e-Tuition and Foundation/Agency Accounts:*** Without these sources of revenue, we could not do our jobs. Our travel budget amounts to just under \$400 per person. Thus, our ability to maintain AACSB accreditation would be jeopardized without these funds to support travel, training, and research.

## **2. What three core functions (e.g., programs, units, positions, or activities) do you consider to be the least critical to the mission of your department?**

- ***One MIS Graduate Teaching Assistant:*** We currently receive funding for two MIS graduate assistant positions each semester. However, we believe that we could cross-train the department GTA to help out with MIS issues when student demand is high.
- ***International Exchange Programs:*** While we recognize the opportunities that these programs offer our students and faculty, the programs are not critical to the mission of our department. The costs associated with faculty travel to support these programs can be significant.
- ***The WebMBA Program:*** This program takes important teaching resources from our department. And while we do not consider this program critical to our department's mission, we are aware that it might impact other areas within UWG.

**3. If the state portion of UWG's budget was increased by 10%, and your department received a proportional share, how and where would you apply that funding?**

We would likely apply the additional funds to our travel budget. Over the past 18 years our travel budget has continued to decrease. In 1992, each member of the department received about \$1,050 each year for travel. Today, even with significantly higher travel costs, each member of the department receives a little less than \$400.

As we mentioned in question #1, we currently must rely on other sources of revenue to support travel, research, and training.

**4. If the state portion of UWG's budget was decreased by a net 10%, and your department received a proportional cut, how would you apply these cuts (to what programs, units, or activities)?**

- We would likely delay hiring an additional lecturer for a year. We currently have approval to hire a lecturer to begin in the Fall 2011 semester. This individual will teach MGNT 3615 and CISM 2201. The current line for this position in the budget is around \$85,000. While the lecturer would not make the total amount in this line, it would still represent a significant savings. However, with this reduction, we would not be able to offer all needed classes. Some of the student demand would have to be "forced" into the summer session. Additionally, if this position is taken away, we would need sufficient notice. Students begin registering for Fall classes during the Spring semester. If we remove the four sections that this position is scheduled to teach after students have registered, it is possible that 160 – 200 students would have to revise their schedules.
- We would cut one of the MIS graduate teaching assistants. GTAs currently make \$8,000 per year and get \$4,600 in free tuition. Thus, the elimination of this position would

result in a \$12,600 net savings. However, with this reduction, it is possible that we may not be able to meet student demand during peak times.

- While we are uncertain how to list the amount of Dr. Turner's salary that is attributable to his upcoming work in the dean's office, this might also be considered a net decrease in salaries attributable to the Management Department. Because there are no plans to replace Dr. Turner's position, there are some savings in salary.
- Based on Charles Hodges' memo, we also believe that our significant involvement in the WebMBA program might be considered in examining our contribution to the "bottom line." If Dr. Hodges' numbers are correct, the four WebMBA courses that we teach each year generate about \$100,000 in revenue for the university.
- If the above items do not adequately represent our proportional cuts, we could contribute a portion of our e-Tuition funds for the upcoming budget year. However, again, we want to emphasize that these funds are critical for supporting faculty development initiatives.

**5. If the state portion of UWG's budget were to remain unchanged how do you plan to reallocate your budget to address your highest priorities?**

Given that we must supplement existing non-personal service funds with other sources of revenue, reallocation of budget items does not seem particularly relevant.

We would request that administration consider removing the existing restrictions that are placed on e-Tuition funds. We began generating these funds, in good faith, after we were told that we would be able to use them as we had the funds in our existing agency account. At some point, the rules changed. The elimination of these restrictions would give us more flexibility in using these funds for travel, research, training, and supplies.

**6. How was stakeholder input, from all levels, solicited and considered in developing the departmental response?**

A department meeting was held on January 14, 2011 from 11 am – 1 pm in the Richards College of Business. Prior to the meeting, all departmental members were provided with current budget-related information via e-mail..

Doug Turner, Mary-Kathryn Zachary, Jeff Rooks, Monica Smith, Erich Bergiel, Joan Deng, Brad Prince, Liz Runyan, John Upson, Faramarz Parsa, and Tom Gainey attended and actively participated in this meeting.

Additionally, Leanne DeFoor and Samantha Dukes “virtually” attended the meeting and actively participated using Fuze Virtual Meeting software that was set up and monitored by Brad Prince.

All full-time departmental members reviewed and endorsed the final report.