Planning & Development Committee Meeting
December 17, 2002

Present:  Al Baumstark, Greg Brack, Kyle Bruner, Damon Camp, Tim Crimmins, Martin Fraser, Bonnie Fritz, Peggy Gallagher, Christine Gallant, Mohamed Ghazi, Ronald Henry, Charlene Hurt, Steven Kaminshine, LaLoria Konata, George Rainbolt, Phang Tai, Susan Walcott, Bill Waugh.


The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the 11/18/02 meeting minutes
2. Review of the Action Plan 2003 (Reviewed and prepared by Provost Henry)
3. Subcommittee Reports
4. Other Issues

The meeting started at apx. 1:05pm. The minutes from 11/18/02 were approved.

Ron Henry began the discussion on the 2nd item of the agenda: Review of the Action Plan 2003. He briefly reminded the group of its charge to give final approval of the Action Plan on behalf of the Senate. He gave a quick overview of the total plan (its layout and structure), and then explained some of the plan's content. Ron mentioned that the plan covered various projects for 2003, and that his intent at the today's current meeting was to just present the plan to the committee. He mentioned that he'd provide the tables for the plan (which were not yet in the present draft) to the group before the next Planning and Development meeting.

Susan Walcott questioned how the shift in State Government would effect the plan. Ron answered that he didn't know and explained that the Deans of the Colleges and FACP would meet on January 8th regarding specific questions and concerns. Those questions and concerns would then be due to the Regents on January 15th for a January 21st approval.
Bonnie Fritz discussed a memo sent to P&D by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee in regards to their desired modifications to the plan. It read as follows:

Faculty Affairs would like to submit the following two items for insertion in the 2003 Action Plan. Because the Strategic Planning committee has completed its phase and Planning & Development is the committee in charge of modifications to the document, we are forwarding this request to you for consideration.

**Item 1**

3.2.4 Academic Programs & Faculty
Faculty Support & Development. [Insert as Paragraph 3]

The Lanette L. Suttles Child Development Center. The Center provides research, recruitment, and retention support for students, faculty and staff. This support includes: a research site for departments and faculty across the university; training programs for graduate and undergraduate students; the Hope Scholarship-funded "Best Practices" statewide training for infant through pre-K teachers and center directors; recruitment and retention incentives for students and faculty; and quality child development care for the children of students, faculty and staff. Plans will be developed for enlarging and upgrading the facility and its capacity, thus providing enhanced support for each facet of the center's service while retaining the high quality of its staff.

**Item 2 Page 17**

Comprehensive Campaign. [To be inserted after the last sentence in the paragraph].

As one means of providing support for this campaign, a naming campaign is suggested for but not confined to new buildings.

In regards to item #1, Ron Henry warned the committee of the enormous costs that could be involved in "planning" and that the university was already using non-university funds to help fund that particular center.

Phang Tai discussed the usefulness of the center & the 2 year waiting period that the center currently had for potential future day-care attendants, and affirmed that he thought it would be a good idea for the university to look into more planning, as long as a commitment wasn't needed at the present time.

Tim Crimmins discussed whether the center could perform more preliminary research/conceptual planning on the issue themselves and not at the expense of university funds.

George Rainbolt suggested the following amendments: changes in bold
to item#1: change the last sentence (. . . Plans will be developed . . .) to the following:

"Within the Center's existing budget, plans will be developed . . ."

to item#2: change the last section of the sentence to the following:

". . . a naming campaign will be continued but not confined to new buildings. The naming of existing buildings might assist recruitment efforts."

His amendments were accepted & approved.

Charlene Hurt ended the discussion on the amendment by mentioning that Facilities may also be a good area to insert this section into.
Tim Crimmins opened discussion on tuition & funding for the upcoming year. He asked what the chances were of the university getting higher tuition as a research university, and what the budgetary effects of those chances would be. Ron Henry replied that the chances were high, but there were too many dependents for him to say what the budgetary outcome would be, he then briefly explained different methods used in calculating some of those budgetary concerns. With the expected increase in tuition, his overall outlook of the situation appeared positive and he invited emailed comments from the group. "Our intent is to maximize the number of credit hours that will be generated in the Spring, but at the same time keep the university capable (with respect to its support units) of providing basic services to students. He mentioned that the university for the 1st time was projected to 'break' the 700,000 credit hours for the year!

Greg Brack gave a brief update from the Fire Safety Committee. They looked into the Gas Cylinder situation (see P&D Minutes 11/18/02). Phang Tai commented on the disconnect between units and also that one of the fire-safety issues he noticed was that of the practice of individual office units trying to police themselves. Tai also mentioned that there wasn't always enough funding available for newly found violations. Tai mentioned a situation of a $750,000 citation that was given, when only $125,000 had been planned for. He explained that more planning for such unforeseen problems was needed (example: the infrastructure funding for the Natural Science Center building).

That discussion led way to a discussion about the MRR List & its subcommittee with the Budget Committee. The committee discussed in depth the priority of the items on the list, the time it took for the list to arrive to P&D for review, smaller university units that may have problems making the list, the approval/deadline dates of the list, etc. Phang Tai explained that a problem that P&D seemed to frequently run into was receiving the MRR List, and documents similar to it, in a timely enough manner to properly review & approve it.

Nothing major was reported from the representatives for Traffic Safety or University Offices. The traffic safety committee was preparing to merge its current plan into a long range plan and the 34 Peachtree Street project was due for completion in late-January/early-February. Renovations in the Library were also complete. Martin Fraser reported that the subcommittee on University Closings had their draft ready and things were moving along well.

After all the subcommittee representatives gave their reports, the meeting ended at apx. 2:17pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Lydia K. Woltz
Administrative Coordinator