Planning & Development Committee Meeting  
October 26, 2004

Present:  J. L. Albert, Pam Barr, Al Baumstark, Michael Binford, Cathy Brack, Greg Brack, Joan Carson, Mary Jane Casto, Martin Fraser, Richard Glover, Amy Helling, Hugh Hudson, LaLoria Konata, John K. Lee, Marcia Pearl, Jerry Rackliffe, Jeffrey C. Rupp, Tarianna Stewart, Phang C. Tai, Ellen Taylor, William L. Waugh, Carol Winkler


Others Attending: Mary Ann Gaunt, Connie Sampson, Harvey Shumpert

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the 9/20/04 Minutes

2. ASUR Reports  
   (ASUR Process - Joan Carson and Mary Jane Casto)  
   (ASUR Police Dept. Update - Connie Sampson)

3. Subcommittee Reports  
   (Fire Safety - Greg Brack)  
   (MRRF - Al Baumstark)  
   (Other Subcommittee Reports)

The September 20th minutes were seconded & approved.

Due to scheduling conflicts the meeting was held in Rm 718 GCB and started at apx. 1:05pm. The meeting began with a slide presentation from Connie B. Sampson, Director & Chief of the GSU Police Department. Connie’s presentation covered the day-in and day-out operations of the department; covering every area from staffing & training, bike patrols, community policing, areas patrolled on campus, the University Village substation, standard security tactics, guidelines and measures, new technology used by the police department, and the budget(s) that ran it all. Because the amount of material presented, she announced that any of the members desiring a copy could request one from her office.

Once finished, Jerry Rackliffe over-viewed the budget for the department. The committee asked some basic questions in regards to the operation of some of the video cameras stationed around campus. Jerry mentioned he would send the committee an overall report including a list of where all the video cameras were located, and invited the committee to reply back to him with any feedback they had.
The meeting moved onto item #2 on the agenda, **ASUR Process - Joan Carson and Mary Jane Casto**. The document in discussion was "*Administrative & Support Unit Review Procedures - Revised May 11, 2004 Draft*."

**Timothy Crimmins** (absent from today’s meeting) sent the following email prior to the meeting.

```
From: Timothy Crimmins
To: Phang Tai, Joan Carson
Date: Monday - October 25, 2004 8:41 PM
Subject: Asur Processes

P. C. and Joan,

I have class tomorrow and will not be able to make the P&D meeting. I have two suggestions about the ASUR procedures document:

1. Change references to the "Senior Faculty Associate" to Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness.

2. Add a section at the end of the document that addresses what will happen to recommendations for increases in financial resources that result from the Action Plan. If the Provost recommends increases, there should be a copy of the recommendation to members of the Budget Committee and FACP. Adding this step will keep the process transparent as it is implemented.

Best,

Tim
```

**Joan Carson** began the discussion on this matter. She said that the document was originally drafted by Tim, and was a revision of the 1999 version. She said the current document incorporated procedures that the committee had made since that time.

**Carol Winkler** - "*I have a question based on the town hall meeting this morning. At least from what I understood from what the provost said, if there was gonna be an illumination of administrative support units, it would go through this process, and there was conversation on the academic side that we need to make sure that the criteria for illumination would be included here. If my interpretation about what he said was accurate; is there anything in this document that would allow that type of analysis to be done in a fair way across the units?*” She mentioned that the process for both the academic side and the administrative side should (in fairness) parallel each other.

Joan Carson said that currently there was not, but added that she didn’t get a chance to attend the town hall meeting, so that she did not know of any new future plans that would accommodate that sort of parallel processing. She also mentioned (in regards to parallel processing) that the academic programs that may be eliminated wouldn’t necessarily go through an "*academic program review*” as much as they would the “*targeted program ventilation process;*” . . . two very different processes.
Jeff Rupp mentioned there was a joint subcommittee of the Budget and APACE committees that may be handling that some of what Carol was referring to.

Joan agreed with the Carol’s concerns and suggested that, if P&D would be willing to agree with the normal procedures as they stood, as the document evolved she would talk with Ron Henry to see whether the committee needed to consider parallel criteria as such.

Joan briefly went over the major procedures new to the document since its last draft, and mentioned that she thought she could incorporate Tim’s two emailed suggestions into the process without any problems. **The committee motioned & seconded** to accept the document with the minor changes mentioned.

**The committee decided to postpone discussion on the ASUR report for the GSU Library until the next meeting.**

Greg Brack reported in for the Fire Safety Subcommittee. **“We’ve met twice this year. We are now working a new committee created by the provost called the Compliance Committee, which is several committees working together to integrate all needed information for compliance. This year the Fire Safety Committee has joined with other committees in recommending that we begin to perform some practical drills; there seems to be very little preparedness on campus in the natural practice of emergency drills.”**

Phang Tai questioned whether the Fire Safety Committee had discussed creating a subcommittee to handle hazardous chemicals. Greg said he would bring the subject up at the next fire safety meeting. Tai suggested it might wise to make it a joint committee with the Research Committee.

Phang Tai announced that Al Baumstark volunteered to be the Chair of the MRR Joint Subcommittee. Al went over the minutes to the committee’s 10/11/04 meeting and highlighting the committee’s stand on budget flexibility and their business for the year to come. He announced that the group did pass a motion in regards the infrastructure list, saying that there were items that could be removed without damage to the university & could be picked back up at a later time. Also he said the rating system used would be looked at after everything had been re-worked for the current year and gave some examples of how the priority system currently worked and how they would try to de-politicize that system based on each building’s usage. Lastly, he briefly discussed the air quality problems in the 1 Park Place Building.

Harvey Shumpert mentioned that he had recently talked to someone about meeting with Carol Winkler about those problems. (Carol had been key in making sure those problems were addressed.)

Phang Tai pointed out that it was very important that the priority list from MRR be followed, so that priority of each project would not be taken out of place. Also, he mentioned that the 1 Park Place building was a **Foundation** owned building and not a GSU owned building, and the air quality problems should be taken care of with the rental payments made to the **Foundation**.
Harvey Shumpert mentioned that the company ISES inspected all the Foundation owned buildings and there was an inspection report for each building. Harvey mentioned that he could allow Carol to look at the report on 1 Park Place if she desired.

Hugh Hudson on MRR Money - “When this was talked about in FACP, the Provost seemed rather adamant that the money should not be considered as a possible source for solving our budgetary problems for this year, that we should use all 9.2 million to address infrastructure needs.”

Al Baumstark finished the discussion by mentioning that the next procedure was for the MRR committee to look at the Facilities Planning List and agree on how to use it. “If it doesn’t change the list, there is not much to be done, but if it does change it dramatically, we have to go through the Deans and get approval from everyone all over again.” Harvey Shumpert mentioned he would make sure the committee got a hold of the final list.

Amy Helling reported in for the Traffic Safety Subcommittee. She mentioned that the group met and discussed (among other items) signage, pedestrian usage patterns, and the Decatur Street updates. She also mentioned that they discussed looking into how safety issues were not just exclusively related to traffic.

Bill Waugh reported in for the University Closings Subcommittee. He mentioned that currently the group was distracted with Federal Mandates but would be back on track soon. Phang Tai briefly mentioned the subcommittees relativity to accessibility of those in possession of a Panther Card (used to access locked buildings when they were closed).

After Bill’s report & Tai’s comments, the meeting disbanded at apx. 2:18pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz
Administrative Coordinator