Planning & Development Committee Meeting  
December 13, 2004

Present: Pam Barr, Al Baumstark, Michael Binford, Cathy Brack, Greg Brack, Joan Carson, Mary Jane Casto, Martin Fraser, Christine Gallant, Sandra Garber, Charlene S. Hurt, Siva Nathan, Marcia Pearl, Jerry Rackliffe, George Rainbolt, Hazel Scott, Tarianna Stewart, Phang C. Tai, Ellen Taylor, Carol Winkler, James (Jim) Wolk, Maryann Wysor.


Others Attending: Beth Jones, Harvey Shumpert

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of Minutes 11/15/04

2. Preliminary Discussion of the 2005 Strategic Plan (Provost Henry)

3. Planning & Development Composition (From Senate Statutes & Bylaws)

4. Administrative Support Unit (ASU) Evaluation Subcommittee Report (Siva Nathan) Discussion by MaryAnn Casto

5. Subcommittee Reports
   a. Fire Safety Subcommittee
   b. Joint Subcommittee on MRR
   c. Other Subcommittee Reports

Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx. 1pm. The November 15th minutes were seconded & approved.

Ron Henry headed the discussion on the 2nd item of the agenda: Preliminary Discussion of the 2005 Strategic Plan. Beforehand, Phang Tai reminded the group that this Action Plan was for 2005 only, and that the next Strategic Plan would be for 2005-2010.
**Ron Henry** began and mentioned that he wouldn’t ask for approval of this 3rd draft until P&D’s January 24th meeting, so that the committee would have time to review & consider the changes. He went over the draft as a whole, spoke on structural additions and modifications in its content and briefly focused on and discussed the following areas:

- Recruitment & Retention of Students - announcing that the recent decrease in students (by apx. 800 students) was mainly from graduate business students & international students.
- International Students & Study Abroad - mentioning that the decrease in this group was consistent with national trends.
- Undergraduate Indicators - modifications in wording
- Academic Programs & Faculty - modification/addition of needed paragraphs referencing other tables within the document
- Context: Internal Commitments, Internal Strategy, and Budget Considerations
- Infrastructure - announcing GSU’s new university website
- Priorities for 2005 - Heading inserts, added phrases in regards to APACE.
- Facilities - Science Building (item#7 on Regents’ list) reporting $45 million instead of $9 million. An additional sentence was added stating that a request would be sent to the Regents’ for a humanities building to replace Sparks Hall.

Ron mentioned other changes within the document as the group discussed various concerns such as the way salary requests worked, NIH rankings, and P.R. for student retention concerns. No motions were made and Ron mentioned he would deliver the next draft with any committee suggestions to the committee shortly.

The group then moved on to the next item on the agenda: *Planning & Development Composition (From Senate Statutes & Bylaws).*

The following document was passed out for review.

---

**PRINCIPALS FOR FORMING COMMITTEES**

The Statutes and Bylaws Committee agreed by consensus to the following principles for forming committees:

1. Except in compelling cases, exofficio administrators or staff that are added to committees will be nonvoting.
2. Faculty senators' appointment to committees will not be restricted by proportional rules nor will committees have limitations on the number of faculty that will be on committees.
3. The nominations committee will be asked to follow two broad principles (to accomplish the same goals as 2):
   a. In general, faculty senators will not serve on more than two Standing Senate committees unless the faculty senator submits a compelling argument for three or more committee assignments. (This does not include committees that are not part of the nominations process; i.e., Executive Committee, FACP, and Nominations).
   b. In general, committees will remain approximately the same size unless there is a specific request from the current committee to increase or decrease its size.
Phang Tai headed this discussion and focusing mainly on the number of people on the committee and the roles they played in regards to there voting authority.

Christine Gallant strongly urged to keep the proportional representation of the colleges the way it was because of the large scope of the demands within the committee; saying that P&D had more of an comprehensive overview of university matters than other committees.

Carol Winkler said she also found herself having to explain to others the large number of people on the committee due to the committee’s tremendous workload.

George Rainbolt added that proportional commitment wasn’t necessarily needed for every committee, but that it may need to be emphasized that for P&D, it was.

Others in the group agreed with the views of Christine, Carol, & George and after a brief discussion, the following motion was made:

Christine Gallant - “I move that we retain the proviso that makes at-large members chosen on a proportional basis so they generally reflect the percentage of the elected members of the senate that teach college units.”

The motion was seconded and the following comments were discussed.

Joan Carson - “When you have a small college you only have a few senators and they really get over worked”

Ron Henry - Stating a correction in regards to the document: “This committee does not have the approval of the University Strategic Plan. You have the recommendation to the University Senate, and you have approval of the Annual Action Plan. You approve the Annual Action Plan; it doesn’t go any further, but the strategic 5 year plan is only a recommendation from here to the Senate.”

The group again discussed briefly the number of official & non-official members within the group and decided to accept the amended suggestions in regards to:

- changing the number of “33” senators to the more mathematically proportional number of “at least 28”
- changing the name of the position of “Provost” to “Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness”
- adding Ron’s corrective sentence in regards to the “recommendation of the University Strategic Plan and the approval of the Annual Action Plan”

The committee then moved on to the next item on the agenda.
Item #4 - Administrative Support Unit (ASU) Evaluation Subcommittee Report

Siva Nathan, Chair of the Evaluation Subcommittee headed the discussion. He presented and went over the report from that subcommittee entitled Guidelines for Initial Ranking of Activities within Administrative and Support Units and explained this would be obtained through the use of measures of “Centrality & Criticality” (formerly “Centrality & Equality”).

Centrality: referring to the degree to which each activity within an admin. & support unit supports the mission of the university.

Criticality: referring to the degree to which an activity is more or less essential to university operations.

Carol Winkler questioned why “Equality” was replaced with “Critically”?

Joan Carson in response: “The equality issue was one that we thought was important, but not for the 1st cut. It will be something that will come up again. Right now, the reason that this process is happening is for budgetary issues. If something was found to be of low quality and high centrality; low quality may be because that unit is already operating on a diminished budget that was cut, so we wouldn’t want to penalize that unit even further.”

George Rainbolt - “On the academic side, Quality & Centrality were definitely orthogonal to each other, but these are not; so anything that’s Critical is necessarily Central. So I’m wondering if the quadrant model is really appropriate here; whether we shouldn’t just have one Centrality initial cut.

Sandra Garber - “One of the discussions we had, related to the fact that we could not imagine anything not being Central at this point. What activity is being executed that’s not Cental & doesn’t support the mission of the institution? So then, you have to look at the Critical aspect.

Siva Nathan - “Look at the two components of Criticality. They’re not perfectly orthogonal, but it’s quite possible to be low on one and high on the other.”

More discussion continued on this issue and Siva Nathan suggested a 3 dimensional model by using Centrality, Scope, & Duplication.

It was asked if there was a list of units activities of the units. It was answered that a template of each unit’s activities had been created and that this list would be supplied to the committee.

George Rainbolt suggested that the list should be attached as an appendix to the document. Discussion on the issue finally came to an end and Siva Nathan agreed that the activities list should be added to the document.

Charlene Hurt - “I move that we vote now on the document as we agreed it would be changed.” Her motion passed.

The committee then moved on to the next issue on the agenda: the subcommittee reports.
Greg Brack reported in for the Fire Safety Subcommittee. He mentioned that they were currently working on issues of people putting surplus items into hallways where they shouldn’t. He mentioned that hopefully a campus-wide email would be sent out in regards to this issue in January of 2005.

Phang Tai asked for an update on Panther Card Access in the campus buildings. Beth Jones responded that right now there was a cost factor that would not allow for the access to be campus wide. Sandra Garber reminded the group of the “slowing pendulum of the 96 Olympics” and cautioned against the downside of the issue which could result in an eventual waste of money. Beth mentioned there were also staffing issues in the Panther Office (staffed only by 3 people to support the entire university) and cost issues in regards to ADA policies.

The group then went on to talk about the budgetary costs of access and security to the campus community. Lastly, Greg Brack mentioned that some of the issues were also related to Homeland Security guidelines, then the group moved on to the next issue.

Al Baumstark reported on the MRR List. He reported that the group met and would have a list sent out by the end of the week. He mentioned that all the issues were addressed in a positive way and by the 2nd week of January 2005, he would have a report for the P&D committee. Harvey Shumpert reported on the Master Plan and mentioned that they were currently interviewing firms to complete it. He mentioned that painting & carpeting for the RCB building was currently underway and that the West Exhibit Plan was almost completed. He said that the 1.5 million dollar bid for the elevators was awarded for Library North. He reported that no contractor had been selected yet for the Kell Hall Air Quality issue. The group then moved to the last report of the meeting.


I. The Subcommittee’s Charge & Collection of Information
II. Recommended Budget Principles & Priorities for New Funds
III. Recommended Budget Principles & Priorities in the Event of Budget Cuts and/or Redirection

She briefly went over document with no major issues to and Phang Tai adjourned the meeting at apx. 2:20pm.