Planning & Development Committee Meeting  
September 20, 2004

Present:  J. L. Albert, Lisa Armistead, Benjamin Baez, Pam Barr, Al Baumstark, Michael Binford, Mary Jane Casto, Timothy Crimmins, Martin Fraser, Christine Gallant, Sandra Garber, Josue Heredia, John Hicks, Charlene S. Hurt, John K. Lee, Robin Morris, Siva Nathan, George Rainbolt, Hazel Scott, Phang C. Tai, Ellen Taylor, Carol Winkler, James (Jim) Wolk.


The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the 8/23/04 Minutes
2. ASUR Reports tabled from Previous Meetings
3. Organization of the ASUR Committee 2004/2005
4. Subcommittee Reports/Signup
5. MRRF and Budget / Strategic Planning update

The August 23rd minutes were seconded & approved.

Phang Tai made an announcement that the Dec. 21st meeting had been changed to Dec. 13th, then moved to the first item on the agenda, the ASUR Reports. He briefly went over who/what ASUR was and explained to the group that the ASUR Reports and templates they were about to discuss, were those tabled from April-June P&D meetings. The ASUR documents passed out for discussion were:

1) ASUR Committee Report for University Information Services (UIS) 4-13-04
2) Template for Administrative and Support Unit Review Self-Study - Draft 4-6-04
3) Template for ASUR report - Draft 4-6-04
4) ASUR Committee Membership 2004-2005
**ASUR DOCUMENT #1**

Mary Jane Casto reported on UIS saying the group’s report was well written and well received. Recommendations from the ASUR committee were:

< A permanent level of funding for technical training due to constantly changing technology & software systems such as PeopleSoft, Banner, etc.; employees would need constant training to stay “up to date”.

< For the unit to look within its own group to see if one of its positions could be re-purposed as a Business Analyst or Project Manager.

< To do a customer satisfaction and customer needs assessment.

< To look at duplication of programming & production control services within the university. (Software was constantly being purchased first, then afterwards. . . IS&T & UIS were being asked for product support when they were not aware of the software OR its implementation into, and on, university systems and workstations).

Marty Fraser questioned funding for any training that was needed. Mary Jane said if needed it could be developed into the Action Plan from the Provost, “but currently, that stage hasn't been reached yet.”

Tim Crimmins questioned whether any type of customer satisfaction survey was done and/or required within UIS' Self Study. He expressed that a self-study should not be done without paying attention to feedback from the customers. Mary Jane replied that only a staff survey was required at the time when UIS was complying to the review, but that in the new template, that issue had been corrected.

Tim Crimmins “The bigger question here is for IS&T. UIS is an IS&T unit. Is there an ongoing process of gathering customer service information? I'd rather see it dealt with structurally by the larger unit if that is going to happen in the future; that is my suggestion.”

Mary Jane Casto “I agree with you. Right now, several of the units are evaluated frequently, due to the surveys that go out when Remedy trouble tickets are closed. One of J.L.’s [referring to committee member J.L. Albert] goals is to get all of the units within IS&T under that Remedy umbrella, and then that would be a lot more customer feedback for all the units. ASUR recommended that they move forward with the customer satisfaction needs assessment survey; so it will happen.”

Phang Tai asked whether these areas of concern would be addressed before the Action Plan was submitted, and Mary Jane affirmed it would.

The group made the motion to accept ASUR's UIS Report and **THE MOTION WAS SECONDED AND PASSED.**
The committee moved on to the new template for each unit's self-study, "Self-Study-Template for Administrative and Support Unit Review DRAFT 4-6-04".

Mary Jane Casto explained that the template was similar to previous templates, but had "fine-tuned the process". In regards to any complexity in appearance of the information asked for by the report, she explained that the units under review did receive briefing and retreat with Julia Bannerman of Mgt. & Staff Development Services and her staff, and were guided through the whole process before their reports were put together.

The main headings of the template were (not including subheadings):
I. Mission & Functional Responsibilities
II. Goals & Objectives
III. Services Provided w/Required Appendix
IV. Structure, Organization, & Climate w/Required Appendix
V. Resources
VI. Summary of Report & Strategic Directions, and 1Yr, 2Yr, & 3Yr Goals

New to the template was a page limit on reports turned in. P&D members had mixed feelings about this requirement, but no suggested changes were made to the limitation.

Mary Jane gave a brief overview, and the group discussed the document in depth. Afterwards, the group MOTIONED AND ACCEPTED TO AMEND THE TEMPLATE AS FOLLOWS: [additions/changes are in bold, deletions stricken out.]

- **SECTION I.C.**
  What are the unit's key indicators (performance outcome measures) and how are they incorporated into your processes?

- **SECTION I.E.1.**
  How does the unit compare with similar units at peer institutions (e.g., Urban 13+, Board of Regents peer institutions) in terms of . . .

- **Omittance Due to Redundancy**
  **DELETE** II.B.2 - Does measurement include feedback from the providers and recipients of the service/product?
  **KEEP** II.D.1 - How does the unit learn about the customers' needs and obtain feedback regarding service delivery?

- **SECTION III. Required Appendix**
  Summary results of customer feedback data (e.g., surveys and/or focus groups). These data should cover both actual & potential customers and should be designed to fit the specific needs of the unit under review.
**Tim Crimmins** in regards to SECTION III changes (above) - “It is not clear who will be doing the designing.”

**Mary Jane** explained there was a process document (currently not present) that she felt would be the best place to address that question. **Siva Nathan** also reminded the group to keep in mind that what they had in hand was the template only, which did not contain the full detail of the document in its entirety.

**ASUR DOCUMENT #3**

The committee then moved on to the next ASUR document: “**Template for ASUR Report - Administrative Support Unit Review - DRAFT 4-6-04**”

The headings of the Template were:

I. Unit Profile
   A) Mission  B) No. of Employees  C) Customer Base  D) Budget Analysis
   E) Key Indicators
II. Evaluation of Self-Study
III. Key Indicators
IV. Action Recommendations

**Carol Winkler** explained that it was just an ‘in-house’ template that the Review Subcommittee used to evaluate the Self Study documents turned in by each unit under review. It was noted that the headings of the outline were what the ASUR committee used to evaluate feedback received from each unit's Self-Study-Template section by section, but were intentionally not identical (by headings); used as a synopsis for the unit profile.

**Charlene Hurt** suggested that P&D accept the document as an internal document used by ASUR.

**Tim Crimmins** agreed with Charlene's suggestion and added, “As a customer that has read the UIS report, I would suggest, under A) Mission, that you pay attention to the 'organizational plate', because UIS begins with a unit profile mission, but it is not described as being a unit within IS&T; so if you're not familiar with the organizational structure, you might not figure this out.”  **Carol agreed with Tim.**

The group **MOTIONED IN AND ACCEPTED** the template as an internal document of ASUR.
The committee then moved on to the last ASUR document: **“The ASUR Committee Membership 2004-2005”**

P&D Committee members were asked whether they approved of the make-up of the ASUR committee by email on 8/30/04. The following concerns were addressed via email and during the current meeting:

**Tim Crimmins:** I am concerned about the balance between faculty and staff in the ASUR list that has been distributed. Assuming that a faculty member will be appointed under the "variable" slot for Academic Affairs, there are five faculty, eight staff, one student, and one senior faculty/administrator. I would like to see more faculty appointments.

**Christine Gallant** mentioned that she was aware of at least one faculty member on the committee who was placed on the committee without prior consultation.

**Siva Nathan** agreed that it was good to have a mix of faculty (academic & administrative, new & old) and expressed that he had been assured that everyone on the committee gave their approval and wanted to be on the committee.

The requirements to be an ASUR committee member were also discussed. **Phang Tai** mentioned that the chair of ASUR was usually a member from P&D. The group also dispelled the thought that the members had to be Senators; **Siva Nathan**, “all that’s required is they be on the Diversity Committee”. **Carol Winkler** explained the member listed under the variable position was usually given to someone who was affiliated with the department under review.

**George Rainbolt** suggested that it be written/clarified that “committee members be chosen in consultation with the chair of the relevant senate committee.”

**Tim Crimmins** [interjecting about all the changes about to be proposed] ‘Joan Carson wants to get this process going, and I think we can approve this committee and then enter into negotiations with Joan about how she appoints members in the future.’

The committee **MOTIONED IN AND ACCEPTED** Tim's suggestion and the committee moved on to item #5 on the agenda “MRRF and Budget / Strategic Planning”

**“MRRF AND BUDGET” / Strategic Planning**

**Beth Jones** for “MRRF and Budget” (see P&D minutes 8-23-04) announced that from the 3 projects currently ongoing (Urban Life Elevator Upgrade, Library North Upgrade, and Kell Hall -Indoor Air Quality Improvements) progress was being made and money was still left over. She also mentioned that Fire Marshall regulatory items were still being worked on. She briefly went over budget cuts and said that from the $68 million University System cuts, GSU's budget was cut ~ $7.3 million. She mentioned that one of the ways the Chancellor was going to try to handle this was through a tuition increase. She also mentioned that all the units should be prepared to place a 1% hold back in their budget.
In regards to buildings with electronic doors accessible by swipe cards, Beth also reported that she would soon receive a matrix of the hours of operation for all those buildings. In particular, Dr. Patton approved that the Kell Hall building could be locked up and accessible by card swipe after 8pm. She mentioned that a mass email to the students and an article in GSU's Signal would be sent out towards the beginning of October. **Charlene Hurt** mentioned that for a fee, departments could have anyone they needed issued a swipe card to access the buildings, and that departments needing buildings open after certain hours, for special events, would need to work with the GSU Police Dept. and the Panther-Card Office when/if needed.

Various groups reported in for the P&D subcommittees. **Beth Jones** (for Traffic Safety) announced that the city council decided to allow additional GSU Campus signs letting people know when they were on campus grounds, and that GSU recently received a couple of grants to further the plans on the pedestrian areas of Decatur & Piedmont Streets. **Tim Crimmins** asked about the progress of changing Decatur Street into a 2-lane street. Beth said that $700,000 in grant money recently received would be used to get those plans ‘under-way’.

“MRRF and Budget / **STRATEGIC PLANNING**”

**Phang Tai** received the email from Ron Henry informing him that he had been selected as a member of the Collegial Group for the Strategic Plan 2005 development. He attached to the email a set of questions that would be addressed as the current strategic plan was revised.

**Attached to the email was the following document . . .**
Strategic Plan 2005 development  
September 10, 2004

For the next five-year strategic plan, we need to analyze the current and projected environmental scan. Then, we need to test the current high priority areas in light of probable conditions to see if we should add or delete from our current priorities.

1. What have been the university’s major accomplishments during the past five years?
2. Are these accomplishments aligned with our mission/vision?
3. What are the major changes in the environment since the 2000-2005 plan was developed?
4. What major changes in the environment will likely occur during the next five years?
5. Which major program clusters have come to characterize Georgia State? [A program cluster includes departments, centers, institutes, concentrations, and majors and can cut across colleges]
6. Which programs have achieved or have significant potential to achieve national recognition – what is the evidence?
7. What are the educational attributes or characteristics that enable Georgia State to establish a comparative advantage in relation to other institutions?
8. Which programs leverage the comparative advantage of being in Atlanta?
9. What major goals should guide Georgia State’s development during the next five years?
10. From you reading of the current strategic plan [http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwsen/strategic_plan/strategic_plan-2000.html], what is missing? Is the current plan sufficiently aspirational?

Three major groups independently address the questions:
Academic group – 22 faculty
Collegial group – 22 chairs, directors, and associate deans
Deans group + representatives from VP areas

Composition of groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Collegial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYSPS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPSS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative group:
6 deans, 1 Univ. Lib., 2 Assoc. Provosts, 1 VP Research, 1 Asst. Provost Int’l, 1 VPSS, 3 VPFA, 1 VPD, 1 VPEA, 1 Legal Affairs, 1 AVP Opp. Dev., 1 Enroll Serv., 1 Univ. Rel. In addition, the provost and associate provost for academic programs will be members of all three groups.

Strategic Plan 2005 development  
September 10, 2004
Tai passed out the document for review & briefly went over its purpose & the organizational make-up. He explained that for this 2005-2010 Action Plan, the Provost created 3 groups to ‘oversee’ it: 1 Academic Group (22 members), 1 Collegial Group (22 members), and 1 Administrative Group (21 members). He reminded P&D that after the Strategic Plan was drafted, it (along with the University Action Plan) would be sent to P&D for approval before being sent to the Senate in the Spring. He also announced that he, Jeff Rupp, Timothy Crimmins, and James Wolk would represent P&D on the Strategic Planning Subcommittee and that he, Carol Winkler, & Pam Barr would represent P&D on the CBSAC Committee.

**During the meeting,** sign up sheets for Planning & Development sub-committees were passed around. The final composition of the subcommittees resulted as follows:

**Budget Priorities Subcommittee** - Martin Fraser, Christine Gallant, Ellen Taylor, William L. Waugh

**Child Development Center Task Force** - Lisa Armistead

**Faculty/Grad Asst/Staff Offices** - Michael Binford, Timothy Crimmins, Martin Fraser, Sandra Garber, Siva Nathan, Joseph S. Rabianski, Carol Winkler (Chair)

**Fire Safety Subcommittee** - Al Baumstark, Greg Brack (Chair), Mary Jane Casto

**Institutional Effectiveness (Performance Indicators)** - Greg Brack, Jeffrey C. Rupp (Chair), William L. Waugh

**Joint Subcommittee on Major Renovations & Repairs (MRR)** - J. L. Albert, Al Baumstark (Chair), Martin Fraser, Sandra Garber, Hugh Hudson, LaLoria Konata, Richard Miller, Marcia Pearl, Carol Winkler, Elizabeth Jones (attending)

**Traffic Safety Subcommittee** - Pam Barr, Christine Gallant, Amy Helling, Elizabeth Jones (Chair)

**University Closings Subcommittee** - Lisa Armistead, Cathy Brack, Mary Jane Casto, Vijay K. Vaishnavi, William L. Waugh

After collection of the handouts and a brief reminder about the upcoming meeting dates for the year . . .

(M) 9/20/04
(Tuesday) 10/26/04
(M) 11/15/04
(Monday) 12/13/04
(Monday) 1/24/05
(T) 2/15/05
(M) 3/21/05
(T) 4/19/05
(M) 5/16/05

. . . the meeting adjourned at apx. 2:25pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz
Administrative Coordinator