Planning & Development Committee
July 11, 2005


Others Attending: Carlton Mullis & Anthony Coleman from the GSU Police Department

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of Minutes 4/25/05

2. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REQUEST - Public Safety Subcommittee (Connie Sampson)

3. ASUR Reports - Office of Dean of Students

4. Other Issues

**Agenda Item #1** - Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx. 1:03pm. The 4/25/05 minutes were motioned in and approved.

**Agenda Item #2** - Since the last meeting of 4/25/05, Phang Tai received an email from the Senate Executive Committee requesting that P&D produce a report regarding the campus’ perception of crime on campus.

Tim Crimmins asked what prompted the Executive Committee’s inquiry and Siva Nathan explained that Hugh Hudson sent an email to the Exec. Committee due to recent burglary & indecent exposure incidents that had taken place in the General Classroom Building.

Officials from the GSU Police Department (Carlton Mullis & Anthony Coleman) attended the meeting and presented a report entitled “Six Month Comparison of All Areas on Campus”. They went over the report and discussed its content with the committee. Some brief points in there discussion were:

- The mistaken classification of “larceny” as “burglary” by the civilian campus community when reviewing crime statistic reports, and the same with categories of “indecent exposure” vs. “sex offenses” & “trespassing”

- Clarification on how the number of incidents were also given. Example: 5 computers stolen from 1 room is reported as 1 incident, and 5 computers stolen from 5 different rooms, at the same time, would most likely be reported as 5 different incidents.
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In regards to the perception of crime, Al Baumstark noted the serious difference between the type of petty crime where students left items lying around that were then stolen vs. organized crime where seasoned criminals were actually casing the campus community.

After the discussion with officers Mullis & Coleman the committee decided that there was enough concern to form a Subcommittee on Public Safety to reply back to the Executive Committee’s request. However, it was mentioned that if enough information could not be compiled by the subcommittee within the short time frame given, the report brought to the meeting by the police department would probably suffice as a short term answer. The committee motioned on forming the subcommittee, and the motion was accepted. Mary Jane Casto & Sandra Garber volunteered to be on the committee and Phang Tai mentioned that H. Richard (Dick) Miller (not in attendance at this meeting) would also be beneficial to the group if he was able to commit.

Frank Whittington & Siva Nathan noted that the new committee should try to maintain focus on the campus’ perception of crime and not get sidetracked by the actual crimes in question, because crime & safety issues were already being taking care of by several other committees & subcommittees. The group then moved on to the next issue at hand.

**Agenda Item #3** - ASUR Reports - Office of Dean of Students. Mary Jane Casto headed the discussion on ASUR ODOS. She explained that the Dean of Students had 7 units reporting to her, and that this report covered only the unit directly under her. It covered Student Judicial Affairs, Administrative & Business Operations, and Student Assistance. She briefly went over the responsibilities of those sections then went over the actions recommendations in the report.

In regards to the recommendation on hardship withdrawals . . .

*Since peer institutions do not handle hardship withdrawal requests, it is recommended that ODOS examine the efficacy of handling these requests in their unit versus another department within the University (e.g. Office of the Registrar)*

Hazel Scott announced the correction that most institutions outside of the state of Georgia did not have a hardship withdrawal procedure. She mentioned between the 2 peer institutions within the state (University of Georgia & Georgia Institute of Technology), UGA processed hardship withdrawals out of their Associate VPs office (a title equivalent to that of the person processing hardship withdrawals from GSU’s ODOS office) and Georgia Tech. used an entirely different process all together.

In regards to the recommendation on key indicators . . .

*Key indicators were not listed in the self-study. It is recommended that the unit address the key indicators and outcomes in the action plan*

Siva Nathan mentioned that some of the units were have trouble defining "key indicators" and the outcomes that went along with them. He mentioned that ASUR was currently working on a way to make the process easier to understand & respond to.
After the Siva Nathan’s comments, Mary Jane highlighted the last 4 action recommendations within the report:

With the growth in the University and the need to provide efficient documentation and process, it is recommended that resources be allocated for the judicial tracking software and technology to support a paperless environment.

Many students present with financial crises and request social services beyond the domain of the ODOS. However, it is recommended that resources for social service referrals are identified and this information be readily available (online, ODOS office) to students.

No peer institution reports an "all faculty" panel or committee to adjudicate general conduct matters as is the procedure at Georgia State University in conjunction with the Senate Committee on Student Discipline. ODOS should examine the value of adding students to this Committee as is done in peer institutions.

The unit should identify steps in its action plan to address concerns that were identified as a result of the fraternity incidents in 2003-2004.

Tim Crimmins then motioned for the ASUR ODOS report to be accepted, and the group seconded & accepted the report with no further comments.

Phang Tai adjourned the meeting at 1:48pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz
Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator