Planning & Development Committee
Organization Meeting - August 28, 2006


Absent:  Al Baumstark, Cathy Brack, Janet Burns, Marva Carter, Mary Jane Casto, James Emshoff, William (Bill) Fritz, Ron Henry, John Hicks, Harold (Hal) McAlister, Yi Pan, David P. Richardson, Mary Ann Romski, Hazel Scott, Bruce Seaman, Roy Sobelson, Greg Streib, Frank Whittington, Carol Winkler, Maryann Wysor.

Attending:  Beth Jones, Ramesh Vakamudi.

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the minutes 6-20-06
2. Campus Master Plan 2005-2015 (Executive Summary)
3. ASUR Research Office Reports
   a) College Schedulers & Registrar and GoSolar
   b) Customer Communications Center
   c) Georgia Career Information Center (GCIC)
   d) Office of Education Opportunity (OEO) and TRIO Programs
   e) TECHNOLOGY AND SYSTEMS SUPPORT
4. Other Issues

Agenda Item #1 - Minutes - Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx.1:03pm. The group motioned in and approved the minutes.

The meeting then moved on to the 2nd item on the agenda, discussion of the Campus Master Plan. Ramesh Vakamudi from Planning & Facilites headed the discussion. He began by letting the group know that the plan had been approved by the Board of Regents since the last meeting.

[Printed versions were sent to various Chairman before the meeting, and the updated version was now ready via web: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwmsp/2006/index.htm.]
Jeff Rupp asked when programming of the Convocation Center & the expansion of the Recreation Center would take place. Ramesh said the expansion of the Rec. Ctr. would take place within 5-10 years, but that the Convocation Center, due to the need for more space, would be at least 15 years.

Andrew Sumner asked whether the Board of Regents had any specific concerns with the Plan. Ramesh said that he couldn’t remember them having any major concerns, but that they had some basic questions regarding predictions of housing needs.

Vijay Vaishnavi questioned the references of "potential housing" mentioned in the report. Ramesh explained that the university needed apx. 2 million sq. ft. within the next 10 years and this part of the report was potential housing referred to those needs.

Tim Crimmins: "Is the Law Building still an option after the merge and acquisition?"
Ramesh: "The President is still in negotiations with those things, but the idea of that is still there. The Board of Regents also understands that the Master Plan is a general document and not driven by each specific location per project, especially since some of projects aren’t funded."

Vijay questioned proposed sites for "Wall Street Housing"; Ramesh said that the City of Atlanta’s help was needed with that and that it was probably going to be a joint project.

Jeff Rupp asked where would Physical Plant go to in the event that changes took place within that area of Classroom South. Ramesh explained that Physical Plant’s current location would probably be okay, but that the biggest issue of concern in that area would be the Sports Arena.

Phang Tai asked for an update of status of the student dormitories; Tim Crimmins asked about available beds for the students. Ramesh told the group that they were looking at the area of Piedmont/Edgewood to build Greek Housing for Graduate Students. He mentioned that they were also discussing concepts with graduate students.

Both Ramesh Vakamudi and Robbin Morris explained to the group that apx. 4,000 needed beds would be built before the old dorms went off line. They mentioned that we currently had 2000 beds + 400 in the lofts and 2000 at the Village Dormitories. They explained that for the Village (since it was currently up for sale) they would try to negotiate the use of the beds after the sale, if the new dorms were not on line at the time of closing.

The group then finished their discussion of the Master Plan. Phang Tai mentioned the next step was to send it to the Senate for final approval. The group motioned in and accepted the report.

Tim Crimmins applauded Ramesh for his EXCELLENT work in the report and his presentation.
The group then moved on to the 3rd item on the agenda, the ASUR Reports of the Research Offices.

Siva Nathan headed the discussion of the ASUR Reports. He mentioned that most of these reports were completed over the summer section. Only 1 office "Design & Construction" was moved over to the next report cycle of the 2007 year; this was due to major changes that took place internally with their unit. Siva announced the upcoming units to be reviewed for the 2007 year as International Affairs, Budget & Planning, International Student & Scholar Svcs., Recreation Services, The Development Office, the Spectrum office, The Realto, Safety & Risk Mgt., Accounting Services, Revenue & Receivable Svcs., African American Student Svcs. & Programs, and (carried over from the current year) Design & Construction. Siva mentioned that ASUR was currently in the process of assigning subcommittees to these units. Joan Carson mentioned that if anyone wanted to volunteer to sit on any of the subcommittees they felt appropriate to please contact ASUR.

The sections currently discussed were as follows:

a) College Schedulers & Registrar and GoSolar
b) Customer Communications Center
c) Georgia Career Information Center (GCIC)
d) Office of Education Opportunity (OEO) and TRIO Programs
e) TECHNOLOGY AND SYSTEMS SUPPORT
   1. College of Education
   2. College of Law
   3. College of Health & Human Svcs
   4. J. Mack Robinson College of Business
   5. Facilities Mgt. Services Division
   6. Information Systems & Technology
   7. College of Arts & Sciences

The template required by ASUR of each of the 5 reports included:
I. Unit Profile
II. Evaluation of Self Study
III. Key Observations
IV. Action Recommendations

Because of the large quantity of reports at hand, Siva went to the Action Recommendations for each section and highlighted any major concerns before Q&A of that section. Each section was explained thoroughly by Siva; highlighted comments/concerns discussed within each section were as follows:
Siva summarized the report then went over the recommendations. **He applauded Cherise Peters for her excellent work with the report.**

**George Rainbolt** noted a correction needed in the report. In the action recommendations at the end of the report it was mentioned that there was no student survey regarding the quality of services provided by the unit. **George mentioned that there was definitely a report and results that should have been mentioned.**

Siva responded that he would investigate the issue to see why this info. was left out. He explained to the committee that one of the problems at hand with the reports was that people knew how to do their jobs, but didn’t effectively know how to analyze their duties to report on them efficiently. He said there was a big tendency for people to inundate ASUR with useless information or print out documentation from banner to give to ASUR as their self-study. He said that ASUR was slowly but surely working on ways to help the units report this information in the correct manner.

**Tim Crimmins** briefly discussed the issue of classroom size, mentioning the current high demand for 70+ sized classrooms. George Rainbolt explained that plus-sized classrooms were normally put into a lower ranked category than those taught with fewer students. **Robin Morris** added that the space needed increased exponentially when building a 200+ classroom explaining that at the current time the university didn’t have enough land to support it. **Pam Barr** mentioned there seemed to be a problem prioritizing the utilization of classrooms being held off the schedule in the event that they would be requested for other uses (*example conferences for internal/external use*). “These rooms are being kept off the schedule just in case . . . but in the meantime our students are sitting on top of each other. It’s the whole 1st & 2nd floor of Classroom South.”

One concern briefly noted in this area was a decrease in budget with no clear explanation. **Jerry Rackcliffe** explained that the "decrease" might have actually been a "movement" of money (*example: if an employee internally changed offices*). He mentioned he’d take a look at the issue to make sure.

**Time Crimmins** mentioned that the unit seemed to be reporting only on *"I piece of the whole"* and that there may need to be better communication within the surrounding units. Joan Carson explained that what Tim was referring to was actually correct: She explained that it was considered to either look at the units a) by functions or b) by the relational unit as a whole and after talking closely with the VPs and Deans it was decided to take each subunit by "function". Joan mentioned that this may be done differently during the 2007 cycle.
The group discussed how the unit sustained itself virtually through outsourcing. **Jerry Rackcliffe** explained to the group that none of this unit's funding came from the university. The group's main concern for this unit was to seek a source for a more solid base of support and to strongly consider a contingency plan in case their resources ran out. **Tim Crimmins** also mentioned more interaction with the GSU community.

**Office of Education Opportunity (OEO) and TRIO Programs (4 of 5)**

Siva explained this unit also received most of it's budget from outside GSU, in the form of Federal/State Grants (only 10% came from the university).

**Robin Morris** mentioned that the unit had just underwent a random Federal Audit that was not included in the report; Siva mentioned he would look into this.

**George Rainbolt** mentioned that compared to his own, the services provided by this unit seemed very expensive. **Rebecca Stout** explained that reason behind the heavy costs. She mentioned that one of the programs they provided for was (for example) *UPWARD BOUND*, which was a program that sustained each student for 4 years.

**TECHNOLOGY AND SYSTEMS SUPPORT (5 of 5)**

For the Colleges of Arts & Sciences, Education, Law, Health & Human Svcs, and Business, the Division of Facilities Mgt., and Information Systems & Technology

Siva mentioned that the biggest observation in this unit was its variation in the quality of each of their "Self Studies".

**Tim Crimmins:** "This was a wonderful report and we should definitely send this to the IS&T committee." He explained that if you analyzed the amount each subunit spent on network/computer support to the number of full time faculty it had you would come up with the following figures:

- A&S $1,443
- Education $1,596
- Business $2,042
- HHS $2,389
- Policy Studies $2,571
- College of Law $12,857

He noted that, obviously, Law was reporting something the others hadn’t (most likely the Law Library). However, he mentioned from this range of $1,400-$2,500, a reasonable target to aim for could be decided upon and used as a benchmark for IS&T. In addition, going by this benchmark, the HIGH demand for WEBCT support could probably be disbursed throughout the colleges more efficiently.

**J.L. Albert** mentioned that this could also aid in the issue of ascertaining how much space was needed regarding the data rooms occupied/utilized by each college. "*In term of Real Estate, the Data Center is the most expensive area when it comes to floorspace.*"
AT THE END OF EACH SECTION, EACH REPORT WAS MOTIONED IN AND ACCEPTED WITH THE COMMENTS MADE.

The meeting then moved on to the other issues of the day.

Robin Morris announced that the Contract Managers for the new Science Center had been signed and the Architect and the Construction Managers would be signed within the next week or so. He announced that the Groundbreaking Ceremony for the new building would take place in October and that the actual building would commence in Feb/March of 2007.

Charlene Hurt announced that the 1st & 2nd & 5th floors of the Library North were now open and that floors 1 & 2 of Library South would open around February.

Phang Tai mentioned to the group to keep in mind that new organization for the MRRV committee was coming up soon, because the committee was made up of members from P&D and the Budget committee. He also reminded the same of the Annual Strategic Plan Committee.

Elizabeth Beck asked if the committee could follow up with issues regarding safety. She mentioned that recently 2 men entered her office in the Urban Life Building (while she was there) with the intentions to rob her. She mentioned that one of the men entered through a coded door that he knew the code to. Beth Jones explained to the committee that the university could spot check and add coded or swipe-key locks when needed, but at the time it was too expensive to make such adjustments throughout the main campus. She assured, however, that she would look into the situation.

These last issues ended the meeting and Phang Tai adjourned the group at apx. 2:20pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator