Planning & Development Committee
February 18, 2008

Present: Pam Barr, Brenda Blackwell, Greg Brack, Janet Burns, Mary Finn, Christine Gallant, Sandra Garber, Charlene S. Hurt, Jerry Rackliffe, Phang C. Tai, Vijay K. Vaishnavi


Attending: Beth Jones, W. John McCullum, John Marshall

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the 1/15/08 P&D Minutes
2. FACP Approved Crosswalk Countdown Request
3. CBSAC Approved MRRF List / Foundation Bldg Priority List (John Marshall)
4. ASUR REPORTS (Mary Finn)
   a. Intercollegiate Athletics
   b. Office of African American Student Services and Programs
5. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS & OTHER BUSINESS
   a. DIC Proposal (Christine Gallant)
   b. Green Issues - Recycling & Sustainability (Sandra Garber)
   c. Areas of Focus Review Teams

Agenda Item #1 - Minutes
Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx. 1:05pm. The motion was made and seconded to approve the January 15th minutes.

Agenda Item #2 - FACP Approved Crosswalks
Phang Tai announced request for additional crosswalk countdowns had been approved. Beth Jones mentioned that the city agreed to help with the coordination, and that the installation would probably be completed within a couple of months; she said she'd keep the committee updated. Tai also announced the new space allotment for 2 floors in the 34 Peachtree Center Building and praised Beth and all the coordinating subcommittees for their hard work in both matters.

Agenda Item #3 - CBSAC Approved MRRF List
John McCullum lead the discussion. He mentioned that there was a lot of dialogue between the legislators & the Board of Regents. Some of the legislators asked that the amount for MRR be raised. It could potentially mean an additional 8-9 million dollars to the university depending on how the funding would be given out. When asked by the Regents about preliminary plans in regards to the possible increase, John said he used the MRRF List to respond.

McCullum - “There was a conference call meeting with about 5 universities, including GSU, UGA, Kennesaw State, and others. As far as I know we were the only University prepared to answer the questions asked by the Board of Regents representative and it was because of the MRRF list. Every time a question was asked, the other Universities replied that they either didn't have the info., they weren't prepared to give an answer, or they hadn't discussed it with their VPs. We were able to respond with a direct answer for every question asked.”

PRAISE WAS GIVEN TO RAMESH VAKAMUDI, THE MRRF COMMITTEE, AND OTHERS INVOLVED IN PUTTING TOGETHER THE LIST.

Other Q&A Discussed

Charlene Hurt, “Can the Board of Regents make the decision of what to do with the excess on their own.” McCullum answered no, and explained that the process went from the Board of Regents to the Legislators, then to the Governor for final approval, but mentioned that the even though this particular effort came from the Legislators Office, most first initiatives usually came from the Board of Regents.

Sandra Garber, “Are they trying to do away with the Regulatory vs. Non-Regulatory Lists? If so, this all may be a moot point.

John Marshall explained that an amended list was called for after it was learned that the funding amounts could be possibly doubled. “The question to us was; if we're going to double the amount of funding . . . what are you gonna spend it on?”

Jerry Rackcliffe reminded the group that the Major/Minor Repairs List used in the past had been replaced by a new modeling system that took in account (among other things) age & usefulness of the facility. He mentioned next in line (based on that model) was The Alpharetta Building in FY09, the Arts & Humanities Bldg. and the Plaza Redevelopment 2-3 yrs later, followed by the Academic Building after that.

Phang Tai - mentioned that the faculty would like to have some sort of list/report of building issues to use to help them give input/feedback regarding what should be done to/with Foundation owned buildings. McCullum explained that he had an old report for the buildings if they were to be upgraded to top of the line double-AA Office Space, and that the group could probably use it as a guideline for life-safety systems, but reminded the committee that it was better to work with what the Foundations could provide, rather than what GSU could do to upgrade the buildings because GSU was only a tenant in these buildings and the repair costs, “had to come from somewhere.” Tai mentioned that if they had some sort of list/report to start with, it could help them generate something to advocate to FACP.
Building Signage - The group briefly discussed the issue of building directories and came to the conclusion that this was another issue that could piggy-back off of the report above that could be presented to FACP.

The motion was made and seconded, and the committee approved the MRRF List. The group than moved on to item #4 on the Agenda.

ASUR REPORTS - Intercollegiate Athletics

Mary Finn lead the discussion on ASUR starting with Intercollegiate Athletics. This group had challenges due to the way it formatted its report. It seemed as though the unit took its information from NCAA accreditation document and used it for ASUR which didn't quite fit in with what was actually needed. Because of that, the group tended to confuse “goals” with “performance measures”. From the ASUR recommendations to the unit, the key recommendations Mary pointed out were: A need for a survey tool that could address all customers . . . and . . . A need for the unit to understand the discrimination felt by student athletes of varying sports.

After Q&A from P&D such as the unit's funding sources and actual customer base, and a discussion incurred of how the unit needed much more direction in how to respond better to what ASUR was asking for, P&D made the recommendation that:

1) The unit complete yearly updates not only to keep up with their effectiveness but to better get acclimated to how the reports should be completed (i.e., get help with the report).

2) The word “discrimination” in this report be changed to another word that may better describe the less enthusiastic treatment given to athletic programs of less popular sports that the report was referring to.

The committee motioned in to accept the report with the p&d suggestions and recommendations noted.

Office of African American Student Services and Programs

Mary explained that this unit was a small unit of about 5 employees who operated under Douglas Covey's area. She mentioned that the unit's report was delayed due to a medical emergency to one of their key employees, so that there were some small inaccuracies in the directory information included in the report such as telephone & office numbers. She mentioned the groups strengths were that it was very engaged with its customer base; their weakness was that they didn't give enough feedback from the surveys taken. This group was also confused about what was needed in regards to the groups Outcomes & Goals. One of the key ASUR recommendations noted, was for the unit to develop some sort of database to help track information received from their customer base. After going over the ASUR recommendations included in the report, there was no further Q&A about this particular unit.
The committee motioned in to accept the report with the p&d suggestions and recommendations noted.

The Group than moved on to Agenda Item #5

**DIC PROPOSAL**

**From the Jan 2008 P&D meeting**, Christine Gallant proposed to **add members** of the Disability Initiatives Committee (DIC) to the MRRF committee as *ex officio* members. They would review MRRF’s annual list of projects for repair & renovation and help prioritize that list according to ADA’s list of priorities based on the following ADA order:

- **Priority 1**, Accessible Approach/Entrance
- **Priority 2**, Access to Goods and Services
- **Priority 3**, Access to Rest Rooms
- **Priority 4**, Additional Access not required by priorities 1-3. “When amenities such as drinking fountains & public telephones are provided, they should also be accessible to people with disabilities.

**At that meeting** there was an ongoing discussion of where MRRF's own priorities would rank before, within, or after ADA's list of priorities.

**During this meeting** Christine presented a memo which entitled

“Proposal for Policy on Priorities in Allocation for ADA-Compliance”

She noted a couple of stylistic & wording changes she would suggest (as an English Professor) and then gave a short background on MRRF . . . being a joint committee of **P&D** and the **Budget** that worked with **GSU’s Facilities Dept.** to manage how money would be spent from two yearly allocations received from the Board of Regents: allocation 1 (the largest of the two allocations) to be spent on general major renovations & repairs and allocation 2 (the smaller allocation) to be spent on regulatory projects including keeping the university ADA compliant.

The report also included the **legal mandates** stating GSU's requirement to comply with ADA's rules & regulations and gave a more in depth explanation to the roles of the DIC members to be added to MRRF and an in-depth explanation of the 4 priorities to be considered. She also mentioned that the proposal had received input from P&D, Budget, & Cultural Diversity.

**The intentions from Frank Whittington & the ADA group was to draft a policy that would effect the allocation of the funds in question in time enough to present it to the full Senate on March 13th.**

**Q&A regarding the proposal**

**Phang Tai** explained that P&D was the group that would/could initiate sending policies to the Senate if needed, and that MRRF was only a **subcommittee** of P&D (joined/assisted by Budget) so that bringing the matter to the full Senate was not needed. **Other P&D members agreed.**
John McCullum was uncomfortable with the word “deciding” in the following sentence (line 58 of the report):

“Facilities Management Services shall follow these priorities when deciding the Regulatory projects to be funded, as shall MRRF where possible when recommending funding for major non-Regulatory repairs and renovations to facilities.

McCullum mentioned that Facilities did not “decide” anything in regards to MRRF, they just implemented recommendations from the MRRF committee. In response, it was suggested that the phrase “wherever / whenever possible” be inserted before “when deciding” in that sentence. Christine Agreed this could be done.

Two other issues noted by McCullum was:

< He explained that ss engineers, facilities looked at renovations & repairs from a totally different perspective, and as this proposal currently was it read as a direct priorities list. “If I was to apply this to Kell Hall (for example) there's no way item# 1 could be done.” He later added that the spirit of the MRR committee was to let Faculty/Staff make the final decisions about MRR based on the economic & financial impact Facilities made them aware of.

< “There seems to be some issues regarding the priorities of Life Safety Systems Issues vs. ADA Criteria. This may call for a separate processes.”

Charlene Hurt noted that, because ADA was federal law, it my not be something that would be able to be easily seperated and/or picked apart. She proposed a new subcommittee that would be able to advice Facilities on such issues, but the group felt that advice was already being offered through various subcommittees in place.

Mary Finn - “It appears that this policy is trying to effect two separate decision making processes, 1 being regulatory & 2 being non-regulatory. I'd suggest not trying to do it all in one policy.

Sandra Garber as a member/former member of many of the committees and subcommittees involved, mentioned that she agreed with Mary, and suggested:

< adding the 2 DIC members be one motion
< since MRRF is a subcommittee, that the issue not go to the full senate due to overkill
< there be some sort of recommendation to Facilities Mgt. that an entity comparable to MRRF or integrated into MRRF be developed to look into Regulatory projects.

Brenda Blackwell - “This document is asking for a policy to follow the law. The law already exists, what we need is a procedure to follow it, not a new policy. The law is the policy.
EVENTUALLY THE FOLLOWING 2 MOTIONS WERE MADE:

**MOTION #1**
The motion was made to add 2 members of the Disability Initiatives Committee (DIC) to the MRRF Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

**MOTION #2**
The MRRF Committee should expand & collaborate a policy with Facilities and DIC to develop a prioritized projects list for Regulatory Funding. The motion was seconded and approved.

Janet Burns praised Christine & the committee members on the great extent of their commitment to the extensive issues & work involved, then the group moved on to the next item on the agenda.

BECAUSE THE CURRENT DISCUSSIONS LASTED LONGER THAN THE USUAL EXPECTED MEETING TIMES . . .

**AGENDA ITEM# 5B, GREEN ISSUES WAS TABLED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING**

AGENDA ITEM# 5C, Areas of Focus Review Teams: **Phang Tai** sent the following email prior to the meeting:

>>> Paul Alberto 1/30/2008 3:21:49 PM >>>
Hi guys, A reminder that under the procedure for awarding Area of Focus money there will be two review teams - one from the Deans and one from faculty/senate. Ours will be composed of two members from each of the following committees: CAP, Executive Committee, P&D and Research. The Provost would like the names of our committee members by March 1. We need to be sure our committee is representative across the colleges (and not primary participants of any of the submissions). So, can we meet with names of possible members sometime the end of February? Thanks, Paul

Charlene Hurt mentioned she specifically came to the meeting to ask for people to submit more than two names for consideration. Phang Tai asked that members have about 2-3 weeks to devote to the issues on hand and stressed that the group needed to functionable by the end of February / early March.

No other major issues were discussed and the meeting was adjourned at apx. 2:47pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator