Planning & Development
October 27th, 2008

Present: Pam Barr, Jennifer Chiovaro, Douglas Covey, Timothy Crimmins, William M. Downs, Evan Eskridge, Mary Finn, Sandra Garber, Chris Henrich, Phillip Mitchem, Jerry Rackliffe, D. Mike Raderstorf, Timothy Renick, Jeffrey C. Rupp, Nancy Seamans, Mary Shoffner, Ruth Stanford, Andrew Sumner, Phang C. Tai.


Others Attending: Beth Jones

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the 8/25/08 P&D Minutes

2. ASUR REPORTS (Mary Finn)
   a. External Affairs
   b. Business Services
   c. Office of Disbursements

3. Subcommittee Reports & Other Business

Agenda Item #1
Phang Tai called the meeting to order at 1pm. In the last paragraph on page 2 of the minutes, the word extended was changed to expended, and Mike Raderstorf was changed to from absent to present. The motion was then made and seconded to approve the 8/25/08 minutes. Phang Tai introduced the 1st of 3 student senators to join the group, Evan Eskridge, VP of SGA, then the group moved on to the 2nd item on the agenda.

Agenda Item #2
Mary Finn headed the discussions on each of the ASUR reports. For each unit, she gave a brief description, then went over each of the unit's major recommendations.

ASUR - EXTERNAL AFFAIRS - This 1st unit included 4 “sub-units” Alumni Relations, University Stewardship & Events, State Relations, & University Relations. University Relations underwent the ASUR process previously in AY 2002.
Starting with **Alumni Relations**, she explained that group was to attract/serve/engage alumni of the university. The key recommendations she noted for them was in regards to the providing career services through alumni services. Several colleges provided this same service so there was question of whether it was needed. Also recommended was for the unit to establish a clearer organizational structure (example: people being housed in one unit, with a support budget in another unit). She explained that the unit's VP, Thomas Lewis would soon be leaving, and that the restructuring would probably take place with his replacement.

**University Stewardship** - The mission for this group was to establish & nurture lasting relationships with university donors & create distinctive events to advance the university's relationships on a whole. The recommendation Mary highlighted was also the reorganizational structure. [*... Consider a different organizational structure that does not mix accountability, budgeting, & planning & resource allocation in the three different departments of the President, Development & External Affairs.*]

**State Relations** - The group's mission was to strengthen the relationships between the state, federal & local governments. Mary explained that the key recommendation to this group was to “link up” with the other 2 subunits (Alumni Relations & Univ. Stewardship) ... the Alumni network to help accomplish their mission.

Mary mentioned that the last 2 pages of the External Affairs report was recommendations to the group as whole. She then took Q&A from the P&D members.

**Tim Crimmins** mentioned that the Strategic Planning Subcommittee was currently discussing how “Alumni Giving” was looked at in College/University rankings, and suggested that there should be some measure taken to connect that activity's impact to the academic programs. **Andrew Sumner** added that the groups may also want to see how the colleges/departments were effected. **Mary** noted that the Office of Development may also be a source to consider in the matter.

**Phang Tai** - “*Shouldn't Career Services be under the unit of Student Services?*”

**Douglas Covey** explained that historically, it had been under Alumni Services, but that there were models used where universities housed it under Student Services. He mentioned that GSU's Career Services Office did have a new Director who was currently working towards a closer collaboration with the Student Svs. Office.

After those comments were finished up, the report was accepted & motioned in with the comments & suggestions made.
**ASUR - BUSINESS SERVICES** - Mary mentioned that the committee felt it would be neglectful if they didn't **recognize & praise** this unit for keeping GSU out of the headlines due to it's excellent usage and training on P-Card usage. The only recommendation she highlighted was for the group to keep increasing it's training and to keep up the good work and to add “Training” to the services they provide, being that it is one of their core functions. There were no Q&A on this unit; **the report was accepted & motioned in.**

**ASUR - OFFICE OF DISBURSEMENTS** - This group's mission was to promote fiscal responsibility & accountability over the expenditure of University funds. The only recommendations highlighted were to keep their current name as Disbursements (they had been going back/forth between “Disbursements” and “Financial Operations”) and to make their reports more reader friendly to the public (i.e., explaining terminology & acronyms not normally used outside of the unit) and to keep People Soft training & HR Outsourcing “on their radar” to prepare for how modifications to those areas could impact their office. There were also no Q&A on this unit, **and the report was accepted & motioned in.**

**Highlights of the New ASUR Process** - Mary then passed out the new ASUR process for the upcoming review cycle. She went over the report that would be emailed to the committee members after the meeting. A brief outline of the report is as follows:


1) Integrated Assessment - This new process will integrate the current IE Outcomes reporting process for administrative units and the ASUR process

2) Unit of Analysis - All departments of a division or subdivision will go through review as a single entity. Dividing the University departments in this way yields 15 units for review.

3) Executive Summary - The VP/AP/AVP will prepare and submit a synthesized executive summary of the department review results.

4) Cycle Length - The full cycle length will be 6 years (rather than 7). Although a division or subdivision would undergo an abbreviated review every 3 years, the reports go to the P&D/Faculty only every-other time (once every six years).

5) Focus - The self-study report would focus on Mission, Functional Responsibilities and Outcomes.

6) Support - The process will include more intensive facilitation for the units undergoing review than the current program.

**This document in it's entirety will be reviewed at the next P&D meeting.**

**Election of the New ASUR Chair** - Congratulations to the new ASUR Chair, Chris Henrich of Psychology who accepted the enormous task of taking on the responsibility of chairing the ASUR Committee for the next 2 years. After Chris’ election, the group then moved on to the last item on the agenda.
Agenda Item #3 Subcommittee Reports & Other Business

MRRF (Major Renovations & Repairs Fund) Subcommittee - Sandra Garber mentioned that the group would start meeting this week and after its report went through CBSAC it would get to P&D by January. Phang Tai reminded the group that these funds were the major source of repairs for all the facilities, and usually accounted for about 5 million of the total 17 million needed in repairs. Slight changes mentioned in regards to the report were:

Jerry Rackliffe - the Major/Minor repairs list was being replaced by a 6-Year List, but that we were still on the list.

Sandra Garber - a section for regulatory funding will now be included on the list rather than separating them out.

Campus Safety/Lighting Up the Campus - Beth Jones reported that she was not able to find extra money in the budget to add more lighting to this project, but she had not received any reports that new areas were needed.

Escort Services: Beth Jones - Between January - September an average of 97 people used the escort services; from a low of 55 people in June to a high of 138 in January. The service was mentioned at a couple of GSU Police events and was also publicized through GSU's Incept Program.

Other Business - Phang Tai mentioned GSU's mention in the New York Times regarding our Biosafety Level 4 facilities and their security risks (see link below).

Phang Tai asked Jerry Rackliffe about approved money from the Provost for campus security. Jerry explained that $100,000 went towards Police security for the NSC building & $200,000 went towards research security & research infrastructure. He also explained to the group that the New Science Building would have to have the same high level security measures in place.

No other major issues were discussed and the meeting was adjourned at apx. 1:50pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator