Planning & Development Committee
SPECIAL MEETING to replace 11/17/09 Meeting
WEDNESDAY - November 4, 2009 - 1:30-3PM

Present: Davis (Greg) Abt (Student Senator), Pam Barr, Al Baumstark, Elizabeth Beck, Cathy Brack, Jennifer Chiovaro, Douglas Covey, Michael Eriksen, Mary Finn, Christine Gallant, Sandra Garber, Robert Harrison, Leslie Madden, Richard Miller, Robin Morris, Risa Palm, Jerry Rackliffe, D. Mike Raderstorf, George Rainbolt, Lesley Reid, Timothy Renick, Jeffrey C. Rupp, Nancy Seamans, Mary Shoffner, Ruth Stanford, Andrew Sumner, Phang C. Tai, Vijay K. Vaishnavi, Shelly-Ann Williams.

Absent: J. L. Albert, Marsha Clarkson, Dabney Dixon, Lacey Enyart (Student Senator), Paul Gallimore, T.J. Hausauer (Student Senator), Chris Henrich, William Nichols, George Pierce, Bruce Seaman, Roy Sobelson, Carol Winkler, Maryann Wysor, Yi Zhao.

Others Attending: Peggy Albers, Elisabeth Burgess, Fatuma Dahir, Larry Heath, Jr. (SGA Senator), Hugh Hudson, Beth Jones, Maryann Romski, Sara Weigle

Replacements: Risa Palm replaced Ron Henry, Leslie Madden replaced Casey Long

The Agenda was for the meeting was as follows:

1. P&D Minutes 9/29/09
2. Discussion of the process of the Strategic Plan 2010-2015, Provost Palm
3. Subcommittee Reports
4. Other Issues

**This particular meeting was held earlier than (and in replacement of) the intended 11/17/09 meeting, specifically to discuss GSU’s Strategic Plan for the years 2010-2015**

AGENDA ITEM #1 - Approval of The Minutes
Phang Tai called the meeting at apx. 1:35pm. The motion was made & approved to accept the 9/29/09 minutes.

AGENDA ITEM #2
Discussion of the process of the Strategic Plan 2010-2015, Provost Palm

Provost Risa Palm passed out the document below to the group to review before the meeting. She mentioned that President Becker had stressed that with this being a “New Day” this was a good time to take a break from some of the practices of the past. She explained to P&D that she wanted to give them an idea of what was being considered so that they could give her their feedback & perspective, and so that she could plan how to proceed. She also mentioned that she’d recently met with the Regents Professors, and what they thought was needed was: an increase in faculty size & faculty strengths, more support staff for research, more start-up and equipment costs, and more funding for graduate students who were not supported by grants.
PASSED OUT BY PROVOST PALM PRIOR TO THE MEETING

Steps in strategic planning:
I. Identify a consultant to help with this project: November 2009
II. Select a planning committee (SPC) of staff, faculty, students, and administration: November 2009
III. Visit by Maura Cotter and David Ward with strategic planning committee and university leadership: January 2010
IV. Introduce the process to the faculty, staff, students - conduct open forums throughout campus - use an outside person as a facilitator/trainer: January-February 2010
V. Develop Key performance indicators: measure of an essential outcome of performance activity or health condition of the organization - to be done by strategic planning committee: February-March 2010
VI. Refine list of key performance indicators: (consultation of strategic planning committee with university community): March-April 2010
VII. Perform an external environmental assessment: May 2010
   A. Political/economic/social/technological trends - identify trends and events that will have positive or negative impact on GSU - but only those that affect the key performance indicators!
   B. Cross-impact analysis of each item - extent to which event has an influence on each indicator
   C. Analysis of Collaborators: employers, partners, students, suppliers, government agencies
   D. Analysis of competitors
VIII. Perform an internal environmental assessment: June-July 2010
   A. Analysis of organizational performance: internal politics that affect the institution; academic traditions that affect institution;
      Productivity
      Benchmarks
      Policies
      Procedures - in this analysis, every organizational process should be analyzed for impacts on organizational performance (e.g., three signatures on documents, cross-functioning of offices)
   B. Analysis of organizational design: governance factors
      How is the university governed? What are the organizational structures? How do these impact outcomes?
   C. Analysis of resource bases
      1. Areas of excellence
      2. High demand programs and services that affect GSU
      3. Areas of poor quality
      4. Low demand programs
      5. Fiscal and capital resource qualities that affect institution
      6. Human resource qualities that affect institution
IX. Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis: identification of most important strengths in academic, enrollment, administrative, resources, and campus support, information technology, other
   Identification of most important weaknesses in above areas: August 2010
X. Brainstorming sessions: SPC members produce ideas to strength current strengths, reduce weaknesses, mitigate threats and allow campus to seize opportunities. Elicit a limited set of major goals that will advance GSU over the coming years. September 2010
XI. Public comment on SWOT analysis and identification of strategies and goals: October 2010
XII. Formulate strategies, goals, and objectives by SPC - strategic goals including 1-year, 5-year, 10-year, 20-year objective: November 2010
XIII. Finalize strategies, goals and objectives by GSU community: December 2010
XIII. Roll-out plan: January 2011
She explained that after considering the needs of the Regents Professors, she considered what those needs might be in regards to undergraduate teaching groups. She imagined that the answers would result in:

- filling in the gaps with teachers with variable strengths so that a gambit of areas could be taught
- more teachers to help with the student to teacher ratio
- more funding to hire and pay graduate teaching assistants that we currently can’t pay enough
- a better infrastructure for student learning & advisement
- and far more facilities space (library, conference rooms, etc.)

She added that she could not ask each/every department for what they needed because the end result would be way too much and there were not enough resources to do everything at once.

For research on the subject of University Strategic Planning, she looked at similar Universities, pulled articles from the library & relied on her own experience in the matter. She noted that a major area of concern was that GSU was using old/past strategic plans to build upon, which would/could make change somewhat difficult. She explained that that difficulty was one of the main reasons she wanted to present the draft above. She explained that strategic plans of most successful universities started in a smaller draft/planning stage which would later be vetted through various committees for feedback, as opposed to building upon an older plan. She highlighted that there was a consensus with her initial meeting parties that it was extremely important to hire a consultant with knowledge of how the process could be successfully done, and to also consult with someone with higher education experience on a national level. “We’ve put out an RFP for a group of people knowledgeable in University Strategic Planning (approved by Jerry Rackliffe) and we’ll also have Maureen Cotter from the University of Wisconsin and David Ward (former President of UW) the current President of The American Council on Education come talk to us about facilitation of a successful plan; they’ll be here on January 10th & 11th to meet with us & give us a sense of what other universities (and the external world) are doing. We have an RFP with a 30 day waiting period before we can hire a consultant in the matter. We should have a proposal of consultants by early December.

She mentioned that she had spoken to Susan Herbst, Executive Vice Chancellor, SVC Academic Affairs and was told there was not an urgent rush on a completed strategic plan, but that everyone involved was ready to start taking action with the plan. The current draft (above) allowed for 12 months of preparation, but she mentioned that she would be open to ideas that could shorten this time. She mentioned key items that needed to be considered in the planning stages would be:

- Open forums to listen to people’s ideas and feedback (internal/external assumptions of and by GSU)
- Development of KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) to assess the progress of the plan (locally, nationally, culturally, economically, governmentally, etc.)

 She mentioned that she had spoken to Susan Herbst, Executive Vice Chancellor, SVC Academic Affairs and was told there was not an urgent rush on a completed strategic plan, but that everyone involved was ready to start taking action with the plan. The current draft (above) allowed for 12 months of preparation, but she mentioned that she would be open to ideas that could shorten this time. She mentioned key items that needed to be considered in the planning stages would be:

- Open forums to listen to people’s ideas and feedback (internal/external assumptions of and by GSU)
- Development of KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) to assess the progress of the plan (locally, nationally, culturally, economically, governmentally, etc.)
- SWOT Analysis - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats
  see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SWOT_Analysis
- criteria within the plan that could cover 1, 5, 10, & 20 years out that could finally be run through P&D and the Executive Committee of the Senate

Lastly, she announced that a Strategic Planning Subcommittee of no more than 12 members would need to be started ASAP. She noted that volunteers be aware that the subcommittee would be extremely active.
Q&A and Comments

Christine Gallant began by giving much praise to Risa Palm for her hard work and effort since she arrived and mentioned that she was extremely impressed by the plan and showed evidence of group involvement and shared governance. She especially liked the idea that at every point, public comment was sought and that the plan made adjustments for budget cuts. She questioned would the plans of the Diversity Strategic Committee would be connected to the Strategic Plan. Palm answered that it would have to be folded/integrated in. “When you have a plan from some group(s) that is not integrated into the whole plan, it can act somewhat as an independent (or even oppositional) plan; which doesn’t help.” She explained that she didn’t want to end up with a Christmas Tree Plan, where the Christmas Tree full of ornaments was the Strategic Plan full of several independent plans.

Michael Erikson commented that (for the Draft currently being discussed) more time should be taken off the back and added to the front end of the plan to give it a better balance. Palm replied that Phang Tai had also expressed somewhat of the same idea, and that she would consult with the President & others on this. Carol Winkler also noted that the end of the plan was around finals, and it would be a good idea to plan around them, Provost Palm agreed.

Q&A and comments re: Mission & Vision Statement (MVS)

Mary Shoffner stated that she thought it was important to add an MVS to the plan and that doing so would help show who we were and where we want to go as a university. Rob Harrison disagreed and felt instead of a broad MVS, it was more important to make sure the plan was focused in a clear direction, “Focus the light in the right place.” Christine Gallant thought that the steps of the draft somewhat replaced the need for an MVS and thought it would be more added red tape. Michael Erikson mentioned any MVS (made via the Strategic Plan Subcommittee) should be in-line with the general direction of President Becker’s mission and then be vetted through the proper committees to comment on. George Rainbolt “I believe that we should explicitly say that we’re developing (or revising) a strategic plan and mission & vision plan, to make it clear that we’re doing it all at the same time. As of now, it doesn’t appear in the document, & I think it should be somewhere.” Phang Tai “We have a mission statement in all of our plans, so it’s not a far fetched idea to add one here. What’s going to be difficult is deciding what we’re going to emphasize, and how we’re going to focus & refine it.”

Robin Morris ended the Q&A on the mission statement by going over what the current mission statement actually was.
George Rainbolt suggested that the time frames for items VII and VIII be swapped to have the internal assessments performed in April/May while employees were still around, and then (when employees were usually on Summer break and not needed as much) perform the external assessments in June/July; Palm and the group agreed. Paul Alberto, Robert Harrison, & Vijay Vaishnavi discussed the interchangeability of the items within those sections, and suggested that because after looking outward, the community may need to look back inward, predetermined cycles (time periods) should be added.

Mary Shoffner thought it was important to add some of GSU’s external stakeholders to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee. Their opinions/impressions of who we are are very important. Provost Palm asked of the group whether they thought that it was important to have them on the subcommittee or just in the vetting process. Vijay thought that if the university started a trend of waiting on the input of various outside entities it may open a doorway to un-needed time constraints; “if we allowed them to be such a big part of the planning process, it would start a trend of pushing that practice”. Christine Gallant and others agreed with his concerns.

From the GSU 2005 University Strategic Plan

Mission - The overarching aspiration of Georgia State University is to become one of the nation's premiere research universities in focused areas that maximize our unique strengths. We recognize that perhaps our greatest comparative advantage is our location in Atlanta, a cosmopolitan city with a diverse population, and with close proximity to corporations and centers of state and city government as well as easy access to an international airport. The University will achieve this goal through the continual pursuit of excellence in its instructional and strategic research programs. Georgia State will strive to fulfill the expectations of the citizens of Georgia by providing undergraduate and graduate programs of the highest quality in the arts and sciences, business, education, health and human sciences, law, and policy studies for traditional and non-traditional students.

Georgia State’s mission as a research university in an urban setting is multi-faceted:

- The University, which has one of the most diverse undergraduate student populations nationally and the most diverse in the University System of Georgia, is dedicated to undergraduate programs based on a core curriculum that promotes interdisciplinary, intercultural, and international perspectives and that provide options that emphasize an urban focus.
- The University, which has one of the most diverse graduate and professional student populations nationally and the most diverse in the University System of Georgia, is dedicated to provide premier graduate and professional programs in a significant number of areas.
- The University is committed to graduate students who are proficient in their discipline as trained and talented professionals and have interpersonal skills and competence to lead in a global society.
- The University is committed to the enhancement of scholarship of its disciplinary and interdisciplinary research programs, centers and institutes that have achieved, or demonstrated promise to achieve, national and international recognition.
- The University is committed to have its undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs contribute to the economic, educational, social, professional, and cultural vitality of the city, the state, and the region.
- The University recognizes, nevertheless, that it must select some programs on which to focus special resources in order to achieve the national and international distinction it must achieve to serve Georgia best.

http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwact/pdf_plan_archive/2005_strategicplan.pdf
Paul Alberto offered the view that the university could target those stakeholders as focus groups which would help systemize the process of allowing for the external input. Robin Morris noted that in our most recent relationship with the Board of Regents members (in the search for the current GSU President & Provost), the experience actually proved to be a positive one. He mentioned that due to the engagement things became much easier to facilitate, because the Regents knew who GSU was and where they wanted to go. He also mentioned that the new President of the Board of Regents became a fan of GSU through that relationship.

Hugh Hudson asked Provost Palm if she could talk a little about how she saw this document driving the budget being that it, somewhat, set the guidelines behind it. Palm answered that she saw it as a driver for both the budget and philanthropy. “What we’re honestly saying, is . . . This is what the University feels is very very important. Therefore will you help us with your millions & millions of dollars? . . .” She explained a lot of donors were associated with supporting various areas of interest, and this document would help us show a plan of where we needed their support to go (especially long term).

Carol Winkler, George Rainbolt, & Rob Harrison briefly discussed item VII-A in regards to what was driving the trends that might impact the University. Some of the points raised were . . . Nationally, where was everyone else going? . . . and . . . Which committees were behind setting the priorities for where we’re going? George Rainbolt pointed out how positive it was that an actual plan for the process was being done, and mentioned that in the past, units would make plans based on re-direction, that would be changed every couple of weeks due to bad planning. Hugh Hudson mentioned that redirection was going to happen and there would be winners and unfortunately losers, but that it was important that people could tell (especially in an economic recession) where they stood so that they could be prepared.

Rob Harrison “One way to help avoid this is to set an interdisciplinary target. If we’re gonna set a plan to do something, we should also target what would make it happen. Instead of it being a Christmas Tree with several smaller individual plans, it would be like a Christmas Tree all bundled up and ready to fit into your car.” Provost Palm mentioned that that was how Carnegie Mellon structured their plan: to orient a variety of things across disciplines to eliminate the number of interdisciplinary areas.

Robin Morris “Another thing we haven’t talked about, and a very good reason of why we need to have a focused strategic plan, is that right now, trying to figure out a marketing plan for this University is a bear. Everyone here agrees that one of our biggest deficits is our marketing of who we are & what we do. And unless we’re real clear about that (regardless of winners & losers) we’re not gonna ever make a lot of progress and the bottom line about funding and resources is that it’s really about our reputation. A marketing plan is really critical for that & I think those things are all interrelated, which I think is another major advantage of this.”
Ending Comments

- George Rainbolt mentioned that the plan would take a lot of courage, and that if units went out on a limb, to be careful to support the limb so that it wouldn’t get cut off.
- Christine Gallant reminded the group to be mindful that the stimulus money would soon come to an end in 2011.
- Mary Shoffner addressed GSU’s history and roots as a professional and night school, and the internal/external impression of who we were. *“There still seems to be some Schizophrenia about GSU being an undergraduate and a graduate university, and I was hoping this could be addressed a little more clearly.”*
- Michael Eriksen stressed that the university had to be able to answer the question of what would make us a great University in the 21st century.
- Jerry Rackliffe mentioned that we needed to make a decision where/what we wanted our future state to be, and that the plan needed to have a method/process that could present various different ways of getting us there, including having a plan for budget cuts so that we could decide which method/process to use. He also noted (in regards to the University’s debt capacity) that the university was currently an A1 category and did not want to fall to an A2. *“The bigger we get the more of a moving target we become, so the plan needs to be one that is adjustable.”*

In closing the discussion, Provost Palm reiterated that she new there would be several different opinions on the matter, and that there would probably not be a complete consensus, but that with vetting through President Becker, use of the consultants, Regents Professors, and the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, she was ready to get the process started. She asked that before the next meeting in December that everyone on P&D:

1) send any suggestions/comments on the process of the document to risapalm@gsu.edu
2) send her their names (or names of nominees) if they felt they could be a part of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee

**Being that there were no further issues to discuss Phang Tai adjourned the meeting at 2:41pm.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator