P&D AGENDA MEETING & SCHEDULE
February 15, 2010

Present: J. L. Albert, Pam Barr, Dabney Dixon, Mary Finn, Sandra Garber, Chris Henrich, Lisa Palm, D. Mike Raderstorf, George Rainbolt, Lesley Reid, Timothy Renick, Jeffrey C. Rupp, Nancy Seamans, Ruth Stanford, Andrew Sumner, Phang C. Tai, Vijay K. Vaishnavi, Shelly-Ann Williams

Absent: Davis (Greg) Abt (Student Senator), Al Baumstark, Elizabeth Beck, Cathy Brack, Jennifer Chiovoro, Marsha Clarkson, Douglas Covey, Michael Eriksen, Christine Gallant, Paul Gallimore, Robert Harrison, T.J. Hausauer (Student Senator), Shelby Lohr (Student Senator), Leslie Madden, Richard Miller, Robin Morris, William Nichols, George Pierce, Jerry Rackliffe, Bruce Seaman, Mary Shoffner, Roy Sobelson, Carol Winkler, Maryann Wysor, Yi Zhao

Others Attending: Beth Jones

Replacements: Student Senator Lacey Enyart was replaced by Shelby Lohr.

The Agenda was for the meeting was as follows:

1. P&D Minutes 11/4/09
2. MRRF Discussion & Approval
3. Strategic Planning Committee Updates (Pam Barr, SPC Co-Chair)
4. Other Issues

AGENDA ITEM #1 - Approval of The Minutes

Phang Tai called the meeting at apx. 1:05pm. The motion was made & approved to accept the 11/04/09 minutes.

AGENDA ITEM #2 - MRRF Discussion & Approval

Phang Tai gave a brief background on the Major Repair & Renovation Funds Committee (MRRF) reminding the group that the committee consisted mainly of members from both P&D and Budget, and that the committee sent a finalized MRRF list of projects over to GSU’s CBSAC for pre-approval before returning it to P&D for its final approval.

Tai introduced Sandra Garber, MRRF Committee Chair to discuss the approved MRRF list of proposed projects finalized on December 2, 2009. She gave some background on the committee and a more detailed account of the steps & approvals the final project list went through before its approval. The list of 18 proposed projects were ranked by priority and proposed for year 2011 and included each project’s name, cost & description, and cumulative total costs. She mentioned $5 million was the usual amount funded by the Board of Regents but that additional items were always on the list, so that if any of the prioritized items fell through, the next item on the list would have already been approved by the Board. Sandra stated that $5.5 million was funded this time around, so that items 1-10 (and possibly item 11) would most likely be completed . . . barring no unforseen events.
TOP 11 ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>PROJECTS FOR RANKING 2011</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Replace Roof Drains - University Center</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Replace Roof - Kell Hall</td>
<td>$878,000</td>
<td>$1,328,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Replace standby boiler and chiller - 75 Piedmont Building</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$2,228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Replace AAON unit - Research Support Building</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$2,478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Upgrade lighting - Sports Arena</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$2,598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fume Hood Conversions - Natural Science Center</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$3,498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Replace Cooling Tower - College of Education</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$3,658,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Address ADA Compliance Issues - Campus Wide</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$4,158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Upgrade Building Fire Alarm Systems - Campus Wide</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$4,483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Repair HVAC Systems - Language Research Center</td>
<td>$635,500</td>
<td>$5,118,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Curtain Wall Replacement - Library South</td>
<td>$404,000</td>
<td>$5,522,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q&A and Comments

**George Rainbolt** reminded the group that this list of 18 was narrowed down from an original list of apx. 50+ projects, and just because they didn’t see an item of interest on the list did not mean that it was not being attended to.

**Vijay Vaishnavi** questioned whether compliancy issues would hinder the ability of any of the items being funded or pushed back . . . particularly item #8. Sandra replied, in regards to compliancy, and regulatory vs. non-regulatory items as in the case of #8, that there used to be separate list for these types of items but that now there was a system in place (also based on a set of priorities) to incorporate them into this one MRRF list. **Afterwards, the motion was made & approved to accept the proposed MRRF project list.**

**Jeff Rupp** commended Sandra Garber and the MRRF committee on the tremendous amount of effort put into the preparation of the report. Phang Tai & the rest of the P&D Committee agreed.

AGENDA ITEM #3 - Strategic Planning Committee Updates

Tai then introduced **Pam Barr, Strategic Planning Co-Chair** to update the group on the university’s Strategic Plan; he reminded the group that the final plan would come to P&D 1st then go to the whole Senate for approval. She briefly told the group of how the committee went through it’s fact findings and some of the peer institutions looked at, and mentioned that they felt it important to focus on the process & time line of the plan, and that the plan’s intended schedule should be launched in the next few days.

“The subcommittee of the Committee (after interviewing several consultants) decided against hiring a major consulting firm to walk us through every step of the process, which seemed unnecessary & expensive. Instead we will utilize some internal talent & a few outside consultants to help us facilitate the process with various constituencies as appropriate, which allows the community to have a much greater voice in the process . . . more than they normally could with an outside consultant.”
Pam announced that President Becker would kick-off GSU’s involvement & vision with the process within the next week. Distributed prior to the meeting, she discussed the Strategic Planning Schedule from February - August of 2010 which included dates for emailing the plan to the GSU community, distributing questionnaires, launching the strategic planning website www.gsu.edu/strategicplan, open forums, and other items to distribute & promote the plan. President Becker’s opening event would be held on February 23rd at 2pm in the GSU Speakers Auditorium.

To help build a theme for the plan, the three main questions that will be asked to the community through email, the website, 5x7 handouts, the GSU Villager, and other methods will be:
1. What will a great public research university look like in the future; and what are one or two examples of specific steps to achieve this vision?
2. What are the distinctive strengths of Georgia State that differentiate us and that should be built upon for the future?
3. What are the important priorities Georgia State should pursue in order to contribute to the local, national and global community?

Once feedback from the questions were analyzed, a final Strategic Plan would be drafted in early Fall, to go through P&D, the Senate, then to President Becker in December, to be presented by in January of 2011. In closing on the issue, Pam noted that even though the plan was ambitious, it was doable, and it provided for multiple opportunities for community involvement.

Q&A and Comments
Phang Tai reminded the committee that the process would indeed be a quite different process then what they were used to. He asked that the committee members try to keep up with the plan’s changes/differences so that it wouldn’t become repetitive in the long run, and he asked Pam Barr to try to keep the committee updated as much as possible as the process moved along.

Sandra Garber cautioned the group that (unlike strategic plans in GSU’s past) this strategic plan would be used as a decision making tool, and that it presented a great opportunity for them to voice what they thought GSU should be and what they wanted it to become.

Risa Palm stressed to the group how much work was put into getting some of the GSU community leadership to accept the idea of change, and how important it was to take advantage of defending their views/ideology of what they thought a great community should/could be; she stressed that they should make sure they attended the President’s upcoming talk on Feb. 23rd.

George Rainbolt, Sandra Garber, & others briefly discussed the Strategic Plan of Arizona State Univ. pre/post the current economic condition and what they liked/disliked with the plan, its methodology, and its outcomes as an example of what could be good/bad about a transitioning strategic plan.
AGENDA ITEM #4 - Other Issues

Traffic Safety & Campus Lighting - Beth Jones reminded the group that the ribbon cutting ceremony for the new Science Building (Piedmont/Decatur) would be held on March 29th. George Rainbolt cautioned the group that the sidewalks on the East side of Piedmont had been removed & students had no choice but to cut across the street when exiting the MARTA Station. He mentioned that he’d seen a few “very near misses” and asked whether temporary “pedestrian walking” signs could be placed in the area. Beth said she would look into the issue to see what could be done at the current time, and noted that streetlights were indeed in the plans for that particular area. It was also mentioned that the street lights on Decatur Street turned off after 7pm. Beth mentioned that the streets discussed were City of Atlanta streets, but that the City had been very receptive to the university’s needs, and she would talk to the officials to see what could be done about the issues discussed.

EPA P3 Sponsored, Student Design Competition for Sustainability
Ruth Stanford announced that she and other faculty advisors (John Steward & Christine Stauber) in collaboration with Art & Design, the School of Public Health, Sociology, the Atlanta Bicycle Coalition, & Central Atlanta Progress received $10,000 in seed grant money to promote bicycling on campus. One of the elements of the project was a bike rack design competition. She brought a scaled down model of the winning design (a bike rack abstractly spelling out the word BIKE) to propose a resolution in support of placing the rack on campus. She highlighted that in April, the group of students from the competition would travel to Washington, D.C. to compete and present their work in the competition for an additional $60,000 in grant money.

The resolution was made & passed to allow the winning student designed bike rack to be placed somewhere on campus, exact location to be decided later.

Phang Tai suggested that Ruth meet with Beth Jones to figure out the installation location of the winning rack and any additional racks; Ruth & Beth agreed.

Mike Raderstorf made the last update of the meeting and announced that the GSU Police Office acquired a grant to put up 40 exterior security cameras and mentioned that if extra bike racks were going to be placed around campus, it would be a good idea to place them near those cameras. Afterwards, Phang Tai adjourned the meeting at apx.1:55pm.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator