P&D AGENDA MEETING & SCHEDULE
August 16, 2010

Present: Pam Barr, Jennifer Chiovaro, Andrew Cohen, Douglas Covey, Donald Edwards, Robert Harrison, Chris Henrich, Richard Miller, Robin Morris, Risa Palm, Jerry Rackliffe, George Rainbolt, Timothy Renick, Bruce Seaman, Nancy Seamans, Phang C. Tai, Volkan Topalli, Irene Weber, Carol Winkler, Yi Zhao.

Absent: J. L. Albert, Al Baumstark, Elizabeth Beck, Cathy Brack, Laura Burtle, David Caudill, Jeremy Crampton, Christine Gallant, Paul Gallimore, Sandra, Olga Jarrett, George Pierce, D. Mike Raderstorf, Lesley Reid, Jeffrey C. Rupp, Roy Sobelson, Andrew Sumner, Maryann Wysor.

Others Attending: Beth Jones

The Agenda was for the meeting was as follows:

1. FYI - P&D Minutes 4/19/10
2. Strategic Planning Committee Update (Paul Alberto)
3. Campus Safety (Beth Jones)
4. MRRF Update (George Rainbolt)
5. Other Issues

AGENDA ITEM #1 - Approval of The Minutes
Phang Tai called the meeting at apx. 1:05pm. Afterwards, the motion was made and approved to accept the 4/19/10 minutes.

AGENDA ITEM #2 - Strategic Planning Committee Update
[As Explained by Provost Ron Henry (see minutes 12/13/04) - This Subcommittee of P&D does not have the approval of the University Strategic Plan, it has the recommendation to the University Senate, and the approval of the Annual Action Plan. It approves the Annual Action Plan; it doesn’t go any further, but the strategic 5 year plan is only a recommendation from here to the Senate.]

Phang Tai explained to the group that the new/current Strategic Planning Subcommittee for 2010-2015 was recently appointed by the Provost in Sept/Oct 2009 and this meeting was mainly to report on its progress. Tai briefly went over the responsibilities of both committees, then turned the discussion over to Paul Alberto, Strategic Planning Subcommittee Chair.

Alberto passed out a two paged document entitled “Summary of Goals & Implementation Strategies (7-26-10)” He explained to the group that (as opposed to the last strategic plan) this strategic plan was not to be a plan that would describe ongoing necessary improvements, but one which planned for major ways to lift the University in certain areas. He explained that through open forums, questionnaires, focus groups, campus discussions, etc, the subcommittee came up with the following 4 Goals & Strategies:

Goal 1 - To Accelerate Interdisciplinary Research Capability & Graduate Offerings
via (1) Two-level Semi-autonomous Center Structures (2) Research & Graduate Studies (3) Supporting Infrastructure.
Goal 2 - To Internationalize the University and Build Sustainable International Relationships
via (1) an International Consortium of Premier City-based Universities (2) an International House (a
centralized campus location for international services & hosting) . . . like a clearinghouse.

Goal 3 - To be a National Resource for Development of Solutions to Complex Challenges of Cities
most likely named the “Center for the Progress of Cities” CPC . . . . other naming suggestions not listed
among other universities may be emailed directly to palberto@gsu.edu

Goal 4 - Advancing Undergraduate Student Success
via (1) an Undergraduate Honors College (2) Increasing the Level of Institutional Support (3) Student
Success Centers (4) Undergraduate Signature Experiences by . . . being a member of a research team,
educational experience, city fellow, leadership academy, etc.

After Alberto went over the document in its entirety, the sections that were explained/discussed more
in depth were as follows:

Goal 1 (1) - Alberto explained that the background behind this item, was that the University needed to
raise its “Federal-External-Funding” from 32 million to 60 million annually; and goal 1(1) was a way
of doing this. “The goal is to have at least 5 university level research centers within the next year.”
The centers would be semi-autonomous because they would report to the VP of Research, but not have
to go through some of the department & college level restrictions. The centers would have to bring in
at least $1 million/yr and have either a disciplinary or interdisciplinary set of core faculty; other faculty
could come/go depending on projects and funding. He explained that knowing some centers may need
help getting started, there would be “research center incubators” to help. Those who needed help (if
they had the funds or were going to eventually have the funds) could apply, and they would be given
assistance with location, admin. staff., training, etc. for up to 3 years. Afterwards, they could either
apply to become an actual research center, disband and move on, or negotiate with one of the Deans of
the academic departments to see if they could become a research center based within an academic
college or school.

Goal 2 (1) - Alberto explained that GSU wanted to be the linchpin in a consortium of international
city-based research universities distributed throughout the world (total number of universities to be left
up to “the powers that be”). He explained that the ideas behind this were that the relationships built
would be substantial, there would be time for faculty to get to know each other and each other’s
research better, more time and convenience with joint funded projects, greater depth and frequency of
student exchanges with membership universities, etc. He also noted that this did not mean that
research centers couldn’t go outside of the consortium, but it meant that if the research centers wanted
added backing and support, they should look to the consortium centers first.

After Alberto explained some of the sections in depth he announced that 2 speakers had been
invited to the university, and that the committee should make an effort to come see them.

• Neil Howe, co-author of “Millennials Go to College” and "Millennials Rising,” will speak on
meeting the educational needs of the incoming generation of students on August 26th at 10am
in the Student Center Speakers Auditorium
• Dr. Gregory Petsko, professor of Biochemistry and Chemistry at Brandeis University and
member of the National Academy of Sciences who studies university reform, will speak on
September 7th at 10:30 am.
Robin Morris noted that Dr. Petsko had actually been commissioned by the APLU (Association of Public & Land Grant Universities) to look at factors that affected success in research development at major research universities and gave a great talk, so the provost was glad to bring him to the University.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS/conCERNS

CLERICAL

Carol Winkler suggested changes in the 1st paragraph of the document, to make sure the all of the university communities felt included when they read sentence #2. Paul Alberto let the group know that it was intended to be a listing of AREAS and that he would work on the way it was written. Lastly, the word “Geogia” would be corrected as “Georgia State University” in the last sentence.

IN REGARDS TO GOAL 1 (2)

George Rainbolt expressed concerns over the $1 million minimum mark for research centers, believing the number may be too large for certain disciplines to meet on average. He expressed that Arts & Humanities in its entirety, currently only held a little under 1 million in funding. He explained that for such a big new venture, “all hands should be on deck” and thought it may be received as unfriendly to start the process with an amount that may exclude apx. 1/3 of the faculty. He suggested the monetary amount that would/could be tiered.

Volkan Topalli noted that if the university needed to go from $32 to $60 million in grants, it would almost be impossible to do with grants amounting to less than $1 million/year. Robin Morris (in regards to certain disciplines being able meet the demand) stated that NSF, NIH, DOD, etc. were beginning to be more inclusive with the discipline of Arts & Humanities, and stated that various departments, colleges, and joint colleges who worked with various funding methods for research centers could be viewed somewhat as the tier(s) needed.

Robin Morris - “The bottom line right now is that we have one program project on this campus and we just lost the only center grant that we have on this campus. We are never going to increase our funding big time (I don’t care where it comes from) unless we start competing at that higher level; this is the framework for doing it.”

Paul Alberto - “This particular implementation strategy was written for 1 reason only: to get external federal funds from 30-60 million dollars. One feasible strategy for doing that . . . by getting in place these types of centers. We see them at all the top research universities in the country.”

In closing on this particular section, George Rainbolt disagreed that the main goal involved should be the generation of money and instead stated that the goal should be about solving a certain issue(s), therefore making the case for the need of that certain amount of money.

IN REGARDS TO GOAL 3

Robert Harrison suggested that GSU could operate a Business Incubator which would be a good way to gain interest from various legislators concerned with bringing business into the local economy. Alberto mentioned he could write it in this section as a 3rd bullet.
IN REGARDS TO GOAL 3 (1)
Carol Winkler mentioned that the CPC could potentially encompass a lot of work that was already taking place and questioned whether the notion behind the it was to eventually create an institutional umbrella that would direct all of the research centers.

Paul Alberto - “Direct is a strong word. We’re talking about a confederation of current researchers & resource projects to begin with. As they come together and form a united board, it’ll allow 2 things to happen: 1) a very unified public PR profile of our activities dealing with cities, and 2) they can then work out the mechanics that they feel will be most helpful to them as researchers and money ‘garnerers’ so it will allow both of those things. What we want to do is get ourselves known as a national resource for the development of answers to a subset of issues.”

IN REGARDS TO GOAL 4
Robert Harrison mentioned that he really wanted to take advantage of this area, because he currently knew of high school seniors that would be great for the program. He explained that he tried this before, but was told extra courses would have to be created among other things, and pre-warned there could be a lot of institutional barriers in place that would eventually make the goal difficult to implement.

Phang Tai responded that the Presidential Scholar & Assistantship program was a similar plan and could be a good reference. Another member mentioned that Boston University also had a similar program that worked specifically with high school graduating seniors. Paul Alberto mentioned that at several faculty luncheons held, 3/4 faculty uniformly said that they would allow undergraduate students to work in their labs. He added that if the final draft of the plan went through, the President would pull together the final who/where/how of the program. He also reminded the committee that not only was the goal to reach as many young people as possible, but also to keep it open to a wide variety of students and not just those in the advanced programs.

IN REGARDS TO GOAL 4 (3)
Bruce Seaman noted that some basic areas where classroom technology was concerned was already slow. He mentioned that the “(ELMO) Document Cameras” aka Doc Cams (for instance) were items that many teachers used and needed, but that were located sporadically around the campus, and questioned why it was taking so long to place them throughout the classrooms. Robin Morris and others answered that that matter would actually fall under Edgar Torbert and the Classroom Facilities Council.

IN REGARDS TO GOAL 4 (4)
Carol Winkler wanted to know whether City Fellows counted as internships. Alberto responded that he thought so, but wasn’t sure; “If all of the goals and plans for the centers are passed, within the 1st couple of months, a director would be hired and a board appointed to work all the details out.” She also asked whether campus life & recreation in regards to the downtown “signature experience” was being addressed. Alberto explained that it was not, because that issue was considered to be “ongoing betterment” which was different than a singular idea that would “strategically” move the university forward. He explained however, that there would be a section (apx. 1-2 pgs) included in the plan that described who/where the university was, how it was getting better, and some of the things that would help to move it forward.
**Don Edwards** suggested that concerning undergraduate researchers, the group look at the clearinghouse services of MIT. He explained that their clearinghouse operated somewhat as a matchmaker for students and faculty and helped utilize both money and/or course credit for student compensation. He also explained to help make the undergraduate experience unique, he’d really like to see the idea of residential housing expanded upon; explaining that it provided a framework of smaller units for the students to identify with. He noted (with the exception of UC Santa Cruz) there weren’t many other public urban universities that were able to offer this, and that it would help set GSU apart. **Risa Palm** responded that she fully agreed with the idea, and that she had also seen this type of housing setup at UC Boulder. She reminded the group that GSU had just purchased 2 hotels (The Wyndham Garden Hotel and Baymont Inn and Suites on Piedmont Avenue) and that the President had talked about utilizing one of the hotels for the idea.

**George Rainbolt** “We should also not forget the non-resident students. For retention & recruitment rates, it would be good to set up something like this for non-resident students and that would be VERY distinctive from other universities.”

**IN CLOSING ON THE ITEM**

With the plan due to the Senate in early December, **George Rainbolt** suggested a special P&D meeting to be called between P&D’s October 18th and November 16th meeting. The group agreed. The meeting has been set for **Monday, November 8th, 2010**

Paul Alberto reminded the group that they also had the Diversity Strategic Plan to review; which had a time line similar to that of the University Strategic Plan.

**AGENDA ITEM #3 - Campus Safety**

**Beth Jones** gave updates on Campus & Traffic Safety. She mentioned the street-scaping on Piedmont would begin on September 13th, and that sidewalks from Piedmont down to John Wesley Dobbs would be repaired within 6-10 months. With the new addition of the Baymont & Wyndham Hotels, she was now trying to get approval for the City to repair sidewalks and streetlights at the corner of Piedmont & Ellis. She highlighted that City approval had finally been received on the Science Park Crossing area, and would start immediately. **Phang Tai** mentioned that there was an electrical box on the corner of Piedmont/Decatur causing an obstruction to the view of pedestrians trying to see oncoming cars; Beth mentioned she’d look into it. **Bruce Seaman & Don Edwards** asked about security within the parking decks, Beth responded that more security cameras were being placed, and noted that more police presence had already been implemented.
AGENDA ITEM #4 - MRRF Update

George Rainbolt MRRF co-chair with Volkan Topalli gave the updates for the Major Renovations and Repairs subcommittee. He explained that there was some urgency in their upcoming meetings due to the retirement of John McCullum, explaining that John was key to the group’s process, and it would be best to meet before his retirement in case they needed his input. Phang Tai also reminded the group that Christine Gallant from P&D also played a key role on this committee.

There were no other updates or issues that needed to be discussed for the day, so, Phang Tai adjourned the meeting at apx. 2:11pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lydia Woltz, Admin. Coordinator