Planning & Development Committee Meeting  
January 14, 2002


Others Attending:  Harvey Shumpert

The meeting began at 1:07pm.  
Phang Tai brought the meeting to order; no changes were made to the minutes.  The minutes were approved.

Bonnie Fritz made the following motion by email to P.C. Tai to discuss at the meeting.  A motion was made and accepted to discuss the matter at hand.

Suggestion From Bonnie Fritz

Motion to Implement Traffic Safety Measures to the University Action Plan

A Traffic Safety Subcommittee of the Senate Planning and Development Committee will investigate, and report recommendations for, short and long term solutions to traffic safety issues at key pedestrian crossings adjacent to campus buildings.  A report to the full Senate will be submitted within the fiscal year 2002.

Rationale
Recent accidents, two of which caused student deaths due to traffic violations at crosswalks adjacent to campus, have created a need for university action.  Roughly twenty-five thousand students plus faculty, staff, and visitors use crossings at major thoroughways such as Decatur Street, Courtland Street, Piedmont Avenue, and Peachtree Street.  Traffic here speeds unchecked through red lights and along blind corners blocked by construction and power poles, while university pedestrians crowd around poles and trees blocking narrow sidewalks and face hard to see, often broken, crossing signals.

Short-term solutions might include visual regulation (speed signs, speed bumps, working lights and crossing signals) and police officers positioned to direct pedestrians at crosswalks and to enforce traffic laws.  Long term solutions might include narrowing key corridors from four to two lanes, building pedestrian bridges, widening sidewalks, and removing pedestrian obstacles such as blind construction corners, trees, and poles.  Finally, partnership with the local city and county governments needs to be in place for timely implementation of the best solutions possible to ensure the physical safety of our community.

Draft of January 13, 2002

John DeCastro made the point that FY02 (end of paragraph #1) would be too soon to submit a report to the Senate.  Bonnie said its urgency was due to the recent traffic deaths that were occurring.  Hazel Scott & Katherine Johnston discussed the convenient timing of such a proposal since the City of Atlanta was on the verge of instituting a new walkway and the election of new Mayor.  Hazel asked whether the university had a committee currently discussing the issue; Katherine said she didn't know of one at the time.  Ron Henry agreed that FY02 may be too soon to submit a report.  George Rainbolt made a motion to add the suggestion into the action plan and change the word fiscal to the word calendar (end of paragraph #1).  The motion was seconded & passed.
Ron Henry moved the discussion on to section 3.2.4 of the Action Plan, Academic Programs & Faculty. John DeCastro discussed the Tenure Track data under Table 10 Undergraduate Process Indicators and mentioned that a comparable Graduate table should also be added. Vijay K. Vaishnavi discussed the importance of people's perceptions once sources such as World Report & U.S. News reported the outcome. John DeCastro made a motion that the following sentence be added behind sentence #2 of the second paragraph of the section Facilities on the last page of the Action Plan:

*A study will be undertaken to investigate long term solutions for critical office needs.*

The motion was seconded & passed.

More changes to that paragraph were suggested & motioned in. It was decided that that paragraph should actually be the 1st paragraph in the section; the final version read as follows:

*Office space for faculty, staff, and graduate students is in short supply. Consideration Priority will be given to renting and/or reconfiguring office space as an interim measure. A study will be undertaken to investigate long term solutions for critical office needs. Funds are needed to complete build-out of the Wachovia building that is scheduled for completion in spring 2003. Also funds are needed to renovate existing space such as that vacated in the Sports Arena and to convert some less-desirable classroom space in Sparks Hall into office space.*

The 1st sentence of the last paragraph was changed to read as follows:

*A long-range plan including the criteria for this budget will be developed for the Major Renovations and Rehabilitation budget.*

Lauren Adamson & Ron Henry finished up the discussion on section 3.2.4 highlighting the following areas of concern: 1) Rejuvanating the Academic Program Review process; the University System of Georgia requires a program review at least once every 7 years; and 2) Continuing to Wrap up the Administrative Support and Assessment Process. Also discussed, was the two new appointments of Valerie Miller & Joan Carson to Senior Faculty Associate.

The discussion moved on to section 3.2.6 "Infrastructure/Support Improvements" of the Action Plan. Charlene Hurt made a suggestion to add behind sentence #1 of 3.2.6., paragraph #2 . . . "and library & computer workstations".

Peggy Gallagher asked about the status of the Comprehensive Campaign and the property that used to be the Jail. Ron Henry said that the campaign was currently at apx. $103 million, and to reach the desired level would be challenging. In regards to the property that used to be the jail, Ron Henry explained that, "The property will either go to GSU or the State Government, but right now, the university doesn't have the funds to develop it."
Next, the committee moved on to the discussion of office space. Charlene Hunt explained that the Library has been engaged in a master planning process to build meeting rooms on the 2nd floor of Library North that will hopefully be available for faculty who need a place to meet with students. This plan will be introduced to the Administrative Council in February, and it will also be planned for in the budget with any left over money. Katherine Johnston mentioned that the university real estate officer was still seeking space, but that the average rental space was expensive ($16-$18 per sq. ft.).

Vijay K. Vaishnavi questioned why the university was having such a problem with space, asking whether there was some significant change that took place, that wasn't planned for in the university's Master Plan. Ron Henry explained that the master plan was a 10 year plan, and that within that time span the university had an extreme increase in student population.

More discussion took place in regards to the space problem, then the meeting moved on to updating some of the tables & indicators. John DeCastro noted that there were no list of peer institutions in regards to table #19 Faculty Diversity. **John made a motion** that either an equivalent of Table 10 Undergraduate Process Indicators be inserted for the Graduate level, or that table 10 be modified to include both graduate & undergraduate data. The motion passed.

Carol Winkler, Ron Henry, & John DeCastro briefly discussed how well the Action Plan & Tables appeared to outside readers who access it from the WEB. Ron Henry said that they were currently working on making it more reader friendly. DeCastro mentioned it would also be more helpful to have the tables on the same web-page as the actual text. The motion was made, seconded, & approved that the 03’ Action plan be amended.

Marty Fraser reported on the Subcommittee for University Closings. He went over the following points that the sub-committee was currently discussing:

1. The persons who wrote the GSU plan and who submitted it for approval should be identified in the plan.
2. Who approves the university plan should be identified in the plan.
3. Faculty and student involvement in the development of plans should be identified.
4. The GSU plan should specify levels of closure that clearly and specifically distinguish between closed and evacuated. The level of closure should be clearly and consistently identified to university personnel and students. Public statements should be consistent with actions taken by the university and its representatives. Staggered release of faculty, staff, students, and visitors should be considered, as permitted.
5. The university plan should include a policy for managing students. The processes for cessation of academic functions should be specified. (e.g., how and when will lectures, teaching labs, testing, research activities, etc. be suspended?).
6. Provide for phone in for information (perhaps by switching over the Registrar's lines).
7. The role of the Health Center should be specified (e.g., is a medically trained person available for triaging?).
8. Consider how to connect the GSU plan with the city, EMS, hospitals, and fire departments.
9. Develop a way to reflect lessons learned from the 911 event in university plans.
10. The university should consider supplying emergency kits to units containing instructions, plastic bags to protect books, equipment, electronic storage media, etc.), tape, flashlights, radio, first aid kit.
11. Specify the level of bus service for outlying GSU sites, such as the dorms, needed to transport students and personnel.
12. Specify how members of the surrounding community will be handled if they come to the campus and to remote sites, such as the Village and the Alpharetta campus, for assistance.
13. Do not depend on the Web to disseminate or reference the plan during a crisis.

Charlene Hunt suggested that during "phase closings" it might be a good idea to consider extra pay for those who have to stay longer.

Carol Winkler suggested that to achieve the maximum flow of vehicles from the parking decks, there should be a plan in place to route people to the various exits more evenly, so that everyone wasn't coming out of one exit only.

Katherine Johnston expressed that some of what she was hearing was redundant and questioned whether the University Police Department & Harvey Shumpert had been consulted first. She mentioned that there was already a plan in place for catastrophic events (planned during the Olympics) that could be consulted. Marty Fraser replied that there was some redundancy, but that the committee wanted to first look at "what was already there". Lauren Adamson & Nancy Floyd discussed having a designated point person(s) within each department that would be responsible for making sure that that particular department knew what to do in the event of a crisis. Dabney Dixon made the point that even though the university shouldn't solely rely on the WEB, it shouldn't be overlooked that information on the WEB during a crises was extremely invaluable.

Brief updates on the Aderhold Facility, the "re-bricking" of Library South, and the Wachovia Building were given then the meeting ended at approximately 2:39pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz