Planning & Development Committee  
September 12, 2005


The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of Minutes 8/16/05
2. ASUR Composition Proposal
3. Subcommittee Reports  
   a) Subcommittee on Public Safety  
   b) Other Subcommittee Updates
4. Master Plan Update
5. Other Issues

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of the 8/16/05 minutes - Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx. 1pm. On the last page of the minutes, the year 1997 was corrected to 2007. The 8/16/05 minutes were then motioned in and approved.

Agenda Item #4 - Master Plan Update
The meeting actually began with item#4 of the agenda. Ramesh Vakamudi from Facilities Planning (assisted by Greg Wright) gave a detailed presentation about the update. The presentation spanned the first hour of the meeting; Ramesh began by telling the group that what they last had in hand was a "full update" and what he was presenting was a "plan update". He reminded the group that the last "plan" in 1999 was called the "Mainstreet Plan". He explained that the goals/subjects of the plan were the same, that it was currently in draft format, that it had been presented to CBSAC, and that he would present it to a student forum in about a week. He then proceeded with a slide presentation that went over GSU’s process checks, Strategic Plan 2005-2010, theme of vision sessions, environmental scans from 1997-2004, physical conditions, and opportunities.

In Ramesh’s detail presentation some of the areas particularly covered were:

Physical Space - He mentioned these studies were based on what was needed for the students and what was needed for national guidelines. He explained the difference from the last plan was the focus on the student need in a metropolitan area.
In regards to this area on within the strategic plan, the areas covered were:

< Integrating the University into the city of Atlanta
< use of structures & systems to connect campus functions
< housing 20% of the 36,000 student population

Ramesh commented on how Decatur Street used to be the main area of focus, but with rapid growth there were many more streets to focus on. He also mentioned that for the student population, GSU currently had ASF (assignable square footage) of 2,716,274 sq ft, but that we needed 3,304,609 sq ft to meet national guidelines.

Phang Tai mentioned that he thought the needed space for staff shown was not proportionately adequate and that more space was needed. Carol Winkler also agreed with Tai, especially in the area of student & graduate assistants. Tim Crimmins mentioned that some depts (ex: Dept English) were pretty much "ran" by Graduate Teaching Assistants. Ramesh concluded that some of the space for such employees was allocated in the "instructional staff" area instead of the Faculty area, but that he would look at this section to try to address the problem.

Ramesh briefly covered space by room type: general classroom space, lab space, office space, library space, etc. He mentioned that most of this space was made up for by demolitions, vacated, and dispossession space. Tim Crimmins highlighted how some buildings couldn’t functionally be used for other buildings (ex: office vs. classroom) and that if this subject wasn’t planned for early, the chance to do so could be missed. Ramesh assured that group that the subject of "Possible Space" was on the list, but that what they were seeing now was the definite list. He mentioned that he would check into adding a section for Deficits in the report (ex: Deficit in Classroom Bldgs, Deficit in Office Space, etc.).

Joan Carson - What is Underground Housing? Jerry Rackcliffe explained that they were looking into ways to dispose of the GSU Village Property and that the city of Atlanta expressed interest in moving the students’ housing closer to the surrounding areas of Underground Atlanta. He mentioned the university was also considering areas around Auburn Avenue. He mentioned there was about 20-40 million in equity in the GSU Village, and that it had been offered to GA Tech., but they were not interested in it. He noted that the firm handling the property was currently researching a good price to sell it for.

Ramesh went over campus maps which highlighted GSU’s owned space vs. leased space, surface parking lots, walking distance maps (which showed the time it took to/from walk from various locations on campus) and mentioned that he didn’t have a graph that figured in elevator waiting time, but that it was not a factor that was overlooked. He mentioned that Broad Street had joined the list of streets to look into for possible conversion to "walk-thru only" streets, but that the impact on the surrounding restaurants & businesses had to be considered. In regards to parking spaces, he mentioned that GSU currently had apx. 5,757 spaces (which was not a significant shortage) due to mass transit & car-pooling and he also mentioned they were looking into the issues of "being at the mercy of Turner Field during game time."
Vijay K. Vaishnavi went over some of the improvements being made to let the public know they were on campus grounds, such as: lowering of GSU signs, the color of the signs, and the brick crosswalks. Ramesh mentioned that 4 schools that were looked at in comparison: DePaul & Loyola University and the Illinois Inst. of Technology in Chicago, and George Washington University in D.C. Out of the 4 schools GSU appeared to be, by far, the most aesthetically pleasing.

Ramesh’s presentation continued Q&A from the group on various subjects and Ramesh concluded his presentation at 2:08pm mentioning the next step would be to meet with the Board of Regents at the end of the month.

The group then moved on to the remaining items on the agenda.

**Agenda Item #2 - ASUR Composition Proposal**

Siva Nathan headed the discussion on the changes in composition of the current ASUR committee. Within the discussion by various members of the group, Charlene Hurt suggested that the term served by any new person(s) should be more than 1 year because it took that long to learn the process/functions of the group. Tim Crimmins reminded the group not to forget the larger units that were at times under-represented and also that there was a large segment of administrative areas that were not represented at all. Phang Tai suggested, "2 people with 2 yr terms from each of the colleges." Joan Carson - "I don’t have an objection, but I’d be concerned about the percentage of Faculty vs. Staff."

Tim Crimmins motioned to approve Phang Tai’s suggestion of “2 people with 2yr terms from each of the colleges.”

Al Baumstark - "We need to stagger the 2 year terms so that the two representative don’t come out at the same time. So currently we should appoint 1 person for this 1 year, then next year we need to appoint 1 person for 2 years, then from each year after that 1 person for 2 years."

**THE GROUP ACCEPTED TIM & AL’S MOTION.**

The document distributed in regards to this issue was entitled "The University Senate Planning and Development Committee approved the composition of the Administrative and Support Unit Review Committee on 10/26/04 as follows"

Within that document the group agreed on the following **changes in bold:**

*Paragraph 1* - A variable member will be appointed to each review subcommittee, that **faculty** member chosen in consultation with the Chair of a University Senate Committee that is relevant to the unit being reviewed.
Paragraph 2 - The ASUR Committee feels that it would be appropriate to add two additional one-year term members to represent academic support staff. The one two-year appointment will rotate among the colleges in the following order: AYSPS, Arts & Sciences, COE, CHHS, College of Law, RCB. The appointment will be made by the Provost who will solicit a nominations from the deans of the relevant colleges.

There were no other updates from subcommittee groups, and the committee decided to cover ASUR’s review of Facilities Planning during the next meeting. The meeting adjourned at 2:33pm.