President Crecine Looks Ahead To The Decade For Georgia Tech In State Of The Institute Address Given On Oct. 30

"A State of the Institute address typically looks back on the past year and forward to the year ahead. I am taking a much longer-term view this year, because I believe our actions during this academic year are critical to our success later in this decade and beyond. If our collective choices over the next several months are even moderately strategic and wise, the 1990s could be the greatest decade in the history of Georgia Tech.

It may appear slightly Pollyannish for me to stand here, grandly optimistic when Georgia Tech has just taken a disproportionate (4 percent versus 3 percent system-wide) budget cut from the State, when the State and national economy are in precarious positions, when Federal R&D dollars are subject to great uncertainty, and when the demographic trends for students are so negative. But I truly believe the next ten years will be "the decade of Georgia Tech." This is a belief firmly rooted in the way Georgia Tech is currently positioned for the future. Some of this positioning comes from our traditions, some from an institutional willingness to seriously address fundamental issues during the past several years, and some of our positioning comes from discovering and exploiting opportunities in recent years. We are one of the handful of quality institutions in the nation with a clear technological focus in an age where technology is increasingly important and, in some instances, where technology is dominant. We are an urban university with the potential for a residential campus in the heart of America's leading new city. We are a public university in an age where access to education is more dependent on resources than intellect, where the costs of quality private higher education are soaring. We are a public technological university in a state where public support for public higher education is often linked with economic development goals; economic development is a natural objective for any technological university.

In one form or another, Georgia Tech has made remarkable progress on a set of fundamental issues over the past year. We have in place three new colleges. The Colleges of Sciences and Computing give dramatic new focus and visibility to two areas fundamental to the success of any university of the next century, particularly a technological.
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1996 Committee Is Ready To Begin Working On Tasks Of "Olympic" Proportions

By Jackie Nemeth

The 1996 Committee, which consists of student, faculty and staff representatives from all parts of the Georgia Tech community, had their first meeting on Oct. 24 to begin planning for Georgia Tech's role in helping stage the best Olympic Games ever. To help accomplish that task, Acting Executive Vice President Michael E. Thomas said an academic and research programs logistics taskforce will be the first group formed under the auspices of the 1996 Committee. The task force will be charged with minimizing any disruption to normal Tech life from the Olympics.

"The 1996 Committee's task is to plan for and anticipate the changes and opportunities the 1996 Summer Olympics present to Georgia Tech," Thomas said. "We want to plan for the Olympics in a way that will not dominate Tech's main missions -- education, research and service."

Thomas said the Olympics will allow Tech many new opportunities and facilities. "There is more national and international interest in Georgia Tech, and that will translate into opportunities for improved faculty and student recruitment," Thomas said. "We will also gain a natatorium, housing for an additional 4,500 students, and many other important new facilities."

Executive Assistant to President John P. Crecine and Vice President for Strategic Planning Joseph E. "Tim" Gilmour said the Olympics provide an unparalleled opportunity to enhance Tech's campus. "Georgia Tech is not only positioned for the future Olympics ever, but also to make Georgia Tech an even better place in 1997," Gilmour said. "We plan to strengthen our facility development capacities here, and we will do everything possible to build and operate these facilities in plenty of time for the 1996 Olympics."

Special Assistant to President
Unlike the original formula, the revised formula recognizes the extra and unique costs associated with providing a technological education; advanced graduate study in computing, the sciences and engineering; the recruitment of faculty in a national market; and an aging physical plant. The formula also rewards the units in the System — not just Georgia Tech, but UGA, Georgia State and the Medical College — for their success in attracting sponsored research funds.

A new formula that better captures the costs of the institutions that comprise the State University System means a new deal for Georgia Tech — a fair deal — and a promise of a more appropriate level of funding so we can address embarrassing shortfalls like a student/faculty ratio of 21:1. This is not an instant solution: a four or five-year implementation is a reality, as is the state's overall budget crunch.

When new resources come, and they will come, these resources will not be distributed across the board, and will not reflect the students. New resources will go first to areas of strategic importance, and to areas that have shown leadership and success in fulfilling their missions. Success in attracting students, effectively teaching, and graduating students will be rewarded. Student decisions on courses and majors will have a major role in resource allocation to particular academic units. So will outside supporters, such as donors and research sponsors: we will endorse their support of areas with resources of our own. Simply put, new resources will be used where they will do the most good for the overall institution. In most cases, resources will reward demonstrated performance more than promises for better performance.

The formula revision is the most important and fundamental step toward a stable and adequate funding base for Georgia Tech during the past twenty years. Over the long term, this fundamental change will mean more to Georgia Tech than the Olympics.

Another fundamental issue on which we have made dramatic progress involves our most important resource base, our Resident Instruction appropriation from the State. Following nearly three years of effort, Georgia Tech has finally received a signal from the Board of Regents that they better understand Georgia Tech's severe and chronic underfunding and that they have made a serious commitment to deal with the problem.

That commitment comes in the form of a Revised Regents' Request Formula, the vehicle used by the University System to justify its lump-sum allocation from the Governor and the Legislature.

Georgia Research Alliance has a strong, legislative agenda and is built on the new level of cooperation among the leadership of the State's research universities.

I will mention an extraordinary opportunity, Atlanta's hosting of the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. Our involvement in Atlanta's Olympic bid was early; it was strategic, and Georgia Tech people made a truly significant contribution to its success. This is an opportunity that Georgia Tech helped create. Our involvement, past and present, has been predicated on our ability to simultaneously pursue two goals: helping to make the Atlanta Bid and the Atlanta Olympics the best ever, and leaving Georgia Tech after the bid and after the Olympics in an overall better position as a university. As the site of the Olympic Village, Georgia Tech must attend to the kind of infrastructure and housing issues for the Olympic family that we ought to be attending to for the benefit of the Georgia Tech family, especially for our students. The visibility of Georgia Tech — in terms of our contributions to the Bid. Our role as the site of the Village — already has created some truly extraordinary opportunities for us in research, often not directly related to the Olympics. This heightened visibility is the source of many opportunities for every group and program in the institution — students, faculty, and staff; research/development, service, and athletic missions. We only need be strategic in pursuing opportunities, following up on those that promise to strengthen our educational, research, and service missions, while still helping Atlanta to stage the best Olympic Games ever.

Georgia Tech's extraordinary potential for the future owes much to the progress we have made on some fundamentals over the past couple of years. It also owes much to an extraordinary set of opportunities that we face. The 1990s will not become the best decade in Georgia Tech's history by accident. We will all have to work hard, and a "dark horse" need also a continued commitment to institutional goals as well as personal goals, and a focus on several critical areas:
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government, or the Board of Regents, or professional organizations. Our primary customers are those who pay for the services we provide: the students we educate, the sponsors for whom we conduct research, and those we serve through our economic development efforts. There are some customers of Georgia Tech we treat comparatively well: our research sponsors and our economic development clients for example. It is time that we put our students into that category, too.

-A Marketing Orientation. Like it or not, Georgia Tech’s monopoly on the best students in the Southeast with an interest in a technical education is over. The days of just taking applications and expecting the best and the brightest to show up every fall are done. Georgia Tech is a great institution, but to exploit its full potential, we must market it as if it were a business.

We have enormous comparative advantages: our cost, our quality, our Atlanta location, our technological focus, the lure of the Olympics, the co-op program, even the success of our sports teams contribute to our overall attractiveness. We need to do a better job of telling the world our virtues, and of exploiting our resources. Each of you is a potential salesperson for Georgia Tech, just as each student is a potential advertisement and each alumnus is a potential recruiter.

A marketing mindset is even more important if we are to meet the demographic challenges of the future. It doesn’t take a genius to predict the mix of 18-year-olds in the year 2000: just look at the 8-year-olds of today. Those children are increasingly minority and increasingly female, a trend that should be important to any institution like Georgia Tech that has traditionally relied on white males to make up the bulk of its student body.

We need to market to more than potential students. We need to tell the city and the State the story of Georgia Tech’s economic development contributions: tell them about the Scientific Atlanta’s, the Hayes Microsystems, the ATDC graduate companies, and the NCR’s, as well as the resource Georgia Tech is to the general citizenry of the State. We need to emphasize the importance of our graduates to the success and Georgia locational decisions of IBM, Bell South, Georgia Power, Georgia-Pacific, and the like.

We need to market our research capabilities as well.

-Georgia Tech must remain flexible as an organization, “light on its feet.” Strategic planning can take an organization only so far as the organization can predict the future with accuracy and confidence. Successful organizations need an ability to react quickly to new opportunities and marketplace changes. In any system with as little slack as Georgia Tech has, we must be able to react quickly or our ability to compete — for students, for external support, for faculty, etc. — diminishes greatly as does our ability to exploit opportunities like those that are coming our way because of our involvement in the Atlanta Olympics.

Our academic restructuring proved that we can change quickly given the proper impetus. We accomplished the most significant academic reorganization of a major research university during the past twenty years in under two years, and we will shortly have nine new degree programs to show for our efforts. I am very proud of what we were able to do in so short a time and of how high quality the degree programs turned out to be. Another case in point is our research program, which by all accounts is tremendously healthy but overly dependent on Department of Defense funding. Our research program leaders, particularly in GTRI, have moved quickly to leverage our strengths into related fields, including environmental research.

This “organizational flexibility” is a characteristic that we need to consciously attend to, and work to improve. I talked about many of these issues and focal points during my State of the Institute address last year, when I laid out a set of goals for 1996. (Last year, the choice of 1996 was arbitrary; this year, it is not.) Goals are without much value if you do not regularly attend to them, so I want to update our progress.

On the faculty side, our student/faculty ratio remains an obsession 2:1. We desperately need progress on this front, not just for our goal of 15:1 by 1996 but to maintain our educational quality. We were gladdened by a 20 percent increase in the number of female professors, but the number of black faculty remained flat. As we add faculty to reduce our student/faculty ratio, we will work toward our goal of tripling the number of female and minority faculty. Our commitment to racial and sexual diversity remains strong.

The news is mixed from the student point of view. Our average SAT’s fell last year, as did the number of National Merit Scholars, making the goal of a 1225 average SAT and 175 merit scholars by 1996 more of a challenge. This is not so much a reflection of Georgia Tech, but of the competition we face. The graduation rate increased slightly, but we need to make a big jump if we are to graduate 80 percent of our students. Our recent decision to build the Success Center as a recruitment tool and the new academic options resulting from the restructuring will help achieve our goals here. The Olympics gave us good press on the housing front, assuring us of being able to house our goal of 75 percent of the student body on campus if we manage the situation correctly.

In terms of graduate students, we are making impressive strides. Our graduate students are up, both in number and in quality. Accounting for the growth are Ph.D. programs, helping us achieve our goal of a 2:1 Ph.D. to master’s ratio. As we aspire to be a national research university, our Ph.D. programs are crucial. Especially worthy of note is a 19 percent rise in minority Ph.D. enrollment, helping to propel us upward in the ranks of engineering and science minority Ph.D. producers. The only discordant note is the Master of Science in Management program, where resource constraints have kept us from increasing our enrollment.

In terms of resources, we met one of our important goals when our endowment grew by $32 million dollars this year, a 12 percent hike. The amount of research also grew quickly, up to a total of expenditure of $174 million dollars. We still will
Your Thoughts And Ideas Are Needed For "Faculty Forum"

Normally, the Whistle staff and its contributing writers are the primary sources for story ideas in this paper. However, the "Faculty Forum," a new feature of the Whistle, depends on your input.

The "Faculty Forum" is designed to be an open column through which Tech faculty and staff can express their views on a variety of campus issues. Possible ideas could range from the parking situation to campuswide recycling or from academic issues to the 1996 Summer Olympics.

A faculty review committee will be responsible for reviewing and selecting material for the "Faculty Forum." The committee includes: Bud Foote (Literature, Communications and Culture), Ruth Hale (Library) and Eugene Comiskey (Management). Whistle Managing Editor Jackie Nemeth will adjust the piece to Associated Press Style Book format without changing the piece's content.

At the end of each "Faculty Forum" piece, a disclaimer box will list editorial review committee members, what type of material is appropriate for the column, and where to send essays for selection.

The following disclaimer will also be printed in the box: "Opinions expressed on this page (or these pages) do not necessarily reflect the views of the administration of the Georgia Institute of Technology, the Editorial Review Committee, or the Whistle staff."

If you are interested in sharing your thoughts about issues which affect the Tech community, please submit a double-spaced essay (under 750 words) to Foote, 326 Skiles, mail code 0165. If you have questions about the "Faculty Forum," please call Foote at 4-2730, Hale at 4-4354, Comiskey at 4-4394, or Nemeth at 4-2453.

Address . . . continued from page 3

need to increase the growth rate if we are to reach $375 million by 1996. Despite our hopes for an increase in state resources, extramural funding remains Georgia Tech's "margin of sustenance" instead of our "margin of excellence."

My final goal was the one most easily accomplished — to maintain competitive Division I athletic programs. In the short run, I have people like Dennis Scott, Kenny Anderson, Shawn Jones, and Ken Swilling to thank for that. In the longer run, we have Homer Rice, Bobby Cremins, Bobby Ross, and Bobby Devall to thank and an athletic program that has for a decade paid tribute to the fundamental values of Georgia Tech and to the fundamentals of building a strong program, around strong leaders, and student-athletes with motivation and character.

Environmental Forum
To Bring "Much Ado About Oil" Nov. 8

The Environmental Forum will host a panel discussion focusing on the current oil shortage problem on Nov. 8 in the Student Center Theater at noon.

The discussion, entitled "Much Ado About Oil" will feature the following speakers and topics: Dr. Leland Long, professor in the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, on "Oil Reserves and Extraction Methods;" Dr. David Ray, professor in the Department of History, Technology and Society, on "The History of OPEC;" Dr. Augustus W. Giebelhaus, acting department head of the Department of History, Technology and Society, on "A Historical Perspective;" and Dr. Erik Ferguson, professor of City Planning, on "Alternate Fuel Sources and Transportation Modes."

Job Hunting?

If you're looking for employment opportunities, call the Job Line in the personnel office—ext. 4-4922.
Georgia Tech Governmental Affairs Committee Straw Polls Student Body

The Governmental Affairs committee of the Georgia Tech Student Government Association conducted a straw poll of the student body on Oct. 23, 1990. Over six percent of the student body participated in the poll.

The following proposed changes to the Statutes will be sent to the Chancellor's Office at the Board of Regents for final approval.

General Faculty Adopts Proposed Changes To The Statutes

The proposed changes to the Statutes of the Georgia Institute of Technology were presented in a first reading to the General Faculty on 24 April 1990 in accordance with the Statutes, Sections 2.5.1.3. and 2.8. The General Faculty voted on and adopted the proposed changes to the Statutes during its Oct. 30 meeting. Pending President John P. Crecine's approval, the proposed changes to the Statutes will be sent to the Chancellor's Office at the Board of Regents for final approval.

The proposed changes are designed to clarify the link between administrative titles and the responsibilities referenced in the Statutes. The changes are as follows:

Article II, The Administration (second paragraph): "...Through memorandums and organizational charts, the President advises the Institute of organizational changes and shifts in the responsibilities of members of the Administration. Hereafter in these Statutes, members of the Administration will be referred to as administrators, Administrators referenced by their function and designated certain responsibilities by the Statutes are as follows:

- Administrator in charge of counseling and career planning, development, graduate students, institute relations (or planning), public relations, publications, student affairs; chief academic officer; chief financial officer; chief operating officer of the Georgia Tech Research Institute; Director of Libraries (Administrator in charge of Libraries); and Registrar (Administrator in charge of Record Courses Offered).

- The President shall designate on election year an annual basis an appropriate administrator to fulfill the responsibilities of these administrative functions identified in the Statutes.

- "Without the right to vote: The Administrator in charge of student affairs, the chief financial officer, the Administrator in charge of institute relations, the Administrator in charge of development, the Registrar, and the chief operating officer of the Georgia Tech Research Institute."

Section 2.5.2.1 (a): "The elected representatives shall be distributed among the Departments of Instruction, and the colleges without such departments, the operational units and a unit of Administration and Services of the Georgia Tech Research Institute, and a composite unit of Services and Central Administration in the ratio of one representative for each twenty members of the General Faculty (rounded)."

Section 2.5.2.1 (b): "The representatives from Services and Central Administration shall be elected proportionally from the Libraries, the Office of the Administrator in charge of student affairs, and the aggregate of others."

Section 2.5.2.1 (c)(3): "In the Georgia Tech Research Institute, the Georgia Tech Research Institute, the Libraries, and the Office of the Administrator in charge of student affairs shall recommend to the Executive Board for approval as a constituent unit."

Section 2.5.2.6 (a): "Representatives of a Department of Instruction (a School, Department, or College without departments), a unit or a unit of Administration and Services or other subunit which the chief operating officer of the Georgia Tech Research Institute may recommend to the Executive Board to be open and a secret ballot used."

Section 2.5.2.6 (b): "Nominations for representatives of the aggregate units in the Services and Central Administration (other than the Libraries and the Office of the Administrator in charge of student affairs) shall be supervised by the Executive Board (with nominations by petition admissible)."

Section 2.5.2.12 (a): "Representatives from Departments of Instruction, colleges without such Departments, subunits of the Libraries, and the Office of the Administrator in charge of student affairs shall be elected by a process to be determined by the members of that unit, except that the nominations shall be open and a secret ballot used."

Section 2.5.2.12 (b): "Without the right to vote: The Administrator in charge of student affairs, the Deans of the Colleges, the Administrator in charge of graduate studies, and the Registrar."

Section 2.5.2.12 (c): "The Graduate Committee shall consist of representatives of the Administration, the Academic Faculty, and the Students, with all members having voting privileges. The Administration shall be represented by the Administrator in charge of graduate studies and by the Registrar who shall be Secretary."

Rousseau Joins Conference On Academic Issues

Dr. Ronald W. Rousseau, director and professor in the School of Chemical Engineering, recently joined research scientists from 30 leading universities as special guests at the Hoechst Celanese Corp. University Day conference in Warren, N.J.

The theme of the conference was "Bridges to Academe." Participating scientists, many of whom served as deans of schools of science and engineering and as heads of natural science departments, shared their views on such issues as ongoing changes in the U.S. university system, what universities want from industry, what industry expects from universities, and models of university-industry interaction.

Participants were joined by scientists who play pivotal roles in Hoechst Celanese Corp. research and technology management at facilities devoted to advanced materials, fibers, film, pharmaceuticals and specialty chemicals.

Send Those Receipts!

Help Techwood Tutorial Project help others — send your Kroger receipts to TTP at mail code 0458. This is part of a student-organized, campus-wide effort to raise $400,000 in receipts to get computers for the two schools served by the program.
Tech Ranked Among Nation's Best As NSF Announces Research Expenditures Results

By Jackie Nemeth

According to NSF FY 1989 data, Georgia's three major research universities Georgia Tech, the University of Georgia, and Emory University, expended an astounding total of $385,330,000 in research funding for the year.

Vice President for Research and Graduate Programs Demetrius T. Paris said Georgia's research universities expended a larger amount of research funding than the North Carolina Research Triangle universities — North Carolina State University, Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The research Triangle schools expended $382,078,000 in research funding during FY 1989. Georgia Tech led the way for all six universities with a record setting $385,330,000.

"These new rankings represent a significant change in the position we had in 1988," Paris said. "We are also proud that Georgia Tech's and Georgia's research knowledge rank highly on the national level."

Georgia Tech was ranked 19th (up from 27th) among the top 100 U.S. colleges and universities in total and federally financed R&D expenditures during fiscal years 1988-89.

In FY89, Tech earned $21,346,000 which resulted in a fifth place finish among the top 100 U.S. colleges and universities in industry-sponsored R&D expenditures. Other schools in the top five include the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Michigan and North Carolina State University.

1996 Committee ...

continued from page 1

Crecine Norman Johnson said the Olympics present Tech with the opportunity to make Georgia Tech and Atlanta "the greatest neighborhood in the nation and a place where everyone can feel welcome."

"When the Olympics are over, we want everyone across the nation and around the world to think that Georgia Tech is a great place to go to school with great people working and going to school there," Johnson said. "We want everyone to feel they have a place at Georgia Tech."

Special Assistant to President Crecine John F. Friedmann said everyone's involvement is needed for solutions to the problems and uncertainties that the Olympics will present. Challenges include how to structure the 1996 summer quarter, how to keep ongoing research programs in operation and how to keep them secure, and how to coordinate the cooperative education program.

Other "Olympic" opportunities for Tech include writing a definitive history of the modern Olympic Games and operating a computer bulletin board to keep everyone informed about Tech's progress in Olympic related matters. Friedmann stressed the importance of the Tech community knowing about Olympic developments and making suggestions or asking questions.

"We need to make sure everyone is kept aware of Olympic developments," Friedmann said. "People who see an issue or a problem they have a place at Georgia Tech?"

"People who see an issue or a potential problem related to the Olympics needs to let someone on their minds and how we can work together on it."

The 50 members of the 1996 Committee and their respective organizations are as follows:

Officers: President John P. Crecine (Chair), Norman Johnson (Vice Chair, Community Affairs), John F. Friedmann (Executive Coordinator), and Joseph E. "Tim" Gilmour (Vice Chair, Facilities).

Ex-Officio: Aaron Bertrand (Chair, Executive Board), Michael D. Furman (GTOC), J. R. Gray (Editor, The Technique), Homer Rice (Director, Athletics), Stacia Smith (President, Student Government Association), Blake Swaggart (President, Graduate Student Senate), and Michael E. Thomas (Acting Executive Vice President).

Members: John Adershold (Georgia Tech Advisory Board member, Alumni Board member), Thomas M. Akins (Facilities Executive Board, and Director of Cooperative Division), Rolla Barger (Plant Operations, GTOC), Ronald Bell (Vice President, Georgia Tech Research Corp.), Thomas D. Boston (School of Economics), Linda Brady (Department of International Affairs), Donald Bratcher (Director, Office of Human Relations), Robert Cannon (Interim Dean, Ivan Allen College of Management, Policy and International Affairs), John Carter (Vice President and Executive Director, Alumni Association, and Student Recruitment Task Force Chairman), William Cambridge (Director, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences), Donald Chapman (Georgia Tech Advisory Board member, Alexander-Tharpe Fund Board member), Rich DeAugustinis (Interfraternity Council, GTOC).

Also, Lowell Ebyon (GTRI), Nicholas L. Faust (GTRI), Peter Freeman (Dean, College of Computing), H. Wayne Hodges (ATDC), Denney Freeston (College of Engineering, Continuing Education), Don Giddens (Director, Aerospace Engineering, and Alumni Association Board member), Andrew Harris (GTRI), John J. Jarvis (Director, School of Industrial and Systems Engineering), James M. Langley (Vice President, External Affairs), Linda Martinson (Vice President, Planning, Budget and Finance), Bernadette McGlade (Associate Athletic Director), Robert C. McMath (Ivan Allen College of Management, Policy and International Affairs), A Raymond Moore (Facilities Executive Board, Office of Interdisciplinary Programs).

In addition, James Murphy (Associate Athletic Director), George Nebenhausner (School of Industrial and Systems Engineering), Blake Patton (Georgia Tech Advisory Board member, varsity swimming), Dan Pittard (alumni, McKinsey & Co.), James Priest (Director, Plant Operations), Catherine Ross (College of Architecture), David Sawicki (Facilities Executive Board, School of Public Policy), William Sayle (School of Electrical Engineering), Michael J. Sinclair (Office of Interdisciplinary Programs), Terry Sicha (Housing), David Spence (Executive Vice Chancellor, Board of Regents), Cedric Stallworth (Georgia Tech Advisory Board) and Dr. F. L. Sudath (Vice President for Information Technology, College of Sciences Faculty Member).

People

Electrical Engineering


Kevin F. Brennan (Vice Chair, Communications), and Kimberly Churches (Vice Chair, Facilities), and Gary St. John (Chair, Community Affairs), and David E. Morelli (Vice Chair, Graduate Student Affairs), and Kevin F. Brennan (Vice Chair, Community Affairs).
man O’Hare, Auxiliary Services Director Roger Wehrli, Office of Human Relations Director Don Bratcher, Personnel Director John Gibson, Associate Dean for the College of Sciences Thomas Tornabene, and Director for Student Affairs Gary Schwarzmueller.

Another interesting event during the Human Relations Awareness Week was a panel discussion with Tech students who were either born or have lived in the Middle East. Though the intent was to sensitize members of the Tech community to the position of students from Middle Eastern countries and to re-evaluate the justification of individual prejudices, most of the students’ comments expressed disenchantment with the American presence in Saudi Arabia.

Managers Simulate Mobility Impairments During Human Relations Week

By Vera L. Dudley

In recognition of Disabilities Day during Georgia Tech’s Human Relations Week, 11 of Tech’s top administrators volunteered to view campus logistics from the view of a blind, wheelchair bound or mobility impaired person on crutches.

After viewing a thought provoking videotape produced by Tech students, most of whom are members of the Student Disabilities Association (SDA), the officials were divided into groups of four or five and escorted across campus using the same mode of transportation and routes to locations most disabled students frequent. The goal of the videotape and exercise was to point out areas that could be improved upon and to demonstrate the recent attention Tech has given to the issue of accessibility.

Examples of recent accommodations are the bridge across North Avenue which joins main campus to the Burge Parking Deck and the Alumni/Faculty House, ramps at the Athletic Association Building, the Catholic Center, the Centennial Research Building, and powered doors at the ISyE/Management Complex.

The video also portrayed examples of poor designs and neglect such as curb cuts on slopes which can cause wheelchair tip over and deposit a person into the street, drop-offs in sidewalks, and extremely high emergency telephones over an unpaved ground. Others had no advance warning of construction repairs on sidewalks or buildings, no signage indicating the availability and location of elevators or ramps, and blockage of curb cuts by vehicles.

SDA members, Sarah Endicott, an occupational therapist and information specialist at the Center for Rehabilitation Technology, and Rosemary Watkins, assistant to the
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ACADEMICS
November 7 - Academic advisement for Winter Quarter 1991 and early registration (through Nov. 9)
Early registration (Phase I) for Winter Quarter 1991, through Dec. 5

ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT
November 5 - TTN, "Rebel Without A Cause," through Nov. 11, Student Center, 1st floor
November 6 - Astrogal "Lecture & Demonstration, "Thank You Lucky Stars," 11:05 a.m., Student Center, 2nd floor lounge
November 9 - Movie, "No Way Out," 7 p.m., midnight shows, Architecture Auditorium
November 10 - Movie, "In Country," 7 p.m., midnight shows, Architecture Auditorium

LECTURES & SEMINARS
November 5 - CIMS Seminar, Michael O'Brien, TDK Corp. of America, "Kanban in Japan Behind the CIMS" 4 p.m., Instructional Ctr, Rm. 211
November 6 & 9 - Institute of Paper Science & Technology Seminar, "Alkaline Chemical Recovery Technology," call Dan Denton at 3-6225 to register
November 8 - Textile & Fiber Seminar Engineering, Hawthorne A. Davis, "On The Mechanism By Which Polymer Molecules Produce Fiber Properties," 11 a.m., Highpoint Textile Bldg., Rm. 310
November 9 - Chemistry & Biochemistry Seminar, John Pratsunsit, Georgia Tech, "Putting The Pieces Together: The Synthetic Character Of Molecular Thermodynamics," 3 p.m., Boggs Bldg., B6A
November 12 - CIMS Seminar, David Gregerson & Christopher Allen, NCR Corp., "Computer-Aided Engineering: Where CIM Begins," 4 p.m., Instructional Ctr, Rm. 211
Aerospace Engineering Seminar Ph.D. Dissertation Presentation, John Anastasidis, "Stability Of Cylindrical Laminates By Higher Order Shear Deformable Theories," 4 p.m., Montgomery Knight Building, Rm. 317

ATHLETICS
November 10 - Football vs. Virginia Tech, 1 p.m., Bobby Dodd Stadium/Grant Field

Briefly...
Faculty Women's Club Events
The Georgia Tech Faculty Women's Club will be keeping busy during November with the following activities. On Nov. 14, the club will learn "the art of rug hooking" at 10:30 a.m. at the Sandy Springs Branch of the Atlanta/Fulton County library (395 Mt. Vernon Hwy. NE). The club will host an Arts & Crafts Festival Nov. 28-30 from 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m. in the Student Center; proceeds from the fair will go toward a student award. Volunteers will also be needed for the Festival of Trees coming up on November 9 & 10.
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November 12 - CIMS Seminar, David Gregerson & Christopher Allen, NCR Corp., "Computer-Aided Engineering: Where CIM Begins," 4 p.m., Instructional Ctr, Rm. 211
Aerospace Engineering Seminar Ph.D. Dissertation Presentation, John Anastasidis, "Stability Of Cylindrical Laminates By Higher Order Shear Deformable Theories," 4 p.m., Montgomery Knight Building, Rm. 317