

MINUTES #178

Minutes #178 - Faculty Senate

Special Meeting on the Proposed TTU-TTUHSC Master Plan

April 2, 1997

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 2, 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with President John Howe presiding. Senators present were Bremer, Casadonte, Couch, Coulter, DeBell, Dornier, Dowell, Dunham, Dunne, Fox, P. Goebel, Held, Herring, Hufford, Khan, Mann, Meek, Miller, Morrow, Myers, Nguyen, Olivarez, Reckner, Reed, River, Robert, Schaller, Stinespring, L. Thompson, V. Thompson, and Whisnant. Senators Elbow, Fedler, George, Lan, Rainger, Sarkar, Tock, and Urban were absent because of University business. Senators Corbett, Coombs, Floyd, U. Goebel, Hensley, Jackson, Liman, Opp, Stout, and Welton were absent.

I. President Howe called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and recognized the following guest: Donald R. Haragan, President; John Burns, Provost; John Montford, Chancellor; Doug Mann and Richard Mecias from the architecture firm of Hellmuth, Obeta and Kassabaum; John Opperman, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance; Virginia Sowell, Associate Provost, Margaret Lutherer, Director of News and Publications; Candace Haigler and Larry Blanton, Biology; Dale Duhan, College of Business Administration; Peg Wilson and Elizabeth Hall, Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation; Ernest Fish and Ronald Sosebee, College of Agriculture; Matt Henry, Lubbock Avalanche-Journal; Christy Everett and Mary Hudspeth, Journalism Students; and other members of the media. Professor Clarke Cochran, Political Science, served as Parliamentarian.

II. Minutes of the March 12, 1997 meeting were approved as submitted.

III. Announcements

A community-wide public forum entitled "The Lubbock Independent School District and Texas Tech University: A Winning Collaborative Partnership" co-sponsored by the Faculty Senate and the Texas Tech College of Education will be held April 17, 1997 from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. in Human Sciences room 169. Program speakers will include Dr. John Montford, Chancellor, Dr. Elaine Jarchow, Dean College of Education, and Dr. Curtis Culwell, LISD Superintendent. The panel of reactors include Dr. Jacquelin Collins,

Associate Dean, Arts and Sciences; Dr. Cliff Fedler, Associate Professor, Civil Engineering; and Dr. Otto Schacht, Dean Arts and Sciences, South Plains College. Dr. John Howe will serve as moderator for audience participation. The results of the faculty club survey were presented in report form. The survey revealed that 91% of the 64 respondents thought Texas Tech University should have a faculty club and 78% would be willing to pay to join. The two most popular options for a club were a "lunch room plus bar plus meeting rooms" and "stand alone building with dinning rooms, bar, meeting rooms, exercise facilities and RHIM-run hotel rooms," with the former being cited as more practical, the latter more fun. For more details see the report available in the Faculty Senate Office and on the Senate Web site.

The Faculty Senate elections will be conducted again due to a ballot distribution problem at Copytech. The Senate will not be liable for the cost of the new election.

IV. Remarks from Invited Guests

Chancellor John Montford prefaced the proposed Master Plan (MP) presentation by the Hellmuth, Obeta and Kassabaum (HOK) architectural firm with several remarks. Primary competitors for Texas Tech University are the University of Texas and Texas A & M University, both of which have access to the Permanent University Fund, receiving annually approximately \$150 million and \$75.8 million, respectively, for capital improvements. Texas Tech does not have access to PUF funds but does receive about \$16.9 million in Higher Education Assistance Funds (HEAF) funds for the main campus and \$8 million for the Heath Sciences Center for capital improvements. Montford's vision for making Texas Tech University and TTUHSC competitive includes a three-pronged process: 1) Developing a master plan for the university, 2) developing a strategic plan, and 3) initiating a major capital campaign, tentatively set to begin October 25, 1997. The Capital Campaign, with a goal of raising \$500 million in endowed funds by the year 2,000, will coincide with Texas Tech University's 75th anniversary. Currently endowed funds stand at \$135 million. Proceeds from the endowment would be used for academic endeavors such as scholarships, fellowships, and professorships.

Chancellor Montford indicated that faculty and student input is needed on the MP. Various projects in the plan will be financed on a per project basis. Current projects will be funded by \$117 million in revenue bonds, 40% of which will be for the Health Sciences Center and 60% for academic facilities on the main campus. Some HEAF funding will be used as well. A report from the TTU Board of Regents was distributed in which a four-year capital projects plan was established. The report included a priority list of Educational and General (E & G) projects for TTU and the TTUHSC and a priority list for Auxiliary and other Non-E & G Projects, approximate project costs and finance strategies. The report is available in the Faculty

Senate Office.

Representatives for Hellmuth, Obeta and Kassabaum architecture firm, Doug Mann and Richard Mecias, presented the proposed MP. The plan has evolved since its origins in June of 1996 and is still evolving. Input is still needed. A general consensus from TTU and the community is needed. Extensive consultation with the Texas Department of Transportation has resolved some roadway issues and locations, especially in relation to the 12-lane Brownfield Highway that will run through the campus. Based on requests from the Board of Regents, goals of the MP project were to: 1) Evaluate usage of 1,800 acres of endowed lands at TTU, 2) evaluate campus image and arrival sequence, 3) identify vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian circulation issues, and 4) incorporate the 10-minute walk in campus design. Detailed maps of the proposed MP were presented and general design concepts explained. Parking issues were discussed. About 1,000 of the current surface parking spaces would be eliminated and incorporated into three large multi-level parking structures to allow for the creation of pedestrian malls across campus. John Opperman, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, indicated that the new parking structures could be financed by a combination of revenue bonds and user fees. Opperman estimated that by using such mixed financing annual surface parking fees per space would rise to \$150 and structure parking spaces to \$200. Senator Held presented figures suggesting that the cost of building a parking structure would be about \$7,000 per space and would necessitate nearly tripling parking fees to cover the cost of the debt incurred by the bonds. Faculty generally voiced concerns over proposed dramatic increases in parking fees, and especially the disproportionate impact such increases would have on lower paid staff. It was suggested that a sliding scale be used to allow those with lower salaries to pay proportionally less for parking than those with larger salaries. Proposed uses of the north west campus lands include a golf course, a residential community, student housing community, and research lands which would include the Plant Stress Laboratory. The land for non-research use could be retained by Texas Tech and used to generate revenue or could be sold. Regardless, strict guidelines will be attached to the use of such lands. Revenues from the sale or lease of the land could be contributed to the Capital Campaign.

Senator Held raised several issues from the MP that directly impact the Biology Department and faculty and students using their facilities. Motions unanimously passed by the Biology Department faculty on April 1, 1997 were summarized in a handout which is available in the Senate Office. The four motions concern how: 1) The plan may ruin a \$10 million electron microscope facility, 2) the plan may cause accidents near the biology building, 3) destruction of parking lots will be detrimental to the effectiveness of the faculty and staff, and 4) diversion of Indiana Ave. and Flint Ave. will be detrimental to the effectiveness of faculty and staff. The main elements in

the MP that interfere with Biology are the close proximity of a new road to the building and the traffic on the road flowing to and from a 1,000-space parking structure. The resolutions were not voted on by the Senate but were seen as indicative of a need for more input from each department on the development of the MP. Chancellor Montford indicated he appreciated efforts to address issues of concern.

Senator Held proposed a resolution: The Faculty Senate requests a delay in the finalization of the master plan and its submission to the Board of Regents until all academic units are satisfied that they have had adequate input. This process of consultation should be continued, if necessary, through the early fall semester of 1997. Senator Mann seconded the motion. The resolution passed unanimously. Chancellor Montford indicated that the presentation of the MP to the Board of Regents was tentatively scheduled for the August Regents meeting, but some delay could be accommodated if needed.

Senator Howe suggested that a clearly legible color copy of the MP be given to each department, the Faculty Senate office and the Student Senate office to improve the access of interested parties to the plan. Chancellor Montford, President Haragan, and HOK agreed. It also was suggested that large poster displays of the MP be placed in a readily accessible campus location such as the University Center to facilitate faculty and student evaluation and input.

President Haragan suggested that each college compile an organized critique of the plan. Senator Casadonte suggested that each department with input from all faculty could evaluate the plan and such input should be used at the college level in preparation of the college critique. Senator Stinespring offered the following motion seconded by Senator Virginia Thompson: The Faculty Senate requests that college deans provide department chairs with sufficient information on the MP to evaluate the plan, and that each college compile a critique of the MP based upon departmental input. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie D. Thompson