



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1991-1992

Volume V

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of February 24, 1992

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

Room 126 CH

NOTE TIME CHANGE: 3:00 P.M.

Meeting Notice: Monday, February 24, 1992

Order of Business

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Proposals and Statements
- III. President's Report
- IV. Approval of Minutes
- V. Old Business
 - (a) Resolution on Faculty Approval Process for Proposed Associate of Applied Science Degree (note: this item may be postponed again)
- VI. Meeting of the Committee of the Whole
 - (a) Discussion of proposed bond issue to finance construction of a facility for the Elliott School of Communication and other projects. (yellow attachment). Bring report from Planning and Budget Committee on Mill Levy.
 - (b) Discussion of university policy on faculty teaching loads
- VII. Report of the Committee of the Whole.
- VIII. New Business
 - (a) Nominations of faculty members for appointment to University Academic Advisory Committee as at-large members (all members of the General Faculty are eligible for nomination except chairs of college or divisional program review committees and members of the Mission Steering Committee. Election by the Senate will take place March 16th)
- IX. As may arise.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. J. Mandt, President	3125	Box 74
James Clark, Vice President	3220	Box 78
Joyce Cavarozzi, Secretary	3541	Box 53
Kathryn Griffith, President Elect	3165	Box 17
Albert Gosman, Elected by Senate	3402	Box 35
Robert Wherritt, Elected by Senate	3160	Box 33
Anneke Allen, Appointed by Senate President	3120	Box 51
David Alexander, Past President	3190	Box 32

TABULATION AND SENATE RANKING OF ISSUES

45

Straw Poll on Agenda Items

ITEM	PRIORITY		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
1. Regents faculty evaluation policy	27	5	4
2. Senate mill levy proposal	4	20	7
3. Discussion of mill levy bond issue	29	7	2
4. Faculty salary policy	16	11	8
5. Endowment Association policy	9	14	10
6. Alumni Association policy	1	15	17
7. Joint faculty appointments policy	0	7	25
8. Review of administrative performance	16	11	8
9. Tenure/Promotion policy	7	13	11
10. Status of film/tape library	0	8	24
11. Revision of grievance policy	4	16	12
12. Faculty workload policy	34	2	2
13. Mandatory Retirement	5	10	9
14. _____			
15. _____			
16. _____			
17. _____			
18. _____			

Highest Priority (Ranked)

1. Faculty Workload policy
2. Mill levy bond issue
3. Faculty evaluation policy
4. Faculty salary policy
4. (tie) Review of administrative performance

Secondary Priority (ranked)

1. Endowment Association policy
2. Tenure/Promotion policy
3. Senate mill levy proposal
4. Grievance policy revision
5. Mandatory retirement policy

(4/9)

**ELLIOTT SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION
ALTERNATIVE LOCATION EVALUATION**

**The Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas**

INTRODUCTION

This study was prepared through a joint effort of The Wichita State University's "on-call" consultants, PLACES ARCHITECTS, and MID-KANSAS ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC. The purpose of this study was to evaluate several different alternative locations of the Wichita State Campus for an expanded Elliott School of Communication. The Elliott School is presently and primarily housed in the Wilner Auditorium facility; some auxiliary functions are also housed in the Communication Building across 17th Street south of the Campus.

The Wilner Auditorium Building was constructed in 1938 and is plagued with non-compliance with current Building Codes: lack of basement sprinkling system, non-conforming fire alarm system, inadequate exit routes from most areas, inadequate emergency lighting, and non-conforming stair enclosures. Handicapped accessibility is nearly non-existent to most areas beyond the ground level and mechanical systems are energy inefficient, inadequate, and inflexible. Spaces for offices and classrooms are antiquated, cramped, uncomfortable, and in some instances, unsafe. (See also Appendix C.) Due to these pressing issues and the redefinition of the Elliott School's programs by interests and qualifications of new faculty, the space requirements of the School also need to be redefined. (See also Appendix D.)

ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS

Five alternative locations were suggested to the study team for evaluation of suitability for new Elliott School quarters:

- A. A new addition to the existing Media Resources Center.
- B. A new free standing facility north of the Media Resources Center.
- C. Remodeling of Neff Hall.
- D. Remodeling of Math/Physics Building.
- E. Remodeling of Brennan Halls I and II.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

In order to conduct as thorough of an evaluation as possible for a project as significant as the Elliott School of Communication, the study team generated a broad list of criteria which were considered at each alterative site. The list of criteria are as follows:

1. ACCOMMODATION OF PROGRAM SPACES: How efficiently will the new location accommodate the space requirements of the Elliott School?
2. ASSOCIATED CLASSROOM USAGE: Are there opportunities available for shared usage of areas in the Elliott School by other Schools requiring similar space or vice versa?
3. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CAMPUS MASTER PLAN: Does the alterative location comply with the University's General Development Plan/2010 and Beyond. (Appendix B.)
4. PROXIMITY TO PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC: Considering the population of the Elliott School students and staff, is the alternative location convenient to campus pedestrian traffic routes and adjacent to other campus buildings?
5. AESTHETICS: Does the alternative location lend itself to creating a pleasing and distinctive identity for the Elliott School from both interior and exterior aspects, as well as enhancing and uplifting the architectural appeal of the Campus in general?
6. HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY: How well does the alternative location lend itself to compliance with current handicapped accessibility standards?

7. BUILDING STRUCTURE: Can the structural system of the alternative location be created or modified relatively easily to comfortably house the program spaces of the Elliott School?
8. BUILDING ENVELOPE: Can the exterior "skin" of the alternative location be created or modified relatively easily to efficiently enclose the program spaces of the Elliott School and assist in fulfilling Criteria 5?
9. CONFORMANCE TO BUILDING CODES: How well does the alternative location comply or lend itself to being brought into compliance with current Life Safety and Building Codes?
10. AVAILABILITY OF UTILITIES: How near to the alternative location are main Campus utility lines?
11. HVAC & PLUMBING: Will the mechanical and plumbing systems at the alternative location be adequate or easily modified to provide a comfortable, flexible and efficient atmosphere?
12. ASBESTOS REMOVAL: Does asbestos exist at the alternative location to the extent of becoming a major cost issue for removal?
13. IMPACT ON PARKING: Will placement of the Elliott School at the alternative location impact the parking capacity positively or negatively in the area?
14. ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST: What are the preliminary cost estimates for each alternative location?

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In order to investigate thoroughly all issues and aspects connected to the possible sites for relocation of the Elliott School of Communication, the following series of activities and procedures were followed:

- Initial meeting with Planning Staff and Physical Plant staff to determine scope of study and determine time frame.
- Meeting of study teams to determine evaluation criteria, division of responsibilities, and evaluation methodology.
- Review architectural and mechanical drawings of each existing alternative location on file at Physical Plant offices.
- Meeting with Mr. Vernon Keel, Director of Elliott School of Communication to discuss mission and space needs program for Elliott School and tour existing Elliott School facilities in Wilner Auditorium.
- Meeting with Mr. Mike Wood, Director of Media Resources Center and Mr. Vernon Keel to determine association of both concerns to each other; to clarify mission of MRC; discuss impact of possible adjacent construction to MRC; and tour existing MRC facility and site.
- Tour each alternative location site and facilities to familiarize study team with physical conditions of each site concerning structure, Building Code, Life Safety, and Handicapped Accessibility compliance, utilities, pedestrian and parking patterns, etc.
- Meeting with Mr. Bill Wynne, University Registrar, to assess space needs of the University in general, impact on space

1

available to the University if Elliott School would be relocated to each of the alternative locations.

- Meeting with University Housing Staff to consider future plans for Brennan Halls, feasibility of remodeling into other uses, and problems associated with facilities.
- Meetings with Physical Plant and Maintenance Staffs to discuss physical condition of and concerns with each existing property, physical history connected to each alternative site, etc.
- Meeting with Mr. John Gist, Director of Planning, to discuss general space requirements of the University, the University's Master Plan and other potential occupancies planned for various alternative locations.
- Construction of evaluation matrix to objectively consider each evaluation criteria for each alternative location in order to determine the most optimum alternative available.
- Produce study booklet.

EVALUATION MATRIX

The following matrix was constructed in order to objectively compare each evaluation criteria with each alternative site. Once the alternative sites were established and the evaluation criteria determined by the study team, an efficient method of objectively evaluating each site was required. As each site was compared against the evaluation criteria, a weight was given to the success of the site in fulfilling the needs of the criteria on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the most successful. A total score could then be achieved to determine the optimum site, the one most successful in satisfying all evaluation criteria.

A narrative briefly discussing each matrix intersection (or point of comparison) follows on page 11.

**Elliott School of Communication
Alternative Location Evaluation**

I t e m	A New Build. MRC addn.	B New Build. North of MRC	C Remodel Neff Hall	D Remodel Math/ Physics	E Remodel Brennen 1 & 2
1 Accommodation of Program Spaces	5	4	3	2	1
2 Associated Classroom Usage	5	4	3	2	1
3 Compliance with Campus Master Plan	5	5	2	1	3
4 Proximity to Pedestrian Traffic	2	3	5	4	1
5 Aesthetics	4	5	3	2	1
6 Handicapped Accessibility	4	5	3	2	1
7 Building Structure	4	5	3	2	1
8 Building Envelope	5	4	3	1	2
9 Conformance to Building Codes	4	5	3	2	1
10 Availability of Utilities	2	2	3	3	4
11 HVAC & Plumbing	4	5	3	2	1
12 Asbestos Removal	5	5	1	1	1
13 Impact on Parking	1	2	5	5	3
14 Estimated Construction Costs	4	3	2	5	1
Total Points	54	57	42	34	22

G e n e r a l N o t e s :

1. Each item for five possible locations for the Elliott School of Communications has been ranked from 1 to 5 points. (1 being the worst and 5 being the best)
2. See the following naratives for issues considered when ranking each item.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of the study team that a new, free standing facility be constructed for the Elliott School of Communication north of the Media Resources Center. The need for new quarters is clearly apparent by the condition of spaces in which the School is presently housed. They are not only very uncomfortable for a learning environment, but are, in some cases, unsafe.

The objectivity of the evaluation matrix demonstrate that a new, free standing facility north of the existing Media Resources Center ranks the highest in satisfying the list of criteria established for a new School of Communications facility at the University. Proximity of the Elliott School to the exiting Media Resources Center is a priority; it also will have the address the identity and individuality of the Media Resources Center.

The expense involved in renovating Neff Hall and the Math/Physics Building is prohibitive for spaces which will, inevitably, be a compromise for their occupants. The extreme inflexibility of their structural and mechanical systems, as well as the nonconformity to current Building Codes, doom the two structures to obsolescence. A "patch and repair" maintenances program until their replacement by updated general classroom facilities would be the most cost effective approach to use in connection with Neff Hall and Math/Physics.

It is the recommendation of the study team to absolutely not consider Brennan Halls for remodeled quarters for the Elliott School. The proximity of the Halls from the MRC and condition of the facilities, as well as the inflexibility of structure, makes renovation into classroom space extremely costly. We would agree with the Housing Staff that the best scenario might be to remove the structures from the inventory of housing at the University.

1

It is the further recommendation of the study team that as a new structure is contemplated, priority be given to structural and sub-system flexibility for future adaptability to new uses as the facility ages.

Permanence of new facilities need not be compromised for the sake of flexibility, in fact, in the long term, flexibility may enhance permanence. A structure could be modified and spaces manipulated to find a new life as the needs of the University change. Math/Physics, Neff Hall, and Brennan Halls are all permanently designed and constructed facilities, so well built that removing them will eventually become a financial burden. Having the ability to improve the building's envelope, to easily modify and enhance the structure's sub-systems (i.e. mechanical, electrical, plumbing, etc.) being able to manipulate spaces within the facility for new uses could have extended the usable life of these buildings tremendously.

"Overdesigning" and "over building" a University facility simply for the sake of permanence do not always serve the best interests of the University; cost effectiveness, value engineering, and flexibility, will.

As a new facility to house the Elliott School of Communication is planned, we urge the University to consider this recommendation.

Row/
Col.

COMMENTS ON ITEMS FROM EVALUATION MATRIX

- 1A. An addition to the Media Resource Center ranks the highest for accommodation of program spaces and would allow the new Elliott School of Communication to be designed to use existing Media Resource space without duplication. Being a new building, it could be designed to accommodate the spaces needed for the school's program needs.
- 1B. A separate free standing building close to the Media Resource Center could be designed to accommodate the programmed space needs, but would require walking between buildings to share space with the Media Resource Center.
- 1C. Remodel of Neff Hall would require working with the physical constraints of an existing building that was not designed with the program needs of the Elliott School of Communication in mind. It does present the best alternative of the three remodel sites however.
- 1D. The Math/Physics building has more physical constraints than Neff Hall and would be extremely difficult to remodel into useable spaces that fit the program needs of the Elliott School of Communications.
- 1E. It would be extremely difficult if not impossible to remodel Brennen Hall to meet the program needs of the Elliott School of Communications.
- 2A. With a new facility designed and connected to the Media Resource Center, similar and associated classroom spaces could be utilized in both existing and new spaces. Elliott School and MRC space needs are closely connected and some spaces in both facilities could be used by both concerns for maximum

flexibility and utilization of space.

- 2B. Similar and associated classroom spaces could be utilized in both the existing MRC and a new Elliott School if constructed adjacently though not as efficiently as if physically connected. The movement of video and electronic equipment from building to building becomes somewhat more difficult, also.
- 2C. As the distance from the MRC increases, the opportunity for associated space sharing becomes less of an opportunity, particularly for the more expensive video and electronic media spaces. Lecture halls and classroom spaces could be shared, however, by other, non-communication oriented schools.
- 2D. As with Neff Hall, the Math Physics Building location would offer little opportunity for the sharing of associated spaces.
- 2E. Remodeling Brennen Hall into the Elliott School of Communications would create an even more difficult opportunity for sharing associated spaces than now exists with their present Wilner Auditorium quarters. It would also increase the difficulty of other non-communication schools to utilize spaces than now exists.
- 3A. The Master Plan, used to project the look of the campus through the year 2010 and beyond, showed the Elliott School of Communication attached to the Media Resource Center so this location best fits the original Master Plan.
- 3B. The Campus Master Plan shows a new building site in the area north of the Media Resource Center. This represents the next best location for the new Elliott School of Communication.
- 3C. The Campus Master Plan shows Neff Hall as being removed in the

future. Remodeling it now would require revision of the Master Plan but it could be done.

- 3D. The Math/Physics building is shown to be removed on the Master Plan and a new building site created in that area. If Math/Physics is remodeled now it will require redesign of the Master Plan.

- 3E. Remodel of Brennen Hall would not disrupt the building layouts on the Master Plan but would put The Elliott School of Communication a long way from where it was originally planned to be located.

- 4A. An addition to the Media Resource Center would be readily accessible for students that spend most of their time on that part of the campus, but it would not be convenient for students that had to come from other parts of the campus.

- 4B. A new building north of the Media Resource Center would be readily accessible for students that spend most of their time on that part of the campus, but it would not be convenient for students that had to come from other parts of the campus.

- 4C. The Neff Hall building appears to offer the best location for pedestrian access because it is centrally located and would allow pedestrians to walk to the center of the campus from other buildings and all parking lots.

- 4D. The Math/Physics building offers the second best central location for pedestrian access from all areas of the campus.

- 4E. The present Brennen Hall location presents the worst location for pedestrian access. It requires that students travel long distances and continually cross 17th Street.

- 5A. Construction of an Elliott School addition to the MRC could be accomplished to compliment and blend with the design of the existing structure, however, the identity of each concern would be diminished. The impact on the image of the existing MRC would depend on how the new addition would connect, architectural materials selection, sight lines to the MRC from traffic and pedestrian patterns, height and mass of the new addition, etc., but compromises would need to be made. Diminishing of a "separate identity" for the Elliott School could also impact the encouragement of gift giving from private sources for a new facility.
- 5B. A new facility for the Elliott School could be designed to be more clearly identified as a separate entity while still complimenting and fitting in with other nearby facilities. The MRC's image would not be threatened and a future connecting link or infill addition could be planned to eventually unify the facilities when the need arises.
- 5C. While a remodeling project presents new and increased challenges for creating rewarding architectural spaces, there are also many compromises to be made in terms of complete flexibility in floor plan arrangement, space function proximity, articulation of the building envelope, etc. The accommodation of interior spaces required by the Elliott School will be extremely difficult within the confines of the existing Neff Hall architecture. Refinishing/recovering of the exterior facades of Neff Hall could be relatively successful in updating the architectural aesthetics of the building and creating an Elliott School identity. The fact that a major addition would be required to be constructed to house the space required by the Elliott School may be advantageous, also, as a means of establishing a new architectural look for the assembly.

- 5D. The Math Physics Building's architectural constraints are similar to and as limiting as Neff Hall in providing opportunities for enhancing the facility's aesthetics. As with Neff Hall, the exterior facades of the facility could be refinished or recovered to update the architecture and create identity. However, due to the apparent ability to house the Elliott School space needs within Math Physics, little or no additional spaces need to be constructed further denying the opportunity to help modify the structures architecture beyond superficial treatment.
- 5E. The remodeling of Brennen Halls would be very similar to Neff Hall in terms of opportunities for aesthetic enhancement. Major additions would have to be planned for many of the spaces required by the Elliott School which would provide a chance to create a new architectural identity, but a tremendous amount of work and money would have to be spent on Brennen Halls (as well as Neff Hall of Math Physics) to avoid the finished structure from appearing to be an obviously remodeled 1950's facility.
- 6A. A new addition to the Media Resource Center could be designed to meet the necessary requirements for handicapped accessibility but would have to contend with constraints cause by the fact that it would be attached to an existing building.
- 6B. A new building on this site could be designed to meet all the handicapped accessibility requirements without having to deal with any existing constraints.
- 6C. Some handicap accessibility presently exists, but it is minimal, and the rest rooms do not comply with current requirements.
- 6D. Only the middle level of the building is handicap accessible,

1

the upper and lower levels are not. Rest rooms do not comply with current requirements.

- 6E. Brennen Hall has no handicap accessibility at the present time or any handicapped rest rooms.
- 7A. The structure for an addition to the Media Resource Center could be designed with adequate floor-to-ceiling heights to meet the needs of heating and air conditioning, electrical, and other utility systems that would need to be located in the ceiling cavity and in raised floors. The structure would have to be compatible with the existing Media Resource Center.
- 7B. Design of the structure for a free-standing building north of the Media Resource Center could be designed without the constraint of being attached to another building. It could be designed to meet the needs of heating and air conditioning, electrical, and other utility systems that would need to be located in the ceiling cavity and in raised floors.
- 7C. Neff Hall does not appear to have major structural deficiencies. The floor to floor height of 12 feet may be a problem if both ceiling and floor cavity spaces are required to accommodate all of the heating and air conditioning, electrical, and other utilities necessary.
- 7D. The present structure has experienced settling, floor slab deflection, column stress fatigue, and water seal failures. The structure is capable of only limited floor loads and may not be able to support new electrical and mechanical equipment required for the Elliott School of communications.
- 7E. The Brennen Hall buildings have floor to floor heights of nine and one half feet. This leaves no room for the necessary mechanical and electrical equipment that need to be installed

if the building is to be remodeled for the Elliott School of Communications.

- 8A. A building addition attached to the Media Resource Center could share a common wall and thus reduce the number of exterior walls for both the Media Resource Center and the Elliott School of Communications. The new building walls, windows, and roof could be designed to be well-insulated, water-proof, and energy efficient.
- 8B. A free standing building could be designed to be well-insulated, water proof, and energy efficient.
- 8C. Neff Hall's building envelope is not energy efficient because of its uninsulated walls, single pane windows, and minimal roof insulation. The walls do not have vapor barriers and therefore will not allow installation of a humidification system to prevent static electricity problems.
- 8D. The Math/Physics building envelope is not energy efficient because of its uninsulated walls, and minimal roof insulation. Storm windows have been added to the single pane windows which makes it better than Neff Hall. The walls do not have vapor barriers and therefore will not allow installation of a humidification system to prevent static electricity problems.
- 8E. Brennen Hall's building envelope is not energy efficient because of its uninsulated walls, single pane windows, and minimal roof insulation. Some of the walls have ventilation louvers in them which leak air into the building. The walls do not have vapor barriers and therefore will not allow installation of a humidification system to prevent static electricity problems.
- 9A. An addition to the Media Resource Center could be designed to

1

meet all the latest building code requirements. As a major addition to and existing building it may require that the present Media Resource Center be brought up to code in some areas.

- 9B. A new building north of the Media Resource Center could be designed to meet all the latest building code requirements.
- 9C. The present Neff Hall building violates several building code and life safety regulations. Major changes to the building walls, the HVAC systems, the electrical systems, and the possible addition of a fire sprinkler system will be required.
- 9D. The present Math/Physics building violates several building code and life safety regulations. Major changes to the building walls, the HVAC systems, the electrical systems, and the possible addition of a fire sprinkler system will be required.
- 9E. The present Brennen Hall buildings violate several building code and life safety regulations. Major changes to the building walls, the HVAC systems, the electrical systems, and the possible addition of a fire sprinkler system will be required.
- 10A. Water, sewer, storm sewer, electricity, and telephone are available in the area where an addition to the MRC would take place. However, an addition in this area would require that the storm sewer be relocated and possibly an 8" sanitary sewer also. A building addition in this area would require that the parking areas east of the MRC be redesigned and graded so that storm water will drain around the new building. If the building addition is to tie into the existing campus chilled water and steam piping systems, new lines could be connected to the piping in the mechanical room of the MRC and be routed

through the building to the new Elliott School of Communications.

- 10B. The building site north of the MRC and east of the Grace Wilkie building has water, and telephone lines in the immediate vicinity. Storm and sanitary sewers are farther away and would require cutting, trenching, and patching a large amount of parking lot to get to them. The chilled and hot water lines that serve the cooling and heating needs of The Corbin Education Center run through this area, so care would have to be taken to not disturb them if a new building is located on this site. Connection to the existing campus chilled water and steam systems will require that a new underground tunnel extension be provided from the existing utility tunnel south of Grace Wilkie and north of the MRC.
- 10C. Since Neff Hall is an existing building it already has all the utilities connected to it and most likely would not require new power, storm, sanitary, and water services. However, the present chilled water and heating system piping is old, too small, and insulated with asbestos. If this building is to be remodeled these systems should be replaced.
- 10D. The situation at the Math/Physics building is the same as Neff Hall.
- 10E. The Brennen Hall buildings are existing buildings with Sanitary, storm, water, electricity, and telephone presently connected and utility mains close at hand. These buildings are not close to the campus chilled water and steam systems and there are no plans for extending them to the area in the future. These buildings therefore would have to be designed with "stand alone" heating and air conditioning systems.
- 11A. An addition to the Media Resource Center could be properly

designed as a separate HVAC system to meet the needs of the Elliott School of Communication without a requirement for any demolition or reuse of existing equipment. It could be designed as a stand-alone heating and air conditioning system and later be connected to the central plant steam and chilled water systems. If it is to connect to the present chilled water system there will be some areas in the Media Resource Center that will need to be remodeled in order to connect to the pipes in the utility tunnel that passes under the existing building.

- 11B. A new building north of the Media Resource Center could be properly designed as a separate HVAC system to meet the needs of the Elliott School of Communication without a requirement for demolition or reuse of existing equipment. It would need to be designed with a stand-alone heating and air conditioning system until such time that a utility tunnel and piping can be run to the building from the existing central plant systems.
- 11C. Remodel of Neff Hall would require that all the existing heating and air conditioning systems in the building be demolished. New mechanical and electrical equipment rooms would need to be provided in the building to accommodate new equipment that would be required. The heating and air conditioning systems could be designed as stand-alone systems until such time that they could be connected to the central plant systems. Connection of the heating and air conditioning systems to the existing central plant would require remodeling of the piping and pumping systems in the existing mechanical room in the basement of the engineering building.
- 11D. Remodel of Math/Physics would require that all the existing heating and air conditioning systems in the building be demolished. New mechanical and electrical equipment rooms would need to be provided in the building to accommodate new

equipment that would be required. The heating and air conditioning systems could be designed as stand-alone systems until such time that they could be connected to the central plant systems. Connection of the heating and air conditioning systems to the existing central plant would require remodeling of the piping and pumping systems in the existing mechanical room in the basement of the engineering building.

11E. Remodel of Brennen Hall would require that all the existing heating and air conditioning systems in the building be demolished. New mechanical and electrical equipment rooms would need to be provided in the building to accommodate new equipment that would be required. The heating and air conditioning systems would need to be stand-alone systems and could not be connected to the central plant systems.

12A. Since this would be a new building it would not require any asbestos removal.

12B. Since this would be a new building it would not require any asbestos removal.

12C. Asbestos insulation was used through out this building on the piping systems. It would need to be removed if this building is remodeled.

12D. Asbestos insulation was used through out this building on the piping systems. It would need to be removed if this building is remodeled.

12E. Asbestos insulation was used through out this building on the piping systems. It would need to be removed if this building is remodeled.

13A. The East side of the Media Resource Center appears to be the

only side of the building to which an addition could be attached for the new Elliott School of Communication. Adding on to this side of the building would eliminate existing parking and make a presently congested area more congested. Since speech classes are to be taught in this new building, there would be more students wanting to park in a smaller parking lot.

13B. The building site north of the Media Resource Center was shown on the 2010 and beyond master plan in anticipation of a parking garage being constructed in the general area. If the Elliott School of Communication is constructed first it will eliminate existing parking and make a presently congested area more congested. Since speech classes are to be taught in this new building, there would be more students wanting to park in a smaller parking lot.

13C. Remodeling Neff Hall would not require remodel or elimination of any parking on campus.

13D. Remodeling Math/Physics would not require remodel or elimination of any parking on campus.

13E. Presently there is parking space available at Brennen Hall, but remodeling would most likely require revision of the parking lot.

14A. Addition to Media Resources Center:
Approximate total project costs for ²⁵~~23~~,000 square feet of addition to existing MRC.
\$ 3,000,000

14B. New Building north of MRC:
Approximate total project costs for ²⁶~~24~~,000 square feet of new Elliott School of Communication Facility.

\$ 2,900,000

14C. Remodeling (and addition to) Neff Hall:

Approximate total project costs for complete remodeling of Neff Hall and additions to structure to meet space requirements of Elliott School of Communications (approximately 6,000 square feet).

\$ 2,720,000

14D. Remodeling of Math/Physics Building:

Approximate total project costs for complete remodeling of Math/Physics building to meet space program requirements of Elliott School of Communications.

\$ 2,500,000

14E. Remodeling of Brennen Halls I and II:

Approximate total project costs for complete remodeling of Brennen Halls and additions to structure to meet space program requirements of Elliott School of Communications (approximately 6,000 square feet).

\$ 3,200,000



The
**Wichita
State University**
Elliott School of Communication

47

October 28, 1991



TO: John Gist, Facilities Planning
FROM: Vernon Keel, Elliott School of Communication
SUBJECT: Change in Space Needs for New Communication Building

This memo follows our discussion last week about changes in the space needs for the new communication building. These are changes in the recommendations made a couple of years ago, which were significantly scaled down from earlier estimates for a larger facility.

As I explained last week, our needs are much better defined now that we have essentially a new faculty in place in the Elliott School (out of 15 full-time faculty, only five were here when I came two years ago). Our programs are being redefined by the interests and qualifications of our new faculty, and our space needs must be redefined to serve those programs.

Underlying Assumptions. The underlying assumptions for space/facilities planning in communication are as follows:

- 1) **Anticipating Growth.** We do not expect exceptional growth in the coming years, but the new facility should be designed to accommodate some moderate increases in faculty, staff, students and program offerings.
- 2) **Expanding Graduate Education.** A major thrust of the new programs in the Elliott School will be in professional education at the graduate level. While enrollments at the undergraduate level are expected to stabilize, enrollments at the graduate level should increase to meet local needs. This will require that we plan to accommodate more graduate assistants with offices and computer and research facilities and to allow for expansion of the research effort.
- 3) **Developing New Communication Technologies.** Few areas have experienced such enormous technological change as has the media and communication industry. We are required to plan for facilities to accommodate instruction, application and research in the area of new communication technologies.
- 4) **Expanding the Research Effort.** This is tied to our effort in Number 2 above to expand the graduate program. We are committed to a formalized research program that is tied to instruction and to service to the media and communication industry. Some limited but special space needs accompany this effort.

Keel letter to John Gist, 10/28/91, page 2

With those assumptions in mind, here is the explanation for changes in the space needs from what was previously submitted:

Faculty/Administrative Offices. The original proposal called for 19 faculty offices. The new one lists 17. With a current faculty of 15, this allows for some modest growth in the years ahead. Five of those faculty positions are at the director or coordinator level so they are slightly larger than the 12 regular faculty offices. We have added an administrative conference room, which could double as a seminar room, and a machine work room for copying, duplicating, FAX and other equipment. We are also requesting a modest-sized room for a research center to accommodate the expanded research effort in the Elliott School. While we are requesting an additional GTA room, we have reduced the number of lecturer offices from four to three. Finally, we are requesting a slightly larger main office area, again to accommodate the increased clerical and support activity.

Specialized Labs. The space originally designated as a journalism computer lab (25 stations) is the same as before but will be two writing labs (15 stations each). We have increased the size of the audio production lab and classroom and added three video editing labs, changed the faculty computer room to a GTA computer lab, and added an Integrated Media Lab to accommodate instruction in the area of new communication technologies.

Classrooms. We have replaced a small classroom (25 students) with a seminar room, retained four smaller classrooms and a larger classroom. A major change here is that we have eliminated any Electronic Classrooms and replaced them with a specialized media applications classroom that will allow faculty to use new technologies in their instruction. This change was made in consultation with Mike Wood at the Media Resources Center.

Please do not hesitate to give me a call if you have any questions. Thanks for your help on this.

cc. Dean Thomas, LAS

Communication Building

Estimated Space Needs for New Communication Building

Faculty/Administrative Offices				
Director's Office	200			
Conference Room	200			
Associate Director	150			
Graduate Coordinator	150			
Basic Course Coordinator	150			
Director of Debate and Forensics	150			
Director of Research	150			
14 Faculty Offices (@120)	1,680			
Administrative Assistant (Secy)	120			
Main Office Work Area (2-4 peop)	500			
Storage	360			
Machine Room	150			
Research Center	300			
Library/Reading Room	500			
Seminar/Conf. Room	400			
GTA Offices (6@150)	900			
Lecturer Offices (3@150)	450			
Lounge Area	200			
Total Fac/Adm Offices	6,710			
Specialized Labs				
Writing Labs (2@400)	800			
Photo Lab/Darkroom	750			
Audio Production Lab	450			
Video Editing Labs (5@150)	750			
Audio/Video Classroom (adjacen	375			
Equipment Storage (2@150)	300			
Debate Squad Room.	200			
GTA Computer Lab	200			
Integrated Media Lab	400			
Total Specialized Labs	4,225			
Classrooms				
Public Speaking (4@600)	2,400			
Larger Classroom (60 students)	900			
Media Applications Classroom/Lt	1,000			
Seminar Room	400			
Commons Area w/attached kitch	750			
Total Classrooms	5,450			
Total Net Sq. Ft. Required	16,385			
Multiplier	1.60			
Total Gross Sq. Ft. Required	26,216			

1/21/92



FACULTY SENATE

The Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of February 24, 1992

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Allen, R. Armstrong, W. Armstrong, Bair, Bajaj, Behrman, Benson, Bernhart, Billings, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Christensen, Clark, Cottle, Daugherty, Duell, Erickson, Farnsworth, Gosman, Griffith, Gythiel, Hawley, Hay, Horn, Hoyer, Hubbard, Jeffers, Kahn, Kitch, Koppenhaver, Lee, Mandt, Martin, Masud, Merriman, Muth, Olivero, Parkhurst, Paske, Perel, Rogers, Romig, Sethi, Sweney, Wherritt, Yeager, Zytow

MEMBERS ABSENT: Baxter, Bereman, Carper, Murdock, Parker, Widener

GUESTS: Brandhorst, Brunner, Dreifort, Loper, Lowe, Platt, Tilford, Zoller

I. Meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m. by President Mandt. He asked that Informal Proposals and Statements be brief to allow more time for discussion of the bond issue and the University policy on faculty teaching loads.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS.

Senator Erickson stated there were signs on campus announcing a meeting Tuesday evening at which someone will justify the death sentence of Salman Rushky.

Senator Perel commented on the proposed joint degree program. He said he wasn't as concerned as some but felt it would have been a better proposal had there been more discussion. He said he was in favor of it. It was something that was going to have to be done to stem the invasion of other institutions. Let's don't wait until the deadline of December 10 to work out the problems.

III. PRESIDENT'S REPORT.

President Mandt reported on the last Regent's meeting.

1. Mission Statements from the seven campuses didn't satisfy the Board of Regents staff and some members of the Board. The Missions Statements were not detailed or precise enough. The Board decided to postpone action on the Mission Statements a month. President Hammond of Ft Hays State pointed out that would delay the whole process a month. The delay decision was reversed and Council of Presidents are to try to work out the difficulties.

2. Board action:

a. Board approved the proposal of our Intercollegiate Department of Athletics to raise 1 1/4 million for the construction of a tennis facility.

b. They approved spending some of the reserve funds of the CAC for continuing renovation of the second floor.

The cooperative degree program with Vo Tech received approval from COCAO and the Council of Presidents.

3. The Council of Senate Presidents met with Governor Finney. The council emphasized a long range funding program rather than a "start and stop" approach. Governor Finney offered some suggestions for the Council's consideration.

Senator Griffith gave kudos for President Mandt she had heard at the Council of Faculty Senate President's dinner.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Minutes and Committee of the Whole notes for January 27, 1992 were approved.

V. OLD BUSINESS.

The approval process for proposed Associate of Applied Science Degrees is still being discussed with the Provost's office. There is a draft of a proposal on his desk at this time. This item will be postponed until a later meeting.

After a move to rise from the Committee of the Whole and report, President Mandt said that on the agenda for next week there was a place for any resolution to be considered, whether formal or straw vote.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

a. Nomination of faculty members for appointment to University Academic Advisory Committee were taken. Senator Muth said it is difficult to discover who is excluded since college chairs are not elected yet. President Mandt said that those excluded by the rules would be taken off the list of nominees when it is distributed. President Mandt said there was no limit to the number of nominees, as long as there was a second. The following were nominated:

Senator Alexander nominated Senator Hoyer. Senator Gosman seconded.
Senator Clark nominated Senator Sweney. Senator Billings seconded.
Senator Billings nominated Senator Perel. Senator Allen seconded.
Senator Burk nominated Senator Muth. Senator Clark seconded.
Senator Clark nominated Senator Campbell. Senator Billings seconded.
Senator Mandt nominated Professor Kiralyfalvi. Senator Alexander seconded.
Senator Muth nominated Professor Dreifort. Senator Burk seconded.
Senator Gosman nominated Senator Cavarozzi. Senator Clark seconded.
Senator Burk nominated Senator Duell. Senator Carroll seconded.

Senator Perel moved the nominations be closed. Senator Clark seconded. Motion passed.

President Mandt said the election will be held in three weeks.

Senator Kitch distributed raw data from the salary study. Only the first page deals with administrators, and it has the only valid national comparisons.

Feb 24 { Senator Griffith had two nominations from the Rules Committee for the General Education Committee. Stephen Moore was nominated to complete the term of Sally Kitch, which runs until 1994, and Anneke Allen was nominated to begin an early term, which runs until 1995. Senator Perel seconded. The nomination were approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Cavarozzi, Faculty Senate Secretary

impossible to drop anyone off in front. V. P. Lowe said that in the long range plan there are three parking garages, and they will cost. Senator Wherritt asked if we are really thinking "user friendly" for our buildings.

Senator Rogers asked that at this stage, will there be no attempt for a bond issue for the Marcus Center? V. P. Lowe said that that is correct. Senator Rogers asked if it was also the case that we are not talking about changing the perimeter road. V. P. Lowe said that money comes from student fees and is on hold.

Senator Clark asked how much we paid for the report. There are two major mistakes which V. P. Lowe had pointed out, but how can we have confidence in the rest of the report. V. P. Lowe said the resources of items I and II are important. The report cost \$10,000 and involved two firms. Senator Clark said he thought the Business School could have done it better for much less money.

Professor Platt said the Faculty Planning and Budget Committee should be commended for their report. He would like to see two areas in it that aren't there now: (1) A section that identifies the non-Sedgwick County money that is in the buildings, so we know who is paying for them, and (2) While there are tables about various funding for various projects, nowhere is there any listing about dollars for laboratory equipment, scholarships, graduate assistants, etc. When the Senate is in a position to offer alternatives, then they would have them. Senator Griffith said the concept was good. We have a set of priorities on buildings, but not on academic things. We hope that academic priorities might come out of strategic planning. Should we go ahead with buildings until academic questions are answered?

Presiding Senator Alexander turned the meeting over to Senator Clark who introduced Provost Cottle.

Provost Cottle said he was amazed when he came here that there was no faculty workload policy. At the first Dean's retreat, it was discussed for each college. The Deans were charged to go back to the college and Departments and create/develop a workload policy consistent with national standards and department goals. The Dean would then see there was compatibility across departments, and the Provost across colleges. Four of the six colleges are done and accepted. LAS and Fine Arts are still working on theirs. Provost Cottle said he never intended this to be brought in at this time, but at the end of Fall, 1991. But there were mission reviews, etc. However, he thinks it is consistent with what is happening.

Provost Cottle said the process was that AVP McDougall talked with each Dean alone as the documents were received. The intent is not to set one standard, but to make them compatible, to make them a guide with a lot of variables. This has been proceeding for the last six or seven months. He has heard he is out to get the older faculty. That is nonsense. Faculty from the departments made the policies. The Regents didn't require us. Good common sense to do it, and the AAUP manual talks about re-appraising work load policy.

Senator Lee said our Handbook had a policy stating procedure. When does this go to faculty review? Provost Cottle said he would more than happy to give the policies to the appropriate committee. He pointed out they are individual college policies. Senator Lee said that each division has its own mechanism, but that part that is appropriate to university policy needs to go to committee. Provost Cottle said he

would be happy to do that.

Senator Paske said the process engaged in has disturbed a large number of faculty. It hasn't been handled diplomatically or well. And if the policy was to start with the faculty, in the administrative structure, some of the Provost's administrators were not working well. If national standards are to be used, the national standard is a nine hour teaching load, plus research, minimum keeping up in the area and or university service. Provost Cottle said he was not trying to create a problem. The faculty needs to clearly understand expectations.

AVP Zoller said the Handbook, page 57, 5.101 said the teaching load is twelve hour maximum, with no more than three preparations. The question was is there a way to justify course reduction. Senator Paske said he did not understand the problem they were trying to solve. If a policy is needed, that can be done easily from the one in place. There seems to be a hidden agenda. AVP McDougall said there was input into the process from LAS. Their document has been forwarded once.

Senator Daugherty said there was concern about impact on quality of this policy. There are good teachers who carry a twelve hour teaching load who don't do research. But others who have not kept up in disciplines may not be the best teachers, and they will teach more classes. Provost Cottle said your concern is with having poor teachers teaching more. Should we not do that? These are tight fiscal times and hopefully departments will recognized those who aren't teaching well and mentor them.
CHECK TAPE.

Senator Gosman said there is a large morale problem. People don't understand where the need is. Faculty think this is more than 'no workload policy.' They think administration don't understand what it was, and don't like what it was. Did this thing have to start in the fall, as stated? It could have been delayed. The whole thing is very frightening. Most people realize when you set up a workload policy, the natural thought for faculty is to try to fulfill all of it, and this defeats the policy.

Senator Perel asked if this was to be a bottom up process, starting with faculty. Provost cottle said yes, with the departments. Senator Perel said there had not been the slightest discussion of this matter. He was amazed it started in September because he only heard about it two weeks ago. There has been an obvious misunderstanding of the structure. LAS Associate Dean Loper said all chairs were asked to discuss with the faculty. Senator Carroll said Education started the process in September, and the departments did it without chair input.

Senator Bajaj said teaching load is important, and there are discrepancies in teaching loads. He would appreciate a policy.

President Mandt said there are two problems. (1) There is still a transmission problem to where information is supposed to go, and (2) the talk about 3,6,9 hour loads seems to indicate that's the only work load. Is part of the study what the real working hours are? Provost Cottle said it is hard to compare across disciplines. AVP McDougall said that Health Professions, Education and Fine Arts have work load hours that take into account the actual work load. AVP Zoller said there was discussion about the difference between large classes that have computer scored exams and an English class with written exams to grade. Senator Billings said that disturbed her.

Large classes had objective tests because they were large. She also said that nothing gets from the Dean's office to the faculty.

Senator Rogers said that if this is to be addressed in a rational way, then the gradual rise in graduate hour production needs to be addressed. He is teaching twice as many students as when he first came to WSU. There is something wrong with that notion of efficiency. Senator Campbell said that those in clinical work would just love a twelve hour only load.

Senator Sweney said there is conflict because there are scarce resources. Decisions made on local level are the hardest to do, and there is a divisive effect on the faculty. "Professionalism" is at stake here. Our dignity is threatened by workloads.

Senator Clark said that in his department half the faculty have increased work loads for the fall, and none have less. Is that the intent? Provost Cottle said that is not the intention. The intention is that the workload reflect what we are doing.

Senator Perel moved to rise and report. Senator Erickson seconded. Passed.

Committee of the Whole

February 24, 1992

VI. (a) Discussion of proposed bond issue to finance construction of a facility for the Elliott School of Communication and other projects.

Presiding Officer, Senator Alexander, introduced Vernon Keel, Director of Elliott School of Communication.

Director Keel said in 1984 Dr. Armstrong stated the need to improve the communications programs; in 1985 a white paper was prepared; in 1985-86, the communications programs went through Regents program review. It was recommended that a reorganization of speech, radio, television, film and journalism be integrated into a new unit. In 1987, after approval by the President, LAS approved the proposal of an integrated school of communication; 1988, the Board of Regents approved the proposal for a new school and the naming of the school after the Elliots who had that year committed for endowment support.

Director Keel said he has worked in three areas:

1. People: He has hired 10 new faculty, five remain from old guard.
2. Programs: The entrance requirements were raised for the graduate program. They received approval for an undergraduate admissions procedure starting Fall 1992. They rearranged, revised, dropped and added courses. The school is sponsoring an international symposium on communication research in September, 1992.
3. Facilities: This is the main issue. They have raised \$450,000, \$250,000 of that amount is deferred. Fund effort is stalled at this time.

Vice President Lowe reported on the consultant's recommendations on the location for the Elliott School of Communication. The price range is from 2.5 to 3.2 million dollars. The reports were given to President Mandt, Professor Brooks, Senator Rogers and Senator Griffith. President Mandt said the summary of the report had been shared with the Senate. V. P. Lowe said that the Phi Delta Theta property at 17th and Vassar was for sale to the University.

Upgrading of the Ulrich Museum would be about \$400,000.

The sequential plan for long range development has a tentative calendar: March 6 to the President of the Unclassified and Classified Senates, with the potential to go to the Board of Trustees in March, but probably in April. Then the plan would go to the Board of Regents. The bond issue would include the re-funding of two outstanding issues and these projects.

The five year capital improvement plan would use revenue bonds and/or private funds. Parking to be paid for from student fees is on hold. The funds were used for Eck Stadium. The Marcus Center is tentatively on hold.

President Mandt asked what the additional bond debt would be. V. P. Lowe said it was not calculated yet, and would partly depend on which proposal for the Elliott School was used. Senator Merriman asked after this bond issue, what percentage would be left for the kinds of things the faculty was interested in. V. P. Lowe said we needed to be careful not to put Mill Levy dollars into programming the state should do. The Mill Levy is primarily for what the state doesn't do.

Senator Rogers asked Director Keel if the specialized classrooms were needed for the program. Professor Keel said the need was very important. The labs are now in the old communications building that was condemned, and one was in the basement of Wilner. The School doesn't have facilities in major areas of the discipline. Senator Rogers said that with respect to that, one of the problems is equipping buildings after they are built. Director Keel said they have upgraded equipment in the last few years. They have had some private funds, but they need help from other areas. V.P. Lowe said the project budget should include equipment.

Senator Hoyer said the asbestos removal money is in the project. Doesn't that have to be done anyway? V. P. Lowe said the asbestos in Neff is minimal, but it's a high priority. We have to deal with it in Math/Physics or any remodeling.

Senator Griffith asked (a) what the total package price, including equipment, would be, and (b) if there were plans to refigure the golf course. V. P. Lowe said the architects fees, equipment, etc. are not included in the total cost of the Elliott building, and that there would be additional costs in heating and electricity. The perimeter road to free up the site for the chemistry building, which would cost about 1.125 million with parking, would not be in this bond issue.

Senator Billings asked what role the Elliott School has for 3rd world scholars. Professor Keel said that technology is not driving their program. The program asks what intellectual skills people need who will shape our perceptions of reality through communications. Cross cultural communication, across boundaries communication and ethics are taught from the beginning. Their students must be informed citizens first of all, and have the intellectual ability to perceive and understand.

Senator Clark said if we're going to re-use Math/Physics for anything we need to deal with the asbestos problem. It is not fair to add it to the cost of the Elliott School building. V. P. Lowe said there may not be a need to re-do it. Senator Clark said 25% of the Mill Levy pays off the current debt service. If 3 million is added, it would be 35%. Is that 35% a fair ballpark figure? V. P. Lowe said yes, as a ballpark figure.

Senator Romig asked what are the benefits to the community? What happens to the quality faculty of the school if facilities aren't improved? Professor Keel said that Wichita is the major media center in Kansas, and their program meets community needs and the mission of WSU. He said he didn't come to WSU because of a new building, but because of the opportunity to build a program. The need to improve facilities was for the sake of the program. Everyone understood that facilities need to be improved, and questions of faculty would have to be asked if they were not improved,

Senator Perel said he was glad the asbestos problem is now acknowledged. He said that some buildings are state funded and some not. Why shouldn't the state fund the Elliott School. V. P. Lowe said they should, but right now with all the capital projects in Kansas, the chemistry building won't get the first planning dollars until 1996. The Regents might request additional funding to pledge to state wide revenue bonds. Tied into the chemistry building is the expansion of heating and air conditioning for all the campus.

Senator Wherritt said he wanted to bring attention to the accessibility of buildings, and the library was an example. It is hard to get in, to park, and