

**Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at
Prairie View A&M University and at
Texas Southern University**

BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS
(OCR) ISSUES FOR THE

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
October 2000**

**A Plan to Strengthen Education at Prairie View A&M University
and at Texas Southern University
September 2000**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Background	1
Texas' Response to OCR	1
The Committee on OCR Issues	1
The Priority Plan	4
Mission	4
Prairie View A&M University	
Texas Southern University	
Programs	7
Prairie View A&M University	
Texas Southern University	
Facilities	13
Prairie View A&M University	
Texas Southern University	
Recruitment, Retention and Graduation	14
Prairie View A&M University	
Texas Southern University	
Systems	17
Prairie View A&M University	
Texas Southern University	
Features to Ensure Success of the Priority Plan	18
Prairie View A&M University	
Texas Southern University	

Summary Tables of the Priority Plan	18
Estimated Costs of the Priority Plan	31
System to Measure Progress under the Priority Plan	31
Responsibilities in Implementing the Priority Plan	32
Conclusion	32

Appendices

Appendix 1 – *Commitment to Resolve signed by Governor George W. Bush and OCR officials*

Appendix 2 – *Members of Committee on OCR Issues*

Appendix 3 – *Charge to the Committee on OCR Issues*

Appendix 4 – *Minutes of Committee on OCR Issues meetings*

Appendix 5 – *Reports of OCR subcommittees*

Appendix 6 - *Changes to Prairie View A&M University Mission in the Texas Education Code and the Institution Mission Statement*

Appendix 7 - *Priority Plan Cost Estimates and Rationale
Prairie View A&M University
Texas Southern University*

Appendix 8 - *Priority Plan Implementation Schedule
Prairie View A&M University
Texas Southern University*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a priority plan to strengthen the education of students at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University. It is the most recent step in Texas' long-term commitment to higher education for all Texans beginning with the development of the "Texas Plan" in 1983.

The plan is based on recommendations by the Committee on OCR Issues. The Committee on OCR Issues was formed to address concerns expressed by OCR after it conducted a two-year review of public higher education in Texas pursuant to Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. In March 1999, OCR officials indicated they had reached a preliminary conclusion that disparities traceable to *de jure* segregation still existed at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University, Texas' two historically Black public universities. These disparities were in the areas of the mission of the universities, the land grant status of Prairie View A&M University when compared to Texas A&M University, program duplication, facilities, funding and the racial identifiability of public universities in Texas.

The Governor's Office agreed to respond to OCR's concerns through the Coordinating Board's higher education planning process, the mechanism the Board has used to develop a new plan for public higher education in Texas. Thus, the issues raised by OCR were recognized as particular and important aspects of an overarching issue for the state: closing gaps in participation and success in higher education across Texas for all the people of the state.

The committee was composed of representatives from Texas Southern and Prairie View, from other Texas public universities, and from business and employers. It was charged with reviewing OCR's concerns and developing recommendations to strengthen education at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University.

The committee met monthly from November 1999 and April 2000 and formed subcommittees to examine mission, land grant status, program duplication, facilities, funding and recruitment, retention and graduation at Prairie View and Texas Southern. Coordinating Board staff was assigned to work with each subcommittee. Both the committee and the subcommittees met with representatives from Texas Southern and Prairie View and reviewed large amounts of information prepared by the institutions and by other sources. The public was also invited to present testimony at one of the committee meetings and throughout the process.

The committee agreed that Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University would be enhanced and strengthened by ensuring that any student attending these universities would receive the best quality education available in an environment conducive to high levels of student achievement and success.

A vision was put forth that each institution should be one where any parent would be willing to send his or her child because it offers high quality, desirable programs and facilities and is successful in helping students achieve their full potential.

The committee adopted its recommendations unanimously at its final meeting on April 28, 2000. Those recommendations were used as the bases for the priority plan described in this document. The priority plan calls for an ambitious set of actions to raise the educational success of students, particularly in retention and graduation. The plan also places emphasis on establishing or improving systems and developing the infrastructure to support the delivery of high quality education and provide excellent student services. In addition, the components of the plan are each to be tied to a benchmark to guide and ensure each institution's progress under the plan.

For Texas Southern University, the plan includes actions to strengthen its operational systems related to finance, academics, human resources, facilities planning, information technology, and related areas, including establishing a system for generating revenue through an active and effective institutional development office. It requires actions to improve recruitment, retention, and graduation of students; developing an attractive and well-maintained campus; strengthen academic programs (especially those in law, pharmacy, business and educator preparation); construct a new science building; add ten new high value, high demand programs in seven fields; re-establish the School of Public Affairs; create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs; develop a program of merit scholarships; and other important steps, including a change in the statutory mission statement to remove an apparent limit on the mission of the Texas University to "urban programming."

For Prairie View A&M University, the plan includes key initiatives to improve the recruitment, retention and graduation of students; strengthen systems related to information technology and human resources to support the development of students, faculty, and staff; strengthen key academic programs (particularly nursing, engineering, educator preparation, architecture, and juvenile justice); add state-of-the-art buildings for key programs; complete building renovations; strengthen its institutional development office; create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs; add a merit scholarship program; amend the statutory mission statement to ensure that it includes no exclusionary language that discourages any Texan from taking advantage of the excellent educational opportunities afforded at Prairie View A&M University; and other important steps.

BACKGROUND

In February 1997, Governor George W. Bush was notified by OCR that it was going to conduct a review of Texas' system of higher education "to ensure that former *de jure* state higher education systems have both implemented their OCR-approved desegregation plans and eliminated vestiges of the formerly *de jure* systems." The standard under which OCR was to conduct its review was set out in *U.S. v. Fordice*, 505 U.S. 717(1992). In *United States v. Fordice*, the Supreme Court found that under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fourteenth Amendment, race neutral policies alone are not sufficient to determine that a state has effectively discharged its affirmative obligation to dismantle a formerly *de jure* segregated system of higher education. According to the standards announced by the Court, "[I]f policies traceable to the *de jure* system are still in force and have discriminatory effects, those policies too must be reformed to the extent practicable and consistent with sound education practices." *Fordice*, 505 U.S. 717,729 (1992).

OCR officials discussed their initial findings with representatives from the Governor's Office, the Attorney General's Office and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board in March 1999. OCR officials indicated that they reached a preliminary conclusion that disparities traceable to *de jure* segregation still existed. These disparities were in the areas of the mission of the universities, the land grant status of Prairie View A&M University when compared to Texas A&M University, program duplication, facilities, funding and the racial identifiability of public universities in Texas.

TEXAS' RESPONSE TO OCR

During the initial meeting between OCR and the Governor's representatives at the outset of the review, OCR explained its desire to work collaboratively with the State to address OCR's concerns. After a series of meetings, the Governor's Office agreed to respond to OCR's concerns through the Coordinating Board's higher education planning process, the mechanism the Board is using to develop a new plan for public higher education in Texas. Thus, the issues raised by OCR were to be treated as particular and important aspects of an overarching issue for the state: closing gaps in participation and success in higher education across Texas for all the people of the state. A Commitment to Resolve outlining the collaborative process and signed by Governor George W. Bush and OCR officials was finalized on May 17, 2000 and is attached as Appendix 1.

In March 1996, the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, rendered its decision in the case of *Hopwood v. Texas et al*, 84 F.2d 720 (5th Cir. 1996). In *Hopwood*, the Court invalidated the University of Texas Law School's affirmative action policy with respect to admissions. The Court concluded that diversity was not a sufficiently compelling state interest. The State and OCR are mindful of

this holding and will seek to implement the measures in this Plan in a manner that complies with both Fordice and Hopwood.

THE COMMITTEE ON OCR ISSUES

The Committee on OCR Issues was established as part of the Coordinating Board's higher education planning process. The committee was composed of staff and alumni from the Texas Southern and Prairie View; experts from Texas' public universities in the areas of funding, facilities, programs and recruitment, retention and graduation; and representatives from business and employers. A list of committee members is included in Appendix 2.

The charge to the Committee on OCR Issues was developed to both further the goals of the Coordinating Board in the development of a plan for quality higher education in Texas and to address the concerns of OCR. The goal of the Coordinating Board was to use the opportunity of OCR's review to enhance and strengthen Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University and make them more competitive by providing the highest quality education for all students. A copy of the committee's charge is included in Appendix 3.

The committee met in six public meetings between November 1999 and April 2000. At the first meeting in November 1999, subcommittees were formed to look at mission, land grant status, program duplication, facilities, funding and recruitment, retention and graduation at Prairie View and Texas Southern. Coordinating Board staff from the Universities and Health Related Institutions, Campus Planning and Finance Divisions and from the Office of Access and Equity were assigned to work with each subcommittee. The charges to the subcommittees are included in Appendix 3.

At the first two meetings in November and December 1999, President Charles Hines of Prairie View A&M and President Priscilla Slade of Texas Southern presented overviews of their institutions. The two meetings took place at each respective campus so that committee members could tour the campus. In addition to the presidents, information was provided to the committee and the subcommittees by staff, faculty, students and alumni of Texas Southern and Prairie View A&M; staff and consultants from OCR; members of the Texas Legislature and their staffs; a U.S. representative; and members of the public, including the Reverend Jesse Jackson. Public testimony was invited in both written and oral form including a public hearing held on January 31, 2000. A copy of the minutes of each committee meeting is included in Appendix 4.

The committee worked closely with key staff from each institution throughout the process and reviewed data from a variety of sources related to programs, funding, facilities, enrollment, graduation, accreditation and other relevant areas. Among the documents reviewed by the committee and the subcommittees were the following:

- I. *Strategic Plans for Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University;*
- II. *An Action Plan to Strengthen and Prairie View A&M University, January 20, 2000;*
- III. *Prairie View A&M University – Prioritization of Requirements, Needs, Programs and Facilities, March 2000;*
- IV. *Prairie View A&M University, Funding Proposal to the 76th Legislature;*
- V. *Texas Southern University Program Enhancement Plan, January 2000;*
- VI. *A Performance Review of Texas Southern University, Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, February 1999;*
- VII. *Texas Southern University’s Performance Review Progress Report, February 2000;*
- VIII. *State Auditor’s Office, Texas Southern University’s Accountability Systems, February 1999 and February 2000 follow-up;*
- IX. *Texas Southern University, Status Report to State Auditor’s Office, October 20, 1999;*
- X. *Texas Southern University Special Items Report, August 31, 1999;*
- XI. *Information regarding the South Texas Initiative; and*
- XII. *List of tuition revenue bonds authorized during 72nd, 73rd, 74th and 75th legislative sessions.*

Each subcommittee met at various times between November 1999 and April 2000, either by telephone conference call or at the institutions. In March and April 1999, the subcommittees presented initial reports to the full Committee on OCR Issues which served as the basis for the committees’ recommendations. The subcommittees assigned to look at facilities, funding, and recruitment, retention, and graduation produced written reports which are included in Appendix 5.

The committee agreed that the charge to enhance and strengthen Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University was best served by ensuring that any student attending these universities would receive the best quality education available in an environment conducive to high levels of student achievement and success. A vision was put forth that each institution should be one where any parent would be willing to send his or her child since it offers high quality, desirable programs and is successful in helping students achieve their full potential. The committee also agreed that it was essential to look at the institutions separately and to develop recommendations tailored specifically to each institution.

The committee decided that doing what would improve the education of students at each institution would also serve to improve the institution. Accordingly, the recommendations were prioritized according to their impact on the educational success of students, particularly in improving retention and graduation rates.

Emphasis was also placed on establishing or improving systems and developing the infrastructure to support the delivery of high quality education and provide excellent student services. In addition, the committee decided that each recommendation should be tied to a benchmark to monitor and to support each institution's progress under the plan.

THE PRIORITY PLAN

This Priority Plan's goal is to strengthen the education of students at Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University. It is based on the recommendations of a committee that conducted a broad examination of each institution, including its unique strengths, its role within the higher education system in the state, its potential for growth, and the degree to which each could possibly assimilate desirable change. Committee analysis relied on a voluminous quantity of information and testimony provided by the public, education experts, the Office for Civil Rights, institutional representatives and others. This information was used by the committee to create a vision of each institution that reflected its mission, as expressed in a set of academic programs that collectively define a unique and important role for the institution in educating the people of Texas.

This vision was simultaneously used as the basis for addressing the concerns of the Office for Civil Rights: that the mission of each institution not reflect any racial or ethnic character that its programs reflect its mission, and that they be supported with the funding and facilities consistent with a top-notch university.

The plan addresses both the concerns of the OCR and the goal of the Committee on OCR Issues to strengthen the education at Prairie View and Texas Southern by focusing on this outcome: That each institution have programs and facilities so strong that they will be attractive to any student. In the final analysis, what is best for these schools is that they provide a high quality education that is accessible by all Texans. In this way, what is best for these schools is consistent with the goals of the OCR, with the requirements of law, and with what is best for Texas.

Full implementation of the plan is contingent on funding by the Legislature of Texas.

Details of the priority plan are described in the following sections.

MISSION

The plan components related to mission are based on reviews of the Texas Constitution, the statutory language of the Texas Education Code establishing the institutions, and the mission statements and tables of programs approved for the institutions by the Coordinating Board.

It is also based on the more general concept of mission as what the institutions do and whom they serve. The plan focuses on ensuring that the mission of each institution supports the goal of being an educational asset accessible by all Texans. This includes a commitment to serve all Texans and a vision that brings the research, educational, and public service resources of the institution to bear on the needs of the state, the nation, and the world.

To support that mission, Texas continues efforts to open doors to public institutions of higher education for all its citizens. Graduates in the top 10% of their high school class are guaranteed admission to any university in the state. The Texas GRANTS program pays tuition and fees for high school graduates who have completed the high school recommended (college prep) curriculum. All public institutions of higher education in Texas must have a plan to ensure their student body reflects the population of the state to comply with the Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy as required by law.

In turn, the responsibility of Texas' higher education institutions is to provide high quality programs that produce graduates with the knowledge, skills, and experience to live full, productive lives. Thus, the missions of the two institutions are embodied in and most clearly defined by the slate of degree programs that the institutions offer. A thoughtful and strategic analysis of programs is highly relevant to the mission of these institutions. Parts of the plan enhancing the mission of the institutions with the development of new degree programs are described in the Program section of this document.

Prairie View A&M University

Prairie View A&M University is designated in the Texas Constitution as “an institution of the first class under the direction of the same governing board as Texas A&M University (Article VII, Section 14).” Its history as a legally designated Black postsecondary institution, described in detail during the meeting and tour of campus at Prairie View in November 1999, may be implicitly reflected for many in the Texas Education Code (Sec. 87.104) which states:

In addition to its designation as a statewide general purpose institution of higher education and its designation as a land-grant institution, Prairie View A&M University is designated as a statewide special purpose institution of higher education for instruction, research, and public service programs which are dedicated to: (1) enabling students with latent aptitudes, talents, and abilities and of diverse economic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds to realize their full potential; (2) assisting small and medium-sized communities to achieve their optimal growth and development; and (3) assisting small and medium-sized agricultural, business, and industrial enterprises to manage their growth and development effectively.

Further, race specific or language that could be construed as exclusionary can be found in several places in the institutional mission statement.

To make Prairie View A&M an educational asset accessible by all Texans, the plan requires removing language from the Texas Education Code and Institutional Mission Statement which might give the impression of excluding any Texan from attending Prairie View. Specific changes are detailed in Appendix 6.

Part of Prairie View's mission is to help small and medium-sized communities grow and develop and to assist agricultural, business and industrial enterprises, both of which are implemented through various programs. That part of its mission is the basis for Prairie View's current focus on research and action to support the crucial problems that America's cities face in the 21st century: An infrastructure in increasing disrepair, lack of accessible health care, problems with young people who disregard education and become involved too often in crime and, in an increasingly global community, the inability to distribute food in many cities throughout the world. Prairie View A&M has a number of programs currently in place or in development to support these efforts.

These efforts are considered to be appropriate and valuable expressions of Prairie View's mission. Not only will Texas cities benefit from such efforts, but cities all across the nation and the world. Moreover, the ubiquity and pressing nature of the problems faced by cities will require ever more scholars and practitioners equipped with the skills and research to address them effectively expanding both the contributions and enrollment of Prairie View.

One other aspect of Prairie View A&M University's mission that is important to sustain and develop relates to its role as a historically Black institution providing educational opportunities to those who might not have the academic background to find success in higher education. This role has led Prairie View to develop and implement very successful programs that help students succeed. The development of those programs under a mission to enable "students with latent aptitudes, talents, and abilities and of diverse economic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds to realize their full potential" does not negate their usefulness to all Texans who could benefit from them. Thus, while the mission must not be race specific, and while this language will be removed, the lessons learned under that part of its mission can and should be applied to any and all Texans who might benefit.

Texas Southern University

Texas Southern University, like most other public institutions of higher education in Texas, is not specifically referenced in the Texas constitution. It is defined in the Texas Education Code (Section 106.02) as follows:

In addition to providing other general academic and related programs, Texas Southern University is designated as a special purpose institution of higher education for urban programming and shall provide instruction, research, programs, and services as are appropriate to this designation.

This language is not considered exclusionary. The plan requires replacing the underlined phrase above with “In addition to its designation as a statewide general purpose institution of higher education,” a change to express more clearly its role in providing Texans a range of degree programs commonly offered by other universities, in addition to degree programs that establish a distinctive identity and attractiveness for TSU.

The institutional mission statement of the institution elaborates on its urban programming mission and its commitment to an open access philosophy, a philosophy shared by a number of public institutions of higher education in Texas. No language in this mission statement could be construed as exclusionary and thus no change to it is required.

Texas Southern’s urban programming mission is manifest in programs to help address the pressing needs of urban areas: the continuing need for economic development and vitality across all sectors of a city, the environmental toxins peculiar to urban density, and governmental policy applications that address urban issues. Texas Southern has a number of programs currently in place or in development to support these efforts.

Texas Southern is an open enrollment institution providing educational opportunities to those who might not have the academic background to find success in higher education. This is an important asset to the state of Texas.

These efforts are appropriate and valuable expressions of Texas Southern’s mission. The programs at Texas Southern that address these urgent urban programming issues have the capacity to be a resource to urban areas in Texas, in the United States, and the world. Moreover, the ubiquity and pressing nature of the problems faced by urban areas will require ever more scholars and practitioners equipped with the skills and research to address them effectively expanding both the contributions and enrollment of Texas Southern.

PROGRAMS

High quality academic programs are an essential element to the success of both institutions. While enhancing key programs will serve to strengthen the institution, it is equally important that all academic programs remain healthy, productive, and vigorous. To ensure the general quality and integrity for all academic programs, the plan requires both institutions to redouble their efforts to maintain accreditation status in those programs that are currently accredited and

proceed to acquire accreditation for other programs where it would be appropriate.

The state expects institutions to maintain accreditation whenever accreditation is required to allow program graduates to sit for licensure or engage in professional practice (e.g., law, engineering, and pharmacy). Similarly all programs are expected to remain in good standing with state licensing agencies that do not formally accredit programs, but where good standing is necessary for program graduates to be able to sit for licensing or engage in professional practice. Examples of such areas are education and nursing. Accreditation can also be desirable and therefore appropriate when it is not required for licensure or professional practice, but where accreditation is considered the mark of a high quality program and will bring prestige to the institution (e.g., business). A goal of the review of existing programs in the Plans for Prairie View and Texas Southern is to identify additional academic areas in which this latter category of accreditation should be pursued to benefit students and ensure high quality. To this end, each institution will develop, with Coordinating Board staff, an action plan to survey their academic programs take the necessary steps to comply with this component. This plan will be completed by June 2001.

It is important that both institutions have nationally recognized programs. To this end, the plan requires the establishment of 12 endowed chairs to bring the prestige and experience necessary to attract research dollars and top quality faculty and students that would result in clear gains in scholarship and service to the state. This endowment is to be supported with \$6 million in seed money appropriated by the legislature in \$2 million increments over the next three biennia that would be matched by at least \$6 million generated from private sources. The state-backed matching program does not exist in Texas and the plan is not intended to set a standard for other public higher education institutions in the state. Rather, this action is designed to quickly enhance the academic level of Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University and to provide a jump-start for each institution's own developmental efforts. It is intended and expected that both institutions will continue on their own to find ways to endow chairs in such a way as to raise the level of academic quality and reputation.

The plan further requires each institution to review a number of specific existing programs and make any necessary improvements identified in the review. Such improvements may include, but are not limited to, modernizing and upgrading the curricula, upgrading equipment, technology, and labs, improving the numbers and/or quality of faculty, increasing program retention and graduation rates, increasing licensure rates of graduates and any other actions that would improve the quality of the program from the point of view of students, parents, accrediting agencies, employers of program graduates, and/or peers within the academic profession.

With respect particularly to improving educator preparation programs these improvements may include updating the curriculum, developing benchmarks for student success on the EXCET test and improving collaboration between the university and local school districts.

The institutions will, with Coordinating Board staff, develop a plan for review which also specifies what action will be taken as a result of that review, by June 2001.

The plan requires each institution to develop and implement a number of new academic programs. The programs in the plan were selected from a larger number of new programs that had been suggested during the development of this plan that might strengthen each institution and support its mission. These programs included those suggested by the institution as well as by educational consultants. A number of factors that bear on what programs to include in the plan were cited by professional educators. First, implementing a large number of programs would dilute the resources of the institution and to that degree lower the quality of all the programs. Second, mission definition would best be served by focusing on key programs that would be or would soon become nationally recognized. Third, related to the second, the programs would have to quickly become attractive enough to draw the number of students necessary to support the program through formula funding. Fourth, the focus on a small number of key, nationally recognized programs would increase the quality of both students and faculty. Finally, programs must be included that would result in clear and demonstrable successes upon which the institution would continue to build.

Sorting among academic programs to choose those that best serve to strengthen the institutions is not a process entirely subject to a mathematical method. A number of factors contribute to what constitutes a wise choice: the number and quality of faculty in the particular program or related programs, the number and quality of students, the level of the degree offered, the current stature and reputation of the program, its current access to research dollars, the number and nature of similar programs across the region and the state, the level of academic quality necessary to induce top scholars to participate, the level of research funds available, and other elements.

Similarly, there is no precise formula for how many programs to add over what time period. Too few and the opportunity to do the most to enhance the institutions is squandered. Too many, and especially, too many too soon, and the institution is expanded on the foundation of mediocrity.

Ultimately the programs cited in this plan for improvement and for development, as well as the timing of new programs, have been chosen on the basis of the professional judgment of committee and staff members, consultants, administrators, and others, as to which would serve to strengthen the education

of students at each institution, support its success in fulfilling its mission, and serve Texas and Texans in the most positive way¹.

There are other programs at each institution that would serve its mission and, perhaps, under some conditions, be easily implemented. It is the intent of this plan that this phase of program development at both institutions be very focused and, should either elect to start other programs, they should be complementary to this plan's overarching goals.

Prairie View A&M University

The plan specifies five academic areas to be enhanced that are highly supportive of the mission of Prairie View: The College of Nursing, the College of Engineering, educator preparation, the School of Architecture, and juvenile justice. The plan includes the following improvements:

The College of Nursing supports Prairie View's focus on urban healthcare issues, including access to care. Located in downtown Houston, it has links to the medical centers of several Texas universities. It is a strong program that will benefit from review of and improvements to its existing degree programs and a new, state-of-the-art equipped building.

The College of Engineering supports Prairie Views' mission in assisting communities, agriculture, business and industrial enterprises to grow and develop. It is another strong program that will be made stronger by efforts to enhance existing programs and the development of both an MS and a PhD program in Electrical Engineering to serve as an academic mainstay for the college. A renovated state-of-the-art building with appropriate equipment will provide a basis for generating research dollars and scholarship and will add to the quality of existing programs.

An MS in Computer Science will provide the academic talent in computers and technology that all programs at Prairie View, but particularly its engineering program, can draw on as needed. Similarly, an MS in Information Systems must also be developed.

Prairie View has trained thousands of public school teachers and administrators who serve our Texas public education system. Texas must continue to support that effort by enhancing its educator preparation programs. A new PhD program

¹ The plan recognizes that as each institution continually adjusts to changes in society one or more of the programs specified may later not be the most appropriate. It is, therefore, the intent of this plan that the institutions have the flexibility to choose those that best serve its mission as conditions justify during the six years of the plan with the approval of the Coordinating Board. The set of programs included here are those that the committee, institutional representatives, and the Coordinating Board staff believe would best serve students, the institution and Texas at present.

in Educational Leadership will greatly enhance these efforts with its focus on urban educational problems.

The School of Architecture supports Prairie View's focus on assisting cities with their infrastructure needs. Both a new program that offers a BS in Construction Science and another that offers a Masters of Architecture will firmly anchor this focus in the school of architecture. A new state-of-the-art building will attract high quality faculty and students, support acquisition of research dollars, and create an environment that helps produce meaningful scholarship.

A new program in Juvenile Justice at Prairie View, its first PhD program and the only type of program of its kind in the nation, addresses a core focus of Prairie View—urban crime committed by children. Already nationally recognized, a new PhD in Juvenile Forensic Psychology will provide more power to address this critical problem in our nation's cities. A new building will increase the attractiveness and quality of this unique program, inviting quality faculty, research funds, students, public service, and scholarship.

Based on input from professional educators and others as to what implementation schedule would most likely lead to success, the plan requires implementing the programs on the following schedule. For the 2002/2003 biennium: the MS in Computer Science and the MS/PhD in Electrical Engineering. For the 2004/2005 biennium: The BS in Construction Science, the Masters in Architecture, and the PhD in Educational Leadership. For the 2006/2007 biennium: the PhD in Juvenile Forensic Psychology and the MS in Information Systems.

This plan specifies new programs for the next six years. Prairie View A&M University is encouraged to look at its needs beyond those six years and consider the subsequent development of a Masters in Accounting and two PhD programs from Engineering or Computer Science.

Texas Southern University

Texas Southern University has experienced a serious decline in enrollment resulting in a decline in revenue, to one degree or another, across all programs. This may have resulted for some programs in an inability to keep pace with similar programs at other institutions in terms of scholarship, technology, and the accumulation and application of new processes and procedures. On this basis, the plan requires Texas Southern to conduct a review of graduate and undergraduate programs and use the results of that review to strengthen programs.

Texas Southern has four prominent programs that have served Texas particularly well: law, pharmacy, business, and educator preparation. Strengthening these programs is crucial to establishing an institutional reputation that all Texans will

find appealing and that those with the desire to pursue studies in these areas will choose to participate. The plan requires Texas Southern to review these programs and make the necessary improvements with support from the State.

The plan also specifies new programs to support the urban programming mission of Texas Southern University.

Texas Southern will reestablish the School of Public Affairs with its emphasis on urban government policy. In addition to consolidating current programs, the school will house two new programs: an MS and a PhD in Urban Planning and Environmental Policy. A PhD in Administration of Justice, focusing on policy dealing with urban crime, in collaboration with the School of Law, is also part of the plan.

The plan also requires both an MS and a PhD in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Science, programs that will build on the strengths of the existing School of Pharmacy and the current PhD offering in Environmental Toxicology.

Texas Southern's engineering technology program is a promising and potentially productive program given the dramatic rise in technological applications in business during this computer revolution. To support the engineering technology program, the plan requires a BS in Computer Engineering Technology degree.

An MS in Computer Science will provide the academic talent in computers and technology that all programs at Texas Southern, but particularly its engineering technology program, can draw on as needed. Similarly, an MS in Management Information Systems will, in addition to producing a cadre of professionals for use in business and government, provide a resource to the university community as well.

Texas Southern plays a major role in producing professionals in the health care industry in Houston. The plan's new MS in Health Care Administration will add substantially to this effort.

Based on input from professional educators and others as to what implementation schedule would most likely lead to success, the plan requires implementing the programs on the following schedule. For the 2002/2003 biennium: MS/PhD in Urban Planning and Environmental Policy and the MS in Health Care Administration. For the 2004/2005 biennium: the MS in Computer Science, the MS/PhD in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Science, and the BS in Computer Engineering Technology. For the 2006/2007 biennium: the MS in Management Information Systems and the MS/PhD in Administration of Justice.

This plan specifies new programs for the next six years. Texas Southern University is encouraged to look at its needs beyond those six years and

consider the subsequent development of a PhD in Business and another in Developmental Education.

FACILITIES

Programs must have the facilities and equipment that support top quality academics and grounds conducive to the academic nature of an institution. These conditions are necessary for attracting and keeping high quality faculty, staff, and students, and for ensuring students have an environment that supports the acquisition of skills necessary to compete successfully with graduates from other institutions.

The components of the plan related to facilities were developed through an extensive and intensive process. Committee on OCR Issues members toured each campus and members of the subcommittee on facilities made special trips to examine particular facilities and landscapes. Each institution provided the Coordinating Board an annually updated Campus Master Plan which details their short-and long-term goals for new buildings, renovations, landscaping, and related issues, which the committee also reviewed. Data on square footage and student enrollment and the consultation and advice of facilities experts, institutional administrators, and others were also considered. In addition, each institution has its own institutional master plan designed to ensure the facilities are in place for the anticipated changes.

Prairie View A&M University

The plan requires three new buildings for Prairie View to support new and existing programs: nursing, architecture, and juvenile justice. Prairie View A&M will either upgrade its current engineering facilities or build a new facility as determined by further inquiry into the ability of current facilities to support the engineering programs. Whether to build a new facility or upgrade its current facility will be determined by August 2001. These projects must be completed by August 2005.

Prairie View will continue to carry out the renovations that have been identified in the latest campus master plan that it provides to the Coordinating Board on an annual basis. Over 75 items are on that list. This work must be completed by September 2005.

Prairie View A&M has made many landscaping improvements over the past five years. The plan does not call for any additional actions at this time.

Texas Southern University

In the case of Texas Southern University, a recently completed independent facilities audit has provided additional information to that previously submitted to

the Coordinating Board, and the subsequent development of its own institutional campus master plan. Specifically, the audit examines the cost of renovating facilities on campus on the basis of their current condition but, by itself, does not indicate which facilities Texas Southern should renovate and which facilities it should remove. That is, the audit provides information that will be valuable to the creation of the new campus master plan, included in the priority plan, to guide future planning, renovation, and construction for the campus. The new master plan will be completed by January 2002.

The plan provides a new science building at Texas Southern to support its science-related programs². The new master plan will determine the location for this building. This building will be completed by May 2006.

Texas Southern will also finish facilities renovations needed to make the campus a safe, healthy and attractive place for pursuit of higher education. The campus master plan will identify these renovations, which will be completed by March 2005.

Landscaping at Texas Southern does not provide enough definition to the campus as an institution of higher learning. Texas Southern will implement a landscaping plan that provides the definition and environment of a top-quality university and complete implementation of that plan by March 2004.

As noted in the next section, additional student housing is an important component of the priority plan to help establish a culture of success at Texas Southern University.

RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND GRADUATION

The quality of programs relies a great deal on the quality of students attracted to and succeeding at a university. While recognizing that many brilliant students attend and succeed at both institutions, Prairie View's history of serving "students with latent aptitudes, talents, and abilities and of diverse economic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds to realize their full potential," and Texas Southern's open door policy have contributed to a lower level of academic readiness for the student body as a whole. The plan is designed to raise the overall academic quality of the student body to a level that supports nationally recognized programs—to support at each institution, a student culture of success.

² Educational facilities in Texas are normally funded through tuition revenue bonds based on projected estimates of tuition revenue for the institution or, if applicable, its parent system. Texas Southern University is an independent university and its bonding capacity may not absorb the total cost of this building. Four alternative funding plans may be considered: Use statewide revenue to pledge against the debt capacity of all public universities, arrange for Texas Southern and a university system to pledge combined revenue against the debt, use a combination of tuition revenue bonds and state general obligation bonds to reach the needed funding level, or use part of the Higher Education Assistance Fund devoted to endowments to partially fund the building.

Under the plan a merit-based honors scholarship program will be established at both Prairie View and Texas Southern, funded by \$6 million in seed money appropriated by the legislature in \$2 million increments over the next three biennia that would be matched by \$6 million generated from private sources. As with the plan component establishing endowed chairs, the state matching concept does not exist in Texas. Rather, this component, like the establishment of faculty chairs, is designed to quickly enhance the academic level of the institutions and to provide a jump-start for their own developmental efforts.

Prairie View A&M University

In recent years, Prairie View has performed a great service for Texas in developing successful programs that help students achieve their goals. The plan requires the expansion of two such programs: The University College and Project ACCESS.

The University College program is of a type that is referred to among recruitment and retention professionals as “intrusive.” This means that the student services focusing on academic preparation and success are not just passively provided, waiting for students who conclude that they need such services to seek them out. Nor are they simply advertised to students. Rather, these programs explicitly structure the students’ total campus and academic experience (hence the term intrusive) to create the most supportive and enhancing environment possible. For example, students are placed in groups that are housed together, take the same set of core courses, and have a designated advisor, who assertively works with them.

University College was piloted on a group of about 600 incoming freshmen last year and has proven successful in terms of grade point averages and retention. Under the plan Prairie View will extend the University College to the entire incoming freshmen class.

The plan will also expand Project ACCESS. Project ACCESS is a summer program for students prior to their freshmen year that focuses on increasing academic achievement and teaching specific skills in time management, note-taking, and other areas to enhance students’ ability to make a successful transition to college. Students may participate in this program whether or not they intend to enroll at Prairie View. Expanding this program is not only good for Prairie View, but for all institutions which subsequently enroll these students.

Prairie View recognizes the challenge faced in raising the general academic level of its students in order to enhance scholarship, generate research dollars, and attract new students. Part of this challenge is to streamline its academic support services for students to make them efficient, user friendly, and effective. The plan provides a centralized student development and support center to house all

educational and general, non-auxiliary student affairs, enrollment, and support functions.

Texas Southern University

High quality services can do a great deal to attract and maintain student enrollment and low quality services can present unnecessary obstacles. Under the plan, Texas Southern University will upgrade its student enrollment services. This is especially crucial for Texas Southern to make gains under the Coordinating Board's Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy which requires all public higher education institutions in the state to implement strategic enrollment management principles, in effect consolidating and focusing student support services, to meet the enrollment goals of the state.

Another important component of the plan is raising the academic level of students, particularly given Texas Southern University's open door policy. Of special importance is helping young students in their transition to college, particularly between their high school graduation and the following fall term and during their freshmen year. It is also important that all students have available a high quality academic support center. Texas Southern University, using the experience of institutions with demonstrably successful programs, will establish a summer and first year academic support program for incoming freshmen and upgrade its academic support center.

As noted, successful academic support programs tend to be more intrusive, organizing the student's experience at the university by creating an environment that supports success. That environment often capitalizes on the manner in which students are housed, allowing for the creation of smaller and more accessible peer support groups and the development of a stronger relationship with one or more advisors assigned to each group. Moreover, having more students live on campus helps create a strong sense of community on which to build a culture for success. Texas Southern will benefit by additional student housing, to be constructed under the plan.

To support its mission as an open door university Texas Southern will improve its programs providing basic skills in reading, writing, and math.

One barrier to education identified at Texas Southern for a number of potential students was the lack of availability of child care. On-site child care can also be an attractive incentive to faculty and staff. Texas Southern will develop a child care center to provide students, faculty, and staff child care services in conjunction with the Child and Family Development Program.

SYSTEMS

The quality of academic services relies in a very fundamental way on the university's basic day-to-day activities in managing finances, securing equipment and supplies, and other actions that support its operations. Without the basic operational systems functioning smoothly, an institution will not be able to fulfill its educational objectives.

It is the expectation of this plan that universities use information technology to improve the full range of services they provide. Moreover, the pervasive influence of technology on the nation's business, government, and society is an important aspect of higher education that the committee considered in what would make Prairie View and Texas Southern outstanding universities. The plan calls for funding to strengthen the information technology services of both institutions.

Competition for good faculty is strong among institutions of higher education. The components of the plan previously described will create a competitive environment from which to attract both distinguished established faculty and promising new faculty. Faculty have expectations about the services they receive from their university, however, and both Prairie View and Texas Southern will strengthen the human resources function and infrastructure and will provide a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure. Two other important benefits of this component are a stronger and well-trained staff (as continuing education is an important part of human resources), and a better capacity to recruit both staff and faculty.

Institutions of high caliber require high levels of supplemental, non-state funding to attract and keep high quality faculty and students. This includes not only actions to attract private funds, but organized efforts to secure educational grants, research dollars, and other competitive sources of funding. Texas Southern and Prairie View will strengthen their institutional development in order to obtain additional funds.

Prairie View A&M University

With the exception of those items listed above, the plan requires no other actions to be taken by Prairie View A&M University.

Texas Southern University

The Texas State Auditor's Office and the Comptroller of Public Accounts have made a number of recommendations on the basis of their individual analyses of various aspects of Texas Southern's operations. Texas Southern has aggressively adopted the recommendations from these agencies and will continue to carry them out under the plan.

In addition, Texas Southern will strengthen its academic planning and support functions, particularly with regard to developing a comprehensive institutional research, planning, and evaluation system and will improve its systems for facilities planning, construction, operation, and maintenance.

FEATURES TO ENSURE SUCCESS OF THE PRIORITY PLAN

The plan has three significant features to ensure that it is successful in enhancing the education of students at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University.

First, plan components for each institution are a complete package, with each making a significant contribution to the overall goal of strengthening education at Prairie View and Texas Southern. The plan prioritizes the components because some components actually build on the successful implementation of others.

Second, each component has associated with it a benchmark for success, and third, the plan provides a system for measuring progress under the plan.

The priorities and benchmarks are described in this section.

Prairie View A&M University

For Prairie View the highest priority are components that focus on increasing the level of academic quality of students. The system functions related to information technology services and human resources are also prioritized highly. Next in priority are programs and the facilities that support these programs. Increasing monetary and faculty resources are the next priority followed by several more programs and another facility.

Texas Southern University

Components that ensure successful operating systems at Texas Southern are essential. Increasing the success of students builds on the systems, as do strong, high- quality programs and facilities, a child care center which will serve both the program and the recruitment, retention, and graduation goals.

SUMMARY TABLES OF THE PRIORITY PLAN

The following tables list, for each institution, each plan component, its rationale, its benchmark, and the biennia under which the work will occur.

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/07 (3)
1 Recruitment, Retention and Graduation	1.1 Create the University College, which provides an academically focused, student-centered environment for the entire university community with an emphasis on freshmen.	<p>To better serve its students and the state, Prairie View should increase its retention and graduation rates. The University College is an outgrowth of two successfully piloted programs: the Academy for Collegiate Excellence and Student Success (ACCESS) and the Panther Living and Academic Community Experience (PLACE).</p> <p>University College is a program that provides an academically focused, student-centered, structured environment for the entire university community with an emphasis on freshmen. It consists of three divisions. The Advisement Division provides freshmen with holistic and accessible advisement and serves as a central point for accessing services and referrals to services. The Academic Enhancement Division is responsible for the Center for Academic Support and encompasses the developmental education program. The Student Life Division is responsible for the residential learning community with an emphasis on a living environment that is academically focused, including orientation to student life, tutoring, group study, and on and off campus enrichment activities.</p> <p>University Colleges comprehensive integration of its students into the higher education environment has demonstrated success in increased retention, higher GPAs and higher levels of semester credit</p>	<p>14.1 percentage point increase in retention rates and 9 percentage point increase in graduation rates over the next 6 years.</p> <p><i>(98 graduation rate 25.9%; 98 first-time, full-time freshmen retention rate 63.0%)</i></p>	T		
	1.2 Expand Project ACCESS, which provides a summer academic program for students prior to their freshman year and a freshman component that stresses academic advisement and support services for students.	<p>Project ACCESS is currently in place at Prairie View and has two components. The first is a summer bootcamp for students prior to enrollment in their freshman year. The second is a freshman component that stresses academic advisement and support services for students. Lessons learned from the ACCESS program are applied in the University College. Funding is needed to expand the summer bootcamp component of Project ACCESS.</p>	<p>14.1 percentage point increase in retention rates and 9 percentage point increase in graduation rates over the next 6 years.</p> <p><i>(98 graduation rate 25.9%; 98 first-time, full-time freshmen retention rate 63.0%)</i></p>	T	T	

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/07 (3)
1 Recruitment, Retention and Graduation (continued)	1.3 Provide start up funding for the operation of a student development and support center to house all educational and general, non-auxiliary student affairs, enrollment, and support functions.	Educational and general, non-auxiliary student affairs, enrollment, and support functions should be housed in the same building. Currently, these functions and services are located in various buildings across the campus, none of which provide sufficient space, configurations or ambience to deliver the requisite support and services to students and constituents. Using a one-stop® system will enable students to perform routine business and engage academic and student support professionals on a variety of services targeting access, enrollment, matriculation, retention, graduation and success.	Center established and operational with all student-related functions housed in facility.	T	T	T
	1.4 Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program	Merit scholarships will strengthen the academic environment at the institution, improve the institution's image and provide the stimuli to attract students who are well-prepared academically. The state would fund fifty percent of the scholarships on the condition that the institution raise matching funds.	Program funded and fully utilized; all available scholarships are awarded to students with high scores on admissions tests who took the college prep curriculum in high school.	T	T	T
2 Systems	2.1 Strengthen information technology services.	Strengthening these services will further the integration of technology into all aspects of the institution's mission and position the institution to respond effectively to the changing demands of higher education and industry. This includes technology upgrades and sufficient resources to further implement the student information system and the electronic document management system; enhance integration of appropriate technology into education, research and operations; and offer adequate services and presence on the Web. Costs include hardware and software upgrades, training and consulting.	Students, faculty and staff have access to and use information technology resources.	T		
	2.2 Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and develop a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.	The institution needs to create a training and development program for university staff, develop a compensation plan to bring salaries in line with peer institutions, allocate resources for advertising and recruitment and develop a reward and recognition plan.	Appropriate systems and training programs are in place and in use by faculty and staff.	T		
3 Programs	3.1 Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as	Accreditation is a significant measure of academic excellence. The institution should obtain accreditation for programs that are not	Programs are accredited as appropriate.	T	T	T

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/07 (3)
	appropriate, obtain accreditation for programs that are not currently accredited.	currently accredited but that would be strengthened by going through the accreditation process.				
4 Programs and Facilities	4.1 Construct new College of Nursing Building.	Prairie View has an excellent College of Nursing that needs a new facility to replace the current inadequate and out-dated building. The new facility will provide space for 300 students and have at least ten classrooms fully wired for electronic delivery of classes to students.	Building constructed, equipped, functional and in use; building sized appropriately to the projected number of students enrolled such that infrastructure formula funding will provide adequate resources to maintain the building.	2*	T	T
	4.2 Enhance the College of Nursing by strengthening existing nursing and related programs.	Along with an excellent facility, Prairie View needs to ensure that the programs in place at the College of Nursing are of the highest quality and provide the best academic preparation for their students to enter the field of nursing.	Reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs completed and improvements are implemented.	T	T	T
5 Programs and Facilities	5.1 Enhance the College of Engineering by strengthening existing engineering and related programs	The College of Engineering's status as a nationally prominent engineering school will be solidified and enhanced, making it even more attractive to all students. Strengthening current programs means reviewing the programs and completing any necessary improvements identified in the review. Typical improvements would include modernizing and upgrading the curricula, upgrading equipment, technology and labs, improving the numbers and/or quality of faculty, increasing program retention and graduation rates, gaining or maintaining accreditation for the programs, increasing licensure rates of graduates and any other actions that would improve the quality of the program from the point of view of students, parents, accrediting agencies, employers of program graduates, and/or peers within the academic profession.	Reviews of undergraduate engineering programs, related undergraduate science programs, and graduate engineering programs completed and improvements are implemented.	T	T	T

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/07 (3)
5 Programs and Facilities (continued)	5.2 Develop new MS/PhD programs in Electrical Engineering.	Prairie View is well known for its excellent engineering programs. Engineering is a niche area where Prairie View can excel by developing high value, high demand programs; a Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering will further Prairie View's goals in this area. It will also enable the institution to attract more students for undergraduate and graduate programs, in particular, students with strong high school academic preparation in math and science.	Faculty and curriculum in place and students enrolled in programs; enrollments in new programs are sufficient for formula funding to support the direct instructional cost and the administrative overhead funding by the Instruction & Operations formula.	T		
	5.3 Upgrade or build additional engineering facilities as needed.	A state-of-the-art engineering facility will attract students and enhance the program. Prairie View should review whether upgrading or building a new facility would be the most cost-effective route.	Formal review of need for a new facility is completed and approved by Board of Regents. If new facility is needed, building constructed, equipped, functional and in use; building sized appropriately to the projected number of students enrolled such that infrastructure formula funding will provide adequate resources to maintain the building.	2*	T	T
6 Programs	6.1 Enhance Educator Preparation programs.	Prairie View's contribution to educator preparation is important to the state and to the institution. A review of the program will ensure it is effective and of high quality.	Outside review of programs completed, appropriate changes completed and programs accredited by SBEC.	T	T	T
7 Programs and Facilities	7.1 Develop new BS in Construction Science	The School of Architecture should continue its development into a program of state and national prominence by increasing and improving its program offerings and consolidating its activities in a new building.	Faculty and curriculum in place and students enrolled in program; enrollments are sufficient for formula funding to support the direct instructional cost and the administrative overhead funding by the Instruction & Operations formula.		T	
	7.2 Develop new Masters of Architecture				T	

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/07 (3)
7 Programs and Facilities (continued)	7.3 Construct new School of Architecture Building.	A new building would house Architecture, Construction Science, Urban Planning and associated programs. A state-of-the-art facility will attract new students and enhance the program. It will also create additional classroom space and help recruit more students.	Building built, equipped, functional and in use; building sized appropriately to the number of students enrolled such that infrastructure formula funding will provide adequate resources to maintain the building.	2*	T	T
8 Facilities	8.1 Carry out renovations identified in Master Plan.	The state and the institution should maintain their investments in the physical facilities and provide an environment which attracts students, faculty and staff. It is also important to ensure that all buildings and facilities support state-of-the-art technology for students and faculty.	Planned renovations completed on time and within budget.	T	T	T
9 Systems	9.1 Strengthen institutional development office.	A comprehensive development operation with funding to cover professional development officers and support staff is necessary to increase non-state dollars for faculty endowments, student scholarships and fellowships and other steps to high quality programs.	Complete major capital campaign to generate matching funds for Recommendations 1.4 and 10.1 and to enlarge endowment significantly .	T	T	T
10 Programs	10.1 Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs.	This can be the most significant action to ensure that any new program is of the highest quality, integrity, and reputation. The state would fund fifty percent of the endowment on the condition that the institution raise matching funds. There would thus be an incentive for the development office to seek and obtain the matching funds and for donors to contribute since their donation will be matched by the state.	Selected new and existing programs have at least one endowed chair.	T	T	T
11 Programs and Facilities	11.1 Develop new PhD program in Juvenile Forensic Psychology	Prairie View is becoming a state and national leader in the study of juvenile justice and should supplement its offerings in this area, which represents a niche in which the institution can excel by offering unique, high value, high demand programs. The committee felt that this prominent program was important to make as strong as possible was Juvenile Justice. Specifically, a new PhD program and a building to house the related degree programs were considered essential to maintaining this as a nationally recognized academic area.	Faculty and curriculum in place and students enrolled in program; enrollments in program are sufficient for formula funding to support the direct instructional cost and the administrative overhead funding by the Instruction & Operations formula.			T

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/07 (3)
11 Programs and Facilities (continued)	11.2 New building for juvenile justice-related programs.	A building for juvenile justice-related programs is a high priority for the institution. A state-of-the-art facility should attract students and help enhance the program.	Building built, equipped, functional, and in use; building sized appropriately to the projected number of students enrolled such that infrastructure formula funding will provide adequate resources to maintain the facilities.	2*	T	T
12 Programs	12.1 Develop new PhD in Educational Leadership	Complementary program to existing education programs, a major field of study at Prairie View (not in first biennium).	Faculty and curriculum in place and students enrolled in program; enrollments are sufficient for formula funding to support the direct instructional cost and the administrative overhead funding by the Instruction & Operations formula.		T	
	12.2 Develop new MS in Computer Science	Complementary to Electrical Engineering program.		T		
	12.3 Develop new MS in Information Systems	High-value, high demand program that will strengthen program offerings and attract other race students.				T
13 Mission	13.1 Delete language in the statutory mission Texas Education Code, ' 87.104. Purpose of the University	There should be no exclusionary language that discourages any Texan from taking advantage of the excellent educational opportunities afforded at Prairie View.	Language deleted	T		
	13.2 Delete race-specific or exclusionary language in the institutional mission statement.			T		

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/06 (3)
1 Systems	1.1 Continue to meet all recommendations from the State Auditor's Office, the Comptroller of Public Accounts and any other recommendations to strengthen financial and administrative systems.	Financial, management information, facilities planning and operations, student services, human resource and other systems are necessary for proper operation of a University.	State Auditor and Comptroller certify successful compliance with recommendations.	T	T	T
	1.2 Strengthen academic planning and support functions.	A comprehensive institutional research, planning and evaluation system is essential to ensure high quality degree programs that meet the needs of the students, the region and the state. Academic systems are traditionally put into place to conduct periodic reviews of programs, report on program outcomes, monitor faculty workloads, enhance institutional research, ensure salaries are competitive to hire and retain faculty and staff, enhance existing programs and library, conduct academic planning and develop and implement new programs. Many of these functions are already being carried out at Texas Southern; this recommendation emphasizes the importance of strengthening existing systems and developing any needed systems.	A system for academic planning is put in place with sufficient funding and staff to ensure implementation.	T		
	1.3 Establish institutional development office.	Institutional development is an essential function at any institution. It generates funds to ensure that new and existing programs are of the highest quality and reputation. It also provides a mechanism to raise private and federal funds to pay for programs, faculty chairs and scholarships. Texas Southern has recently undertaken a \$50 million capital campaign. To successfully complete this campaign as well as future campaigns, Texas Southern must ensure that it has a fully staffed and functional development office.	Complete major capital campaign to generate matching funds for Recommendations 2.5 and 8.1 and to enlarge endowment significantly.	T	T	T
	1.4 Develop and implement systems for facilities planning, construction, operation and maintenance.	The state and the institution must maintain their investments in the physical facilities and provide an environment which attracts and supports students, faculty and staff.	System is put in place with sufficient funding and staff assigned to ensure implementation.	T		
1 Systems (continued)	1.5 Strengthen information technology services.	This will enable the university to have the hardware, software and training for an effective academic computing system, information systems infrastructure and an electronic communications network.	Students, faculty and staff have access to and use information technology resources.	T	T	T

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/06 (3)
	1.6 Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and provide a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.	The institution needs to create a training and development program for university staff, develop a compensation plan to bring salaries in line with peer institutions, allocate resources for advertising and recruitment and develop a reward and recognition plan.	Appropriate systems and training programs are in place and in use by faculty and staff.	T		
2 Recruitment, Retention and Graduation	2.1 Upgrade student enrollment services.	Between 1993 and 1998, TSU's enrollment dropped 40%. The institution believes that problems in receiving financial aid and poor student registration and enrollment services were important reasons behind the drop in enrollment. To combat the drop, the institution has made improvements to financial aid distribution but still needs to improve enrollment services. Efficient and well-organized enrollment services will help in attracting students and maintaining enrollments. Increased staffing and additional technology will also enable implementation of strategic enrollment management principles consistent with the Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy.	Enrollment services are made more efficient and customer-oriented, thereby facilitating enrollment and increasing the level of student satisfaction.	T	T	
	2.2 Establish a summer and first year academic support program for incoming freshmen and upgrade the academic support center.	A comprehensive and integrated academic support program beginning the summer before freshman year will help students bridge the transition from high school to the university, provide academic enrichment and support all aspects of the student's life, thereby increasing the chances of student success and completion. The general academic support center will provide comprehensive academic services for students, including orientation, assessment, learning skills, academic advisement, tutorial assistance, supplemental instruction and life skills workshops.	14.4 percentage point increase in retention rates and 19.8 percentage point increase in graduation rates over the next 6 years <i>(98 six-year graduation rate 10.6%; 98 retention rate for first-time, full-time freshmen 48.2%)</i>	T	T	T
	2.3 Build additional student housing.	The supply of on-campus housing does not meet current demand. Of the 6,500 students enrolled in fall 1999, only 850 were able to live on campus. This recommendation would increase the number by 600 units. Increasing the amount of available housing will enable more students to not only live on the campus but also give them access to academic support services and increase the chance they will complete their studies and graduate from the institution.	Buildings constructed and students in residence.	T	T	T

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/00 (3)
2 Recruitment, Retention and Graduation (continued)	2.4 Improve programs providing basic skills in reading, writing and math.	It is essential to provide students with academic skills to complete college. Currently, about 25% of the institution's students were in remediation during the fall 1999 semester.	Success on retake of the Texas Academic Skills Program test increases by 39.8 percentage points. (98-99 initial pass rate 25.2%; retake pass rate 40.2%)	T	T	T
	2.5 Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program.	Merit scholarships will strengthen the academic environment at the institution, improve the institution's image and provide the stimuli to attract students who are well-prepared academically. The state would fund fifty percent of the scholarships on the condition that the institution raise matching funds.	Program funded and fully utilized; all available scholarships are awarded to students with high scores on admissions tests who took the college prep curriculum in high school.	T	T	T
3 Facilities	3.1 Finish facilities renovations in plan approved by Coordinating Board to help provide a safe, efficient and attractive campus.	An attractive, well-maintained campus is essential to making Texas Southern a place where any student would want to pursue his or her higher education. In addition, the state and the institution must maintain their investments in physical facilities and provide an environment which attracts and supports students, faculty and staff.	Renovations completed.	T	T	T
	3.2 Develop a campus master plan outlining future planning, renovation and construction		The plan is on file at the Coordinating Board and identified goals of the plan are met on an annual basis.	T		
	3.3 Implement a landscaping plan.			T	T	T
4 Programs	4.1 Conduct a review of graduate and undergraduate programs and use the results of the review to strengthen programs.	Reviewing academic programs is an ongoing process that all institutions should have in place. Strengthening programs would require implementing any improvements identified in the review. Typical improvements would include modernizing and upgrading the curricula, upgrading equipment, technology and labs, improving the numbers and/or quality of faculty, increasing program retention and graduation rates, gaining accreditation for the program, increasing licensure rates of graduates and any other actions that would improve the quality of the program from the point of view of students, parents, accrediting agencies, employers of program graduates, and/or peers within the academic profession.	All programs reviewed and enhancement plans for each in place as needed; unproductive programs discontinued	T	T	T

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/01 (3)
4 Programs (continued)	4.2 Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as appropriate, obtain accreditation for all programs that are not currently accredited.	Accreditation is a significant measure of academic excellence. The institution should obtain accreditation for programs that are not currently accredited but that would be strengthened by going through the accreditation process.	All programs are accredited as appropriate	T	T	T
	4.3 Strengthen programs in Law, Pharmacy, Business and Educator Preparation.	<p>TSU has four prominent programs that provide opportunities for many Texans. It is important to students, the institution and the state that these programs be strong and competitive. Strengthening these programs means reviewing them and completing any necessary improvements identified in the review. Typical improvements would include modernizing and upgrading the curricula, upgrading equipment, technology and labs, improving the numbers and/or quality of faculty, increasing program retention and graduation rates, gaining or maintaining accreditation for the program, increasing licensure rates of graduates and any other actions that would improve the quality of the program from the point of view of students, parents, accrediting agencies, employers of program graduates, and/or peers within the academic profession.</p> <p>Improving educator preparation programs includes updating the curriculum, developing benchmarks for student success on the Excet test and improving collaboration between the university and local schools districts. In addition to the above steps, it is important to ensure that entering students are well-prepared and can successfully complete the program. Special courses to strengthen the performance of entering students should be made available.</p>	<p>Law: Continue to increase bar passage rates (65% in July 99; state average 84.8%)</p> <p>Pharmacy: Continue to increase NAPLEX passage rate (Sept-Dec 99 first time takers 55%)</p> <p>Educator Preparation: Continue to increase Excet passage rate (98-99 rate on first year 71.47%, on cumulative 82.43%)</p>	T	T	T
5 Facilities	5.1 Plan, design and construct a new Science Building in accordance with the Campus Master Plan.	A state-of-the-art, fully-equipped facility is needed to provide an enhanced learning environment for existing and planned programs in the Natural and Physical Sciences. An enhanced environment will help the institution attract new students to the sciences.	Building constructed, equipped, functional, and in use; building sized appropriately to the projected number of students enrolled such that infrastructure formula funding will provide adequate resources to maintain the building	T	T	T
6 Programs	6.1 Develop new MS/PhD in Urban Planning and Environmental Policy	Consistent with TSU's urban mission. Will enhance institution's capability to provide solutions to urban problems and give students an opportunity to focus on urban issues. Will help TSU fulfill its mission to provide instruction, research and public service for the state and region.	Faculty and curriculum in place and students enrolled in program; enrollments in new programs are sufficient for formula funding to	T		

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM			
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/06 (3)	
	6.2 Develop new MS in Health Care Administration	An MS in health care administration would enable the college to obtain accreditation for the BA in health administration, a longstanding and productive program, thereby increasing the attractiveness and viability of the program.	support the direct instructional cost and the administrative overhead funding by the Instruction & Operations formula.	T			
	6.3 Develop new MS in Computer Science	Provide for advanced study and research in computer science and associated technology, fields with a high demand for graduates.			T		
	6.4 Develop new MS/PhD in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Sciences	These programs, both in the College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, are in areas with high demand for graduates and significant potential for career opportunities.			T		
	6.5 Develop new BS in Computer Engineering Technology	Provide for advanced study and research in computer science and associated technology, fields with a high demand for graduates.			T		
	6.6 Develop new MS in Management Information Systems						T
	6.7 Develop new MA/PhD in Administration of Justice	Consistent with TSU's urban mission. Will enhance institutions capability to provide solutions to urban problems and give students an opportunity to focus on urban issues. Will help TSU fulfill its mission to provide instruction, research and public service for the state and region.					T
	7 Programs	7.1 Reestablish the School of Public Affairs		Will help TSU fulfill its mission to provide instruction, research and public service for the state and region.	Appropriate programs are developed. Faculty and curriculum in place and students enrolled in program; enrollments in new programs are sufficient for formula funding to support the direct instructional cost and the administrative overhead funding by the Instruction & Operations formula.	T	
8 Programs	8.1 Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs	This can be the most significant action to ensure that any new program is of the highest quality, integrity, and reputation. The state would fund fifty percent of the endowment on the condition that the institution raise matching funds. There	Selected new and existing programs have at least one endowed chair	T	T	T	

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

PRIORITY	COMPONENTS	RATIONALE	BENCHMARK	BIENNIUM		
				02/03 (1)	04/05 (2)	06/06 (3)
		would thus be an incentive for the development office to seek and obtain the matching funds and for donors to contribute since their donation will be matched by the state.				
9 Recruitment, Retention and Graduation	9.1 Develop a Child Care Center to provide student, faculty and staff child care services in conjunction with Child and Family Development Program	Center will serve two purposes: 1) Enable TSU to obtain national accreditation for its Child Development Lab, thereby enhancing its Child and Family Development Program and 2) Provide adequate childcare services to meet the needs of non-traditional students. Faculty should also have access to these services. By providing these services, student retention and faculty productivity should increase.	Child Care Center established, equipped, staffed, and children enrolled.	T		
10 Mission	10.1 Change statutory mission statement at Texas Education Code, ' 106.02.	Clarify mission of the institution.	Language amended.	T		

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE PRIORITY PLAN

Coordinating Board staff worked with staff from each institution to estimate the cost of each component of the priority plan. These estimates do not represent a commitment to fund the priority plan at this level, rather they are intended to provide legislators some key information they will need as they make decisions about the priority plan. Appendix 7 shows the estimated overall cost of implementing the priority plan for each institution over the next three biennia and in total. Those estimated costs, the specific methodology used, and a potential source of funding for each component are detailed in Appendix 7.

SYSTEM TO MEASURE PROGRESS UNDER THE PRIORITY PLAN

Prairie View A&M University, Texas Southern University, the Coordinating Board, and the Office for Civil Rights worked together to develop an implementation schedule for each component of the plan. That schedule is attached as Appendix 8. The schedule reflects the major benchmarks and time lines associated with each component and serves as the framework in which the specific steps necessary to implement each component will be carried out.

Prairie View A&M University, Texas Southern University and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will identify for each component of the plan still more specific steps, and time tables, for successful implementation. These action steps will include specific benchmarks to assess progress relative to each component of the plan. A comprehensive and detailed set of these action steps will be completed for each institution by June 2001³.

The Coordinating Board will work with both institutions and with the Texas A&M University System to track progress under the priority plan, identify any obstacles, and find ways to successfully overcome such obstacles. First, Coordinating Board staff will work on a continual basis with staff from both institutions to provide assistance needed to ensure that progress is made for each component of the priority plan. Second, a joint meeting will be held semi-annually to review progress under the plan. Third, the institutions will submit each year a written update on the status of each component of the plan with respect to the benchmarks in the comprehensive set of action steps. This will include appropriate rationale for any benchmarks not being achieved and the action taken by the institution as a result.

The institutions' annual reports to the Coordinating Board will be used as the basis for its annual reports to the Office for Civil Rights during the six-year life of the plan. The annual report to the Office for Civil Rights submitted by the Coordinating Board will include copies of the institutional reports and other supporting information evidencing implementation of the plan measures and related actions taken by the state. It will also report its annual

³ As it is determined what specific action steps are necessary to successfully implement any component of the plan, the timeframes included in the implementation schedule in Appendix 8 may change somewhat.

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Priority Plan Components
October 2000

determination of whether additional or different actions will be necessary to carry out the Texas Commitment.

RESPONSIBILITIES IN IMPLEMENTING THE PRIORITY PLAN

The priority plan is designed to strengthen and enhance education to a much higher level at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University over the next six years. It is based on a comprehensive analysis of the institutions and represents the best thinking of experts in academic programs, institutional management, facilities experts, funding experts, and others. The goals of the plan are ambitious but decidedly attainable.

The plan will require funding to implement it. In Texas, the Legislature is responsible for the appropriations of state funds brought before it. The Governor is committed to working with the Legislature to fund this plan.

In addition, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is committed to providing the assistance, in collaboration with other institutions as necessary, to make this plan succeed.

Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University have been fully involved with the development of this plan and its goals are their goals. Each institution is committed to implement this plan and take any other actions that will help it become a top-notch educational asset available for all Texans. Each institution will work to uncover any resource, be it expertise or funding, to help implement this plan and achieve its goals.

CONCLUSION

This plan to strengthen the education of students at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University reflects the goal of Texas to provide a high quality education that is accessible by all Texans. That goal is consistent with the responsibility of the Office for Civil Rights to ensure that the requirements of federal law are met.

This plan is the result of the efforts of many concerned about the education of students at Prairie View A&M and Texas Southern—committee members, consultants, professional educators, Coordinating Board members and staff, and the many who attended and gave testimony at the public committee meetings. The planning process lasted eighteen months and required a great deal of review and deliberation. The result is a comprehensive plan to boldly help Texas reach its goal.

Appendix I

Commitment to Resolve signed by Governor George W Bush and OCR officials

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS
SOUTHERN DIVISION, DALLAS OFFICE
Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas
1999 BRYAN STREET, SUITE 2600
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201 (214) 880-2459
(214) 880-3082 FAX

MAY 23 2000

Mr. Clay Johnson
Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, TX 78711

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I am pleased that our collaborative efforts have resulted in the "Texas Commitment," signed by Governor George W. Bush on May 11, 2000. Enclosed is the final, fully executed "Texas Commitment" with signatures affixed of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights and the Enforcement Director for the Southern Division as well as myself, Director of the Dallas Enforcement Office. I have been encouraged by the progress of our cooperative endeavor in the development of the document. By this letter, I am very pleased to accept the Commitment on behalf of the United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR).

The initiatives identified in the "Texas Commitment" will provide a framework for the State's development of the "implementation plan." That plan will encompass those specific measures designed to address issues of concern identified to the State regarding its higher education system, consistent with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and *United States v. Fordice*, 505 U.S. 717 (1992). We anticipate that the successful implementation of measures developed as a result of this process will be effective in strengthening the role of the State's historically black institutions (Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University), rendering them attractive to all students, regardless of race, color or national origin and also will assist the State in fulfilling its commitment to ensuring equal access to high quality education for all of its citizens.

OCR looks forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the State in the coming months and to the development and implementation of the final State "implementation plan."

Very truly yours,

Taylor D. August
Director, Dallas Office

Our mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the Nation

Texas Commitment

The State of Texas is committed to ensuring equal access to high quality education for all of the State's citizens regardless of race, color, or national origin, and is aware of its affirmative duties under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Texas has been and will continue to be engaged in on-going efforts to provide all of its citizens with full opportunities to participate in the benefits of the State's public higher education system.

I. LEGAL CONTEXT

A- Fordice

In United States V, Fordice the Supreme Court found @ under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fourteenth Amendment, race neutral policies alone are not sufficient to determine that a state has effectively discharged its affirmative obligation to dismantle a formerly *de jure* segregated system of higher education. According to the standards announced by the Court, "[i]f policies traceable to the *de jure* system are still in force and have discriminatory effects, those policies too must be reformed to the extent practicable and consistent with sound education practices." Fordice, 505 U.S. 717, 729 (1992).

The Court urged an examination of "a wide range of factors to determine whether (a) state has perpetuated its formerly *de jure* segregation in any facet of its institutional system." o ice 505 U.S. at 728. As identified by the Court, a few examples of this wide range of possible factors include, but are not limited to, the following: admissions standards; program duplication; institutional mission assignments and continued racial identifiability of previously segregated institutions. The Court went on to note:

If the State Perpetuates policies and practices traceable to its prior system that continue to have segregative effects-whether by influencing student enrollment decisions or by fostering segregation in other facets of the university system- and such policies are without sound educational justification and can be practicably eliminated, the State has not satisfied its burden of proving that it has dismantled its prior system. Fordice- 505 U.S. at 729.

B. The United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) Federal Register Notice

Responding to inquiries concerning the effect of Fordice, on January 31, 1994, OCR Published a Notice in the Federal Register outlining the procedures and analysis that the agency planned to follow in future reviews of states with a history of de jure segregated systems of higher education. 59 Fed. Reg. 4271 (1994)

The Notice stated that OCR planned to apply the Fordice standard to all pending Title VI evaluations of statewide higher education systems with OCR-accepted desegregation plans that had expired, including Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia. Specifically, the Notice explained that OCR planned to examine a wide range of factors to ensure that the vestiges of segregation in these States' systems have been eliminated. The comprehensive array of factors that

OCR planned to consider included those addressed in Fordice and those reflected in the criteria for acceptable desegregation plans specified in the Department's 'Revised Criteria Specifying the Ingredients of Acceptable Plans to Desegregate State Systems of Public Higher Education,' published in the Federal Register on February 12, 1978, (43 Fed. Reg. 6658). 59 Fed. Reg. 4272.

Additionally, OCR reaffirmed in the Notice its position that States may not place an unfair burden upon African-American students and faculty in the desegregation process and that State systems of higher education may be required to strengthen and enhance historically black institutions. Further, OCR announced that it planned to "strictly" scrutinize state proposals to close or merge traditionally or historically black institutions, and any other actions that might impose undue burdens on black students, faculty, or administrators or diminish the unique roles of those institutions." 59 Fed. Reg. 4272.

C. Summary

From the conclusion of Texas' five-year Plan in 1988 until the current review, which officially began in 1997, OCR did not comment upon the status of the State's compliance with Title VI. However, in January 1994, Raymond Pierce, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights for the Department of Education, informed the State of OCR's intent to reexamine the status of Texas' desegregation efforts in its state-supported system of higher education. In a February 1997 letter to Governor Bush, Assistant Secretary Norma V. Cantú indicated the benefits of collaboration between the State and OCR. During the initial meeting- between OCR and the Governor's representative at the outset of the review, OCR explained its desire to work collaboratively with the State to address OCR's concerns. Following OCR's data collection and on-site visits to selected institutions, and beginning in March 1999, the State and OCR held a series of meetings which have culminated in this agreement and the formation of the collaborative process.

II. TEXAS COMMITMENTS

As part of its continuing efforts to create the best possible higher education opportunities for all Texans seeking postsecondary education, the State of Texas, without admitting that any of its present day policies or practices are traceable to its prior *de jure* dual system, voluntarily commits to engage in a collaborative process with OCR as requested by OCR. The purpose of this process is to identify and implement specific measures that are realistically designed to produce results in addressing issues of concern presented to Texas regarding its higher education system, as reflected in the measures described below. In addition, the State has taken the initiative to address other related issues affecting access to higher education in Texas in order to ensure a comprehensive and integrated plan for Texas higher education.

It is understood when the public agencies or institutions of higher education in Texas implement any of the measures or operate any other programs relating to admissions or financial aid in a race-conscious manner, they must operate in conformity with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and its implementing regulations, applicable federal court case law, including Fordice, Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978), Hopwood v. Texas, 78 F.3d 932 (5th Cir. 1996), and the U.S. Department of Education's published policy regarding race-targeted financial aid, 59 Federal Register 4271 (Feb. 23, 1994), so long as they are controlling law.

Texas is developing a comprehensive plan for its higher education system that, among other things, will address OCR's concerns through a collaborative process involving the State and OCR. To that end, Texas commits to develop specific recommended measures that reflect the following areas, including approximate spending levels required to implement those measures. These measures will be incorporated into the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (Board) comprehensive education plan. The Board will recommend the plan to the Texas legislature. The Governor, as chief executive officer of Texas, will approve the measures contained in the plan and recommended by the Board, formally notify OCR of his approval of the measures, and advocate their adoption by the legislature. Those areas the measures will address are as follows:

1. Further define and enhance the missions of Texas' historically black institutions to ensure that they do not promote racial identifiability and that they do foster desegregation in other areas to the extent practicable. *To this end, these missions will be given expression through program enhancement at the historically black institutions and program differentiation as historically black and historically white institutions serving the same or similar service areas, or having overlapping missions from the de jure era. Actions related to the missions of these institutions will ensure that their missions are not based on race, either overtly or by inference. These, actions will include authorizing new, high value, high demand academic programs that are not unnecessarily duplicative of programs offered by proximately historically white institutions (HWIs), and –strengthening existing programs, at historically black institutions in a manner that is congruent with their statutory missions and mission statement, as enhanced or otherwise modified.*
2. Strengthen existing programs and authorize new, high value, high demand programs or program components, that are not unnecessarily duplicative of programs offered by proximate HWIs, at each of the historically black institutions. *The State will use its best efforts to ensure that the necessary actions are taken to ensure the successful implementation of those authorized programs. The steps necessary to implement the programs or components, the personnel and other resources necessary to successfully implement and begin operating such programs, and the funding requirements will be clearly identified along with implementation dates.*
3. Provide Texas' historically black institutions the facilities and other resources needed to ensure the successful implementation of measures identified pursuant to items 1 and 2. ***The resources provided will include, but will not be limited to, new facilities or modifications to existing facilities, additional equipment and laboratories, additional faculty and staff, technological improvements, expanded library resources and other fiscal and human resources.***
4. Enhance facilities and campus environments at Texas' historically black institutions and ensure equity with comparable public HWIs with respect to physical character (i.e., landscape, ambience, and appearance), quality, adequacy and availability of facilities to support programs. *This includes the provision of sufficient resources and strategies to ensure equity, and the provision of all appropriate assistance to the institutions to ensure the development, funding and implementation of projects to address capital improvements and operations and maintenance needs. Equity does not mean that the State will replicate the facilities at comparable HWIs that are funded exclusively with private donations.*
5. Improve the recruitment, retention and participation rates of African-American and Hispanic students at the State's historically white institutions. *The State and its institutions are committed*

to the continuing support, implementation, and, where possible, the augmentation of these efforts to improve recruitment, retention and success of other race students, faculty, and staff. The Task Force on Participation and Success (see infra) will make recommendations for inclusion in the comprehensive plan. These recommendations will not be part of the measures produced by the Committee on OCR Issues. The Slate will act on the recommendations of the Task Force on Participation and Success through the Board's review and adoption process and subsequent legislative action, as necessary. OCR will provide the Board and the legislature, as necessary, with comments on the substance of these recommendations.

The State has placed the responsibility for developing measures reflecting the above commitments and addressing other related issues with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The Board is engaged in a comprehensive planning process for Texas higher education and has recently designated a Higher Education Planning Committee to identify the five most important goals for a new higher education plan, and the best strategies for reaching the goals by specific dates. This statewide planning process includes two major committees which will not only issues identified by OCR, but also the broader issues of African-American and Hispanic student access, retention, and graduation with aspect to higher education in the State.

The first of these is the Committee on OCR Issues. The charge of the Committee on OCR issues states in part:

Texas is committed to providing quality education for all of its people. in addition, the state is committed to strengthening Texas' historically black universities Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University along with the state's other public universities. To carry out those commitments, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will create a new higher education plan for the entire state. The concerns of the OCR will be addressed through the process used to develop the new plan.

The Higher Education Planning Committee appointed by the Coordinating Board chair will recommend the new plan to the Board. The Planning Committees will receive recommendations from the Task Force on Participation and Success, the Task Force on Medical Nursing and Allied Health Education, the Task Force on Development of the Technological Workforce and from the Committee on OCR Issues.

The Committee on OCR Issues will collaborate with OCR throughout the development of the State's measures with respect to substantive input and outcomes as well as process.

The Committee on OCR Issues is comprised of stakeholders drawn from university groups and employer-related groups, including alumni, governing board members, administrators and faculty from the historically black institutions and from the higher education community at large. Employer-related members include private and public sector employers, relevant licensing agency representatives, and representatives from the Houston business community.

The second committee central to this effort to improve African-American and Hispanic student access, retention, and graduation, is the Task Force on Participation and Success, also a critical part of the State's comprehensive planning process for higher education. The Board's charge to the Task Force on Participation and Success is to review the gaps in participation and graduation between Texas and other states, and within the State of Texas; identify the best strategies to increase participation in higher education; identify the best strategies to increase the number of students graduating from Texas public colleges and universities; and identify target years for closing gaps in participation and success in higher education.'

The Task Force on Health Professions Education and the Task Force on Development of the Technological Workforce are the two other committees that will provide recommendations to the Higher Education Planning Committee. The State will facilitate communication among each of the four committees to assist in the development of comprehensive strategies that will effectively address the issues identified by OCR. To assist in that effort, OCR will be notified and invited to attend all meetings of these committees and will be provided status reports on committee discussions.

The work of the Committee on OCR Issues will culminate in April 2000, with recommendations to the Higher Education Planning Committee on May 1, 2000. The Portions of the recommendations of the Task Force on Participation and Success that are relevant to commitment number five above also will be submitted to OCR. The Higher Education Planning Committee will submit the recommended measures of the Committee on OCR Issues to OCR for official comment on May 2, 2000. OCR will provide the Office of the Governor and the Higher Education Planning Committee with official written comments on the acceptability of the Committee's recommendations by June 16, 2000. The official comments will address whether OCR believes the recommendations are early designed to accomplish the objectives embodied in the measures set forth above and may identify potential corrective measures. The Higher Education Planning Committee will submit its initial recommendations, along with OCR's comments, to the Board on June 22, 2000. This submission will reflect its work and may contain measures that are responsive to issues raised by OCR in its June 16, 2000, filing with the Board. Immediately thereafter, a copy of this submission will be sent to OCR. During its July 13-14, 2000, meeting, the Board will receive the Higher Education Planning Committee's report on July 17, 2000, the Board will provide OCR with a written explanation responding to each of OCR's suggestions or concerns. The explanation will detail (with documentation) why any rejected suggestion is either impracticable or contrary to sound educational policy.

Between July 15 and September 7, 2000, the Board will receive public comments on the proposed plan. In July, August and September, OCR, the Governor's office, representatives from the Higher Education Coordinating Board, and other officials that the State deems appropriate will engage in discussions, as necessary, regarding points of agreement and disagreement between the State and OCR. On September 8, 2000, the Higher Education Planning Committee will submit to the Board its revised final comprehensive education plan, which will reflect the changes agreed to by the State and OCR regarding the proposed measures. To facilitate the resolution process, by October 9, 2000, OCR may file official written comments with the Office of the Governor and the Board on the acceptability to OCR of the measures contained in the September 8 plan. These comments will

present OCR's preliminary conclusions, acknowledge progress, and indicate deficiencies which may require further State efforts. The State and OCR may meet again in October, as necessary , to discuss any remaining concerns OCR may have.

On October 27, 2000, the Board will vote to adopt the comprehensive education plan, including the OCR-related specific measures. The measures in the adopted comprehensive education plan will be submitted to OCR on October 27, 2000, after Board approval. OCR will assess the acceptability of the OCR related measures in the comprehensive educational plan. It is anticipated that the measures will address all concerns that OCR had communicated. If not, OCR will notify the Office of the Governor of any remaining issues that it may have regarding those measures by November 10, 2000. OCR and the Office of the Governor will engage in good faith discussions to address OCR's concerns, resolve any differences, and, if necessary, develop alternative methodologies and approaches realistically designed to address the measures described herein. The Office of the Governor and OCR will collaborate to ensure that the measures satisfy the Title VI concerns raised. OCR will determine the acceptability of any modifications to the measures. These measures will constitute the "final State implementation plan" (hereinafter the implementation plan). The Office of the Governor, as chief executive officer of Texas, will approve the implementation plan by November 17, 2000. OCR will advise the State of the acceptability of the approved implementation plan. The Governor subsequently will advocate its adoption by the legislature. The State will begin implementation of measures not requiring funding or other legislative action as soon as practicable after OCR's acceptance of the final implementation plan. The State will begin implementation of measures requiring legislative action or funding as soon as practicable after legislative action and the provision of necessary appropriations. The Governor will take necessary action to ensure that implementation of the State's implementation plan begins no later than the beginning of the 2001-2002 academic year.

Appendix 2

Members of Committee on OCR Issues

APPENDIX 2

COMMITTEE ON OCR ISSUES Members

Dr. Janelle C. Ashley is Vice President for Academic Affairs at Stephen F. Austin State University. She received her B.B.A. in Business Education from Stephen F. Austin in 1962 and her Ph.D. in Management from the University of North Texas in 1972. She has over twenty-five years teaching experience primarily in business policy, strategic management, and human resource management. She specializes in human resource services and management development. She has published over 25 works, including a Small Business Administration Small Marketers Aid and articles in *Burroughs Clearing House*, and *The Bankers Magazine*. She has been an active member of the Board of Directors of Citizens 1st Bank and of the Angelina and Neches River Authority. Dr. Ashley is married and has three children.

Mr. Bruce A. Austin currently holds the position of Director of Harris County Community Development Department. Mr. Austin received a B.A. in Political Science and a Master's degree in Public Administration from Texas Southern University. He earned his Juris Doctorate from the Thurgood Marshall School of Law. He has also studied Computer Conductivity at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and Community and Economic Development at Harvard University. After serving on active duty in the U.S. Navy, Mr. Austin began his career in the Texas Legislature and worked for two state representatives. He is an adjunct professor in Public Administration of the University of Houston, Clear Lake and at Texas Southern University. He has served for six years as the Director of the Association for Community College Trustees and the National Organization of Community College Trustees. He has been elected twice to the Houston Community College Board of Trustees, where his term runs through 2001.

Dr. Judith Craven was recently appointed to the Board of Directors at Compaq Computer Corporation, where she serves on the Human Resources Committee. She received her Bachelor of Science degree from Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio in 1966 and her Masters of Public Health in 1981 from the University of Texas School of Public Health in Houston, Texas. She earned her Doctor of Medicine degree at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston. Dr. Craven served in the U.S. States Army Medical Corps Reserves as a Major from 1983-1995. She was president of United Way of the Texas Gulf Coast from 1992-1998 and Vice President for Multicultural Affairs at the UT Health Science Center from 1987-1992. She is a member of the American Medical Association and the American Public Health Association. She was inducted into the Texas Women's Hall of Fame in 1989. Dr. Craven is married and has two daughters.

Mr. Phil Diebel is a CPA and Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs at the University of North Texas, a position he has held since 1983. He also serves as Special Assistant to the Chancellor for University systems issues relating to the University of North Texas Health Science Center in areas pertaining to debt financing, investments, computing and other fiscal matters that go before the Board of Regents. He formerly served as Controller for the University of North Texas from 1981 to 1983 and has worked for the State Comptroller-s Office. Mr. Diebel has extensive knowledge of financial operations, including planning, analysis, budgeting, preparation of the Legislative Appropriations Request and maintaining appropriate internal controls to assure legal and policy compliance. He is married and has three children. He is also active in the community and serves on different Boards including the Denton Community Theater.

Mr. Tim E. Donathen is Assistant Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning at the Texas A&M University System. Mr. Donathen received his Bachelor of Environmental Design degree in 1974 from TAMU and his Masters of Architecture in 1977. He holds professional registrations both as an architect and an interior designer. Over the past nineteen years as an architect for the TAMU System, he has personally managed more than 30 major projects totaling over \$400 million, including the \$85 million George Bush Presidential Library Center.

Dr. Charlene T. Evans currently holds the position of Executive Vice President at Texas Southern University. Prior to assuming her current role, she served as Chair of the Department of English at Texas Southern University from 1991-1997. She received her BA in English from the University of Texas at Austin, her MA in English from Atlanta University and her Ph.D. from Rice University. Prior to becoming the Chair of the English Department at TSU, Dr. Evans was an Associate Professor in the Department of English, Foreign Languages, and Reading. She was also a part-time instructor of English at Houston Community College.

Dr. Jerry Gaston currently serves as the Deputy Chancellor of the Texas A&M University System. Prior to that, he was Vice President for Administration at Texas A&M University and Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration. Mr. Gaston is a member and past president of the Rotary Club of College Station. He received both his B.A. and M.A. degrees from East Texas State University. He received his MPhil in 1967 and a Ph.D. in 1969 from Yale University.

Mr. C. Ray Hayes is the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration for Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. Mr. Hayes is a native of Mississippi and received his Bachelor of Science degree from the College of Business and Industry at Mississippi State University and later received a Master of Business Administration. Mr. Hayes has co-authored several articles on budgeting and formula funding and is active in the

*

formula study committee that makes funding recommendations to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Texas Legislature. He recently chaired a Texas A&M System Task Force implementing a management information system for the future.

Mr. Alvin L. Henry is a human services consultant and President of Human Resources Consultants, Inc. in Houston. He is an attorney and a member of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission. He is a former assistant to the mayor of Houston and a former president of Texas Southern University national alumni organization. He is also an advisory director at Comerica Bank Texas, and former president and chief executive officer of Neighborhood Centers Inc. Mr. Henry earned his bachelor's degree from Howard University in Washington, D.C., and his law degree from the Texas Southern University's Thurgood Marshall School of Law. He has also served on a number of state and federal commissions.

Mr. Alphonso Jackson is the President of Central and South West-TEXAS Corporation in Dallas. Prior to becoming President, Mr. Jackson was Vice President of Corporate Resources for Central and South West Energy & International, Inc. Until July 1996, he served as President and CEO of The Housing Authority of the City of Dallas, where he formulated and implemented housing policy for the \$95 million operation. Mr. Jackson received his Bachelor's degree in political science and a master's degree in education administration from Truman State University and a law degree from Washington University School of Law. He serves on many boards which include Chase Bank of Texas N.A., Zale-Lipshy University Hospital, Central Power & Light Company, Corpus Christi and West Texas Utilities, Abilene to name a few.

Mr. Jodie L. Jiles is Managing Director of Public Finance for Bear Stearns & Company, Inc. in Houston. He received his BBA in accounting from Texas Southern University and his Master of Professional Accountancy from the University of Texas at Austin. He is a Board Member and executive committee member of the Greater Houston Partnership and serves on the boards of the One Hundred Club of Greater Houston, the University of Houston Foundation, the Greater Houston Inner-City Games and the Municipal Advisory Council of Texas. He is a founding board member and former secretary/treasurer of the Harris County Houston Sports Authority. Mr. Jiles also serves as Secretary of the Board for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Mr. Ronald E. Jones is Vice President for Student and Enrollment Services at Prairie View A&M University. Mr. Jones received his Bachelor of Science degree in Political Science from Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, where he graduated cum laude. He received his M.A. degree in Criminal Justice with a specialization in Criminology from Sam Houston State University. Prior to his current position, Mr. Jones was the Special Assistant to the President for Program Development and Integration at Prairie View A&M University. Mr. Jones has also served in the U.S. Army as Colonel from 1970-1995.

Dr. Edward W. Martin is Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Biology at Prairie View A&M University. Dr. Martin received his B.A. degree in zoology from Fisk University in 1950, where he graduated cum laude. He received his M.A. in Zoology in 1952 and his Ph.D. in Zoology in 1962 from the University of Iowa. Prior to beginning his service as Dean, he was Chair of the Biology Department. He has received numerous honors, awards, and recognitions from Who's Who in the South and Southwest, American Men of Science, and recipient of the Minnie Stevens Piper Professor Award for Teaching Excellence. He is a member of Beta Kappa Chi Scientific Honor Society, Beta Beta Beta Biology Honor Society, and Alpha Kappa Mu National Honor Society.

Mr. Frederick D. McClure of Dallas is Vice Chairman of the Texas A&M University System Board of Regents. He received his bachelor of science degree in agricultural economics from Texas A&M University in 1976, graduating *summa cum laude*. While at Texas A&M University, he served as student body president, was elected to *Phi Kappa Phi* and received the Brown-Rudder Outstanding Student Award. Mr. McClure, who is a member of the State Bar of Texas, received his juris doctor degree in 1981 from the Baylor University School of Law where he was elected president of the Student Bar Association and was a member of the National Order of Barristers. He is a managing director of Public Strategies, Inc., which has offices in Dallas, Austin, San Antonio, Sacramento, San Francisco, Washington, D.C. and Mexico City.

Mr. William A. Nance is Vice President for Finance & Support Services at Southwest Texas State University, a position he has held since 1993. Prior to beginning his service at SWT, he was the Director of Finance for the Board of Regents at the Texas State University System from 1984-1991. He received his Bachelor of Business Administration in Finance in 1971 at the University of Texas at Austin, where he graduated cum laude. He served as the Director of Systems for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board from 1981-1984. While at the Coordinating Board, he also served as the Assistant Director of Financial Planning and as a loan officer. He is a member of the Texas Association of State Senior College and University Business Officers.

Dr. Raymond J. Rodrigues is Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Texas-Brownsville and Texas Southmost College. He received his Ph.D. in Secondary Education from the University of New Mexico and his Masters of Education in Education from Rutgers University. Mr. Rodrigues has published numerous books and articles in English education studies, writing with computers, and multicultural studies in English. He has been teaching since 1965, when he started as an English teacher at Clark High School in Las Vegas, Nevada. Mr. Rodrigues has served in the U.S. Army Air Defense and was an Officer at Fort Bliss, Texas and in Germany. He serves on the New

England Association of Schools and Colleges, Hudson-Mohawk Association, and the Task Force on Admission Standards.

Mr. Juan R. Sandoval is Vice President for Finance and Administration at the University of Texas at El Paso. Prior to his current position, Mr. Sandoval served as Vice President for Finance and Administration and Comptroller at UTEP. He received his B.B.A. in Accounting in 1976 and MBA in 1981 from UTEP. Mr. Sandoval is married and has three children.

Dr. Edward P. Sheridan is Senior vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the University of Houston System and Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Houston. He received his Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from Loyola University in Chicago 1968. Prior to joining the University of Houston System, Dr. Sheridan served as both Provost and Professor of Psychology at the University of Missouri-Columbia. He was also a professor and chairman of the Division of Psychology at the Northwestern University Medical School from 1981-1990 and adjunct professor at the Northwestern University Law School from 1982-1990. Dr. Sheridan is a 1997 recipient of the American Psychological Association award for Distinguished Career Contributions to Education and Training in Psychology. He is board certified in Health Psychology by the American Board of Professional Psychology.

Mrs. Opal Johnson Smith is president of the Prairie View A&M University National Alumni Association. Mrs. Johnson-Smith received her Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics with a minor in Spanish from Prairie View A&M University in 1954. She received her Master of Education in Administration and Supervision from Texas Woman's University. After having served in public education for 35 years, she retired in 1993. Immediately after retirement, she oversaw a proposal which resulted in a \$15 million grant in mathematics, science and technology for the Dallas Independent School District. She has served as chair for three Prairie View Athletic Scholarship Galas held in Dallas, raising over \$65,000.00 for Prairie View A&M University.

Dr. George C. Wright is a native of Lexington, Kentucky and currently serves as Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Texas at Arlington. Dr. Wright received his B.A. and M.A. degrees from the University of Kentucky and received his Ph.D. in 1977 from Duke University. His major area of study and professorship is history.

Dr. Wright has published three books, numerous articles, chapters in books, and essays and he is currently working on a book, a biography of **Robert Charles O'Hara Benjamin: A Forgotten Afro-American Leader.**

Appendix 3

Charge to the Committee on OCR Issues

APPENDIX 3

CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE ON OCR ISSUES

Texas is committed to providing quality education for all its people. In addition, the state is committed to strengthening Texas= historically black universities, Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University, along with the state=s other public universities. To carry out those commitments, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will create a new higher education plan for the entire state. The concerns raised by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education will be addressed through the process used to develop the new plan.

The Higher Education Planning Committee appointed by the Coordinating Board chair will recommend the new plan to the Board. The Planning Committee will receive recommendations from the Task Force on Participation and Success, the Task Force on Medical, Nursing and Allied Health Education, the Task Force on Development of the Technological Workforce and from the Committee on OCR Issues.

The Committee on OCR Issues is charged to do the following:

1. Review the OCR issues regarding mission, land grant status, program duplication, facilities, funding, and equality of access to educational opportunities at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University. As part of the review, receive information from OCR and its experts.
2. As part of the Coordinating Board=s new statewide plan to improve higher education for all Texans, identify the best measures that Texas can implement to address the issues raised by OCR.
3. Identify any further issues and steps that Texas should consider to strengthen Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University.
4. By April 2000, provide the Coordinating Board=s Higher Education Planning Committee with recommendations for strengthening Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University as part of the new plan for Texas higher education.
5. Conduct an open process that gives all stakeholders an opportunity to provide input.

Charge to the Committee on OCR Issues

CHARGES TO THE SUBCOMMITTEES

MISSION

(Subcommittee chair: Mr. Fred McClure)

Examine the missions of Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University to determine whether any changes should be made to strengthen the institutions and better serve the educational needs of the people of Texas.

PROGRAMS

(Subcommittee chair: Dr. Jerry Gaston)

Examine academic programs at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University to determine steps that should be taken to strengthen the institutions and best serve the educational needs of the people of Texas. Also, examine developmental education programs at Prairie View A&M University, Texas Southern University and other institutions to determine steps that should be taken to strengthen developmental education at Prairie View and Texas Southern.

FACILITIES

(Subcommittee chair: Mr. William Nance)

Examine facilities at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University and identify any changes in facilities and facilities management that should be taken to strengthen the institutions and better serve the educational needs of the people of Texas.

FUNDING

(Subcommittee chair: Mr. Alphonso Jackson)

Examine funding for Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University and identify any changes that should be made to strengthen the institutions and better serve the educational needs of the people of Texas.

RECRUITMENT, RETENTION AND GRADUATION

(Subcommittee chair: Dr. Judith Craven)

Examine recruitment and retention activities at Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University to determine the best strategies for recruiting and retaining students, faculty and professional and administrative staff and ensuring that students graduate.

Appendix 4

Minutes of Committee on OCR Issues meetings

**Committee on OCR Issues
November 8, 1999 Meeting
Prairie View A&M University
Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair of the Committee, Mr. Jodie L. Jiles.

Mr. Jiles began by recognizing a number of people in attendance at the meeting.

Legislative aides representing Lieutenant Governor Rick Perry (Mr. Richard Powell), Senator Teel Bivins (Mr. Chet Dombrowski), Senator Steve Ogden (Ms. Constance Allison and Ms. Tiffany Britton) and the House Appropriations Committee (Ms. Kathleen Gardiner) were noted.

Ms. Sandra Stephens and Ms. Angela Hights from the Office for Civil Rights were then recognized.

Coordinating Board Chair, Ms. Pam Willeford, and Coordinating Board member and Chair of the Coordinating Board Planning Committee, Dr. Martin Basaldua, were introduced. Dr. Don Brown, Commissioner of Higher Education for Texas was also recognized.

Mr. Jiles then asked committee members to introduce themselves. All committee members were present except Dr. Jerry Gaston, who was represented by Dr. Howard Graves, the Chancellor of the Texas A&M University System, Dr. Edward Sheridan who was represented by Mr. Dennis Duffy, general counsel for the University of Houston System, and Mr. Frederick McClure.

Also present were Mr. Delmar Cain, General Counsel for the Texas A&M University System and Mr. Anthony Haley from Texas Southern University.

Dr. Brown then introduced staff from the Coordinating Board. Present were Ms. Lynn Rodriguez, Dr. David Gardner, Ms. Teri Flack, Mr. Kenneth Vickers, Mr. William Beckham, Ms. Janet Beinke, Ms. Patricia Parker, Mr. Mike Collins, and Dr. Paul Grubb.

Dr. Brown then introduced Dr. Charles Hines, President of Prairie View A&M University. Dr. Hines presented Mr. Jiles a book, Black Texans: A History of African-Americans in Texas, 1528-1995 by Alwyn Barr, and indicated that its subject matter provided a good background for understanding the legacy of Prairie View A&M University.

Dr. Hines gave the committee a presentation on the history and mission of Prairie View, its programs, its many accomplishments, its strengths and its vision, particularly as they related to the educational goals laid out by Governor George W. Bush.

Following Dr. Hine's presentation, committee members were taken on a tour of the Prairie View A&M University campus. Mr. Frank Jackson hosted the tour and gave a presentation on the

university's history in the community, the A&M system and the state as the area developed from a slave plantation to housing a major university.

Lunch was provided to the committee at the President's Dining Room at the Student Union Building and the committee then resumed its deliberations.

Mr. Jiles introduced several other people attending the meeting.

Ms. Nancy Fuller and Ms. Beth Page from the Office of the Attorney General were recognized.

Mr. Clay Johnson, Governor Bush's Chief of Staff was introduced.

Ms. Trish Conradt from House Speaker Pete Laney's office was also acknowledged.

Ms. Pam Willeford greeted the members of the committee, noting her pleasure of their willingness to serve on this important committee and the Board's commitment to full participation and full success in higher education. Ms. Willeford then described the Coordinating Board's process for developing a plan for higher education in Texas, describing particularly how the Committee on OCR Issues was part of that process. Ms. Willeford described the features of the plan she expected to be developed and the timeline for its completion.

Dr. Martin Basaldua also thanked the committee members for their service and then read the charge to the committee (attached to these minutes).

Ms. Lynn Rodriguez then made a presentation describing the relationship between the Office for Civil Rights and Texas since the 1970s and the three voluntary plans for integration that Texas adopted since 1983: The original Texas Plan (1983-1988), a second Texas Plan (1989-1993), and Access and Equity 2000 (1994-2000). Ms. Rodriguez then gave some basic statistics about both Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University, and related how the Office for Civil Rights had just completed another investigation of Texas public higher education and identified six key issues with respect to Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University.

Ms. Sandra Stephens and Ms. Angela Hights from the Office for Civil Rights then presented a summary of the issues on which the committee is focused. Ms. Stephens provided a background history of how OCR was involved in investigating Texas and other states and the criteria used in evaluating the higher education system. She specifically cited three factors provided by the *Fordice* case: 1) the policy or practice is traceable to a de jure segregated system, 2) the policy or practice has a current segregative effect, and 3) the policy can be eliminated without harming the educational process. Ms. Stephens expressed her pleasure that Texas was working collaboratively and openly on the issues raised by the OCR.

Ms. Hights provided a description of the six issues relating to Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University identified by OCR. She provided statistics that suggest current segregation due to past discrimination in the areas of mission, land grant status, program duplication, facilities and other resources, funding, and racial identifiability. Ms. Hights then responded to several questions from the committee members.

Mr. Jiles then named the five subcommittees and their chairs and read the charges to the subcommittees (attached to these minutes).

Mr. Jiles noted that the business of a university is highly complex. He continued that while each subcommittee had a separate focus, the content areas were all interrelated and it would be important for the each committee to keep abreast of what the others were doing. He suggested each subcommittee meet to work on their charge and then collaborate with the other committees as necessary. He asked the chairs of the subcommittees to be diligent in keeping each other informed as necessary about their work.

Mr. Jiles described the timeline for the work of the committee. The committee will meet at Texas Southern University on December 6, 1999. The subcommittees will then have two more months to meet their charge until they bring their recommendations back to the full committee at a meeting on January 31, 2000 (place to be determined). Committee members will consider a draft final report at a meeting on February 28, 2000 (place to be determined) with a final meeting on March 20, 2000 to adopt the report for presentation to the Coordinating Board Higher Education Planning Committee in April 2000.

The business of the committee being complete, Mr. Jiles adjourned the meeting at 2:47 p.m.

**Committee on OCR Issues
December 6, 1999 Meeting
Texas Southern University
Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair of the Committee, Mr. Jodie L. Jiles.

Mr. Jiles began by recognizing a number of people in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. Clay Johnson and Mr. John Alexander from the office of Governor Bush.

Legislative aides representing Senator Rodney Ellis (Ms. Adrian Collins and Mr. Christopher Lopez), Speaker James E. "Pete" Laney (Ms. Trish Conratt), and United States Representative Sheila Jackson Lee (Ms. Marie Dixon).

Mr. Jiles asked committee members to (re)introduce themselves. All committee members were present except Ms. Jeannette Ashley, Dr. Edward Martin, Mr. Fred McClure, and Dr. George Wright.

Also introducing themselves were Coordinating Board Chair, Ms. Pam Willeford, Coordinating Board member and Chair of the Coordinating Board Planning Committee, Dr. Martin Basaldua, Dr. Don Brown, Commissioner of Higher Education for Texas, and Ms. Lynn Rodriguez, General Counsel and Director of the Office of Access and Equity at the Coordinating Board.

During the course of the meeting Mr. Jiles recognized several other people present:

Legislative aides representing Lieutenant Governor Rick Perry (Mr. Richard Powell), Senator Rodney Ellis (Mr. William-Paul Thomas), Representative Ron Wilson (Mr. Al Freeman), Senate Education Higher Education Subcommittee (Ms. Patricia Hayes) and the House Appropriations Committee (Ms. Kathleen Gardiner) were noted.

Mr. Taylor August, Ms. Sandra Stephens and Ms. Angela Hights from the Office for Civil Rights were recognized.

Also recognized were individuals serving on the Recruitment, Retention and Graduation Subcommittee: Mr. Ed Apodaca, Dr. Doris Price, Mr. Tom Simmons, and Dr. Gayla Thomas.

Dr. Brown introduced Dr. Priscilla Slade, President of Texas Southern University. Dr. Slade welcomed the committee to the campus. Dr. Slade then gave the committee an overview of Texas Southern University with specific reference to its doctoral programs, faculty, research capabilities, libraries, students, degrees awarded, radio station, and athletics. Dr. Slade noted that the accomplishments of the university in these areas were remarkable in light of its mission to serve a highly diverse population and its limited access to resources.

Dr. Slade noted the importance of historically black universities in providing more opportunities for leadership development, increased academic performance, and enhanced intellectual,

social, and psychological development than black students may get in predominately white institutions.

Dr. Slade then described the five points of vision in the university's "Destination 2000" plan to support efforts to provide quality education for its constituents and help enlarge the minority middle class. Dr. Slade also noted that the state must provide funding to increase the quality of current offerings and increase retention, address public health issues of urban and underprivileged populations, and expand the doctoral level program offerings.

After the presentation, several members asked questions of Dr. Slade to clarify what the institution would need and why.

Mr. Jiles thanked Dr. Slade for her presentation and for hosting the meeting.

Mr. Jiles introduced Mr. William-Paul Thomas who read a statement on behalf of Senator Rodney Ellis who was unable to attend. That statement is attached to the minutes.

Mr. Jiles thanked Mr. Thomas and, there being no questions, led the committee to its bus tour of the Texas Southern University campus. Ms. Takasha Francis, a recent graduate of Texas Southern University, former TSU debate team member, and former Miss TSU, led the tour.

Lunch was provide to the committee at the original gymnasium of Texas Southern University which has since been remodeled and serves as an arts gallery.

Mr. Jiles began the afternoon by noting the arrival of Ms. Carol Nobles from the State Auditor's Office.

Dr. Jerry Gaston then gave a brief overview of the services and resources available to Prairie View A&M University through the Texas A&M University System office, including regular meetings of the chief academic officers, facilities planning and construction, audits, office of general counsel, and accounting systems.

Mr. Jiles called on Dr. Don Brown to give a presentation on higher education in Texas. Before beginning, Commissioner Brown introduced Coordinating Staff who were present but had not been introduced. Dr. Brown introduced Ms. Teri Flack, Mr. Kenneth Vickers, Mr. William Beckham, Dr. Paul Meyer, Ms. Patricia Parker, and Dr. Paul Grubb.

Commissioner Don Brown gave a presentation on the future of Texas discussing changing demographics and emerging workforce needs. Dr. Brown stressed the importance of closing the gaps that exist in participating and succeeding in higher education; gaps that are evident between Texas and other states, and between the various populations in Texas. Dr. Brown also pointed out the negative economic impact of these factors on the Texas economy if current trends were not altered in a positive manner.

Mr. Jiles then invited Mr. Taylor August to talk about the work of the committee from the point of view of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR). Mr. August first expressed support for the open, collaborative process that Texas had adopted with the OCR to address issues. Mr. August stated that the relationship between OCR and Texas was not in conflict, as some media may have painted the picture, but rather was a cooperative process.

Mr. August then discussed the legal standard of Fordice that would be applied to the product of this committee. Mr. August pointed out that the OCR's concerns resulted from an interdependence of factors that manifested in various ways; as disparities in mission, programs, facilities, and funding resulting in schools that were racially identifiable. Mr. August stated that he saw no difficulties in resolving the issues raised by OCR through this committee within its broader goal of strengthening the universities but members needed to understand that the ultimate standard, from the OCR perspective, would be from Fordice.

Mr. August then responded to questions from committee members. Mr. Jiles reiterated that the state and OCR are cooperating fully.

Mr. Jiles recognized the presence of Dr. Charles Hines, President of Prairie View A&M University.

Mr. Jiles then introduced Representative Garnet Coleman who addressed the members. Representative Coleman described the development of the "Coleman Report" which showed the funding level per student by sex and ethnicity for each university in the state and how it showed that Texas was not funding Texas Southern University or Prairie View A&M University as it was other the other institutions.

Representative Coleman noted the difference in standards between the OCR's concerns and the disparity study he had asked Representative Junnel to request of the Texas Comptroller's Office. The Comptroller, he said, used the Hopwood ruling as the standard whereas the OCR was using Fordice. Representative Coleman then described how the Chancellor's report to the last legislative session showed that the changing demographics of Texas revealed that the problem with access and participation was bigger than Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University but, rather, affected all the institutions of higher education. Representative Coleman noted that the issues this committee were focusing on were long-standing and many people had played a part. In closing, Representative Coleman noted that the statement submitted by Senator Ellis earlier in the meeting was, except for the first paragraph, identical to an op-ed piece that he and Senator Ellis had co-written.

Mr. Jiles thanked Representative Coleman for his comments and continuing concern.

Mr. Jiles then asked the committee members to meet in their assigned subcommittees and provided the following instructions:

The objective simply stated is to ensure that each university's programs and facilities are so strong and attractive that their quality would not deter any student from attending.

The mission and program subcommittees were to meet together this afternoon.

In arranging future meeting dates, work to have subcommittees meet at the same place and time so there is maximum communication between them. Also, let Coordinating Board staff know future meeting dates.

Subcommittees should:

- feel free to use any available resources, including input from the institutions
- recommend the development of mission statements that support the future of Texas

- recommend facilities and funding that strengthen the institutions and support their mission and programs
- develop recommendations for recruiting, retaining, developing, and graduating students who will contribute economically, politically, and socially to the state

In considering what is best for the state as a whole, it is important to review the role and mission of other public higher education institutions.

It is important to focus quickly on understanding the issues for your subcommittee, then work closely with the other subcommittees to ensure the recommendations fit the entire package. The work of all subcommittees will tie together. No subcommittee's work is complete until the whole committee is done with its work.

As you do your work, go back to your charge. Let the charge guide you as you make your recommendations.

TIMELINE

1. By January 31, the subcommittees should have draft recommendations
2. Staff and subcommittee chairs will then prepare a draft report that includes the recommendations
3. On February 28, we will consider draft report and recommendations in preparation for adopting a report and recommendations at the March 20 meeting

The meeting of the Committee on OCR Issues then adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

**Committee on OCR Issues
January 31, 2000 Meeting
Houston Community College District
John B. Coleman Health Science Center**

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair of the committee, Mr. Jodie L. Jiles.

Mr. Jiles began by recognizing the Chancellor of the Houston Community College District, Dr. Ruth Burgos-Sasscer. Dr. Burgos-Sasscer welcomed the committee to Houston and the John B. Coleman Health Science Center which had opened six months before and has 1,500 students in various allied health and nursing programs.

Mr. Jiles recognized a number of people in attendance at the meeting, including: Dr. Norma Perez, Director of the John B. Coleman Health Science Center for her willingness to host the meeting; Dr. Charles Cook, a former Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board member and current Vice-Chancellor of Instructional Development at the Houston Community College District, for helping arrange the meeting, and; Mr. Clay Johnson from the office of Governor Bush.

Legislative aides representing Speaker James E. Pete Laney (Ms. Trish Conradt), the Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education (Ms. Pat Hayes), and Representative Garnet Coleman (Mr. Todd Stevens).

Also present were Ms. Nancy Fuller from the Texas Attorney General's Office, Ms. Sandra Stevens and Ms. Angela Hights from the Office for Civil Rights and Dr. Clifton Conrad, a consultant in programs to the Office for Civil Rights.

Mr. Jiles recognized committee member Mr. Bruce Austin's election as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Houston Community College District. He then asked committee members to (re)introduce themselves. All committee members were present except Mr. Alvin Henry, Mr. Alphonso Jackson and Dr. George Wright. Dr. Elaine Carlson attended for Dr. Edward Sheridan. Also in attendance were Dr. Doris Price and Dr. Gayla Thomas from the Recruitment, Retention and Graduation Subcommittee.

Also introducing themselves were Coordinating Board Chair, Ms. Pam Willeford, Coordinating Board member and Chair of the Coordinating Board Planning Committee, Dr. Martin Basaldua, Dr. Don Brown, Commissioner of Higher Education for Texas, and Ms. Lynn Rodriguez, General Counsel and Director of the Office of Access and Equity at the Coordinating Board.

Mr. Jiles reminded everyone about the Coordinating Board's web site, www.thecb.state.tx.us, where minutes from previous meetings, meeting schedules, and information on the higher education planning committee can be found.

Mr. Jiles, reviewed the actions taken the prior week by the Coordinating Board related to facilities requests by Texas Southern University. These actions included: re-approval of the Martin Luther King renovation and addition; re-approval of the New Student Health Center; purchase of properties, and re-approval of Spurgeon Gray Hall renovation and addition.

Mr. Jiles also noted that the Coordinating Board had given Prairie View A&M University approval to expand its table of programs to allow planning authority for the Doctor of Philosophy in Juvenile Justice.

Mr. Jiles then reviewed the agenda for the day as well as the charge to the committee. He then introduced Dr. Martin Basaldua who welcomed everyone to the meeting and stressed the importance of the committee having public input as it deliberates on ways to strengthen and enhance Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University. Dr. Basaldua thanked those who came to testify and also noted that the committee would take written testimony any time.

Mr. Mike Collins, Assistant to the Commissioner of Higher Education, read the instructions concerning public testimony and asked those who wished to give public testimony to complete the necessary form.

The following individuals provided public testimony: Ms. Dollie Braithwaite, Houston, Texas; Ms. Mehea Washington Becnel; Houston, Texas; Mr. Al Chambliss, Houston, Texas; Dr. Robert Gilmore, Houston, Texas; Mr. Charles R. Glass, Houston, Texas; Dr. Henry L. Huckaby, Houston, Texas; Dr. Bettye Davis Lewis, Houston, Texas; Ms. Alice E. Pradia, Houston, Texas, and Ms. Georgia D. Provost, Houston, Texas. Also present but not testifying was Mr. Glenn Johnson.

Mr. Jiles then asked Dr. Basaldua to give an overview of the higher education planning process currently underway by the Coordinating Board. Dr. Basaldua said that a committee was trying to devise a higher education plan for the near future that had three to five goals with strategies to meet those goals and benchmarks to measure our progress towards them. In addition to the Committee on OCR Issues, the planning committee also has three task forces examining important areas: the Task Force on Participation and Success, the Task Force on Health Professions Education and the Task Force on Development of the Technology Workforce.

Dr. Basaldua noted that Rand Corporation has been hired to conduct a needs and priority analysis of higher education in Texas. Dr. Basaldua explained that the planning committee expected to complete this effort by late summer 2000.

Mr. Jiles reminded everyone that the next two meetings of the Committee on OCR Issues would be held on February 28, 2000 and March 21, 2000.

The committee then recessed for lunch. Upon return, Mr. Jiles asked Ms. Sandra Stephens from the Office for Civil Rights to introduce Dr. Clifton Conrad. Dr. Conrad has been a consultant to the Office for Civil Rights for a number of years and, in particular, during the OCR's review of Texas over the past two years.

Dr. Conrad's presentation focused on the goals of 1) increasing other race presence, and 2) addressing disparities. He suggested that it was essential to enhance and strengthen a distinctive mission for Historically Black Institutions to help achieve those goals. This process included creating an academic niche for an institution both in its statement of mission and by locating at the institution high demand, high quality, and unique programs, especially at the graduate level.

Mr. Jiles thanked Dr. Conrad for his presentation.

Mr. Jiles then asked that the subcommittees report their draft recommendations to the committee. Dr. Judith Craven asked subcommittee members Mr. Ronald Jones (Prairie View A&M University) and Dr. Gayla Thomas (Texas Southern University) to present the draft recommendations for the Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation Subcommittee. Mr. Phil Dieble presented the preliminary recommendations from the Funding Subcommittee. Mr. Bill Nance presented the preliminary recommendations for the Facilities Subcommittee. Dr. Jerry Gaston then presented the draft recommendations for the Program Subcommittee.

Dr. Charles Hines, President of Prairie View A&M University, commented that he had not seen the recommendations of the subcommittees, and in particular the Program Subcommittee, prior to this meeting. He further stated that if he had seen the recommendations he may have had the opportunity to clear up what appeared to be misunderstandings about what areas of the institution need to be strengthened and improved.

Dr. Thomas, Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness at Texas Southern University, said that some of the recommendations referred to conditions cited that did not exist at the institution.

Mr. Jiles reminded everyone that these were preliminary recommendations and reiterated his commitment that the schools would be involved in creating realistic, useful, and focused recommendations that will strengthen and enhance each institution that this committee is charged to make.

Dr. Craven asked Dr. Bobby Wilson, Vice President of Academic Affairs at Texas Southern University, and President Hines to give a brief general response to the set of recommendations as a whole. Dr. Wilson indicated that Texas Southern University is working hard to strengthen and enhance the institution and wants to work with the committee to develop a workable plan. President Hines said that Prairie View A&M University has a plan for the future, that they are implementing that plan, and that he expects it to be successful in strengthening and enhancing the institution.

Mr. Jiles then adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

February 18, 2000

**Committee on OCR Issues
February 28, 2000 Meeting
University of Houston**

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair of the Committee, Mr. Jodie L. Jiles.

Mr. Jiles welcomed the committee members. All committee members were present except Mr. Ray Hayes, Mr. Fred McClure and Mr. Bill Nance. Also in attendance were Mr. Ed Apodaca, Dr. Doris Price and Dr. Gayla Thomas from the Recruitment, Retention and Graduation Subcommittee. Also present were Texas Higher Education Commissioner Dr. Don Brown and the General Counsel and Director of the Office of Access and Equity for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Ms. Lynn Rodriguez.

During the meeting Mr. Jiles recognized a number of people in attendance at the meeting including: Mr. Clay Johnson (Chief of Staff to Governor George Bush), Ms. Tiffany Britton (aide to Senator Steve Ogden), Ms. Trish Conradt (representing Speaker Pete Laney), Mr. Todd Stevens (representing Representative Garnet Coleman), Ms. Beth Page and Sarah Sarahan (Attorney General's Office), Mr. Williard Jackson (Chairman of the Board of Regents for Texas Southern University), Dr. Priscilla Slade (President of Texas Southern University), Dr. Max Castillo (President of the University of Houston–Downtown), and Ms. Angela Hights (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights).

Mr. Jiles introduced Representative Garnet Coleman whose district includes Texas Southern University and the University of Houston among other institutions of higher education. Representative Coleman expounded on three issues: funding for the historically black universities has not been adequate, demographic changes in Texas show the importance of providing higher education to all Texans, and the Committee on OCR Issues should maintain communication with key leaders in finance and education in the Texas legislature.

Mr. Jiles thanked Representative Coleman for his comments.

Mr. Jiles recognized Dr. Arthur Smith, Chancellor of the University of Houston System and President of the University of Houston. Dr. Smith gave an overview of the University of Houston System, its four institutions, its involvement in the multi-institution teaching center in the Woodlands, its students, and its successes. He told the committee of his commitment to working with Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University for their mutual benefit in serving the higher educational needs of the Houston area. He indicated he thought that Texas Southern University should remain independent but, should it be that Texas Southern University not remain independent, his preference is that it become part of the University of Houston system.

The committee then adjourned for lunch and subcommittee group meetings.

After the subcommittee meetings, U.S. Representative Sheila Jackson-Lee spoke to the committee, urging it to move quickly to address the disparities of the public historically black universities in Texas. She introduced Texas Senator Rodney Ellis who stated that the issues of this committee were the same ones the state was supposed to have corrected twenty years ago. Senator Ellis then introduced the Reverend Jesse Jackson.

Reverend Jackson related his experience of driving down the street that separates Texas Southern University and the University of Houston and easily noting the less appealing physical environment of Texas Southern University. He questioned how obvious disparities such as this were allowed to continue despite a budget surplus. Reverend Jackson commented on the changing demographics of Texas and the country and the urgency of providing hope, through education, for all its citizens to gainfully participate in the riches of the state. Reverend Jackson urged the committee to address the issues of disparity in a timely fashion.

Mr. Jiles thanked Representative Jackson-Lee, Representative Ellis, and Reverend Jackson for their remarks.

Mr. Jiles asked the subcommittee chairs to report on their recommendations to the committee. Mr. Alphonso Jackson reported on the funding subcommittee's work. Dr. George Wright reported on the work of the mission subcommittee. Dr. Judith Craven reported on the recommendations of the recruitment, retention, and graduation subcommittee. Mr. Tim Donathen reported for the facilities subcommittee. Dr. Jerry Gaston reported for the programs subcommittee.

Mr. Jiles thanked the committee members for their hard work and the staff at the institutions for their responsiveness to requests from the committee. He noted that while much progress had been made, the subcommittee chairs were reporting that more information was needed with respect to certain factual issues, priorities, time lines, and benchmarks. Mr. Jiles asked members to discuss the best way to proceed, given the substantial progress of the committee and its remaining work.

The committee discussed various alternatives and agreed to continue the work of the subcommittees to formulate precise recommendations and to devote the entire meeting on March 20, 2000 to a working meeting of the whole committee which would review the subcommittee recommendations. Mr. Jiles also raised the possibility of meeting again after the March 20 meeting.

Mr. Jiles adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

**Committee on OCR Issues
March 20, 2000 Meeting
Institute of Biosciences and Technology
Texas A & M University System Health Science Center**

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair of the Committee, Mr. Jodie L. Jiles.

Mr. Jiles welcomed the committee members. All committee members were present except Mr. Fred McClure and Mr. Alphonso Jackson. Also in attendance were Mr. Ed Apodaca and Dr. Doris Price from the Recruitment, Retention and Graduation Subcommittee.

Also present were the chair of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Ms. Pam Willeford, chair of the Planning Committee for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and Board member, Dr. Martin Basaldua, Texas Higher Education Commissioner Dr. Don Brown and the General Counsel and Director of the Office of Access and Equity for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Ms. Lynn Rodriguez.

During the meeting Mr. Jiles recognized a number of people in attendance at the meeting including: Dr. Charles Hines (President of Prairie View A&M University), Ms. Beth Page and Ms. Sarah Sarahan (Attorney General's Office), Ms. Patricia Hayes (the Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education), Ms. Joan Sessoms Ford, Ms. Sandra Stephens, and Ms. Angela Hights (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights).

Mr. Jiles introduced Chairman Pam Willeford who thanked the committee for its work and reiterated the importance of recommendations. She briefly described again the planning process and how this committee was an integral part of that process.

Mr. Jiles reviewed the charge to the committee. Ms. Rodriguez reviewed the agenda and materials for the committee, noting that the committee meeting this day was a working meeting where a list of potential recommendations for each institution would be examined. Mr. Jiles thanked the OCR staff and staff of Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University for their hard work and timeliness in providing information for the committee.

The committee members reviewed a comprehensive list of potential recommendations for Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University as they were listed in a time line across the next seven fiscal years. The recommendations were described principally by Dr. Hines (representing Prairie View A&M University), Dr. Bobby Wilson (representing Texas Southern University), or one of the subcommittee chairs who responded to questions from members of the committee. The recommendations pertaining to Prairie View A&M were reviewed first, before lunch. The recommendations pertaining to Texas Southern University were reviewed next, after lunch.

Ms. Willeford again thanked the committee members for their work. She asked members to consider four questions as they made their recommendations. What are the priorities? What will make the most difference? How will we see the difference? How much will it cost?

The committee then approved the minutes from the February 28, 2000 meeting. The next meeting was scheduled for April 28, 2000 at a place to be determined.

Dr. Brown indicated that he would direct his staff to provide a modified time line (with alternatives) in which recommendations were prioritized. He also indicated that benchmarks to show that recommendations had been successfully implemented would be included.

Mr. Jiles adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

**Committee on OCR Issues
April 28, 2000 Meeting
Reuel A. Stallones School of Public Health
University of Texas-Houston Health Science Center**

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair of the Committee, Mr. Jodie L. Jiles.

Mr. Jiles welcomed the committee members. All committee members were present except Mr. Phillip Diebel, Mr. Alvin Henry, Mr. Fred McClure, Dr. Raymond Rodrigues, and Dr. George C. Wright. Also in attendance were Dr. Doris Price and Dr. Gayla Thomas from the Recruitment, Retention and Graduation Subcommittee.

Mr. Jiles congratulated Dr. Priscilla Slade (not present) who had been officially installed as President of Texas Southern University the day before and thanked her for her efforts.

Also present were the chair of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Ms. Pam Willeford, chair of the Planning Committee for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and Board member, Dr. Martin Basaldua, Texas Higher Education Commissioner Dr. Don Brown and the General Counsel and Director of the Office of Access and Equity for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Ms. Lynn Rodriguez.

During the meeting Mr. Jiles recognized a number of people in attendance at the meeting including: Mr. Clay Johnson (Governor's Office); Mr. Richard Powell (Lt. Governor's Office); Dr. Charles Hines (President of Prairie View A&M University); Dr. Bobby Wilson, Mr. Gayla Thomas, and Ms. Paulette Frederick (Texas Southern University); Ms. Trish Conrad (Speaker of the House); Ms. Nancy Fuller and Ms. Sarah Sarahan (Attorney General's Office); Ms. Patricia Hayes (the Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education); Mr. William Paul Thomas, Mr. Rick Svatora (Senator Rodney Ellis); and Mr. Todd Edwards (Representative Garnet Coleman).

Dr. R. Palmer Beasley, Dean of the University of Texas-Health Science Center at Houston, greeted the committee and stated his commitment to participation and success in higher education.

Mr. Jiles explained to the committee that its task for this meeting was to review, dissect and finalize the recommendations for Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University. He asked Ms. Lynn Rodriguez to read the original charge to the committee in preparation for its work and Ms. Rodriguez complied.

Mr. Jiles then asked Commissioner Don Brown to review the recommendations compiled by staff. Commissioner Brown began by explaining the process the committee had gone through to get all the ideas out on the table including five public meetings, public testimony, numerous subcommittee meetings, a close working relationship with officials from each university, and other various input. He noted that the goal of the recommendations are to have universities with programs and facilities so strong and attractive that their quality would not deter any student from attending.

Dr. Brown explained how Coordinating Board staff then used this inclusive list of recommendations for each university to arrive at the recommendations, and their priorities, he

was about to present at this meeting. Specifically the list was reviewed and the recommendation(s) chosen that best answered this question: What one action or set of actions would do the most to strengthen the education of students? The list was then reviewed for the second priority action and so on.

Commissioner Brown began with the recommendations for Prairie View A&M University. He reviewed the outcomes the committee could expect if the recommendations were carried out including high value, high demand programs that enroll and graduate students from across the state, an attractive, inviting and fully functional campus and student housing, a student body of over 10,000 in a highly supportive environment, high levels of academic achievement, graduates well-versed in technology applications in their fields, and a vigorous and productive development operation generating large amounts of non-state dollars. Dr. Brown then went through each recommendation, noting for each their time line, benchmark, and rationale. The recommendations generated questions and discussion among committee members and Dr. Charles Hines responded to several questions. The discussion resulted in several changes to the recommendations.

Dr. Gaston moved to adopt the recommendations for Prairie View A&M University and Mr. Donathen seconded the motion. After a brief discussion the committee adopted the recommendations unanimously.

Commissioner Brown then explained the recommendations for Texas Southern University. Again, he reviewed the outcomes the committee could expect if the recommendations were carried out including high value, high demand programs that enroll and graduate students from across the state, an attractive, inviting and fully functional campus and student housing, a student body of over 10,000 in a highly supportive environment, high levels of academic achievement, graduates well-versed in technology applications in their fields, and a vigorous and productive development operation generating large amounts of non-state dollars. Dr. Brown then went through each recommendation, noting for each their time line, benchmark, and rationale. The recommendations generated questions and discussion among committee members and Dr. Bobby Wilson, Mr. Gayla Thomas, and Ms. Paulette Frederick responded to several questions. The discussion resulted in several changes to the recommendations.

Mr. Juan Sandavol moved to adopt the recommendations for Texas Southern University and Mr. Bruce Austin seconded the motion. After a brief discussion the committee adopted the recommendations unanimously.

Mr. Jiles made a motion to add a recommendation to the list for Prairie View A&M University based on a discussion that arose while considering the recommendations for Texas Southern University. That recommendation concerned gaining and maintaining accreditation of programs as appropriate. Mr. Donathen seconded that motion. The committee approved the motion unanimously.

U.S. Representative Shirley Jackson-Lee had entered the meeting during the final discussions on Texas Southern University and Mr. Jiles acknowledged her presence and invited her to speak. Representative Jackson-Lee thanked the committee for their work. She indicated that she was going to reserve judgement about the recommendations until she had the opportunity to study them in depth but they appeared to be a good start. She told the committee that she would be focusing her efforts on ensuring that the public, historically black universities in Texas got their fair share of the resources. She indicated her desire was to enhance and increase

these resources as Texas proceeds to get these institutions where they need to be and complementary to the state's other universities.

Mr. Jiles thanked Representative Jackson-Lee.

Mr. Jiles then provided time for each member of the committee to say a few words.

Dr. Craven then provided Mr. Jiles with a copy of her subcommittee's report and recommendations. Mr. Jiles accepted the report with thanks.

Ms. Willeford thanked the staff from the institutions for their efforts in working with the committee. She then thanked committee members for their hard work.

Mr. Jiles noted that the committee had to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. Dr. Gaston made the motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Jones seconded that motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Jiles recognized Representative Jackson-Lee who thanked Mr. Jiles for his efforts and the work of the committee. She noted her role in funding the National Institute of Health and the tension that existed in funding research for finding cures for different types of diseases and the challenges involved in making decisions about priority. She indicated her hope that the vision in the recommendations adopted by the committee were not dissolved in her continued efforts to secure more resources for the universities.

Mr. Jiles then thanked the staff from the institutions, the staff from the Coordinating Board, the Coordinating Board Chair, Ms. Pam Willeford, and the members of the committee before adjourning the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Appendix 5

Reports of OCR subcommittees

APPENDIX 5

RECRUITMENT, RETENTION & GRADUATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Recommendation # 1: Commuter Student and Child Care Component

Establish and staff a component which addresses the special needs of commuter and non-traditional students to include accommodations for childcare and other student services.

Recommendation # 2: Summer Academy and Student Enrichment Program

This project is a summer program for students entering the institution in need of remediation. TASP.

Recommendation # 3: Upgrade Student Enrollment Services

Upgrade student enrollment services. Necessary changes should include an increase in staffing and the purchase of state of the art technology. Use strategic enrollment management principles to implement the Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy.

Recommendation # 4: General University Academic Center

Upgrade the General University Academic Center to provide a comprehensive Academic Support Services Center for first-time freshmen, transfers and students matriculating in the general core. The support should consist of orientation, assessment, learning skills, academic advisement, tutorial assistance, supplemental instruction, and life skills workshops.

Recommendation # 5: Student Retention Services Office

Create and staff a student retention services office to organize, implement and monitor student retention programs and initiatives.

Recommendation # 6: Information Technology Services

This recommendation is designed to strengthen the Information Technology Services offered to Students, Faculty, and Staff. Improvements will include technology upgrades and sufficient resources to further implement Student Information System; enhance integration of appropriate technology into education, research, and operations; and offer adequate services and presence on the Web. This project will include equipment, personnel, and training.

Recommendation # 7: University Wellness Center

Develop a University Wellness Center to provide holistic health advisement and services to Texas Southern University students. The Wellness Center should have the coordinated resources of Recreation Services, Health Center, Food Services, Counseling Center, Health and Kinesiology Department.

Recommendation #8: Student Services Center

Renovate the Student Center, creating additional space for student activities to meet the needs of our current population. Provide additional leadership, educational and entertainment programs for students in residence and create opportunities for commuter students to return to campus to participate in programs and activities. Necessary changes to meet objectives are: 1) Expanded and updated facilities to house campus activities; 2) Staffing to allow for expanded hours of operation and programs; 3) Development of a Student Leadership Training and Tutorial Program; and 4) New furnishing and equipment for the Student Center.

Recommendation # 9: Human Resources

Create a training and development program for university staff; develop a compensation plan to bring salaries in line with peer institutions, allocate resources for advertising and recruitment, develop a reward and recognition plan. For professional positions, hire staff with demonstrable credentials in the area rather than use faculty or other institution staff.

Recommendation # 10: Development Office

Develop a comprehensive development operation with funding to cover professional development officers and support staff. This will increase non-state dollars for faculty endowments, student scholarships and fellowships and other institutional development.

Recommendation # 11: Public Relations Office

Create a comprehensive development operation with funding to cover professional development officers and support staff.

Recommendation # 12: Faculty Salaries

Develop a compensation plan to bring salaries in line with peer institutions, allocate resources for advertising and recruitment, develop a reward and recognition plan. As a senior level institution of higher education, Texas Southern University must maintain a faculty with the credentials and scholarly capability to offer a quality university-level education to its clientele.

Recommendation # 13: Faculty Development Office

Create a faculty development office to increase the scholarship of the faculty and the intellectual capacity of the University. The University's ability to support faculty development is at a level of approximately 5% of need. Increased funds are needed to support faculty development through research and seed grants, travel to professional meetings, leaves of absences, and workshops.

Recommendation # 15: Housing Department

Renovation of existing facilities. Construct affordable privatized and/or semi-privatized on-campus housing with ability to provide single-parent/family housing, computer/cable accessibility in each room, funding for counseling and academic advisement staffing and programs designed to interact with and enhance students' academic achievement. Existing facilities do not provide family housing, do not have upgraded amenities (computer labs/ accessibility in rooms/ halls, no cable in room), and not enough counseling/academic tutorial programs. Currently 13% of university enrolled students can reside on campus.

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY

Recommendation # 1: University College

University College (UC) is a program committed to providing an academically focused, student-centered, structured environment for the entire university community with an emphasis on freshmen. The Advisement Division (AD) provides freshmen with holistic, intrusive, accessible advisement as well as a central point for accessing services and referrals to service. The AD is responsible for providing tutoring, workshops, and other academic strengthening programs for all students. The emphasis is a living environment that is academically focused. Study hall is offered within the residence as is tutoring and group study. The University College provides students with ongoing orientation to university life and also offers opportunities to attend enrichment activities on and off the campus. computer laboratories will be used for delivery of effective developmental education programs (math, reading and writing laboratories); upgrade of computers or purchase new computers, software, and peripherals; equipment to support Video Supplemental Instruction.

Recommendation # 2: Student Development and Support Center

A state-of-the-art facility to house all educational and general, non-auxiliary student affairs, enrollment, and support functions. Currently, these functions and services are located in various buildings across the campus, none of which provides sufficient space, configurations, nor ambience to deliver the requisite support and services to students and constituents. Using a one-stop system, this project will enable students to perform routine business, and engage academic and student support professionals on a variety of services targeting access, enrollment, matriculation, retention, graduation, and success.

Recommendation # 3: Child and Family Studies Center

Establish and staff a facility that provides childcare and development services to students, staff, and faculty. A Child and Family Studies Center will provide a comprehensive laboratory program for: 1) instructional and experiential training opportunities in child and family development and functioning for matriculating undergraduate and graduate students in Human Sciences, Human Nutrition and Food, Social Work and Sociology, Psychology, Criminal/Juvenile Justice, Elementary Education, Health and Human Performance, Nursing, and Communication; 2) research protocols for the study and analysis of family functioning and social policies impacting families; and 3) outreach and continuing education programs focusing on child, family, consumer and related sciences.

Recommendation # 4: Information Technology Services

This project is designed to strengthen the Information Technology Services offered to Students, Faculty, and Staff. This will include technology upgrades and sufficient resources to further implement Student Information System; enhance integration of appropriate technology into education, research, and operations; and offer adequate services and presence on the Web. Equipment needed: Servers, Datafile Vault, and Electronic Document Management. Consulting: Contract to digitize old documents, Help and SIS implementation, and Campus Networking. Others: Training, provide Internet Services to dorms. Personnel: systems analyst, systems programmer, data manager, network technicians, data security officer, and webmaster.

Recommendation # 5: Recruitment, Retention and Graduation Offices

This program will require a minimum of four additional recruiters. In addition to expanding the university's reach into all geographic areas of Texas, the program components will enable the university to meet the mandates of HB 1678, Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategies, and to attract, recruit, enroll, and graduate a diverse student population. The university recruitment and retention program must be strengthened by providing desk and laptop computers with portable printers and ethernet cards to recruiters, upgrading, brochures and related mailouts, acquiring mass media marketing, and providing extensive visibility of university programs throughout Texas.

Recommendation # 6: Student Retention Services Office

Create and staff a student retention services office to organize, implement and monitor student retention programs and initiatives.

Recommendation # 7: Delivery of Student Financial Services

Strengthen the delivery of student financial assistance and services to students. The major components of this program will focus on: 1) access, services, and personal attention to students; 2) compliance with federal, state, and local mandates on fiscal stewardship; and 3) continued and expanded use of technologies to optimize resources, deliver services, and ensure compliance with mandates. Indeed at PVAMU, where one-fifth of the student body comes from families with annual incomes under \$9,000 and almost fifty percent come from

families with annual incomes under \$20,000, the delivery of student financial aid and services is critical to the academic success of students and the survivability of the university. The resource requirements include: staffing: Coordinator, Customer Service Operations (1); Customer services Associates (3); Quality Assurance Specialist (1); Technical Support Associate (1); Financial Information Analyst (1). Material and Equipment: Computer, electronic, telecommunications, printing, and office-related hardware, software, and supplies.

Recommendation # 8: University scholars program

Establish a University scholars program to identify, attract, enroll, retain, and graduate academically talented students reflective of the population of Texas

Recommendation # 9: Pre-college programs

Enhance the existing Pre-college programs by extending them to the critical middle school years.

Recommendation # 10 Northwest Houston Graduate Facility

Establish a Northwest Houston Graduate Facility to improve visibility of and access to graduate program offerings.

Recommendation # 11: Academy for Collegiate Excellence and Student Success

Enhance the Academy for Collegiate Excellence and Student Success (ACCESS) to accommodate more students reflective of the population of Texas

Recommendation # 12: Center for Teaching Excellence and Distance Learning

This program proposes an increase in the scope of services available to include micro teaching, regularly scheduled workshops course materials development, computing and on-demand distance learning technology training (web based, interactive video, and video streaming) and student assessment training. Expansion and restructuring of the Center for Teaching Excellence and Distance Learning will require employment of one (1) doctorate with training and experience in instructional design and faculty development; one (1) staff assistant; and one (1) secretary.

Recommendation # 13: Faculty Salaries

Develop a compensation plan to bring salaries in line with peer institutions, allocate resources for advertising and recruitment, and develop a reward and recognition plan. Lack of institutional funding during the past decade and before had made it impossible to award salary increases to many faculty who earned them. As a result, the salary compression becomes more severe each biennium resulting in instances of persistent inequity.

Recommendation # 14: Human Resources

Create a training and development program for university staff; develop a compensation plan to bring salaries in line with peer institutions, allocate resources for advertising and recruitment, develop a reward and recognition plan. For professional positions, hire staff with demonstrable credentials in the area rather than use faculty or other institution staff.

Recommendation # 15: University Relations and Development Office

Develop a comprehensive development operation with funding to cover professional development officers and support staff. This will increase non-state dollars for faculty endowments, student scholarships and fellowships and other institutional development.

FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

The administration and Board of Regents of Texas Southern University are to be commended for the recent renovations completed and the projects recently approved by the Coordinating Board including:

- a) E. O. Bell Building renovation,
- b) Fairchild Building renovation,
- c) Education Building renovation,
- d) Gray Hall addition and renovation,
- e) Martin Luther King Building renovation,
- f) KTSU radio station renovation,
- g) thermal utilities renovation,
- h) dorm rehabilitations,
- i) track and field renovation,
- j) new Health Center,
- k) new Student Recreation Center.

Recommendations:

1. Continue the current administrative commitment to the renovation of existing facilities and elimination of deferred maintenance through the maximum use of existing resources.
2. Secure an appropriate level of funding proportionate to similar new facilities to construct a new Science Building that meets the current and future needs for teaching and research. The Facilities Subcommittee found that the four most recent science buildings constructed in the state were built for a total project cost (construction, A/E fees, furnishings and equipment and overhead) of \$188 per gross square foot. Nabrit has 146,958 gross square feet. Using 150,000 gross square feet and escalating the cost per foot by five percent per year for inflation for four years derives a total project cost of \$34,200,000.
3. Once vacated, renovate the Nabrit Science Building for the Social Sciences or the next high priority department(s) or for use as transition or surge space while other facilities are remodeled. The Facilities Subcommittee found Nabrit to be structurally sound and suitable for renovation. A total renovation can be completed for approximately 70 percent of the cost of new construction.
4. Review Prairie View A & M's and other's use of privatized student housing and other alternate sources of financing and consider adoption of such for the residence hall program.

5. Finalize the detailed facilities planning and construction policy and procedure document currently being drafted. The policy should include, but not be limited to the following:

- a) criteria for the selection of architects,
- b) specific stages of Board of Regents review,
- c) the use of planning committees including appropriate faculty and staff,
- d) change order approval process,
- e) campus design standards,
- f) project cost accounting and construction payment process,
- g) delegations of authority,
- h) alternative construction delivery methods.

6. If new programs are recommended as an expansion of the university's mission, role and scope which require new or renovated facilities, the Legislature should appropriate funding for the new facilities. Consideration should be given to Tuition Revenue Bond funding as well as "cash appropriations" depending on the type of project and bonding capacity of the university.

7. Enhance construction oversight through the use of the following strategies:

- a. Establish and maintain 2-3 professional staff positions to be held by an architect and/or engineer to provide long term institutional assistance on facilities development matters such as campus master planning, land use recommendations, landscaping development standards, and oversight of private sector services for design and construction of campus improvements. Establish a fee based on a percentage of total construction program costs to fund these full time licensed professionals.
- b. Based on state statutes and Board of Regents policies and procedures, TSU should employ private architectural or engineering firms to design and construction management firms to manage large complex projects under the direction of the in-house professional staff.
- c. Establish an accounting program with staff support to maintain up-to-date project cost accounting to assure prompt and accurate payment of fees and monthly construction progress invoices to avoid late payment charges or construction delays that could occur due to payment delay.

8. Based upon an academic plan, identify properties adjacent to the campus as the most likely new campus construction sites and acquire those properties over time as opportunities or needs arise. A source of funds for such property acquisitions should be set aside from HEAF or institutional funds so that funds are readily available at the appropriate time.

9. Prepare and execute a landscape master plan with particular attention to the southern edge of campus.

10. Develop a plan to optimize the use of existing space with the possibility of "mothballing" or demolishing underutilized space. Areas cleared through the demolition of existing space should be used for additional parking or for landscaped "green space" on campus.
11. Prepare and execute a campus-wide telecommunications infrastructure plan to guide planners and contractors during the design and construction of all new and renovated facilities, including residence halls.
12. Benchmark other universities budgeting and staffing for Building Maintenance and reallocate resources as necessary.
13. The facilities development program outlined in Recommendations 2. and 3. should take place over a ten year period. Each new construction and major renovation project will operate on a four year timeline from the feasibility/funding development stage to construction completion and occupancy.
14. Benchmarks to be monitored during the plan include classroom and lab utilization, space deficit/surplus vs. the space planning model and progress toward enrollment projections prepared as a part of new program implementation.

PRAIRIE VIEW A & M UNIVERSITY

The administration of Prairie View A & M University, the Texas A & M University System and the Board of Regents, Texas A & M University System are to be commended for the outstanding improvement in the physical facilities and appearance of Prairie View A & M in the last 15-20 years, particularly:

- a) landscaping, lighting and pedestrian/vehicular traffic improvements,
- b) Coleman Library,
- c) Central plant and water system improvements,
- d) new and renovated engineering facilities,
- e) agricultural research facilities,
- f) new science building,
- g) campus telecommunications network,
- h) Banks building renovation,
- i) new gym and swimming pool renovation,
- j) administration building renovation,
- k) physical education and intramural complex,
- l) general office/classroom building.

Recommendations:

1. Continue the current administrative commitment to the renovation of existing facilities and elimination of deferred maintenance through the maximum use of existing resources.

2. Continue the plans in place and on the Coordinating Board MP 1 form (masterplan) with the following priority order.

- a) architecture building and cultural center,
- b) student enrollment and development center,
- c) juvenile justice and rural law enforcement building,
- d) child development center,
- e) electric, water and security upgrades,
- f) roof upgrades,
- g) grounds, sidewalk and street projects,
- h) new science building construction,
- i) privatized housing phase four,
- j) E & G infrastructure improvements,
- k) student center addition and improvements,
- l) stadium improvements,
- m) indoor sports arena.

3. Demolish the current College of Nursing facility and construct a new building and parking garage on site with the new building equipped with the most current instructional equipment.

4. If new programs are recommended as an expansion of either university's mission, role and scope which require new or renovated facilities, the Legislature should appropriate funding for the new facilities. Consideration should be given to Tuition Revenue Bond funding as well as "cash appropriations" depending on the type of project and bonding capacity of the university.

5. Examine Prairie View's agricultural research facilities for their capacity to accommodate any significant increase in research funding. Consider cooperative arrangements with Texas A&M for the use of their facilities on a temporary basis should increased research funding accrue to Prairie View A&M.

6. Benchmark other universities budgeting and staffing for Building Maintenance and reallocate resources as necessary.

7. The facilities development program outlined in recommendations 2. and 3. should take place over a ten year period. Each new construction and major renovation project will operate on a four year timeline from the feasibility/funding development stage to construction completion and occupancy.

8. Benchmarks to be monitored during the plan include classroom and lab utilization, space deficit/surplus vs. the space planning model and progress toward enrollment projections prepared as a part of any new program implementation.

FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Note: The Finance subcommittee did not approve/finalize any type of report. What follows is the last draft report that was discussed, although not approved, as a final report by the Finance subcommittee.

1. The general academic funding formulas by design are neutral providing the same level of funding for the same program offered at any public university in the state. Funding per full-time student equivalents (FTSEs) can vary from institution to institution because of the mix of programs at that institution, any special item funding, additional fees approved by the board, level of contracts and grants, and gifts to the institution.

Total expenditures, general revenue per FTSEs, and average salary for a full professor for selected institutions is presented in the table below.

	FY 1998 Expenditures per FTSE	FY 1998 General Revenue per FTSE	FY 1999 Average Professor Salaries
Texas A&M University	\$15,496	\$6,879	\$75,972
Prairie View A&M University	\$12,702	\$4,398	\$50,409
University of Houston	\$12,843	\$5,833	\$78,770
Texas Southern University	\$13,780	\$7,144	\$57,184
Tarleton State University	\$7,768	\$3,759	\$52,337
Lamar University	\$9,298	\$5,199	\$53,662
Sam Houston State Univ.	\$7,212	\$3,842	\$57,343
Stephen F. Austin	\$7,840	\$4,055	\$54,902
Statewide	\$12,276	\$5,415	\$69,623

Institutions are given wide latitude in determining how to spend state appropriations. Institutions often have significant sources of revenue in addition to state appropriations but the use of these funds is usually restricted in accordance with the conditions of contracts or grants which provides these funds. The percent of state appropriated funds budgeted for selected functional categories are presented in the table below.

Instruction includes faculty salaries and departmental operating expense. Academic Support includes Library and Instructional Administration which indirectly supports Instruction. Institutional Support is administrative overhead of operating the institution. O & M of Plant includes the routine maintenance of the buildings and grounds plus the cost of utilities.

FY 1999 All Funds State Appropriations	Instruction	Academic Support	Institutional Support	O & M of Plant
Texas A&M University	61.48%	5.99%	4.52%	15.18%
Prairie View A&M University	44.71%	6.41%	14.67%	13.55%
University of Houston	50.83%	10.76%	11.12%	9.94%
Texas Southern University	47.46%	8.80%	30.85%	9.56%
Tarleton State University	58.01%	10.39%	7.51%	12.60%
Lamar University	54.17%	9.62%	11.84%	13.11%
Sam Houston State Univ.	55.88%	13.12%	7.50%	11.13%
Stephen F. Austin	55.91%	8.78%	13.04%	12.77%
Statewide	54.48%	9.51%	10.08%	11.98%

Expenditure priorities should be examined where expenditures per functional category varies significantly from statewide averages (or identified peer institutions). As an example, it might be a priority to have faculty salaries in each discipline more closely approximate the statewide average for that discipline. For example, it might be a priority to have the law school faculty salary at TSU to approximate the statewide average salary for law school faculty. It might also be a priority to limit Institutional Support expenditures to the statewide average.

2. Texas Southern University should be commended for the progress accomplished in the implementation of the recommendations from the State Auditor's Office. The State Auditor's Office will be issuing a follow-up audit by February 28, 2000 as directed by rider 5 in the Appropriations Act.

The performance review of Texas Southern University by the Comptroller of Public Accounts reported 124 recommendation for improvement. Twelve of these recommendations were categorized under the heading of financial management and internal controls. Texas Southern University should address all recommendation for financial management and internal controls prior to the next legislative session.

3. Prairie View A&M has experienced success in preparing talented but marginally prepared students for college through its Academy for Collegiate Excellence and Student Success (ACCESS). Other universities and colleges have experienced similar success with enrichment programs in the summer prior to the start of the fall semester.

(ACCESS is a Bridge to College program designed to improve students' academic performance and assist in their smooth transition from high school to college. It consists of a seven-week summer residential, academic component and a freshman year component that provides continued academic enhancement and a wide variety of student support services.)

Special Item funding for Prairie View A&M's ACCESS program should be reinstated and expanded to fund more students in this program. Texas Southern University should seek special item funding to implement a similar enrichment program to improve the success of its students.

4. An appropriate source and level of funding should be provided for enhancing existing academic programs and the development of approved new academic programs. The funding should be comparable to the funding provided to improve academic programs at the South Texas Border Institutions.

5. The legislature should provide an appropriate source and level of funding for identified deferred maintenance needs and for the need for new facilities.

6. The Board of Regents should establish a development office to raise gift funds to supplement the legislative appropriations to establish endowed professorships and endowed scholarships.

Appendix 6

Changes to Prairie View A&M University Mission in the Texas Education Code and the Institution Mission Statement

PRAIRIE VIEW A & M UNIVERSITY TEXAS CONSTITUTION (ARTICLE VII)

Sec. 14. Prairie View A&M University. Sec. 14. Prairie View A&M University in Waller County is an institution of the first class under the direction of the same governing board as Texas A&M University referred to in Article VII, Section 13, of this constitution as the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. Amended Nov. 6, 1984.

TEXAS EDUCATION CODE Sec. 87.101. Prairie View A & M University. Prairie View A & M University is a coeducational institution of higher education located at Prairie View, in Waller County. Acts 1971, 62nd Leg., p. 3206, ch. 1024, art. 1, Sec. 1, eff. Sept. 1, 1971. Amended by Acts 1973, 63rd Leg., p. 580, ch. 249, Sec. 2, eff. Aug. 27, 1973.

Sec. 87.104. Purpose of the University.

In addition to its designation as a statewide general purpose institution of higher education and its designation as a land-grant institution, Prairie View A&M University is designated as a statewide special purpose institution of higher education for instruction, research, and public service programs which are dedicated to: (1) enabling students ~~with latent aptitudes, talents, and abilities~~ and of diverse economic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds to realize their full potential; (2) assisting small and medium-sized communities to achieve their optimal growth and development; and (3) assisting small and medium-sized agricultural, business, and industrial enterprises to manage their growth and development effectively.

Added by Acts 1981, 67th Leg., p. 3040, ch. 795, Sec. 1, eff. June 17, 1981.

INSTITUTION MISSION: Prairie View A&M University

Prairie View A&M University is dedicated to excellence in teaching, research and service. It is committed to achieving relevance in each component of its mission by addressing issues and proposing solutions through programs and services designed to respond to the needs and aspirations of individuals, families, organizations, agencies, schools, and communities B both rural and urban. Prairie View A&M University is a state-assisted institution; a land-grant institution by federal statute; and a ~~A~~state wide special purpose institution by legislative designation, serving a diverse ethnic and socioeconomic population ~~prominent among whom are~~ including the unserved and underserved. Having been designated by the Texas Constitution as one of three "institutions of the first class" (1984), the University is committed to attaining and sustaining intellectual rigor while not abandoning its historical mission of providing equal opportunity access ~~to persons who would likely be excluded from higher education were it not for Prairie View A&M University.~~ The University is committed to preparing undergraduates in a range of careers including but not limited to engineering, computer science, natural sciences, architecture, business, technology, criminal justice, the humanities, education, agricultural sciences, nursing, mathematics, and the social sciences. It is committed to advanced education through the master-s degree in education, engineering, natural sciences, nursing, selected social sciences, agriculture, business, and human sciences. It is committed to expanding its advanced education programs to the doctoral level.

Though the University-s service area has generally extended throughout Texas and the world, the University-s target service area for offering undergraduate and graduate programs of study includes the Texas Gulf Coast Region; the rapidly growing residential and commercial area known as the Northwest Houston Corridor as noted in the original Texas Plan; and urban Texas centers likely to benefit from Prairie View A&M University-s specialized programs and initiatives in nursing, juvenile justice, architecture, education, and social work. The University-s public service programs offered primarily

through the Cooperative Extension Program target the state of Texas, especially the rural and urban counties. The University's research foci include extending knowledge in all disciplines offered and incorporating research based experiences in both undergraduate and graduate students- academic development, particularly for students in agriculture, life sciences, the social sciences, engineering, computer sciences, and nursing.

Role and Scope

Following the 1871 legislature authorization establishing the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas (later to be named Texas A&M University), legislators pledged in the Texas Constitution of 1876 that ~~Aseparate schools shall be provided for the white and colored children, and impartial provisions shall be made for both.~~ On August 14, 1876, the Texas Legislature established the ~~AAgricultural and Mechanical College of Texas for Colored Youths~~ and placed responsibility for its management with the Board of Directors of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Bryan. The A&M College of Texas for Colored Youths opened at Prairie View, Texas on March 11, 1878. Though the University was established to serve the needs of ~~Apersons of color~~ in the state of Texas, today, admission to Prairie View A&M University, like all public institutions in the State, is without regard to race, creed, color, gender or national origin. ~~However, the continued unequal economic, political, and social status accorded ethnic minorities, particularly African Americans justifies the continued existence of educational institutions, such as Prairie View A&M University where there is commitment to meeting the special needs and supporting the aspirations of African Americans while not neglecting those of other populations.~~

The University's original curriculum was designated by the Texas Legislature in 1879 to be that of a ~~ANormal School~~ for the ~~Apreparation and training of Colored teachers.~~ This curriculum was expanded to include the arts and sciences, home economics, agriculture, mechanical arts, and nursing after the University was established as a branch of the agricultural experiment station (Hatch Act, 1887) and as a land-grant college (Morrill Act, 1890). That the college would conduct substantive research, both basic and applied, was affirmed. A natural concomitant was the expansion of graduate study. By 1937, eighteen years after the college was authorized to offer bachelors- degrees rather than diplomas and certificates, graduate study through the master-~~s~~ level had grown to the point of there being established a graduate studies division. Degrees were offered in agricultural economics, rural education, agricultural education, school administration and supervision, and rural sociology.

Prairie View Normal and Industrial College became Prairie View University in 1945 and the school was authorized to offer, ~~As the need arises,~~ all courses offered at the University of Texas. In 1947 the Texas Legislature changed the name to Prairie View A&M College of Texas and provided that ~~Acourses be offered in agriculture, the mechanical arts, engineering, and the natural sciences connected therewith, together with any other courses authorized at Prairie View at the time of passage of this Act, all of which shall be equivalent to those offered at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas at Bryan.~~ By August 27, 1973, when the name of the institution was changed to Prairie View A&M University, and its status as an independent unit of The Texas A&M University System was reconfirmed, the undergraduate and graduate curriculum framework were basically set. Despite resource shortages, poor physical facilities, the challenges to attracting and retaining doctoral level faculty, and lack of support for research infrastructure development, the enrollment, undergraduate and graduate grew.

The Texas Legislature acknowledged the University's rich tradition of service and identified various state-wide needs the University should address, including the assistance of students of diverse ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds to realize their full potential, and the assistance of small and medium-sized communities and businesses in their growth and development. However, not until 1983, when

the Texas Legislature proposed a constitutional amendment to restructure the Permanent University Fund to include Prairie View A&M University as a beneficiary of its proceeds did the University realize an opportunity to deliver on its charge to attain a curriculum resembling that of an institution nationally recognized in its areas of education and research@ (Board of Regents Texas A&M University System, January 1985).

In 1986, the total enrollment was 5,000 and the graduate enrollment was 400. Steadily, the enrollment increased over the next decade, especially in the graduate program. Most significant impactors on growth were access to funds released to the University following the restructuring of the Permanent University Fund and the Texas Plan's declaration of the Houston Northwest Corridor as part of the University's geographic service area. Growth in that segment of the University's service area was augmented by Houston's becoming the hub of the State's international interests, establishing major ports, becoming home to numerous consulates, expansion of travel and sports arenas, hosting of international banks and multinational corporate structures (Texas Plan, 1983, p.137). The Texas Plan projected doctoral programs for the University when it indicated that A. . .any new undergraduate, graduate, or professional degree program or course of study proposed. . .by Prairie View A&M University will receive priority consideration, provided those requests are consistent with the mission of the institution@ (Texas Plan, 1983, p. 132).

Salient features of the University's role and scope relative to teaching, research, and service as it moves into the 21st century follow:

Sustained commitment to educate for the professions and for meaningful societal participation, first generation college students many of whom come from families regarded as the unserved and the underserved educationally and economically.

Heightened commitment to educating for leadership in the professions, persons regardless of social and economic background, whose educational promise and career aspirations make them especially suited to advanced undergraduate study via honors programs and services and to graduate study through the doctorate.

Expanded research agenda to include creation and dissemination of new knowledge in basic and applied research in architecture, environmental science, space technology, food science, juvenile justice, education, as well as in focus areas of engineering, natural sciences, agriculture, and social sciences. Broadened service and outreach to encompass results driven impacts on youth and families in urban and rural communities.

Appendix 7

*Priority Plan Cost Estimates and Rationale
Prairie View A&M University
Texas Southern University*

Prairie View A&M University
Priority Plan – Cost Estimates (in millions)
October 2000

Priority		Biennium			Remaining Costs (see note 1)	Total	Source of Funding
		02/03	04/05	06/07			
1	Recruitment, Retention and Graduation						
	1.1 Create the University College, which provides an academically focused, student-centered environment for the entire university community with an emphasis on freshmen.	\$3.00				\$3.00	Special item
	1.2 Expand Project ACCESS, which provides a summer academic program for students prior to their freshman year and a freshman component that stresses academic advisement and support services for students.	\$1.00	\$1.50			\$2.50	Special item
	1.3 Provide start up funding for the operation of a student development and support center to house all educational and general, non-auxiliary student affairs, enrollment, and support functions.	\$1.00	\$1.50	\$2.00		\$4.50	Special item
	1.4 Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program.	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00		\$6.00	Special item (need 50% match from private sources)
2	Systems						
	2.1 Strengthen information technology services	\$1.00				\$1.00	Special item
	2.2 Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and develop a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.					\$0.00	Institutional/formula funding
3	Programs						
	3.1 Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as appropriate, obtain accreditation for programs that are not currently accredited.	\$0.50	\$0.40	\$0.30		\$1.20	Special item
4	Programs and Facilities						
	4.1 Construct new College of Nursing Building.	\$2.60	\$5.20	\$5.20	\$39.00	\$52.00	Tuition Revenue Bonds (\$30 construction)
	4.2 Enhance the College of Nursing by strengthening existing nursing and related programs.	\$1.00	\$0.78	\$0.52	\$0.26	\$2.56	Special item
5	Programs and Facilities						
	5.1 Enhance the College of Engineering by strengthening existing engineering and related programs.	\$0.68	\$0.51	\$0.34	\$0.17	\$1.70	Special item
	5.2 Develop new MS/PhD programs in Electrical Engineering.	\$2.21	\$1.66	\$1.11	\$0.55	\$5.53	Special item
	5.3 Upgrade or build additional engineering facilities as needed.	\$1.00	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$16.60	\$21.80	Tuition Revenue Bonds or PUF (\$12.0 construction)
6	Programs						
	6.1 Enhance Educator Preparation programs.	\$0.67	\$0.50	\$0.34	\$0.17	\$1.68	Special item
7	Programs and Facilities						

	7.1 Develop new BS in Construction Science		\$0.39	\$0.29		\$0.29	\$0.97	Special item
	7.2 Develop new Masters of Architecture		\$0.86	\$0.64		\$0.64	\$2.14	
	7.3 Construct new School of Architecture Building		\$1.20	\$2.40	\$2.40	\$18.40	\$24.40	Tuition Revenue Bonds or PUF (\$14 construction)
8	Facilities							
	8.1 Carry out renovations identified in Master Plan		\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$10.50	\$15.00	Tuition Revenue Bonds or PUF (\$15 base)
9	Systems							
	9.1 Strengthen institutional development office						\$0.00	Institutional/formula funding
10	Programs							
	10.1 Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs		\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00		\$6.00	Special item (need 50% match from private sources)
11	Programs and Facilities							
	11.1 Develop new PhD program in Juvenile Forensic Psychology				\$0.76	\$1.14	\$1.90	Special item
	11.2 New building for juvenile justice-related programs		\$1.30	\$2.60	\$2.60	\$20.20	\$26.70	Tuition Revenue Bonds (\$15 construction)
12	Programs							
	12.1 Develop new PhD in Educational Leadership			\$0.39	\$0.29	\$0.29	\$0.97	Special item
	12.2 Develop new MS in Computer Science		\$0.94	\$0.70	\$0.47	\$0.23	\$2.34	Special item
	12.3 Develop new MS in Information Systems				\$0.94	\$1.40	\$2.34	Special item
13	Mission							
	13.1 Delete language in the statutory mission						\$0.00	Institutional/formula funding
	13.2 Delete race-specific or exclusionary language in the institutional mission statement.						\$0.00	Institutional/formula funding

1. Remaining costs if funded over 10 biennia.

Prairie View A&M University
Priority Plan – Cost Estimates (in millions)
October 2000

Source of Funds	Biennium 02/03	04/05	06/07	Remaining Costs (see note 1)	Total
Tuition Revenue Bonds	\$3.90	\$7.80	\$7.80	\$59.20	\$78.70
Special item	\$16.00	\$13.19	\$12.00	\$5.14	\$46.33
Programs	\$8.00	\$8.19	\$8.00	\$5.14	\$29.33
Systems	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1.00
Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation	\$7.00	\$5.00	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$16.00
SUBTOTAL (TRB+Special items)	\$19.90	\$20.99	\$19.80	\$64.34	\$125.03
Institutional	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Tuition Revenue Bonds or PUF	\$3.70	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$45.50	\$61.20
TOTAL (IN MILLIONS)	\$23.60	\$26.99	\$25.80	\$109.84	\$186.23

1. Remaining costs if funded over 10 bienna.

**Priority Plan
Cost Estimates and Rationale
Prairie View A&M University**

Priority One: Recruitment, Retention and Graduation

1. Create the University College, which provides an academically focused, student-centered environment for the entire university community, with an emphasis on freshmen.

\$3 million dollars special item in the first biennium. This money was considered necessary by student support, academic and developmental education experts as start-up funds for creating a University College. The one-time funding is for staff, equipment, and other items. It is expected that subsequently the University College will support itself with regular formula funding.

2. Expand Project ACCESS, which provides a summer academic program for students prior to their freshman year and a freshman component that stresses academic advisement and support services for students.

\$2.5 million dollars special item over the first two biennia. This money was considered necessary by student support, academic and developmental education experts as start-up funds for expanding Project ACCESS. The one-time funding is for staff, equipment, and other items to deal with the expected growth of this program. It is expected that subsequently Project ACCESS will support itself.

3. Provide start up funding for the operation of a student development and support center to house all educational and general, non-auxiliary student affairs, enrollment, and support functions.

\$4.5 million special item spread over the next three biennia. Student support, developmental education and academic experts considered this funding necessary to consolidate the activities mentioned into a one-stop shopping service. The funding is intended to increase staff, complete the necessary move and renovations into a single center, and expand the breadth and depth of services provided.

4. Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program.

\$6 million dollars special item to be matched dollar for dollar from funds obtained through private sources. The endowed scholarship program with funding of \$2 million each year for six years is designed to enhance the recruitment and retention of top quality students. Our recommendation is for a fifty-fifty match with \$1 million in general revenue matching \$1 million in private gifts for the creation of the endowed scholarship fund. The state has never before provided general revenue funding for creating an endowed scholarship at an institution of higher education. This recommendation is not being made for any higher education institution other than Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University.

Priority Two: Systems

1. Strengthen information technology services

\$1 million dollars special item in the first biennium. This money was considered necessary by education system and information technology experts who reviewed the level of information technology at Prairie View A&M University. It is primarily intended for hardware and software to integrate the university systems and staff.

2. Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and develop a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding. This recommendation is currently being implemented by Prairie View A&M. It is intended that Prairie View A&M staff seek out the technical expertise necessary to complete this recommendation and Coordinating Board staff are available for help.

Priority Three: Programs

1. Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as appropriate, obtain accreditation for programs that are not currently accredited.

\$1.2 million dollars special item spread over three biennia. This money was considered necessary by experts on accreditation for a review and the subsequent steps to maintain accreditation and/or obtain it, as appropriate. It is expected that the institution will be able to maintain accreditation for all programs subsequent to this initial effort.

Priority Four: Programs and Facilities

1. Construct new College of Nursing Building.

\$52 million dollar tuition revenue bond (including debt service) with a \$30 million dollar construction cost. A comparative analysis was conducted to determine the amount of square feet available per full-time-equivalent student. Prairie View had a larger amount of space per FTE than other institutions, but the quality of space was not satisfactory.

A nursing building would be classified as a classroom building that cost, on average, \$177 per gross square foot. Since the current building would have to be demolished and a parking garage added, the cost was increased to \$250 per gross square foot plus an additional \$5 million for the garage. This would construct a 100,000 gross square foot building with 60,000 net assignable square feet at a cost of \$30 million.

Institution	Nursing NASF	Fall 1998	FTE	Feet per	Feet per
		Nursing Credit Hours		FTE	Credit Hr
Texas Women's University	42,772	9,245	616.33	69.40	4.63
Prairie View A&M	25,937	3,680	245.33	105.72	7.05
UT-Arlington	32,805	8,100	540.00	60.75	4.05
Midwestern State University	10,502	1,920	128.00	82.05	5.47
Lamar University	8,456	3,297	219.80	38.47	2.56
San Angelo State	9,471	1,922	128.13	73.92	4.93
Texas A&M-Corpus Christi	7,726	2,598	173.20	44.61	2.97
Stephen Austin State	7,629	1,202	80.13	95.20	6.35
UT-Pan American	9,276	1,882	125.47	73.93	4.93
West Texas A&M	7,098	2,914	194.27	36.54	2.44
Total	161,672	36,760	2450.67	65.97	4.40

FTE is calculated by credit hours divided by 15.

2. Enhance the College of Nursing by strengthening existing nursing and related programs.

\$2.6 million special item spread out over four biennia. To strengthen and enhance programs, we assumed the need for additional instructional effort equivalent to three semester credit hours for the estimated number of students in the programs. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this additional effort in each area to arrive at an estimated annual program cost. The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	SCH equivalent to effort	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
Nursing	600	3	5.32	54.44	\$1,042,574(1) 781,931 (2) 521,287 (3) 260,644 (4)

Priority Five: Programs and Facilities

1. Enhance the College of Engineering by strengthening existing engineering and related programs.

\$1.7 million special item spread out over four biennia. To strengthen and enhance programs, we assumed the need for additional instructional effort equivalent to three semester credit hours for the estimated number of students in the programs. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this additional effort in each area to arrive at an estimated annual program cost. The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	SCH equivalent to effort	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
Engineering and engineering related	600	3	3.46	54.44	\$678,066 (1) 508,550 (2) 339,033 (3) 169,517 (4)

2. Develop new MS/PhD programs in Electrical Engineering.

\$5.5 million special item spread out over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of

new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
Masters in Electrical Engineering	25	24	8.2	54.44	\$535,658 (1) 401,744 (2) 267,829 (3) 133,915 (4)
PhD in Electrical Engineering	40	18	21.4	54.44	\$1,677,526 (1) 1,258,145 (2) 838,763 (3) 419,382 (4)

3. Upgrade or build additional engineering facilities as needed.

\$21.8 million dollar tuition revenue bond (including debt service) with a \$12 million dollar construction cost or PUF. In comparing costs of engineering buildings, \$200 per gross square foot was developed. A 60,000 gross square foot building or an addition to a current building would provide a minimum of 36,000 net assignable square feet. The construction of an architecture building would free up space currently used for architecture instruction in the Engineering Building. The Wilson Engineering Complex has 46,838 net assignable square feet and the addition of the 36,000 feet would total 82,838 NASF.

Priority Six: Programs

1. Enhance Educator Preparation programs.

\$1.7 million special item spread out over four biennia. To strengthen and enhance programs, we assumed the need for additional instructional effort equivalent to three semester credit hours for the estimated number of students in the programs. We then applied the formula funding rate to this additional effort in each area to arrive at an estimated annual program cost. The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	SCH equivalent to effort	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
Educator Preparation	400	6	2.57	54.44	\$671,532 (1) 503,649 (2) 335,766 (3) 167,883 (4)

Priority Seven: Programs and Facilities

1. Develop new BS in Construction Science

\$.97 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
BS in Construction Science	75	27	1.76	54.44	\$388,026 (1) 291,020 (2) 194,013 (3) 97,007 (4)

2. Develop new Masters of Architecture

\$2.1 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
M.Arch in Architecture	40	24	8.2	54.44	\$857,054 (1) 642,791 (2) 428,527 (3) 214,264 (4)

3. Construct new School of Architecture Building

\$24.4 million dollar tuition revenue bond (including debt service) with a \$14 million dollar construction cost or PUF. In comparing costs of engineering, architecture and science buildings, a project cost of \$191 per gross square foot was developed. A 73,298 gross square foot building would provide almost 44,000 net assignable square feet. In fall 1998, Prairie View generated 1,376 semester credit hours in architecture. A 44,000 net assignable square foot building would provide approximately 32 square feet per semester credit hour and free up space in the Engineering Building for engineering students. The average space per credit hour is 1 square feet, 2 with Texas A&M University having the greatest amount of space at 18.5.

	Hours	Total NASF	Feet per SCH
Texas A&M	5,159	95,606	18.53189
UT-Austin	6,677	79,222	11.86491
Texas Tech	8,984	86,111	9.584929
UT-San Antonio	3,462	19,317	5.579723
UT-Arlington	5,151	75,730	14.702
Total	29,433	355,986	12.09479

Priority Eight: Facilities

\$15 million dollar cost paid by Tuition Revenue Bonds or PUF. Institutions are required to submit four annual Master Plan reports to the Coordinating Board every October. The first report (MP1) is a list of major projects the institution plans to undertake in the next five years. The second report (MP2) is a list of deferred maintenance items that require action in the next five years. The third report (MP3) is a report that describes how much will be expended to address the deferred maintenance items in the MP2 for the next five years. The fourth report (MP4) details how much was spent in the previous year on deferred maintenance.

The following list of repair and renovation and deferred maintenance items was submitted to the Coordinating Board in October 1999.

Bldg No.	Description	Amount
0529	CENTRAL PLANT UPGRADE & SYSTEMS	\$ 3,878,000
0705	EXIT SIGN UPGRADE	\$ 22,135
0743	FIRE ALARM IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 100,000
0758	FOUNDATION REPAIR	\$ 100,000
0758	GYM FLOOR REPLACEMENT	\$ 250,000
0734	CLARIFIER CLEANING	\$ 44,000
IN01	ABOVE GROUND WATER TANK IMPROVEMENT	\$ 140,000
0669	LIGHTNING ARRESTER REPAIRS	\$ 40,000
IN02	ELEVATOR UPGRADE COMPLIANCE	\$ 30,000
0537	BELOW GRADE WATERPROOFING	\$ 30,000
0501	BELOW GRADE WATERPROOFING	\$ 15,000
0669	GYM FLOOR LIGHTING UPGRADE	\$ 22,000
IN03	STREET GATE ARMS INSTALLATION	\$ 90,000
0529	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 30,000
0739	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 35,000
0517	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 15,000
0689	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 250,000
0676	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 30,000
0739	COOLING TOWER REPAIRS	\$ 100,000
0689	CHILLED WATER PIPING INSTALLATION	\$ 300,000
0761	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 95,000
0674	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 35,000

October 2000

0512	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 125,000
0744	ROOF RESTORATION	\$ 100,000
0544	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 75,000
0541	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 75,000
IN04	REPLCE TRANSITE PIPING	\$ 98,000
IN05	REPLACE TRANSITE PIPING	\$ 88,000
IN06	REPLACE TRANSITE PIPING	\$ 65,000
0669	POOL IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 80,000
0512	CLEAN HVAC DUCTWORK ALL BUILDINGS	\$ 200,000
0744	FOUNDATION IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 150,000
0743	BELOW GRADE WATERPROOFING	\$ 70,000
0537	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 100,000
0688	ROOF REPLACEMENT	\$ 20,000
0744	LIGHTNING ARRESTER REPAIRS	\$ 90,000
IN07	STREET MODIFICATIONS	\$ 300,000
IN08	STREET RESURFACING	\$ 2,000,000
IN09	REPAIR FEEDER 2000	\$ 20,000
IN10	REPLACE UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL	\$ 400,000
IN11	REPLACE HIGH VOLTAGE CABLE	\$ 170,000
IN12	REPLACE OVERHEADHIGH VOLTAGE	\$ 120,000
IN13	REPLACE TUNNEL PIPING	\$ 100,000
IN14	REROUTE CHILL LINES HARRINGTON SCIENCE BLDG.	\$ 40,000
IN15	REPLACE SWITCH GEAR ARCHIECTURE	\$ 600,000
IN16	REPLACE SWITCH GEAR NORRIS	\$ 320,000
IN17	REPLACE CLAY PIPE SS-AI	\$ 30,000
IN18	REHAB BOOST PUMP WATER TOWER	\$ 18,000
IN19	REPLACE SS CLAY PIPE - W-CAMPUS	\$ 45,000
0517	REHAB BUILDING	\$ 100,000
0739	CHILLER RETROFIT	\$ 300,000
0739	BOILER REPLACEMENT	\$ 900,000
0739	UPGRADE PP CONDENSER HEADER	\$ 250,000
0739	CONTROL PANEL UPGRADE	\$ 150,000
0669	EXTERIOR AIR GRILL WATERPROOFING	\$ 11,000
IN20	ENERGY MANAGEMENT UPGRADE ALL BUILDINGS	\$ 1,000,000
IN21	ELEVATED WATER TOWER IMPROVEMENT	\$ 150,000
IN22	REPLACE CLAY SS PIPE CENTRAL CAMPUS	\$ 33,000
IN23	REPLACE CLAY SS PIPING THIRD STREET	\$ 45,000
IN24	REPLACE CLAY SS PIPING AVENUE A	\$ 68,000
IN25	REHAB GAS DETECTOR SCALES	\$ 15,000
IN26	SIDEWALK EXPANSION JOINT UPGRADE	\$ 12,000
IN27	GAS LINE IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 240,000
IN28	NEW ROAD BYPASS	\$ 200,000
IN29	EMERGENCY PORTABLE SEWAGE PUMP	\$ 65,000
0525	EQUIPMENT SHED IMPROVEMENT	\$ 40,000
0727	RELOCATED STEAM STATION	\$ 70,000
0512	REPLACE EMERGENCY GENERATOR SWITCH	\$ 20,000
IN30	SURGE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT WASTEWATER PLANT	\$ 24,000
IN31	INSTALL CHEMICAL STORAGE GROUNDS	\$ 15,000

IN32	SOIL EROSION CONTAINMENT	\$ 50,000
IN33	BACKFLOW IRRIGATION METERING UPGRADE	\$ 50,000
IN34	TREE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM	\$ 40,000
0658	HEAT EXCHANGER REPLACEMENT	\$ 20,000
0727	EMERGENCY GENERATOR INSTALLATION	\$ 45,000
0669	ROOM PARTITION INSTALLATION	\$ 20,000
0529	UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK REMOVAL	\$ 25,000
0689	INTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENT	\$ 40,000
0669	CEREMONIAL ADA/SAFETY UPGRADE	\$ 108,000
IN35	REKEY MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL ROOMS ALL BUILDINGS	\$ 40,000
IN36	REKEY TELEPHONE & COMMUNICATION ROOMS ALL BUILDINGS	\$ 25,000
IN37	TREE INVENTORY UPGRADE	\$ 15,000
0555	DEMOLISH	\$ 100,000
0679	DEMOLISH	\$ 200,000
	TOTAL	\$15,636,135

Priority Nine: Systems

1. Strengthen institutional development office

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding

Priority Ten: Programs

1. Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs

\$6 million special item over three biennia. To recruit and retain the best faculty, we recommended creating two endowed faculty chairs each year for six years. The state has never before provided general revenue funding for creating endowed chairs. Our recommendation is for a fifty-fifty match with general revenue matching private gifts for the creation of the endowed chairs. We also recommended the endowment for each chair is established at \$1 million. This recommendation is not being made for any higher education institution other than Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University.

Priority Eleven: Programs and Facilities

1. Develop new PhD program in Juvenile Forensic Psychology

\$1.9 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of

new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
PhD in Juvenile Forensic Psychology	20	18	19.29	54.44	\$756,062 (1) 567,047 (2) 378,031 (3) 189,016 (4)

2. New building for juvenile justice-related programs

\$26.7 million dollar tuition revenue bond (including debt service) and a \$15 million dollar bond package. In fall 1998, criminal justice programs accounted for 1,146 credit hours or approximately 77 FTE. In fall 1999, criminal justice programs generated 1,806 credit hours or 121 FTE including 300 hours in juvenile justice. Psychology curriculum generated 3,111 credit hours or 207 FTE.

A classroom building of 70,423 gross square feet with 49,296 assignable square feet would provide an average of 122 square feet per FTE in criminal justice and psychology. This would provide considerable space for these programs and be sufficient for growth in the juvenile justice program.

Because accommodations for psychology labs increase the construction cost of a building, an estimated \$212 per gross square foot has been calculated for this building.

Priority Twelve: Programs

1. New PhD in Educational Leadership

\$.97 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
PhD in Educational Leadership	20	18	9.95	54.44	\$389,986 (1) 292,490 (2) 194,993 (3) 97,497 (4)

2. Develop new MS in Computer Science

\$2.3 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MS in Computer Science	50	24	7.17	54.44	\$936,750 (1) 702,563 (2) 468,375 (3) 234,188 (4)

3. Develop new MS in Information Systems

\$2.3 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the all funds formula-funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MS in Information Systems	50	24	7.17	54.44	\$936,750 (1) 702,563 (2) 468,375 (3) 234,188 (4)

Priority Thirteen: Mission

1. Delete language in the statutory mission in the Texas Education Code, section 87.104.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding.

2. Delete race-specific or exclusionary language in the institutional mission statement.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding.

Texas Southern University
Priority Plan - Cost Estimates (in millions)
October 2000

Priority	Biennium	Biennium			Remaining Costs (see note 1)	Total	Source of Funding
		02/03	04/05	06/07			
1	Systems						
	1.1 Continue to meet all recommendations from the State Auditor's Office, the Comptroller of Public Accounts and any other recommendations to strengthen financial and administrative systems.				\$0.0		Institutional/formula funding
	1.2 Strengthen academic planning and support functions.	\$1.0			\$1.0		Special item
	1.3 Establish institutional development office.	\$0.5			\$0.5		Special item
	1.4 Develop and implement systems for facilities planning, construction, operation and maintenance.				\$0.0		Institutional/formula funding
	1.5 Strengthen information technology services.	\$0.5	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$1.0		Special item funding
	1.6 Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and provide a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.				\$0.0		Institutional/formula funding
2	Recruitment, Retention and Graduation						
	2.1 Upgrade student enrollment services.				\$0.0		Institutional/formula funding
	2.2 Establish a summer and first year academic support	\$2	\$3	\$4	\$28	\$37.0	Special item

	program for incoming freshmen and upgrade the academic support center.						
	2.3 Build additional student housing.	\$1.5	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$22.5	\$30.0	Private Funding
	2.4 Improve programs providing basic skills in reading, writing and math.	\$0.9	\$1.1	\$0.9	\$0.45	\$3.3	Special Item
	2.5 Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program.	\$2	\$2	\$2		\$6.0	Special item (need 50% match from private sources)
3	Facilities						
	3.1 Finish facilities renovations in plan approved by Coordinating Board to help provide a safe, efficient and attractive campus.	\$2.8	\$2.8	\$2.8	\$19.6	\$28.0	Tuition Revenue Bonds or HEAF (\$16 base)
	3.2 Develop a campus master plan outlining future planning, renovation and construction.	\$0.25				\$0.3	Special item
	3.3 Implement a landscaping plan.	\$0.87	\$0.87	\$0.87	\$6.09	\$8.7	Tuition Revenue Bonds (\$5 base)
4	Programs						
	4.1 Conduct a review of graduate and undergraduate programs and use the results of the review to strengthen programs.	\$0.5	\$0.4	\$0.3		\$1.2	Special item
	4.2 Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as appropriate, obtain accreditation for all programs that are not currently accredited.	\$0.5	\$0.4	\$0.3		\$1.2	Special item
	4.3 Strengthen programs in Law, Pharmacy, Business and Educator Preparation.	\$3.14	\$2.35	\$1.57	\$0.78	\$7.8	Special Item
5	Facilities						
	5.1 Plan, design and construct a new Science	\$2.6	\$5.2	\$5.2	\$39	\$52.0	Tuition Revenue Bonds (\$30 construction)

	Building in conjunction with the Campus Master Plan.							
6	Programs							
	6.1 Develop new MA/PhD in Urban Planning and Environmental Policy	\$0.56	\$0.42	\$0.28	\$0.14	\$1.4	Special item	
	6.2 Develop new MS in Health Care Administration	\$0.51	\$0.38	\$0.25	\$0.13	\$1.3	Special item	
	6.3 Develop new MS in Computer Science		\$0.56	\$0.42	\$0.42	\$1.4	Special item	
	6.4 Develop new MS/PhD in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Sciences		\$0.95	\$0.72	\$0.72	\$2.4	Special item	
	6.5 Develop new BS in Computer Engineering Technology		\$0.75	\$0.56	\$0.56	\$1.9	Special item	
	6.6 Develop new MS in Management Information Systems			\$0.75	\$1.12	\$1.9	Special item	1.87
	6.7 Develop new MA/PhD in Administration of Justice Programs			\$0.71	\$1.08	\$1.8	Special item	
7	7.1 Reestablish the School of Public Affairs	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.5		\$1.5	Special item	
8	Programs							
	8.1 Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs	\$2	\$2	\$2		\$6.0	Special item (need 50% match from private sources)	
9	Recruitment, Retention and Graduation							
	9.1 Develop a Child Care Center to provide student, faculty and staff child care services in conjunction with Child and Family Development Program	\$1.1				\$1.1	Institutional funding	
10	Mission							
	10.1 Change statutory mission statement at Texas Education Code, _106.02.					\$0.0	Institutional funding	

1.Remaining costs if funded over 10 biennia.

Texas Southern University
Priority Plan - Cost Estimates (in millions)
October 2000

Source of Funds	Biennium 02/03	04/05	06/07	Remaining Costs (see note 1)	Total
Tuition Revenue Bonds	\$3.47	\$6.07	\$6.07	\$45.09	\$60.70
Special item	\$14.86	\$15.06	\$15.51	\$33.40	\$78.83
Programs	\$7.71	\$8.71	\$8.36	\$4.95	\$29.73
Systems	\$2.00	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$0.00	\$2.50
Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation Facilities	\$4.90	\$6.10	\$6.90	\$28.45	\$46.35
	\$0.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.25
SUBTOTAL (TRB+Special items)	\$18.33	\$21.13	\$21.58	\$78.49	\$139.53
Institutional	\$1.10	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1.10
Tuition Revenue Bonds or HEAF	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$19.60	\$28.00
Private	\$1.50	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$22.50	\$30.00
TOTAL (IN MILLIONS)	\$23.73	\$26.93	\$27.38	\$120.59	\$198.63

1. Remaining costs if funded over 10 biennia.

**Priority Plan
Cost Estimates and Rationale
Texas Southern University**

Priority One: Systems

1. Continue to meet all recommendations from the State Auditor's Office, the Comptroller of Public Accounts and any other recommendations to strengthen financial and administrative systems.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding.

2. Strengthen academic planning and support functions.

\$1 million dollars special item in the first biennium. This money was considered necessary by education system experts who reviewed the functions to boost staffing and equipment for enhancing Texas Southern's research, planning and evaluation system, with particular regard to its academic programs.

3. Establish institutional development office.

\$0.5 million dollars special item in the first biennium. This money was considered necessary by education system experts who reviewed the office for increasing the number of staff in the office. It is expected that the results of its developmental efforts in the near future will serve to fund this office entirely.

4. Develop and implement systems for facilities planning, construction, operation and maintenance.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding. This recommendation is currently being implemented with the assistance of staff from the Coordinating Board and a consultant hired by Texas Southern.

5. Strengthen information technology services.

\$1 million dollars special item spread over three biennia. This money was considered necessary by education system and information technology experts who reviewed the level of information technology at Texas Southern. It is primarily intended for hardware and software to integrate the university systems and staff.

6. Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and provide a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding. This recommendation is currently being implemented by Texas Southern. It is intended that Texas Southern staff seek out the technical expertise necessary to complete this recommendation. Coordinating Board staff are available to help.

Priority Two: Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation

1. Upgrade student enrollment services.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding. It is intended that Texas Southern staff seek out the technical expertise necessary to complete this recommendation. Coordinating Board staff are available to help.

2. Establish a summer and first-year academic support program for incoming freshmen and upgrade the academic support center.

\$37 million dollars special item over ten biennia. An assumption to this plan is that funding is in addition to the current level of special items currently received by the institution. Last biennium, Prairie View received about \$600,000 per year in special item funding to provide similar services related to the delivery of developmental education and assessment services for about 600 students. The \$1,000 per student was the basis for the figures for Texas Southern with an assumption of about 1,000 students per year the first biennium, 1,500 per year the second biennium, and 2,000 per year for each successive biennium.

3. Build additional student housing.

\$30 million dollars (including estimated debt service) from private funding. In the three-biennium plan, a total base cost of \$17.2 million was estimated. The Coordinating Board database indicates housing that is constructed and operated by institutions and not private enterprise. An estimate was derived from the most recent student housing projects presented to the Coordinating Board. The average cost per bed in apartment style dormitories that institutions construct and manage average between \$14,000 and \$23,000 per bed. The total cost of \$30 million includes debt service, but if student housing were privately owned, debt service would not be a factor. The schedule and total cost of student housing at Texas Southern University would depend on the contract signed with a private developer.

4. Improve programs providing basic skills in reading, writing and math.

\$3.4 million dollars special item over four biennia. This money was considered necessary by education experts who reviewed the developmental programs at Texas Southern. It is primarily intended for program review and changes suggested by that review and is likely to include staffing, curriculum development, and the addition of more classes.

5. Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program.

\$6 million dollars special item to be matched dollar for dollar from funds obtained through private sources. The endowed scholarship program with funding of \$2 million each year for six years is designed to enhance the recruitment and retention of top quality students. Our recommendation is for a fifty-fifty match with \$1 million in general revenue matching \$1 million in private gifts for the creation of the endowed scholarship fund. The state has never before provided general revenue funding for creating an endowed scholarship at an institution of higher education. This recommendation is not being made for any higher education institution other than Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University.

Priority Three: Facilities

1. Finish facilities renovations in plan approved by Coordinating Board to help provide a safe, efficient and attractive campus.

Texas Southern University contracted with Ferro-Saylor, Inc., 3D/International, and ESPA Corporation to conduct a facilities audit of campus buildings and structures that excluded buildings or structures constructed or renovated in the past two years, or are currently being renovated. The following is a list of buildings and infrastructure items and the amount needed to eliminate all mechanical system deficiencies from the audit that was completed in July 2000. Auxiliary projects are prohibited by law to receive State funding and are excluded from this list.

The development of a campus master plan will affect which buildings are actually selected for renovation and when, as well as which buildings will be demolished and when.

Bldg No.	Building	Amount
101	Hannah Hall	\$1,800,327
103	Robert T. Library	\$2,019,476
104	Nabrit Science	\$3,254,788
105	Fairchild Building	\$212,973
106	Industrial Education	\$364,308
108	University Auditorium	\$3,425,745
109	Rhinehart Auditorium	\$418,527
110	Banks Child Dev. Lab	\$396,198
116	Auto Mechanics Bldg	\$462,354
126	Satellite Thermal Plan	\$484,271
132	E.O. Bell Bldg	\$804,421
144	R.S. Music Center	\$1,812,483
145	Lane Home Economics	\$1,450,435
147	T. Marshall Law Bldg	\$2,065,770
148	Sterling Student Center	\$2,609,441
152	Warehouse & Receiving	\$1,471,032
153	Athletic Facility	\$587,739
154	H&PE Observation	\$56,903
161	Gen Service Building	\$1,499,132
163	School of Technology	\$3,097,773
164	H&PE Building	\$1,205,901

	Tunnel Utilities	\$2,985,156
	Sanitary Sewers	\$3,536,594
	Storm Sewers	\$2,251,943
	Total	\$38,388,969

2. Develop a campus master plan outlining future planning, renovation and construction.

\$.25 million special item in first biennium. This funding is considered necessary by facilities experts for consulting and other expenses associated with a comprehensive review of the campus and the development of a high quality, integrated campus master plan.

3. Implement a landscaping plan.

\$8.7 million dollar tuition revenue bond (including debt service) with a \$5 million dollar base cost. Landscaping plans approved by the Coordinating Board have ranged from \$400,000 to \$6.5 million depending on the scope of the project. The Facilities Committee visited the campus and strongly recommended that a plan be put in place. The consensus was to estimate this cost on the high range of the projects approved because of improvements, e.g. fences, changes in flow of traffic, and general improvements to the beautification to the Texas Southern campus.

Priority Four: Programs

1. Conduct a review of graduate and undergraduate programs and use the results of the review to strengthen programs.

\$1.2 million dollars special item spread over three biennia. This money was considered necessary by experts on academic system management for a review and the subsequent steps to ensure a strong cadre of academic programs and a strong system for continually evaluating it. It is expected that the institution will develop a continuing review system that can be subsequently funded with formula funding.

2. Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as appropriate, obtain accreditation for all programs that are not currently accredited.

\$1.2 million dollars special item spread over three biennia. This money was considered necessary by experts on accreditation for a review and the subsequent steps to maintain accreditation and/or obtain it, as appropriate. It is expected that the institution will be able to maintain accreditation for all programs subsequent to this initial effort.

3. Strengthen programs in Law, Pharmacy, Business and Educator Preparation.

\$7.8 million special item spread out over four biennia. To strengthen and enhance programs, we assumed the need for additional instructional effort equivalent to three semester credit hours for the estimated number of students in the programs. We then applied the formula funding rate to this additional effort in each area to arrive at an estimated annual program cost. The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation

October 2000

for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	SCH equivalent to effort	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
Law	625	3	3.22	54.44	\$657,324 (1) 492,993 (2) 328,662 (3) 164,331 (4)
Educator Preparation	500	3	2.57	54.44	\$419,708 (1) 314,781 (2) 209,854 (3) 104,927 (4)
Pre-Pharmacy	400	3	4.00	54.44	\$522,594 (1) 391,946 (2) 261,297 (3) 130,649 (4)
Pharmacy	400	3	9.00	54.44	\$1,175,836 (1) 881,877 (2) 587,918 (3) 293,959 (4)
Business	700	3	1.59	54.44	\$363,530 (1) 272,648 (2) 181,765 (3) 90,883 (4)

Priority Five: Facilities

1. Plan, design and construct a new Science Building in conjunction with the Campus Master Plan.

\$52 million dollar tuition revenue bond (including debt service) with a \$30 million dollar construction cost. The cost of the science building was based on costs for the following projects approved by the Coordinating Board in 1998 and 1999.

Institution	Type	Cost	Gross Sq. Ft.	Fall 99 Headcount	Cost per GSF
A&M Corpus Christi	Science	\$13,729,000	67,366	6,621	\$203.80
UT Brownsville	Science	\$22,500,000	101,378	10,433	\$221.94
Prairie View A&M	Science	\$28,000,000	166,217	6,273	\$168.45
Tarleton	Science	\$28,000,000	155,188	7,433	\$180.43
Total	Science	\$92,229,000	490,149		\$188.16

A \$30 million science building at \$188.16 per gross square foot would produce a building approximately 159,434 gross square feet. This building would be considerably larger than the science building at UT Brownsville for 10,433 students, and almost equal to the science buildings at Tarleton State University and Prairie View A&M University.

Priority Six: Programs

1. Develop new MA/PhD in Urban Planning and Environmental Policy

\$1.4 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the formula funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated Biennial program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MA Urban Planning & Environmental Policy	20	24	3.94	54.44	\$205,902 (1) 154,427 (2) 102,951 (3) 51,476 (4)
PhD Urban Planning & Environmental Policy	15	18	12.04	54.44	\$353,926 (1) 265,445 (2) 176,963 (3) 88,482 (4)

2. Develop new MS in Health Care Administration

\$1.3 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the formula funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MS in Health Care Administration	30	24	6.47	54.44	\$507,178 (1) 380,384 (2) 253,589 (3) 126,795 (4)

3. Develop new MS in Computer Science

\$1.4 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the formula funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of

hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MS in Computer Science	30	24	7.17	54.44	\$562,050 (1) 421,538 (2) 281,025 (3) 140,513 (4)

4. Develop new MS/PhD in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

\$2.4 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the formula funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MS in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Science	20	24	7.55	54.44	\$394,558 (1) 295,919 (2) 197,279 (3) 98,640 (4)
PhD in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Science	15	18	19.11	54.44	\$561,756 (1) 421,317 (2) 280,878 (3) 140,439 (4)

5. Develop new BS in Computer Engineering Technology

\$1.9 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the formula funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
BS in Computer Engineering Technology	100	27	2.56	54.44	\$752,534 (1) 564,401 (2) 376,267 (3) 188,134 (4)

6. Develop new MS in Management Information Systems

\$1.9 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the formula funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of

hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MS in Management Information Sciences	40	24	7.17	54.44	\$749,400 (1) 562,050 (2) 374,700 (3) 187,350 (4)

7. Develop new MA/PhD in Administration of Justice

\$1.8 million special item spread over four biennia. To develop new academic programs, we estimated the number of new students to the university in each program after the program had matured (been in operation for four years) and multiplied the students by the average number of semester credit hours taken per academic year. We then applied the formula funding rate to this new additional student semester credit hours generated by the new programs to arrive an estimated annual program cost. The funding provided for start-up of new programs (cost of hiring faculty and developing curriculum) is assumed to be covered by the formula funding that would be provided for a mature program.

The all funds formula rate is general revenue and tuition and lab fees but our recommendation for special item funding is all general revenue. The special item funding would be provided over four biennia, with 100 percent in the first biennium, 75 percent in the second biennium, 50 percent in the third biennium, and 25 percent in the fourth biennium. In the second biennium, the institution would start to receive the regular formula funding for semester credit hours generated in these programs in addition to this special item funding.

Program	Estimated # of students	Average SCH per student	Program Weight	Instruction & Operations Funding Rate	Estimated Biennial Program Cost
MA in Administration of Justice	35	24	3.94	54.44	\$360,328 (1) 270,246 (2) 180,164 (3) 90,082 (4)
PhD in Administration of Justice	15	18	12.04	54.44	\$353,926 (1) 265,445 (2) 176,963 (3) 88,482 (4)

Priority Seven: Programs

1. Reestablish the School of Public Affairs

\$1.5 million special item spread out over three biennia. This money was considered necessary by education experts who reviewed the benefits that this school would bring in both academic organization of degree programs and value to the state. The money is intended for administrative support staff and it is intended that subsequently the school will operate with formula funding money.

Priority Eight: Programs

1. Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs

\$6 million special item spread over three biennia. To recruit and retain the best faculty, we recommended creating two endowed faculty chair each year for six years. The state has never before provided general revenue funding for creating endowed chairs. Our recommendation is for a fifty-fifty match with general revenue matching private gifts for the creation of the endowed chairs. We also recommended the endowment for each chair be established at \$1 million. This recommendation is not being made for any higher education institution other than Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University.

Priority Nine: Recruitment, Retention and Graduation

1. Develop a Child Care Center to provide student, faculty and staff child care services in conjunction with Child and Family Development Program

\$1.1 million special item for one biennium. This is seed money considered by professionals to be necessary to start a child care center on campus and ensure its facilities support the Child and Family Development Program.

October 2000

Priority Ten: Mission

1. Change statutory mission statement at Texas Education Code, 106.02.

No additional cost. Funded by regular formula funding.

Appendix 8

*Priority Plan Implementation Schedule
Prairie View A&M University
Texas Southern University*

**Priority Plan
Implementation Schedule
Prairie View A&M University**

Priority One: Recruitment, Retention and Graduation

1. Create the University College, which provides an academically focused, student-centered environment for the entire university community with an emphasis on freshmen.

September 2001 - Implement program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2003 - program fully functional and self-sustaining

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Expand Project ACCESS, which provides a summer academic program for students prior to their freshman year and a freshman component that stresses academic advisement and support services for students.

September 2001 - Expand program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2005 - program fully functional and self-sustaining

October 2005 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Provide start up funding for the operation of a student development and support center to house all educational and general, non-auxiliary student affairs, enrollment, and support functions.

September 2001 - Implement

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007 - Support center fully developed and fully functional

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

4. Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program.

September 2000 - Design and develop program criteria

January 2001 - Work with institutional development office to secure matching funds

September 2001 - Implement

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007 - Program fully developed and fully functional

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Two: Systems

1. Strengthen information technology services.

March 2001 - Assessment Review completed and targets identified

September 2001 - Modifications completed

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and develop a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.

March 2001 - Assessment review completed and targets identified

December 2001 - Modifications completed

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Three: Programs

1. Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as appropriate, obtain accreditation for programs that are not currently accredited.

April 2001 - Accreditation review completed and target programs identified

December 2001 - Accreditation process for targeted non-accredited programs begun

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2003 - Accreditation process complete

October 2003 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Four: Programs and Facilities

1. Construct new College of Nursing Building.

September 2001 - Start planning and design September 2001

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2005 - Complete

October 2005 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Enhance the College of Nursing by strengthening existing nursing and related programs.

July 2001 - Assessment review completed and yearly goals identified

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007 - Goals identified in the assessment review met

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Five: Programs and Facilities

1. Enhance the College of Engineering by strengthening existing engineering and related programs.

July 2001 - Assessment review completed and yearly goals identified

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007 - Goals identified in the assessment review met

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Develop new MS/PhD programs in Electrical Engineering.

September 2001 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

January 2002 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2002 - Accept first students in program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2007 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Upgrade or build additional engineering facilities as needed.

September 2001 - Start planning and design

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2005 - Complete

October 2005 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Six: Programs

1. Enhance Educator Preparation programs.

July 2001 - Assessment review completed and yearly goals identified

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007 - Goals identified in the assessment review met

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Seven: Programs and Facilities

1. Develop new BS in Construction Science.

September 2002 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

November 2002 - Coordinating Board approval

January 2003 - Accept first students in program

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

January 2008 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Develop new Masters of Architecture.

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

February 2003 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

April 2003 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2003 - Accept first students in program

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2008 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Construct new School of Architecture Building.

September 2001 - Start planning and design

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2005 - Complete

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Eight: Facilities

1. Carry out renovations identified in Master Plan.

September 2001 - Begin renovations

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2005 - All renovations complete

October 2005 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Bldg No.	Description	Start	Complete
0529	CENTRAL PLANT UPGRADE & SYSTEMS	Sep-01	Sep-03
0705	EXIT SIGN UPGRADE	Sep-01	Oct-02
0743	FIRE ALARM IMPROVEMENTS	Mar-01	Jun-02
0758	FOUNDATION REPAIR	Mar-02	Jun-02
0758	GYM FLOOR REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jan-02
0734	CLARIFIER CLEANING	Sep-01	Oct-03
IN01	ABOVE GROUND WATER TANK IMPROVEMENT	Sep-01	Feb-02
0669	LIGHTNING ARRESTER REPAIRS	Feb-02	Mar-02
IN02	ELEVATOR UPGRADE COMPLIANCE	Sep-01	Mar-02
0537	BELOW GRADE WATERPROOFING	Mar-02	Jun-02
0501	BELOW GRADE WATERPROOFING	Mar-02	Jun-02
0669	GYM FLOOR LIGHTING UPGRADE	Mar-02	Jun-02
IN03	STREET GATE ARMS INSTALLATION	Sep-01	Oct-01
0529	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0739	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0517	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0689	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0676	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0739	COOLING TOWER REPAIRS	Sep-01	Feb-02
0689	CHILLED WATER PIPING INSTALLATION	Sep-01	Feb-02
0761	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0674	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0512	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0744	ROOF RESTORATION	Sep-01	Jun-02
0544	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0541	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
IN04	REPLCE TRANSITE PIPING	Mar-02	Jul-02
IN05	REPLACE TRANSITE PIPING	Mar-02	Jul-02
IN06	REPLACE TRANSITE PIPING	Mar-02	Jul-02
0669	POOL IMPROVEMENTS	Feb-02	Mar-02
0512	CLEAN HVAC DUCTWORK ALL BUILDINGS	Feb-02	Mar-05
0744	FOUNDATION IMPROVEMENTS	Mar-02	Jun-02
0743	BELOW GRADE WATERPROOFING	Mar-02	Jun-02
0537	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0688	ROOF REPLACEMENT	Sep-01	Jun-02
0744	LIGHTNING ARRESTER REPAIRS	Sep-01	Jun-02
IN07	STREET MODIFICATIONS	Sep-02	Sep-05
IN08	STREET RESURFACING	Sep-02	Sep-05
IN09	REPAIR FEEDER 2000	Apr-02	May-02
IN10	REPLACE UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL	Sep-02	Dec-03
IN11	REPLACE HIGH VOLTAGE CABLE	Sep-02	Dec-03
IN12	REPLACE OVERHEADHIGH VOLTAGE	Sep-02	Dec-03
IN13	REPLACE TUNNEL PIPING	Sep-02	Dec-03
IN14	REROUTE CHILL LINES HARRINGTON	Sep-02	Dec-03

	SCIENCE BLDG		
IN15	REPLACE SWITCH GEAR ARCHIECTURE	Sep-02	Dec-03
IN16	REPLACE SWITCH GEAR NORRIS	Sep-02	Dec-03
IN17	REPLACE CLAY PIPE SS-AI	Sep-02	Dec-03
IN18	REHAB BOOST PUMP WATER TOWER	Jun-02	Jan-03
IN19	REPLACE SS CLAY PIPE - W-CAMPUS	Jun-02	Jan-03
0517	REHAB BUILDING	Jun-02	Jan-03
0739	CHILLER RETROFIT	Jun-02	Jan-03
0739	BOILER REPLACEMENT	Jun-02	Jan-03
0739	UPGRADE PP CONDENSER HEADER	Jun-02	Jan-03
0739	CONTROL PANEL UPGRADE	Jun-02	Jan-03
0669	EXTERIOR AIR GRILL WATERPROOFING	Sep-02	Oct-02
IN20	ENERGY MANAGEMENT UPGRADE ALL BUILDINGS	Jun-02	Jul-04
IN21	ELEVATED WATER TOWER IMPROVEMENT	Jul-03	Oct-03
IN22	REPLACE CLAY SS PIPE CENTRAL CAMPUS	Jul-02	Sep-02
IN23	REPLACE CLAY SS PIPING THIRD STREET	Jul-02	Sep-02
IN24	REPLACE CLAY SS PIPING AVENUE A	Jul-02	Sep-02
IN25	REHAB GAS DETECTOR SCALES	Jul-03	Aug-03
IN26	SIDEWALK EXPANSION JOINT UPGRADE	Feb-02	Mar-02
IN27	GAS LINE IMPROVEMENTS	Jan-02	Feb-02
IN28	NEW ROAD BYPASS	Mar-04	Mar-05
IN29	EMERGENCY PORTABLE SEWAGE PUMP	Mar-05	Apr-05
0525	EQUIPMENT SHED IMPROVEMENT	Sep-01	Sep-02
0727	RELOCATED STEAM STATION	Jan-02	Feb-04
0512	REPLACE EMERGENCY GENERATOR SWITCH	Mar-02	Apr-02
IN30	SURGE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT WASTEWATER PLANT	Apr-03	May-03
IN31	INSTALL CHEMICAL STORAGE GROUNDS	Apr-04	May-04
IN32	SOIL EROSION CONTAINMENT	Mar-03	Apr-03
IN33	BACKFLOW IRRIGATION METERING UPGRADE	Feb-03	Jun-04
IN34	TREE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM	Sep-01	Sep-05
0658	HEAT EXCHANGER REPLACEMENT	Mar-03	Jul-03
0727	EMERGENCY GENERATOR INSTALLATION	Sep-01	Dec-01
0669	ROOM PARTITION INSTALLATION	Sep-01	Dec-02
0529	UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK REMOVAL	Feb-02	Mar-02
0689	INTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENT	May-02	Dec-02
0669	CEREMONIAL ADA/SAFETY UPGRADE	Sep-01	May-05
IN35	REKEY MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL ROOMS ALL BUILDINGS	Mar-02	Jun-02
IN36	REKEY TELEPHONE & COMMUNICATION ROOMS ALL BUILDINGS	Mar-02	Jun-02
IN37	TREE INVENTORY UPGRADE	Oct-01	Mar-02
0555	DEMOLISH	Sep-01	Oct-01
0679	DEMOLISH	Sep-01	Oct-01

Priority Nine: Systems

1. Strengthen institutional development office.

July 2001 - Assessment review completed and goals identified

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007 - Goals identified in the assessment review met

October 2007 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Ten: Programs

1. Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs.

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

December 2002 - Biennial-funding goals met for 4 chairs

September 2004 - 4 Chairs filled

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

December 2004 - Biennial-funding goals met for 4 chairs

September 2006 - 4 Chairs filled

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

December 2006 - Biennial-funding goals met for 4 chairs

September 2008 - 4 Chairs filled

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Eleven: Programs and Facilities

1. Develop new PhD program in Juvenile Forensic Psychology.

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

July 2004 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

January 2005 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2005 - Accept first students in program

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2010 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2010 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. New building for juvenile justice-related programs.

September 2001 - Start planning and design

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2005 - Complete

October 2005 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Twelve: Programs

1. New PhD in Educational Leadership.

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

March 2003 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

September 2003 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2004 - Accept first students in program

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2009 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2009 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Develop new MS in Computer Science.

February 2001 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

April 2001 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2001 - Accept first students in program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2006 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Develop new MS in Information Systems.

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

March 2005 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

May 2005 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2005 - Accept first students in program

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2010 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2010 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Thirteen: Mission

1. Delete language in the statutory mission in the Texas Education Code, section 87.104.

January 2001 - Work with legislature to amend legislation

Upon signing into law - Enact legislation

June 2001 – Amended mission in place

October 2001 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Delete race-specific or exclusionary language in the institutional mission statement.

January 2001 - Finish work with institution to craft new mission language

June 2001 - Texas A&M University System Board of Regents approve change

October 2001 - Coordinating Board approves change

Priority Plan Implementation Schedule Texas Southern University

Priority One: Systems

1. Continue to meet all recommendations from the State Auditor's Office, the Comptroller of Public Accounts and any other recommendations to strengthen financial and administrative systems.

Recommendations have been met and TSU has implemented quality control mechanisms.

2. Strengthen academic planning and support functions.

March 2001 - Assessment Review completed and targets identified

September 2001 - Modifications completed

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Establish institutional development office.

September 2000 - Assess, plan, develop

January 2001 - Office fully staffed and functional

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

4. Develop and implement systems for facilities planning, construction, operation and maintenance.

September 2000 - Assess, plan, develop

September 2001 - Complete implementation

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

5. Strengthen information technology services.

September 2000 - Begin assessment

March 2001 - Assessment Review completed and targets identified

September 2001 - Modifications completed

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

6. Strengthen human resources function and infrastructure and provide a competitive faculty compensation and benefit structure.

March 2001 - Assessment Review completed and targets identified

September 2001 - Modifications completed

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Two: Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation

1. Upgrade student enrollment services.

September 2000 - Begin assessment

March 2001 - Assessment Review completed and targets identified

September 2001 - Modifications completed

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Establish a summer and first-year academic support program for incoming freshmen and upgrade the academic support center.

September 2000 - Assess, plan, develop

September 2001 - Implement program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2003 - Program fully functional and self-sustaining

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Build additional student housing.

October 2000 - Plan and develop a housing plan with a private developer

December 2000 - Complete land purchases begun in January 2000

Start	Complete	Beds
May 2001	June 2002	300
Sep 2001	Sep 2002	300
May 2002	Jun 2003	300
Sep 2003	May 2004	300

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

4. Improve programs providing basic skills in reading, writing and math.

September 2000 - Begin program assessment

March 2001 - Assessment Review completed and targets identified

September 2001 - Modifications completed

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

5. Establish a merit-based honors scholarship program.

September 2000 - Design and develop program criteria

January 2001 - Work with institutional development office to secure matching funds

September 2001- implement program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007 - program fully developed and fully functional

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Three: Facilities

1. Finish facilities renovations in plan approved by Coordinating Board to help provide a safe, efficient and attractive campus.

September 2001 - Begin renovations

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

March 2005 - All renovations complete

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Bldg No.	Building	Start	Complete
101	Hannah Hall	Mar 01	Mar 03
103	Robert T. Library	Apr 01	May 04
104	Nabrit Science	Sep 01	Mar 04
105	Fairchild Building	Aug 01	Dec 03
106	Industrial Education	Nov 01	Nov 04
108	University Auditorium	Feb 01	Oct 03
109	Rhinehart Auditorium	Jan 01	Feb 03
110	Banks Child Dev. Lab	Dec 01	Aug 04
116	Auto Mechanics Bldg	Jan 02	Jan 04
126	Satellite Thermal Plan	Feb 02	Feb 03
132	E.O. Bell Bldg	Jan 02	Mar 03
144	R.S. Music Center	Mar 02	Apr 04
145	Lane Home Economics	Feb 02	Mar 03
147	T. Marshall Law Bldg	Feb 01	Mar 04
148	Sterling Student Center	Apr 02	May 04
152	Warehouse & Receiving	Jan 01	Jan 03
153	Athletic Facility	Mar 01	Mar 03
154	H&PE Observation	Apr 02	Jun 04
161	Gen Service Building	Jul 01	Aug 03
163	School of Technology	Jun 01	Sep 04
164	H&PE Building	Jan 01	Jan 04
	Tunnel Utilities	Feb 01	Mar 03
	Sanitary Sewers	Apr 03	Dec 03
	Storm Sewers	Apr 03	Dec 03

2. Develop a campus master plan outlining future planning, renovation and construction.

September 2001- Begin development

January 2002 - Complete

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Implement a landscaping plan.

February 2002 - Start plan and design

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

March 2004 - Complete plan

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Four: Programs

1. Conduct a review of graduate and undergraduate programs and use the results of the review to strengthen programs.

July 2001 - Assessment review completed and yearly goals identified

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007- All goals identified in the assessment review met

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Maintain accreditation of programs currently accredited; as appropriate, obtain accreditation for all programs that are not currently accredited.

April 2001 - Accreditation review completed and target programs identified

December 2002 – Accreditation process for targeted non-accredited programs begun

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2003 - Accreditation process complete

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Strengthen programs in Law, Pharmacy, Business and Educator Preparation.

July 2001 - Assessment reviews completed and yearly goals identified

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

August 2007- All goals identified in the assessment review met

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Five: Facilities

1. Plan, design and construct a new Science Building in conjunction with the Campus Master Plan.

January 2002 – Start planning

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

May 2006 - Complete

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Six: Programs

1. Develop new MS/PhD in Urban Planning and Environmental Policy

April 2001 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

July 2001 - Coordinating Board approval

January 2002 - Accept first students in program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

January 2007 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

2. Develop new MS in Health Care Administration

February 2001 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

June 2001 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2001 - Accept first students in program

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2006 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

3. Develop new MS in Computer Science

February 2003 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained

April 2003 - Coordinating Board approval

September 2003 - Accept first students in program

October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

September 2008 - Program fully supported through formula funding

October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

4. Develop new MS/PhD in Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

July 2003 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained
January 2004 - Coordinating Board approval
September 2004 - Accept first students in program
October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
September 2009 - Program fully supported through formula funding
October 2010 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

5. Develop new BS in Computer Engineering Technology

September 2002 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained
October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
November 2002 - Coordinating Board approval
January 2003 - Accept first students in program
October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
January 2009 - Program fully supported through formula funding
October 2010 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

6. Develop new MS in Management Information Systems

September 2004 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained
October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
November 2004 - Coordinating Board approval
January 2005 - Accept first students in program
October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
January 2010 - Program fully supported through formula funding
October 2010 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

7. Develop new MS/PhD in Administration of Justice

July 2004 - Planning complete and Board of Regents approval obtained
October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
January 2005 - Coordinating Board approval
September 2005 - Accept first students in program
October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
September 2010 - Program fully supported through formula funding
October 2010 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Seven: Programs

1. Reestablish the School of Public Affairs

March 2001- Coordinating Board approval obtained
October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
September 2007- Programs organized and school fully staffed
October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Eight: Programs

1. Create 12 endowed chairs for new and existing programs

October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
December 2002 - Biennial-funding goals met for 4 chairs
September 2004 - 4 Chairs filled
October 2004 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
December 2004 - Biennial-funding goals met for 4 chairs
September 2006 - 4 Chairs filled
October 2006 - Progress report to Coordinating Board
December 2006 - Biennial-funding goals met for 4 chairs
September 2008 - 4 Chairs filled
October 2008 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Nine: Recruitment, Retention and Graduation

1. Develop a Child Care Center to provide student, faculty and staff childcare services in conjunction with Child and Family Development Program

September 2000 - Begin assessment and planning
February 2001- Planning complete
March 2001 - Begin implementation
March 2002 - Child care center operational
October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board

Priority Ten: Mission

1. Change statutory mission statement at Texas Education Code, section 106.02.

January 2001- Work with legislature to amend legislation
Upon signing into law - Enact legislation
June 2001 - Amended mission in place
October 2002 - Progress report to Coordinating Board