

CONTENTS OF THIS VOLUME  
1961 - 1962

<u>Meeting Nos.</u>	<u>Date</u>
602	September 29-30, 1961
603	November 10-11, 1961
604	December 1-2, 1961
605	February 2-3, 1962
606	March 8, 1962
607	April 27-28, 1962
608 - Legal Size, filed separately	June 29-30, 1962



---

THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Material Supporting  
**Agenda**

Meeting Date: ..... March 8, 1962 .....

Meeting No.: ..... 606 .....

Name: ..... OFFICE COPY .....

---

---

CALENDAR AND AGENDA

Houston, Texas

March 8, 1962

Page No.

Thursday, March 8

11:00 a. m. Meeting of the Board

Place: 2940 Lazy Lane

2:00 p. m. Meeting of the Board

Place: Directors' Room  
Bank Lobby Floor  
Bank of the Southwest

- |        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| I.     | Hogg Foundation (11:00 a. m. )                                  | 2 |
| II.    | Conference with Mr. John McCullough (2:00 p. m. )               | 2 |
| ✓ III. | Approval of Minutes, February 3, 1962                           | 2 |
| ✓ IV.  | Report of Executive Committee                                   | 2 |
|        | Increase in Price of Ticket to O. U. - Texas<br>Game 1962       |   |
| ✓ V.   | Main University   | 3 |
|        | A. Intercollegiate Athletics Council, Recommendations of        | 3 |
|        | 1. 1962 Schedule for Golf, Swimming, and Tennis                 | 3 |
|        | 2. 1962 Baseball Schedule, Amendment to                         | 4 |
|        | 3. Acceptance of Gift and Authorization to Carry<br>out Purpose | 4 |
|        | 4. 1962 Football Program  | 4 |
|        | Increase in Price from 26¢ to 50¢                               |   |



DOCUMENTATION

- I. HOGG FOUNDATION (11:00 a. m. ). --Dr. Ransom states that all material relating to the Hogg Foundation for review and discussion will be supplied by Doctor R. L. Sutherland.
- II. CONFERENCE WITH MR JOHN McCULLOUGH (2:00 p. m. ). -- One purpose of the March meeting is for Mr. John McCullough to meet with the Board in Executive Session to discuss the relationships of The Sealy and Smith Foundation and The University of Texas Medical Branch.
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, FEBRUARY 3, 1962. -- A preliminary draft of the Minutes for February 3, 1962, will be mailed prior to the meeting.
- IV. REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Increase in Price of Ticket to O. U. - Texas Game from \$4.50 to \$5.00. -- The Executive Committee has approved an increase in the price of a ticket for the Oklahoma-Texas football game in Dallas on October 13, 1962, from \$4.50 to \$5.00. This increase was recommended by the Intercollegiate Athletics Council and was concurred in by President Smiley and Chancellor Ransom.

It is presented for the full Board's approval.

(Each of you received on February 14, a memorandum concerning a poll of the Executive Committee on this item which set out the proposal, the urgency of the matter, and the result of the poll. The poll was taken after having cleared procedure with Chairman Hardie and with Regent McNeese, Chairman of the Academic and Developmental Affairs Committee, to whose committee the item would normally have been referred.)

## V. MAIN UNIVERSITY

## A.

Intercollegiate Athletics Council, Recommendations of. --The following recommendations were in the February 2 minutes of the Intercollegiate Athletics Council. They have been approved by Dean Glenn Barnett, President Smiley, and Central Administration and are presented for the Board's approval:

1. Golf, swimming and tennis schedules for 1962.

1962 Golf Schedule

March	9-10	Border Olympics at Laredo
	23	S. M. U. at Dallas
	26	Baylor at Austin
April	2	Texas Tech at Austin
	6	Rice at Austin
	27	A&M at Austin
May	4	T. C. U. at Ft. Worth
	7	Arkansas at Fayetteville
	10-12	Southwest Conference at Waco
June	18-23	N. C. A. A. Championships at Durham, North Carolina

1962 Swimming Schedule

February	1	Oklahoma at Austin
	2	High School Invitational at Austin
	10	Texas Tech at Austin
	17	A&M at College Station
	22-23	Southwestern AAU at Dallas
March	3	S. M. U. at Dallas
	8 - 9	Southwest Conference at Dallas
	29-31	N. C. A. A. Championships at Columbus, Ohio

1962 Tennis Schedule

March	2	Pan-American College at Edinburg
	3	University of Corpus Christi at Corpus Christi
	9	St. Edwards at Austin (University of Texas courts)
	10	Houston at Austin
	12	St. Edwards at Austin (St. Edwards courts)

1962 Tennis Schedule (Continued)

March	14	Trinity at San Antonio
	23-24	Rice Tournament at Houston
	26	Baylor at Waco
	27	L. S. U. at Austin
April	5	Rice at Austin
	10	A&M at College Station
	16	Southwest Texas State at San Marcos
	18	T. C. U. at Austin
	19	Tulane at Austin
	24	S. M. U. at Austin
	30	Texas Tech at Lubbock
May	10-12	Southwest Conference at Waco
	14	Arizona at Austin
June	18-23	N. C. A. A. Championships at Stanford, California

2. Amendment to 1962 baseball schedule.

Baseball Coach Bibb Falk has requested the addition of a baseball game with St. Mary's University of San Antonio at Austin on March 27, 1962.

3. Acceptance of gift for entertainment of football squad.

Each year the Cotton Bowl Athletic Association makes a gift to the host team for the purpose of financing a party for the football squad and their dates. The University has received from Howard Grubbs, Executive Secretary of the Cotton Bowl Association, a check in the amount of \$4,000 for this purpose. Approval of the acceptance of this gift and authorization to draw the necessary vouchers to carry out the purpose of the gift is requested.

4. Increase in price of 1962 football program from 26¢ to 50¢.

Approval is requested to increase the price of the football programs from 26¢ to 50¢. The new price would be in line with program prices at most Southwest Conference schools and will provide a substantial increase in revenue. In previous years the program has sold for 25¢, but in 1961 the State sales tax added 1¢, making a total of 26¢.

B.

Building Matters. -- The following two items were approved for consideration at the March meeting.

1. Engineering-Science Building: Delegation of Authority to Approve Final Plans and Specifications. -- At the meeting of the Committee of the Whole of the Board on Friday, February 2, permission was obtained to present the final plans and specifications for the Engineering-Science Building at the March 8 meeting of the Board, provided the plans and specifications were complete and had been checked out by the staff.

It now appears that plans and specifications cannot be completed and checked out prior to March 20. To avoid further delay it is recommended that the Board delegate the authority to approve final plans and specifications either to a specially appointed committee or to the Executive Committee of the Board. It is hoped that approval can be obtained in time to permit advertising for bids and for recommendations for the awarding of contracts to be presented at the April 27-28 meeting of the Board. This exception to the ordinary procedure is necessary to prevent further delays which might delay completion of the building past the date for the installation of the particle accelerator now under contract.

2. Addition to Law School Building: Award of Contract. -- Bids for the Addition to Law School Building will be opened in Austin on March 6. A tabulation of the bids and recommendations of the Administration will be presented at the meeting. (This item was approved at the February meeting, upon recommendation of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, for consideration at the March meeting.)

## VI. CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION AND MAIN UNIVERSITY

Request for Contract for Study of Business and Accounting Procedures. -- Central Administration presents the following recommendations:

The administration recommends that professional consultants be employed to make a detailed study of the business and accounting procedures of Main University and Central Administration, with special emphasis upon developing machine accounting and data processing, and to make recommendations thereon to the administration and the Board of Regents.



The increasing volume and complexities of the business operations of the institution reasonably require investigation and recommendations by professional consultants to assure the degree of effective fiscal management desired by the administration and by the Board in their trusteeship of public funds.

Two firms deemed best qualified to make this study are Ernst & Ernst and Arthur Andersen & Company. Without expense, obligation or commitment, each of these firms is making a survey of the situation and will present to the administration a proposed program of investigation, the systems and computer experts available in their organization to work on this study, and a date for beginning the work. The administration asks the Board for authority to select the firm offering the most desirable proposal and to enter into a contract not to exceed \$25,000 for this study. The recommended source of funds is a special appropriation from the Available University Fund unappropriated balance. If the estimated cost of the study exceeds \$25,000, it is requested that the Executive Committee be authorized to consider the proposals and to approve a contract if it deems advisable.

## VII. MEDICAL BRANCH

### A.

Interagency Contract with State Hospital Board. -- Regent Robertson will present at the meeting a proposed interagency contract between The University of Texas Medical Branch and the State Board for Hospitals and Special Schools for the operation of a Children's Psychiatric Unit at the Medical Branch.

B.

Building Program. -- The Administration submits as supporting material for the Medical Sciences Building at the Medical Branch the following:

Pages <u>8 - 10</u>	Administration's Recommendations re Medical Branch (exact reproduction)
Pages <u>11 - 12</u>	Excerpts setting out action of the Board re Ten Year Plan (prepared by Dr. Haskew)

Following Page 12 is a report entitled BUILDING PROGRAMS as prepared by Doctor Truslow. Please keep in mind that this report and the recommendations contained therein were made before the proposal for a Medical Sciences Building was reviewed jointly on February 16 by Doctor Truslow and the Administration as set out in the Administration's Recommendations on Pages 8-10.

In compliance with the Rules and Regulations, Part One, Chapter I, Subsection 7.65, Pages 7 and 8, both the recommendations of the institutional head as well as those of the Administration are included.

C.

Executive Dean and Director: Salary.

D.

Position of Dean of Medicine.

If time permits, the foregoing items (C. and D.) will probably be discussed after the conference with Mr. John McCullough. However, at this time the Administration has no further recommendations to present.



(a) Allocate \$2,900,000 (of the \$3,200,000 remaining) in Ten Year Plan for Medical Branch to this structure. Apply for a Health Research Facilities Grant. At present stage, it is impossible to predict size of grant for which structure would be eligible; opinions range from \$1,700,000 to \$2,300,000. If \$2,000,000 were received, \$4,900,000 would be all that is available for the structure unless outside donations are secured. Yet, a \$4,900,000 structure is less than needed. And, if \$2,900,000 is used from Ten Year Plan, many acutely-needed small projects can be financed only from outside funds. Although prospects for such financing exist, they are not established, and Board of Regents will need such information before making a decision to proceed or not to proceed even on a reduced scale.

(b) If the Medical School Assistance Act is passed by Congress, this building should become eligible for a grant thereunder. Matching basis in pending bill fluctuates between half and two-thirds of cost from Federal funds, as different committee versions are produced. If fifty-fifty basis prevails, \$2,900,000 in University funds would produce a \$5,800,000 building. If two-thirds basis prevails, \$2,000,000 in University funds would be sufficient. Note the many contingencies in this alternative. Yet, it seems to merit full exploration.

(c) It is possible that a considerable private donation could be secured to be applied toward Federal matching. Since alternative (a) above can, at most, result only in a restricted structure it appears wise to take time to try (c).

The administration proposes to come before the Regents by the target date with an analysis of possible financing based upon thorough exploration of these and other alternatives. Particularly, we shall search for an alternative which will provide for completion of items included in the Ten Year Plan within the adopted maximum of \$4,900,000 in University funds.

3. This is an extremely important building. It should be done well and carefully. Many aspects of architectural layout should be developed fully and examined carefully in a building so strategic for Medical Branch progress. Hasty decisions can be very costly. !!

Further, decisions on whether a structure shall be attempted within funds available can be made best when it is known what is being left out. For example, if only \$4,500,000 is available, is it better to build part of what is needed or to wait?

Also, it is true that time is of the essence in reaping greatest benefit from this project. Well-made plans can expedite grants, and at the same time save from four to six months in construction time if grants are secured.

But, if plans are to be made a ceiling cost must be established. One possibility is to set \$4,900,000. Preliminary schedules of needs and cost estimates based thereon convince us that this is too low to be

10

realistic. We recommend a figure of \$5,800,000 to include everything--fees, all animal facilities, production of chilled water, equipment, and other components--and shall try to come under that figure.

Against this background, we make the unusual recommendation that the Board of Regents authorize the Consulting Architects to prepare preliminary plans and outline specifications for the Medical Sciences Building at the Medical Branch within a total cost ceiling of \$5,800,000; these plans are to be completed and submitted by July 1, 1962; if the project is constructed, the usual fee arrangement is to prevail; if it is not constructed, the fee established by the Consulting Architects' contract (.5 per cent of estimated cost) is to be paid from Permanent University Fund Bond funds in an amount not to exceed \$29,000.

It is intended that these recommendations reflect a conviction that this advance for the Medical Branch program is of high priority and that every effort should be put forth to come to a sound and speedy conclusion, based on clear information to the Regents. At the same time, ~~it is our conviction that actual commitment to construct this building should not be made at this time; that the authorizations requested merely provide that the Regents will be in position to make a decision on whether and when by September, 1962.~~

ADDENDUMEXCERPTS FROM OFFICIAL RECORDS  
REGARDING TEN YEAR BUILDING PLAN,  
THE MEDICAL BRANCH

- A. September 16-17, 1960. Material Supporting the Agenda for the Meeting of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, p. 29:

## MEDICAL BRANCH

M1. Adopt as tentative and flexible the Master Plan drawing submitted by Jessen, Jessen, Millhouse and Greeven on July 1 (copy attached).

M2. The following projects are recommended:

- |  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| A. Outpatient-Clinical Diagnosis Unit at \$4,680,000 |                  |
| B. Basic Science-Administration Unit at \$4,800,000  |                  |
| C. Laundry Addition at \$135,000                     | X                |
| D. Keiller Building Further Remodeling at \$550,000  | <u>\$780,000</u> |
| E. Central Water-Chilling Addition at \$500,000      |                  |
| F. Other Remodeling and Demolition at \$1,000,000    | ✓                |
| G. Equipment at \$1,500,000                          | X                |
| TOTAL, \$13,165,000                                  |                  |

M3. The foregoing projects have been authorized by the Legislature if constructed entirely from gift and grant funds (Exception: F and G for which legislative authorization not required).

M4. We recommend, however, that upon approval by the Legislature, the Regents provide \$3,700,000 from bond issue funds toward Projects A, B, C, E and G; \$1,200,000 from Available Fund cash toward Projects D and F. No appropriations can be made, of course, prior to legislative approval.

Recommendation is made also that the 57th Legislature be requested to approve the use of Permanent Fund Bond proceeds and Available Fund cash in amounts not to exceed those indicated for the projects named.

M5. The remainder of the funds necessary must come from grants and gifts. No one of the projects listed has been authorized by the Board, and proposals for such authorization subsequently will follow usual channels. (At the July 1-3 Meeting, the Regents did authorize preparation of applications for USPHS and Hill-Burton funds for Project A (Minutes, p. 3-4) but this action did not authorize the project itself).

B. September 23-24, 1960. Meeting of the Board of Regents, Minutes, p. 14:

For the Medical Branch, adopt tentatively the Master Plan and a Ten-Year Building Plan consisting of projects as listed below, with tentative designation of \$3,700,000 in new Permanent University Fund Bonds and \$1,200,000 in Available University Fund cash for the projects.

A. Outpatient-Clinical Diagnosis Unit	\$ 4,680,000	5,800,000
B. Basic Science-Administration Unit	4,800,000	
C. Laundry Addition	135,000	
D. Keiller Building Further Remodeling	550,000	
E. Central-Water-Chilling Addition	500,000	
F. Other Remodeling and Demolition	1,000,000	
G. Equipment	<u>1,500,000</u>	
TOTAL	\$13,165,000	

Specific Approvals

Authorize request to 57th Legislature for approval of use of bond issue funds and Available University Fund cash toward projects listed, remainder to come from gifts and grants.

C. General Appropriations by the First Called Session, 57th Legislature, Senate Bill No.1, p. 206:

"The University of Texas Board of Regents is hereby authorized to accept grants, donations, gifts and matching grants from Federal and State agencies, and to expend Permanent University Fund Bond proceeds and Available University Funds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, equipping and furnishing any one or more of the following buildings at the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston:

- (1) Outpatient-Clinical Diagnostic Unit
- (2) Basic Science-Administration Unit (including Animal Building)
- (3) Laundry Addition
- (4) Low Cost General Purpose Building" *new*

# **BUILDING PROGRAMS**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS**

**MEDICAL CENTER**

**Galveston**



A Report to the Chancellor

The University of Texas  
Austin

by

The Executive Dean and Director

The University of Texas Medical Center  
Galveston

February 15, 1962

## C O N T E N T S

	<b>Page</b>
SECTION I - <u>Background Summary and Current Inventory</u>	1
Some Impressions in 1956 and 1962	1- 3
Physical Plant decisions	3
Budgetary Considerations	4- 5
The Challenge	5- 6
SECTION II - <u>Building Programs at the Medical Branch</u>	7
Inventory of Needs in 1956	7- 8
Inventory of Progress to February 1962	8-12
SECTION III - <u>Immediate Extension and Modification, Etc.</u>	13
Medical Science Buildings	13-15
Further Modifications Proposed	15-17
Special Items	17
SECTION IV - <u>Summary of Financing</u>	18
APPENDIX A	21
APPENDIX B	26
APPENDIX C	28

## S E C T I O N I

### BACKGROUND SUMMARY AND CURRENT INVENTORY

April 1, 1962 will mark the beginning of my seventh year in the appointment as Head of The University of Texas Medical Center in Galveston. None of the present Regents were on the Board at that time. The situations which prevailed were of such extreme seriousness - and even desperation - that they deserve brief recall at this time, if only to put our building program in vivid perspective.

A first view of the Medical Branch in the Spring of 1956 revealed a State-wide, Regental, Legislative and Alumni attitude toward the Medical Branch of despair, discouragement and even contempt. This baseline is easily forgotten in the march of recent events, but it is a reality of major significance in our continued sense of urgency.

In this first view was revealed the fact that a major block to Legislative support and to the interest of our friends in the Community and State was the shadow of possibility of moving the Medical Branch, so, "why contribute to a dying operation." It is remarkable that so little of this is heard today, or has been heard for the past two years. It is even more remarkable that this negative image has been replaced in many quarters completely, and in many quarters partially, with a picture of a School that is really on its way.

This first impression of six years ago revealed salary scales which placed us in the lower 5 per cent of the Nation. The salary budget has now increased in the order of 60 per cent overall, and for many members of the faculty over 100 per cent.

Open antagonism of the County Medical Society was extremely acute because our full-time faculty were practicing medicine

competitively in the community - being forced to, by virtue of the fact for example, that associate professors of Medicine, Surgery, Pediatrics and Obstetrics were averaging \$6,000 to \$8,000 for their "full-time" appointments. Other ranks were paid accordingly. The relationship between the practicing profession and our clinical faculty has been completely changed; and indeed, the Head of the Institution now serves on the Executive Committee of the County Medical Society. This good rapport with the Medical Community was noted with particular satisfaction by the Liaison Survey group.

It was my candid opinion, at that early date, that there were not more than four or five departments in the whole medical school worthy of university stature. Now that leadership based upon intellectual and professional qualifications and a disposition to encourage, support and promote creative research, enlightened teaching and freedom of action has been established in many chairmanship positions, this four or five has been increased to 10 in this brief period!

Student morale in the Spring of 1956 could be gauged by the fact that my first sessions with students at that time never referred to "graduation" - they referred to "going back over the bridge" - a goal they ardently sought to achieve. Review of the Dean's Office files over the 10 years previous to 1956 revealed as much as 10 per cent per class had been in school for six years prior to graduation rather than the usual four - and the Chancellor and the Regents may recall the suit pressed by one student who had been enrolled for some part of 11 years, contending that at least once during those 11 years he had passed every course.

Last month when I asked the inspecting committee about the tone and content of their student interviews, their comment was "we were snowed; this is an outstanding and enthusiastic group of students."

I have received letters from many Deans requesting our formula for establishing the direct Deanship-Student relation centered around meetings held once a month with the SAMA group; and an equal number of inquiries about our Student Research Day programs; and now - these requests have come in to check on our extraordinary success with the Student Elective Programs.

One of the worst blows, nearly seven years ago, was the revelation of a deficit of a Half Million Dollars in the Hospital operation. Hospital collections at that time were in the order of 65 per cent to 70 per cent of the total billings. We now average above 90 per cent. We have converted many ward areas to private and semi-private accommodations. Our income picture is stable and growing.

Equipment-wise we were a University Medical Center without an electron microscope (we now have three), without deep therapy units (there were then 14 cobalt machines in Texas), without

even an ultra centrifuge, a cardiac physiology laboratory or the means to perform diagnostic tests reasonably expectant of a small community hospital (we sent many of these to Houston because of the embarrassment of sending them to St. Mary's Infirmary in Galveston!).

But the awful discovery was the condition of neglect in the maintenance of the physical plant itself. Active programs were operating in buildings which fell into three categories: Termite-ridden fire-traps; decadent fire proof structures left unpainted and unrepaired during a decade of faculty salary augmentation from Physical Plant funds; and three (3) presumably modern buildings (the New John Sealy Hospital, Gail Borden and Ziegler Hospital) untouched since their completion in 1954. The Physical Plant staff, at that time accordingly, was inefficient, quarrelsome and demoralized. Of 22 major structures, four were designated for major renovation (Old OPD, the Old Negro Hospital - now Randall Pavilion, State Psychiatric Hospital and Keiller). Since then two others have been so designated (Psycho II and III and Rebecca Sealy) and six or seven others have been and are still being renovated, unit by unit, many being redesigned for functions more appropriate to our needs. Tragically and incomprehensibly the New John Sealy Hospital itself, with 350,000 gross square feet completed in 1954 included less than 8,000 square feet for research in a University setting in the second half of the Twentieth Century.

In the Spring and Summer of 1956, three basic decisions were made with full agreement among the Executive Director, the President and the Board of Regents with reference to the compelling need for new construction and renovation.

1. First there must be established finally and irreversibly that the Medical Branch either (a) stay in Galveston, or (b) move elsewhere.
2. Second that curriculum, faculty salaries and teaching-patient load were at the heart of how much to build and in what design.
3. Third that a consulting firm in Medical Center planning be hired to help inventory current and eventual space needs and utilization.

THERE MUST BE FEW, IF ANY, MEDICAL CENTER CAMPUSES IN THE U. S. TODAY WITH NO NEW CONSTRUCTION DURING THE PAST EIGHT "GOOD" YEARS!

Nevertheless, today's story is miraculously encouraging. With Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) in renovations already spent, another One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) already committed (not even counting Keiller's \$800,000 plus!) and still another One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) anticipated, the result (fully integrated with the new building program) will offer a plant in which great things will be possible scientifically, educationally and professionally. Now where do we stand at the moment?

## SUMMARY

Academically \* our position is steadily strengthening in both teaching and research, and in the vigor of student and faculty response to, and participation in, the programs underway or evolving. Research has been particularly gratifying, in terms of increasing numbers of well-equipped laboratories - gained through remodeling and redesign of buildings and of unit areas - and substantial increases in research interest and monetary support. Animal care areas, however, are still disgraceful. New construction is the key to further progress in this area - as emphasized by the Liaison Survey group report.

Fiscally we are in a strong position, although I must inform you that the cost of Carla has been great in terms of low-occupancy in the Hospital (and therefore less income) and in terms of Physical Plant time and budget in restoring function. I carry with me an accounting to date on this blow totaling \$528,000 #. This has resulted also in postponing action on many approved projects and in serious delays in current maintenance and operation and finally - but certainly not leastly - in the care and operation of hospital services we are maintaining a steadily increasing volume and quality of activity. Budget-wise, we stand in the strongest of possible positions among Medical Schools in this country. I sincerely believe we must be in the upper 5 per cent in the fact that more than 95 per cent of our faculty salary budget comes from General Fund sources of the University. This, if supported by an adequate maintenance and operation budget for the Physical Plant, would justify a substantial super-structure of grants from the Federal Government or other sources. In the six-year period just past, total research grants have increased from \$700,000 a year to well over Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000). We are now embarking upon another type of grant support which covers programs as well as projects, with special emphasis upon recruitment of graduate students in the basic medical sciences and the education of clinical department faculty members so desperately needed if the Nation is to achieve a substantial increase in the annual out-put of doctors.

Among such grants in the past few months - either awarded or pending - are substantial items between \$40,000 and \$100,000 in the Departments of Microbiology, Surgery, Pharmacology and Anatomy; a General Research Support Grant in the amount of \$148,584; and an application pending in the amount of almost Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000) over a period of seven years for a Clinical Research Center - which would convert 4C to a 15-bed unit with attached research laboratories - a fantastically valuable resource in a Medical Center. Fifteen (15) of these Centers are in existence

\* See Appendix A (Summary of Medical School Accreditation Survey) and Appendix B (Summary of Nursing School Accreditation).

# See Appendix C (Hurricane Loss Accounts).

in the United States. Our people have studied the operation and management of such Centers for over two years, and we regard our chances of award as very, very good.

In this same six-year period, local Hospital income has increased 90 per cent from \$1,800,000 in fiscal 1955 to \$3,425,000 in fiscal 1961 (with 100 beds less in operation), and even with Carla is likely to achieve our budget estimation in fiscal 1962!

In relation to the prospects of steady increase of total local income over the years; and with particular reference to the operation of our new construction areas as they open up, there are three (3) promising developments anticipated. Continued conversion of ward areas to semi-private and private accommodations should continue as a gradual increasing source of income, through increased charges. Increased total grant awards, of course, mean expansion of income from overhead charges; and in the research areas of new construction particularly, much of the clerical and technical help will be paid from project grants. Substantial numbers of clerical and technical people now on the General Fund are eligible for grant-fund-support because their major or entire effort is in research. The decision to abandon the all-inclusive rate and get into an individual charge system was motivated principally by anticipation of substantial increased patient income, accompanied by a greater consideration of the economics of laboratory charges on the part of physicians in their consideration of necessary laboratory determinations for indigent patients.

Finally, at the time the special presentation was made to the Legislative Budget Board and to the Legislative Committees, resulting in their approval of our building program, there was no disguising of the fact that the maintenance of modern air-conditioning structures runs at the rate of about \$1.50 per square foot, and this would require additional appropriations. This is clearly on the record of the testimony by Dr. Melvin Casberg, Mr. E. D. Walker and myself.

Computers in Research and in Medical Center Operation:  
In relation to the income picture and equally in relation to scientific and operational programs of the Medical Center, we are committed to a vast computer transition over the next few months and years. This is a baffling, a confusing new world; but the foresight of certain members of our faculty and of the Business Manager, Mr. Walker, has - over a period of three years - involved us in studies, assembled personnel, and set up an area on the 1st Floor of the Administration Building presently equipped with a 305 RAMAC, anticipating replacement in September by a 1401 TAPE MACHINE, and the addition at the same time of a 1620 RESEARCH COMPUTER. The contemplated transfer by September 1 off of the inclusive rate and onto an individual charge system will be achieved through the computer mechanism. Studies are underway now in regard to the whole super-structure of Current Restricted Funds, Special Funds of all kinds, Research Budget and the rest - for appropriate programming of the new equipment. We have good reason to believe that we are substantially ahead of all but a very few medical schools in relation to operational computer planning; and we should soon equal and keep pace with the several already ahead of us in research computer utilization.

## CONCLUSION

The need is urgent, the spirit of students and faculty is confident and expectant and appropriately impatient. Construction and renovation plans have been well conceived physically and functionally, and the programs are projected securely and efficiently in competent Administrative hands and in the computer patterns of the future. We believe the concluding sentence of the Survey Committee's report to the Chancellor to be no less than a solid prediction of our prospects of preeminence - but this prediction clearly presumes utmost expedition of our new construction programs:

"The school has made great strides in recent years and there is every indication of a potentiality to become a leading Medical Center."



## S E C T I O N    I I

### BUILDING PROGRAMS AT THE MEDICAL BRANCH

New construction needs were perfectly evident in 1956, and in terms of urgency, they were certainly headed by animal quarters and basic science teaching and research space. Not far behind on anyone's list, however, were radiotherapy units, autopsy space, expansion of hospital service laboratories, areas for clinical department research, hospital central service areas, and units suitable to house modern diagnostic, therapeutic and research equipment - all representing serious handicaps to the development of a modern medical center. The obviousness, however, of these needs was paralleled at that time by an equally obvious requirement for a thorough inventory of the Physical Plant and of the size scope and dynamics of appropriate programs of medical care, health education and medical research.

Accordingly, early in 1957, several major decisions served as a basis for our approach to the very complex and critical physical plant situation on the Galveston Campus.

1. No new construction, however urgently justified, would be planned except in accordance with an overall medical center program, even though this may take several years.
2. Studies must be undertaken on present space utilization and present building conditions as to maintenance costs, rehabilitation costs and reasonable life expectancy.
3. Buildings were designated at the earliest possible moment as suitable for:
  - a. Establishment on active current maintenance: Boiler Building 1945, General Stores 1950, Physical Plant Shop 1950, Gail Borden 1953, New John Sealy Hospital 1954, Ziegler Hospital 1954, New Dormitories 1955, Student-Faculty House 1956, Childrens Hospital 1937 (completely renovated 1956).
  - b. Total renovation: Rebecca Sealy 1932, Keiller Building 1925, Psycho II and III 1915, State Psychiatric Hospital 1930 and 1936, Old Outpatient 1932, Negro Hospital 1937 (now Randall Pavilion).

- c. Partial renovation: (10-25 year life)  
Administration Building 1914, Psycho I 1912, Physical Plant 1912 and 1928, Laundry 1928, State Psycho Annex 1942, 1/3rd of S.S.U. 1947, Paint Shop 1950.
  - d. Demolition after new construction program is completed, but justified by temporary remodeling for 2-4 year occupancy of essential units evacuated by building program: Ashbel Smith Building.
  - e. Demolition at earliest possible moment:  
Old John Sealy Hospital 1890 and 1916, Old Animal Care Building 1916, Pharmacology Building 1921, Old Resident and Intern Dormitories 1920's, Preventive Medicine Buildings 1940, 2/3rds of S.S.U. 1947, Air Cooling Unit 1954; and eventually, Ashbel Smith Building 1890.
4. Progress on building renovations and unit renovations must start at once in view of the following considerations:
- a. Appropriate funds appear available.
  - b. Redistribution and regrouping of service, educational and research functions are essentially prerequisite to determine optimum design and function of new construction.
  - c. Essential services, equipment and space must be activated to provide elementary diagnostic and research tools.
  - d. Certain renovations promised essential increase in hospital income.
  - e. No apparent building plan embracing the whole campus operation had apparently ever been made over the 65-year history of the Medical Branch to the extent of involving faculty, administration or professional planners in its design.

As of early 1962, exactly where do we stand?

- 1. New construction has now started on the first of the three major new units, The Central Air Cooling Plant, included in the recommendations contained in the overall medical center program as approved by the Regents and "enabled" by the Legislature. New construction will commence next month on the second of these three major new units, The New Outpatient -

Diagnostic Building, which also includes the hospital central supply areas recommended in the Hamilton Report. THESE WERE STARTED FIRST BECAUSE OF THE EARLIER AVAILABILITY OF MATCHING FUNDS - and not because the priority urgency for The Animal Care and Basic Science areas had lessened in any way! (See Section III of this Report.

2. With regard to total renovation items - the following schedule is completed or projected:
  - a. Randall Pavilion, completed 1960.
  - b. State Psychiatric Hospital, completed March 1962.
  - c. Psycho II and III, completion date: Winter 1962 - Spring 1963.
  - d. Keiller Building, completion date: Fall 1963.
  - e. Old OPD, completion date: Fall 1964.
  - f. Rebecca Sealy, completion date: Fall 1966.

N.B. Funds are now in hand or clearly in sight for all but Rebecca Sealy (See Section IV of this report).

3. Partial Renovation projects are on the following schedule for completion:
  - a. 1/6th of S.S.U., completed 1959.
  - b. Old Physical Plant Building, completed 1960.
  - c. Administration Building, completion date: Spring 1962.
  - d. State Psycho Annex, completion date: Summer 1962.
  - e. Paint Shop, completion date: Fall 1962.
  - f. 1/6th of S.S.U., completion date: Fall 1962.
  - g. 1/2 of Psycho I, completion date: Fall 1962.
  - h. Laundry (including addition), completion date: 1963.
  - i. 1/2 of Psycho I, completion date: 1963.

N.B. Funds for items a-c are allocated and approved; Funds for items d-i will be discussed in Section IV.

4. Temporary renovations in Ashbel Smith (The Old Red Building) are on the following schedule:

- a. Repair of fire loss, completed 1959.
- b. Student Lounge and Bookstore, completed 1960.
- c. Repairs and equipment, Book Bindery, completed 1960.
- d. Four-year temporary renovations for Microbiology, completion date: Fall 1962.
- e. Four-year temporary renovations for Pharmacology and Physiology, completion date: Fall 1962.
- f. Miscellaneous small items, completion date: Fall 1962.

N.B. Funds for items a-d are now in hand or spent. Funds for items e and f will be discussed in Section IV.

5. Progress on demolition may be reported as follows:

- a. Old Resident and Intern Dormitories, razed 1960.
- b. Pharmacology Building, razed 1962.
- c. Old John Sealy Hospital, Demolition date: Spring 1962.
- d. 2/3rds of S.S.U., Demolition date: 1963.
- e. Old Animal Care Buildings, Demolition date: 1964.
- f. Preventive Medicine Building, Demolition date: 1964.
- g. Air Cooling Tower for John Sealy Hospital, Demolition date: ??
- h. Ashbel Smith Building, Demolition date: ??

6. Progress on unit renovations totaling, in the years 1957 through 1961, \$1,325,100 has been achieved at the rate of \$247,000 a year, obtained from the following sources (average basis):

- a. Sealy & Smith Foundation: \$98,000 per year for five years.
- b. Medical Branch General Funds: \$80,000 per year for five years.

- c. U. S. Public Health Service: \$32,000 per year for five years.
- d. Medical Branch Current Restricted Funds: \$23,000 per year for five years.
- e. Miscellaneous Grants: \$14,000 per year for five years.

Please note that from these sources are included only unit renovation items and not renovation items described above at all.

Following are listed examples of unit renovation items completed in reference to four (4) major headings:

- (1) Development of faculty offices and laboratories in clinical departments in the hospital: 2A for Anesthesia Department; 5C for Cardiopulmonary and Neurological and Psychiatric Laboratories; 6 Stem for Surgical Department; and Childrens 4 for Pediatric Research.
- (2) To provide essential services, equipment and elementary diagnostic and research tools: three electron microscopes in the Keiller Building, Angiocardiographic rooms; ex-o-mat and radiographic machine for Radiology; an elementary isotope laboratory in the Old John Sealy which now must be temporarily relocated in the Old Outpatient Building; an isolation recovery room; and an elementary refuse disposal system.
- (3) To provide certain renovations promising substantial increase in hospital income: 5A and 5B; 3A and 3B; and 9A by this Summer; and 2B for an intensive-care unit.
- (4) Modernizing, with reference to equipment and simple appearance, units in the area of research, service, education and administration - including neuropathology laboratory, Tissue Metabolism Laboratory, Pathology research laboratories, Microbiology teaching areas; three (3) major classrooms; Executive Director's Office; Neuroanatomy Laboratory; Tissue Culture Laboratory; Dean's Office; Laundry,

Nursery, Blood Bank, Dog Pound, T. V. antennae and a central distilled water system.

N.B. All of the items listed above were done in accordance with the overall plan in relation to new construction and were done from funds provided as indicated in the total amount for the past five (5) years with an average of \$247,000 a year in the past five years from sources which can be counted upon minimumly to the extent of \$150,000 a year for an almost indefinite period.

## S E C T I O N    I I I

### IMMEDIATE EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF THE 10-YEAR BUILDING PROGRAM

#### A.    MEDICAL SCIENCE BUILDINGS

With this background of careful planning and steady progress in renovation in accordance with the overall program, and with this conservatively reasonable anticipation of operating funds in the new construction and newly renovated areas, and of at least \$150,000 a year from sources other than the Available Fund and Medical Branch General Funds, we can now anticipate in five or six years completion of the remodeling program to a point which might be described as achieving "a physical plant which can settle into a routine maintenance program of modern facilities; with new construction and remodeling keyed only to normal growth rather than awful necessity."

All of this effort, plus the attention and confidence and hopes of the faculty in the achievement of the most important major unit of all is directed to the earliest possible realization of the Animal Care and Basic Science Building which, from here on, will be referred to as the Medical Science Buildings.

The importance of the submission of an application for matching funds for the construction of these buildings by April 1, 1962 cannot be overstated. Faculty efforts on space requirements and needs have been concentrated on this now for several months; but even more significantly, our faculty has been regarding this for over 6 years as the major symbol and achievement of the whole building program.

From a practical standpoint, filing of this application at this time can result in a sequence of events which at best can anticipate the start of construction no sooner than January 1964, and indeed, perhaps later.

From an equally practical standpoint, the University of Texas is filing applications currently from three, and tomorrow from four units eligible for grants from the Health Research Facilities Branch (PHS) in Washington. With the approval of Chancellor Wilson, and with the knowledge of Central Administration and the Board of Regents,

we have had for three years on record with the Health Research Facilities Branch (PHS) our intention of seeking matching funds for these particular structures. No argument for me to seek action on this could be more compelling, however, than to list the units these structures would contain in terms of well-established and acute needs of the Medical Branch, recognized and recorded every year since 1956. These include:

1. An autopsy area worthy of a modern medical center.
2. Clinical research areas adjacent to clinical patient wards and offices.
3. Classrooms, seminar rooms and student locker rooms.
4. Teaching laboratories and student areas sufficient to accommodate the actual class size rather than at best 60 per cent of the current class size.
5. Space for the teaching faculty in the Departments of Pharmacology, Physiology, Microbiology and Biochemistry permitting an expansion from an average of 240 square feet per faculty member to a reasonable 900 square feet per faculty member, which would permit graduate student teaching and research of reasonable quality and depth.
6. A modern central isotope laboratory worthy of a University Medical Center.
7. Provision for a Department of Biophysics.
8. Teaching areas for the School of Nursing and the Schools of Medical Technology and Radio Technology, which were never planned on this campus in spite of the awful need for expansion of these schools.
9. Combined central telephone, television and radio communication center, realistically equipped to face a natural or man-made catastrophe.

This building will represent the margin of difference between a Medical Center capable of recruiting outstanding men in all departmental areas and in all stages of development, and one which will continue to struggle against the difficulties of Galveston which are likely to be present for at least a few more years. It is for this reason that I am recommending allocation to the Medical Science Buildings



of a total in the amount of \$2,900,000 - leaving only a balance of \$300,000 in the Available Fund and Available Fund Bond Issue allocation. It is acknowledged that, on the basis of the 50-50 matching formula for research space alone, this \$2,900,000 cannot be expected to justify more than \$2,000,000 to \$2,300,000 on the basis of research space.

Studies are now being completed to determine the most advantageous economy of construction, decision on the possibility of a first stage and a second stage, and potential participation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this building program. These studies are dealing with the following considerations:

1. Limitation of animal quarters in relation to the Medical Science Buildings on 9th Street to acute animal experimentation requiring constant daily attendance upon the animals by the investigator; and construction of a low-cost animal farm on the western two-thirds of the area now occupied by the condemned S.S.U. Building.
2. Postponement of construction of the upper two floors, pending response to informal inquiries to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration regarding possibility of their interest in the construction of several floors.
3. Dividing the Ninth Street structure into a first phase and building the South Wing and a second phase, completing it with a North Wing.

Action Requested:

1. That University Consulting Architects be authorized to work on sketches and descriptive requirements which are now in their hands and will be coming to them over the next three days from each of the departments involved in the new building - to the end that within a month (which they feel they can do), they have sketches ready sufficient to meet the needs of the application to the Health Research Facilities Branch (PHS) in time for the April 1st deadline.
2. That Central Administration endorse to the Regents the urgent necessity of this project and the allocation of funds in the total amount of \$2,900,000 for maximum matching purposes for either a single building or a Medical Science Building plus an Animal Farm Area, described above, depending upon the studies of our Consulting Architects.

B. REMAINING AVAILABLE FUND ITEMS IN THE ORIGINAL PLAN AND IN THE REVISED PROPOSAL:

1. It is proposed that the balance of \$300,000 be allocated as follows:

a. \$200,000 to provide a second air-cooling unit in the Air Cooling Building for construction in 1963. We estimate that the 2000 tons thus completed will more than carry the educational buildings and physical plant buildings on the Medical Branch campus; and that the remaining 4000 tons represents essentially a replacement of currently operating air-conditioning load in the John Sealy Hospital complex, plus the additional load in hospital buildings - all of which is eligible for Sealy & Smith Foundation support. We would thus anticipate, over a period of four to six years, requesting a total of approximately \$800,000 from the Sealy & Smith Foundation for these purposes.

N.B. It will be necessary, in connection with the additional unit to be constructed by the University and the four additional units to be requested from the Sealy & Smith Foundation, to obtain Legislative permission at the next Session.

b. It is proposed that \$100,000 (representing the entire balance of the original allocation) be designated for repairs and rehabilitation, and that to this sum be added \$300,000 (representing the amount of money in hand saved in the bidding for the basement and Floors 1, 2 and 3 of the New Outpatient Building).

(1) To this total can be added, on an annual basis, at least \$150,000 a year for several years from sources for remodeling and renovation which have been used during the past five years in the amount of approximately \$247,000 per year.

2. It is proposed that the Laundry item be removed from Available Fund support because it is functionally almost 95 per cent Hospital in its utilization, and because informally the Sealy & Smith Foundation has given the opinion that it is eligible for their support. As to the item of \$135,000, we have no record as to how this figure was computed and we feel certain that \$100,000 will more than adequately cover

the needs. You will note that on Page 17 of our Master Plan Proposals of March, 1960 this Laundry Addition was listed at \$50,000 with Sealy & Smith Foundation indicated as a recommended source of support.

Action Requested

That Central Administration approve the revised ten-year building program proposals, based on Medical Branch acknowledgment that this represents depletion of funds from the Available Fund and Available Fund Bond Issue at this time.

C. RENOVATION ITEMS NEEDING CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL FOR PRESENTATION TO THE REGENTS:

1. Authorization to proceed with the plans on the following special items:
  - a. Refinishing of the North Wing of Psycho I to become final location for Psychology Division which must be evacuated from the 1st Floor of Psycho II and III when that building redesigned for the Child Psychiatry Center. Approximate cost: \$25,000.
  - b. Remodeling of State Psycho Annex, including moving of two or three 20 feet length units from the west end of S.S.U. for incorporation into a unit designed to house Educational and Research Services in the area adjacent to the State Psychiatric Hospital.
  - c. Demolition of the rest of the S.S.U. unit which is considered beyond economical repair to make way for animal farm described above.
  - d. Plans on paving, financing and operation of new parking area east of Central Stores.

SECTION IV  
SUMMARY OF FINANCING

The University of Texas - Medical Branch 10-Year Building Program as of February 7, 1962

	Approved by	Present	University	University	Sealy	Federal Govt. *		Other
	Regents	Medical Branch	Funds			Funds	Health Research	
	Sept. 1960	Plan	(10-Year Plan)		and	Facilities		
					Smith			
A. Out-Patient Clinical Diagnostic Unit	\$ 4,680,000	\$ 5,900,000(1)	\$ 1,150,000	\$ -0-	\$2,150,000(5)	\$ 345,000	\$2,205,000(7)	\$ 50,000
B. Basic Science-Administration Unit	4,800,000	5,800,000(2)	2,900,000	-0-	-0-	2,900,000	-0-	-0-
C. Laundry Addition	135,000	100,000	-0-	-0-	100,000(6)			
D. Keiller Building Further Remodeling	550,000	878,792	250,000	300,000 #		281,832		46,960
E. Central Water-Chilling Addition	500,000	1,000,000(3)	200,000	-0-	800,000(6)			
F. Other Remodeling and Demolition	1,000,000	100,000(4)	100,000	-0-				
G. Equipment	<u>1,500,000</u>							
Total	\$13,165,000							
H. Physical Plant Storeroom and Surgical Research		300,000	300,000	-0-				
I. Central Water-Chilling Station		850,000	-0-	850,000 #				
J. Out-Patient Remodeling		800,000			600,000(5)		200,000 #	
K. Psycho II and III (Child Psychiatry)		285,000	-0-	-0-	180,000(5)	-0-	105,000(8)	-0-
L. Ward 9A - John Sealy - Pediatrics		100,000	-0-	-0-	100,000(5)	-0-	-0-	-0-
M. Ward 4C - Clinical Research Center		72,000	-0-					<u>72,000</u>
Total		\$15,307,000	\$ 4,900,000	\$1,115,000(10)	\$3,930,000	\$3,245,000	\$2,510,000	\$122,000

\* HRF - Health Research Facilities  
H-B - Hill-Burton Funds

# Outside of 10-year plan

Remaining items necessary to achieve Physical Plant which

- (a) Contains basic units essential to a modern medical center.
- (b) Permits establishment of routine maintenance program of modern facilities throughout.
- (c) Anticipates new construction and remodeling keyed only to normal growth, rather than awful necessity.

A. Remodeling - based on a six-year program beginning January 1, 1962

Six Year Total

Funds for these items must come principally from the following sources:

In the education area - Medical Branch General Funds and Current Restricted Funds at the rate of \$75,000/year . . . . .	\$ 450,000
Possible remodeling request to Legislature for Rebecca Sealy - \$500,000	
In the hospital area - Sealy & Smith Foundation Funds at the rate of \$100,00 per year . . . . .	600,000
Possible remodeling request to Hill-Burton for Old OPD - \$200,000	
In the Research Area - Federal program grant funds, private foundation grants at the rate of \$50,000/year . . . . .	300,000
General Repair, etc. - Balance of money allocated for construction of B, 1,2,3 of New Outpatient Building . . . . .	300,000
Available Fund Balance . . . . .	<u>100,000</u>
	\$ 1,750,000

N.B. All of this except the final item of \$100,000 depends upon Funds OTHER THAN AVAILABLE FUND AND AVAILABLE FUND BOND ISSUE

Estimates listed below are my own, on the curbstone.

1. Minimal essential remodeling for "Temporarily" (2-4) years dislocated units due to new construction and remodeling. These are almost entirely concentrated in Old OPD and Old Red Building. . . . .	\$ 80,000
2. Remodeling of State Psychiatric Annex including moving of 2 or 3 twenty (20) foot units from S.S.U. to centralize Educational and Research Services department (audio-visual, book bindery, shops, etc.) . . . . .	60,000
3. Remodeling Pharmacology Space in Gail Borden for new department chairman . . . . .	14,000
4. Moving premature nursery on Childrens 4 to area adjacent to nursery on 3 stem . . . . .	15,000
5. Remodeling North-end of Psycho I as final location of psychology division and in order to evacuate Psycho II & III . . . . .	25,000
6. Remodeling Paint Shop for new chairman of Biochemistry . . . . .	30,000
7. Complete south ½ of Psycho I for adolescent unit on first floor and recreational therapy in basement . . . . .	75,000
8. Old Outpatient Remodeling - may require additional funds over and above present \$600,000 Sealy & Smith gift . . . . .	200,000
9. Remodeling of John Sealy Hospital areas for new functions after transfer of present occupants to new OPD. For example: 2B for Intensive Care Ward and Pre-surgical Pathology labs and offices, plus minor remodeling in office areas adjacent to new construction . . . . .	250,000
10. Rebecca Sealy - remodeling for library and for academic offices - suitable for try with Legislature - otherwise, Sealy & Smith (they built the building) and our own funds . . . . .	500,000
11. <u>Contingency</u> - Waterproofing, painting, caulking, utilities, etc. . . . .	<u>500,000</u>
	\$ 1,749,000

69

B. New Construction

Funds for these items must be obtained from Federal, Foundations, or other local sources

1. Athletic facilities and other student activities for which Alumni Funds of about \$140,000 was raised
2. Three low cost service department areas - of about 10,000 square feet each - \$10.00 - \$12.00 per square foot
  - a. Occupational and recreational therapy
  - b. Storage warehouse
  - c. Eventual location for Educational and Research Services (audio-visual, etc.)
3. Additional floor to R. Waverley Smith Pavilion providing private single rooms only
4. A large auditorium of about 750 seats
5. An Administration Building (or addition to the present one) has been repeatedly advocated by the Sealy & Smith Foundation as suitable for their support - and the need for this is growing year by year.

- (1) Includes Equipment - NOTE funds available are estimated to be over \$300,000 in excess of estimated cost due to favorable bids on Basement and Floors 1, 2, and 3.
- (2) Includes Equipment
- (3) Based on 6,000 tons - Present development includes total distribution system plus a 1,000 ton unit. (Five additional units @ \$200,000 each)
- (4) Contingency item - but available for remodeling, etc., after bids are all in.
- (5) Approved Request
- (6) No request made
- (7) Approved
- (8) Pending
- (9) Clinical Research Center Grant (PHS)
- (10) \$300,000 from Available Fund and \$850,000 from Available Fund Bond Issue
- (#) This denotes that this source is eligible for such a grant and is more than likely to be interested.

A P P E N D I X A

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE LIAISON COMMITTEE ON MEDICAL EDUCATION

1. The committee will recommend continued full approval by the American Medical Association and continued full membership in the Association of American Medical Colleges.
2. Organization.
  - a. The Administration was complimented on the implementation of research and educational programs.
  - b. The line of responsibility is frequently not clear to the Faculty in regard to administrative organization.
  - c. There is some confusion among the Faculty concerning the title "Executive Dean," and it is suggested that a more suitable title be considered.
  - d. It appears that the Dean of Medicine has no direct responsibility for fiscal affairs, space and, to some degree, Faculty staffing.
  - e. Board of Regents. It would appear that with two committees (Medical Affairs Committee and Buildings and Grounds Committee) and the Board of Regents having to do with the operation of the medical school, it could well lead to delay and confusion, especially in regard to building programs.
  - f. The committee notes that the medical school has quite good relations with the Galveston County Medical Society and the Texas Medical Association, and these should be maintained.
3. Faculty.
  - a. The committee compliments the trend to incorporating subspecialties into major departments.
  - b. A sounder organization of Faculty affairs might be implemented if all standing committee reports were made to the Executive Committee before presentation to the Faculty.

- c. The policy of using a Nominating Committee is questioned and it is strongly recommended that all standing committees be appointed by the Dean of Medicine with approval by the Executive Committee.
- d. The general plan for augmentation of salaries, and so forth, seems to be working well and should be continued and expanded.
- e. The committee feels there should be a definite statement of policy in regard to sabbatical leaves.
- f. The appointment of department chairmen should be based entirely on merit, and not expediency and local pressures.
- g. The budget appears adequate at present, but will need expansion as the building program progresses.

#### 4. Students.

- a. The committee commends the admission policies and procedures.
- b. The recent trend to admission of nonresidents is commended and the committee recommends that this should be continued and expanded.
- c. The committee feels that the attrition rate is unusually and undesirably high. Some improvement evidently has been made, but efforts in that direction should be continued.
- d. In admitting students to the School of Medicine, the decision should be based entirely on ability and the committee feels that it is very unwise to set an arbitrary minimum of 130 related to fiscal affairs. The maximum number of students accepted should be based on sound academic policy determined by the Faculty.
- e. The committee feels that the quality of students is good and that student morale is high.

#### 5. Physical Plant.

- a. Additional facilities and space for teaching and research are urgently needed in all areas. Plans currently underway should be pushed for early completion and long-range objectives should be developed for the institution.
- b. The Faculty should be consulted on long-range objectives and building plans to prevent areas such as occurred in the Gail Borden Building.



- c. The committee commended the policy of incorporating research facilities in buildings immediately adjacent to patient areas.

6. Library.

- a. The committee compliments the Library on both content and operation.

7. Clinical Facilities.

- a. The school has made good utilization of clinical facilities.
- b. The number of patients available for teaching is quite adequate for the present class size and the curricular program. Expansion can be made by additional usage of material now available and by further utilization of patients at the U. S. Public Health Service Hospital.

8. Curriculum.

- a. Flexibility in the new curriculum is quite satisfactory.
- b. Electives are very important but require complete supervision and control of this Faculty, including approval of programs and reports by the Faculty and/or the Dean's Office.
- c. The committee deplors the Preceptorship Program and externships not under this Faculty's supervision.
- d. The committee suggests consideration be given to adding materials in genetics and rehabilitation to the curriculum.
- e. The committee is aware that the emphasis on didactic teaching has been reduced, but it is strongly recommended that further reduction be carried out.
- f. The committee commends the reduction of number and intensity of examinations for the adoption of a more uniform grading system; but the number and frequency of examinations should be further reduced.
- g. The Alternate Program has merit and should be continued.
- h. The medical student research programs are an important trend toward a more satisfactory academic orientation.
- i. Double laboratory sections in preclinical departments are a severe limitation on the curriculum and an encroachment on Faculty time.

9. Graduate Program.

- a. The expanding program in association with the Graduate School in Austin is to be commended and will be an important aspect in the total educational program and recruitment of Faculty for the basic science departments.

10. Departments.

Anatomy. A good, active, stimulating, research-oriented department, with a good impact on the medical student research program. Total hours allocated to this department seem excessive in relation to other departments teaching in the first year.

Biochemistry. This department falls far short of its mission of teaching and research in a modern medical school. Much of this can be rectified by a wise choice of a new chairman. The total time allocated to this department should be increased. At present, lectures are quite excessive and laboratory time inadequate. The department has not adequately utilized either space or facilities.

Microbiology. Quite satisfactory with an expanding research and training program.

Pathology. Good balance of teaching, service and research in an expanding department. Excellent utilization of personnel. The teaching of clinical pathology as a part of the total general pathology course has merit. The committee questions the limitation of students to two autopsies each.

Pharmacology. This department has good potentiality for growth and development. The department should re-examine its philosophy of teaching pharmacology as a course in clinical therapeutics and the committee questions the present orientation in that direction. The committee recommends that the ratio of lectures to laboratories be altered materially toward the direction of more laboratories.

Physiology. Quite a strong department in teaching, research and graduate program. The department needs more space for its research program. The committee recommends an increase in the allocation of teaching time but questions the overemphasis of lecture hours at the expense of laboratory time.

Preventive Medicine and Public Health. An un-inspiring department without aims and objectives. Requires careful re-evaluation of leadership and program. The committee questions the propriety of providing a tenure position for an unqualified person. It is unfortunate that this

department has been a catch-all for a variety of personnel and disciplines somewhat unrelated. Additional personnel should not be added to the department until a decision has been reached about a department chairman and the future role of the department.

Internal Medicine. A good, solid department of clinical medicine as presently constituted. The committee hopes that in the next few years personnel can be attracted to lend strength to the department's research program. This department may require some assistance in moving away from the tendency of in-breeding.

Neurology and Psychiatry. A good and stimulating approach in neurology and psychiatry. The department has a well-deserved reputation for training of residents -- a good residency program. Clinical material for teaching is good and well utilized. Long-range plans must include consideration of the appointment of a full-time chairman on the basis of merit. It is essential that due consideration be given to a proper balance of research, teaching and patient care. Many students and physicians have been stimulated to careers in psychiatry through the efforts of this department.

Obstetrics & Gynecology - Pediatrics. The choice of department chairmen for these two departments is very fortunate and this vigorous leadership gives promise for outstanding departments in each case.

Surgery. Problems are quite similar to those in Internal Medicine. The department has a good clinical teaching program and the committee commends the inclusion of surgical specialties within the department. The department should proceed with its efforts to attract researchers. The policies of in-breeding should be discouraged.

The committee is aware of curriculum problems but feels that greater emphasis is needed on the basic principles, including diagnosis. The committee recommends that consideration be given to the elimination of surgery clerkships in Year IV. As constituted, there is too great a fragmentation of material and it is suggested that this period be reorganized to provide a more continuous experience in the care of ambulatory patients, preferably on an interdepartmental basis.

The school has made great strides in recent years and there is every indication of a potentiality to become a leading Medical Center.

A P P E N D I X B

ACCREDITATION OF THE SCHOOL OF NURSING

Between October 2 and 7, our School of Nursing was visited by an accreditation team from the National League for Nursing. Visitation included extensive faculty interviews and attendance at clinical classes and on ward services. Our school is one of high standing nationally and the report of the inspectors is full of favorable comments on detailed observations of the curriculum in action. Special appreciation was expressed of the high standing of our graduates in the State and National Examinations - wherein our range of scores over the past three years has been 470 to 724 on a scale in which passing for Texas requirements is 350!

Major problem observed was relatively high turnover of faculty - and severe shortage of faculty in psychiatric and public health nursing. Dean Bartholf stated at the time (and her opinion was supported by the inspecting group) that the turnover and the difficulties of recruitment in psychiatry and public health were factors of our salary scale, and of our twelve-month appointments.

Comparative salary scales of U.T. and National League for Nursing Survey for 1960-61 for University Schools of Nursing show the following:

<u>RANK</u>	<u>UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS</u>	<u>NATIONAL AVERAGES</u>
Instructor	\$5,000 - \$6,000	\$ 4,500 - \$ 7,000
Assistant Professor	\$6,500 - \$7,000	\$ 5,000 - \$10,000
Associate Professor	\$7,000 - \$8,250	\$ 6,500 - \$12,000
Professor	\$12,000	\$ 7,000 - \$14,500

Our lower middle group rating in three of these four groups clearly explains our inability to recruit faculty with doctoral degrees in Nursing, and faculty in the relative shortage areas of psychiatry and public health. We shall come to the Regents at an early meeting with proposals for revised faculty scales.

The matter of nine-month versus twelve-month appointments also needs further study before we shall be ready to make recommendations. Briefly, of 65 Schools of Nursing nationally with comparable programs to ours, there are 37 schools with nine-month faculty appointments, and 28 with twelve-month appointments. Fifteen (15) of these 28 have optional nine-month appointments - because of the pressure from faculties

for opportunity for further study, to teach at a different University, or to do general duty in hospitals to actually care for patients. This latter, I must say, greatly appeals to me.

All in all, our report was highly favorable, and indeed one in which the University can be justly proud. I was particularly pleased about their study and observations of the satisfactory operation of our two-campus program in the first two years of its operation.

A P P E N D I X C

HURRICANE LOSS ACCOUNTS

The following is the complete text of a January 31, 1962, letter from Mr. E. D. Walker, Business Manager and Comptroller of Hospitals, to Dr. John B. Truslow, Executive Dean and Director.

We are nearing completion of the repairs to facilities damaged by Hurricane Carla. Supplies and equipment have been replaced. Certain repair work in the basement of the John Sealy Hospital, which is being done by outside contract, is not quite complete; therefore, an exact amount of the loss is not determinable. However, the amounts shown below do include estimated allowance for work yet to be completed.

All determinable losses from all sources are included:

- |     |   |             |
|-----|---|-------------|
| (1) | <u>Hospitality Shop</u><br>Stock stored in the basement of John Sealy Hospital and stock loss due to utility failures.                              | \$ 2,357.73 |
| (2) | <u>Dietary Department</u><br>Food losses due to failure of utilities and emergency food used for emergency workers and refugees                     | 6,479.38    |
| (3) | <u>Housekeeping Department</u><br>Additional emergency items required for special cleaning and sanitation   | 836.75      |
| (4) | <u>Pharmacy</u><br>Includes drugs, supplies, equipment and repair of equipment  | 10,252.19   |
| (5) | <u>Mail and Telephone</u><br>All desks, file cabinets, tables, postage metering machine were in basement of Ashbel Smith Building which was flooded | 8,202.10    |
| (6) | <u>Print Shop</u><br>Flooding of basement in Ashbel Smith Building destroyed a col-<br>lator, printing supplies and materials                       | 6,703.19    |

(7)	<u>Miscellaneous Cost</u> Mass Typhoid Immunization, Laundry Service, Anti-venom Kits, etc.	\$ 9,265.41
(8)	<u>Physical Plant</u> This includes losses sustained primarily in the basement of the New John Sealy Hospital. Includes all insulation, duct work, motor repair, air conditioning Compressor repair, elevator repair, electrical, controls, etc. Some losses occurred in other buildings (basements) which were flooded: i.e., insulation, pumps, motors, etc.	257,703.97
(9)	<u>Overtime Labor</u> Primarily for emergency work immediately after the hurricane for maintenance and hospital personnel	16,261.45
(10)	<u>Estimated Income Loss</u> Based on actual census in the hospital, the reduction in patient income is conservatively estimated at the above figure	150,000.00
(11)	<u>Other expenses</u> Consists of cost to the maintenance organization for clean-up, repair and overtime work performed by regular Medical Branch employees, plus replacement parts for a large amount of equipment which had to be repaired as a result of the water damage. Includes shrubs and other items destroyed on the campus	60,000.00

Total Calculated Loss \$528,062.17

Items which are definitely not recoverable from Available Fund Appropriations

(1)	Hospitality Shop	\$ 2,357.73	
(2)	Dietary Department	<u>6,479.38</u>	\$ 8,837.11

Items which will probably not be eligible for Available Fund Appropriation - if for no other reason than the problems related to funds in the State Treasury

(9)	Overtime Labor	\$ 16,261.45	
(10)	Estimated Income Loss	150,000.00	
(11)	Other Expenses	<u>60,000.00</u>	<u>226,261.45</u>

Amount eligible for payment from  
Available Fund Appropriation

\$292,963.61

In about three weeks we should be in a position to make a final report on the total losses incurred as all work should be completed by that time. In view of all the expense involved in moving for construction projects and the necessary remodeling, this loss is a pretty severe blow.

The amount of losses covered by the donation of time and materials has not been included in the totals in this summary. These include, among other things, replacement without cost of many drugs in the pharmacy, the loan of equipment by the City Fire Department, Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and other companies, plus the donation of fuel, oil, etc. These tangible items plus a vast amount of time, if included in this total, would up the amount considerably.

In my opinion, by very careful attention to our income possibilities in the hospitals plus the balances we have accrued from prior years, we can come out in the black this year.



232

# DEPARTMENTAL REQUISITION

ORIGINAL—FOR PURCHASING AGENT  
(VIA AUDITOR'S OFFICE)

UNIV. ORDER NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE September 14, 1962

Printing Division  
CONTRACTOR & SHIPPER

Red River and Manor Road  
ADDRESS

Austin, Texas  
CITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Office of the Board of Regents  
DEPARTMENT

Main Building 203  
BUILDING AND ROOM NO.

AUSTIN 12, TEXAS  
ADDRESS

DESTINATION OF GOODS IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE

MATERIAL REQUIRED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
(SHOW DEFINITE DATE)

SUGGESTED SOURCE(S) FOR OPEN MARKET PURCHASES:

DEPARTMENT Board of Regents

ACCT. NO. & TITLE 53-0205-0050

Maintenance and Equipment

DELIVERY \_\_\_\_\_ F.O.B. \_\_\_\_\_

AS PER \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY AND UNIT	UNIT PRICE	EXTENSION
1.	Bind in Pressboard Covers the attached documents in the exact order.  <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; font-family: cursive;">Job #200</div>			
CASH DISCOUNT _____ %		TOTAL		

REQUESTED BY *Belfrage* FUNDS AVAILABLE \_\_\_\_\_ FOR AUDITOR

APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN OR DEAN