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Honor the Past ~ Claim the Future

“We are what we have been and what we will become because of our roots in this place, on this hill, and with this city. We pay tribute to all who have loved this place and still love it, as we honor the past and claim the future.”

President Denise M. Trauth – Celebration, 100th Anniversary of Classes at Texas State, Old Main 2003
Dear Colleagues:

Good campus planning is characterized by key elements, such as an inclusive and participatory approach, sensitivity to the unique qualities of place, insightful analysis, and inspired design. The Campus Master Plan for Texas State University-San Marcos was developed paying special attention to these elements. After two years of discussion and planning, involving hundreds of members of the University and San Marcos communities, I am pleased to share this plan with you.

Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, “The greatest thing in this world is not so much where we are, but in what direction we are moving.” The Campus Master Plan for 2006-2015 supports new and ongoing programmatic initiatives with specific recommendations for additional academic space while respecting long-term aspirations of enhancing the institution’s image. The Plan defines opportunities for accommodating growth and addresses access and vehicular management. As we strive to “Honor the Past and Claim the Future” it achieves both a functional and attractive student centered campus environment.

First impressions sometimes convey surprising and unintended messages. Landscape plays an influential role in creating and shaping a sense of place. Knowing this, we asked that the Master Plan include design guidelines for both architecture and landscape to help connect the different parts of the Texas State campus and create a sense of place that will remain strong and clear in the memories of our graduates.

Implementation of this ambitious Master Plan will require continued campus discussion and financial support. With a sound yet flexible Master Plan based on shared Guiding Principles, we have a clear and powerful guide for the physical development of the campus over the next decade and beyond.

I am indebted to the people, both at Texas State and in the San Marcos community, who created a plan that proposes a new vision of excellence and diversity for Texas State’s future.

Sincerely,

Denise M. Trauth
President
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~ INTRODUCTION ~
Greetings,

It is very exciting to be involved in a master planning process. You get to step outside the box, dream a little (or a lot) and make suggestions that could forever change the look of the campus. You learn very quickly how passionately some individuals feel about certain things.

Marcel Proust, a French intellectual and novelist, said, “The real act of discovery consists not of finding new lands, but in seeing with new eyes.” Our consultants felt certain that land acquisition beyond our boundaries was not necessary and that additional capacity was achievable on campus. Therefore, when we heard “you cannot do that” we countered with, “Why not? What if? and What about?”

The multi-phased effort provided a wide range of constituent groups the opportunity to think strategically about the long-term vision for growth and change at the University. The phases involved reviewing the history of the university, looking at what we currently have, reviewing what works well and what does not, and identifying what we will need to achieve the mission of the University. Transportation, parking, utilities, landscaping, stormwater management, new building locations, and architectural styles were deliberated. There may not be total agreement with everything in the plan, but most of the conclusions outlined are endorsed by many faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the citizens of San Marcos.

The Campus Master Plan, created by and for the Texas State community, will guide the development of our campus for many years to come. The Plan allows us to showcase our status of excellence without sacrificing the carefully cultivated small campus atmosphere. It also enhances our relationship with the greater San Marcos community. The Plan provides suggestions for unifying the campus with appropriate entrances and borders to indicate arrival on campus. It affords opportunities for accentuating the unique physical characteristics of the campus and celebrating its natural beauty. The Plan also presents guidelines for a cohesive architectural style.

The next step is implementation of the Plan. We are confident that this plan will not end up on a shelf. It is composed of many detailed recommendations for future development of the campus. The Master Planning process included careful and deliberate consideration of the recommendations, followed by financial analyses, structural reviews of existing buildings, measurement of spaces, and reviews with the City of San Marcos to ensure the Plan is practical and achievable. Implementation of this plan will enhance the experience of learning, living, working, and visiting Texas State University-San Marcos.

Sincerely,

Nancy Nusbaum
Assistant Vice President for Finance and Support Services Planning, Project Leader of the 2006-2015 Texas State Campus Master Plan
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

IDENTITY
As a public institution, the University has a symbiotic relationship with the San Marcos community. The Master Plan prescribes visual cues that define the campus boundaries without restricting physical access. The intersections of Comanche, North LBJ, and State Street along the northern edge and the intersections of Moon and South LBJ on the southern edge will be highlighted with planted medians, entrance signage, and traffic lights. At the pedestrian scale, the campus will be identified by uniform paving and street furniture. The University will be visually defined by a formal green space extending from the Theatre Center to LBJ Street, the new Fine Arts and Communication Center, and the new Undergraduate Academic Center. Old Main will remain the most important symbol of Texas State and the character of the original academic Quad will be maintained as a way of preserving the small campus atmosphere.

COMMUNITY
The historical practice of juxtaposing academic, residential, and cultural facilities creates the unique character of the Texas State campus. As formal education spills from the classrooms, students and faculty cross paths in a series of outdoor rooms where the opportunity to congregate and converse encourages a vibrant intellectual community. Future residence halls should be limited to five stories with patios and green space to help further stimulate social interaction away from the classroom. Students will have easier access to computer facilities by relocating the open computer lab from the fourth floor of the Math Computer Science building to the first floor of Derrick Hall, directly accessible from the Quad. Additionally, the entrance to the campus will engage the San Marcos community through the distinctive Fine Arts and Communication Center and a public green. The seamless knitting of the southern edge of campus with the surrounding community will help to create a dynamic college town.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
Because the quality of the physical environment has a tremendous influence on the image and function of the institution, the Master Plan guides the extension of the intimate character of the central Quad through a series of pedestrian corridors. Pedestrian access for walkers from McCoy Hall to the College of Education building will be achieved by converting Bobcat Trail to a shaded walkway parallel to the original academic Quad. The systematic removal of surface parking lots will create a comprehensive network of green open spaces and new building footprints. This change to the physical character of the campus is beneficial on many levels: ecologically, it assists with stormwater management and water retention; it softens the look and feel of the campus; socially, it fosters spontaneous student interaction creating a sense of community; and physically, it supports a campus on which walking is preferable over driving. A holistic appearance with the consistent use of native plants, paving materials, and site furnishings will unify the campus and reinforce the unique character of the campus landscape.

ARCHITECTURE
Campus buildings serve different functions, but each contributes to the identity and sense of place at Texas State. A variety of architectural styles adds visual diversity to a campus. However, diversity turns to chaos unless architectural individuality is in harmony with adjoining structures and in context with the balance of the campus. Texas State’s buildings are an eclectic assemblage of architectural styles. Design guidelines now exist to present a unified approach that respects the historical precedent and embraces the technological advances of modern times. As the University adds square footage over the Master Plan anticipates the need to address infrastructure requirements of the campus in the least intrusive manner. New buildings are sited in close proximity to existing buildings to better use the land, and create a compact pedestrian friendly campus.

MOBILITY
Creating an efficient and safe campus network of thoroughfares and pathways for pedestrians, bicycles, buses, and cars is of paramount concern. Therefore, the Master Plan prescribes a new transportation strategy. Redistributing core surface parking to conveniently located parking garages will free-up space for new buildings and open spaces. Parking garages will serve resident and commuter students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the campus. Students and faculty are encouraged to park once and walk or bike during their time on campus. Thoughtful separation of the pedestrian and automobile enriches the campus experience and creates meaningful large scale and intimate gathering spaces. Covered walkways help pedestrians move conveniently, sheltered from rain or excessive summer sun. Cyclists will have designated routes to travel – routes connecting key areas of campus and the San Marcos community. Also, on the southern edge, the streets and sidewalks from downtown San Marcos will penetrate the campus in a seamless pedestrian experience.
UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

Texas State University-San Marcos is a public, student-centered, doctoral granting institution dedicated to excellence in serving the educational needs of the diverse population of Texas and the world beyond.

SHARED VALUES

In pursuing our mission we, the faculty, staff and students of Texas State University-San Marcos, are guided by a shared collection of values. Specifically, we value:

- An exceptional undergraduate experience as the heart of what we do;
- Graduate education as a means of intellectual growth and professional development;
- A diversity of people and ideas, a spirit of inclusiveness, a global perspective, and a sense of community as essential conditions for campus life;
- The cultivation of character and the modeling of honesty, integrity, compassion, fairness, respect, and ethical behavior, both in the classroom and beyond;
- Engaged teaching and learning based in dialogue, student involvement, and the free exchange of ideas;
- Research, scholarship, and creative activity as fundamental sources of new knowledge and as expressions of the human spirit;
- A commitment to public service as a resource for personal, educational, cultural, and economic development;
- Thoughtful reflection, collaboration, planning, and evaluation as essential for meeting the changing needs of those we serve.

THE CAMPUS MASTER PLAN PROCESS

In the spring of 2003 Texas State University-San Marcos launched a campus master planning process intended to lead the University through the year 2015 and beyond. Faculty, staff, and students on the Campus Facilities Planning Committee understood that the process was as important as the product, and with a flawed process the plan could simply languish on the shelf. Therefore, considerable time was spent on creating an inclusive and open process and a reasonable time line with the intention that both the process and the product would be worthwhile and useful.

Critical success factors were created to ensure the success of the process and that the Plan itself would serve the University well. Planning constraints were identified and discussed at length before consultants were ever brought to campus. Key planning assumptions that identified probable future conditions as outlined in the University Strategic Plan were adopted. Faculty, staff, students, and the San Marcos community spent a great deal of time writing the Guiding Principles for the Plan. These Guiding Principles, which focus on identity, community, natural environment, architecture, and mobility, guided us as we shaped the development and improvement of the campus environment and facilities. Information gleaned from an October 2003 Survey of Campus Environment and Facilities was valuable in developing the Principles.

In addition, two university committees were formed by the President to review campus lighting and safety and study the need for a Freshman Building. Recommendations from both of the committees have been incorporated in the Plan.

Foremost in our thinking was that this campus master planning process was to be a public exercise. Many meetings and open forums were held, progress of the plan was ongoing, and feedback was invited regularly. Monthly meetings were held over a twelve-month period not only with faculty, staff, and students, but also with the City of San Marcos staff and members of the San Marcos community. Faculty came forward with suggested class projects allowing us to “draw upon our own internal pool of talent, creativity, and expertise.” Classes in Agriculture (landscape design), Art and Design (sculpture), Geography (advanced GIS), Technology (architectural drafting), History (historical preservation), and Family and Consumer Sciences (interior design) contributed useful suggestions. Many of these projects were either posted on the Campus Master Plan web site or the recommendations were incorporated into the Plan.

In May 2005, the 2006-2015 Campus Master Plan was presented to the Local Planning Committee and later to the Texas State University System Board of Regents. The Board unanimously approved the Plan as presented. A Master Plan process does not end with the approval of the plan. Quickly thereafter, a Campus Master Plan Steering Committee was created and will present the first projects to the Board of Regents at the August 2005 meeting for architect approval.
Strategic Planning Process

A strategic plan should be the initial step in the master planning process. Strategic plans identify the institution's vision of where the leaders want the institution to go and how they want to get there. Master plans are created to support the strategic plan, more specifically the physical environment that needs to exist to help the University achieve its desired vision.

In 2003, Texas State University-San Marcos began the process of reviewing and updating the University Plan. The 2004-2009 University Plan identifies the academic and program goals for the University. It specifically addresses: helping Texas reach its Closing the Gaps targets in access, success, excellence, and research; providing a premier undergraduate experience for students from across Texas and beyond; addressing the special needs of the surrounding Austin-San Antonio region; further expanding opportunities for graduate education; conducting research to expand the knowledge base in many academic disciplines; and serving as a major resource and economic engine for the State.

During the planning process, departments were asked to address five major initiatives: academic programs (including distance learning), student learning and success, scholarly and creative/grant activity, development, and diversity. They were also asked to identify infrastructure (support structures/facilities) needed to fulfill their plans. This information proved valuable for the Campus Master Plan.

When asked what she wanted the Campus Master Plan to address, President Denise M. Trauth referenced the following University Goals and highlighted six key points:

Goal 1: Promote academic quality by building a distinguished faculty, developing a university culture of research, and managing enrollment. (excellence)

Goal 2: Expand access to public university education and contribute to the economic and cultural development of Texas, with special emphasis on development of the Round Rock Higher Education Center. (public)

Goal 3: Provide a premier, student-centered educational experience that fosters retention and success and is built on academic programs with clearly defined learning outcomes and a rigorous level of academic challenge. (student-centered)

Goal 4: Expand educational opportunities, emphasizing doctoral program development, applied scientific and technical programs, and other programs that address critical State needs. (doctoral-granting)

Goal 5: Enrich our learning and working environment by attracting and supporting a more diverse faculty, staff, and student body. (diverse)

Goal 6: Develop and manage human, financial, physical, and technological resources effectively, efficiently, and ethically to support the University’s mission.

These key points: excellence, public, student-centered, doctoral-granting, and diverse, were revisited time and time again during the master planning process. They were considered in conjunction with the Guiding Principles of the Campus Master Plan as reflected graphically in the following matrix.
Campus Environment and Facilities Survey

During the Fall 2003 semester at Texas State University-San Marcos, internet surveys were distributed to all Texas State employees (about 1,000 faculty and 2,000 staff) and 2,500 students, to collect opinions about the campus facilities and environment at Texas State as part of the campus master planning project. A summary of the major findings is provided below:

- Home buildings: A need for remodeling was a major concern of faculty and staff. General remodeling needs, molds, leaks, and ventilation issues were raised by 34% of faculty and 20% of staff in written comments to the survey.

- Physical environment - accessibility: 88% of faculty, 91% of staff, and 84% of students agreed that Texas State needed a common entrance, although 74% of students believed that signage was sufficient. Sizeable numbers of comments reflected the difficulty of navigating campus and building interiors.

- Physical environment-architecture: Just 8% of faculty, 10% of staff, and 20% of students "strongly agreed" that the campus architecture is attractive - the lowest level of strong agreement for items about the campus physical environment. A consistent architectural style was important to 73% of faculty, 72% of staff, and 67% of students. Architecture was the least favorite characteristic of Texas State among faculty and staff.

- Instructional space: 88% of faculty agreed that instructional technology in classrooms has improved over the past five years, but faculty want further improvements in instructional technology. Poor classroom furnishings and insufficient classroom space were other areas of common concern for faculty and students - the faculty wanted to see more rooms that seat 75 or fewer students.

- Safety issues - lighting/phones: One-third of faculty, staff, and students believed that night lighting on campus was insufficient. There was a general lack of awareness about the locations of emergency call phones by all respondents.

- Safety issues - pedestrians: Faculty and staff were more interested than students in seeing more bicycle paths, seemingly because of a concern for the safety of pedestrians rather than an interest in greater access. Comments by faculty, staff, and students indicated some concern about the safety of pedestrians around vehicular traffic.

- Small - campus feel: Those who believed that Texas State has a "small-campus feel" often cited the Quad layout, where many students take the majority of their classes, or the friendliness of people. Those who believed Texas State did not have a small-campus feel generally mentioned the sprawl of campus or its large student enrollment.

- Building design: Natural lighting, accessibility, aesthetics, and common meeting areas were major design elements that faculty and staff would like to see honored in new building designs. Other important design aspects focused on functional space, instructional technology, acoustics, restrooms, furniture, and ventilation.

- Favorite features: The natural landscape of Texas State was by far the most liked aspect of the University by faculty, staff, and students.

- Least favorite features: The mixed architecture was the least-liked aspect of the campus by faculty and staff. Hills were the feature students least liked due to the hardship of navigating campus. Students were also more likely to dislike the architecture than like it.

Information compiled by the Office of Institutional Research.
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

The following is a list of “critical success factors” for the Campus Master Planning process. Achieving these success factors will ensure that the Plan will serve the University well over the next ten years.

- The process will be strongly participatory and continuous and will allow for participation of faculty, staff, students, administration, Board of Regents, and the City of San Marcos throughout the planning process.
- Communication will flow through the Assistant Vice President for Finance and Support Services Planning (project leader) to the consultants.
- The University community will develop a set of “guiding principles” to guide facility decisions that will enable the University to adapt to changing needs.
- The process will be carefully managed to ensure accurate presentation of data as well as adequate time for input and feedback.
- Selection of the consultants will be a joint endeavor of the Facilities Committee, President’s Cabinet, Texas State University System staff, the Regental Planning Committee, and the Board of Regents.
- The process will be very public – the work of the consultants and all relevant planning information will be available throughout the development of the Campus Master Plan.
- The process will identify the facility needs, infrastructure needs, and circulation needs of the University.
- The process will identify building site “opportunities” (rather than placement of specific facilities) to enable us to respond effectively to unanticipated needs, interests, and opportunities.
- The process will include development of agreed upon design principles to increase the coherence of the campus image.

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- Old Main and the Alumni House will not be demolished or significantly modified on the exterior.
- Academic buildings need to be accessible within the 10/15 minute class change period. The class change period will remain the same.
- It is the University’s intention that the President will live in the current house throughout the planning period.
- The University will consider the purchase of property that becomes available. Efforts will be made to maintain the primary boundaries of University Drive, Ranch Road 12 and Sessom Drive.
- Environmental protection of the San Marcos River is important to the University. Sewell Park and the ponds around JC Kellam Administration, Theatre Center, and Freeman Aquatic will be retained.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

Key planning assumptions identifying probable future conditions, outlined in the University Strategic Plan, were adopted as follows:

- The Campus Master Plan and facilities shall accommodate a future student body of no greater than 38,000 students on the San Marcos campus unless there is a fundamental infrastructure change in San Marcos.
- The plan needs to accommodate growth in enrollment and the addition of academic programs as prioritized in the university, division and college strategic plans. Identified doctoral programs for the next three to five year period include Computer Science, Mathematics and Mathematics Education, Criminal Justice, and possibly Physical Therapy.
- Texas State will plan and manage the mix of students in a way that achieves the following:
  • Maintain a commitment to undergraduate education consistent with Texas State’s mission to serve the needs of Texans while controlling the undergraduate growth rate.
  • Increase graduate enrollment as a percentage of the total student body (18% of the SCH by 2015), as resources permit, consistent with Texas State’s desire to be a doctoral intensive university.
  • Support efforts to establish more specific enrollment targets for the University, including targets for the number and academic profile of entering freshmen and transfer students, as well as targets for specific academic programs where appropriate.
  • Increase access to in-state students by providing selected undergraduate and graduate programs via distance education opportunities.
  • Develop distance education programs in areas where Texas State is the most appropriate provider and where programs can be offered with the highest level of quality.
  • Continue serving the regional adult population, giving priority to those with degree aspiration.
  • Continue to pursue the Hispanic Serving Institution designation.
- Research will remain an integral part of the life of the University. The emergence of a stronger culture of research will be reflected in increasing faculty expectations for research facilities. Extramural funding for research is expected to grow with annual expenditures increasing from $20 million to $100 million.
- Increase the number of faculty available to serve our students. The goal is to be in the middle of the faculty/student ratios of Texas public universities.
- The practice of having one centrally located campus library shall continue.
- Campus planning will be a mix of renovation, replacement, and addition of space through new construction. The plan will address the University’s deferred maintenance backlog and infrastructure needs, in addition to any new projects that come forward.
- The university/academic plan and current room inventory (reflecting fall 2003 audited space) will act as a foundation on which to build a comprehensive space needs assessment for all departments/offices at Texas State. Data collected for projected space needs will determine renovations to existing facilities and new construction.
- The current number of residence hall beds (5,690) will be maintained along with the residential housing requirements for freshman and sophomore students. Therefore, upon the completion of San Jacinto Hall, the University will not build any new residence hall structures within this ten-year planning period unless a building site where a current residence hall sits is identified for another purpose (with the exception of Elliott Hall). If this occurs, the Master Plan should include replacement of the demolished residential structure. Additionally, the University will not replace any university-owned apartments identified for demolition.
- Campus land area for the San Marcos campus is not anticipated to be increased or decreased significantly.
- Distribution of parking spaces will match national averages of similar types of institutions (e.g., number of residence hall students, number of commuter students, number of faculty and staff).
Precinct Studies explored discrete areas of the campus at a finer scale of detail in order for the planning team to test technical feasibility and refine the plan information generated in the Conceptual Plan Phase. The team walked each precinct and discussed constraints and opportunities with users. Building setbacks and massing, envelope criteria, engineering systems, and landscape composition were addressed in the documents for this phase of work. The campus plan above illustrates how the Texas State campus was divided into three precincts: core, middle, and edge.

Observations

The Observations Phase involved the accumulation and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data necessary to generate a realistic portrait of the university. The planning team relied upon existing data, studies, visual assessment, interviews, and separate, ongoing planning and design efforts. Information pertaining to the following conditions was gathered, analyzed, and documented in the form of reports, diagrams, and presentations:

- Analysis of Programs
- Strategic Initiatives and Projected Growth of all University Units
- Analysis of Precedent
- Historic Development
- Peer Institutions
- Industry Standards and Models
- Analysis of Place
- Natural and Built Systems
- History
- Building Use and Character
- Landscape and Vegetation
- Centers and Edges
- Surface Hydrology
- Geology and Landform
- Water and Sewer
- HVAC, Electric and Telecommunications
- Codes and Regulations
- Contextual Influences
- Transportation Systems and Parking
- Access
- Circulation

This notion of reciprocity between an institution’s academic mission and its physical plan is at the foundation of this design philosophy. Supporting this is the core belief that for physical planning to be truly successful, it must grow from sound principles while balancing the visionary with the realistic. To achieve this, there must be a collaborative and interactive approach that deliberately involves all interested stakeholders from the university.

Campus Planning Philosophy

The planning team believes in the premise that the principles guiding the physical design and character of an institution are the same as those affecting its academic undertaking. What can be said of the physical elements can also be said of the academic components, that is, “the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.” This knowledge with outside specialists in parking and traffic, mechanical/electrical engineering, civil/stormwater/hydrology, cost estimating, educational programming, economics, and finance.

Precinct Studies were developed that illustrate how the details can be executed. At the conclusion, all the information was consolidated to form a unified Final Plan.

Conceptual Plan

To initiate the Conceptual Plan Phase, planning participants examined a set of guiding principles stating the philosophical positions of the institution. These principles, together with the information accumulated during the Observations phase, informed the content and composition of the Conceptual Plan. With a broad brush approach, like a “sketch before a painting”, the plan began to illustrate the structure, layout and relationships of planned open space, circulation systems, buildings, and focal points. This plan was then used to describe development ideas, obtain input, and build consensus from stakeholders. Proposed and existing buildings and grounds were illustrated and differentiated from one another.
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Design Guidelines
Concurrent with the Precinct Studies and the Final Plan documentation was the development of Design Guidelines for buildings and grounds in order to guide, through a codified system, architecturally unified precincts and campus wide planning proposals. The information generated here was integrated to inform decisions in the precinct plans. The final document serves as a flexible reference for the evaluation of existing and future implementation projects.

Design Guidelines describe height and massing of buildings, disposition, primary entries and service areas, street and open space proportions, and the detailing characteristics of each. Building gross square footage and appropriate use, if determinable, were included. Interrelationships of buildings, streets, and open spaces to each other and to the overall plan were also articulated.

Campus-wide architectural guidelines define architectural features, styles, and vocabulary of new facilities throughout the campus. Building fenestration, treatment of openings, organizational elements, and appropriate architectural materials were evaluated.

Guidelines for the grounds and open space fix and describe the landscape, architectural treatment of specific types of streets, public spaces, parks, and woodland environments. Guidelines for treatment of pavement, outdoor lighting (esthetic and functional), walls and enclosure systems, planting and site furnishings, signage, and other elements that identify special spaces were created. A detailed audit of existing deficiencies or remedial actions was outside of the scope of the campus plan.

Following each workshop, the planning team continued to develop design concepts and prepare documentation at each phase. This approach allowed the Master Plan to be more cohesive in concept and much more efficient in execution. The final planning documents are a series of coordinated individual chapters and reports that address specific areas of concern and allow for continued updates and expansion. The overall schedule for this planning process was approximately one year.

In traditional master planning, a large multi-disciplined consulting team begins work simultaneously, gathering data and reaching conclusions regarding their own specific areas of focus. Unfortunately, this approach can lead to one issue, such as parking or traffic, becoming the dominant form giver for the Master Plan. Another downside to this approach is the enormous amount of resources devoted to the inventory and mapping of “what is” as opposed to thinking about “what should be or could be.”

Working in an incremental process, the planning team for Texas State University-San Marcos started with a small core team of planners who, in conjunction with the Steering Committee (composed of seven senior university representatives), established the broad goals and objectives of the process and identified the initial opportunities and constraints of the plan. Utilizing this approach, the core team developed and refined the initial vision and statement of principles and goals for the Master Plan. Specialty consultants were then brought onto the team to assist in technical issues and to complete specific studies or analysis as the information was required.

Conclusion
In the end, the campus plan is like a good academic curriculum – one that combines tradition and innovation. Equally important, it is visionary and realistic, while being consensus driven to ensure incremental implementation and stakeholder support.