Minutes: Campus Master Plan Coordinating Committee
November 10, 2008

Bob Greenstreet, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and moved to approve the September 30, 2008 minutes. Vince Addesso seconded, and the motion was carried.

Status Report: Bob Greenstreet summarized what happened in Phase A and what is expected in Phase B. Though we have moved away from strictly abstract ideas into “meatier” subjects, the various physical options are still theoretical. Our job will be to review and fine tune the process.

Subcommittee Updates: Chris Gluesing explained that there proved to be some confusion with the criteria, including the qualitative measures and quantitative measures, which were provided by the consultants. The subcommittees generally felt challenged to judge the scenarios because they just didn’t have adequate information. Chris pointed out that this was just a starting point. That only UWM can ultimately determine what scenarios and accompanying decision-making criteria meet our needs and objectives. The consultants are here to provide facilitation, tools, and frameworks to assist us in this process.

Issues Raised by Subcommittees:

1. Liberal Arts & Professions, Lee Ann Garrison:
   a. Don’t know enough to judge
   b. Shouldn’t the Guiding Principles be the criteria?
   c. Is this a “vote”? Where are the experts? The subcommittee doesn’t feel like they have “expert” knowledge or experience.

   Bob Greenstreet’s response: Your expertise is your background and experience as members of the campus community.

2. Engineering & Natural Sciences, Alan Horowitz:
   a. Perplexed by positive, negative, neutral indicators
   b. Concerned that East Side scenario would receive greatest ranking because it is the scenario that people know and are most comfortable with; people are often skeptical of change.
   c. Not enough information
   d. Criteria grid does not adequately reflect the Guiding Principles; too simplified.
   e. Weights or priorities should be given to different items. They recommend a ranking scale such as 1 – 10, or Very Important/Not So Important.

3. Health Disciplines, Mark Harris:
   a. Criteria concerns; guiding principles not there.
   b. Rating seemed irrelevant without more information; felt premature.
Bob Greenstreet asked what the consultants are looking for and Chris Gluesing explained that they really want UWM to articulate and reach consensus on the criteria.

**Moving Forward:** After much discussion of Guiding Principles, criteria, and scenarios, it was decided that the subcommittees focus on the criteria without regard to the scenarios, rate the criteria, and add components they feel are missing.

The consultants created the criteria based on our Guiding Principles. It was suggested that we ask them to redo the list, making it more representative of our Guiding Principles. After more discussion, it was decided to use the Guiding Principles themselves as the criteria. Chris will create a spreadsheet, based on the Guiding Principles, with boxes for weighting the criteria and room for additions, and get these to the subcommittees as soon as possible.

The subcommittees were charged with reviewing and ranking these new criteria by November 30. The Coordinating Committee and subcommittees will reconvene to discuss this matter on Monday, December 1.

**Meeting Adjourned:** 4:30 p.m.