Master Planning Support Team
Minutes
11/17/08

I. Reports:

A. Communications & Marketing:

Chris Gluesing informed the Team that the Board of Visitors would be meeting on December 2 at 7:30 a.m. It will be a listening session in which the consultants will also be participating. There will be a preparatory meeting on November 21 at 3:00 p.m.

The University Neighborhood Association will be meeting in the evening on December 11 at the Urban Ecology Center. We will be providing details on Phase A and describing the launch of Phase B. The consultants will be invited to attend this meeting.

Bob Greenstreet raised the question of whether our contingency fees will cover all of these additional meetings. Chris Gluesing informed the Team that HGA has anticipated the expenses well enough to cover these meetings. However, it was agreed that we should monitor the scope and fees. Chris pointed out that there are a few things outlined in the Scope of Work that HGA has not done. He feels this could be a “credit” back to UWM, which would cushion the contingency fund.

The consultants will be on campus on December 10-11. There will be an Open Forum for the entire campus on the evening of December 10.

B. PEC:

Fehr & Peers made their presentation in September and submitted their report in Mid-October. The subcommittees felt it was responsive to concerns and passed it on to the PEC.

The Sustainability Plan is with PEC for discussion. It appears that there is some question as to what PEC should do with this plan. Kate Sullivan stated that the Sustainability Plan is the Guiding Principle for the subcommittees. The Provost asked who wrote the plan and whether it was fully vetted. Kate responded that the plan was a working document, basically describing what was out there. Laura Pedrick raised the issue of the role of academics in the process. Kate pointed out that PEC was primarily focused on grounds and transportation and that Academics has a role, but that role is outside of PEC.

To improve knowledge of the process, it was suggested that the PEC have one meeting dedicated to Master Planning updates. Rita pointed out that the APBC has a standing agenda point for MP updates. Ruth Williams stated that people
want to know where we are in the process, they want to see the documentation. Alan Horowitz felt that most members are plugged in to the process, but also thought that 10 minutes designated to Master Planning at each meeting would help keep everyone in the loop.

C. Subcommittees:

Chris Gluesing explained that the consultants laid out the different paradigms, but actual drafting won’t take place until December. The consultants laid out a matrix for reviewing various scenarios. They also gave us lists of qualitative and quantitative measures, as well as the opportunity to articulate, in general, what was missing. These three components (or tasks) created some confusion for the subcommittees, who felt that the Guiding Principles should be the primary focus for evaluating scenarios.

The Coordinating Committee discussed the tasks assigned to the subcommittees and decided that we needed to come to a consensus regarding the framework of the criteria (i.e. founded on the Guiding Principles). The three paradigms (or scenarios) can be set aside for the moment. The subcommittees unified behind using the Guiding Principles as criteria, even though there may be some changes made to the Guiding Principles through this process.

The Coordinating Committee created new worksheets for the subcommittees, who will use them to rank/weight the criteria, and to add anything they feel is missing. It was pointed out that the subcommittees must complete their reports by November 30.

Concerns were raised that each subcommittee might have radically different changes, ranks, and additions and that this exercise would not move us forward. However, both Alan Horowitz and Bob Greenstreet explained that differences would be minimal. Most of the work done by the subcommittees was more in the line of clarification rather than great changes.

Because of the time limitations, Bob Greenstreet questioned whether it was necessary for subcommittees to actually meet or if members could work individually. Alan pointed out that the Engineering & Natural Sciences Committee found their meetings to be very helpful as it was beneficial to talk through some of the issues and questions.

Alan Horowitz pointed out that the term “scenario” is misused. We need to deal with alternate futures for all scenarios to see if they’re feasible. The loose use of terms is confusing. We need to be clear and deliberate about how we’re moving through this. It’s not a linear process. The Core Team will need to address these issues.
Ruth Williams stated that the APBC spends much time discussing this. She further asked why we were discussing possibilities when people are reading in the papers about what’s already been done. Finally, she thought that the Planning Support Team needed to take more action.

It was decided that the subcommittees needed to get together to synthesize their responses to the worksheets on November 26. There will be an open invitation to the Planning Support Team.

II. Committee Changes

A. Prasenjit Guptasarma will fill in for Dilano Saldin on the Engineering & Natural Sciences Committee for one year.

B. Claude Schuttey has been appointed Co-Chair of the Coordinating Committee.

III. Introduction of Cheryl Andres, Academic Affairs, who will be supporting the Planning Support Team, Steering Committee, and Coordinating Committee.

IV. Several members had to leave and we did not have a quorum to approve the November 3, 2008 Minutes.

V. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 8 at 8 a.m. (later revised to 2 p.m.)

VI. There was follow-up discussion regarding what the Planning Support Team needs to do to be more active. It was pointed out that the greatest issue is shared understanding and a major role for the Planning Support Team will be in synthesizing the data we receive from the committees. This is a good forum for sharing information and the key is to be pro-active.

Chris Gluesing noted that the Planning Support Team has really evolved since its initial conception. We share information and set the tone for the process. It’s important to remember that there are now two tracks – Academic Planning and Campus Master Planning – and we need to keep the communication flowing between these two tracks. We should be able to get feedback from Ruth and/or Rita. This element should be added as a regular item on the agenda.