I. Initial impressions of February 25-26 Presentations:

Positive: many felt that this presentation was an improvement over previous presentations; people felt more engaged; it seemed that there were more people involved than just committee members; starting to see how it would happen; more comfortable.

Negative: went from three scenarios to one fairly quickly; moving too fast; too soon to eliminate some factors; too soon to discuss other factors; no full airing of alternatives; haven't seen impact of environmental variables.

II. Minutes of January 26, 2009 meeting were passed unanimously.

III. Discuss February 25-26 Master Plan Presentations/Phase B by consulting team

Lora Strigens of HGA discussed the tools necessary to remain nimble in our decision-making process. She illustrated the following tool sets associated with each phase of the plan:

Phase A
1. Building and Infrastructure Assessments
2. Space Needs and Utilization Assessments
3. Parking Study

Phase B
1. Academic Program Distribution
2. Site Studies
3. Decision Tree (the steps needed to make decisions)
   - Key Questions (research, relationships, balance)
4. Objectives Matrix (short-, medium-, and long-term goals)
   - Key Drivers (schools/colleges)

Phase C
1. Design Guidelines (for each site)
2. Detailed Site Studies

Phase D
1. Implementation Plan
2. Final Master Plan Document

There was much discussion regarding additional feedback and the most effective time to collect more data. The committee felt that at this time, more organized responses were needed. Specific feedback from units or departments would be more beneficial than individual responses. It was agreed that Lee Ann Garrison and Alan Horowitz, in
conjunction with a UC representative and an APBC representative, would work on a survey questionnaire. Nancy Matthiowetz and Cindy Walker were mentioned as potential survey experts that could be tapped to assist on this project. The goal is to have the survey ready for the Coordinating Committee to review via email in the next two weeks, with the intent of sending it out to the campus community immediately following the March 25-26 consultant visit.

It was agreed that the Coordinating Committee will send out a notice to the campus community asking them to hold March 25 and 26 for the next consultant visit, and informing them that a survey will be sent out immediately following the March presentations.

IV. Next meeting dates:
Consultants on campus – March 25 and 26
Coordinating Committee – To be determined

V. Other
Lora Strigens will meet with each of the subcommittees before the March 25-26 presentation. She would like to include representatives from each school/college.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.