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MEETING
Purpose: Initial Project Meeting with Campus Planning Support Team
Date: March 24, 2008 Time: 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.
Location: UWM Chapman Hall, Regents Room 211

PRESENT:
Planning Support Team
Jon Jensen, DSF Project Manager
Kate Sullivan, UW System Administration–Director of Facilities Planning
Patricia Arredondo, UWM – Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Dave Danielson, UWM – Director, Physical Plant
Chris Gluesing, UWM – Assistant Director, University Architects & Planning
Cindy Kluge, UWM – Assistant Director, Business Services
Claude Schuttey, UWM – Director, University Architects/Planning & Transportation
Dennis Stecker, UWM – Manager for Space Analysis, University Architects/Planning & Trans
Amy Watson, UWM – Communications Project Manager, University Relations
Ruth Williams, UWM – Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Gwat-Yong Lie, UWM – Associate Dean, Academic Programs & Student Services, Graduate School

Guests
Jeff Kosloske, UW System Administration – Senior Architect
Christy Brown, UWM – Interim Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administrative Affairs
Rita Cheng, UWM – Provost
Lee Ann Garrison, UWM – Associate Professor, Art Department
Marylou Gelfer, UWM – Associate Professor, Communication Sciences & Disorders
Alan Horowitz, UWM – Associate Academic Program Director, Center for Urban Transportation Studies
Tom Luljak, UWM – Vice Chancellor, University Relations

Consultant Team
Greg Havens, Sasaki
Julie Penman, HGA
Lora Strigens, HGA
Jim Vander Heiden, HGA
d’Andre Willis, HGA

COPIES:
Jon Jensen, DSF
Jeff Kosloske, UW System Administration
Kate Sullivan, UW System Administration
Patricia Arredondo, UWM
Chris Gluesing, UWM
Greg Havens, Sasaki
Julie Penman, HGA
Lora Strigens, HGA
Jim Vander Heiden, HGA
d’Andre Willis, HGA
I. Individuals attending introduced themselves.

II. Project Teams – Roles and Responsibilities

A. Rita Cheng (Provost) introduced the Academic and Physical Master Planning Committee Structure and process for committees to date and the goals for each group.

B. Planning Support Team is defined as a process group, not a decision-making group. Its makeup is built diversely to represent both Academic Affairs and Finance & Administrative Affairs. Members have diverse professional backgrounds as well. Co-Chairs are Chris Gluesing (Assistant Director, Planning & Construction) and Patricia Arredondo (Associate Vice Chancellor) to represent both Academic Affairs and Administrative Affairs.

C. The Executive Leadership Team will meet at beginning, middle and end points of Project. The Steering Committee will meet at key decision points in the process. They will provide reports to the Executive Committee, which is about half of the Executive Leadership Team.

D. Agendas and Meeting Minutes of the committees and subcommittees have been and will continue to be posted on the UWM Master Plan website.

E. HGA and Sasaki gave a brief overview of their firm profiles and thoughts on approach to the UWM Mater Plan.

F. The Provost will report on the Master Planning process to the Faculty Senate monthly. Process needs to account for time in the schedule for appropriate consultation and review by this group and others. Consultant team will work to integrate the Committee structure with the Project Work Plan.

G. Students are represented on standing committees and will also be integrated at public meetings and Student Association involvement at listening sessions. Need to work to get both resident and non-resident student interaction.

III. General Contract and Administrative Procedures

A. Communication

1. Jon Jensen (DSF Project Manager) outlined six levels of communication on the Project: Website, General Project Meetings, Planning Support Team Meetings, Special Arranged Meetings, Emails, Telephone calls.

2. Amy Watson (Communications Project Manager, University Relations) will manage posting items to the Master Plan Website. Changes will likely be vetted through Patricia and Chris.

3. General Project Meetings will be open to the public.

4. Chris, Kate Sullivan (Director, Facilities Planning, UW Systems Administration), Patricia, Jon and Lora will be copied on all emails. Chris and Patricia will distribute on campus. Lora will distribute on the Consultant Team side. Each of the committees and subcommittees has their own email reflector address.

5. All meetings will have agendas and minutes.
6. Jon stressed that telephone calls are intended for informational discussions but that decisions be made at published meetings.

7. Kate Sullivan asked that emails have clearly descriptive subject lines to aid organization.

8. Some interim meetings may take advantage of teleconference with web meeting links. This may allow Kate, Jon and Jeff Kosloske (Senior Architect, UW Systems Administration) to meet from Madison.

9. The Planning Support Team currently meets every other week on Mondays at 8:00 a.m. Next meeting is April 7, 2008. The consultants will attend certain sessions of these meetings either in person or via teleconference as indicated by the Work Plan. Agendas for these meetings will likely track closely with preparation for approaching Work Plan milestones.

10. Media relations will be handled by Tom Luljak (Vice Chancellor, University Relations). Inquiries to other team members should be referred to Tom.

11. Consultant Team will prepare meeting minutes for meetings that they lead or plan a substantial role. Committees will generate their own minutes for internal meetings that may be scheduled to complete the Academic Plan or other internal work.

12. DSF holds the contract with the consultants, managed by Jon. Jon will administer the contract. All additional service requests require prior written approval by DSF.

IV. Major Issues/Topics

A. Kate outlined features of a Campus Master Plan – 20 year horizon plan. UWM’s Master Plan will integrate academic, financial and physical planning. This differs from the Six-Year Campus Development Plan that is updated for each biennium. This serves as a tool for the UW System to prioritize ongoing work among the campuses. Master Plan will inform the campus’s capital budgeting ongoing process. The current Six-Year Plan includes plans for the purchase of Columbia-St. Mary’s and regional campus expansion. The UW System is conscious of ongoing updates to Campus Master Plans that happen on a 10-15 year cycle, along with more frequently updated Academic Plans. “Rigorous and defensible” planning builds data and justifications for future building proposals.

B. UWM is organized on two pillars – growth in funded research and commitment to access for Wisconsin residents. Growth has led to the current condition of insufficient space to meet this mission. Funding for UWM is less than a full research institution, leading to search for partners. Transit and parking difficulties are a symptom of this growth. All types of space on campus are challenged.

C. Academic Plan will be a compilation of the plans generated by faculty and individual divisions. Themes will run through these plans as a unifier. Analysis shows need for growth in engineering and the sciences. Plans are on track to be released by the subcommittees on April 11, 2008. Original data, digests and iterative reports will be available to the consultant teams. Departmental growth projections will roll up into Schools or subsets of larger Schools levels to achieve greater accuracy. The Consultant Team noted that drafts of the Academic Plan are critical to preparation for the listening sessions on April 28-30.

V. Consultant Work

A. Greg and Lora, of the consultant team, briefed the team on the schedule and Work Plan.
1. Phase A:
   a. The first set of listening/work sessions is scheduled for April 28-30, 2008. The overall structure and specific meetings were discussed. UWM requested a template for how these workshop days might be structured and will work to establish a list of meetings/groups.
   b. Noted that it is not yet clear when student input will be sought in the Observation Phase. This may happen in the fall, as late-April is difficult timing regarding exams.
   c. Discussed need to establish core values of institution in the beginning of the process. These would be reported back; this should be spelled out more clearly in the Work Plan.
   d. Size of listening sessions was discussed, as well as the balance of finding a group size small enough for good discussion but large enough for a cross section of opinions. Time available in April listening sessions may also dictate size of groups. Work on scheduling these should begin right away. Questions should also be distributed in advance.
   e. It was requested that the Consultant Team issue a draft of questions for the listening sessions prior to the end of April.
   f. The need was discussed for some more general sessions for people who may not fit neatly into other sessions; i.e., an open forum with participation by the Planning Support Team. Campus will review need for other generalist faculty sessions that don’t fit in the committee structure.
   g. A participant expressed the viewpoint that the Academic subcommittees are not inclusive of all faculty and that the faculty will need special focus in order to feel that the process is participatory.
   h. It was determined that some of the external meetings may take place in May rather than during the April sessions. Tom L. noted that there are some opportunities to meet with some leaders of external groups at the end of April.

2. Phase B:
   a. Discussed desire for clarification of where principals would be developed and buy-in for them completed. Needs to be clear that this is ahead of developing solutions.
   b. Discussed phasing and relative weightings of assessment categories on B-2 of the Work Plan. These categories will be reviewed and developed with the Campus to better align with the core academic priorities.
   c. Noted that Work Plan does not reflect yet the early deliverables requested for Parking Business Plan.
   d. Make sure any public/governmental involvement includes Milwaukee County.

3. Phase C:
   a. This phase will focus on the iterative nature of ideas. Broad and specific details will run in parallel.
   b. No comments at this juncture.
4. Phase D:
   a. Noted that the Work Plan needs to spell out the intention that the public communication element will need to occur throughout the process. Tom noted as part of this that the public communication will be ongoing and the process will be undergoing scrutiny from the media and the community.
   b. The Team requested more detail on how scenarios will be developed and evaluated.
   c. Discussed appropriate and most useful Work Plan format for public distribution. Some type of a hybrid form incorporating the visual work plan and more detail on the tasks and schedule.
   d. The Work Plan needs to address real-time things that need immediate attention; e.g., hiring of new faculty, repair and maintenance of existing facilities.

B. April 4 Events:
1. 7:30 a.m. Breakfast of the Executive Leadership Team – “meet and greet” introduction of the Consultant Team.
2. 9:00-10:30 Open Announcement Meeting in the Wisconsin Room. Potentially will open with remarks from Chancellor or other campus leader. Consultant Team will likely make a brief presentation, followed by a reception.
   a. Suggested using this meeting as a forum for HGA and Sasaki to talk about planning process and give a sense of credentials and previous work. What Master Planning is about, what HGA/Sasaki bring to the team. Team recommended bringing pieces of the interview presentation in Madison.
3. 10:30-Noon Joint Meeting of Coordinating Committee and Steering Committee.
   a. Review charge to Steering Committee
   b. Coordinating Committee will brief group on Academic plan process.
   c. (One hour) Working Session on Leadership and Values/Principles. Consider working session with breakouts.

VI. Closing
   A. Reviewed the need to establish and record the decision-making groups and process for the duration of the planning effort. Large decisions may require meeting of Faculty Senate and staff. Decisions also need to proceed up the organization to UW System and Board of Regents. Team will continue to review this.
   
B. Action Items
1. Any comments on the draft work plan should be forwarded to Chris and Patricia by Thursday.

The foregoing represents HGA’s understanding of the discussions and decisions made during this meeting. If anyone has any changes or comments, please notify the author within seven days of the date of this document.