Minutes: Joint Meeting of the Steering and Coordinating Committees: Feedback to the Draft Report-Phase A
September 30, 2008

Introductory remarks were made by Rita Cheng, Chair of the Steering Committee. Christy Brown, Vice Chair of the Steering Committee was introduced. All attendees introduced themselves.

Bob Greenstreet, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, provided an overview of the master plan process to date, noting that it is the first in 35 years and gives UWM an opportunity to “dream big”. Bob reviewed the MP project schedule through December 2009 and stated that the Subcommittees and the Coordinating Committee had met on September 26 and 29 respectively to engage in a similar review process. He also noted that the Planning Support Team has met every two weeks and throughout the summer to facilitate important tasks contributing to the preparation of the Phase A Draft Report. Bob stated the three questions to guide the morning’s discussion: a) Are the data correct/incorrect? b) What requires clarification? and c) What is missing? Essentially, the committees were being asked to give feedback about the 8 sections for Draft Report-Phase A. (The PowerPoint highlighting aspects of the report was presented to the MP committees on September 16). All committee members had access to the report files via Pantherfiles prior to the meeting.

Chairs and Center Directors will have a chance to re-review their input to the Academic Plan report to update their input. Deans will also re-review the space data with UWM space professionals.

Bob gave general feedback that came from the committees that had met in the previous two sessions.

- It was recommended to not report on sites not currently owned by UWM. Lora Strigens, consultant from HGA, clarified that this discussion occurred per the stipulation in the RFP for this contract. Another recommendation from MP committees was to separate out descriptive from analytical material. Lora indicated that all comments about data analysis will be removed from the Phase A report. Bob also reported that methods for space analysis need to be reported for Phase B.

- Definitions for space need to be clear in Phases A and B. For example—classroom utilization. If scheduling data is the source of the room utilization, other uses of the room beyond the schedule are missed. It is not always possible to become granular on all room use, Bob noted; this task is both an “art and a science”. We are working at a high level, the UWM institutional level. We are looking at supply-demand ratio.

- It was recommended that technology availability in classrooms and the use of these classrooms also be reviewed.
Section 1

- **1-1:** Clarify that it is all types of support that have to be considered to bolster research, i.e., animal care. Refer to national standards. Look at the 4th bullet in this section.
- For Bullet 2: “Improve systems in place”; correct language about multiples campuses.
- Bullet #4&6-edit
- Remove or edit Bullet 3

1-3: Clarification: Campus has already forwarded the existing classroom technology information to the consultants. 1-3 should say "The previous Campus Master Plan has never been updated. The Campus Physical Development Plan dated June 2006 was UWM's required submission related to the 2007-2009 State of Wisconsin Capital Budget. A Campus Physical Development plan is submitted every two years as part of the State's biennial capital planning/budgeting process. Although related, it should not be confused with a Master Plan update. Going forward, the new Master Plan will provide a framework for future capital planning processes and capital funding."

- Has sustainability been addressed—related to multiple campuses?
- Correct sentence on “urbanism”.
- Modify introductory comments to indicate that these are “comments heard repeatedly”, not a summary of comments.
- P. 12 analysis: Too little on research space but a lot on teaching space; too simplistic, linear approach used.

Section II

- Make reference to the stormwater plan above and beyond the one mentioned in the report. This is a DSF stormwater management plan.
- Clarify GL Research Facility and the Great Lakes Water Institute.

Section III-Building Assessment

- Use FICM requirements
- Blank space for energy and MEP ratings;
- Comments about quality of building and adjacency considerations need to be discussed.
- Explain methodology about ratings reported; there was 90% agreement in the Facilities data reported and the consultants’ findings.
Section IV Transportation

- Transportation counts are being re-collected currently to supplement counts taken on April 30, 2008.
- U-Pass: the lack of transportation from counties is not mentioned.
- Maps need to show UWM-owned buildings;
- Get U-bike data from Scott Gore.
- Correct typos on top of 4-4.

Section 5

- “Downer Woods” not Downers Woods
- 5.8 map: Clarify location of Student Union
  - Use
  - Gathering spaces instead of labels
- 5.11 site capacity-show with and without Downer Woods
- 5.17-need consistent organizing street names on every map—maybe 3?

Section 6

- Consultants will add section on other systems, i.e., electrical, IT
- Add a table with systems by site location and by capacity
- Remove comments to County Grounds and other non-UWM property.
- Table 10-make corrections
- Peer analysis—use Urban 21;

Section 7

- Do not correlate research space and student ratios; use NSF standards;
- Documentation from Grad School to be noted and shared prior to Oct 16 presentation.
- Table 12: Be clear about industry standards and report underlying definitions of space.
- Clarify proximities, functionality, etc.
- UW has definitions about size of offices and can go into future analysis about how to go forward based on this evaluation.
- Library space: clarification about shelving and space and learning comments need to be accurately reported. The Library addition is one way of address space needs. A written commentary with clarifications was introduced to the consultants.
- Messages about research space and our growth plans—how to best slice the data for our use. Need to work more closely with Philip for these statements.
- Need to have a table similar to Table 12.
- As we move toward interdisciplinary practices, we need to bundle offices, labs, classrooms, etc.
• 7-14: Clarify this to be teaching academic staff, inclusive of adjuncts.
• There needs to be information about Norris Health Center; it is missing.
• 7-9: Clarify sentence e for 7.3.1
• Space implications for on-line courses need to be included (see Phase B too).
• 7.6.1: Reference to Texas Model—discrepancy with Table 10; justification is needed.

Section 8

• Summary of meetings with external partners will be added by consultants.
• Graduation rates and retention rates are out of place here. Refer to Urban 21.
• 8-9: Faculty-student ratios are misleading.
• Some discrepancies between the (Figure #) in the text and the figure numbers themselves. It seems to start at the bottom of page 10 where it says "Figure 24," and continues on the top of page 11. There are actually two figures which are labeled as "Figure 24."

Following review of the draft report, a discussion ensued about the proposed Guiding Principles for the Master Plan.