Master Plan Phase One: Lessons Learned

The Master Plan Steering Committee was assembled as part of the 25-Year Campus Master Planning process that was initiated in 2006. The committee members included staff, faculty and students from across the institution, representing a wide range of stakeholders and university interests. The Steering Committee met regularly with the consultant team as the plan was developed, and continued to support the university’s master planning process by providing feedback on projects in planning and design. As phase one projects were underway, the committee met less frequently. This summary provides feedback from the Master Plan Steering Committee members and other staff involved in planning efforts about the process and their role in the development and implementation of the Master Plan.

Looking Back: Phase One Feedback

Process
- The process was good, through both communication and engagement.
- The consultants brought valuable expertise and leadership in the process.
- The fact that our student enrollment has grown quicker than our infrastructure and facilities is a source of frustration for some. The campus community needs to be educated on the incremental nature of the plan.
- The comprehensive environmental permitting process and Special Review Procedure have proven immensely valuable to the implementation of master plan projects.
- The process was inclusive and comprehensive, and participants felt validated through the planning. However some found it frustrating that not all needs initially identified was implemented in Phase One such as Athletics and Recreation.

Steering Committee
- The Steering Committee served as a forum for conversation, not a decision making body. The recommendations and decisions still lie with the Vice Chancellors and the Chancellor.
- The committee was successful in being democratic and not hierarchal; all members were given equal opportunity to participate and be heard.
- The committee did more advising and less “steering.”
- Involving students on the committee and in broader master planning was and will continue to be important and appreciated.
- As planning shifted to implementation, the committee received valuable information but was not engaged as frequently as the early planning.
- Some felt that information and member participation on ongoing projects were limited during design and construction.
Looking Forward: Phase Two Recommendations

**Process**
- There should be a university-wide open kickoff to the phase 2 planning process, with documentation of what was done in phase one. This type of event may yield new committee members to participate in the process.
- The Phase Two process needs to acknowledge what’s changed: the built environment, the university’s goals and priorities, and some programs have gone away while others have appeared or grown.
- Students should continue to be involved in the process.
- Constituents should be involved throughout the entire process, from the master planning level to design and implementation of individual projects.

**Integrated Planning**
- Looking at the next five years and beyond, coordinating with the Strategic Plan Implementation Group is essential.
- Understanding the debt capacity and available spending will be necessary in order to determine the scope and pace of campus development.
- The planning needs to be realistic – we should not set out to achieve more than our campus can handle or financing can allow.

**Communications**
- We need to do more to market the growth, progress, and successes of the master plan.
- The committee members and university community should be made aware of how projects are funded and what the funding sources are.
- Committee members felt that tabling is one of the more effective ways to reach the broader community, which should be done campus-wide (rather than strictly in the Campus Center).

**Phase 2 Objectives**
- Phase 2 should look at projects that expand the student experience outside the classroom.
- The university should balance some smaller immediate improvements with the larger long-term projects that make up the plan.
- The university is somewhat exposed with the Bayside property after the failed Olympics bid. There is concern that this real estate will get sold, therefore the university should create a clear message and begin development as soon as possible.