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SUMMARY

A. Introduction

- University is seen as an engine for economic growth; knowledge based economy; emphasis on post industrial economy of Milwaukee.
- Concern about increasing costs – must deliver education more efficiently.

B. Comments

- Concerns noted about providing services on multiple sites. What is "best practice"?
- How will library services be provided across multiple locations; library is currently understaffed and budgeted.
- Partnership opportunities like Kenilworth seem to work well for the University.
- Conflicting emotions noted; students want a more traditional college experience; desire to move beyond being a commuter university.
- Satellites work well provided they have "identity". First priority – how to make more engagements for students (physical environment, the experience and the quality).
- Campus town is lacking.
- Growth of the University downtown is desirable; better flow to the existing campus; better for transportation. Enough space is available downtown.
- Students noted that freshmen and sophomore classes should be remain on the existing Kenwood campus; shift junior and senior downtown if a multiple campus is the future.
- Partnerships such as Kenilworth make sense and should be encouraged.
- Transportation will be an issue; bus system has more problems now. Light rail would be desirable if the Tosa site is selected for expansion.
- Campus needs to be more inspiring and linked with the neighborhoods.
- UWM has no sense of school spirit or pride (no football team).
- Students leave campus on Thursday night.
- A vision is needed- a model not based on football – a model to attract a different kind of student.
- It is difficult for students and the community to know what is going on; there is no event calendar.
- Student housing south of the campus is the location of many parties and neighborhood issues.
- A split campus town exists: Downer; Oakland; and North Avenue.
- Hartford school may not be needed by the school district if busing is decreased as currently being discussed.

C. Campus History Summary

- History of the campus was summarized. University was created in 1956 with the merger of Milwaukee State Teachers College and Ascension. The alternative site was to have been the county fair grounds.
- Campus originally intended to extend from the Lake to the River; Locust to Edgewood. Resulted in opposition leading to the boxed in "L" campus of today.
- In 1970s the footprint was developed; University emerged as a commuter campus; dorms were not full until the 1990s.
• The neighborhood gentrified; the area became more desirable as a result of university presence.
• Donner Woods – state statute protects the woods.

**Next Steps**

1. Document meeting minutes
2. Return for field work, data collection, and additional meetings May 20-22.
3. Perform data and site analysis throughout the summer.
4. Present initial analysis findings in the fall.

*The information above will stand as recorded unless Sasaki receives written comments within five days of the distribution date from a recipient requesting an amendment.*
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