These minutes represent a summary of the content and character of each meeting and are not meant to be an exhaustive list of the comments made. Also, these notes are an initial attempt to understand the student life, academic support, and external issues that affect UWM; we will return to gather additional information as necessary.
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SUMMARY

A. Neighborhood Quality
- UWM is unique from examples presented (Penn and South Carolina) because UWM is surrounded by high-quality neighborhoods.
- Livable neighborhoods and communities are important; as the University grows, the commitment to the neighborhood must be maintained.
- Neighborhoods have strong identity; real fear that neighborhoods are losing their identity.
- History of neighborhood participation – University has ignored the input from neighbors when it built residence halls. Neighbors will be disappointed and won't put up with it if feedback from the master plan is not incorporated.
- Need more investment into the neighborhood edges – lighting, trash cans, etc.

B. Faculty and Staff in Neighborhoods:
- Need to attract faculty and staff to live in the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Neighborhood would like to distribute letters to University faculty and staff to encourage Walk to Work programs (which includes the 53211 and 53212 zip codes). Want available real estate in neighborhoods to be publicized to faculty and staff to encourage them to locate close to campus.
- Several faculty members have moved away from campus due to the influx of students into the neighborhoods.
- Young faculty with families are concerned about the schools and safety issues in the neighborhoods.
- East side is the highest tax base in the city, so it may be difficult for faculty and staff to move into this area.
- Faculty don't necessarily want to be living in a neighborhood overrun by students.

C. Students:
- Need to help students learn how to live off campus.
- Columbia Hospital – concentration of students so close to campus can be problematic for the neighborhood. Perhaps a distributed model of residence halls helps distribute the impact.
- Role of Citizenship. There is a real opportunity to include this as a lesson of general education, like a freshman seminar.
- Vast majority are good students, but there are a few that cause real problems.
- Wisconsin as the worst state for drinking. Binge drinking is a real problem. There needs to be stronger programs in place to educate students about drinking.
- Crime is becoming an increasing problem.
- UWM is known as “party central” so young people, even those who aren't students, come to UWM to party.
- Consultants need to understand the history of the development of UWM.
- Distributed campus – UWM is considering moving the graduate students, when it is the undergraduates that are causing the neighborhood problems.
D. University

- There is a neighborhood perception that the Foundation’s real estate arm is interested in buying properties that surround campus.
- Neighbors have encouraged the University to cap enrollment but it has increased another 1,000 this past year.
- Have not heard University take responsibility for the problem.
- Spreading out student population does not solve the problem, it just transfers the problem.
- University may not understand that the neighborhood must be stable, safe, and vibrant.

E. Other

- Why don't Wisconsin Lutheran and Marquette have the same problems as UWM?
  - Education programs are in place.
  - Rules and regulations in place for making sure students stay on campus.
  - Different neighborhood contexts.

Next Steps

1. Document meeting minutes.
2. Perform data and site analysis throughout the summer.
3. Present initial analysis findings in the Fall.
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