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SUMMARY

A. Academic Planning

1. Overview of Academic Planning Process
   - The academic planning process sub-committee structure was originally organized around strategies for the three proposed campuses: Wauwatosa for Engineering; Downtown for Health Sciences and Kenwood.
   - The Engineering and Basic Sciences Subcommittee includes representation from engineering, natural sciences and mathematics.
   - Six departments in engineering and 5 departments in the Colleges of Letters and Sciences are represented by the sub-committee as well research centers such as the Water Institute and the Laboratory for Surface Studies.
   - The sub-committees were initially charged with determining (1) how research and educational programs and support functions should be distributed across the proposed sites, and (2) what collaborations currently exist or are anticipated across units.
   - Larger demographic issues need to be addressed in the plan.
   - An inclusive academic planning process is needed.

2. Academic Issues
   - Many departments may have the same aspirations; advice is needed on academic planning issues during the planning process.
   - The academic, financial and physical planning issues need to be integrated in the planning process.
   - Declining public funds and the funding cycles of higher education require a new way of delivering education in a more cost effective and efficient manner.
   - The university has traditionally transformed incrementally by adding faculty lines that might lead to the formation of new departments. The current academic plan requires a different approach. The plans reflect a radical transition and new model.
   - It is estimated that at least $10 million in funding is available to hire new faculty in science and engineering if the campus DINs are fully funded over the next two biennia.
   - Online classes are more expensive to develop, with hybrid models being another strategy. They do fill rather quickly in some areas.
   - It was noted that a lot of thought will be required to develop the desired broad based scenarios.

3. Research Issues
   - External support and commitment exists for transforming UWM into the second research university for the state. Unlike in many states, there is no second research university in Wisconsin.
   - UWM is seen to be the key to transforming the economic future of the city.
   - The University’s research funding has grown from $24M to $33M over the last two years. This growth has occurred in several units: Letters and Sciences, Nursing, etc.
   - Research could focus on topics areas such as biomedical, energy, environment and water in an interdisciplinary manner; however, the traditional departmental organizational model is an issue.
It was noted that younger faculty are often the drivers of new ideas and innovation but may not be represented on sub-committees. The University needs to ensure that they have the opportunity to contribute to the process.

B. Physical Space Attributes

1. Multiple Campus model
   - Space distribution and split programs are a concern for a multiple campus model
   - The administration seems to be assuming that a multiple campus model is a "done deal"
   - There is an expressed concern to keep all options open in the planning process
   - An even-handed evaluation of possible alternatives is needed
   - New alternatives, in addition to those previously discussed by the University, should be developed.
   - It may be better to move research space off campus rather than undergraduate teaching space. It was noted that separated research campuses around the country either don't work well or require years to evolve.

2. Existing campus
   - The planning process should evaluate the capacity of the existing campus
   - An analysis and understanding of facility needs relative to the academic plan should be carried out
   - There is no preconceived notion of what can go on the Kenwood campus.

3. Programming and Space Needs
   - The desired and necessary program adjacencies need to be considered
   - Overall needs will be established before alternatives are developed and evaluated
   - A multi-disciplinary space and organizational model needs to be developed because such spaces and infrastructure are lacking.
   - Current issue: should space be rented off campus for accommodating non-academic space? Alternatively, should distributed locations be identified?
   - The campus is stymied by immediate space needs issues.
   - Most teaching is conducted in classrooms but there is a lack of flexible classroom space to accommodate different approaches to teaching.
   - Teaching labs are not flexible; interactive teaching requires more space.
   - More collaboration space is needed for the emerging academic plan.

C. Collaboration and Community

1. Collaboration Issues
   - The collaborative aspirations of the departments represented on the sub-committee need to be more fully explored and defined in the final stages of the academic planning process.
   - The programmatic aspirations overlap between departments, raising interesting challenges.
   - Research will need to be collaborative but how the university works will need to provide a culture of collaboration.
   - The cultural shift is happening – the basic sciences are collaborating with business, health science, SOIS, and nursing.

2. Funding
1. Declining state support for the University will result in a growing need for external financial partners.
2. Joint ventures such as Kenilworth are important for the future.

D. 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.
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