MINUTES

Present: Patricia Arredondo, Michael Fendrich, Marylou Gelfer, Chris Gluesing, Mark Harris, Mark Krueger, Randall Lambrecht, David Petering,

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 by M. Gelfer.

1. The minutes of 10/25/07 and the agenda for 11/8/07 were approved by consensus.

2. The need for a consistent meeting location was noted.

3. The document entitled “UWM Master Planning: Academic Planning Process (DRAFT)” was handed out and read. Reactions to the document included the following:
   a. The difference between academic planning and master planning should be more clearly delineated.
   b. The survey needs to elicit more information about interdisciplinary issues and the utilization of space. It was also proposed that academic planning include research considerations as well, since research enhancement is key to the Chancellor’s vision for UWM.
   c. It was suggested that given the subcommittees’ charge as outlined in the document, the survey questions on undergraduate/graduate programs from the questionnaire did not appear completely relevant.
   d. The appropriateness of the survey and the information it would elicit was questioned. It was suggested that the survey was poorly designed, and might yield data that would be uninterpretable, especially in light of the subcommittee’s charge to “identify affinities and key linkages among programs and faculty research areas…”
   e. It was noted that the document said that the subcommittees “will introduce possibilities, not find solutions.” The question was raised as to who would provide solutions, and if that was not in fact a legitimate function of the subcommittee. There was further discussion about the decision-making aspect of the planning process. It was not clear to the members of the subcommittee who would make decisions about the possibilities identified.

4. The following alternative questions were proposed for the survey:
a. Where do you want to be in terms of your research programs in the next 5-10 years?
   b. What kind of collaborations and resources would help you reach your research goals?
   c. What kind of programs will characterize your unit in the next 5-10 years? What program growth do you foresee?
   d. What kind of space and resources do you need to reach your goals?

5. It was suggested that the subcommittees need to engage an expert in survey research as a consultant so that questions can be formulated in a way that will make the results interpretable and usable.

6. The need to go beyond information-gathering was discussed. Subcommittee members proposed that the group should not only solicit and analyze the data yielded by the surveys, but should make recommendations regarding the strongest areas of likely growth. It was further suggested that we draw on the knowledge of individuals who are experts in the areas we want to gather information on, for example, teams of scientists and instructional specialists who could help the committee evaluate the potential of the future directions identified by academic units.

7. An alternative process for master planning was suggested by the committee. This process includes the following:
   a. Begin with a call for academic & research planning issued by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Research. This initial call for academic/research planning will inform the overall master plan and support the mission and goals of the university and Chancellor's vision. This would replace the current document (“UWM Master Planning: Academic Planning Process (DRAFT)” that was reviewed at the meeting.
   b. Present the call for planning and survey to the Faculty Academic Planning and Budget Committee (FAPBC) and to the Academic Deans' Council for feedback (possibly other committees as well, such as the Research Policy Committee).
   c. After approval by the FAPBC and Academic Deans' Council, present the call for planning and survey instrument(s) to the Faculty Senate for approval. Ideally, this would occur in December.
   d. After approval by the Faculty Senate, the survey would be sent out to all academic units.
   e. The results of the survey would go to the Master Planning subcommittees.
   f. Subcommittees would assemble various experts to help them “make sense” of the data and make decisions about priorities. These would lead to recommendations regarding “affinities and key linkages among programs and faculty research areas, including possible scenarios for how these areas might develop in the future to strengthen UWM’s academic programs,” as stated in the current document as the subcommittees’ charge.
8. It was noted that the proposals for cluster hires that are part of the current DIN should be included in academic and master planning considerations, since they are sure to affect both academic programs and space needs.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM. Future meeting dates were identified as November 29 and December 13.

Respectfully submitted,

Marylou Pausewang Gelfer