

**Minutes of the UWM Master Planning
Subcommittees/Coordinating Committee
Input on Phase A
9-26-08 and 9-29-08**

Summary

Phase A should focus exclusively on data that describe current conditions at UWM: its buildings, physical plant, demographics, utility infrastructure, etc. Any material in the draft that contains data analysis, recommendations, or data on sites that UWM does not own should be removed from the Phase A report and addressed in Phase B or later reports.

With respect to UWM data, the following material should be added to the Phase A report:

- Definitions of all data terms such as ‘laboratory,’ ‘seminar room,’ and small classroom to provide a clearer sense of how the space statistics were developed.
- Throughout, incorporate data on space needs, collaborative activity, and partnerships from the Academic Planning Web Questionnaire
- Include IT infrastructure throughout the report as it integrates with all aspects of master planning.

In proceeding to analyze UWM data in approaching Phase B, it will be critical that the report:

- Justify the methodologies used to analyze space utilization (for example, why is the Texas model appropriate?)
- Use multiple models that are endorsed by the campus to capture disciplinary variations in space utilization (i.e., not focusing solely on a funded research space utilization model, which does not address space usage in the arts or humanities)
- Include UW System standards for space utilization in the analysis

It was observed that the PowerPoint presentation contained information beyond that presented in the draft report. While some concerns were expressed about the reliability/validity of report data, particularly the summary notes from listening sessions, the committees endorsed most of the report, with the following edits and additions:

Section1

- In 1.1.1 broaden “The first source of information is the opinions and perception...” to include data sources from the University such as space utilization information, results of the Academic Planning Questionnaire, etc.
- Include need for more seminar rooms, especially with media

Section 2

- Correctly identify the School of Continuing Education on p.4.

Section 3

- Need a better justification/rationale for evaluating certain sites (for Phase B report); ie – the Wauwatosa site should not be included in Phase A as a site already owned and utilized by UWM
- Need to apply objective criteria to all sites (for Phase B report)
- Need to identify issues of contention regarding disparate standards in publicly versus privately funded buildings
- Quality of space needs to be better addressed—statements of aggregate square footage do not capture the lack of *usable* space on campus—a lack that cannot be addressed by offering Friday classes or by utilizing the 30,000 square feet of ‘research space’ in Kenilworth

Section 4

- Need to redo parking assessment to capture more and more typical usage patterns
- Correct “Oakwood” to “Oakland” on p. 1.
- U-Bike data on p.2 needs to be updated.

Section 5

- Overall presentation well done. Editorial corrections needed include correctly identifying Holton Hall (p. 1), Hefter, the date of the Pavilion (Figure 5.2), and names of campus buildings on the graphic displays.

Section 6

- Columbia Hospital, the Eschweiler Buildings and downtown sites mentioned in relation to a School of Public Health were not evaluated (for Phase B report)
- Need to incorporate computer and electronic infrastructure in a way that cuts across all report categories—holistic treatment of IT as a core element of infrastructure
- At what point in the process will the need for physical proximity among collaborators be addressed? (utilize academic planning data on collaborations)

Section 7

- Most concerns centered on this section and focused on comparison models and the premature conclusions that were drawn
- Need to explicitly state all sources used in gathering data
- Lab utilization data seems to contradict campus experience and leaves out labs in disciplines such as Nursing, Architecture, and Social Welfare
- Departments need to be provided the opportunity to review/fine tune space data (as of fall 2007) to ensure accuracy and completeness

- Focus on funded research misses research generated through foundations and community partnerships
- Concern over measurement of office space—in the School of Business, for example, faculty offices are larger to provide space for the conduct of research (follows UW-Madison model)
- Error on page 15: 4 to 1 office assignment of nontenured faculty (should read non-tenure track and utilize UWM's planning ration of 2 to 1)
- Campus need for office space, as articulated in the academic planning data, was not reflected in the space utilization analysis—again, aggregating data is not helpful—by the overall count, UWM shows a deficit of 39 offices—but the campus is 400 offices short in terms of having offices located where they need to be for faculty and staff to be near their units—the latter figure is more meaningful
- Address the impact of ad hoc use of space, such as classes taught in more spaces than in which classes are scheduled.
- Provide distribution data on office and research spaces as well as on classroom space.
- Provide more clarification on the quality of space.

Section 8

- Need to include/consider partnerships in all areas, not just those that yield an economic benefit (utilize academic planning data on external partnerships)
- Need to distinguish between health and public health
- Children's Hospital does not do work in biomedical engineering
- For Phase B report, need to consider space implications of partnerships
- Recommendations on admissions criteria are out of scope for master planning
- Need to address spatial implications of increasing online enrollment

Other Feedback: See attachments

Additional feedback, submitted by individuals, is specific to space. Another commentary speaks to the presentation.

ATTACHMENT 1:
Combined Feedback to the Draft Report

Regarding Section 7:

From Dean Britz, SOIS:

In chapter 7, table 12, it is reported that SOIS has a surplus of 16 offices. This was based on 2007 data and counting 4 people per office (non-tenured and TAS)

Things have changed since 2007.

* We hired 2 more faculty and will add another 2 this coming academic year;

* we introduced our PhD program and as a result add 5 new TA positions and a meeting room for our PhD students;

* we changed on of our labs into office space for our PhD students;

* We hired more RA for faculty.

Other feedback:

1. Figure 5.2 needs to be corrected for the date the Klotsche Center was built.
2. Glossary of terms would be instructive
3. Have schools/college re-check the data; break down by disciplinary groups

UITS: Use the name **University Information Technology Services (UITS)** rather than Information and Media Technology.

From Dean Hobgood, PSOA:

- Here's our current plans:
 - 1) Relocation of the PSOA box office to have greater visibility and access to the community. Possibilities include the Kenilworth, the new location of Admissions on Downer, or the Union. This has not been discussed with our campus constituents.
 - 2) Creation of a Dance Center. This is conceived to be a small proscenium stage, seating 400-700, to be used by the Dance Department and dance partners in the community. It will likely include instructional space. If the Milwaukee Ballet (they are looking to relocate) they/we will need substantial instructional space (1000 students) They mostly provide instruction after school. This should be located off campus. Suggested locations include the Fresh Water Institute area (to help build a presence there for UWM) or a downtown site. The area across from the institute might be suitable if the coal being stored there is relocated and the area cleaned of contaminants. This has not been discussed with the city.
 - 3) Development of a Design Research Center. This initiative will support funded

research activities and contracts/partnerships with local industry in different design fields (Industrial design, animation, game design, health care imaging, film, etc). It **may** also partner with the School of Engineering on some of these initiatives. This should be off campus. Perhaps near Engineering in Innovation Park or Kenilworth or downtown. It is my expectation that companies will be developed and we will need to "lease" space to them- perhaps even create a business incubator space.

Other thoughts that **may** involve the PSOA:

- a) UWM needs a front door or perhaps several entries to campus. Where does our literature and website send guests? Where do the GPS systems send guests? I know that our theatres normally use Kenwood as an address but it is difficult to find the Mainstage Theatre from a Kenwood address. UWM also needs more way finding for guests once they are on campus. If the Union is our defacto front door, we need to make it more attractive (flowers, etc)
- b)UWM needs an assembly place for all faculty and staff to meet. On other campuses I have worked for, this has been a performing arts center. I would certainly be interested in discussing this possibility. This would likely be on campus.

You should note that these ideas have not yet been widely discussed with the PSOA faculty. As we progress, it will certainly involve their counsel and participation. The chairs, program managers and dean's staff were involved in the creation of these ideas during a recent retreat.

Other

- The university may want to look at the Princeton master plan, as it involved comparable issues.

**ATTACHMENT 2:
Feedback from David Petering**

**Master Planning
Phase A Report to Master Planning Team
Observation and Assessment
September 16, 2008**

Notes on meeting by David Petering

- Relatively few faculty attended the meeting; fewer stayed to voice opinions or questions about the presentation.

- The draft report will be placed on the Masterplan website by Friday, September 19. It contains lots of information of all sorts. For example, all buildings were assessed for operational state. Most are considered well along in their usable life as functional buildings, including the Chemistry and Biochemistry building

- Site capacity A most interesting observation had to do with students per sq ft. of space. On a relative basis, the three sections of campus (north of Hartford, south of Hartford and east of Maryland, and the remaining science section) have relative numbers of 0.7, 1.4, and 1.7, respectively. For comparison, the main campus at the University of Michigan around the “Diag” or central open space is 3. So, the planners questioned whether we are over crowded. Looking at the great overhead perspectives of campus that the planners showed, it was immediately evident that the whole south side of the science section (childcare, kenwood parking lot, and the inadequate physics building) offers a large space for future building/expansion. So, does Columbia Hospital and possibly Hartford school.

- Space detail In general, over the whole campus, based on standard formulas for calculating adequacy of space, lecture halls are under-scheduled (chemistry included based on 65% usage during 10 h day), class rooms are over used (chemistry is just right), teaching labs are in deficit (but chemistry was underused based on 35% usage during 10 h day), research labs are about right (based on dollars of extramural funding, taken to be \$30,000,000 (our funding), per total research sq. ft), and offices are fine except for administration (too little). An observation was that more courses on Friday could eliminate some of the deficits.

- Space detail continued In comparison with our urban university peer group, we are almost across the board, except for research space, much below the median. It was

recognized that to grow we need space; we can not expect to attract new faculty without space to offer them. In this part of the discussion there was also a bar graph showing UWM with a 33:1 student to faculty ratio, much higher (ca. 2x) than all of our urban peer institutions.

- Space: current situation we have about 400,000 sq ft deficit in space of various sorts now.

There were lots of caveats by Philip Parsons of Sasaki Associates to deflect that idea that there is a clear way to do the space analysis.

- Partnerships Under the heading of partnerships, it was stated that the campus (chancellor Santiago) will focus on healthcare, advanced manufacturing, biomedical engineering, and water industries. It was unclear whether this represented the partnerships we wanted to develop or our vision for developing UWM. It was evident that this emerged from the administration and not the academic plan. It was a presupposition for the planners.

- Other sites for UWM RFP to which the planners responded included consideration of a number of off campus sites (e.g. county grounds). It was interesting to hear that Columbia Hospital was not among them. I checked this out afterwards and was told that the planners were surprised by the lack of interest. However, in later conversation, I was told that the Regents are interested in Columbia and that \$56,000,000 is enumerated in the state budget to purchase this property. That individual also pointed to the Kenwood Blvd. space in the science section of campus as an obvious place for a major block long building devoted to interdisciplinary science. The site at 11th and Highland that has been repeatedly mentioned for the School of Public Health was not mentioned.

- Campus resources for the community I appreciated the discussion of the spaces that benefit the community: library, union, Klotsche center, Peck school of the arts, historical buildings, beauty of campus (Downer woods), daycare center

- Guiding principles Planning should be open, responsive, rigorous, and bold. Eventually a vision will emerge that will direct academic planning and research aims for the next 20 years. Will this be more effective than our past strategic plans? If it is, then it is imperative that faculty involve themselves fully in the “process.” Among the areas that will be included are: Innovation and Partnerships, Campus Life, Learning and discovery, Location and Connectivity, and Stewardship. The last focuses heavily on environmental concerns—carbon footprint, water use and disposal, natural environment and transportation.

- Roundtable discussions ensued that were based on a variety of topics. At the space table, I brought the lab assignments in chemistry to show that we were at least 35% occupied,
- contrary to the summary in the presentation (quick check of information being used by the Master Planners).

In response to my concern that the Chancellors vision (see Partnerships) not academic planning was driving the process, I was told that the plans (sub-committee summaries) did not provide a lot to go on for the planners to consider other options than the four above. I pointed out that I and two other faculty had submitted a white paper on energy and sustainability as an integrated focus of research across the campus. It should be considered because it was based on the plans described by academic units (though these plans were often a hodge-podge of ideas). One of the planners noted that the Engineering Dean is also very interested in energy.

At the Guiding Principles table, I reiterated my concern since the beginning of this process that academic planning remains largely unconnected from master planning. Others agreed. The original plans were blue sky so they are unrealistic. The sub-committee reports are largely compilations of individual reports with some effort, in particular, by the health disciplines subcommittee to do some synthesis. But none of the groups inquired about capacity, capability, track record, and fiscal plan as indicators of the promise of future plans. I was told that the academic plans may go through another iteration, but it seemed they would not go back to the subcommittees but instead would move to the Academic Planning and Budget Committee. It seems unrealistic that a single committee can cohesively review all of these plans; yet apparently, since the revised academic plans would not go back to the MP sub-committees, that is what will happen. It is opaque how these academic plans will be linked to master planning in this process. Basically, APBC will serve as the single placeholder for faculty governance and input. Previously, I also voiced that the sub-committees of the masterplan were too narrowly constituted. So, the process remains puzzling to me as it has throughout. (I expressed concern last year about the lack of rigor in the process at a Senate meeting last year.)

Finally, back to space. I pressed to find out how independent the planners will be in making their recommendations. How will they come to conclusions? I asked about the county grounds, for example. What if the plans and presumptions for biomedical engineering at the county grounds are wrong (e.g. biomedical engineering is not a good fit for UWM, considering the strength in this general area at MCW and Marquette and in imaging, in particular, already in place at MCW)? Without the connection of rigorous, synthetic academic planning to master planning, I do not see how the planners will be able to move beyond the RFP.

At one point a lead planner from Sasaki urged me not be anxious now because they had lots left to do before the final report was issued. I responded that it will be of no use to be anxious later after the foundations have been laid and there is no chance to change directions.

