

## Engineering Subcommittee—September 28, 2007

Attending:

Alan Horowitz

Marjorie Piechowski

Mark Harris

Guests:

Dave Stack

Helen Mamarchev

Harvey Rabinowitz

Tracy Moraine

Brian Wishne

Jeff Kosloski

Sue Falco

Tien Chen Zeng

Jon Jenson

Dave Danielson

Ruth Williams

Dennis Stecker

Kurt Young-Bitner

Administrative matters:

Will have monthly meetings in EMS that we'll set up via email.

Chair comments:

Ttimelines are reasonable

This subcommittee critical because this area is driver.

Subcommittee is small – members have to reach out to bring in broader perspectives – planning committees from the related disciplines.

Review of Assumptions:

Question raised if Columbia Hospital (CH) is critical if the other regional campuses do develop. Some questions raised about the current status. In capital budget for 2011-13.

Raised the importance of CH for student residential areas.

Degree programs will grow in multidisciplinary areas – change the statement in the assumptions to include multidisciplinary to reflect this.

If we decompress campus, will have to be careful that new programs and expanded enrollments don't recompress it.

Review of Summary of Academic Planning Retreat (May 8, 2007) *subcommittee comments in bold italics*

### **1. Areas of growth:**

A. Programs that will grow with anticipated increases in GPR funding and positions:

- (1) Advanced manufacturing
- (2) Bioengineering/medical imaging
- (3) Engineering
- (4) Health informatics
- (5) Public health

***Should be careful that we don't exclude opportunities for other future programs that aren't on our radar now. The areas identified now are in the DIN but need to keep flexibility. Health areas are ones that will grow. Suggest adding "other programs to be identified." Or, can say that these are the first areas.***

B. Growth that may occur without additional GPR funding and positions:

- (1) Likely growth in:
  - (a) Professional doctorates
  - (b) Overall undergraduate enrollment (not specific to majors and not necessarily in areas destined to receive new GPR funds and positions). Growth of better-prepared students especially valued.  
***Also add growth in nontraditional students with their associated support needs. For example, impact on day care center.***

(2) Growth in the following areas appears to be valued but [*suggest removing intent*] intent and resources are uncertain:

- (a) K-12 education
- (b) liberal arts and sciences
- (c) adult and returning student programs and support
- (d) international and global programming

## **2. Programs that are likely candidates for regional campuses**

A. Graduate and upper division programs that will receive anticipated increases in GPR funding and positions:

- (1) Public health
- (2) Bioengineering/medical imaging
- (3) Health informatics
- (4) Advanced manufacturing
- (5) Engineering

***Add other programs as identified – cannot exclude opportunity for developing programs – areas that may be unknown now.***

***What about basic sciences?***

*Still questions on where students will be – don't know if these assumptions will hold. These are the key questions for the subcommittee. Would another solution be that the necessary undergraduate courses be offered on regional campuses? It might be easier to move the engineering program there than the basic science programs. Include WATER in this. Also don't presume the site.*

B. Programming and new space concepts should be interdisciplinary in new sites

C. No freshmen off the Kenwood campus

*Debatable issue – balancing the value of the first year experience against the full engineering/science program. We cannot make this assumption now.*

D. Implications of regional campus development for utilization of the Kenwood Campus:

(1) Focus of campus activities in years 1 and 2

(2) Focus of cultural home for arts and sciences

(3) Acquisition of Columbia is critical for fully developing the Kenwood campus

*If CH comes on board, is there continuing need for regional campus? Or, do we need all options?*

### **3. Nature of anticipated student experience**

A. We expect:

(1) increasingly varied learning styles

*Need to recognize the role of technology. Our current learning technology support is not adequate for Nursing's delivery of programs to satellite campuses (the colleges).*

*There needs to be major investments in technology. Lab experience may be more difficult. Technology should be able to overcome distances. Also some discussion that engineering and science are areas that have not accommodated varied learning styles in teaching methodology or in space.*

(2) more veterans

(3) more adults learners ("boomers" returning to college)

(4) more students with disabilities

*We agree but acknowledge that we still don't know the impact on our operation and teaching. We recognize that we want our programs – research and learning – to improve and not to merely expand or repeat what we're now doing. Also pointed out that the consultants will bring a great deal of expertise on all of these issues.*

B. We value:

(1) increased diversity

(2) maintaining and strengthening a cohesive academic community

*This is a major concern. Alan doesn't believe that transportation can accommodate and, instead, technology must address.*

(3) more students in residential halls

C. We should:

(1) expand blended and on-line learning

***More extensive than this – perhaps should be expressed as new delivery systems.***

(2) utilize the Kenwood campus all week and all year

(3) consider developing a “University College” approach for the first two undergraduate years to coordinate the curriculum and support services

***Should this also be a degree-granting college?***

#### **4. Infrastructure concerns/issues/ideas**

- Where will students reside?
  - Those attending the Kenwood campus
  - Those attending the regional campuses
- Security
- Transportation and parking
- Community building within each campus and across all campuses; student life
- Supporting students with double majors etc offered on more than one campus
- Library resources
- Technology support
- Student health services
- Support for students with disabilities
- Build labs that can be shared by research groups/projects
- Build green campuses
- Learning spaces to accommodate varying learning styles

***We need to acknowledge that we need broader input rather than what we believe to be our students’ needs.***

#### **5. Effects on Kenwood campus**

- Kenwood campus becomes the cultural center
- Improved neighborhood relations
- Less congestion
- More parking spaces available
- Opportunity to establish a model for urban research universities
- More attractive campus

Addendum – optional strategies to decompress the Kenwood campus

- Utilize campus all week and all year
  - ***Impact on classrooms especially, but doesn’t affect research/office space.***
- Move administrative functions off campus
- More effectively use UWM properties including GLRF, USB, and Plankington