

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – MILWAUKEE
Academic and Physical Master Planning Committees

Health Disciplines Subcommittee Meeting

Thursday, November 29, 2007
9:30 AM – Union 250

MINUTES

Present: Patricia Arredondo, Cindy Brown, Michael Fendrich, Marylou Gelfer, Mark Harris, Pauline Jascur (guest), Sally Lundeen, Laura Pedrick, Julie A. Penman (guest), Steve Percy, David Petering, Alex Rewey (guest), David Stack (guest), Ruth Williams.

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 by M. Gelfer.

1. The minutes of 11/8/07 and the agenda for 11/29/07 were approved by consensus.
2. Michael Fendrich was nominated and unanimously approved to serve as the Health Disciplines Subcommittee's representative to the Campus Planning Steering Committee, contingent upon the nominee's acceptance of the appointment.
3. The document entitled "UWM Academic and Master Planning Process" was discussed. Major points of discussion included the following:
 - a. It should be stated prominently that academic planning is now a UW System requirement, and that any new proposals for academic programs must be part of the unit's academic plan. This information could be put on the first page of the document in the "What is academic planning?" section, and could also be reiterated in the "Overview" to the questionnaire.
 - b. On the Questions comprising the survey portion of the document, it was suggested that the need for space be added, since this would directly impact master planning. It was noted that in previous discussions, questions e. and f. were identified as especially good places (in the "resources" category) for specific mention of space needs.
 - c. It should be clarified that the questions on the survey related to changes in programs and priorities within the next five years can be construed as the unit's academic plan.
 - d. On page 2, there was exception taken to the heading "Assumptions." A suggested change was "Considerations."
 - e. It was suggested that one of the questions on the survey could ask what key linkages the department/center sees with other units, to

more directly address the information the subcommittee needs to get from the surveys.

- f. It was also suggested that departments/centers specify which subcommittees they would like to review their survey.
 - g. Various wording changes were considered for the last questions on the survey, to address information the department/center would like to provide with respect to the planning process.
4. A major point of discussion centered around the question of the decision-making process following the collection of the survey data. It was noted that there would be numerous exchanges from departments/centers to the subcommittees, and from the subcommittees back to departments/centers for feedback on emerging conclusions regarding linkages and affinities. The need for scientists and specialists on the committee was discussed. An alternative point of view was that the subcommittee members should see themselves as representatives and facilitators who bring information from and to their constituents in the planning process. It was also noted that recommendations from the various planning committees would need approval from faculty governance committees. (However, the issue of decision-making remained a controversial one.)
 5. Following its discussion on the "UWM Academic and Master Planning Process" document, the subcommittee reached consensus on the following statement: "The group recommends the 'UWM Academic and Master Planning Process' document to the Campus Planning Coordinating Committee with the suggested changes and additions as it relates to academic planning. We expect there will be subsequent documents showing how academic and master planning will be integrated into a decision-making process."
 6. The issue of which centers were to receive the survey was briefly discussed. R. Williams stated that she had an updated list that she would circulate to subcommittee members. Further discussion of appropriate centers to survey was tabled until the next meeting.
 7. The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 AM. Future meeting dates were identified as December 13, 9:30 – 11:00, in Union 250.

Respectfully submitted,

Marylou Pausewang Gelfer

Addendum to Minutes
Thursday, December 6, 2007

Beginning on 12/3/07, a number of e-mails were exchanged which suggested that the committee re-think the "UWM Academic and Master Planning Process" document, specifically the questionnaire at the end, and rescind its decision to recommend the document to the Campus Planning Coordinating Committee.

The issues raised with respect to the questionnaire included the following:

1. Poor design – meaning of questions and expected range of response are not clear; too open-ended.
2. Does not reflect suggestions made by the Health Disciplines Subcommittee at previous meetings.
3. May be ignored by intended respondents
4. Will not yield data that can meaningfully be analyzed.
5. Experts in survey research should be consulted to aid in the design.
6. Consultants should gather this information.
7. Need clarification on the purpose of the questionnaire.

M. Gelfer discussed these views with Planning Support Team members, gathered additional information at the Campus Planning Coordinating Committee, and attempted to address some of the above-mentioned issues through an e-mail to the committee members.

At the time of this writing, the "UWM Academic and Master Planning Process" document has been sent out to chairs, although only for information purposes (the questionnaire is not on line yet, and not ready to be utilized). Meetings are being held to introduce chairs to the planning process and the need for the information sought in the questions on the questionnaire. The planners on the Planning Support Team have confirmed that the questions will indeed furnish an appropriate background for the consultants to begin their work when they arrive on campus in (possibly) April. The format of the questions is currently being revised with help from an expert in survey research.

It has also been noted that the questionnaires will be only a beginning to the data-collection process. Subcommittees who do the initial review of the responses can return questionnaires to departments for more information or interview chairs in person. When the consultants arrive on campus, they will have further questions to gather the information they need.

These issues will be further discussed at the next meeting of the Health Disciplines Subcommittee.