

date	1 May 2008		
project name	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Master Plan	project #	07G2U
meeting date	April 29, 2008	time	8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
location	Lapham Hall		
recorded by	Tyler Patrick		
distribution	Jon Jenson, Jeff Kosloske, Kate Sullivan, Patricia Arredondo, Chris Gluesing, Jim Vander Heiden, d'Andre Willis, Lora Strigens, Julie Penman, Greg Havens, Janne Corneil, Philip Parsons, Kathryn Madden		
purpose	College of Letters and Science – Natural Sciences		

These minutes represent a summary of the content and character of each meeting and are not meant to be an exhaustive list of the comments made. Also, these notes are an initial attempt to understand the academic issues on campus; we will return to gather additional information as necessary.

ATTENDEES

Reinhold Hutz, Bioscience
Mark Harris, Graduate School, Geoscience
Dilano Saldin, Physics
Craig Sandgren, Bioscience
Thomas Schuck, Biological Sciences
Marija Gajdardziska-Josifovska, L&S Admin & Physics
Richard Meadows, L&S Admin
Allen Bell, Math Sciences
Tim Grundl, Geosciences
Kristene Surerus, Chemistry/Biochemistry
Karen Brucks, Math Sciences
Peter Geissinger, Chemistry/Biochemistry
Michael Weinert, Physics (LSS&APCC)
Keith Sverdrup, Geosciences (APCC)
Ron Perez, CEAS
Jeff Kosloske, UWSA
Tricia Ripp, State WI DOA/DSF
Dennis Stecker, Univ Architects/Planning
Kate Sullivan, UWSA
Janne Corneil, Sasaki
Tyler Patrick, Sasaki

SUMMARY

A. Academics

- 1) Overview of the College of Letters and Science
 - Largest academic unit on campus; spread out over 14 buildings on campus
 - Have 1/3 of campus ASF (total campus ASF is 1.2 million)
 - Delivering 56% of the credits
 - Natural Sciences: 62% of L&S total space
 - Graduate students are distributed around the College more so than the undergraduates
 - Credit Hours grew 17% (in the last four years) - happened with no increase in space
 - Natural Science Faculty FTE grew 11.7% in the last four years
 - Natural Sciences enrollments grew just slightly more than the rest of the College
- 2) Recruitment
 - Need proximate housing for visiting faculty
 - Quality of life is a large issue but it is not the only issue
 - Need to improve quality of students
 - Teaching load is a factor as well; most young faculty are focused on research so a higher teaching load could be a detriment.
 - Competition for students and faculty is world wide
- 3) Demographics
 - Undergraduate population is regional
 - Graduate is more out-of-state and international – more so than other departments
- 4) Hopes for the Master Plan
 - Preserve leading role for Natural Sciences in transformation of UWM into a Great American 21st Century Urban Research University:
 - Would like to expand national and international reputation across several programs, not just a select few.
- 5) Funding
 - Philanthropy is not part of Milwaukee's history but it will happen with time
 - A lot of growth is coming from federal funding
 - Continue investment in core areas to serve as nucleus for new academic and research programs
 - Need to identify donors

B. Physical Space Attributes

- 1) Models for Campus Development:
 - Centralized Campus (Vertical Growth Model)
 - Distributed Campus (Horizontal Growth Model)
 - Virtual Campus (Online Growth Model)
- 2) Urbanism
 - Differentiates UWM from its competitors
 - Defines student population – creates need to teach to various types of students.
 - Academic programs take advantage of our urban setting. Biology, for instance, focuses on urban issues, such as brownfields and groundwater. Research also

takes advantage of location, with a focus on issues relevant to SE Wisconsin and its economic development.

- RET (Research Experience in Teaching) – Training teachers to teach K-12.
- 3) General Observations about Existing Space:
- Need space that fosters collaboration – both internally and externally
 - Visiting Scholar space is needed (2-3 offices per department)
 - Kitchen/Common Rooms for student and faculty interaction, as well as group study space.
 - Conference Rooms needed, particularly with state-of-the-art telecommunications.
 - Research laboratories should be organized into groups of faculty rather than separate facilities for each specific faculty member. Medical College follows this model – large open bays that are highly flexible.
 - Instructional spaces – must be fully mediated.
 - Studio-type spaces may be appropriate, such as those that are being developed in the humanities.
 - Upgrade networking to ensure its continued success.
 - Number of online sections and online enrollment has increased each semester.
 - Online credits steadily rising as a percentage of total L&S credits. Could grow to 10% in the next few years.
 - 1,000 students who are only taking online classes. L&S represents only 25% but expect it to increase.
 - No memorable buildings or public spaces on campus
 - No unifying theme, architecturally – buildings on campus seem as though they are "Government-issued" and utilitarian.
 - Problem recruiting people because of visual spaces
 - Lapham Hall – successful retrofit and addition through state funding
 - Physics Bldg – have not made progress – would like to follow lead of Lapham Hall
 - EMS – Math; 15,000 asf for 150 people
 - West Quad – Good collaboration and proximity. Big question is what happens if anyone moves off campus?
- 4) Case Studies
- Lapham Hall: a successful example of a shared-space model between Biology and GeoScience. Renovations meet departmental needs but not the types of collaborative spaces that are needed (see Rochester example).
 - Staged Project Model
 - New Wing Added
 - Move (with compression) instruction and research to new wing
 - Remodeled old building
 - Expand all existing activities in proper locations in new and modeled space
 - Move-in new activities
 - 100% State Funding
 - Physics Building: Space Plans with Problems
 - Water and HVAC Problems + Safety Concerns
 - Four separate biannual proposals to State
 - Funding is major obstacle for Phys, Chem, and EMS. How to raise 10-20% of dollars from Federal and/or Private sources to get State Money (80-90%).
 - Need solution for moving in specialized equipment

- 5) Water Institute:
 - 7 miles away
 - Collaboration is difficult
 - Shared support facilities
 - Lesson learned: locating sciences across town would be a huge problem
- 6) Wauwatosa Site
 - Instructional and research happens together now; however, there is no dedicated research facility. This could be feasible. Would require designated faculty for research only. You can't have a research-only space and still require faculty to teach at main campus. Redesignate faculty workload, such as a teaching load reduction or a semester of research/semester of teaching.
 - A second option is a satellite campus in Wauwatosa but this does not seem realistic or popular due to the student migration issue.
 - Requires a transit solution

C. Collaboration and Community

- 1) Collaborations
 - Collaborations come and go, so the most important thing is for related programs to be kept together. Columbia-St. Mary's may be the key to doing this.
 - Need to improve work on policy; do so by working more closely with Humanities.
 - Continue the commitment to local schools (K-12). Most important dimension of this is the Milwaukee Math Partnership (NSF-Funded). Also, Teachers for a New Era (TNE)
 - L&S has a responsibility for training future teachers.
 - Need good models for how to make collaborations work well.
 - In general, the College is organized strongly around undergraduate education; at graduate level, there are truly interdisciplinary collaborations

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.

The information above will stand as recorded unless Sasaki receives written comments within five days of the distribution date from a recipient requesting an amendment.