

date 15 May 2008

project name University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Master Plan project # 07G2U

meeting date April 28, 2008 time 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

location SARUP

recorded by Kathryn Madden

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, Tyler Patrick

purpose School of Architecture and Urban Planning

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. Additional detailed information about academic programs and space needs is included in hand outs provided by the departments.

#### ATTENDEES

Tricia Ripps, DOA/DSF/Capital Budget  
Linda Krause, Architecture  
Brain Wishne, Architecture, Chair  
Bob Greenstreet, Architecture  
Arijit Sen, Architecture  
Chris Cornelius, Architecture  
Grace La, Architecture, PCC Chair  
Jim Dicker, Architecture  
Gil Snyder, Architecture  
Kate Sullivan  
Jon Jenson  
Janne Corneil, Sasaki  
d'Andre Willis, HGA  
Kathryn Madden, madden planning group/Sasaki

#### SUMMARY

##### A. Academics

###### 1) Overview

- Only accredited school in State – mandate to provide entry in to the profession; accept in-state students but need cross fertilization of international and out of state students

- Majors and enrollment are as follows:
  - BSAS: 660
  - M.Arch: 123
  - MUP: 49
  - PhD: 15
  - Total: 837
- Mission - Balance the universal (making of architecture) and the specific (uniqueness of region, how are we different here)
- Currently in top 20 architecture graduate schools, with goal of being in top ten – ensure quality of undergraduate program (mandate) and focus on graduate program (interest)

## 2) Programs

- B.S. Architecture Studies – non-professional
- M.A. Architecture – 1<sup>st</sup> year professional degree (2 years + architecture undergraduate or 3.5 years + non-architecture undergraduate); about 1/3 come in without design background
- PhD
- Planning Undergraduate – undergraduate planning certificate
- Masters in Urban Planning (MUP); also a GIS certificate; highly policy oriented; also empirical research science
- MUP Joint degrees with architecture, engineering (transportation), and public administration (public health)
- International (Paris) and distant studios (e.g. Chicago Hayworth Merchandise Mart with SOM) – 12 students live away all semester for 12 credits; affects space demand

## 3) Faculty and Staff

- Architecture - 28 tenured faculty (most tenured) + other
- Planning – 8 faculty; small department in process with two recent resignations and new faculty ; need four to six more positions for critical mass
- Need teaching assistants for improvement in graduate program

## 4) Change and Growth Areas

- Landscape Architecture (MLA) – Milwaukee would like to offer a design degree in landscape, complementing Madison, which offers a non-accredited agriculture/horticulture based degree; federal funding of Great Lakes, freshwater studies; would need a department chair and two tenure track faculty (one now)
- Institutes – applied research, downtown facility
- Potential to reduce undergraduate program by one studio group (15 to 20) to allow greater focus on graduate programs (reference Boyer Report)
- Water-based studies

## 5) Research

- Applied research is often shoestring response; faculty with students, pro bono

- Goal to be more pro-active, have a downtown face; model would be the Detroit Urban Lab, Kent State, Arizona State; hard to sustain financially and otherwise
- Digital fabrication lab – campus push to focus more on research; integrated design center

B. Physical Space Attributes

1) General Observations about Campus

- Little cohesion to green spaces
- SARUP would like to be more involved in design of campus and more visible on campus, not just within their building
- Green jobs and green technology; should be an overall agenda – translate green to master plan

2) General Observations about Existing Space

- Current building is 14 years old, turned back on campus – can the building become more extroverted and can the program be more visible with experiences in other parts of campus
- Question of how to achieve and fund adaptations – get more control of classroom space in building or infill building
- Studio based approach requires dedicated “lab” space for undergraduate and graduate students
- Planners spread across space now

3) Space Needs:

- Labs - In addition to studio space, really need specialized lab space (like digital fabrication lab)
- Classrooms – would like to have more control over class use in SARUP; need larger lecture spaces (140 to 200 seats)
- Critical space – demand for space is ‘lumpy’ – at review time, great demand for critical space, which is now totally inadequate; reflects on school with outside guests, but also need for pedagogy; sometimes use outside space but this is counter productive
- Exhibit space – ongoing shows and student work
- Student life – raise school profile with improvement in student life

C. Collaboration and Community

1) On Campus

- Campus-based space is close to the core

2) Off Campus

- Recently started a new charter high school in city to steer students toward planning
- Would like to spread within field of influence – green tech center downtown, thematically linked to other organizations

D. 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.*