University of Wisconsin Milwaukee
Phase 1
Introduction
Caudill Rowlett Scott (CRS), a firm of architects, planners and engineers, has been engaged in long-range planning for the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee since February 1970. This work is being done within the framework of currently approved Coordinating Council for Higher Education (CCHE) guidelines regarding mission, program and enrollment, and is under the direction of the Bureau of Capital Development.

This project is being conducted in two phases: basic program and plan concepts and detailed program and plan development.

Phase 1 is defined as 1) analysis of the basic educational program and physical plan assumptions, 2) identification of problems inherent in physical facilities, 3) delineation of concepts implied by the basic educational program and analysis of general space allocations needed to implement these concepts, and 4) development and presentation of alternative concepts for physical development.

After four months of research and documentation, a team of planners from CRS came to the campus for an extensive work session the week of 1 June through 5 June. At the end of the session a brief presentation was made to summarize the findings and analyses and to present alternative physical concepts for consideration. This report is a documentation of that presentation.

This document should be considered as a workbook to aid in resolving programmatic issues and selecting the most appropriate physical and organizational alternatives.
Program Analysis
The following six illustrations deal with that program material which affects the plan organizationally and quantitatively.

The general organization of UWM consists of central support such as administration, recreation, Union, and Library; two colleges handling complete programs, first level through graduate; and seven schools handling only upper division and graduate programs.

Enrollment maximum has been set by CCHE paper 70-1 at 25,000 head-count as a proportionate amount of the total Wisconsin higher education student pool. The 25,000 head-count figure is considered to represent 18,400 full-time equivalent (FTE) students, both day and night included, and 17,100 FTE day. The 17,100 FTE figure is used in projecting instructional space.

The bar charts in this section show existing space and proposed projections for instructional space based on 17,100 FTE. Subtracting the black and white bars from the dashed bars leaves the UWM instructional space entitlement after 1974.

The curriculum crossover among disciplines gives an indication of scheduling and physical movement relationships. For example, Letters and Science teaches 70% of the credit hours taught and provides most of the basic coursework for the seven schools. Most schools provide the greatest part of the curriculum for their own majors, of course, but there are some significant curriculum relationships among the various schools and colleges.

It should be noted that while the CCHE sets the amount of instructional space, the use of this space is left to the discretion of the institution.
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## Crossover by Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Letters &amp; Science</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Applied Sci &amp; Engr</th>
<th>Bus Admin</th>
<th>Soc Welfare</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Library &amp; Information</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters &amp; Science</td>
<td>114,840</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>5,528</td>
<td>8,185</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>143,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sci &amp; Engr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126,405</td>
<td>27,930</td>
<td>19,045</td>
<td>13,751</td>
<td>7,970</td>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>208,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1985 Program Development Sketch
The administration of UWM has prepared a 1985 Program Development Sketch as an evolution of the CCHE guidelines which defines in greater detail the mission as an urban university.

The three prime objectives in the mission of UWM are 1) to service the educational needs of the residents of the Milwaukee metropolitan area, which implies an increased variety of educational opportunities, 2) prepare people for urban life, and 3) provide a resource for solving urban problems.

In order to implement the above objectives, the administration has defined a three-fold general thrust of development, modification, and in some cases, curtailment, of existing programs.

From the Development Sketch and interviews with the Deans, one significant direction in teaching methods is a move toward more interdisciplinary project teams rather than the more traditional classroom/lecture situation. This teaching concept very directly affects the relationships of disciplines and departments, both physically and programmatically.
1 SERVICE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF RESIDENTS OF MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN REGION
VARIED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

2 SPECIALIZATION IN PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL SERVICES SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO PREPARE PEOPLE TO CORE EFFECTIVELY WITH THE ISSUES OF AN URBAN SOCIETY
FIRST CHOICE INSTITUTION FOR URBAN STUDIES

3 PARTICIPATE IN CREATION OF SOLUTIONS TO URBAN PROBLEMS IN MILWAUKEE, THE STATE, THE NATION, AND THE WORLD
RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES CONCERNED WITH ENHANCEMENT OF URBAN LIFE

*WITHIN GENERAL PARAMETERS OF CCHE MISSION AND PROGRAM GUIDELINES
1985 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT SKETCH

GENERAL THRUST

A DEVELOPMENT

1. ENGINEERING
   UNDERGRAD. GROWTH AT CURRENT RATE OF 7% TO 10% TOTAL U.G
   MASTERS
   PHD. IF AUTHORIZED BY CCHE

2. ARCHITECTURE
   STUDENTS 100 TO 300 (1976-1974)
   M.A.
   ECONOMICS/SOCIOLOGY ORIENTED

3. NURSING
   INTENSIFICATION OF PRESENT PROGRAMS

4. BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
   STABILIZE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM
   < M.B.A.
   SPECIALIZATION RE: INFORMATION SYSTEMS
   PHD. ??

5. NEW FIELDS
   ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS
   ??

B MODIFICATION

1. SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
   INTENSIFY CONVENTIONAL TEACHER TRAINING →
   PROBLEMS OF URBAN COMMUNITY
   INTENSIFY SPECIAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS CON-
   FRONTED BY STUDENTS IN URBAN AREA
   INTENSIFY TEACHER SUPPORTING ROLES (PARA-PROFESSIONAL)
2. School of Social Welfare

- Professionals in "helping professions" not solely in traditional fields of social work, criminal justice, home economics, urban family management, and family living

- Affinities to education, nursing

C. Curtailment

1. College of Letters and Sciences

- Traditional approach - discipline majors, general education

- Elimination of areas not in context of urban mission

- Intensified development of appropriate urban programs

- Graduate - problem-oriented interdisciplinary areas
TEACHING METHODS

INTERDISCIPLINARY PROJECT
Student Profiles
Two of the unique factors of UWM are the composition of the student body and the scheduling of classes. There is very little to distinguish between day and night classes or day and night students — full-time and part-time students participate in both day and night programs. Traditionally, full-time students are day and part-time are night.

Eighty-five percent of the student body is drawn from the Milwaukee metropolitan area. Half the full-time students work 20 or more hours a week, 40% work full-time and attend school part-time. Therefore, a typical UWM student is a working, urban resident — a busy student who has to be several places on a given day. A closer proximity among the University, residence and working areas could greatly affect the efficiency of students' use of time.

Enrollment projections usually are based on birthrate data and projected high school graduations. In the case of UWM, however, there is another potential source of students emerging — the new urban student. This student may be returning to school for further training from a work situation, he may be seeking a new professional career — there are increasing needs of minority groups who have not previously been in the educational market, and with increased leisure time there is more demand for recreational learning. All of these are going to generate a market demand for those students not previously considered in projection data, and in numbers difficult to anticipate.

The generalized enrollment distribution by assembly districts is shown on page 23.

Because of the varying sizes of the districts, the interpretation of this material must of necessity be very general, but there seems to be an intermediate section of the city between the immediate campus environs and the suburbs that is not appreciably represented in the student body at UWM. The question arises as to whether there is a student potential in the definition of UWM's urban mission that is not yet being served.

One aspect of education that must be addressed, but is very difficult to analyze, is the size group that is most effective for both social and educational interaction. It is hoped that this issue can be resolved to a greater extent as the study continues, in terms of class sizes, student union programs, and the most effective size for a campus itself.
SCHEDULING

There is no distinction between day and night classes.
OBJECTIVE

SERVICE THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN REGION.

85% of the student body is drawn from the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

50% of the full-time student body works more than 20 hours/week.

40% of the student body attend school part-time while working full-time.

UWM is primarily a commuter institution.
STUDENT FLOW

EXISTING PATTERN

FUTURE PATTERN

FUTURE PATTERN
1985 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT SKETCH

EXPANDED OPERATIONAL BASE

NEW URBAN STUDENTS*

TRADITIONAL FULL TIME STUDENTS

*MISSION: SERVE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF DIFFERENTIAL URBAN POPULATION

SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS FOR PROFESSIONAL "RETRENDS"
NEW CAREERS (ESP. WOMEN)
MINORITY GROUPS
"RECREATIONAL LEARNING"

ESTABLISH LINKAGES WITH OTHER POST-HIGH SCHOOL INSTITUTIONS
INTERACTION

SOCIAL INTERACTION INCREASES ON A GEOMETRIC SCALE

WHAT SIZE GROUPS OF INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONAL GROUPINGS ARE MOST CONDUCIVE TO EFFECTIVE INTERACTION
Analysis of the Surrounding Community

The illustrations represent an analysis of the university community from the standpoint of land use and circulation.

The University is located in an area which is zoned primarily for residential use. The existing residential districts indicate mostly single-family housing east of campus, with medium density housing around and south of the campus. The highest density housing is allowed west from the campus to the river. Partial rezoning has allowed a small commercial node to develop on Downer Street. Other commercial developments which might serve the university community are confined north and south of the campus along Oakland Avenue.

The residential zoning around the campus discourages student housing primarily because of the parking restrictions — one space for every two sleeping rooms.

It can be concluded generally that existing zoning for single- and two-family residential use around the campus does not support the urban institution and is not conducive to the kinds of commercial, recreational and housing opportunities needed to support a growing resident student body.

Two other institutional activities which have a direct bearing on the University — the Columbia Hospital and Hartford School — are located within the area.

Hartford Elementary School, serving the adjacent residential areas, is located near the center of the campus. From the standpoint of a growing student population (both resident and commuter) and safety for children passing through the university campus, Hartford School should be relocated. Several alternatives have been investigated including the possibility of developing a new elementary school coupled with the transfer of certain grades to the proposed junior high in the Bartlett District.

The feasibility of a new elementary site south of the campus will improve if future hospital expansion changes the character of the neighborhood northwest of the campus.

Transportation to the campus is mainly by automobile and bus. Access is difficult from greater Milwaukee as east/west movement is not direct. The primary north/south streets (Downer and Oakland) are adequate to serve the campus. However, east/west movement across the Milwaukee River is difficult due to a lack of bridges.

As the campus population increases, the existing street system will require improvement.

A transit system now serves greater Milwaukee including the campus. Greater use of this system should be encouraged to reduce the parking problem.

Generally, it can be concluded from the analysis of the community land use (zoning) and circulation that a growing urban institution will not be adequately accommodated until changes in the physical and administrative policies have been made.
MOVEMENT ALTERNATIVES

A. AUTOMOBILE
   TRANSIT/BUS

B. AUTOMOBILE
   WALKING/BUS

C. AUTOMOBILE
ZONING
HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS
SCHOOL DISTRICTS
Parking Alternatives
The illustrations represent an analysis of the existing and projected parking demand. Several parking solutions have been investigated and their costs compared.

Approximately 7,000 automobiles are now being parked on the campus and within the community. As the student and staff population reaches 30,000, parking needs will increase to 12,000 spaces.

If these spaces were provided on grade, as indicated on page 43, they would consume most of the existing campus site. If the same number of spaces were provided as structured parking, eight structures of five levels each would be required, costing in excess of $30 million.

Given the current average land cost of five dollars per square foot in the community, a comparison of structures versus surface costs indicates that structured parking costs about $1,000 per space more than surface parking. However, when these costs are related to the needs of approximately 10,000 additional spaces, surface parking costs are $10 million less than structured parking.

Analysis of the parking need versus cost, combined with the unpleasant possibility of removing homes for parking lots, indicates that alternatives for reducing parking demand within the area must be investigated.

One alternative would involve the development of parking lots at some distance from the campus. Access to the campus would be by bus or other type of shuttle service. The placement of remote parking lots within the area with either pedestrian or shuttle bus access would present another alternative. For example, the ten-acre transportation property located five blocks from campus might make an excellent site for remote parking.

A solution to the parking problem will probably be found in a combination of a transit system and remote and on-campus parking in both surface and structured lots.
EXISTING PARKING - OFF CAMPUS

272 METERS
3274 RESTRICTED
3230 UNRESTRICTED
6776 TOTAL
PARKING - SURFACE

12000 CARS
100 ACRES
PARKING - STRUCTURED

12000 CARS
5-LEVEL STRUCTURES
# PARKING - SURFACE VS. STRUCTURE

## SURFACE

- **Land Cost**: 1750 / SPACE
- **Construction Cost**: 525 / SPACE
- **Total**: $2275 / SPACE

## STRUCTURE (ASSUMING 5 LEVELS)

- **Land Cost**: 350 / SPACE
- **Construction Cost**: 3000 / SPACE
- **Total**: $3350 / SPACE

*Assume value @ $5.00 / SF*
PARKING ALTERNATIVES

NEED: 10,000 SPACES + EXISTING PERMANENT SPACES

CRITERIA: $50 SF/SPACE

= $5,000,000 SF

SURFACE:

COST: LAND

IMPROVEMENT

TOTAL

TOTAL FOR 10,000 SPACES $22,100,000

STRUCTURE:

COST: LAND ($5/SF DIVIDED BY 5 LEVELS) $1.00/SF

IMPROVEMENT 8.50/SF

TOTAL 9.50/SF

TOTAL FOR 10,000 SPACES $33,200,000
Utilities
At present the campus is served with adequate utilities. Most of the city and private utilities are located in an easement along Downer, Maryland, Hartford and Kenwood Streets.

New sanitary sewers have been developed along Kenwood and Maryland. The development of the sewers will reduce the load on older combined sewers.

New sanitary sewers are now proposed along Downer and Hartford Streets. In time, all sanitary sewers will be linked throughout the area. The University has developed a separate tunnel system from the central plant to serve the buildings on campus.
UTILITY AVAILABILITY

- ELECTRICITY
- WATER
- GAS
UTILITIES-STEAM TUNNELS
Analysis of the Campus
The following section is a description in
greater detail of the existing central campus in
terms of density, land use, and building use,
along with a generalized illustration of the
amount of further building required for the
25,000 student enrollment. Buildings required
for 1974 and after are shown at an average of
four floors. The general conclusion of this
numerical analysis is that there is sufficient
space on campus to support the academic and
related programs. The real space problems
involve parking and outdoor Physical
Education spaces.
OPEN SPACES
DENSITY

GROUND AREA COVERAGE

- .09
- .19
- .36

FLOOR AREA RATIO
1 (SUBURBAN)
ASSUMED DEMOLITION TO 1980
Physical Education and Recreation
There is reason to believe that the redefinition of the role of UWM as an urban institution will greatly alleviate the need for outdoor physical recreation space – that an urban institution should more concern itself with the types of physical activities more relevant to urban life. Facilities required for these activities would be more related to individual life-time sports such as handball, tennis, exercising and similar activities.

Fields for team sports related to Physical Education and Intercollegiate athletics can be more easily removed because of the difference in type of schedule from recreational activities.

Some of the land acquisition alternatives have been explored from a cost standpoint and are summarized at the end of this section.
P.E. & RECREATION - OUTDOORS

EXISTING

PROPOSED

24 ACRES

3 ACRES

N

100 300 600 1200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor and Outdoor P.E. Facilities Located Together Remote From Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both Indoor and Outdoor P.E. Facilities Located On Existing Campus Separated On Existing Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor P.E. Facilities Located On Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Facilities Remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---
LAND ACQUISITION ALTERNATIVES

CAR BARN SITE
10 ACRES
1/3 MILE FROM CAMPUS
ADJACENT MAJOR STREETS
COST $1-2 MILLION
$100,000 - 200,000/ACRE

COUNTY DAY SCHOOL
2.8 ACRES
4.5 MILES FROM CAMPUS
ADJACENT FREEWAY
COST $3-4 MILLION
SOME EXIST. BLDGS. & P.E. FACILITIES

HARTFORD SCHOOL
2.42 ACRES
CONTIGUOUS TO CAMPUS
COST $1.42 - 2 MILLION
EXIST. BLDG. CONTAINING 71,000 NSF

ADJACENT PROPERTY
CONTINUOUS TO CAMPUS
$250,000/ACRE
EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AREA
Physical Alternatives
For the purposes of evaluating various alternatives for meeting the physical needs of UWM, two basic categories of physical organizations have been studied—centralized and decentralized—each with a set of alternate schemes.

Centralized schemes include locating the physical plant completely on the L-shaped site; contiguous expansion on adjacent land; and academic development on the existing L-shaped site with remote support facilities such as outdoor recreation space and parking.

Decentralized schemes include the formation of satellite campuses and a dual campus plan which would include a greater development of the Civic Center site.

These concepts were evaluated from a purely physical viewpoint and a set of implication criteria were established from the analysis presented earlier. A summary of the physical advantages and disadvantages of each is presented on page 73 along with a schematic representation of each scheme.

Briefly, the conclusions were these:

**Contained:** While this scheme allows the greatest convenience of movement and communication on the campus itself, its increased density amplifies the problems of access, parking and general lack of open space. It also does very little to help provide job and service convenience for students.

**Adjacent expansion:** Somewhat eases the density and open space requirements, but does very little to relieve congestion or increase proximity to jobs and services. It should be noted that because of the scale of the parking problem, sufficient area to park enough cars on the surface to adequately support the campus population would be impractical.

**Remote Support:** Depending on the amount of land available for acquisition, this concept could conceivably solve the parking and open space problem. However, its success would depend on some sort of transportation system linking the campus and its remote support activities. Again, this scheme does not appreciably expand the job and service opportunities for the student.

**Satellite:** By the very nature of decentralization, this scheme can provide more opportunities for housing, service and job convenience. It will also ease the congestion and parking problem on the central campus. However, there is less opportunity for student exposure to the total university, less interaction among faculty and students, and greater difficulty in campus communication and administration.

**Dual campus:** To a lesser extent than the satellite concept, the dual scheme relieves some of the pressure of parking, traffic congestion, and lack of open space. It also spreads the opportunity for job, service, and housing availability. It has much the same disadvantages as the satellite scheme in terms of mix and intra-campus communication and would necessitate a strong transportation link with the existing campus.

It should be noted that, even in the decentralized schemes, the volume of commitment to the existing site requires that steps be taken to solve or ease parking and congestion problems that exist at the present. Regardless of the direction taken in physically accommodating the enrollment expansion projected for UWM, the existing campus must be studied in terms of organization of space, traffic access and circulation, pedestrian movement, open space requirements, and utilities systems. These will be considered in greater detail in Phase 2 of the planning study.
### PHYSICAL ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRALIZED</th>
<th>DECENTRALIZED</th>
<th>Satellite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contained</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Increased congestion, accessibility, and parking problems.
2. Limited amount of open space
3. Doesn't help services, housing, job shortages
4. Provides most opportunity for academic and social mix.
5. Least flexible and adaptable in terms of physical facilities.
SLIGHT EASING OF CONGESTION, PARKING, AND OPEN SPACE NEEDS, BUT DOESN'T APPRECIABLY AFFECT THE MAJOR PROBLEMS OF CONGESTION, ACCESSIBILITY, AND PROXIMITY TO SERVICES, HOUSING, AND JOBS.
REMOTE SUPPORT

1. Eases congestion, accessibility, and parking
2. Allows more open space on campus
3. Slightly more flexible and adaptable than completely contained
4. Inconvenience of remote parking and recreation
5. Services, housing, job problems not eased appreciably over contained scheme
1. GREATLY EASES CONGESTION, ACCESSIBILITY, AND PARKING
2. MUCH GREATER FLEXIBILITY AND ADAPTABILITY THAN CENTRALIZED
3. LESS OPPORTUNITY FOR TOTAL MIX, AND FOR TOTAL UNIVERSITY IDENTITY
4. OPPORTUNITY FOR BETTER ACCESS TO SERVICES, HOUSING, JOBS
5. INCREASES INTRA-CAMPUS COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPORTATION DIFFICULTIES
1. Complicates intra-campus communication and transportation
2. Relieves pressure on parking, accessibility, and neighborhood congestion
3. Provides greater availability for services, housing, and job opportunities.
4. Provides more open space on existing site
## Physical Criteria for evaluating alternative concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Capability</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Availability</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of Exis. Plant</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mix Opportunity</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansibility</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program and Organization Alternatives

Ahead of physical development alternatives, there are programmatic and organizational alternatives which should be considered within the framework of the role of UWM as an urban institution. While it is not for CRS, as physical planners, to make recommendations regarding program considerations, it is imperative in the selection of an appropriate physical alternative that various program issues be resolved. Therefore, we have attempted to set forth some basic programmatic and organizational alternatives and their space allocation, enrollment distribution, and cost implications to aid in this decision-making process.

Program alternatives have been separated into centralized and decentralized concepts.

The dual program could involve a vertical split of all academic functions, but it seems more reasonable to assume that appropriate graduate and professional programs would be developed along with extension programs in closer physical relationship to related urban functions.

Satellite campuses could be developed which offer general two-year or four-year programs to serve a specific geographic area, or graduate and professional programs related to appropriate urban activities, and serving the entire metropolitan area. The above dual and satellite programs would be closely tied to central campus programs. Another programmatic alternative is the development of semi-autonomous four-year campuses in which students might carry out their full undergraduate studies.

For purposes of comparison and evaluation, four program models have been set up. Program model C is an extension of existing policy. Model X is a program of two-year feeder colleges as satellites to the existing campus. A possible enrollment and capital cost implication is shown in terms of space allocations and cost figures for similar two-year facilities. Model Y considers these same factors with regard to a four-year satellite. The cost is higher because of the types of facilities required for four-year programs. The numbers of students allocated to the satellite alternatives are based on an analysis of the capital commitment to facilities on the existing campus.

The space allocation alternatives are especially important because of the timing of upcoming budget proposals. This chart shows that while there is no timing emergency if the centralized concept is continued, a major redistribution of currently requested space might be required if any type of satellite system is adopted.

Organizational alternatives are represented for each of the models reflecting the UWM organizational chart shown earlier. The C alternative, of course, requires no revision. The X model would remove some of the undergraduate programs from the central campus along with a proportionate amount of support space. The Y model would remove a cross-section of the four-year programs and also some support space. The Z model is almost entirely an organizational change requiring division of the large College of Letters and Science and the potentially large College of Applied Science and Engineering into smaller units, all on the existing campus.

One of the most discussed implications of the X, Y and Z alternatives is the separation into groups of a size that may be more effective for both social and educational interaction,
PROGRAM MODELS

C  CENTRALIZED ON CENTRAL CAMPUS

X  DECENTRALIZED WITH 2 YEAR AREA FEEDER COLLEGES

Y  DECENTRALIZED WITH 4 YEAR SEMI-AUTONOMOUS AREA COLLEGES

Z  DECENTRALIZED COLLEGES ON CENTRAL CAMPUS
## ENROLLMENT MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>MODEL SAT CAMPUS</th>
<th>MAIN CAMPUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOWER DIVISION</td>
<td>8690</td>
<td>10,033</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>18,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER DIVISION</td>
<td>7193</td>
<td>9,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>2972</td>
<td>5112</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18,979</td>
<td>25,060</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SATELLITE CAMPUS

- BLDG @ $4000/STUDENT x 7000 STUDENTS = $28,000,000
- SITE 100 ACRES @ $50,000/ACRE = 5,000,000
- CONTINGENCY = 33,000,000
- TOTAL SATELLITE = 3,300,000

**Total Satellite Cost:** $36,300,000
### ENROLLMENT MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>MODEL SAT CAMPUS</th>
<th>MAIN CAMPUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOWER DIVISION</strong></td>
<td>8690</td>
<td>10,033</td>
<td>2@1000</td>
<td>6033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UPPER DIVISION</strong></td>
<td>7193</td>
<td>9594</td>
<td>2@1500</td>
<td>6594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADUATE</strong></td>
<td>2972</td>
<td>5112</td>
<td></td>
<td>5112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHD</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>18,979</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>17,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SATELLITE CAMPUS

- **BLDG @ $5000/STUDENT** × 7000 STUDENTS = $35,000,000
- **SITE 100 ACRES @ $50,000/ACRE** = $5,000,000
- **CONTINGENCY** = $40,000,000
- **TOTAL SATELLITE** = $44,000,000
SPACE ALLOCATION ALTERNATIVES

25,000 STUDENT ALLOWABLE 2,469,210 $

CENTRALIZED CONCEPTS (C&Z)

1972 NETAssignable
PROPOSED 1971-73 PROGRAM 1,484,325
688,962

TOTAL THROUGH 1974 2,172,987

DEFICIT 296,223

CENTRAL CAMPUS

2,172,987

296,223

DE-CENTRALIZED CONCEPTS (X&Y)

1972 NETAssignable
1971-73 PROGRAM 1,484,325
CENTRAL SATELLITE 451,692
236,970

TOTAL THROUGH 1974 2,172,987

DEFICIT 296,223

CENTRAL CAMPUS

1,936,017

SATELLITES

533,193
ORGANIZATIONAL ALTERNATIVES

C

CENTRALIZED

X

2-YR DECENTRALIZED

Y

1-YR DECENTRALIZED

Z

DECENTRALIZED ORGANIZATIONALLY
## Program Criteria for Evaluating Alternative Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Image Related to Mission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attraction to Urban Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenience to Employment &amp; Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety of Educational Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction of Students, Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic: Interdisciplinary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interlevel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breadth of Course Offerings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduling Flexibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality &amp; Accessibility of Support Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Among Components: Affinities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity for Innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptability to Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expansibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Directions
The educational program should be the primary determinant of physical plan direction. Since many programmatic issues have yet to be resolved, the preliminary directions outlined below are based almost entirely on physical criteria. These directions should be refined or revised on the basis of input regarding basic program issues, along with further analysis of community development and needs.

Preliminary investigation of program alternatives and space requirements for a student body of 25,000 indicates that satellite campuses might well be advisable. Their desirability might increase as a safety valve against future growth beyond 25,000, past the current planning period.

Even if a decentralized concept is adopted the need will still exist for additional space to satisfy the parking and Physical Education space requirements of the existing campus. Since the residential environment around the campus is stable and space for parking and Physical Education does not have to be contiguous to the campus, two remote sites in the general area are under consideration.

The transport property, ten acres located only five blocks from the campus, could be used for parking. It would be best, if financially feasible, to develop parking structures on the site, either with private or public financing or a combination of both. Methods for accomplishing this should be investigated.

The Country Day School property, 28 acres at a ten-minute drive from the campus, offers a solution to needs for indoor and outdoor space for Physical Education and Athletic programs.

Even with the use of remote sites for support functions it is still desirable to fill out the “L” by continuing to purchase houses within the areas shown on the east side of Cramer and the west side of Maryland as they become available. Arrangements should be made with the Milwaukee School Board and other appropriate agencies to acquire the Hartford School site.
PRELIMINARY DIRECTION

COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL
*ACQUIRE FOR PIE AND ATHLETICS

TRANSPORT PROPERTY
*ACQUIRE FOR PARKING

RESIDENCES, HARTFORD SCHOOL
*ACQUIRE TO CONSOLIDATE EXISTING SITE

STUDY ZONING PROVISIONS FOR APPROPRIATE INSTITUTION-RELATED LAND USE

SATELLITE CAMPUSES

CIVIC CENTER CAMPUS
*UTILIZE FOR EXTENSION, OUTREACH PROGRAMS

400 1200 2400 4800
Summary
The analysis has dealt with physical and programmatic problems. The five physical alternatives and four programmatic models discussed lead to one basic question:
Will the mission of UWM be best served by a centralized or a decentralized operation?

The most difficult physical problem is that of parking and transportation. In terms of the physical plan, if a decentralized concept is adopted, quantitative aspects of the satellites become more important than the specific programs offered; how many campuses and how large. If the growth of the central campus were to be permanently held to 18,000 students, for instance, it is obvious that the impact on the community in terms of commerce and cars would be quite different than at an enrollment of 25,000 or more.

It should be repeated that, in spite of the scale of some physical implications of the various alternatives, the basic questions should be answered in terms of the maximum program effectiveness.

In order to refine the analysis and clarify the best conceptual alternatives, several basic issues should be discussed and resolved to the maximum extent possible at this time. Among these are the following:

Basic Issues

1 Expanded Operational Base
Is UWM reaching all the students implied by the urban mission?
If not:
How can these students be more effectively served?
Relative to their life styles, economic and social status, employment and housing opportunities
Who should serve them?
UWM or other institutions
What, if any, is the effect on projections of student enrollment and composition?

2 Academic Program
Will the urban mission and expanded operational base affect curriculum and teaching methods in ways not reflected in the current program and space projections?
If so, how?
Will the existing academic organization be altered to help implement —
New teaching methods
Different management techniques
More effective interaction?

3 Transportation and Parking
Can administrative and financial policies be developed to effect transit and parking solutions appropriate to the urban university?
Participation in developing a transit system
Private development and operation of parking facilities
Subsidation of costs to students