Strategic Plan 2017 – 2020

Introduction

Strategic Planning Process

Some of the groundwork for the department's strategic plan began in 2015-16 through the Recruitment Committee's efforts to better define the program's particular perspective on urban planning to sharpen our marketing messages. The program's embrace of our "4 Ps"—Partnerships, Power, Place, and Possibilities—emerged from this effort. The more important result from this series of faculty conversations is that the faculty achieved a clarity of vision for the program that brought together a group of people who have only a short history of working together.

The Department of Urban Planning launched the strategic planning effort at its August 2015 faculty retreat. The program last conducted strategic planning in 2013. The faculty proposed conducting strategic planning during 2015-16 in preparation for the development of the reaccreditation self-study during 2016-17. An alternative to traditional strategic planning was proposed, called "strategic doing" based on the work of Ed Morrison, which had been successful within the School of Continuing Education. The faculty subsequently held a retreat in April 2016 to begin this process.

One clear outcome from April retreat was a plan to hold mini-retreats with subsets of our adjunct faculty—land use faculty, GIS faculty, and undergraduate course faculty—over the summer. Meetings were held with the Land Use Team (Strautmanis, Kessler, and Piotrowski, which Frank facilitating) and the GIS Team (Flack, Vepraskas, and Schneider, with Frank facilitating) during Summer 2016. These meetings identified some gaps and overlap, which faculty members addressed almost immediately, sharing revisions to their syllabi with the rest of the team. The adjunct faculty members left these meetings with a greater sense of the bigger effort and how their courses fit in. Overall, the meetings were very successful.

The discussions at the April retreat ultimately surfaced several critical issues for strategic planning during 2016-17. The August retreat in 2016 also focused on strategic planning. The 2013 strategic planning retreat had not been documented; no report could be located. The faculty reviewed the Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures documented in the PAB Self-Study from 2012. The minutes of the meeting do not record any specific findings or conclusions in regard to the 2012 Self-Study summary of the programs goals and objectives.

By the end of September, the faculty were ready to move ahead forcefully with a more traditional strategic planning process. The faculty decided to develop its own ideas before consulting with stakeholders, and then ask for feedback on the priorities faculty identified and elicit stakeholder suggestions for actions to achieve the programs goals.

The process continued to unfold at faculty meetings throughout the Fall of 2016, with SWOT analysis, Mission, Vision, and statement of Goal Fulfillment. In Spring 2017, focus turned to Goals and Objectives and completing the Outcomes Assessment Plan (PAB template) that would clearly identify the measures and benchmarks for determining whether objectives are achieved, along with the results of prior efforts related to the same objectives, and specific actions to be undertaken in the future to achieve the program's goals.

In the Spring Semester, the faculty also launched its stakeholder involvement effort with a series of focus groups and the implementation of an alumni survey and an employer survey. For each of the focus groups, the focus group had an opportunity to review materials highlighting the program's revised

mission, vision, and goals. Participants were asked to assess the program's success from their perspective and to raise suggestions and concerns. The faculty highlighted the critical need to attract a more diverse student body. Each focus group devoted at least half of its time to this issue. The consensus that emerged from each of the groups was that the program is strong, producing well-trained planners, but that lack of diversity undermines the program's ability to achieve its goals. The summaries of each of these meeting can be found in the Appendix.

Stakeholder Involvement	Date	Participants
Employer Focus Group	March 9, 2017	Ben McKay, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Karen Sands, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage Commission Carolyn Seboe, HNTB Sam Leichtling, City of Milwaukee, Neighborhood Services Note: Only half of the employer organizations invited to attend were able to send representatives. In addition, the organizations were originally selected to exclude alumni who are also employers. In the end, however, only one of the employers is not also an alumna of the program.
Student Focus Group	March 27, 2017	Invited officers of the Milwaukee Student Planning Association. Attendees: Four first-year students and three second year students.
Community Stakeholder Workshop	April 27, 2017	Invitations to leaders of over 100 community-based organizations with missions focused largely on central city neighborhoods and issues. Over 40 attendees. See Appendix for the list of attendees, materials displayed at the Open House portion of the meeting.
Alumni Board	May 11, 2017	Eight members of the urban planning alumni board met with Nancy Frank to offer feedback on the draft strategic plan.
Alumni Survey	April-May 2017	Online survey sent to 85 alumni who graduated from 2013-2015. Response rate = 56 percent
Employer Survey	June 2017	Faculty have reviewed preliminary results of the survey. The survey will close after the Strategic Plan is adopted.

The results of these meetings were energizing and encouraging. The Community Stakeholder Workshop was especially so because the program had never before reached out to these stakeholders as a group. Attendees had an opportunity to review displays relating to:

- Mission, Vision, and Goals
- Graphs showing poor performance on diversity
- Samples of the programs community-engaged work in Applied Planning Workshop, Bike and Ped Planning, Bus Rapid Transit Workshop course, and the work of Community Design Solutions.
- List of Applied Planning Workshops focusing on Milwaukee neighborhoods
- Brochure highlighting the program's community-based work since 2007
- Program recruitment materials

For the most part, the focus groups confirmed our Mission and Vision. Interestingly, the process of preparing for each of the focus groups helped the faculty to more clearly articulate its goals. Prior to each meeting we discovered—by seeing our story through the eyes of another—ways in which we wanted to refine our goals and objectives. Three major themes emerge from the stakeholder meetings.

1. Increasing the size and diversity of our student body must be our highest goal. Employers stressed the urgency of this goal, noting that they need to diversify their workforce and will need to hire students from outside our program if the program cannot deliver a more diverse workforce to them. The ethical necessity of assuring that the planning workforce reflects the community was the forefront. All of the employers are struggling to achieve this goal, and the urban planning program is critical to their success.
2. Students are eager to engage the issues of structural inequality, persistent and concentrated poverty in large cities, and racial barriers that impede transformation of struggling neighborhoods and the people who live there. Students suggested that they would be interested in having more coursework on this topic.
3. Community stakeholders have an abundance of ideas for more effective ways that the program can support them and their neighborhoods in achieving their goals. Internships for graduate students, engagement of neighborhood youth in planning-related activities for their neighborhoods, an expanded pre-college program (PUPS), and increase communication between community organizations and the program emerged as near-term actions that the program can pursue without additional resources. In fact, some of these ideas will increase the program's capacity.

The conclusions from the focus groups were incorporated in the Outcomes Assessment Plan, a template provided by the PAB to assist programs in developing complete strategic plans. The Outcomes Assessment Plan was adopted by the faculty as its summary of the Department's strategic plan on May 25, 2017. In addition, the faculty reviewed and approved an implementation schedule for achieving specific benchmarks and actions identified in the summary plan (see Appendix for both the Outcomes Assessment Plan and the Implementation Schedule).

Mission, Vision, and Goals

Pre-amble

The Master of Urban Planning program is a professional planning program designed to prepare students for careers in public planning agencies, non-profit organizations or in private practice. We embrace and further the aspirations of the UW Milwaukee by:
  A. graduating highly skilled professional planners;
  B. generating scholarly research that contributes to the field of planning;

C. positively influencing planning and development in the city of Milwaukee and its region through community outreach and engagement; and

D. fostering a culture that embraces diverse perspectives by providing an inclusive work and learning environment for our faculty and students.

As a PAB-accredited program in urban planning, we provide a nationally-recognized, professional, skills-oriented master's degree program through a strong core curriculum and opportunities for students and faculty to apply planning skills to address urban and regional issues.

Mission

We train planners for technical and environmentally sound professional practice informed by a lens of racial, gender, and economic justice and supported by the voices of community members through meaningful participation in the planning process.

Vision

Planners trained at UWM will possess the skills, values, and knowledge to engage all members of their community to capitalize on the opportunity to integrate sound land use, urban design, infrastructure, and economic incentives to produce neighborhoods, cities, and regions that are sustainable, just, and prosperous.

Our Guiding Principles: Partnerships, Power, Place, and Possibilities

Partnerships: Build strong and lasting collaborations with a diverse array of stakeholders throughout all parts of our communities.

> DUP conducts hands-on projects with neighborhood groups, local agencies, non-profit companies, consultants, and other organizations

Place: Shape the long-term physical and social environment of communities in ways that enhance equity and democratic principles.

> DUP projects illustrate physical changes to transportation, land use, water, and economic development systems to help create and strengthen social and economic bonds within specific geographic areas.

Power: Influence community policy and project decisions to eliminate racial, economic, and gender inequalities and to support the public interest.

> DUP work is shared through the media and used by organizations and agencies at local, regional, state, and national levels.

Possibilities: Envision a more just and sustainable community, communicate how it can be achieved, and influence implementation.

> DUP prepares students to advance social, environmental, and economic goals as leaders in their organizations and communities and helps cultivate student commitment to social and economic justice.

Definitions of mission fulfillment

> In addition to the outcomes defined by our 4 Ps, students demonstrate through projects, assignments, and the comprehensive exam that:

- They can articulate the inter-connectedness of People, Profit, and Planet (re-phrased in our goals as Goals 3 and 4, calling on the program to increase its impact on achieving a just, sustainable, and prosperous City and region and intensifying student capabilities to achieve these same goals for the communities they will work with as professionals.
- They can articulate both ethical and efficiency arguments for improving social equity.
- Using analytic and participatory methods, students can work in teams to design a planning process and carry it out to produce a professional quality plan that meets the needs articulated by a community client.

Goals, Objectives, and Proposed Actions

The program identified seven goals relating to:

- the size and composition of the student body;
- the capacity, productivity and rewards to faculty;
- the impact of the program on making Milwaukee and other cities more just, sustainable, and prosperous;
- becoming even more focused on assuring that students are prepared for practice and the we are achieving our learning outcomes;
- strengthening the visibility of the program, which assists in achieving other goals, like attracting students and faculty;
- strengthening the organizational competence of the program, by further strengthening the programs assessment of student learning and, within the faculty, developing clear implementation schedules and responsibilities; and
- providing state-of-the-art technology to students and faculty. Details about the Goals, Objectives, and Benchmarks for measuring progress are provided in the Appendix.

The Goals and Objectives are documented in the Appendix.

Review of 2012 Goals, Objectives, and Performance Indicators

Two summaries Goals and Objectives are attached as appendices to this document. The "Outcomes Assessment Table" was developed for the 2012 reaccreditation self-study. This document included Goals, Objectives, and Performance Indicators, but did not include any action plans to move toward the objectives.

Reviewing the goals and objectives, the similarity to the program's 2017 goals and objectives is remarkable. This similarity is especially striking because the faculty has experienced tremendous turnover since 2012, and the faculty did not use the 2012 goals as a "first draft" for 2017. Comparing the goals also reveals a sharpened attention to the aspiration of the department to be more than a really fine planning program, but to make a real difference in preparing students for sound professional practice informed by a lens of racial, gender, and economic justice and supported by the voices of community members.

This Appendix includes a section that reviews progress on the program's 2012 Goals and Objectives. This analysis was not completed until June 2017 in preparation of the PAB Self-Study, and after the 2017 Strategic Plan was adopted. However, given the similarity between the principal goals and objectives in 2012 and in 2017, the omission of this detailed review was not a glaring omission. Indeed, the fact that the new strategic plan was created out of the discussions of the faculty in 2016-17 reflecting the circumstances and conditions now and in the future, strengthens the new plan. It reflects the sincere views and aspirations of the faculty, informed by our consultation with stakeholders.

Analysis

Program Strengths

Faculty and their work:

The faculty, despite its small size, is quite diverse. The faculty is socially inclusive across, race, ethnicity, and gender. Faculty have training from a wide range of institutions and geographic areas. About half of the faculty have a planning degree and substantial planning practice experience. Others have degrees in related disciplines. The faculty also demonstrates diversity across subject matter within planning. Each faculty member can boast at least two areas of subject matter expertise, resulting in a well-rounded array of knowledge and skills available to students. Adjunct faculty members are highly-respected professionals who have demonstrated leadership and innovation in their areas of teaching.

A majority of faculty members are actively engaged in either research, planning-related public service, or both. The faculty are grounded in practice. Faculty research and public service is purposively aimed toward planning concerns and solutions across scales—locally, regionally, nationally, and (to a limited extent) globally. Recognition of structural inequalities of opportunity and access are a theme within each faculty member's work.

The faculty is collaborative and collegial. The faculty maintain a wide range of collaborative relationships within UWM and in the community, including joint degree programs, participation in multidisciplinary research and programming, and working on planning problems with professionals and the public. The Department of Urban Planning strives to solve conflicts among its members in ways that respect each other's perspectives and values. Students and alumni regularly comment that faculty members are student-centered in their orientation, showing both rigor and compassion in coaching students toward excellence in planning.

Program characteristics and context:

The MUP program is located within the School of Architecture and Urban Planning. Although collaborations between Architecture and Urban Planning are relatively modest, the program benefits from its location in a small school that understands professional education in a field concerning the quality of the urban environment.

The program is founded on a strong core curriculum that addresses our mission: professional, skills-oriented, engaged, and oriented toward creating just and sustainable communities. Electives within urban planning emphasize the specialization areas of its faculty, including adjunct faculty. Additional electives are available in an array of disciplines outside of planning, and students are encouraged to select electives from both urban planning courses and other programs. The comprehensive exam is a strong learning assessment tool that coaches students to master key ideas, skills, and approaches within planning work.

Consistent with PAB standards, the program strives "to attract a student population, particularly from groups historically lacking access to, and under-represented in, higher education, as well as representative of the type of mixtures of ethnic, racial, and economic groups to be found in the settings where planners often practice."

For at least a decade, the program has required all faculty to integrate content and discussion of social justice, social equity, race, and class in all courses. The faculty also committed to the 2010 Commitment, spearheaded within the Architecture profession, to assure that all courses incorporate discussions of sustainability.   Courses typically achieve these objectives.

Collaborations across campus and in the community contribute to the program's quality. The GIS certificate is jointly offered by Urban Planning and Geography. Collaboration with the programs in which urban planning offers a coordinated degree—Architecture, Public Administration, and Civil Engineering—assures that these programs are periodically refreshed and relationships renewed. In addition, urban planning faculty participate in the Urban Studies and Freshwater Sciences. A longstanding partnership with the Center for Economic Development makes a work-study fellowship available to one student each year. Within the community and state, faculty members have strong relationships with the state chapter of APA, local agencies at the local and regional level, and community-based organizations concerned with neighborhoods or special issues (water, transportation, economic development, etc.)

Finally, the program's location within the central city of the largest metro area in Wisconsin offers access to high quality internships opportunities and current issues for course projects.

Students and alumni:

Students and alumni are sought after by employers for both internships and post-graduation employment. Our alumni frequently express pride and gratitude for their experience and growth in the MUP program. A strong alumni organization of planners located in the Milwaukee area is eager to assist program faculty in recruitment, public awareness of planning, program delivery, and professional development.

Weaknesses

Faculty and their work:

With two retirements (Bill Huxhold and Sam White) and the death of Welford Sanders since May 2015, the current size of the full-time faculty is smaller than desirable. At this time, campus administrators are not yet able to provide any assurances about when Urban Planning may be able to recruit new faculty members. Only a third of the faculty is intensively engaged in research and scholarly activity in planning. While all faculty members remain engaged in scholarship and creative problem-solving, the program would benefit if a larger proportion of the faculty were actively (and successfully) involved in pursuing extramural funding and publishing peer reviewed articles.

The Urban Planning faculty have not been successful in attracting champions within the Architecture faculty to co-lead and advocate for the M.Arch/MUP coordinated degree (aka "joint degree"). Without informed and engaged champions within **both** programs, the joint degree has not been able to achieve its potential in attracting students and shaping the curriculum to fit joint students' educational needs.

Program characteristics and context:

Because of recent faculty losses and budget constraints that prevent recruiting to fill those positions, the curriculum for three previously strong concentrations are now patched together with adjuncts—thought the quality of the adjuncts is outstanding. The areas that are experiencing this stress include GIS and real estate (both "transcript-designated specializations" in Urban Planning) and economic development, a core skill for all MUP alumni and directly related to critical needs in the Milwaukee region and the State of Wisconsin.

Up until the past 6-9 months, the job market for planners in Wisconsin has been very weak since at least 2010. Increasingly, we are seeing employers have difficulty hiring interns from planning (a function of both the supply of internships and the lack of demand due to low enrollment in the program).

The program has not yet institutionalized a strong implementation of the assessment of student learning. The faculty do not have a shared understanding of the assessments that we already do, and

assessments like the comprehensive exam are not systematically incorporated into course and program revisions. The revisions that occur are largely due to individual efforts by faculty rather than from an open and fact-based assessment of student capabilities and opportunities to address weaknesses in the curriculum.

Despite the faculty's relatively high level of positive engagement in local planning issues, the faculty is not visible enough in local media.

Student and alumni:

In recent academic years (2015-16 and 2016-17) too few students enrolled in Urban Planning. Low enrollment, if it persists, may risk loss of program autonomy (e.g., force a merger with another academic unit). In addition, despite concerted efforts to increase the number and proportion of underrepresented students—especially in term of race, ethnicity and gender—the proportion of such students in the program has not increased or increases have not been sustained beyond a single year.

Opportunities

Program characteristics and context:

Faculty engagement across campus presents a number of opportunities that need only modest investments of time to build relationships and program innovations. Cross-disciplinary opportunities include:

- Collaboration on an undergraduate major with Urban Studies;
- Attracting a larger number of Urban Studies graduate students to take our courses;
- Collaboration with Public Health on development an undergraduate major;
- Expanding effort related to freshwater policy;
- Renewed engagement with civil engineering (transportation and water); and
- Better communicate the MIED fellowship work-study opportunity in advance of the recruitment season.

In addition, the program's consensus that equity and sustainability are strong themes in the program creates an opportunity to better integrate these themes and communicate our commitment to them to external audiences.

An opportunity also exists to collaborate with UWM's Architecture faculty and with the UW – Madison Urban and Regional Planning program. Each of these programs have been stressed by the fiscal cuts that have hit our programs, creating added interest in collaborations that can increase our combined reach and effectiveness without too much additional investment. Conversations occurred during 2015-16, but progress stalled while the URPL program completed its own internal re-organization with Landscape Architecture and a key UWM Architecture professor has been on leave in Europe.

The Architecture minor will soon be offered at no cost to undergraduate engineering students at UW – Madison. The architecture curriculum for the minor offers some significant opportunities to inform undergraduate engineering students about planning.

Threats

Capitalizing on these opportunities has been put at risk because of our ongoing intensive work on recruiting a larger and more diverse pool of applicants to the MUP program. Low enrollments risk or further delay the program's ability to argue successfully for permission to replace faculty. Given the amount of time that faculty have been investing in updating the website, moving forward on a social media campaign, revising recruitment materials and messages, and improving processes for recruiting

(and then implementing these changes), faculty have precious little time left to pursue the opportunities that we see before us.

For example, expanding the MIED work study fellowship by securing permanent and enhanced funding would allow the program to follow through on the opportunity to use the fellowship as a recruitment incentive. But time spent on addressing immediate recruitment efforts results in under-investment of effort in seeking funding that would improve future recruitment prospects.

The age of some faculty and key leaders in SARUP, along with a stressful work environment and years of no or very small salary increases, increases the risk of additional retirements or resignations in the future—before the program has had the opportunity to rebuild from the recent losses it has sustained. For example, Dean Robert Greenstreet has been a strong advocate and supporter of the planning program. If he were to leave his position in the School within the next 3-4 years, Urban Planning could be faced with a less hospitable environment within SARUP or UWM administrators could use the loss of the dean as an opportunity to merge SARUP with another campus unit.

Actions for Achieving Goals

The faculty used the PAB Outcomes Assessment Plan template as the vehicle for summarizing the actions that the program will take to achieve its Goals and Objectives. The template includes a column for specifying the timeframe for implementing actions and achieving the benchmarks set. The Timeline establishes the implementation plan for the strategic plan (see Appendix).

Appendix

A. SWOT ANALYSIS

SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Strong core curriculum that addresses our mission: professional, skills-oriented, engaged, and oriented toward creating just and sustainable communities - Array of electives within the program with more electives available across campus addressing our mission - Diverse faculty: social diversity, subject-matter diversity - Collaborative and collegial faculty - Faculty grounded in practice - Respected planners engaged as adjunct faculty - Students are sought after by employers - Strong alumni relationships - Strong curricular focus on social justice, social equity, and issues of race and class—equity across the curriculum and specialized course opportunities - Partnership with the MIED fellowship program - Relationships with professional and community-based organizations - Comprehensive exam provides a good learning assessment tool. "Exit interviews" provide good sense of student satisfaction - The program, consistent with PAB standards, strives "to attract a student population, particularly from groups historically lacking access to, and under-represented in, higher education, as well as representative of the type of mixtures of ethnic, racial, and economic groups to be found in the settings where planners often practice." - Location in a large metro area offers access to high quality internship opportunities and current issues for course projects	- Too few faculty FTE in instruction - Lack of clarity about when budget constraints will be relieved so that new faculty can be hired - Too few faculty productively engaged in research - Too few students during 2015-16 and 2016-17 - Recent loss (two retirements and one death) of key three faculty members - Lack of social diversity among student body: race, ethnicity, and gender - Curriculum needs patched together for GIS concentration, real estate concentration, and key core course (810) - Weak curriculum in economic development - Weak implementation of assessment of student learning to improve instruction and program - Lack of champions within the architecture faculty for the M.Arch/MUP joint degree - Weak job market in Wisconsin for planners - Our commitment to attract students from under-represented groups has not been matched by success in attracting such students. - Not visible enough in local media - Low enrollment risks loss of program autonomy

Opportunities	Threats
- Cross-disciplinary opportunities: - Urban studies undergrad - Urban studies grad programs - Public health undergrad - Freshwater policy - Renewed engagement with civil engineering (new Institute for Transportation Infrastructure) - Better communicate the MIED opportunity - To better integrate equity into the curriculum - Opportunities to collaborate more with Architecture and with UW-Madison URPL	- Risk that we will not be able to hire new faculty to replace those lost, especially if enrollments remain low for a third year. - Merger of UW – Madison's URPL and LArch departments; increased capacity for physical planning and urban design - Key leaders in SARUP and DUP may be nearing retirement or could resign. - Lack of capacity: faculty are spending much time recruiting for students because of the urgency of increasing the size of student body - Lack of merit salary increases - Lack of permanent and consistent funding for the MIED fellowship

B. 2012 Strategic Plan from Outcomes Assessment Table

The table below represents the program's 2012 strategic plan, as communicated in the 2012 PAB Self-Study. Following this table are the Goals and Objectives in the 2017 strategic plan. Annotations document the Goals and Objectives that address the same concerns and aspirations.

Outcomes Assessment Table

Short-term goals	Goals, objectives, performance indicators and data
Goal 1	Achieve a diverse student body, focusing especially on gender and racial-ethnic diversity, but also encompassing diversity more broadly define (geographic origin, academic background, age and prior experience, etc.)
1. Objective	Enrollment of students identifying as members of minority racial and ethnic groups more closely approximates the racial-ethnic composition of Milwaukee County and other major cities.
a. Performance Indicator	Enrollment of students as a percentage of the domestic (non-international) student body identifying themselves as belonging to any of the following racial-ethnic categories: black, African-American, Hispanic, Latino, Asian, Southeast Asian, American Indian, Native American, Native Alaskan, multi-racial or multi-ethnic.
Data:	In 2011, enrollment of racial-ethnic minority students was 16 percent of the domestic student body, up from 6 percent in 2006
2. Objective	Enrollment of female students reaches at 50 percent of the student body.
a. Performance Indicator	Enrollment of females as a proportion of all students, domestic and international
Data:	2011-12: Females comprise 36 percent of the student body. 2006-07: Females comprised 30 percent of the student body. The percentage female has fluctuated over the period, but has been on an upward trend both since 2007 and since 2009, when female enrollment was at its lowest point.

Goal 2:	Assess student learning in a way that meets student needs to see their progress toward achieving competency as planners and in a way that allows the program to identify areas needing improvement.
1. Objective	By the end of AY 2012-13, develop a comprehensive student learning assessment plan.
A. Performance Indicator	Plan is written and approved by the end of AY 2012-13.
B. Performance Indicator	Measures identified in the plan are consistent with existing data systems and can be implemented without undue effort.
C. Performance Indicator	The assessment plan includes specific measures for the following long-term goals: 1.C. developing students' problem-solving and communication skills; 1.D. encouraging excellence in teaching using problem-based and service learning approaches that give students the opportunity to practice in courses the skills that will be required in professional practice; 1.F. using the Milwaukee metropolitan area as a teaching laboratory, through class projects and internships. 3. Establish a national reputation for excellence through the faculty's continued involvement in externally funded research and service, publication of research in peer-reviewed journals, and publication of monographs recognized for their contributions to the field of planning. 4. Apply the faculty's expertise by forming partnerships with civic, voluntary, and professional organizations in order to address real planning issues through faculty service, applied research, and service learning activities with our students. 5. Build upon our recognized strengths related to urban revitalization and economic development, Geographic Information Systems, urban design, and transportation planning by encouraging collaborative work within and across programs, such as nurturing our joint degree programs, involvement in interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaborations, and other opportunities that reinforce our program's strengths. 6. Increase awareness of urban planning as both a career choice and an important influence on the quality of life in cities, for example, by offering a

	limited number of undergraduate courses, engaging in outreach to pre-college students, and demonstrating the benefits of planning through both funded and unfunded community service activities.
	7. Promote relationships with the professional community through involvement with alumni, the American Planning Association, and other practitioner organizations.
	8. Promote lifelong learning and the professional development of planners through involvement in presentations and continuing education to planning.
2. Objective	Implement an annual schedule for carrying out the data collection needed.
A. Performance Indicator	The annual student learning assessment document is reviewed each August at the faculty retreat.
B. Performance Indicator	No more than 10 percent of the indicators have missing data.

Long-Range Goals	
Goal 1:	Maintain a high quality program, continually improving the quality of teaching, advising, and student services.
1. Objective	Assure student access for students of varying financial capacity and work needs.
A. Performance Indicator	Maintain a rotation of core courses to assure full-time workers have access to the program.
Data:	The department has for the accreditation period rotated all core courses to be offered at least once during the evening hours.
B. Performance indicator	Increase the number of students receiving financial support through the program.
Data:	In 2011-12, 8 student FTEs received assistantships or student hourly employment.

Data:	At least 4 students are supported by TA or PA-ships each year.
2. Objective	Incorporate student feedback, along with other assessment evidence, to improve both the curriculum and program.
A. Performance Indicator	Continue to take feedback from students through annual surveys and group interviews with graduating students and students completing their first year in the program.
Data:	Surveys have been updated and administered and meetings held with students annually. Feedback from students is incorporated into program planning and development.
B Performance Indicator	Aggregate annual evaluation scores rise above the previous year.
Data:	Evaluation scores have been stable throughout the period.
Goal 2:	Attract a highly qualified and diverse student body.
1. Objective	Increase the quality of students applying and admitted to the program.
A. Performance Indicator	The size of the applicant pool increases over time, allowing the program to be more selective (assuming the proportion of highly qualified students in the pool remains the same as it grows).
Data:	For the Fall 2007 recruitment, the program received 75 applications. For the Fall 2011 recruitment cycle, the program received 94 applications.
B. Performance Indicator	Attract an increasing qualified applicant pool, measured by GRE scores.
Data:	Mean combined GRE scores (sum of Verbal and Quantitative scores) of enrolled students each fall is greater than the 2007 baseline of 1153. Not achieved in any year. In Fall 2011, the mean combined score was 1097.
Data:	The number of applicants with combined verbal and quantitative scores above 1500 increases. Fall 2007 baseline: 8

	Fall 2008 low: 4
	Fall 2009 high: 12
	Fall 2011: 9
C. Performance Indicator	The qualifications of enrolled students increases.
Data:	At least 30 percent of enrolled students each fall have a combined GRE over 1200.
	Fall 2007 baseline: 32%
	Fall 2008 low: 14.3%
	Fall 2010 high: 35.2%
	Fall 2011: 30%
Data:	At least 75 percent of enrolled students each fall have a GPA greater than 3.15. **Not met.**
	Fall 2007 baseline and high: 68%
	Fall 2008 low: 46.4%
	Fall 2011: 56.7%
2. Objective	Increase the diversity of the student body in terms of Wisconsin residency, international students, and minority students.
A. Performance Indicator	At least 25% of students are NOT Wisconsin residents.
Data:	2007 baseline and low: 20%
	2010 high: 35.5%
	2011: 23.3%
B. Performance Indicator	No more than 25% of students studied the same undergraduate major
Data:	Achieved each year (see Part V)
C. Performance Indicator	At least 2 new international students each fall.
Data:	2007 baseline and low: 1
	2009 high: 2

	2011 high: 1
D. Performance Indicator	At least 2 US minority students enroll each fall.
Data:	2007 baseline and low: 0 2011 and high: 4
Data:	See Short-Term Goal 1 and Diversity Plan
3. Objective	Assure that the curriculum includes content on the histories and experiences of disadvantaged groups.
A. Performance Indicator	At least three graduate courses in the program discuss "equity" issues and/or the histories and cultures of disadvantaged groups.
Data:	Curriculum matrix and faculty merit summaries demonstrate that this goal has been achieved.
Data:	Creation in 2010 of a new course on Race and Class in Planning
Goal 3:	Establish a national reputation for excellence through the faculty's involvement in research and service, publication in peer-reviewed journals, and publication of monographs recognized for their contributions to the field of planning
1. Objective	Research productivity is maintained or increased
A. Performance Indicator	Faculty have at least 8 active funded research projects annually.
Data:	2007 baseline: 4 2010 low: 2 2009 high: 5 2011: 1
2. Objective	Faculty publish in peer-reviewed journals.

A. Performance Indicator	Publication of at least 6 peer-reviewed articles annually and make at least 6 presentations of research at national and international conferences.
Data:	2007 baseline: 2 2009 low: 0 2010 high: 9 2011: 5
Data:	2007 baseline: 6 2008 low: 2 2010 high: 25 2011:10
3. Objective	Faculty hold leadership roles in national organizations and state government boards and commissions related to planning policy and implementation.
Performance Indicator	Faculty name appears on the masthead or other evidence or role.
Data:	National organization leadership 2007 baseline: 4 2008 low: 1 2011 high: 5
Data:	State government boards and commissions 2007 baseline:8 2008 low: 7 2011 high: 10
Goal 4:	Apply the faculty's expertise by forming partnerships with civic, voluntary, and professional organizations in order to address real planning issues through faculty service, applied research, and service learning activities with our students.
1. Objective	Integrate faculty partnerships with applied work in courses and student internships.

A. Performance Indicator	Number of applied projects in courses: 793, 810, 811, and internships
Data:	2007 baseline: 19 2008 low: 12 2010 high: 42 2011: 35
Goal 5:	Build upon our recognized strengths related to urban revitalization and economic development, Geographic Information Systems, urban design, and transportation planning by encouraging collaborative work within and across programs, such as nurturing our joint degree programs, involvement in interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaborations, and other opportunities that reinforce our program's strengths.
1. Objective	Inter-departmental collaborations within UWM
A. Performance Indicator	Annual inventory of collaborative work.
Data:	Current collaborations include the School of Continuing Education and the School of Freshwater Sciences.
2. Objective	Maintain and strengthen cross-disciplinary academic programs, including joint programs and certificates offered jointly with other departments at UWM.
A. Performance Indicator	Enrollment in joint programs and certificate programs is stable or increasing.
Data:	Not compiled quantitatively. Joint program enrollments are probably at a historic low. Certificate enrollments are strong.
3. Objective	Inter-institutional collaborations grow.
A. Performance Indicator	Number and depth of inter-institutional collaborations grow. • Faculty collaborative research • Visiting scholars • Guest speakers
Data:	Not compiled quantitatively. Collaborations have occurred in the past 5 years with the following institutions: • Huazhong University of Science and Technology (visiting scholars)

	• University of Florida (study abroad) • University of Utah (guest speaker) • University of Wisconsin - Madison (unfunded research) • Concordia University (community service)
Goal 6:	Increase awareness of urban planning as both a career choice and an important influence on the quality of life in cities, for example, by offering a limited number of undergraduate courses, engaging in outreach to pre-college students, and demonstrating the benefits of planning through both funded and unfunded community service activities.
1. Objective	Participate in opportunities to talk about planning to pre-graduate students at the undergraduate or K12 level or to the general public.
A. Performance Indicator	Participation in "standard" opportunities, such as UWM Open House, interviews on UWM talk radio program, and non-academic speaking by faculty.
Data:	Faculty and students participate annually in working the SARUP booth at the UWM Open House Each year, faculty are interviewed on the UWM talk radio program 1-2 times. Faculty speaking to non-academic audiences ranges between 2 and 10 times each year.
2. Objective	Offer undergraduate courses that serve to inform undergraduate students about the planning field.
A. Performance Indicator	Offer at least 7 courses and reach at least 250 undergraduates per calendar year.
Data:	2007-08: 14 undergraduate courses enrolled 365 undergraduate students. CY year 2011: 14 undergraduate courses enrolled 315 undergraduate students.
3. Objective	Faculty share expertise with local government and nonprofits concerning planning issues.
A. Performance Indicator	Number of presentations as recorded on merit summaries.
Data:	2007 baseline: 2

	2009 low: 2 2010 high: 7 2011: 2
4. Objective	Participate in activities that offer opportunities to engage pre-college youth in planning problems and methods.
A. Performance Indicator	Number of activities by students or faculty addressed to pre-college audience (list)
Data:	3 activities annually: - PUPs (Pre-Urban Planners) summer and after school programming, coordinated by faculty and taught by students - SUPAR Aquaponics project taught by faculty - SUPAR GIS programming taught by students
Goal 7:	Promote relationships with the professional community through involvement with alumni, the American Planning Association, and other practitioner organizations.
1. Objective	Collaborate with or provide service to professional (not scholarly) organizations, offer programming aimed at professionals and alumni at UWM or at professional conferences, and publish in the newsletters of professional organizations.
A. Performance Indicator	Relationships with and service to professional organizations (at least 3 annually)
Data:	2009 Low: 1 2010 High: 8 2011: 4
2. Objective	Offer activities aimed at alumni and practicing planners, such as seminars, visiting lecturers, etc.
A. Performance Indicator	Number of activities offered (speakers, seminars, etc.)
Data:	The number of programs has been stable at 8-9 per year.

3. Objective	Publish articles in the publications of professional organizations or present at professional (non-academic) conferences.
A. Performance Indicator	Publish in professional publications (non-refereed acceptable, such as APA-WI, APA, TRB, ULI, WHB, etc.) (number of articles)
Data:	Not compiled.
Goal 8:	Promote relationships with the professional community through involvement with alumni, the American Planning Association, and other practitioner organizations.
1. Objective	Share expertise with professionals through professional conference presentations and continuing education to planning professionals.
A. Performance Indicator	Continuing education courses offered by faculty
Data:	9 courses carrying CM credit have been offered each year.
B. Performance Indicator	Presentations at professional conferences (e.g., state or national APA, UEDA, etc.)
Data:	For the past three years, the number of presentations has been stable at 2 each year.

C. 2017 Goals, Objectives, and Benchmarks

Except as indicated below, notations in parentheses to 2012 Goals and Objectives are to the "Long-Range Goals" only.

Goal 1: Increase the number and diversity of MUP students (2012 Goal 1)

A. Increase enrollment in MUP programs

> **Benchmark:** 25 new students each fall and 1-3 new students each spring

B. Increase the number of under-represented students, achieving a student body that better reflects the diversity of Milwaukee

> **Benchmark:** Percent of Milwaukee Co. residents by race-ethnicity (2010 census): African-American: 10 percent, Latino: 2 percent, Native American: <1 percent

C. Maintain an approximate 50/50 balance of male and female students

>   **Benchmark:** Achieve a 50/50 balance of men/women on a rolling average

D. Grow the number of undergraduates engaged in urban planning activities: certificate, electives, 3+2 undergraduate program in Urban Studies; MSPA (2012 Goal 6)

>   **Benchmark:** Increasing trend over time

E. Increase funding for MUP students (2012 Goal 1, Objective 1, Performance Indicator B)

>   **Benchmark:** number and average award to MUP students increases by 5 percent annually, on average, from now through next preparation of the re-accreditation self-study

F. Ensure the distribution of funding supports diversity goals

>   **Benchmark:** Funding to under-represented students (race/ethnicity; gender) is on par with funding to majority students

G. Undertake program revisions, consistent with Goals 3 and 4, to create an academic environment that addresses the concerns of structural inequality, segregation, and social justice.

>   **Benchmark:** Annual survey and interviews with students identify these as covered well in the curriculum.

Goal 2: Rebuild faculty capacity

A. Rebuild teaching capacity in key areas, including concentrations and electives in economic development, housing and social inequities (2012 Goal 5)

>   **Benchmark:** Tenure track faculty or professionals with long-term commitments are teaching core and key electives with excellent teaching evaluations (8.3 or higher on Q2).

B. Increase faculty scholarship including grant applications, grant funding received, number of publications (2012 Goals 3)

>   **Benchmark:** Average productivity per faculty member shows increasing trend over next 7 years.

C. Produce and publish high quality research (2012 Goal 3, Objective 2)

>   **Benchmark:** Number of publications in peer review journals and non-traditional scholarly outlets. Annual summary includes a discussion of the quality of journals where each faculty member has published.

Goal 3: Increase the program's impact in achieving a sustainable, just, and prosperous City of Milwaukee and region

A. Faculty expectations relate to productivity and quality in research, teaching, and service in ways that align with our Vision, Mission, and Goals

>   **Benchmark:** Each faculty member achieves the standard in ways that fit with their research and teaching focus and workload.

B. Engage stakeholders to help us more directly provide benefits to under-served communities.

Benchmark: Feedback from community stakeholders indicates that they perceive planning faculty as engaged in community-based research, practice, and service learning in ways valued by community stakeholders.

C. Attract a more diverse student body and prepare all graduates to work with diverse communities.

Benchmark: All students have at least one engagement experience and receive high evaluations from the community partners with whom they work.

Goal 4: Intensify student capabilities and preparation for planning practice (2012 Short-Range Goal 2)

A. Curriculum prepares students to work in the diverse environment of large cities; understanding of how to work with neighborhood leaders and residents to reduce segregation and concentrated poverty
Benchmark: Every student participates in at least one applied project (e.g., 810, 811, 991) that requires intensive engagement with a client on planning issues related to reducing segregation and concentrated poverty.

B. All students engage in internship for credit

Benchmark: All students gain pre-professional experience.

C. Improve student perceptions regarding elective options in the MUP program

Benchmark: Almost every student expresses satisfaction with the array of electives available to them.

D. Enhance communication skills for professional practice

Benchmark: Employer survey and focus group results assess our graduates' communication skills as strong.

E. Maintain the strength of the Milwaukee Student Planning Association

Benchmark: At least one MSPA representative is present at department meetings.

Goal 5: Strengthen the visibility of the MUP program and its impact (2012 Goals 4 and 6)

A. Engage stakeholders in ways that will win them as champions of the department

Benchmark: Feedback from community stakeholders at biennial meetings suggest that the number of champions of our program is increasing.

B. Publicize through media and other high visibility opportunities the ways that our curriculum and graduates link to community goals and produce real community impact. (2012 Goal 6, Objective 3)

Benchmark: Weekly activity on Facebook, web or blog.

C. Re-commit and, if necessary, refine the expectation (in our merit standards) that all faculty members routinely engage with members of the Milwaukee community at a significant level (2012 Goal 5, Objective 1, Performance Indicator A)

Benchmark: Based on merit summaries, all faculty achieve standard and a majority of faculty exceed expectations.

D. Engage with students and faculty in undergraduate programs related to planning at UWM (2012 Goal 5, Objective 2)

   Benchmark: All planning-related undergrad programs at UWM are engaged annually.

E. Engage more strategically with Architecture around common goals and interests. (2012 Goal 5, Objective 2)

   Benchmark: Urban planning faculty perceive that engagement with Architecture faculty is improving (based on faculty discussions at annual retreat and strategic planning).

Goal 6: Strengthen the organizational competence of the department

A. Revise and update our learning assessment process/program
   Benchmark: Learning assessment is reviewed at least biennially and used for program revision.

B. Revise and update curriculum based upon learning outcomes assessment

   Benchmark: Curriculum responds to identified learning needs.

C. Program faculty implement program action plan

   Benchmark: Actions are implemented. Outcomes are measured.

D. Achieve timely engagement in Strategic Planning and implementation

   Benchmark: Strategic plan is completed at least one year before self-study is due to PAB.

Goal 7: Provide state-of-the-art software and computers for our students and faculty
A. Maintain a variety of urban planning software on lab computers that are accessible to MUP students

   Benchmark: Student satisfaction

B. Engage alumni and professionals to determine software skills desired.

   Benchmark: Employer satisfaction with graduates' skill levels.

D. OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN

Goal 1: Increase the number and diversity of MUP students

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/ Action Plan
A. Increase enrollment in MUP programs	Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments by Fall semester and academic year	25 new students each fall and 1-3 new students each spring	Achieve goal by Fall 2019 Achieve 20 enrolled new students by Fall 2018 Achieve 50 applications received, with at least 90 percent achieving admissible GPA by admission cycle in AY 2018-19	New students enrolled Fall 2016: 6Fall 2017 (project'd): 7	Compile the recruitment actions developed over 2015-17 into an annual recruitment plan with timeframes and links to specific materials and texts of communications. Review successes and challenges of 2016-17 recruitment season and revise to be more efficient and effective.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/ Action Plan
B. Increase the number of under-represented students, achieving a student body that better reflects the diversity of Milwaukee	Self-reported race/ethnicity on student records	Percent of Milwaukee Co. residents by race-ethnicity (2010): African-American: 10% Latino: 2% Native Am: <1 percent Average percentage of students by race/ethnicity in PAB programs in the Upper Midwest: UIC, Cleveland State, Wayne State, and UW – Madison.	Diversity plan updated in Fall 2017 New funding in place for Fall 2018 recruitment (see Goal 1, Obj E)	5-year average: African-Am: 6% Latino: 8% Native Am: 1% See Appendix, Diversity	Update the program's 2012 diversity plan; Track implementation actions at faculty meetings; Report annually to external stakeholders. With the dean, alumni, and local employers and foundations, create new funding for students of color (see Goal 1, Obj D)
C. Maintain an approximate 50/50 balance of male and female students	Self-reported gender on student records	Achieve a 50/50 balance of men/women on a rolling average	Update diversity plan in Fall 2017 Achieve 50/50 balance by Fall 2020	% TA/PA funding to women 2012-13: 42% 2013-14: 37% 2014-15: 50% 2015-16: 57% 2016-17: 71% 5-year average: Women: 51%	Update diversity plan and report progress annually to external stakeholders. Build relationships with programs and institutions where potential women applicants can be identified.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/ Action Plan
D. Grow the number of undergraduates engaged in urban planning activities: certificate, electives, 3+2 undergraduate program in Urban Studies; MSPA	Undergraduate student credit hours in Urb Plan courses	Continually increasing number	Undergraduate outreach plan to be completed by end of 2017-18.	Ongoing Trend UP (Arch) 2011-12: 861 (9297) 2012-13: 717 (9383) 2013-14: 778 (8804) 2014-15: 585 (8287) 2015-16: 597 (7333) UP declined more than Arch SCH in UG courses	Develop and implement a plan for outreach and attraction of undergraduate students to certificate and courses.
E. Increase funding for MUP students	Number of funded students (all sources) Average award Planetizen data collection method	Increase by 5 percent annually on average over the next accreditation period	2017-18 through preparation of next reaccreditation self-study Track as part of strategic plan review	Ongoing efforts: APA-WI contract— ▪ Partial funds for project assistant; dept contribution MIED work-study— ▪ Half-funding for project assistant; dept match for other half	Pursue funding for both diversity and internships focused on working with communities in need and youth engagement in planning. Track total funding annually and awards to students by gender, race and ethnicity. Market existing internship arrangement with City of Milwaukee like the MIED work-study.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/ Action Plan
F. Ensure the distribution of funding supports diversity goals	Proportion of students by race, ethnicity, and gender receiving funding Level of funding per student by race, ethnicity, and gender	Funding to under-represented students (race/ethnicity; gender) is on par with funding to majority students	Ongoing	Summary report prepared for Diversity Report (2012), but no rationale for decisions are articulated for not funding students of color or women.	Admissions and Awards Committee prepares a report annually on funding decisions with rationale for decisions that do not support diversity goals
G. Undertake program revisions, consistent with Goals 3 and 4, to create an academic environment that addresses the concerns of structural inequality, segregation, and social justice.	Course content and student feedback in annual surveys and meetings with 1st year and graduating students.	Topics are covered coherently and with increasing depth in multiple core courses or in a single course. Student surveys and interviews identify these as covered well in the curriculum.	Develop in 2017-18	Students interested in addressing issues of social equity will see that our program and faculty are aligned with their interests.	Develop a new seminar course, or integrate into an existing course, significant content on strategically addressing segregation and issues of concentrated poverty, lack of access to opportunity, etc. If integrated into an existing course, revise the course objectives to reflect this content.

Goal 2: Rebuild faculty capacity

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
A. Rebuild teaching capacity in key areas, including specializations and electives in economic development, housing and social inequities	Tenure track faculty or with long-term commitments are teaching core and key electives with excellent teaching evaluations (8.3 or higher on Q2).	Core courses and electives in specific areas (GIS, RE, economic development, housing, and social inequities) are taught by tenure-track faculty or adjuncts with longer-term commitments to teaching. Teaching evaluation scores of 8.3 or higher on Q2 in these courses.	Staffing plan for AY 2018-19 in place by the end of AY 2017-18	In AY 2017-18, all core courses will be taught by tenured faculty. Courses in GIS and RE specializations and the ED course are taught by adjuncts with long-term commitments to teaching the course: 3 out of 4 adjuncts in specializations or key electives meet benchmark in 2016-17 Tenured faculty member will teach course on social inequities at graduate level beginning in Spring 2019. Plan for teaching housing is not yet underway.	Engage SARUP Dean, Provost, and alumni in developing a plan to rebuild teaching capacity in key areas development. Forge campus and community partnerships, where possible, to fill gaps until additional permanent faculty can be hired.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
B. Increase faculty scholarship including grant applications, grant funding received, number of publications	Annual summaries of faculty research activity: • Grants submitted • Grants awarded • Peer review pubs • Other pubs	Annual summary of collective productivity of faculty showing 7 years of trend data. Increasing trend line on average productivity per faculty member.	Annual summary and trend analysis implemented by Spring 2018.	First iteration of the summary is complete as part of the PAB self-study.	Develop a plan for specific rewards for faculty for meeting strategic needs in • Research and publication • Teaching high priority courses, and • Engaged teaching and scholarship with communities to advance social justice
C. Produce and publish high quality research	Number of publications in peer review journals and non-traditional scholarly outlets.	Annual summary includes an analysis of the quality of journals where faculty are publishing	Workload and performance indicators discussed and seek consensus prior to 2017 merit exercise in Spring 2018.	See Table 3.E Mean 2010-2017 (through Spring only) Peer reviewed, mean = 7/year* All publications, mean = 21/year (excludes grants and presentations)	Develop a fund to reward or award to recognize outstanding scholarship. Revise merit standards as needed.

*Figures for 2017 are through the first five months only. For calculating mean, 2017 was treated as a full year.

Goal 3: Increase the program's impact in achieving a sustainable, just, and prosperous City of Milwaukee and region

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
A. Faculty expectations relate to productivity and quality in research, teaching, and service in ways that align with our Vision, Mission, and Goals	Annual merit summaries and deliberation process	Each faculty member achieves the standard in ways that fit with their research and teaching focus and workload.	Complete development of standard defining the faculty expectations in time for the 2017-18 merit review.	Workload policy adopted January 1998 Satisfactory performance adopted April 1998	Review and revise merit and tenure standards as needed to achieve our Vision, Mission, and Goals. Specifically, review standards for Satisfactory Performance used for merit and post-tenure review and the workload policy.
B. Engage stakeholders to help us more directly provide benefits to under-served communities.	Annual merit summaries Feedback from community stakeholders	Planning faculty are engaged in community-based research, practice, and service learning in ways valued by community stakeholders.	Ongoing	April 2017 community stakeholder meeting and May 30, 2017 report back to stakeholders	Incorporate into department annual workplans. See Strategic Plan narrative for details.
C. Attract a more diverse student body and prepare all graduates to work with diverse communities.	Amount of funding Number of graduate students engaged in planning and outreach with community organizations.	All students have at least one engagement experience and receive high evaluations from the community partners with whom they work.	Implement as soon as possible; on-going.	Faculty, in consultation with students, has decided to require internships	Pursue external funding that will support under-served communities in Milwaukee and southeast WI and provide experience working with communities

Goal 4: Intensify student capabilities and preparation for planning practice

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
A. Curriculum prepares students to work in the diverse environment of large cities; understanding of how to work with neighborhood leaders and residents to reduce segregation and concentrated poverty	Syllabus review Student feedback Community stakeholder feedback	Every student participates in at least one applied project (e.g., 810, 811, 991) that requires intensive engagement with a client on planning related to reducing segregation and concentrated poverty.	Immediate and on-going.	Our students have the skills required to achieve our vision.	Develop a program for intensive student engagement with community-based organizations, including internships over a 1-2 year timeframe rather than a semester-length experience. As described in Goal 1, Obj G, develop a new or revised course that addresses issues of segregation and the ongoing social drivers of segregation and its impact.
B. All students engage in internship for credit	Graduation requirement	All students gain pre-professional experience.	Fall 2019	Annual student surveys report that virtually all students do at least 1 semester of internship.	Modify requirements and messaging regarding internships and practice-based learning; promote multiple semesters of internship and work with distressed communities. Collect data on work with

					under-served communities.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
C. Improve student perceptions regarding elective options in the MUP program	Student surveys	Almost every student expresses satisfaction with the array of electives available to them	Fall 2017 electives meeting	Increased course options; Increased student satisfaction	Explore offering courses jointly with architecture, public health, urban studies and other relevant programs. Invite faculty from other programs to come to our electives meeting. Create an array of 1 credit "tool" classes
D. Enhance communication skills for professional practice	Scores on rubrics related to communication skills Employer survey and focus group results.	Scores and assessments are high.	Fall 2019, new rubrics will be implemented in courses and/or comprehensive exam	Rubrics for writing in 711 are long-standing and in 721 since 2012. Rubrics in 810 for writing and presentation implemented for decades. Rubrics in 811 implemented in 2014.	Faculty will share what we do in each class, creating a ramp to mastery, being transparent with students about this element of the curriculum. Revise class assignments to provide more practice in writing and oral communication practice. Develop rubrics

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
E. Maintain the strength of the Milwaukee Student Planning Association	Attendance at departmental meetings	At least one MSPA representative is present at department meetings	Fall 2017	MSPA is a vital partner in program implementation	Faculty engages MSPA about their plans for strengthening the organization. Place a stronger emphasis on having MSPA representatives attending department meetings. Schedules meetings to be acceptable to at least two MSPA officers.

Goal 5: Strengthen the visibility of the MUP program and its impact

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
A. Engage stakeholders in ways that will win them as champions of the department	Feedback from community stakeholders.	Continuous growth in the number of community champions.	Ongoing	During 2016-17, the faculty re-oriented its diversity recruitment strategy to focus on value to the community rather than marketing and funding of students from diverse backgrounds. Multiple benefits from this re-orientation are observed.	Institutionalize strategic planning and stakeholder engagement. Engage community stakeholders on a 2-year cycle (next meeting 2018-19). Form small task groups with community stakeholders to work on shared goals.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
B. Publicize through media and other high visibility opportunities the ways that our curriculum and graduates link to community goals and produce real community impact	Number of web, Facebook, and blog posts and measures of the reach of these posts. Number of traditional media mentions of program, faculty or students.	Weekly activity on Facebook, web or blog.	Ongoing	Media highlight activities and outcomes that demonstrate achievement of our mission and vision	Engage students in media campaign to build skills. Maintain regular communication with community stakeholders.
C. Re-commit and, if necessary, refine the expectation (in our merit standards) that all faculty members routinely engage with members of the Milwaukee community at a significant level	Merit summaries Individual engagement plans prepared as part of post-tenure review plan.	All faculty achieve standard and a majority of faculty exceed expectations.	Review, revise and recommit before Spring 2018 merit exercise.	Number and quality of community engagement increases over time	In addition to annual reporting of engagement, prepare individual engagement plans with discussion of how the plan achieves Objectives A and B, and program Mission and Vision
D. Engage with students and faculty in undergraduate programs related to planning at UWM	Guest lectures and class visits. On-going agreements with specific faculty to visit their classes. Meet with plan-related faculty biennially	All planning-related undergrad programs at UWM are engaged annually.	Ongoing	Increasing number of faculty and undergraduate students at UWM and other institutions are aware of urban planning and see our program as strong	Develop a strategy or decision process for increasing engagement with other programs, at UWM and with other universities.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
E. Engage more strategically with Architecture around common goals and interests.	UP faculty perception of engagement with Architecture faculty	Discussions during update of strategic plan in 2019-20.	Ongoing	This goal was in the department's prior trategic plan; results were mixed—success primarily around the charter high school. New faculty, unfamiliar with that plan, raised the issue this year. Current positive engagements exist with a small number of architecture faculty.	Identify activities that the Architecture faculty are engaged in that we might join. Hold a meeting where we share interests and invite Arch faculty to participate in teaching, research or service activities.

Goal 6: Strengthen the organizational competence of the department

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
A. Revise and update our learning assessment process/program	Program-level (as opposed to course-level) review of learning objectives and outcome measures.	Learning assessment is reviewed at least biennially and used for program revision.	AY 2018-19	Student surveys and interviews have been used routinely over the years to revise the program. Extend to include direct	Revise learning assessment process and outcome measures

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
				measures of performance.	
B. Revise and update curriculum based upon learning outcomes assessment	Merit summaries and department meeting minutes	Curriculum responds to identified learning needs	Ongoing	Information gathering during 2016-17 strategic planning has informed program decisions.	Implement a more formal outcomes assessment process
C. Program faculty implement program action plan	Activities and outcomes reporting at each faculty meeting	Actions are implemented	AY 2017-18	Annual workplan guides implementation process	Create an annual workplan at our summer retreat and monitor progress throughout the year.
		Outcomes are measured			
D. Achieve timely engagement in Strategic Planning and implementation	Strategic plan is updated at least every 3 years.	Strategic plan is completed at least one year before self-study is due to PAB.	Update plan: AY 2019-20	Stronger plans and better implementation will be more likely to achieve our goals.	Develop a strategic planning schedule and institute an annual workplan as a tool for implementation.
	New strategic plan is completed every 7 years.		New plan completed: AY 2023-24		

Goal 7: Provide state-of-the-art software and computers for our students and faculty.

Outcome/Objective	Performance Indicator/ Measurement Tool	Program Benchmark	Timeframe	Results	Analysis/Action Plan
A. Maintain a variety of urban planning software on lab computers that are accessible to MUP students.	Student feedback	Student satisfaction	Ongoing	Students have the tools they need to practice skills and do their coursework efficiently	Review annually with students
B. Engage alumni and professionals to determine software skills desired.	Meet with professionals about emerging skills their employees need.	Employer satisfaction with graduates skill levels	Employer focus group in 2019-20

Employer survey in 2018-19 | Alumni survey and Employer survey implemented in

Spring 2017. | Review periodically with stakeholders (e.g., strategic plan update (2019-20) and strategic planning (2023-24) |

Summary, Employer Focus Group

Employers present:

> Carolyn Seboe, HNTB (4 alumni employed)
> Sam Leichtling, City of Milwaukee (many alumni employed)
> Aaron Michelson, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (several alumni employed)
> Karen Sands, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage Commission (employed a series of alumni over the last 10 years)

An effort was made to invite employers who were not UWM MUP graduates themselves and who had supervised more than one MUP alumnus over the last 10 years. These criteria could not be met. All of the attendees except Karen Sands are alumni of the program. Several invitees were unable to attend at the last minute.

In general, the group agreed that recent graduates are well-prepared, especially in their ability to do planning research, analysis, and writing. Also strong in advocating for and implementing public involvement in planning. The group urged that the program replace Sam White with a faculty member who would put an equal emphasis on communication skills, as Sam was so effective in improving students' skills. The only negative observation regarding skills and knowledge relates to the graduates' ability to interpret codes.

The employers supported the "generalist" approach that most students pursue. Specializations are not important to the employers in recruiting staff. Ironically, for internships, specializations (especially GIS) are highly sought after because the generalist full-time planners often lack skills in that area.

The employers emphasized the importance of internships, advising the program to "strong-arm" students into taking as much internship as possible, putting internship ahead of additional elective courses if they need to choose.

The group suggested that the program increase the communication it has with employers.

A major area of discussion concerned the program's lack of diversity. One employer indicated that the agency is unlikely to be able to designate the MUP degree as a requirement, but the applicant pool lacks sufficient diversity when they require the MUP degree. Some projects must have staff from specific zip codes in order to be successful.

Suggestions for increasing diversity included:

- Reaching out to Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) firms. A number of planning related firms work in Architecture, Engineering, and Economic Development. Some firms to consider marketing to include La Braza, P3, The Story, Miller, and Maldonado (all civic engagement and public involvement firms).
- Community organizations to identify mid-career professionals who are ready to upgrade their skills with the MUP degree. The employers noted that MUP may compete poorly with Urban Studies for mid-career professional because of the substantially longer program in MUP compared to the masters in Urban Studies. But, on the other hand, MUP means a job is waiting for good students, but graduates of the Urban Studies program often struggle to find jobs.

- Pursue the 3+2 program with Urban Studies. The program has been working on this, and the alumni supported this approach.
- Work with the alumni group to develop a substantial scholarship to support students of color.

Summary of Student Focus Group

Four first-year students and three second-year students attended.

The questions that framed the conversation included:

-

The conversation started with a focus on achieving the goal of working more effectively with diverse communities.   The students offered a number of suggestions.

- Don't go into the community as a white savior
- Piggyback with other organizations and UWM departments that are already working in the neighborhoods, such as the College of Nursing.
- Go with humility, build relationships first.
- Look at the Public Allies and Americorps programs as models for how to enter the community.

The content that Kirk delivers in the Urb Plan 141 course provides more background on the history and policies that brought cities to where they are today. This may be a gap in the grad program. Consider having students do neighborhood histories as an assignment in 711.

Have students engage in on-going planning processes as participant-observers. Bringing in a single speaker to a course is too limited to that individual's point of view.

How can the program build in opportunities for students to learn skills of public engagement across race and class divisions?

- Look at the training provided by:
  - the Zeidler Center in Milwaukee
  - The Chicago Community Trust "On the Table" model

Ask community organizations, "What do you need?" The provision of those services needs to be embedded in a class or classes. Better to build longer-term client relationships with multi-year commitments than one-off engagements. Let the client drive the process.

Have more relationships with Urban Studies. Urban Studies students have a broader perspective and backgrounds than urban planning students.

Build on Arijit's experience working with Washington Park.

Help staff the MKE United effort.

Beyond increasing diversity and engagement with the issues of race, segregation, and disadvantage, another suggestion was to avoid such a sharp focus on Milwaukee examples. Innovation is happening elsewhere. Cities are facing other issues not found in Milwaukee. Consider an annual fall trip, like the University of Michigan visit to Milwaukee last fall. Iowa State also offers a regular field travel class (1-2 credits) for a 4-day trip.

Provide opportunities to learn about smaller cities. Try to incorporate best practices from other countries.

Provide 1-credit modules for learning specialized software (e.g., SketchUp). One-credit courses would also provide more variety in content learned.

Students also offered suggestions on student recruitment.

The program should plug its strengths:
- Practice focus and course projects
- No PhD program competing for faculty time and attention
- Transportation offerings
- Applied focus: "We do stuff". Students are out in the community from the second week of classes.
- Access to community, faculty professional networks.
- Community Design Solutions

Weaknesses

- Lack of "access" to planning consulting: not visible and little knowledge about it in classes.

Need to sell MUP as important.

Summary of Community Stakeholder Conversations

This report summarizes the results of a meeting on April 27, 2017, between the UWM Department of Urban Planning and a group of community organization leaders with missions that relate to community development and neighborhood planning as well as the elimination of racism, segregation, and persistent and concentrated poverty.

Four major domains of shared interest and opportunity emerged from the conversations:

- Engagement: ways that urban planning faculty and students can be more engaged with community organizations and neighborhoods;
- Research and Projects: specific information needs or planning-related activities that urban planning students and faculty might work with community organizations to provide;
- Communication: ways in which increased communication between the UWM urban planning program and the community could provide benefits to both UWM and the community; and
- Youth engagement: ways that planning students can be resource for engaging neighborhood youth while building cultural competence and understanding of majority white MUP students and faculty.

In addition, many groups also identified ways that the urban planning program can work to build bridges between the community and all of UWM and to increase the collaboration between community organizations. Each of these areas are detailed below.

Engagement

> **General Principles**
>
> - Focus on building long-term relationships, understanding, and trust.
> - Draw on community leaders as a resource to mentor students and faculty on how to present projects within the community in a respectful and aware manner, in which all participants meet on common ground.
> - Be authentically "present" in neighborhoods to attract students that reflect the diversity of Milwaukee, create opportunity for neighborhood youth, and create better projects that will benefit faculty, students, residents, and businesses.
> - Serve as a connector, bringing along other UWM programs, creating multi-disciplinary teams, and bridging with multiple sectors in the broader community.
>   - Vision: create a single point of contact with UWM for community-based research, projects, and internships.

Internships

A several of the six breakout groups focused on internships as an opportunity for mutual benefit. The list below identifies the main comments that emerged about internships.

- Intensify the engagement and exposure of planning students.
  - Students need to be engaged over an extended period of time, perhaps over the entire two years of their degree program, rather engaging for a short-term assignment—particularly when the assignment offers no direct benefit to the community.
  - Find strategies to help organizations cope with the lack of continuity when an intern moves on.
- Urban planning interns need to understand the experiences of people within systems that block opportunity in order to understand the barriers that residents face.
- Placements with the alders' offices can improve the communication between the alders and all parts of their districts.
  - Students can train neighbors on how to get notifications.
- Placements with local businesses and developers
  - Assist developers in cutting red tape
  - Place students in BIDs to increase the BIDs' capacities
  - Build understanding and trust

Projects

At the meeting, the kinds of projects that the Urban Planning program has done with community partners were highlighted in the materials presented at the beginning of the meeting. The breakout groups offered this advice about class projects.

- Bring the neighborhood into projects earlier so that it is planning "with" rather than "for".
  - Ensure that the project addresses an actual need in the community.
  - Create more connections with developers so that projects are more complete and connected to community needs.
- Conduct projects with an impact that neighbors can see.
  - Resources for implementation (funding or in-kind) are identified in advance of the project.
- Use projects to build the neighborhood's own planning capacity, knowledge, and buy-in.
  - For example, provide assistance in developing organizational programs and board development.
  - Train community members in community engagement techniques and skills.
  - Assist businesses in building skills, e.g., Word, Excel, and use of publicly accessible mapping and data tools.
  - Provide assistance to community groups in reaching out to other community groups.
- Conduct mini focus groups or charrettes with the community and businesses, working in collaboration with neighborhood-based organizations.
- Provide data for smaller organizations to support their planning.

- Create a community development alliance, engaging many parts of UWM and other local university partners.
- Address the bigger issues behind crime: police-community relations and the challenges of finding work with a criminal record.

Specific Project Ideas

The participants at the meeting identified a variety of projects that would address the goals of eliminating racial and ethnic disparities.

- Co-op home ownership plans and policies
- Jobs and workforce initiatives to eliminate the spatial mismatch
- Hold community dialogues using the Medical College of Wisconsin's model; they do not have capacity to reach all neighborhoods, nor does the Urban Planning program— Collaborate.
- Actively participate in the MKE United effort to assist the City in setting a small number of priorities and assisting in getting neighborhoods to pull together on reaching priorities.
    - Bring block and neighborhood conversations "up" and into higher level conversations, to connect across neighborhoods and organizations.
    - Act as a connector for different community groups (and the private sector) to collaborate.
- Facilitate community meetings so that community members are part of the decision-making process throughout planning and development projects.
    - Work with the City and developers to get the neighborhood voice into project planning early and to work on job training programs for neighborhood members while the project is being planned.
    - Facilitate inter-generational conversations.
- Work on renderings for neighborhoods.
- Do site or neighborhood charrettes at lower cost than CDS charrettes.
- Work with BIDs and neighborhoods on communicating neighborhood identity and "brand".

Research and Data Projects

Much of what our planning students need to learn relates to research, data, and turning data into information that is useful to communities. The participants offered lots of ideas about how our program can link our students' learning needs with the neighborhoods' data and information needs.

- Conduct systematic follow-up on neighborhood plans (whether a plan was done by the City, by MUP students or by others).
    - What was implemented?
    - Lessons learned?

- o Do pre- and post-implementation assessment: evaluations, economic impact of development changes in an area
- Be a resource for survey research and interviews with neighborhood members
  - o Must be developed in collaboration with neighborhood stakeholders
  - o Work with communities to do Community Asset Mapping
    - ▪ Create a neighborhood "211"-style directory of neighborhood organizations
- Document the experiences of people within systems to understand the real barriers to change
- Help with communications and marketing of neighborhoods and businesses
- Create presentations about local case studies and best practices to show block groups ideas that they could pursue in their own areas
- Map small areas with data that reflects community needs and trends
- Identify buildings that local groups could share for activities of various kinds
- Marshall data to reduce negative perceptions of the neighborhoods since the perceptions are often more negative than the realities

Communication Efforts

A number of recommendations from meeting participants relate to improving communication. These ideas fell into three main categories:

Communicating about Urban Planning and UWM Resources

- Answers to "what do urban planners do and what does the program do?" should be clear to the community.
- Communicate lists projects in Milwaukee carried out by the Urban Planning program and summarize lessons learned.
- Communicate to community stakeholders the completed Projects and Research outlined above.
- Hold an annual showcase of community-based projects by students from across UWM, not just Urban Planning.
- Assist SEWRPC in communicating regional-scale plans to neighborhood stakeholders and their potential role in implementing parts of the plan that fit their mission and priorities.

Communication Strategies

- Add video, broadcasting, and multimedia to tell the story of plans and recommendations.
- Redefine "urban" to remove negative connotations.
  - o Suggestion: Change program name to City and Neighborhood Planning.
- Create an email blast to networks, including how to hire student interns and how to have a project carried out with your community; create a central portal, ideally for all UWM community-engaged activities.

- Conduct workshops with neighborhood organizations on how urban planning benefits them; have past community clients present to show how the services and plans were used by them.

Communicating for Recruiting for Diversity

- Tell stories of working planners and architects who are people of color and women: "How did they get here?"

Youth Engagement

Youth engagement was a theme heard from most of the breakout groups. Youth engagement in planning has emerged as a win-win-win strategy.

- Community youth learn about the impact that they can have on their neighborhoods and their own lives through planning activities.
- Community youth learn about planning as a career path and how their participation in the planning profession could transform the profession and, more importantly, change neighborhoods where misguided public policies and neglect have left them struggling.
- For urban planning students, working with neighborhood youth on community planning and development projects would be the kind of project-based learning that is most valuable to any student.
- And finally, urban planning students would gain an invaluable experience working alongside people who our students know too often primarily as statistics from the census and other data sources. This experience would be transformational to them as students and future professionals. We believe that this engagement--working with youth on planning--will transform the ways in which they work with urban neighborhoods after graduation.

Strategies

- Do presentations for MPS students to expose them to urban planning and related career paths.
- Engage neighborhood youth in planning activities:
  - Data collection, like neighborhood audits
  - Community engagement
  - Design and planning
- Ask businesses to identify 1-2 teenagers in their communities and pair them with a graduate student to work on planning-related activities.
- Create an MPS "daycamp" about planning.
  - Intensify the expand the PUPs program (the UWM Urban Planning pre-college program for middle or high school students). PUPs stands for Pre-Urban Planners Preparing Urban Problem Solutions.
  - Consider working with smaller numbers of students at a time, but engaging more intensively.
  - Consider working with middle school students rather than high school students.
- Explore how the program might use Earn and Learn students to achieve the kinds of engagement discussed above.

Alumni Board Focus Group

Department Chair Nancy Frank met with the UWM Alumni Association, Urban Planning Chapter Alumni Board. Eight alumni attended the discussion that followed their regular board meeting.

The focus of discussion was on strategies for raising funds and targeting funding to attract a more diverse student body. The alumni believe that employers are urgently concerned about the need to diversify the planning workforce in the Milwaukee area and will be willing to support a scholarship aimed at increasing the number of under-represented minorities in the MUP student body. Nancy Frank shared the program's commitment to once again offer the $8000 Chancellor's award (which includes a Non-Resident Tuition Remission) toward this goal. The other idea that received substantial report was to raise funds equivalent to a .33 graduate assistantship to be awarded to a bachelor-degree holding mid-career professional working in one of Milwaukee's (or other urban area) organizations working on community development issues in segregated neighborhoods experiencing concentrated poverty and other social stresses.