

**University of Wisconsin–Madison  
Reaccreditation Self-Study**

---

**Team 1:  
Rethinking the Public Research  
University**

**Report Submitted by Co-Chairs  
Michael F. Bernard-Donals, Professor of English  
Robert D. Mathieu, Professor of Astronomy**

## Team Members

Emily Auerbach, Professor, Division of Continuing Studies and Department of English  
Michael Bernard-Donals, Chair, Department of English (Team co-chair)  
David Bethea, Chair, Department of Slavic Languages and Literature  
Gilles Bousquet, Dean, Division of International Studies  
Barbara Bowers, Associate Dean, School of Nursing  
Hardin Coleman, Associate Dean, School of Education, Professor, Department of Counseling  
Psychology  
Michael Collins, Professor, Department of Pathobiological Sciences  
Hector DeLuca, Professor, Department of Biochemistry, and Department of Biomolecular  
Chemistry  
Sharon Dunwoody, Associate Dean, Graduate School; Professor, School of Journalism and Mass  
Communication  
Susan Hagness, Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Charles Hoslet, Director, Office of Corporate Relations  
Deborah Jenson, Director, Center for the Humanities; Associate Professor, Department of French  
and Italian  
Mike Knetter, Dean, School of Business  
Brent Maddux, Graduate Student, Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, L&S  
Robert Mathieu, University Committee Chair; Professor, Department of Astronomy, L&S (Team  
co-chair)  
Steve Nadler, Chair, Department of Philosophy  
Javier Nieto, Chair, Department of Population Health Sciences  
Ken Potter, Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering  
Pam Ruegg, Professor, Department of Dairy Science  
John Sharpless, Professor, Department of History  
Peyton Smith, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Extended Programs, Office of the Provost  
Tom Still, President, Wisconsin Technology Council  
Dick Wagner, UW–Madison Alumnus  
Randy Wallar, Associate Director, Morgridge Center  
Anne Whisner, Civic Engagement Coordinator, Morgridge Center  
Mathilde Andrejko, Project Assistant, Reaccreditation Project (note-taker)  
Maury Cotter, Director, Office of Quality Improvement (facilitator)

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Wisconsin-Madison is both a great research university and a great public university. Through the power of the Wisconsin Idea, these two roles merge to create a great **public research** university. In this context, the definition of being public is *a mutual commitment between the UW–Madison and the people of Wisconsin to support and enhance one another and the global community.*

A great public research university must address great public challenges and goals. In the next decade, we seek to more intentionally couple the intellectual capacity of the university with the identified needs of the state, the nation, and the world. For UW–Madison to enhance its role as the exemplar of a great public research university into the twenty-first century, faculty, staff, and students must see and embrace their roles as contributing to the public good, and must engage with the issues and opportunities that face the people of both Wisconsin and the global community.

Our overarching recommendation for the next decade calls for the **UW–Madison to more strongly embrace the Wisconsin Idea for the public good, and to demonstrate that our connections and responsibilities with the people of Wisconsin and the global community are opportunities for the very best work that a great public research university can do.**

We will foster aligned and sustained public work by faculty, students and staff; build partnerships with the public; enhance public access to the opportunities and resources of the university; and change our organizational and reward structures to encourage public work. Our educational mission is one of our strongest embodiments of the Wisconsin Idea.

The university's current work is already rich in engaged citizenship and demonstrates the power of good ideas applied to solving social, economic, health, educational, environmental, and other challenges faced by people in Wisconsin and across the globe. We also recognize the public good of the university's commitment to ensuring that hardworking, talented Wisconsin students, regardless of background and means, can obtain one of the finest educations, and degrees, and degrees in the world. The UW–Madison begins the twenty-first century from a position of impressive tradition and strength.

We nonetheless assert that UW–Madison has substantial untapped ability to address the opportunities and issues identified by the state and global publics. We also assert that engaging that capacity will require intentional commitment and action by the university community to advance the public good. Finally, we assert that such a commitment will lead to enhanced prestige and recognition of UW–Madison in research, in education, and in leadership for all public research universities. In ten years, the UW–Madison will attract—and produce—the finest **public intellectuals**: scholars, researchers, teachers, and students who intentionally connect their intellectual power to serving the public good.

We have in our midst at UW–Madison remarkable talent and knowledge by which to join with the public in this work. Still needed is a new model for the university that aligns that talent and fosters interdisciplinary engagement of the UW–Madison community with major public issues.

## A. Recommendations: What We Do

### **1. Aligned and Sustained Public Work**

We seek systemic and enduring impact for the public good. This goal will require, and motivate, interdisciplinary connection across the campus, a long-standing strategic goal of the university.

1.1 Develop and implement interdisciplinary systems that enable aligned and sustained engagement of the university with public opportunities and challenges.

1.2 Develop funding and resource models that promote aligned, sustained engagement on timelines appropriate to the goals.

1.3 Develop a broad, inclusive understanding of the role of the humanities and the arts within coherent, sustained engagement for the public good.

1.4 Focus university-wide attention on a select few of the foremost public opportunities and challenges.

### **2. Partnerships with the Public**

We envision establishing a highly collaborative relationship between the university and the public. Being a public research university means having public conversations and establishing public relationships.

2.1 Establish ongoing and mutual communication with the public.

2.2 Develop modes of operation to work collaboratively with the public.

2.3 Develop institutional partnerships for impact throughout Wisconsin.

2.4 Enhance knowledge transfer to bring economic benefit to the public.

### **3. Expanded Access of the Public to the Opportunities and Resources of UW–Madison**

The UW–Madison is a resource of and for the people of Wisconsin. All Wisconsin residents – whether or not they are enrolled students at UW–Madison—should have access to the teaching, research, and other benefits of the university. In return, access of the public brings diverse perspectives to the campus.

3.1 Enhance financial aid programs as one of the highest priorities of the UW–Madison.

3.2 Invest in programs and technology to broaden public access to the university.

3.3 Become the trusted and accessible source of expertise for the public.

3.4 Expand the sharing of academic programs and courses with other universities in Wisconsin, regionally, and beyond.

#### **4. Engaged Students Serving the Public**

Forty thousand students represent tremendous capacity for connecting the knowledge and research capability of the university, and of the students themselves, to the public. We seek to increase the role of students in connecting the *intellectual capacity* of the UW–Madison in public work.

4.1 Embed the Wisconsin Idea in student recruitment and admissions.

4.2 Integrate the Wisconsin Idea throughout the academic and nonacademic student experiences.

4.3 Work with the state of Wisconsin to develop programs that encourage UW–Madison students to stay in or return to Wisconsin after their education.

#### **5. Recognition of the Impact of UW–Madison for the Public Good**

Exceptional public work already occurs at UW–Madison. Making widely known the public work of the university is critical to developing support, trust, and further opportunities with the public.

5.1 Develop and support more powerful strategies of communicating our public work to members of our public.

#### **B. Recommendations: Systems That Enable**

To accomplish these goals, significant changes must occur in the university’s governance and organizational structures, its rewards systems, the way it implements budgets and allocates funds, and the infrastructure that supports that work. *Public* work requires easy movement between the academic center of the university and the public domain outside, and it requires that faculty and staff be able to forge relationships with the public and with one another across disciplines. We make the following recommendations for systems that will enable coherent and sustainable engagement with the public.

#### **6. Organizational Structures**

6.1 Develop criteria for merging, reorganizing, and regrouping departments, centers, colleges, and units to better promote interdisciplinary public work.

6.2 Make clear that the UW–Madison wishes to hire more faculty who value the Wisconsin Idea and public work.

6.3 Create an administrative structure that increases awareness of and connects the excellent public work across the entire university.

## **7. Rewards**

7.1 Create a task force, reporting to the provost and the Faculty Senate, to develop guidelines and criteria that will adequately protect and reward faculty at all ranks who engage in high-quality research and teaching that involve explicitly public work.

7.2 Align the criteria and policies of Divisional Committees and other university structures (including those in the departments) that oversee the granting of tenure, promotion, and mentoring in a way that gives meaningful weight to intellectual work done in the public sphere.

7.3 Define the extent to which units must include considerations of public research and scholarship in their criteria for merit and other professional rewards.

7.4 Establish rewards for excellent work in the public sphere—like the Hamel Family Fellowships—that have the prestige and the dollar equivalents to current WARF awards that principally value pure research (e.g., Romnes, Kellett, WARF named professorships).

## **8. Budget and Funds**

8.1 Design greater flexibility in budgeting lines.

8.2 Develop criteria for budgeting decisions that promote public work.

8.3 Establish grant support for addressing issues of importance to the public.

8.4 Develop cost-sharing strategies that do not disadvantage units whose public work does not generate significant revenue.

## **9. Processes and Infrastructure**

9.1 Fully invest in CIC broadband.

9.2 Make better use of technology to avoid redundancy, to share resources, and to increase access.

9.3 Streamline industry-sponsored research agreements.

The responsibility of the UW–Madison in the twenty-first century to benefit both the people of Wisconsin and the global community represents a powerful opportunity to leverage alignments of local and global work. We envision an implementation of the Wisconsin Idea in which the **state of Wisconsin becomes our laboratory for the world, and in which the world is our laboratory for Wisconsin**. The research and education achievements of the UW–Madison on behalf of and in concert with the people of Wisconsin will be internationally recognized and respected.

## **II. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

### **A. Foundational Ideas**

The Wisconsin Idea in the twenty-first century carries a tension between our responsibilities and connections to the local and global publics. In this tension is an exciting vitality for the university that serves well both Wisconsin and the world.

A great public research university must address great public challenges and goals. In the next decade, we seek to increase the University of Wisconsin–Madison’s public roles, and to more intentionally couple the intellectual capacity of the university with the identified needs of the state and the world. Ultimately, our connections and responsibilities to the people of Wisconsin and to the global community are opportunities for the very best work that a great public research university can do.

The UW–Madison is one of the world’s great research universities, and one of the nation’s great public universities. For the UW–Madison to enhance its role as a great **public research** university over the next ten years and on into the twenty-first century, faculty, staff, and students must see and embrace their roles as contributing to the public good, and be engaged with the issues and opportunities that face the people of both the Wisconsin and the global communities.

Our definition of “public” in this context is “a mutual engagement between the university and the people of Wisconsin to support and enhance one another and the global community.” We see this definition as an extension of the Wisconsin Idea, promulgated at the beginning of the last century, which held that the boundaries of the university were the boundaries of the state, and which explicitly committed the university to serve all the people of the state. One hundred years later, the Wisconsin Idea remains vital in spirit and importance.

Given the global connections of knowledge and information, of economies, of channels of communication, and of people, the original exposition of the Wisconsin Idea has become limited in scope. The Wisconsin Idea of the twenty-first century must recognize the close connections of Wisconsin and global issues, and affirm the symbiotic relationships of their solutions. The broadened responsibility of the UW–Madison to benefit both the people of Wisconsin and the global community adds an exciting vitality that well serves the university, the state of Wisconsin, and the world.

**Our overarching recommendation for the next decade calls for UW–Madison to more strongly embrace the Wisconsin Idea for the public good, and to demonstrate that our connections and responsibilities with the people of Wisconsin and the global community are opportunities for the very best work that a great public research university can do.**

UW–Madison comprises a remarkable collection of talented individuals—faculty, staff, and students— committed to the public good. We have found the university’s current work to be exemplary of engaged citizenship and of the power of good ideas applied to social, economic, health, educational, environmental, and other needs in Wisconsin and across the globe. We also recognize the public good of the university’s commitment to ensuring that hardworking, talented

Wisconsin students, regardless of background and means, can obtain one of the finest educations and degrees in the world. The UW–Madison begins the twenty-first century from a position of impressive tradition and strength.

That said, we assert that the UW–Madison has substantial untapped capacity to address the rich opportunities and pressing challenges of the state and global publics. We also assert that applying that capacity will require an intentional commitment by the university community to embrace its capability to advance the public good. This is not an “apple pie” statement without consequences. In fact, the implications for how the UW–Madison functions would be major and demanding. Such a commitment of the university will lead to enhanced prestige and recognition of the UW–Madison in research, in education, and in leadership among public research universities.

In this report we provide key ideas, specific recommendations, and approaches for the UW–Madison such that *all* members of the university community have the opportunity to apply some facets of their work to the public good. Our recommendations are designed to allow members of the university and the public to work together across disciplinary, community, and bureaucratic boundaries; make the UW–Madison a public space in which members of the university and the greater community share a physical space and common intellectual and civic ideas; and make the UW–Madison accessible to all who wish to make use of its resources and the expertise found among its students, faculty, and staff.

In ten years, the UW–Madison will attract—and produce—**public intellectuals**: scholars, researchers, teachers, and students who intentionally connect their intellectual power to serving the public good. Students, faculty, and staff of the UW–Madison and the people of Wisconsin will see themselves as collaborating for a better Wisconsin and a better world. And throughout the world, the UW–Madison will be recognized as a truly great *public research* university.

## B. Publicity: Why the Wisconsin Idea Is Still Important

In today’s world, publicity usually means the gaining of attention, and is equated with celebrity. Here we use a more classical meaning of “publicity”: the conditions that create a public space where civic engagement and the free and vigorous exchange of ideas, regardless of the status of the people advancing them, foster a greater good for the individuals so engaged. One of the most significant meanings of “public” resonates back to the 1861 Morrill Act’s insistence that land grant universities should serve the sons and daughters of the working class. The Morrill Act meant to provide practical training in the arts and sciences that would serve the growing middle class, and to provide students with a clear sense of the contemporary culture, language, and skills that they would need to succeed as fully involved members of the public sphere.

The Morrill Act and the GI Bill of 1944 are among the most significant and successful contemporary public initiatives in support of higher education for the broad public good. We approach the centennial anniversary (2012) of *The Wisconsin Idea* by Charles McCarthy, within which President Theodore Roosevelt wrote that “all through the Union, we need to learn the Wisconsin lesson of scientific popular self-help, and of patient care in radical legislation.” This is



a propitious time to recognize and reaffirm that the ideas of the Morrill Act form the very foundation of who we are as the UW–Madison.

We also stress that the greatness and international reputation of the UW–Madison as a research university rest upon these roots. Many accomplishments for which the UW–Madison is most renowned spring from the ideals of the Wisconsin Idea. These include applications of Vitamin D, shared university governance, iodized salt, the conceptualization of Social Security and Worker’s Compensation, *The Dictionary of American Regional English*, blood-thinning drugs, the Innocence Project, development of Fast Plants, and pioneering stem cell research.

As we begin the twenty-first century, we assert that it is vital that the UW–Madison remains aligned with its foundational ideals. We see the UW–Madison as a premier research university in the country *because of* its willingness to engage with the public, to provide an education whose outcome is critical to economic health and citizenship, and to include members of the public in its mission—not just those who gain admission to the university but also those who share in its goals to foster the public good.

We cite four reasons why the Wisconsin Idea and, more broadly, explicit recognition of our *publicity* remain essential to a vital future for the UW–Madison.

### **1. As the UW–Madison, each of us bears a covenant with the state.**

Each reaccreditation of the university has an obligation to (re)affirm that we are the University of *Wisconsin*–Madison. That bond to the state ties us to the past, to the present, and to the future. Our origin as a state land-grant university has already been noted. Lest 150 years seem too long of a time to reach back for definition of who we are, our current commitments to the state are seen everywhere on campus: at the Teacher Education building; at Agricultural Hall, and the barns of west campus; at the UW Hospital, and the MedFlight helicopter flying overhead; and the 25,000 students from Wisconsin as classes change. The new Wisconsin Idea in Action database currently lists more than 600 outreach initiatives ([www.searchwisconsinidea.wisc.edu/index.pl](http://www.searchwisconsinidea.wisc.edu/index.pl)).

Equally important, the university’s commitments to Wisconsin are seen throughout the state: 90 percent of the pharmacists in the state; 3,000 nurses and 1,800 librarians, in most every town; thirteen agricultural research stations; more than 6,000 K–12 teachers and principals across the state; touring artists; Cooperative Extension offices and faculty in every county; respected voices and programs on Wisconsin Public Radio; alumni among business and civic leadership.

The UW–Madison today represents the cumulative investment of the people of Wisconsin and of the university over more than 150 years. In recognition of those who came before us, each of us bears responsibility for maintaining and enhancing the Wisconsin Idea for the future university community and the future people of the state. We are a public trust.

### **2. The Wisconsin Idea is an essential component of our identity.**

The UW–Madison is one of the world’s great research universities. That said, it is not the only great research university, or indeed the only great state research university. So we find ourselves always competing with others for the very best in faculty, students, and staff. In terms of funds, we typically do not compete from a position of strength.

Nonetheless, we often succeed in attracting the very best, specifically because we are the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Part of being the UW–Madison is of course a tradition in forefront research, a dedication to the best in education, our pledge of academic freedom, and our setting in a wonderful city by the lakes. But a major part of being the UW–Madison is an internationally recognized identity for commitment to the public good, for commitment to the people. Great public intellectuals choose to come to the UW–Madison because of the Wisconsin Idea, because of our land-grant history, because of our tradition of shared governance by all.

However, great ideas are emulated by others. The UW–Madison is not the only university with a strong commitment to the public good. Without a major recommitment to leadership in the Wisconsin Idea, we will assuredly lose that competitive advantage.

### **3. There is much need in the state and the world.**

Together, UW–Madison and the people of Wisconsin face many opportunities and challenges. It is critically important to create a knowledgeable citizenry that contributes to the public good and engages in that public discourse required for a vital democracy. It is equally important that the basic research and applied work of the university contribute centrally to resolving major public challenges and developing rich public opportunities. Finally, the university must illuminate and bridge the cultural and economic differences and disparities that both enable and prevent people from working together. *In short, the UW–Madison must be an engine for the public good.* We have in our midst at the UW–Madison the talent, the knowledge and the will to join with the public in this work. It is much needed.

### **4. Engagement with the needs of the state is politically essential.**

The people of Wisconsin provide 20 percent of the operating funds of the university, including 75 percent of faculty salaries. Even though the level of state funding in absolute dollars regrettably has decreased, the support of the people of the state remains the foundation for both the education and the research missions of the university.

In this context, the recent findings of Professor Kathy Cramer Walsh are a concern. She visited a wide array of Wisconsin communities beyond a fifty-mile radius from Madison, where she asked—in coffee houses, gas stations, VFW halls, and community centers—what people think of when they think about the UW–Madison. The answers were telling. First, most people really *didn’t* think much about the UW–Madison. Those who did thought about Badger sports first, followed by medical research (particularly the stem-cell work recently in the news), and the university’s high reputation as an educational institution. To a large extent, they did not see the UW–Madison as playing a role in their lives, with the exception of possibly educating their children. Our conversations with legislators similarly revealed a primary, if not sole, emphasis on

the UW–Madison’s educational role. That the university might represent a source of knowledge and methodologies relevant to the issues with which they were wrestling was largely absent.

At the same time, a University Committee survey of the UW–Madison faculty found that the issue most often cited as requiring shared-governance attention was university relations with the state (and especially the legislature). We suggest that the findings of both Professor Cramer-Walsh and the University Committee are closely connected, and all the more accentuated in tight economic times. We also suggest that the resolution of both, as well as the future vitality of the university, will be linked to the people of the state seeing the UW–Madison, through *both* education and research, as a major contributor to solutions for the state’s needs rather than yet another challenge to the state’s limited budgets.

### C. The Current Context for Implementing the Wisconsin Idea

In order to move the Wisconsin Idea into the twenty-first century, it is necessary to acknowledge several substantial challenges to its implementation. In 2007, about 30 percent of the UW–Madison budget—more than \$650 million—was provided by sponsored research, primarily through federal funding. This research funding is a tremendous benefit for Wisconsin. Most of the funds are expended in the state, and the advances in knowledge benefit all people. Nonetheless, much of the funding is not for research directly targeted at addressing issues in Wisconsin, which limits the freedom of the investigators to also turn their intellectual attention toward the Wisconsin public. Solving this challenge will require a change in mindset within the university community, and within funding sources.<sup>1</sup> The degree to which research on reducing diabetes in Uganda will benefit the people of Wisconsin depends on our intentionality in making that connection.

Similarly, in many disciplines professional prestige and promotion are largely if not entirely divorced from direct public impact, and even when public impact is considered, impact on Wisconsin per se is not favored preferentially. This is true both internationally *and* within the university itself. Thus it is a rare letter of recommendation for promotion or a rare highly prestigious award (consider, e.g., the Romnes, Kellett, Vilas, and Hilldale awards) that emphasizes achievement beyond research accomplishment. Such a reward system does not promote commitment to public roles of the university.

A different challenge rests upon the recent difficulties in UW–Madison and UW System relationship with some state policy makers. In discussions with state legislators, with the Wisconsin Alumni Association Board, and with residents as highlighted in Professor Cramer Walsh’s study, time and again we were told that a major obstacle to supporting the public work of UW–Madison is a lack of trust: in the university’s leadership, in the university’s faculty, and in the mission of the university (which is seen by some as elitist). Among policy makers who support our work, several said that they don’t know (or know enough) about the public work that

---

<sup>1</sup> The broader impact criterion of the National Science Foundation is both an example of the possibility of systemic changes in behavior and an opportunity for funding of research applied to the public good in Wisconsin. Similarly, the new National Institutes of Health Roadmap emphasizes funding for research that focuses on the translation of scientific discoveries into practical applications to better public health. Might, for example, WARF/Research Committee funding similarly foster broader impact?

is currently taking place, and questioned whether we are sending the right people to talk with them about it. Clearly, serving the public good will require strengthening our relationship with the public. This is another dimension of being a public trust.

Of course, exceptional public work already takes place at UW–Madison, in which members of the university community are fully engaged with the people of Wisconsin. The Morgridge Center for Public Service, the Center for the Humanities, the Gaylord Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies, the Wisconsin Partnership for a Healthy Future, and many others focus on the public dimension of the university’s work. Our continuing education enterprise served 161,353 learners (2006–07) seeking professional development and personal enrichment in more than 2,000 noncredit programs. Our extensive academic and sports precollege programs draw in some 14,000 youth each year. Attendance at UW–Madison arts events both on campus and throughout the state is about 150,000 people annually.

However, because of the size of the university and its decentralized structures, this public work is often unknown even to members of the university community. The lack of effective systems to align these efforts is ultimately inefficient and expensive, and substantially raises the bar for broad participation (by both the university and public communities) and for the development of new initiatives.

Finally, explicit in our definition of “public” is a responsibility of UW–Madison to benefit both the people of Wisconsin and the global community. To a certain extent this requires finding a balance between efforts that may compete for resources. We suggest that this also represents a powerful opportunity to connect local and global work whose net impact is greater than the sum of the parts. We envision an implementation of the Wisconsin Idea in which the state of Wisconsin becomes our laboratory for the world, and in which the world is our laboratory for Wisconsin. The research and education achievements of UW–Madison on behalf of and in concert with the people of Wisconsin will be internationally recognized and respected.

#### D. Charge to Team 1: Rethinking the Public University

Our charge was to rethink and define the meaning of “public research university,” the concept that underlies the entire reaccreditation initiative. The charge notes that “the separate ideas encompassed by the terms ‘public,’ ‘research,’ and ‘university’ are fundamental.” The team undertook specifically the question of how the public status and role of UW–Madison can enhance its leadership as a great public research university.

Specific questions in the charge included:

- What will define the “public research university” of the future?
- Who is our public?
- How can (or how should) the university be of service to the public?
- How can the university be seen as a public space?
- How can the university become more accessible to and better serve the people of Wisconsin?

- How can the Wisconsin Idea guide our definition of our future role and responsibility to the state of Wisconsin in a global society?

The team was also charged to consider cross-cutting themes such as diversity, technology, and systems that enable. The issue of diversity is integral to the question of access that we have considered at length—to what extent can we better provide access to all those who wish to become involved in the university’s work? Broadly, we seek in our recommendations for the university to be a leveler across the state for access to a wide variety of opportunities, including but not limited to education. We also consider diversity issues with respect to those who have easy access to knowledge (especially through modern technology) and those who do not. The question of systems that enable (and to some extent prevent) the very best public work is addressed extensively in our report in terms of budgeting, rewards systems, governance, and other university structures (such as the organization of colleges, divisions, and departments).

#### E. Approach to Our Work

Team 1 was composed of twenty-three people representing a broad cross-section of the university and local communities, including faculty from the colleges of Agricultural and Life Sciences, Engineering, and Letters and Science, and the schools of Business, Education, Medicine and Public Health, Nursing, and Veterinary Medicine, and the divisions of Continuing Studies and International Studies; academic staff members from university administration; community members and alumni of the UW–Madison; and a student representative (who changed during our work). The team met nine times between October 2007 and February 2008. Team meetings were facilitated by the directors of the Office of Quality Improvement and reaccreditation staff.

At its first meeting, the team discussed its charge, had a freewheeling and open discussion about the idea of the public research university, and created a schedule of six subsequent two-hour meetings. During these meetings, the team heard from other representatives from across the university whose units and areas represented a wide array of implementations of the Wisconsin Idea, including Cooperative Extension, the School of Medicine and Public Health, the Morgridge Center of Public Service, and the Center for the Humanities.

The team undertook to identify key constituencies of the university in the state of Wisconsin, ultimately settling upon communities and people, policy makers, the private sector, and students. The team also defined three key facets of the university’s work—education, research, and engagement/problem solving. Here we made the (admittedly boundaryless) distinction between research purely for the advancement of knowledge and research with the express purpose of addressing a real-world problem.

The team then subdivided into four working groups according to constituency, with the overarching charge of determining “What do we do? With whom?” We emphasize the wording “With whom?” From the very beginning it was clear that a theme of our work was going to be the importance of a mutual, collaborative relationship between the university and the public. The working groups met to define their constituencies, to undertake research on university work being done with those constituencies, and to meet with members of those constituencies. In this

effort we were aided enormously by the contemporaneous work of the Wisconsin Idea Project and its resulting database and by the Office of Human Resources. Each working group created a document that defined its constituency, identified the key issues of importance to its constituency, and made key recommendations on how the university might work more effectively with the public (as defined, in part by that constituency), including specifically which systems would need to be transformed in order to do this work.

The team concluded with a four-hour retreat at which members distilled and integrated the key ideas and recommendations, and discussed the changes required to achieve these goals. Sections III and IV of this report present the key ideas and specific recommendations, respectively, of the team. Between November and February, members of the team met with key legislative members to discuss their perception of the university's public mission, as well as key issues facing the state.

### III. VISION FOR THE FUTURE

What should be our bold visions as we move forward in the next ten years at UW–Madison? How can we make the university a more explicitly *public* entity, working with the people of the state and the broader global community? How can we ensure that our students see the education gained here as having a real impact upon the lives of the people of the state of Wisconsin, or the states in which they will work, or upon the global agenda? How can we promote faculty and staff work that is thoroughly engaged in the public sphere and has applicability to the issues of importance for the state and global communities? How can we reward such work in a way that continues to promote and ensure scholarly and intellectual excellence?

#### A. Key Ideas

Five ideas compel us, and provide the framework for the recommendations that follow.

#### 1. Aligned and Sustained Public Work

While it is impossible for us to appraise all the activities that UW–Madison faculty, staff and students undertake each year on behalf of the people of Wisconsin, the result would surely be inspiring. That said, because of the short duration of the funding support for many of these activities, especially in cases of external funding, many of these initiatives might be characterized as “1,000 points of flashing light.” A common concern expressed by Wisconsin communities is that our interventions have been too brief to accomplish their goals.

In addition, our investigations show that it is common for multiple parts of the university to be working with the same constituency, unbeknownst to one another. This situation describes a missed opportunity for systemic and enduring impact, *and* a missed opportunity for interdisciplinary connection across the campus, a long-standing strategic goal of the university.

**This situation calls for a bold new model for the UW–Madison that promotes aligned and sustained engagement of the university with major public issues.** Specifically, the university should move aggressively toward:

- systemic approaches toward public issues
- interdisciplinary coherence of public work
- adequate durations of engagement for sustained impact

Arguably, these goals might be stated for almost any initiative of the university. We suggest that compelling public opportunities and challenges can provide the common human bond to motivate the major changes necessary to supersede disciplinary and organizational boundaries.

These goals are embedded in a vision for the UW–Madison in which our public engagement is highly integrated within the mission, the organizational structures, and the daily business of the university. We are not suggesting merely the addition of an “Institute of Public Research” or a peripheral “Office of Public Outreach.” *In our vision, conversations, plans, and actions in every corner of the university will include public engagement in the same way that they currently include teaching and research.* Furthermore, these conversations will cross the university community. Ultimately, it will be the very integration of teaching, research, and public engagement across the campus that will mark the UW–Madison as a remarkable public research university.

## 2. Partnerships with the Public

Often, scholars at the UW–Madison select and pursue their work according to personal interests and external funding opportunities; thereafter they make their work public—for example, through public talks, seminars with stakeholders, teaching in K–12 schools, perhaps public writing or exposure through the media. This unidirectional approach to the Wisconsin Idea is implicit in the word “outreach.” Such outreach is an important role of a public university, for in so doing the university provides discovery and intellectual leadership, opens new windows for the public, and identifies key directions for the common good. The current scope and breadth of outreach activities by the university community is outstanding.

As a complement to this approach, **we envision also establishing a highly collaborative relationship between the university and the public.** In the best spirit of the Wisconsin Idea, the UW–Madison should work *with* the public to identify major opportunities and challenges toward which we could direct our intellectual energy in concert with members of the public. Our constituents know well the challenges and opportunities that face them, and their voices can help guide the intellectual energies of the university. At the same time, the university should provide insights that anticipate the opportunities and challenges of the future for the public. Thus we suggest that being a public research university requires having public conversations and establishing public relationships.

Equally important, and currently less developed, the UW–Madison should work *with* the public to develop and implement solutions and to take advantage of opportunities. At their best, the UW–Madison has much to offer the people of Wisconsin, and the people of Wisconsin have much to offer the UW–Madison. Either working alone is limited by perspective, by knowledge, and by person power. By working in partnership, with the public, other institutions of higher

education, the private sector, or government agencies, the benefits of the UW–Madison for Wisconsin will be amplified manyfold.

### **3. Expanded Public Accessibility to the Opportunities and Resources of UW–Madison**

The UW–Madison is a resource of and for the people of Wisconsin. It is the people’s university to which the people should have access. Of course, a primary access route will be as students at the UW–Madison, but all people should have access to the teaching, research, and other benefits of the university. In addition, access of the public brings valuable and diverse perspectives to the campus.

“Accessibility” means that there should be no walls between the university and the public, whether physical, organizational or psychological. Rather, the university should build bridges to the public. While the UW–Madison remains one of the most selective public universities in the country, it should not be seen as an exclusive university. The public should understand that resources at the UW–Madison are attainable, approachable, and accessible. Similarly, the university’s physical landscape should be welcoming to all people, as it is their university.

An important goal is to spread access to the university more evenly throughout the state. The broad reach of new information technologies greatly increases the opportunities for access at a distance, and allows the university to serve both the state and global publics. However, it is essential that we recognize the widening divide between the haves and have-nots with respect to digital technology and access. Furthermore, the value of access via personal contact—even if only by voice or image—must not be minimized in a world where such interaction is less and less available.

An equally important goal is to spread access to the university more evenly across other dimensions of the public. We must always recognize and value that the demographics of the people of the state are in some ways different from those of the university. Twenty-five percent of the Wisconsin public have four-year college degrees; perhaps 7 percent have attended a research university. Forty-five percent of the Wisconsin public live outside cities, while 30 percent live in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. Four percent of the public are first-generation. Half have annual household incomes below \$49,000<sup>2</sup>. The university and these publics have much to learn from each other, but often are not yet comfortable with each other. Our recommendations for access seek to change that dynamic.

### **4. Engaged Students Serving the Public**

UW is rightfully proud of its long tradition of national leadership in placing students in service to the public, ranging from the Peace Corps and Teach for America to chief executive officers in the private sector. Forty-four percent of undergraduates participate in campus or community volunteer service. The Morgridge Center for Public Service is a leading example of the commitment of alumni, students, and the entire university to enhancing opportunities for students to serve the public good.

---

<sup>2</sup> 2006 Census Bureau’s *Statistical Abstract of the United States*  
<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2006/2006edition.html>



Nonetheless, the more than 40,000 students of the UW–Madison community represent a tremendous capacity for connecting the knowledge and research capability of the university, and of the students themselves, to the public, and vice versa. Much of this capacity remains untapped. We seek to enhance the role of students in connecting the intellectual capacity of the UW–Madison with the public.

Several principles must guide the implementation of this idea of enhancing the role of students in connecting the intellectual capacity of the university with the public. First and foremost, the best interests of the students are paramount. We must seek to identify opportunities that *both* add value to the experiences, education, and life paths of the students and enhance the public good.

Second, we specifically seek to connect the newly developed intellectual capacities of the students to the public good (in contrast to, but not replacing, service work). Through their work in classes, research experiences, and learning communities, the students of the UW–Madison carry with them the intellectual capital of the university. That intellectual investment and capability can be much more intentionally connected to the public good.

Third, engagement of students in the Wisconsin Idea occurs both during their time at UW and throughout their lives beyond UW. Thus our recommendations focus both on development and engagement while UW students and on continued service to the public, and especially to Wisconsin, both in the public and private sectors.

Finally, we stress the importance of both undergraduate and graduate students in the connection of the intellectual capacity of the UW–Madison with the public.

## **5. Recognition of the Impact of the UW–Madison on the Public Good**

Exceptional public work already occurs as the UW–Madison partners with members of the public and the global community to engage issues of local as well as global importance. This work can go unnoticed by all but those immediate publics involved, and indeed even in those cases the linkages to the UW–Madison are not always clear to the people involved (especially in the case of Extension activities). Making widely known the public work of the university is critical to developing support, trust, and further opportunities with the public.

### **B. What Success Would Look Like**

If these key ideas were to guide the UW–Madison what might the results look like in 2018?

- The UW–Madison will be a national model for innovative approaches to working with the public, and providing resources to the state and the global community. It will become, in other words, a model public research university for the twenty-first century.
- The partnerships of UW Madison and the public will have enhanced the university's international status and reputation.

- The UW–Madison will be a great public research university that serves the public good in both the state and the global communities.
- The UW–Madison will have effectively turned its attention to helping revitalize the city of Milwaukee in partnership with the Milwaukee public, with UW–Milwaukee and with other Milwaukee colleges and universities, and with an array of public and private sector entities.
- Our constituencies in the state will be aware that there are valuable resources on campus for their benefit.
- Policy makers (including state legislators) will have a greater understanding about the work done at the UW–Madison and how it is of public benefit.
- The UW–Madison will have established collaborations with other UW System institutions, businesses, and local organizations to engage with rural communities across the state, particularly those with higher levels of isolation and deprivation.
- The UW–Madison will continue to have a significant role in the development of new economic benefits for the state, originating directly from UW activities (start-up companies, new industry, etc.).
- The UW–Madison will have played a central role in improving K–12 education in the state.
- Wisconsin civic culture will be invigorated by an investment in the humanities and the arts, to the benefit of Wisconsin communities throughout the state.
- Challenges and opportunities for the state of Wisconsin will have been identified collaboratively, and the university will have found ways to deploy its intellectual energy toward them.
- People of the state will place their trust in the university, and will see it as an open and transparent institution. Equally important, the university community will place its trust in the public.
- The people of the state, and the university itself, will see the central role of the humanities and the arts in developing an educated, involved, and vital citizenry.
- Repeating Professor Cramer Walsh’s study will find that a greater number of people in the state can identify ways that the UW–Madison improves their lives.
- More faculty and staff will be engaged, through their research and teaching, in Wisconsin Idea work, and will be supported through (new) reward structures and systems that recognize the high value of this work.

- Students who wish to come to the UW–Madison, and turn their intellectual energies toward the state (either while they are at the university or after they graduate) will be encouraged and financially supported.
- All members of the university community—faculty, staff, students, and administrators—will know and value the Wisconsin Idea.
- More students who come to the university will stay in or return to the state after graduation.
- Faculty, staff and students working at the university and the public will see the state as a laboratory for addressing global problems.
- The student body at the UW–Madison will look more diverse, in terms of cultural background, in terms of economic background, in terms of the ratio of traditional and nontraditional students, and in terms of the students’ willingness to engage in work serving the public during and after their time at the university.

#### **IV. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

How do we accomplish all of this? We recommend the following actions, both in what we do as a public research university (section A), and in the systems and rewards structures that the university uses to promulgate its values (section B).

##### **A. Recommendations: What We Do**

These recommendations are organized within the five key ideas and are not intended to overlap with visions and recommendations coming out of other reaccreditation teams. Overlap is unintentional and serendipitous.

Because Teams 3 and 4 have been charged with making recommendations regarding shaping the global agenda of the university, our recommendations focus on initiatives with the Wisconsin public. Assuredly, these boundaries will be, and should be, very porous. Even so, we reaffirm that the UW–Madison bears a special responsibility to the Wisconsin public. Similarly, Team 2 has been charged to consider educational and research excellence, and so we presume and build on that excellence here. Forefront research and education must be primary goals of the UW–Madison, because both are necessary for the Wisconsin Idea to succeed.

##### **1. Aligned and sustained public work.**

**Recommendation 1.1: Develop and implement interdisciplinary systems that enable aligned and sustained engagement of the university with public opportunities and challenges.**

The UW-Madison is a highly decentralized organization that has been very effective in fostering the success of the individual researcher, typically with external funding that requires flexibility in order to follow the time-varying goals of funding agencies. We are proud of our successes with

this model, and rightly so. The challenge to the university is how to develop aligned and sustained effort without losing the strength of individual creativity and commitment, how to develop alignment across organizational structures, and how to maintain flexibility in response to advancing research and changing issues.

The answer to this challenge will require a campuswide intellectual, communal, and administrative effort to invent new approaches that enable interdisciplinary coherence and sustained engagement in public initiatives. We suggest that these “systems” will need to:

- foster systemic engagement with public issues
- promote intellectual excellence and forefront scholarship through public engagement
- integrate seamlessly with public partnerships
- reward public engagement
- facilitate cross-disciplinary research and communication
- link existing funding and personnel and create permeable boundaries for their flow across the university
- assign clear leadership and responsibility for engagement at all levels of the administration and shared governance, from faculty and staff to the chancellor
- apply the assessment capability of the university to measuring impact
- provide adequate management and administrative support to permit success
- be flexible to evolving research and public issues

In the course of our investigations, we heard numerous requests for this recommendation from leaders of public initiatives trying to develop coherent and sustained initiatives on their own. One such call came from Drs. John Frey and Patrick Remington of the School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH, whose recent name change signals a medical school committed to engaging with the pressing health needs of the state). They described a transformation in public health and health care under way in the SMPH, and across the nation, derived from frustration with the health care system’s almost exclusive focus on taking care of people who could have been kept from being sick in the first place and with seeing astronomical increases in health care cost. Drs. Frey and Remington articulated a vision for state health care that integrates the UW health sciences with social work, with law (crime and poor health care being related), with UW Extension for statewide connectivity, with political science and policy, with sociology and economics research, with environmental sciences, with basic sciences that can promote scientific thinking about health care, with humanities and art that link to the human consequences of health and disease, and with industrial engineering studies of health care systems.

We heard about the Community-Academic Partnerships of the new Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, the Wisconsin Research and Education Network (WREN), the Evidence-based Health Policy Project advising state government, the Health Extension Program, and the regional research councils, all of which are existing structures for statewide connection and impact. Given the priority of health care issues for the people of Wisconsin, the university has both a foundation and opportunity for campuswide coherence and sustainable public work. We urge the university to grab this opportunity.

**Recommendation 1.2: Develop a funding and resource model that promotes aligned, sustained engagement on timelines appropriate to the goals.**

The university is extraordinarily skilled at obtaining external funding, especially from federal agencies. In 2007 the external funding of the UW–Madison was second in the nation, and we are one of only two universities to have been in the top 5 nationally for each of the past five years. These are exceptional accomplishments of which we are deservedly proud, and which we will continue. However, the timescales of government funding are often not commensurate with progress on significant public issues, and in the case of federal funding, the challenges of the Wisconsin public specifically.

Aligned and sustained collaborations across the university and the public will require revised and new funding models. Within the context of university-public partnerships, funding and resources need not come solely or directly to the university. Indeed, communities, broadly defined, may succeed in developing substantial funding to support collaborative work through channels not available to the university. Similarly, we must recognize the collaborative role of the private sector in these partnerships. To be clear, we do not recommend that the university “do more with less.” Rather we recommend a funding model for public work that recognizes that the university need not “do it all,” and instead provides for the application of the university’s specific strengths within a larger partnership.

We are also confident that initiatives to address major public issues will attract major private and public funding. In the spirit of alignment rather than prescription, we suggest that such funding be used to promote the broadest engagement of the university with the public. As one of many ideas, a new program matching external funding that addresses identified key public issues within a coherent framework will foster the creativity for which the UW–Madison is famous while focusing attention on specific public issues.

Of course, the cooperative-extension model embodies the idea of a long-term university-community funding collaboration. An evaluation of the cooperative-extension model is needed. UW–Madison should not take lightly the existence of an infrastructure that already places personnel in every county of the state, and that maintains high recognition among the public. At the same time, the array of public issues has changed substantially since the Extension model was created. Whether this model remains the right foundation, with adaptation, for current public work must be considered carefully.

**Recommendation 1.3: Develop a broad, inclusive understanding of the role of the humanities and the arts within a coherent model of engagement with the public.**

In no small part because we have become a university driven by external funding, the visibility of the humanities and the arts has decreased relative to the sciences and engineering. This recommendation emphasizes the essential role played by the humanities and arts in addressing the major challenges that we face. Here we do not mean humanities and arts outreach, as vital and valuable as that is. Rather, we mean the essential intellectual contributions that humanistic viewpoints provide to answer great human questions. The intellectual strength of the UW–

Madison humanities and arts must be an integral part of the aligned and sustained engagement that we recommend.

At its best, the Wisconsin Idea aims to foster *humanistic thinking*. Such thinking gives a sense of the richness of human culture, of the variety of human communities, and fosters a willingness to critically engage with fellow human beings in the project of improving the public welfare. This view of the Wisconsin Idea includes a deep and rich understanding of the human cultures in which new knowledge is produced, and of the ethical, political, and civic consequences of those discoveries.

To that end, the study of the humanities is a study of the domain in which new knowledge is produced, and in which the consequences of those discoveries are debated. We believe that it is *through* our commitment to humanistic thinking that the university will most effectively address public issues by fostering a dedication to identifying and resolving the *human* problems that keep individuals and communities from their full potential.

**Recommendation 1.4: Focus university-wide attention on a select few of the foremost public opportunities and challenges in Wisconsin.**

A great public research university must address great public challenges and goals. By our nature, forefront intellectual problems are being worked on throughout the university, and the impact of new knowledge on the public good is well proven over the ages. Nonetheless, there are opportunities and challenges in our world that will require intentionally aligned and sustained application of many minds—within and beyond the UW–Madison—to take advantage of and solve. Some are of such a compelling nature that we believe they are capable of providing a common focus for much of the university. Possible examples include the revitalization of the Milwaukee metro region, statewide economic vitality through biotechnology, an environmentally sustainable Wisconsin, the criminal justice system broadly considered, improved health, and superb K–12 education.

This recommendation promotes a bold conception of aligning much of the university to addressing a selected set of opportunities and challenges. In saying this we include every member of the university community, and encourage those beyond the UW–Madison to join with us, and us with them. We also include every facet of university activity, from the classrooms, to the laboratories, to the libraries, to the Wisconsin Unions, to sabbaticals, to internships, to theses, to visiting scholars. The conception is inherently interdisciplinary and intergenerational, and above all else, public.

Anticipating concerns with this recommendation, we stress that we see participation in such major initiatives as an opportunity for each member of the university community, not as an obligation. At the same time, we envision a change of state, which we have come to call the 90 percent model as compared to the 10 percent model. The latter, common in many institutes across the campus and the nation, involves a group of faculty, staff, and students—perhaps as much as 10 percent of the university—working together within a separate organizational structure on a set of problems in or near to their traditional disciplinary domains. In the 90

percent model (intentionally a provocative number), most of the faculty, staff, and students—as a community—seek to contribute to the solution of a compelling issue.

This recommendation is a stretch goal. We may well not achieve it, or indeed choose to seek to achieve it. But to achieve it would truly mark a uniquely great public research university.

## **2. Become partners with the public.**

### **Recommendation 2.1: Establish ongoing and mutual communication with the public.**

This recommendation seeks closer and more frequent communication with the people of the state in order to more clearly understand their goals and concerns, and UW–Madison’s potential in helping to address them through collaborative research, teaching, and other activities. We include here policy makers, civic leaders, and business leaders (and especially in the Milwaukee metro region). While perhaps obvious, it is important to acknowledge that coupling the intellectual capacity of the university with the identified needs of the state requires that the public know the capabilities and goals of the university and that the university know the capabilities and goals of the public.

The university needs to develop a streamlined infrastructure for the public to connect with its resources and expertise. The UW–Madison is amazing, but it is also a maze. Depending on the issue, it can be daunting for the public to connect with expertise in the university. To the extent that we do have lists or databases, they are dispersed and difficult to locate. A coordinated central point of information and access would help the public better connect with the university. Here we note the successes of Cooperative Extension, the Office of Corporate Relations, and the Morgridge Center for Public Service, and suggest considering the facets of these models that might be adapted and expanded.

Perhaps equally daunting is for the university to hear and connect with the wide array of public constituencies, even in Wisconsin alone. Still, it is no less important. We heard many variants of this story: the university created a Web-based portal for K–12 teachers with a set of keywords by which to search the database. When the teachers arrived, “their search words hardly overlapped at all with our keywords.” This particular case gave rise to the campuswide *K12@UW–Madison* database now aligned with state standards and using keywords suggested by teachers. Such misalignments—in portals and in major initiatives—can be avoided only through good communication.

Here we discuss modes of communication with four constituencies of this report, in the spirit of providing examples rather than being exhaustive.

*Communities.* Clearly, civic communities are central nodes for connection with the public. The value of personal communication cannot be emphasized enough; we heard often the appreciation and worth of the travels of deans and the chancellor around the state, and also received important feedback from those deans about the public interests. We strongly encourage support of similar activities (e.g., listening sessions) across the state for faculty and staff (perhaps facilitated by legislators in their districts). This level of communication and connection represents a significant

phase change in our modus operandi that will require an “activation energy” to begin. However, our vision is that with this phase change will come substantial efficiencies. For example, we have found that the university already comprises a wide array of individual connections with communities across the state, each of which is an ongoing, active communication channel. Even now we could gain a strategic advantage by bringing these university people together to inform our alignment with the public. As communication and connectivity are fostered, the coherence of information will increase faster than the investment of individual time and resources.

*Private/business sector.* As noted elsewhere in this report, significant activity already occurs between the university and the private sector, which we broadly define to include any for-profit entity including those in industries such as health care and agriculture. Communication occurs regularly through personal interactions between the private sector and the campus, be it through career service offices helping with recruitment; faculty and staff collaborating with private sector researchers; cooperative-extension connections; or meetings between private-sector representatives and WARF, the Office of Corporate Relations, or the University Research Park—to name a few examples. The university also communicates with the private sector when the chancellor, deans, or others meet with business groups such as Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce or local chambers of commerce.

However, most of these interactions tend to occur with either large companies or very small startups, as well as with many producers in the agricultural community. There is a decided lack of communication and personal interaction with small and medium-sized entities in Wisconsin, which make up a majority of the businesses in the state. Efforts should be made to connect better with these entities so that they too are made aware of and can take advantage of the tremendous resources our campus has to offer the private sector.

*Government agencies.* The original Wisconsin Idea was built on the government-university partnership of Governor Bob La Follette and UW President Charles Van Hise. La Follette realized the need for expert assistance and research in structuring new governmental laws and programs of the progressive era. The twenty-first century brings new challenges and opportunities for government-university partnerships. Indeed, the contraction of state resources and related state employment in the agencies translates into fewer research functions remaining in the agencies. The anticipated mass retirement of many experienced, longtime public servants also means such research knowledge as remains may soon walk out the door. State government will need to turn to sources of knowledge that the UW–Madison may provide.

An easy assumption might be that agencies will turn to new information technologies for research and expertise. The dangers of partial or improperly understood information will exist. Informed discussion and evaluation of research is one of the skills provided by a public research university. Because both knowledge and decision making can move very fast in the public-policy environment, prior relationships and development of trust and personal contact are needed to expedite and validate information and expertise for better-informed decisions. Furthermore, agencies may be willing to ask for information but not be aware of the campus resources. Simply meeting with agency heads may not lead to in-depth understanding of resources; active engagement of division administrators or bureau directors may be required. As an example, a half-day on campus with key agency staff could follow up a meeting with a cabinet secretary to better acquaint them with resources and access points.



*Legislature.* We have been struck by how often we heard reminiscences—at both ends of State Street—that “in the past” legislators and faculty used to meet and talk informally about the state’s current challenges and future possibilities. We have not sought to validate these memories, but rather see in them a strong feeling that this level of communication no longer exists and is needed. At some level this is a structural issue. On the legislative side, intellectual counsel is provided by Legislative Council staff. On the university side, much direct communication with legislators occurs through UW–Madison administrative channels or UW System, typically for administrative and political purposes.

Our visits with legislators were marked by surprise that we were there for a mutual conversation rather than for a request, by a perspective of the UW–Madison that was largely or solely as an educational institution, by a general unawareness that the UW–Madison might have knowledge resources of value to them (or indeed about what a research university is about), and by warm requests to return. The visits were also highly enlightening about the issues of the public from the legislators’ perspectives. A key facet of this recommendation is that faculty and staff must actively develop relationships with legislators and legislative service agencies with respect to key issues in the state. The Evidence-Based Health Policy Project is one possible model for such connections. We should more broadly make effective use of the advantage that these relationships require only short walks down State Street.

**Recommendation 2.2: Develop modes of operation to work collaboratively with the public.**

Working collaboratively with the public to develop and implement ideas fundamentally acknowledges and respects the value of the diversity of knowledge and perspectives in working toward a common good. The intellectual capacity of the university is a strong asset for many a public initiative, but it is not enough in itself. The public also brings intellectual capacity, rich perspective, and extensive knowledge. The integration of the university and the public understanding is a powerful facet of the Wisconsin Idea.

We recommend fostering research directions that are informed by public goals and needs and that integrate the public in the work. Such *Wisconsin Idea partnerships* would be targeted, integrative initiatives bringing together interdisciplinary facets of the university with communities, agencies, businesses, and so on, to address important issues.

While in principle the incentives for new research directions could result from a redirection of current funding (e.g., a “broader impact” approach to Research Committee awards), we are confident that as we evolve toward being “part of the solution,” new funding will develop from public and private sources. Indeed, one prominent state legislator mentioned to us his earlier efforts to develop a Wisconsin Idea funding bill, and his interest in doing so again to support ideas such as this recommendation.

An explicit and important goal in this recommendation is to make the UW–Madison a greater public research university. We do not seek inconsequential research questions on behalf of the state; we seek great research questions on behalf of the state. Wisconsin can be our laboratory for urban renewal, for management of water supplies, for engineering applications to health care, for

sustainable energy production, for awareness of cultural traditions beyond our borders, and more. That this great research is done with the public on behalf of the public good will further ensure the UW–Madison’s stature as a great public research university.

To provide specificity for how partnerships might be structured, we recommend taking a closer look at what is working—and what is not—in two prototypes in very different parts of Wisconsin: the city of Ashland in the far northwest and the neighborhoods of South Madison in the city of Madison. These are very different environments that largely lie outside the prosperity shared by many parts of Wisconsin; they are struggling to find their niches in the “knowledge economy.” Yet neither community is merely accepting that fate. Different public-private initiatives have put both communities in touch with the resources of the UW–Madison and related programs, from the humanities to technology development. Neither community has been fully immersed, however, in a conversation about matching its goals and needs with the resources of the university and its partners.

In Ashland, initiatives involving the UW–Madison Office of Corporate Relations, University Research Park, and the Wisconsin Technology Council's core programs have helped to put civic and business leaders in touch with appropriate resources within the high-tech and knowledge-based economies. Those resources have helped Ashland community leaders begin a process of envisioning what kind of businesses would naturally fit within their economic region—and which would not. Collaborations so far have also involved Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College and Northland College; however, involvement by UW–Superior has been limited, despite its location an hour's drive away. A strong core of UW–Madison alumni in Ashland would welcome moving to the next step of planning the region's economic, social and cultural future, which could involve UW–Madison experts in natural resources, downtown redevelopment, and innovation in K–12 education as well as business. A major concern in Ashland is keeping young people at home by providing the right economic opportunities.

The UW–Madison is no stranger to South Madison—examples include the Odyssey Program and Space Place. But UW–Madison could take a more systemic approach to help move the neighborhood ahead. For example, faculty, staff and students from the UW–Madison could be helpful in implementing the South Madison Neighborhood Plan adopted in January 2005. The Applied Population Laboratory could continue its past work in the neighborhood with an eye toward helping city planners and neighborhood residents anticipate housing demands and trends. In late 2007, a survey commissioned through the Community Partnerships Office of the chancellor’s office found that residents of Madison’s Park Street corridor enjoy their neighborhoods and want to remain there, but affordable housing remains a key obstacle. The array of resources of the UW–Madison applied in South Madison would offer lessons that could translate more broadly.

### **Recommendation 2.3: Develop institutional partnerships for impact throughout Wisconsin**

Our research has shown that currently a significant amount of UW–Madison engagement with the public occurs within 50 miles of Madison. While this is not surprising, we must be intentional about more balanced connections and impact across the state.

For example, we must recognize that our position within a statewide system of higher education is an advantage to be leveraged. UW System institutions, private colleges, and technical/community colleges provide broad regional connectivity, while the UW–Madison provides an unparalleled research base. This is an opportunity for partnership—of faculty and staff, of programs, of students—must be leveraged to advantage Wisconsin.

Finally, recognizing the importance of Milwaukee to the health and success of the entire state, we were urged multiple times—including by civic leaders of Milwaukee—to recommend that the UW–Madison engage in the mission of revitalizing the Milwaukee metro regions through partnerships with engaged Milwaukee institutions (and especially with UW–Milwaukee, K–12, business, and community organizations). We agree.

**Recommendation 2.4: Enhance knowledge transfer to bring economic benefit to the public.**

Arguably, one of the most effective ways to collaborate with the public is to become one with the public. A physical analogue is the distinction between transferring heat energy and transferring hot material. Depending on conditions, the latter can be optimally effective. The same can be true for the transfer of knowledge for the public good.

As one example, we focus our final recommendation on connecting the intellectual productivity of the university to the high-technology economy that is the future of the state. Most directly, we need to increase research commercialization so that technology advances at the UW–Madison benefit the public. We must enhance our systems for translating research and ideas into new companies, and for helping to ensure the success of those companies. The UW–Madison is number 2 nationally in funding, number 5 in patents, and number 20 in start-up companies. As one example of an action, we should continue to grow the UW Research Parks, and in particular consider starting a research park in collaboration with UW–Milwaukee and/or other institutions where new companies might be ready to develop.

In closing our recommendations for establishing partnerships with the public, we emphasize that some of our most important channels to accomplish these recommendations are through education of undergraduate and graduate students. In working with them, we are communicating *now* with future leaders and citizens. Explicitly and implicitly, many of our students will be developing exciting new opportunities and engaging with important challenges throughout the state. We are building working partnerships with the future public *now*. Our undergraduate students are a particularly direct means of technology transfer as they enter the workforce. And a great deal of the very best intellectual productivity and knowledge transfer begins with graduate students. Thus our educational mission is one of our strongest embodiments of the Wisconsin Idea.

**3. Expand ACCESS of the public to the opportunities and resources of the university.**

**Recommendation 3.1: Continue to enhance financial aid programs as one of the highest priorities of the UW–Madison.**

The Wisconsin Idea compels us to ensure access to all Wisconsin residents admitted to the UW–Madison. Exclusion based solely on financial capability is a troubling and ever-growing problem. Despite our relatively low undergraduate tuition, a UW–Madison education is too expensive for many Wisconsin students. Fewer students from lower-income families are applying to UW–Madison for traditional educations, and those who do apply and are accepted have greater financial need and incur greater debt over their undergraduate careers. (See “Trends in Cost of Attendance, Financial Need and Financial Aid for Wisconsin Resident New Freshmen” [http://apa.wisc.edu/admissions/Trends\\_FinAid\\_UWMSN\\_2006.pdf](http://apa.wisc.edu/admissions/Trends_FinAid_UWMSN_2006.pdf)).

Given that our educational mission is one of our strongest embodiments of the Wisconsin Idea, this disparity of access based on wealth must be removed. We applaud the extensive efforts of the university to provide resources for financially limited students from around the state who have been admitted to the UW–Madison (such as the faculty-staff fundraising initiative and the commitment of the UW Foundation). We strongly recommend continued work in these and new directions, so that the “meritocratic” and “democratic” principles that we wish to live by are in greater alignment.

Potentially, the Wisconsin Idea might itself contribute to the solution of financial aid challenges. We encourage the UW–Madison to consider programs that would give students, particularly low-income students, the opportunity to use a year between graduation from high school and entrance to college to do public work in return for a reduction in tuition and fees or for forgiveness of loans required to pay for a UW–Madison education. Essentially we recommend a work-study program based on the Wisconsin Idea. In similar spirit, the university might consider programs like You Teach, where the student promises to work in an underserved area in return for loan forgiveness. The idea should be to tailor a multiyear program for each deserving, but financially needy, student who looks for ways to help the state in return for services provided. We note that these ideas might be integrated within the Wisconsin Covenant.

**Recommendation 3.2: Invest in programs and technology to broaden public access to the university.**

The essential goal here is that anyone in the state can have access to the university—not just enrolled students—ranging from just-in-time information to synchronous experiences. The technological revolution of the last fifteen years allows people from across the state and the world to avail themselves of the resources of the UW–Madison community. Alumni, senior citizens, high school students, parents of students (particularly first-generation students), and civic leaders are just a sample of the breadth of the public we envision connecting to the university. The university should be seen as the public’s backyard as much as it should be seen as a place where students learn and knowledge is produced and disseminated.

As part of this access, we should also recognize that access to the UW–Madison can be a portal for the people of Wisconsin to the global community. UW–Madison is a global university, through research, through alumni, through knowledge, through formal connections like the Worldwide Universities Network, and through the vast array of informal connections represented in our faculty, staff, and students. The spirit of public access should not be limited to that

knowledge and action that the UW–Madison can provide directly. It should also include the global connections to resources and people that we can provide.

Amid the remarkable possibilities of digital communication technology, we must continue to recognize and provide access to those for whom such technology is neither easily available nor readily used. Furthermore, the value of access via personal contact—even if only by voice or image—must not be minimized in a world where such interaction is less and less available.

Clearly, a key issue is what systems will enable this high level of access. Once again, we urge an aligned, interdisciplinary, and systemic approach. In the course of developing such a system, the university should evaluate the existing models of Cooperative Extension and the Division of Continuing Studies (DCS), both being traditional access points for the public. Particularly critical in this evaluation will be the effectiveness of the Extension and/or DCS models in the urban portions of the state, and for those who do not have easy access to or facility with technology. Should this evaluation suggest building on either Extension or DCS for public access, then substantially more effective connections of Extension or DCS with departments, schools and colleges will be needed so that faculty and staff can move more fluidly between their traditional and nontraditional roles. The current reality is that large numbers of the faculty and academic staff are entirely disconnected from either of these programs.

**Recommendation 3.3: Become the trusted and accessible source of expertise for the public.**

In today’s globally connected world there is no shortage of access to information. Nonetheless, access to trusted and reliable expertise and knowledge remains an invaluable commodity. Providing this commodity is an entirely appropriate role of a public research university.

Practically speaking, such a concept must be implemented in a limited way and thus strategically targeted. That said, there are already models on the campus ranging from radio call-in opportunities to extension to the university library system to ad hoc calls to departments to a wide array of publicly accessible databases. Indeed, much can be achieved through intentional repackaging of the variety of current university communications. Our essential recommendation is to take a systemic look at the university as an accessible source of expertise for the public.

**Recommendation 3.4: Expand the sharing of academic programs and courses with other universities in Wisconsin, regionally, and beyond.**

The UW–Madison currently has in place a number of articulation agreements with other CIC universities, UW System schools and the College of Menominee Nation, for example, but we would urge that these agreements be expanded. Specifically, we recommend that the UW–Madison seek to share resources—faculty, lab and classroom space, curricula—not only when the absence of a program at one institution can be augmented with faculty in a corresponding program at another, but to pool resources even in instances where similar programs exist in more than one institution.

An example of the former is the current degree-sharing program between UW–Madison and UW–Milwaukee: UW–Milwaukee has a program in architecture whose students can take courses

in art history at UW–Madison to fulfill graduate degree requirements; UW–Madison’s art history students can take courses at UW–Milwaukee in architecture to fulfill their requirements as well. An example of the latter might be to allow students in English at UW–Madison—where there are few faculty with expertise in new media technologies—to take courses with faculty in new media at UW–Milwaukee to fulfill degree requirements at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In addition—while we realize that at present a small number of students take advantage of the transfer agreements that are already in place between UW System institutions—we would recommend expanding these programs to give students at UW–Madison the opportunity to transfer course credit to other UW System institutions, and students at those other institutions to transfer credit to UW–Madison.

We would also urge the university to more vigorously exploit new technologies and course-share agreements that are already in place on the UW–Madison campus and the other public universities in the region (including other UW System institutions as well as our CIC peers). Ideally students at UW–Madison should be able to take advantage of the variety of educational opportunities that exist at the University of Michigan, say, or at UW–La Crosse via distance education, videoconference, and other resources; nor is there a reason why students at those institutions cannot take advantage of the expertise of our faculty and staff.

In short, we see the university as a common, civic space, one that has the potential to expand to the boundaries of the state (or the global community) in ways we could not have imagined even ten years ago.

#### **4. Engage students in serving the public**

##### **Recommendation 4.1: Integrate the Wisconsin Idea throughout the academic and nonacademic student experiences.**

Engagement for the public good is a long-standing tradition of the UW–Madison, perhaps most well-known over the years in our leadership in numbers of Peace Corps and Teach for America volunteers and more than 300 registered student organizations with a service focus or mission.

But the Wisconsin Idea is not a fully systemic or explicit component of the UW–Madison student experience. Indeed, Team 5 has found that most students—undergraduate and graduate—have little or no knowledge of the Wisconsin Idea. This recommendation seeks to make the Wisconsin Idea and the public work of UW–Madison highly visible to all students. It is important to note that we do not seek to make the Wisconsin Idea a requirement, but an ethos of the UW–Madison experience.

Possible approaches to achieving this recommendation include:

- Presence of the Wisconsin Idea in student recruitment, admissions, and financial aid. (Recommendation 4.1).
- High visibility of public work in SOAR and other orientation programs.
- Freshman Wisconsin Idea seminar—a rich array of seminars teaching a common understanding of the Wisconsin Idea blended with disciplinary-specific

perspectives and experiences. Such seminars could be naturally integrated into Freshman Interest Groups.

- Integration of the Wisconsin Idea into residential learning communities, with particular emphasis on interdisciplinary application of knowledge to public issues.
- Additional credit in courses for Wisconsin Idea application of learning.
- Work-study support and internships associated with Wisconsin Idea opportunities.
- Wisconsin Idea undergraduate capstone experiences—in analogy to or part of senior theses, capstone experiences would apply knowledge and research to public problems. The Wisconsin Idea Undergraduate Fellowships would be as well known as the Hilldale Undergraduate/Faculty Research Fellowships.
- Enhanced integration of undergraduate and graduate students in cooperative extension.
- Graduate fellowships for Wisconsin Idea applications of research, culminating in chapters in dissertations.
- Integration of the Wisconsin Idea into research funding proposals, such as the broader impact requirements of the National Science Foundation. Building on this model, integration of the Wisconsin Idea into Research Committee funding for graduate students.

We emphasize again that in all these ideas, we specifically seek to connect the newly developed *intellectual capacities* of the students to the public good.

These ideas are not meant to be either prescriptive or comprehensive. Rather they are intended to demonstrate the breadth of possibilities for integrating the Wisconsin Idea into the student experience from recruitment through graduation. The requirement for success is less funding than commitment by the UW–Madison community.

#### **Recommendation 4.2: Embed the Wisconsin Idea in student recruitment and admissions.**

The Wisconsin Idea is part of the UW–Madison identity, and as noted earlier, is an important factor in attracting the finest public intellectuals to the university. This is no less true for students; the Wisconsin Idea can be one of many factors that keep the very best Wisconsin students in the state for their higher education, and attract the very best students from beyond the state's border.

Furthermore, student recruitment (and admissions) is a very important communication channel to the public, including the families of Wisconsin. We anticipate that a commitment of the university to integrating public work in their students' college educations will be received enthusiastically. The Wisconsin Idea should play an explicit and high-profile role in the recruitment of students. It should be expressed in the very first communications with each student in order to begin introducing the idea into their UW–Madison experience.

Furthermore, we recommend that the university place greater emphasis on the Wisconsin Idea in undergraduate and graduate admission. By this we mean that members of the admissions team should actively identify and offer admission to students who appear willing to become engaged members of the civic space of the university and the state, and who show a commitment to

helping to address issues that are important to the state and the global community. In doing so, we seek to gently shift the student body toward those who will seek out public work both while in school and after they graduate. Undergraduate applicants might have the opportunity to make clear their willingness to take part in the Wisconsin Idea through learning, research, outreach, and engagement; or, the admissions committee might take into account indicative life experiences, which would also add diversity to the campus. Graduate recruitment might include a Wisconsin Idea fellowship program.

**Recommendation 4.3: Work with the state of Wisconsin to develop programs that encourage UW–Madison students to stay in or return to Wisconsin after they have completed their education.**

The impact of a UW–Madison education on the needs of the public only grows with time, because of both the personal growths in abilities and the integration of a lifetime of engagement. This impact occurs in both the private and the public sectors. Recognizing that the lives of UW–Madison students have an impact on the entire world, this recommendation seeks specifically to enhance the impact of UW–Madison students for the good of the state of Wisconsin.

It is important to stress that we do not wish to bind students to Wisconsin, for example, through quid pro quo arrangements of support for education in return for service to the state. Such arrangements may actually hinder the growth and development of the students, which ultimately does not serve either them or the good of Wisconsin. Rather, our recommendation seeks to help students to find rich life opportunities within Wisconsin, and highlight those opportunities that address specific needs of Wisconsin.

As a start, we recommend a major overhaul in the way that career counseling is done on campus. The current balkanization among schools and colleges limits access of students to a diverse pool of employers, and of employers to a more diverse pool of UW students. We recommend a campuswide review of career services, with a focus on improving communication, efficiency, and processes so that employers have an easier time finding, interviewing, and hiring UW–Madison students.

As part of this review, we urge earlier career counseling, with an eye toward the needs of Wisconsin. Undoubtedly, the most important role of the university is to help students appreciate the diverse values of knowledge and to find their passions. That said, we spend insufficient time helping them identify meaningful and rich careers; somehow we expect them to have that wisdom and knowledge a priori and independently. Earlier career counseling can not only benefit the student, it can also benefit Wisconsin, for in such counseling the priority needs of the state can be made known to students.

We encourage greater effort to help UW alumni remain connected to the career opportunities in the state, and to the needs of the state. Rather than labeling students leaving the state as “brain drain,” we should recognize that they are developing within themselves global skills of value to Wisconsin. Having Wisconsin roots, the likelihood of wanting to return—either physically or through distance connections—is enhanced, and with them they bring value and solutions for the needs of the Wisconsin public.



Again, we wish to draw attention to the needs of the Milwaukee metro region. We suggest examination of programs in place in the cities of Philadelphia and Boston, in which the colleges and universities in those cities have partnered with city and state government to reward students who commit to working in the public (or private) sector in those cities with loan forgiveness or other incentives. These programs have had significant success in those cities, and may also serve well in Milwaukee. Indeed a similar program for needs throughout the state of Wisconsin may show similar success in addressing the pressing problem of brain drain.

## **5. Recognition of the impact of UW–Madison for the public good.**

### **Recommendation 5.1: Develop and support more powerful strategies of communicating our public work to members of our public.**

To do a better job of communicating the work already taking place on campus, and the new initiatives that we expect will come out of our recommendations, campus administration needs to develop more powerful strategies of communicating with members of our public—state communities, citizens (including students and their parents), partners in the private sector, members of the legislature and other policy-makers around the state. The Wisconsin Idea Project is an important step in this direction, and we see it as a blueprint for a far broader and more powerful set of communications strategies to communicate the public goals and values of the university.

It is important to stress that it is not merely public work that needs to be communicated. We also need to provide a window for the public into who we are, to provide a better understanding of the role, activities, and ethos of a major research university.

#### **B. Recommendations: Systems that Enable**

These recommendations intend to change the way the university does its business in order to help members of the university community and residents of the state work toward enhancing the public good. These recommendations require significant changes in the university's governance and organizational structure, its rewards systems, the way it implements budgets and allocates funds, and the infrastructure that supports that work. The team urges the leadership of UW–Madison to charge task forces composed of members of the university community to develop detailed recommendations for a UW–Madison deeply committed to the importance of public work, and to put those recommendation into practice in a forceful way.

Interdisciplinarity will be particularly important because *public* work requires easy movement between the intellectual center of the university and the public domain outside of it. Further, it requires that faculty, staff, and students are able to forge relationships not only with members of the public but also with one another across disciplinary and departmental divides. A current example of this kind of work at the UW–Madison is the Center for the Humanities “What Is Human?” initiative, which brings together scholars from the physical and biological sciences, computer science, and the humanities to investigate how changes in technologies and information in the early twenty-first century also change how we think of ourselves as human

beings. This is work of critical importance to the public, because it involves questions of how to handle the explosion in the availability of information when some members of the public do not have access to this information. We wish to foster more interdisciplinary work of this kind by creating systems that allow for intellectual, pedagogical, and financial exchange across disciplines.

We have heard repeatedly throughout this process that nothing will change without significant and commensurate changes in the reward structure of the university. Many members of the faculty and staff do work that is explicitly *public*, ranging from nurses improving public health distribution, to research staff working with K–12 education, to humanities faculty studying the relationship between the reading of imaginative literature and the engagement in civic culture. But because the criteria for tenure and promotion—and indeed most systems of rewards at the UW–Madison—tend to focus emphatically if not exclusively on pure research, many faculty—especially junior faculty—have reason to avoid work that is decidedly public in nature.

Our broad recommendations on systems that enable are intended to guide future task forces toward key issues, rather than provide detailed solutions. The recommendations fall into four broad categories—organizational structure, rewards and recognition, budget and funds, and processes and infrastructure. The remainder of this report is organized by these categories, within each of which we provide recommendations targeting where change will be needed.

## 6. Organizational Structures

The structure of the university—the way units are grouped together into colleges and schools; the logic of the divisions between departments; the leadership and reporting structure by which department chairs report to deans, and deans to provost, and so on—does not readily allow faculty, staff and students to work together in addressing issues of public importance, nor does it allow for easy access between members of the community and the university. Much the same can be said about the allocations and flows of external funds.

### **Recommendation 6.1: Develop criteria that can be used when merging, reorganizing, and regrouping departments, centers, colleges, and units to better promote interdisciplinary public work.**

Most colleges and universities engage in reorganization schemes in order to become more efficient (that is, to save money). We urge the UW–Madison to include a different criterion: to what extent does the reorganization allow for the expansion and enrichment of interdisciplinary work that will have real impact on the public good? Another way to put this is to say that the reorganization of departments and other units should have as its aim making it easier to do public work, and to make such work more highly valued by the university and the public. (Although the Cluster Hiring Initiative provides a good model of interdisciplinarity, it was overlaid upon already-existing departmental and college structures, producing even greater bureaucratic hurdles to the work of the clusters' members.)

### **Recommendation 6.2: Make clear that the UW–Madison wishes to hire more faculty who value the Wisconsin Idea and public work.**

Some faculty come to the UW–Madison because of the Wisconsin Idea; most do not know what the Wisconsin Idea is at the time of hire, and only some come to know it as more than a buzzword after they are here. We of course do not recommend that the UW–Madison hire only faculty who do work that is consistent with the Wisconsin Idea. But we can make it clear—through our public communications, through the language of job advertisements, and through the example that we set in the work that we do and the values that we hold—that we are particularly interested in hiring intellectuals and scholars of the highest caliber who are dedicated to making their public work count. In this way we can both maintain the high intellectual standards that make the UW–Madison an attractive place to the best teacher-scholars in the United States and abroad, and increase our visibility and the consequences of our work on a public scale.

**Recommendation 6.3: Create an administrative structure that increases awareness of and connects the excellent public work across the entire university.**

Because the UW–Madison is so big, the initiatives that directly serve the public are often unknown to large swaths of the university community; in addition, they often appear to the public as disconnected initiatives that can appear as ad hoc responses to public issues. It is also true that the way the university is organized makes it hard for a sociologist working on patterns of movement among the urban poor, for example, to become aware of the work of an immunologist who is studying the effects of a strain of tuberculosis common in northern cities. We note that the Division of Continuing Studies might be boldly reconceptualized to serve this role. We also recommend that the university community examine whether shared governance as it currently exists is the best way to foster interdisciplinary and truly public work.

## **7. Rewards and recognition**

Through WARF, departmental, school/college, and other avenues, the UW–Madison has many ways in which to reward faculty and staff for their excellent work. Perhaps the greatest reward for an academic is the promise of tenure, because with it comes the freedom to pursue research and teaching in pioneering ways. The time has come to reevaluate the reward structures used by the university to recognize excellent work, regardless of rank or classification status, because these rewards often do not value work that is of significant and demonstrable benefit to the public. (In fact, to some of us, the structures currently in place actually discourage the public work we value).

WISELI (Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute) worklife surveys make clear that faculty whose work tends to be more engaged with the public are less satisfied with their work because such work is often undervalued by colleagues and counted less in evaluations for tenure and promotion. One is more likely to get a significant increase in merit pay by getting an article published in a flagship journal than by finding ways to make that research practicable at community centers or in community medicine. It is no wonder, then, why the Wisconsin Idea is often just an idea, rather than a principle that is understood and lived by members of the faculty, staff, and student body.

We urge the university to:

**Recommendation 7.1: Create a task force, reporting to the provost and the Faculty Senate, to develop guidelines and criteria that will adequately protect and reward faculty at all ranks who engage in high-quality research and teaching that involve explicitly public work.**

**Recommendation 7.2: Align the criteria and policies of Divisional Committees and other university structures (including those in the departments) that oversee the granting of tenure, promotion, and mentoring in a way that gives meaningful weight to intellectual work done in the public sphere.**

**Recommendation 7.3: Define the extent to which units must include considerations of public research and scholarship into their criteria for merit and other professional rewards.**

**Recommendation 7.4: Establish rewards for excellent work in the public sphere, like the Hamel Family Fellowships, that have the prestige and the dollar equivalents to current WARF awards that principally value pure research (Romnes/Kellett/WARF).**

## **8. Budget and Funds**

One significant obstacle to public engagement, not to mention fostering truly innovative interdisciplinary work, is the way money flows—and does not flow—within the university. For example, the present system of overhead return inhibits cross-college/school research funding. We urge campus leadership to undertake a review of budgeting practices, and to use criteria ensuring that funding systems foster interdisciplinary programs, faculty, and university communities that have public impact.

Although this would certainly require a reallocation of funds, we believe that the university should work with the state legislature to establish a fund that will provide grants—won through a competition—that would encourage faculty to engage in teaching and research that has a direct impact on the betterment of the state. The disbursement of these grants should be flexible so that the funds could be distributed across units in cases where the consortium of faculty, staff, and students working on them are not located in a single area of the university. Furthermore, emphasis should be given to aligned and sustained work.

Specifically, we recommend that the university:

**Recommendation 8.1: Design greater flexibility in budgeting lines.**

**Recommendation 8.2: Develop criteria for budgeting decisions that promote public work.**

**Recommendation 8.3: Establish grant support for addressing issues of importance to the public.**

**Recommendation 8.4: Develop cost-sharing strategies that do not disadvantage units whose public work does not generate significant revenue.**

## **9. Processes and Infrastructure**

The UW–Madison has invested significant state and private resources in new and upgraded buildings in the last decade. Because the ability to focus on the public interest requires the ability to communicate quickly and easily within the UW–Madison community and across institutions within and outside of the state, the university must also invest in the infrastructure that will allow for the sharing of resources and information.

To this end, we recommend that the university:

**Recommendation 9.1: Fully invest in CIC broadband.**

**Recommendation 9.2: Make better use of technology to avoid redundancy, to share resources, and to increase access.**

**Recommendation 9.3: Streamline industry-sponsored research agreements.**