

Minutes*

**Senate Research Committee
Monday, April 27, 2009
2:15 - 4:00
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Dan Dahlberg (chair), Linda Bearinger, Arlene Carney, Paula Chesley, Jerry Cohen, Tricia Conway, James Cotter, Donald Dengel, Genevieve Escure, Tom Hayes, Michelle Lamere, Frances Lawrenz, Jennifer Linde, Mark Paller, Federico Ponce de Leon, Steven Ruggles, Lynn Zentner
- Absent: Melissa Anderson, Peter Argenta, Leslie Delserone, Robin Dittman, Timothy Mulcahy, George Trachte, Andrew Van de Ven, Karen Williams, Jean Witson
- Guests: Vice President Charles Muscoplat, Carla Carlson (Statewide Strategic Resource Development)

[In these minutes: (1) task force report and draft policy on community-based research; (2) research and UMore Park]

1. Task Force Report and Draft Policy on Community-Based Research

Professor Dahlberg convened the meeting at 2:15 and turned to Dr. Paller to introduce the Report of the University of Minnesota Task Force on Community Research.

Dr. Paller began by providing the Committee with the backdrop to the report and the recommended policy. There has been more interest in the University in doing more community-based research and more community involvement. At the same time, there is awareness that the University has not always done well in doing research in the community and that the outcomes have not always been optimal. The goal of the task force was to develop principles for faculty doing community-based research. It was a distinguished task force, he said, one he was honored to work with. The members of the task force were:

- Darlyne Bailey, PhD, Assistant to the President; Professor of Work and Human Resource Education & Social Work
- Barbara Brandt, PhD, Assistant Vice President for Education, Academic Health Center; Professor, Pharmaceutical Care and Health Systems
- William Doherty, PhD, Professor, Family Social Science; Director of the Citizen Professional Center
- Susan Gust, Community activist; President, Partners Three Consulting Company
- Cathy Jordan, PhD, Director, Children, Youth and Family Consortium; Associate Professor, Pediatrics and Neurology
- Kola Okuyemi, MD, MPH, Director, Program in Health Disparities Research; Associate Professor, Family Medicine and Community Health

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

- Mark S. Paller, MD, MS, Chair, Assistant Vice President for Research, Academic Health Center; Professor, Medicine
- Joanna Ramirez-Barrett, PhD, Director, Innovation Center, NorthPoint Health & Wellness Center
- Michael Resnick, PhD, Director, Healthy Youth Development Prevention Research Center; Professor, Pediatrics
- Mary Story, PhD, RD, Professor, Public Health

Dr. Paller next noted the definition of "community," a group that is self-defined. "A community is a group that self-identifies by geography, age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, illness or health condition, common interest or cause, a sense of identification or shared emotional connection, shared values or norms, mutual influence, or commitment to meeting a shared need. Community need not be defined solely by geography." Some have contended that a group should not be able to define itself, but that, Dr. Paller said, is the point.

Anything that engages the community is community-based research, Dr. Paller said, and the task force provided a spectrum of engagement and shared governance.

Community-placed research is a researcher-initiated project involving a one time or short-term relationship between the investigator and the community, with limited community involvement beyond being a venue for recruiting research participants or for implementing research procedures. Basic community partnership research is a project that involves a relationship with a community partner in which the researcher makes the key decisions in the project, but considers the needs and interests of the community in how the research is conducted and how the outcomes are disseminated. Close community partnership research is an ongoing collaborative project in which goals are co-defined in ways that balance benefit to the researcher and utility of the findings for the community. There is some sharing of decision making between the researcher and the community, but the research methodology is primarily determined by the researcher. Community-based participatory research (CBPR) is a project defined by co-creation of project ideas and procedures by researchers and a community, substantive participation by the community in all or nearly all stages of the research, and shared governance (equal sharing of power and decision-making responsibilities). There is an expectation that findings will be used to change systems or solve community problems.

In order to be helpful, the report also provides examples of different kinds of research along this continuum, Dr. Paller noted.

Community-based research is different from traditional research, Dr. Paller explained. It is a shared partnership with the community, and even the research question may be defined jointly. The research is jointly-governed, jointly-performed, jointly-disseminated, and jointly-owned. It is also an ongoing activity that grows over time.

Once the task force developed definitions, it then prepared a set of principles that correspond to the four loose categories of community-based research, as follows:

Principles for community-placed research

Human research has historically been guided by principles relating to risk and benefits to the individual research subject. Community-placed research has interaction with the community that goes beyond interactions with individual potential research subjects and, therefore, requires consideration of the risks and benefits to the stakeholder community. These principles are in addition to those principles for all human subject research

1. The researcher should be aware and respectful of community interests that go beyond those of individual potential research subjects
2. The researcher should identify stakeholders other than individual potential research subjects
3. The researcher should inform stakeholders in addition to individual potential research subjects about the research
4. The researcher should invite feedback regarding concerns about the research from stakeholders in addition to individual potential research subjects

This is not too prescriptive, Dr. Paller said.

Principles for basic community partnership research

Principles 1-4, plus:

5. The researcher should respect the community partner's interest in the project and be open to ways that the community might benefit or want to use the information.
6. The researcher should disseminate research findings to stakeholders in addition to individual research subjects.

These require a little more give-and-take than community-placed research, Dr. Paller commented.

Principles for close community partnership research

Principles 1-6, plus:

7. Research goals should be co-defined, procedures agreed upon, and grants written collaboratively.
8. The researcher should work on team building for close partnership with the community partner.
9. The researcher should work on capacity building for the community partner so that the partners are stronger because of the collaboration.
10. The dissemination of the research should be used to help build capacity in the community partner and the collaboration.

This more of a partnership and requires more shared responsibility. The PI needs to consider what he or she will be leaving behind, Dr. Paller commented.

Principles for community-based participatory research

Community-based participatory research has its own set of principles that supplant and go beyond the above principles.

1. The research topic should respond to a community-defined need or question and have as an aim to combine knowledge with action to achieve social change.
2. Academic partners should be open to the guidance of community insights and wisdom.
3. Partners should agree upon mission, values, goals, resources, measurable outcomes and accountability for the partnership. Academic partners are especially accountable to the community with which they are working for the impact collaborative activities may have on it. Partners should each identify their own expected benefits of the project and work to help each other achieve them.
4. The relationship between partners should be characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness and commitment. Partners reflect awareness of ways their beliefs, values and personal history may impact collaborative activities and demonstrate capacity to respect, honor, and accommodate other's belief systems, cultural knowledge and customs.
5. The partnership should balance power among partners and enable resources among partners to be shared. Decision-making must be shared. Governance must be shared or be led by the community. Specific plans (principles and processes) for decision-making, governance, and conflict resolution must be clearly defined by the partners at the start of the project.
6. The partnership should build upon identified strengths and assets, but also work to address needs and increase capacity of all partners.
7. Partners should make clear and open communication an ongoing priority by striving to understand each others' needs and self-interests, and develop a common language.
8. Partners should recognize that race, ethnicity, class, and other aspects of culture matter and talk openly about these issues.
9. There should be feedback among all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goals of continuously improving the partnership and its outcomes.
10. Partnerships can dissolve and should plan a process for closure.

For this last category, the task force rewrote all the principles from scratch because in this case the research is now a joint partnership and the researcher is not calling all the shots.

Dr. Paller pointed out that research with human subjects is already covered by the IRB; this recommendation adds principles on how to treat community-based research. They do not propose an IRB-like process; these are principles. No one at the University is going to tell a researcher what category his or her research falls in; the researcher should recognize what principles should cover the research.

The task force also refashioned the principles into a draft policy—the information is the same in the policy as in the report—and proposed it be University policy to guide faculty, staff, and students when doing community-based research. The policy has not been shared widely, Dr. Paller reported, but members of the task force are bringing it to various groups, and this is the first University-wide consultation.

Professor Dahlberg inquired how many faculty members have research programs that would be affected by this policy. Dr. Paller said there are entire centers and groups it would affect; there is a lot of community-based research in education and nursing and in a number of interdisciplinary programs, and the impact could go well beyond what they have thought of thus far. Researchers can read the principles and determine whether they apply to them.

The community is very interested in seeing this policy, Dr. Paller reported. It will help their interactions with the University and bring up issues that researchers may not be aware of. It reminds them to be respectful of communities and can help them avoid inadvertent errors.

It may be that part of a community may not like some research, Professor Cohen commented. What about the case when there is potential or pending litigation? If the researcher does not know about such things beforehand, he or she could be in for an unpleasant surprise later, Dr. Paller observed. Community-based research could be as much service or education as research and the researcher could be helpful by including opponents. The task force wants to sure that researchers avoid a community perception that they will be involved in the research when the researcher does not promise community engagement and does not want it.

Dr. Lawrenz reported that she has an NSF grant for doing community-based research so it is an activity with which she is familiar. She said that policies are not the best way to make people aware of these kinds of guidelines and it is her view that the University should not have a policy on something unless it is prepared to enforce it; she would prefer to see them as guidelines. She suggested that statements surrounding the fourth type of community research (community-based participatory research) might raise expectations for the other types of community-based research that will not be met. She also said that as a general comment, she wonders why the University would develop a policy about this kind of research but not about other kinds of research (although guidelines would be fine). Is the idea to tell a researcher how to do his or her research?

Dr. Paller said that in discussions with those interested in the subject, they wanted a policy, not principles. Dr. Lawrenz responded that she could think of a lot of reasons why people would want a policy, none of them good ones. Dr. Paller said the three senior vice presidents were very interested in the report but agreed that the language is not well-enough defined that it could serve as the basis for imposing disciplinary action on anyone. The question is where to put the principles so they will be found; he said he doesn't have strong feelings about the matter and the most important consideration is that researchers know about them. Dr. Lawrenz concurred and added that equally as important is better coordination, because right now there could be three people from the University doing research in one school at the same time with none of them knowing about the other two. Dr. Paller said that was a good point and observed that it is a problem that University researchers are all over the place and no one knows what is going on. He said he's not in a position to say there should be a registry but they may be a need for coordination.

Professor Bearinger recalled that there was a series of conversations led by Dr. Darlene Bailey about coordination of research and many of the people on this task force were involved in them. She said she was happy to see the algorithm that Dr. Paller presented. In terms of the number of people affected, as an example, Professor Bearinger described the recent call for proposals for 5-year Prevention Research Centers, which included an R01-level proposal requiring a community-based partnership research study. There need to be guidelines on how such work can be recognized in promotion and tenure and merit decisions because it is a slower process of research. The guidelines are a good idea and help provide clarity around the principles, because there have been breaches in the past. It might help to if the document said something more explicitly about protecting human subjects. And the guidelines do need to be made visible to the University community.

Dean Ponce de Leon observed that the Minnesota Extension Service has a long and rich tradition of community engagement and service and said he will ask at the appropriate time that they also be consulted. Professor Cohen suggested the Arboretum also be included in the discussions. Both are entirely appropriate, Dr. Paller said; it is important to cover all the bases. If the principles become University policy, he would not want to see a group adversely affected.

Professor Bearinger said that if NIH and CDC are calling for community-based participatory research, and researchers must write in their proposals what they are doing, there could be an issue in writing the proposals. Someone has to write the grant, and it is likely not going to be the community people. Professor Linde responded that researchers can consult with community people before writing the proposal, rather than writing it and consulting afterwards. She also noted that the task force identified a continuum—but then makes an exponential leap in devising the principles associated with community-based partnership research. Why are those ten principles different? Dr. Paller said that no one has decided when something is a community-based partnership research, but that the principles hold if the project does fit in this category.

Professor Cohen asked if there are consequences from adopting the recommendations as principles versus policy. Dr. Paller said they are like the Code of Conduct, a set of principles the University subscribes to. He said he would leave it up to others to decide how to position the recommendations as policy; his concern is whether there is anything wrong with the words of the principles. They can affect how one does science, Professor Cohen said. If there are consequences, that is different from if they are principles; in the latter case, one can deviate from them if the research falls outside the vision of the principles, is something that does not fit.

Professor Dahlberg asked for an example. When the Provost's Research Council discussed these principles, there was support for the importance of building bonds between faculty and the community. Without following the principles or guidelines, at what point does the community feel as though they are "rats in cages" rather than citizens involved in the research? Professor Cohen said he liked the document but was worried that the senior vice presidents were more likely to impose something on the faculty than to allow flexibility. The document says the researcher defines the nature of the research; no one imposes a definition, Dr. Paller pointed out. He said he would oppose an IRB for community-based research.

Professor Escure commented that it is hard to disagree with the principles and most already follow them. She suggested it might be helpful to include a distinction between domestic and international research. Some people doing international research might not be able to follow the

principles (e.g., in a very remote part of the world). Dr. Paller said that if they are doing community-placed research, the principles would not apply, and if someone does not speak the local language it is unlikely they are doing community-based partnership research.

Professor Linde said that "community-based partnership research" is a phrase that carries very specific meaning. NIH uses it to mean something beyond the words themselves, and it is not likely to define international rural research as community-based partnership research. But community-placed research would fit and those principles should be followed, Professor Bearinger commented. Dr. Paller said he is awaiting comments from the people involved in international activities; if they cite instances along the line of those identified by Professor Escure, the principles can be adjusted.

Professor Dahlberg asked if the Committee wished to endorse the task force report and recommendations as a set of principles to be published on the policy-library website. Professor Hayes said that he would like a clarification on why the senior vice presidents want to see the principles as a policy. So they can be pointed out in the policy library, Dr. Paller said. If a policy is defined as something enforceable, the principles are not acceptable as policy. Ms. Zentner reported that the compliance office is moving toward having only policies that are enforceable. Professor Dahlberg suggested the Committee could vote to support them as guiding principles without endorsing placement on the policy-library website. The Committee voted 12-0 in favor of the principles, with one abstention.

Professor Dahlberg thanked Dr. Paller for his report.

2. Research and UMore Park

Professor Dahlberg now welcomed Vice President Muscoplat and Assistant Vice President Carlson to the meeting to discuss the research aspects of UMore Park.

Dr. Muscoplat began by recalling that UMore Park is land the University owns in Rosemount and Empire Township, about 5000 acres, 8 square miles, which it obtained from the Army after World War II. Part of the site was used for a gunpowder-manufacturing plant. The University originally acquired about 12,000 acres, given to it for \$1 if it used the land for 30 years for a public purpose. The University entered into a joint management agreement with the State of Minnesota as part of the transaction by which the State agreed to fund part of the cost of the new football stadium. Upon completion of payments to the University in 2032, the land will be deeded to the state. The 2,822 acres are dedicated to University research, recreation, and wildlife management in perpetuity.

The Board of Regents adopted a set of principles governing UMore Park in 2006, which were in brief: protect and enhance the value, advance the University's mission with physical and financial resources, improve the long-term financial health of the University, retain oversight of UMore Park's planning and development, optimize the value, utilize market value as benchmark, ensure planning with highest integrity, fairness, and sound business practices, and respect needs of neighboring communities and local, regional, and state governments. The University retained a consultant to help develop a vision and recommendations; they evaluated three scenarios. One, hold the land without development; two, sell the land at wholesale prices; or three, develop a "new community" with a University imprimatur. The overarching vision is (1) a growing University endowment supporting the academic mission in perpetuity, (2) a unique and lasting University legacy of discovery and research-based education, and (3) a vital

regional economy benefitting Minnesota citizens. UMore Park is projected to have about 13,000 housing units with an expected economic impact of \$5-7 billion on the region.

The vision for the property was presented to the Board of Regents in November 2006. UMore Park would be a community of 20,000-30,000 people, with an enhanced quality of life influenced by University expertise, an environmentally sensitive and energy-efficient community with sustainable development as a national/international model, intellectually and culturally rich, that grows the University's endowment in aid of becoming a top-three public university. The development will take place over the next 25-30 years. The Regents in December 2006 adopted a resolution calling for a plan for the entire property, preparation of a concept master plan, and making the land ready for development. The land sits on top of the largest aggregate deposit in the area, Dr. Muscoplat related, as well as the remnants from the World War II plant.

Ms. Carlson led six task forces to define UMore Park's academic planning and development, which drew on over 100 faculty members. The task forces addressed education, environment, energy, health, transportation, and interdisciplinary research opportunities (including arts, culture, and community development), to show how UMore Park will differ from other communities (without University involvement, it would simply be another suburban development). The task forces' recommendations informed the new developer-planner consultant, retained in November, 2007. The Board of Regents has accepted the concept master plan in December 2008 and they are now charged to develop it, Dr. Muscoplat said.

The UMore Park site has about 400 million tons of aggregate that is quite valuable and that will generate a relatively small but steady annual revenue stream for decades. Revenues will be captured in a legacy fund to support the academic mission. The gravel lies fortuitously; mining can take place in the western reaches of the property while Phase 1 development occurs in the north, for example, and once the gravel extraction is complete, the land can be re-contoured for development. This is, Dr. Muscoplat emphasized again, a long-term project that will take decades to bring to fruition. They have started the Environmental Impact Statement process in order to move toward mining the gravel—they hope to start in 2010-11. The University has issued an RFP for a gravel-mining partner.

Dr. Muscoplat described the process used to evaluate the scenarios for UMore Park development and the evaluation criteria used to judge them. The concept master plan was approved in December 2008, and the Board of Regents called for completing requirements that precede development, pursuit of documentation to create a single-owner limited-liability company to manage UMore Park, and development of the legal framework to create a legacy fund to capture proceeds for long-term support of University research, education, and public engagement not otherwise adequately funded by state or federal sources or tuition. He outlined the next steps and what the University would ensure (stewardship, a legacy for the public good, mission support, and economic development).

Ms. Carlson briefly outlined the academic mission: core to the project is differentiating the community from other master-planned communities, adding value to the quality of life and economic development, and create new opportunities to support the University's strategic-positioning goals. The project has an Academic Mission Advisory Board, launched this February, the members of which are Deborah Swackhamer (chair), John Adams, Marilyn Bruin, Frank Cerra, Andrew Furco, Michael Greco, Ann Hill Duin, Arthur Huang, Kelley Jepsen, Mary Jo Kreitzer, Kristi Kremers, Meredith McQuaid, Laura Molgaard, Ed Nater, Thomas Norman, and Richard Strong, and Dan Svedarsky. The Board will

infuse education and research into the planning and development and it will have subcommittees that draw in more faculty, staff, and students. UMore Park provides a 5000-acre research platform for University faculty and students that is unique among higher education institutions. They want to encourage and support faculty who might wish to incorporate research on the property into research grant proposals. They also want to create student opportunities including class projects, capstone courses and new curriculum.

Dr. Muscoplat said that UMore Park will be a revenue center for the University, not a cost center.

Professor Dahlberg said he would like to see a financial plan that includes the dollars invested and an estimate of when the University will start to receive money. The University has invested about \$5 million and will need to put in a little more, Dr. Muscoplat said, but he expects that money will be paid back all at once because of the value of the gravel to the University's mining partner. The University will need to spend more on real estate development, but it will make money from the gravel. There are also significant opportunities to create ancillary businesses derived from mining products or an energy utility, for example, based on investigations into ground-source heat pumps, solar, and biogas generation. A segment of the property is envisioned as an eco-industrial park, which would attract tenants, generating rental income.

Professor Ruggles asked what the University's comparative advantage is when it gets into the energy business. The University won't be in the business; it will allow others to do that, Dr. Muscoplat said.

Professor Hays asked what the projected revenue from the known gravel deposits would be. Dr. Muscoplat said that 3-5 million tons per year would be sold, over several decades, at perhaps \$1 per ton. It is a big number, but it is only possible to sell so much into the local market in any one year. This will not be a windfall, he emphasized. Professor Hays inquired if they expected to use the money for development. They do not, Dr. Muscoplat said; they expect the developers to pay all the costs of development, not the University. Will they build quickly in order get a payoff, Professor Hays then asked? The University must be careful, Dr. Muscoplat responded, and developers will be required to adopt plans that carry the University's imprimatur; the University will be in control. It could be done fast but then the project could lose its academic value. And building can only occur as fast as the market can bear.

Professor Cohen asked what pollutants are still on the site and what the expected clean-up costs would be. Dr. Muscoplat said the pollution is limited to a few hundred acres and they know what some of the pollutants are, given the detailed knowledge of the Gopher Ordnance Works facility and processing techniques. They are working with the Army Corps of Engineers to finish the evaluation. Most of the pollutants are associated with gunpowder and are not in the area that will be developed in the next 15-20 years. The goal is to get the Corps to study and clean up the area. They will not be extracting gravel in the vicinity of the Gopher Ordnance Works.

Will they start building houses while industry remains in the area, Professor Cohen asked? They will, but not next to the industrial area. The plan is to mine in the western part and develop real estate in the center and to the north, separated by some distance from the mine and by berms and visual protection. If it will take multiple decades to develop the area, it can accommodate multiple uses at the same time, as is true in other areas in the metropolitan area. Professor Dengel commented that he would not want to

live near dump trucks hauling gravel; he would want the industry cleared out, and usually the gravel is removed and only then is the land developed. The take-home message, in his view, Professor Cohen said, is that gravel pits are a dicey business and long-term development around gravel is a leap of faith he is not willing to take. Dr. Muscoplat said the University will not do the mining; there are several companies in the Twin Cities that would like to mine the gravel and send the University a check each year. The University will be well-rewarded, he maintained.

Professor Ruggles said that aside from the research platform, the University could just sell the land on the market. Dr. Muscoplat said they studied that alternative and concluded that developing the land with a plan would generate ten times as much money as simply selling the land. Why would the University get into the development business, Professor Ruggles asked? That is also his question, Professor Dahlberg said: is it proper for the University to do this? It would be investing for academic reasons, but only for a few faculty members. He said he did not know of any other university that has taken on a project like this.

It was agreed that the Committee would return to this subject in the fall, and would wish at that time to see financial projections.

Professor Dahlberg thanked Dr. Muscoplat and Ms. Carlson for their report, and adjourned the meeting at 4:05.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota