

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, March 6, 2008**  
**1:15 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Emily Hoover (chair pro tem), Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Shawn Curley, Dan Dahlberg, William Durfee, Barbara Elliott, Marti Hope Gonzales, Jeff Kahn, Judith Martin, Martin Sampson, Cathrine Wambach, Jennifer Windsor, Becky Yust

Absent: Gary Balas, Carolyn Hayes, Lois Heller, Mary Jo Kane, Nelson Rhodus, Geoffrey Sirc

Guests: Professor Kathryn VandenBosch

Other: Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) copyright subcommittee; (2) representative on the committee from the Duluth health sciences programs; (3) senate policies on the web; (4) report on the St. Paul campus plan; (5) cost-pool statement; (6) voting rights in college assemblies]

**1. Copyright Subcommittee**

Professor Hoover convened the meeting at 12:00 and announced that Professor Balas was involved in the CLA dean search so unable to attend the meeting. She asked Committee members to review the changes to the charge to the copyright subcommittee. She recalled that the Committee had suggested to the Provost the creation of a standing subcommittee to assist with writing the administrative policy that will implement the Regents' policy and to serve as a sounding board on copyright disputes and to provide advice to the Provost. There has been a separate committee appointed to actually write the administrative policy, so the charge to the subcommittee needs to be revised. (The members of the committee drafting the administrative policy are:

Wendy Pradt Lougee, University Librarian (co-chair)  
Professor Ruth Okediji, Law (co-chair)  
Professor John Archer, Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature  
Professor Gary Balas, Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics  
Professor Marc Jenkins, Microbiology

Arlene Carney, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs (ex officio)  
Gregory Brown, Office of the General Counsel (ex-officio)

The original charge to the subcommittee suggested the Provost or his designee serve as a member and as chair; Professor Chomsky thought that unusual for a governance body and also wondered if faculty members would be as likely to tell their story if the Provost or his representative is sitting in the chair. All administrators on committees are ex officio, she observed, and it makes sense with this one as well. It

---

\* 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.

is important, however, that the Provost or his representative be part of the subcommittee for the discussions. She also suggested that the subcommittee should elect its own chair.

The Committee agreed with Professor Chomsky's suggestions and also agreed it would ask the Provost's office to provide staff support to the subcommittee.

The Committee also adopted the following statement unanimously:

The Faculty Consultative Committee suggests to the Provost that the standing Copyright Subcommittee it approved on March 6, 2008, be incorporated into the administrative policy implementing the Regents' policy Copyright. FCC believes the subcommittee could serve as a mechanism to help resolve copyright disputes that may arise.

## **2. Representative from the Duluth Health Sciences Programs**

Professor Hoover next said the discussion about the UMD representative needed to be brought to a close. Professor Elliott said the minutes of the February 21 meeting contain a nice summary of the discussion; she said she would be glad to answer any questions.

Professor Chomsky said she had examined the bylaws; they provide for a representative to be elected by the eligible faculty at UMD (that is, those not in the bargaining unit), so the faculty in the Pharmacy program may participate in the selection without any bylaw change.

The Committee concluded it wished to propose no changes in the current representation, so the health sciences faculty at UMD will continue to have an ex officio non-voting representative.

## **3. Senate Policies on the Web**

Committee members agreed that it did not make organizational sense for there to be, on the University Policy Library website, a separate category for Senate policies. Few people would know to look for educational and various other policies under a separate heading. The Senate policies should continue to be listed on the Senate web page, with a link to the policy library, and on the policy library website the Senate-adopted policies should appear in the appropriate category, with a clear indication that they have been adopted or approved by the Faculty or University Senate.

It was also agreed that the policy categories on the University Policy Library Website should probably be refined.

## **4. Report on the St. Paul Campus Plan**

Professor Hoover now welcomed Professor VandenBosch to the meeting. She noted that Professor VandenBosch had been asked to co-chair a committee to develop a plan for the St. Paul campus. A copy of the report (sans appendix) is appended to these minutes.

Professor VandenBosch told the Committee that about a year ago Provost Sullivan asked her to co-chair a committee, along with Associate Vice President Kvavik, to work with the St. Paul deans to characterize endeavors that might take place on the St. Paul campus in the future. The effort arose as a

result of questions the President asked about whether there were any guiding principles about where to house interdisciplinary activities. The answer was "no" and the study of St. Paul was one result.

The charge to the committee was to identify emergent themes to unify clusters of research and academic programs. Desired outcomes will be to:

- Identify campus precincts aligned with themes
- Provide context for assigning new initiatives to the campus
- Align building use with academic priorities and maximize use of classroom space

Professor VandenBosch said she liked the use of the word "emergent" because the committee was asked for a forward-looking vision, for programs to respond to challenges in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century that could be located in St. Paul.

In the course of their work, Professor VandenBosch said, they had discussions with the deans of CBS, CCE, Design, CEHD, CFANS, CVM, and Extension and their associates, conducted interviews of leaders of several campus interdisciplinary groups (Institute on the Environment, IREE, Microbial and Plant Genomics Institute, Bell Museum, Stormwater Linkage Committee), held focus group discussions that provided feedback on a draft of the report, met with the CFANS department heads and FCC, CEHD department heads, the Campus Community Advisory Committee, had discussions with the Falcon Heights community, and will integrate their work with campus master-planning effort. Professor Martin asked if the task force expected that physical-planning elements of the St. Paul plan would be integrated with campus master planning; Professor VandenBosch said they would.

Some of the possible 21<sup>st</sup> –Century challenges to be addressed by St. Paul disciplines are these:

- Increasingly limited land and natural resources
- Sustainable production of healthy foods, clean energy and other products vs. competing land uses.
- Negative impacts on environmental quality, including climate change, loss of habitat, effects on biodiversity
- Changing demographics (in age and ethnicity); challenges in providing access to education, health services and quality of life
- Emergence of new zoonotic and infectious diseases that threaten human and animal health, largely because of increasing contact of the human population with the environment.

There is an unprecedented increase in population and pressure on land and natural resources, areas in which St. Paul disciplines have excelled.

The key findings of the report were these, Professor VandenBosch said:

1. The St. Paul Campus is an integral part of the Twin Cities campus; St. Paul strengths are key to the University's mission and the ties to the Minneapolis campuses are numerous. The primary implication of this finding is that it is important to surmount the distance between the campuses.
2. Proposed themes, primarily interdisciplinary, include environmental sustainability, the bio-economy, safe and healthy foods, (these two related to products from the land and living organisms, with

newly-emerging approaches), education and human development across the life span, and healthy communities.

3. St. Paul Campus is a global campus: As they spoke with the deans, they realized that the problems are global, not Minnesota or U.S., and there is a lot of expertise on the St. Paul campus as well as a lot of international students, which creates a potential synergy.

4. The St. Paul campus can be a magnet for interdisciplinary scholarship around themes with interdisciplinary facilities and the ability to address 'intellectual sprawl' by providing space for external associates and encouraging nearby development. For example, MIT has a lot of private-sector expertise around it, while in the Twin Cities it is scattered all over the metropolitan area; MIT can identify and address opportunities and have more interactions with external partners.

5. A critical mass of academic programs and activities is key to vitality of St. Paul campus. The biggest feature that students must deal with is spending time going back and forth to Minneapolis; a critical mass of programs would help to reduce that demand. That would mean more St. Paul-based majors and CLE courses, bundling classes (an 'Amazon.com' approach, so that several courses that are commonly taken concurrently could be clustered together in St. Paul, so students could minimize the number of trips they must take back and forth between campuses). Critical mass would also mean lab courses and project-based activities, flexible spaces for collaborative learning, appropriate technologies for virtual interactions and distance learning, and living/learning communities tied to campus themes.

6. The St. Paul campus is a public face of the University and a key place for outreach; a number of places make it a destination: Extension, the continuing education (Earle Brown) Conference Center, veterinary clinics, the Raptor Center, demonstration gardens, the Equine Center, and the Bell Museum (when it is built there).

7. The St. Paul campus can be a 'Green Campus,' a demonstration site for sustainable development, renewable energy, and healthy urban environment.

8. Retention of open & agricultural spaces is important for St. Paul as a "living laboratory" important for research, teaching, and outreach; they are key to character of campus and valued by neighboring communities. The campus needs to have greenway connections to surrounding areas.

9. The St. Paul campus must function as a village, with rapid transit links to Minneapolis campus and surrounding communities, diverse dining options and perhaps a Campus Club "annex," hotel space on or near campus (for seminars, conferences, candidates, etc.), more cultural events and recreational sports options on campus, the possible addition of housing options for undergraduates, postdocs and visiting scholars, and affordable housing for young faculty. It cannot have isolated academic programs and it needs amenities, Professor VandenBosch said.

10. It must explore opportunities to partner with the State Fair and other neighbors, including such things as renewable energy, sustainable urban environment, 'clean tech', and other demonstrations at the State Fair, options for commercial, restaurant, and hotel development, and R&D space on the transitway for local high-tech industry.

Professor Hoover said she attended some of the open sessions and found them to be well-rounded and that they generated a lot of interesting comments. One point comes up repeatedly: how to link this plan with the campus master-planning process and the capital budget process. But people are excited about the plan. Professor VandenBosch reported that she met with the President's Executive Committee to report on the preparation of the report, and plan to meet again to detail the reception it has received. The President is enthusiastic about the report, she said. Their next meeting is with Professor Martin and Vice President O'Brien, who are co-chairing the campus master-planning process, to integrate the report into that effort.

What is important in the near term is that faculty, staff, and students develop principles to guide the use of open and agricultural spaces on the St. Paul campus, Professor VandenBosch said. There have been changes in the use of these spaces and animal facilities on the campus and no doubt other changes will occur as well. Decisions about any changes should be well grounded in understanding of the needs of academic and research programs.

Professor Curley said there are financial implications to the report; a number of the recommendations require investment while others are more strategic priority-setting decisions. Where is that happening? Has the committee discussed them? Not yet, Professor VandenBosch said. The deans have their own pieces of the capital-planning process but the document informs the choices that will be made in the future. That is a vague answer, she acknowledged, but development of a vision is an early step. That gets to Professor Hoover's question, Professor Martin said: the relationship between campus master-planning, the six-year capital plan, and this plan. One knows that there can be changes in the six-year capital plan, but it does get to the question of who sets academic priorities. Professor VandenBosch said the scope of the St. Paul plan is in the 10-20-year range because the ideas need a longer framework. It is hoped that the ideas, if embraced, will inform further development of the six year capital plan.

Professor Durfee commented that most of the people with whom he interacts see the East Bank, West Bank, and St. Paul as three campuses. The new translational-research building will be closer to the St. Paul campus than to the West Bank. Is there a plan to discuss the West Bank in a manner similar to this review of the St. Paul campus? Professor Martin reported that they are looking at ALL the campuses in the master-planning process. One element they are considering is better physical integration of all campus segments—that is what campus master-planning is all about. This report sets up St. Paul as a separate entity, Professor Durfee suggested. It arose for a specific purpose, Professor VandenBosch said; if it is a useful model, it would be desirable to apply it to other precincts of the campus. Professor Martin noted that there are AHC and West Bank plans.

Professor Carpenter commented that the report remarks on the St. Paul campus as an integral part of the campus and that it is not freestanding. This is about the University of Minnesota; the St. Paul campus is an integral part of the University. The report needs to be more inclusive. It is a great report and one hopes its goals can be achieved, but she said she would like to see more integration because, for example, the Morris campus is doing an enormous amount of work related to sustainability. Professor VandenBosch agreed the point was well taken and observed that the St. Paul campus also has a lot of connections through, for example, the Research and Outreach Centers. The point also suggests the need for continuing discussion of what is best sited at Morris, in St. Paul, and even at UMore Park. It is not just the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses, Professor Carpenter said; why cannot it be arranged so that UMM students can take Minneapolis/St. Paul courses—and vice-versa?

Professor Elliott pointed out that the Duluth campus has the Natural Resources Research Institute and other projects on the environment and sustainability that should also be a part of connections.

The hotel idea is intriguing, Professor Wambach commented. A site on the transitway, with jazzy mass transit, would make it fun to use. One can imagine a Disneyland hotel with its monorail and shopping—have they speculated about such possibilities? They are beginning to, Professor VandenBosch said. The St. Paul campus, as noted, has a lot of potential as a destination—and a lot of chicken-and-egg questions. They need more infrastructure if more people are to come to the campus, but no one is willing to build the infrastructure unless the people come. The domino effect of the program changes and buildings will take years but they have to start talking about the programs that will be there.

Professor Windsor asked where Senior Vice President Jones's office stands in the process. He could have insights about the plans. The report arose because of questions about St. Paul, Professor VandenBosch said, and Dean Bev Durgan (Dean and Director of the Minnesota Extension Service) reports to Dr. Jones.

Professor Dahlberg said that many of the items in the report require funding, either one-time or recurring, so either the University will have to divert dollars or obtain new funds. The report suggests students will be taking more classes in St. Paul and that there will be more faculty; does that justify moving the money around? Professor VandenBosch said the report is not that mature yet. They have talked about a level of activity that warrants investment, and they must know the plans of individual units about what will be based in St. Paul.

Professor Durfee said it was interesting that they talked to the "St. Paul deans." What is the definition of a St. Paul dean? The College of Design will be off the St. Paul campus in 10-15 years. Is the idea that programs there now will determine the future, not programs that might come in? One senses those seven deans get to say what will happen and the others do not. Professor VandenBosch said she would welcome views from the other deans on the Twin Cities campus, but the ones most interested have been those with programs on the St. Paul campus. She did talk with the Deans' Council and there were a number of interesting questions and ideas. The report presents ideas that are clearly University-wide, Professor Durfee said, and should be discussed at that level.

Professor Sampson said he was interested in the call for synergy with the private sector. The campus is bounded by the State Fair, the Grove, the golf course, and so on, so one would not imagine there is a lot of land available to the private sector. There are opportunities for the University to provide land for private-sector activities, although doing so could come at the cost of open spaces. Professor VandenBosch responded that the users of the open spaces would say that there is no open space to spare. But in 10-20 years there could be big changes, Professor Martin commented.

Professor Kahn related that the members of the Faculty Culture Task Force talked with faculty from all over the University and one of the points universally made was about the lack of gathering spaces. That same issue is implicit in the St. Paul report but it doesn't jump out. It does not have to be free space but could be converted from other uses without great expense so people could have a cup of coffee and a space to talk. Providing such spaces is nothing something universities are good at. Did they hear about that problem? They heard about in connection with interdisciplinary research, Professor VandenBosch said. In a building with different disciplines and people want to interact, they need open spaces where they can eat, have coffee, etc. Rather than want better food, they may want places they can

have an intellectual conversation, Professor Kahn said. Professor Martin said the plea for more informal gathering spaces is widespread; such spaces are needed all over the campus. Professor VandenBosch reported that the Cargill Building is an example of a building with flexible space that fosters interdisciplinary interactions including big and small gatherings, and it functions well.

What has also come up in conversation is the plan talks about academic programs but not about the University's bureaucracy, Professor Hoover said. Recreational Sports has a large presence in St. Paul but it does not seem to mesh well with other activities. Some universities mesh facilities and academic programs better than Minnesota does.

Professor Chomsky said that she is a Campus Club board member and reported that the Club has made a great effort to work with St. Paul people but they realize it has not worked that well. There would be great interest in a St. Paul annex, but there are University subsidization questions and it could be a financial challenge. If the University were supportive, however, the Campus Club would be interested in exploring the possibility of offering the service. Professor VandenBosch said there would be a lot of interest on the St. Paul campus in a Campus Club facility.

Professor Elliott said that as a student at the University, she took courses on the West Bank, the East Bank, and St. Paul, and had to go back and forth. The "Amazon.com" computer possibility would allow students to be in one place for half a day and would be a huge advantage (to both students and faculty). The University does not need the rest of the report to happen in order to implement that recommendation, which would allow St. Paul to capture a larger group of students.

Professor Wambach recalled that President Yudof called for more and better signage, which there now is on the Minneapolis campus. Is there also on St. Paul? It is not at the same level, Professor Martin said. Part of the problem could be as simple as signage, Professor Wambach pointed out, so people are more comfortable coming to the campus. They would not have to wander around looking for buildings, which is frustrating—so people do not schedule events on the campus and students avoid it. On the other hand, Professor Martin commented, for people coming from off-campus, access is a great deal easier to St. Paul than to Minneapolis. If there were a way to make Minneapolis programs more aware of the easy access in St. Paul, they might make more use of the St. Paul campus.

Professor Hoover thanked Professor VandenBosch for making her report. Professor VandenBosch told the Committee the report can be downloaded and commented upon at [http://academic.umn.edu/provost/reports/st\\_paul\\_planning.html](http://academic.umn.edu/provost/reports/st_paul_planning.html).

## **5. Cost-Pool Statement**

Professor Hoover next reminded the Committee that several FCC members had lunch with a number of the deans last December. One issue that kept coming up during the discussion was the cost pools; the faculty members asked the deans about their participation in the decision-making about cost-pool budgets and rates. It appears they have very little. As a result, Professor Balas has suggested that the Committee think about a statement, from it to the President, asking that the deans be more involved. She noted a draft statement that had been circulated to Committee members.

Professor Martin explained that the cost-pool units go through their budget process in the fall while academic units prepare their budgets in the spring. The deans prepare their budgets when the cost-

pool charges have been set; they have nothing to say about those charges but are told to pay. That leads to frustration because if they must pay, they should be able to ask questions about the rates and budgets. The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning has asked whether a unit that saves money in operating or other costs can retain the money; the answer is "not all of it." There need to be more incentives for units to reduce operating costs. Professor Curley said the general logic of the system makes sense because decisions are located at the college level, so the money should go there as well. What is frustrating is that the colleges do not have a lot of control over the money.

Professor Martin noted that the Finance and Planning Committee had recently received the annual utilities report, which contained a lot of good news. The people working with utilities issues are doing an astonishing job, but it is difficult to get people to be aware of space and utility costs.

Professor Wambach said she has the sense that the budget model drives reserves out. Professor Martin said the allocation of costs does not affect reserves, while Professor Dahlberg added that reserves are earmarked for special purposes and cannot be used for general purposes. The ad hoc budget-model subcommittee addresses this point.

Professor Martin said she supported the statement; it makes sense, and the consultation with deans should take place before rates are set. Professor Chomsky agreed. Professor Elliott suggested that the coordinate campus chancellors be included.

Professor Dahlberg pointed out that Vice President Pfutzenreuter and Ms. Tonneson are not the ones who make cost-pool decisions; they are made after a multitude of discussions with a number of units. Professor Martin agreed and said the deans should not be involved in all those discussions but should be provided information before recommendations are made and have discussions with those who are making the recommendations (and those who will make the decisions). The deans become frustrated, Professor Dahlberg said, when cost-pool charges go up 10% while the college revenues only go up 3%. The colleges need to say they will not pay when do not see corresponding increases in revenues, Professor Wambach declared.

The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the following statement, to be taken to the Faculty Senate:

The Faculty Consultative Committee recommends to the President and senior vice presidents that a representative group of the Twin Cities deans (and coordinate campus chancellors, as appropriate) either (1) be involved directly and integrally in the current mechanisms used to determine rates for the cost pools, or (2) be constituted as a separate body to review recommendations on cost pool charges and provide advice to the President on them. In either case, the review and consultation should take place before any decisions have been made about cost-pool charges or rates.

## **6. Voting Rights in College Assemblies**

Professor Hoover next drew the attention of Committee members to an email message that had raised questions about who is entitled to vote in college assemblies and if there are limits on the voting rights that can be awarded. Professor Hoover noted that several years ago the Faculty Senate had adopted, and administration approved, an Academic Unit Governance policy which provides, in essence,



that the tenured and tenure-track faculty retain ultimate authority over policies related to curriculum, research, and unit governance. An academic unit (in this case, a department) may grant voting rights on various matters to whomever it wishes, but a majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty have the right to overturn a decision they believe detrimental to a department. (All of this subject to the understanding that unit governance is advisory to the academic authorities at the University who have been delegated authority by the Board of Regents.) Professor Balas has suggested that a parallel college-assembly governance statement might be considered.

Professor Chomsky said she believed the ideas are parallel. Unless there is a reason to have different ones, the rule should be the same for departments and colleges: the ultimate authority, the group that passes the consultation rules and any changes to it, are the tenured and tenure-track faculty. A college should be able to do whatever it wishes in terms of participation of non-tenured/tenure-track faculty—they can vote on anything the tenured/tenure-track faculty put in a constitution that provides for voting rights for others. It may be that certain issues would require a majority of those voting as well as a majority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty. The major concerns are tenure, curriculum, and research, Professor Martin commented.

Professor Sampson inquired if there is a bottom line, pertinent to college governance, beyond which the tenured/tenure-track faculty may not relinquish their authority, beyond which they do not have a right to rescind the grant of authority. Professor Chomsky said they cannot share the right to make decisions about tenuring faculty, and the governance policy says the regular (that is, tenure and tenure-track) faculty must recommend any tenured or tenure-track hire, but that does not preclude participation by non-tenure-track faculty.

Does this mean all colleges would need to revise their constitutions, Professor Wambach asked? It may be that some of them would need to be changed if a "College Governance Policy" were adopted, Professor Chomsky said. Is someone obligated to tell them that, Professor Wambach inquired?

Professor Chomsky suggested modifying the Academic Unit Governance policy to create a parallel policy for colleges. It would embody what the rule has always been but not codified. It would state that the tenured and tenure-track faculty are ultimately responsible for the curriculum and research and would provide a way to implement, to flesh out, what has always been the case. In the case of the existing policy, Professor Martin recalled, there was a lot of discussion, especially with respect to units that had a lot of non-regular faculty. Professor Chomsky reported that her unit (the Law School) tries to allow as much participation as possible by full-time non-regular faculty and want to be as even-handed as possible. Professor Martin said a statement would embody what faculty believe, that the tenured and tenure-track faculty should be responsible. But they may want the participation of other colleagues, Professor Chomsky said.

Professor Sampson asked if college assemblies approve curricula. Professor Wambach suggested that when colleges write their constitutions, they may need to require a majority in the assembly and on the curriculum committee. For important decisions about curriculum, research, and tenure, the tenured and tenure-track faculty must be a majority. She said she was surprised to learn from Professor Chomsky that the tenured/tenure-track faculty could give away their authority, such as creating a curriculum committee with a non-regular faculty majority. Professor Chomsky pointed out that the actions of such a committee would be subject to the primary responsibility of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is a reasonable interpretation that these decisions must be made with a majority of the tenured and tenure-

track faculty, not just a majority of the body (that contains members other than the tenured and tenure-track faculty). But it would leave units free to decide: a majority of the assembly must be tenured or tenure-track faculty, a majority of certain committees, or there is an appeal to the tenured/tenure-track faculty if such majorities are not required. Other arrangements would probably also be possible.

Professor Dahlberg asked about the genesis of the question: Is there a problem? Is there a slippery slope? If units are writing constitutions, Professor Hoover said, they want to be sure that they are in compliance with University policy. Such a policy reflects the ultimate responsibility that the tenured/tenure-track faculty have always had over these matters, Professor Chomsky repeated.

Professor Chomsky said she would draft a version for the Committee to review. It should also be taken to the deans for review, it was suggested.

Professor Hoover adjourned the meeting at 2:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

\* \* \*

**DEFINING THE ST. PAUL CAMPUS**  
A Working Draft - February 18, 2008

**I. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY**

In 2007, Provost Sullivan charged the seven St. Paul deans, convened by Kate VandenBosch and Bob Kvavik, to identify themes defining the mission of the St. Paul campus for the future. Ideally, these themes will unify clusters of research and academic programs and bring new energy to the campus. A desired outcome is to use the clusters to identify campus precincts aligned with the themes. The defined themes will also provide context for assigning new programmatic initiatives to St. Paul, planning new research facilities in St. Paul, aligning building use with academic priorities, and maximizing use of classroom space.

To meet the charge, Kvavik and VandenBosch met with the Deans of the Colleges of Biological Science (CBS), Continuing Education (CCE), Design (CDES), Education and Human Development (CEHD), Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (CFANS), Veterinary Medicine (CVM), and Extension and their associates. We also met with selected faculty and others with insight into St. Paul Campus strengths and potential, emphasizing leaders of interdisciplinary centers or initiatives. We used a common set of questions, listed in Appendix I, to structure the discussions. From these conversations, clear unifying themes for the campus emerged. In addition, the deans and others identified additional opportunities to bring vitality to campus, as well as obstacles to be overcome.

The key findings are as follows:

1. The St. Paul Campus' future is as an integral part of the Twin Cities campus, rather than as a freestanding or branch campus. The campus' strengths are seen as key to University mission.
2. The proposed themes to characterize St. Paul programs include environmental sustainability; the bio-economy; safe and healthy foods; education and human development across the life span; and healthy communities.

3. St. Paul is a global campus with many ties to international themes in research, education, and campus residences, with potential for greater synergy and visibility.
4. The St. Paul Campus can be a magnet of interdisciplinary scholarship and a key go-to place for expertise around the identified themes.
5. Increasing the critical mass of undergraduate activities is a key to the vitality of the St. Paul campus, and can be achieved through better logistics and support for innovation.
6. The St. Paul Campus can build on current strengths in outreach and engagement to become the public face of the University for diverse groups of constituents.
7. The St. Paul Campus can develop as a 'green campus' and be a demonstration site for renewable energy, sustainable development, and a healthy urban environment.
8. Retention of open and agricultural spaces is key to campus function as a 'living laboratory', as well as to the character of the campus and its connection to surrounding communities.
9. The proximity of the St. Paul Campus to the State Fair grounds and to the transit way offer opportunities for partnerships with the State Fair, the private sector, and the cities of Falcon Heights, St. Paul, and Minneapolis around the proposed themes.
10. Perceived transit difficulties and relative lack of amenities are obstacles to attracting activities to St. Paul. To thrive, the St. Paul campus must function as a village, with frequent and rapid transportation links to the Minneapolis campus and surrounding communities.

This report should be considered a working draft, to be finalized following input from the University community and other constituents. This input will be key to defining next steps.

## II. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges to be addressed by our Land Grant University.** The 21<sup>st</sup> century is expected to be a time of continued rapid change, fueled by the increase in the human population. The global population is projected to increase from 6 to 9 billion people in the first half of the century, while the U.S. population will increase by as much as 100 million people by 2050. The St. Paul Deans and leaders of several interdisciplinary initiatives in St. Paul identified large-scale challenges related to the unprecedented population pressures. These included:

- increasingly limited land and natural resources. Dominant challenges will be meeting societal needs for sustainable production of healthy foods, clean energy, and other products vs. competing land uses.
- negative impacts on environmental quality and ecosystem health, including climate change and loss of biodiversity and habitat.
- changing demographics, further increasing challenges in providing meaningful access to education, health services and quality of life to underserved populations.
- emergence of zoonotic and infectious diseases, due to more intense human interaction with the environment, that threatens both animal and human health.

**Themes for the St. Paul Campus.** The 21<sup>st</sup> century challenges identified above guided the development of crosscutting themes for the St. Paul Campus. The themes, outlined below, arise from and extend the campus' historical roots in agriculture, veterinary medicine, natural resources, and home economics. They build on strengths of academic units with a St. Paul footprint or link, plus opportunities for growth and modest reorganization. The themes identified here integratively build on the mission and goals of individual colleges to create new synergies among St. Paul-based units, raise the profile of the campus, and enhance the overall excellence of the University.

***Products from the land and living sources: the bio-economy.*** Since its beginnings, the St. Paul campus has had a focus on renewable products from the land. New scientific tools and markets are

expanding opportunities for growth of the bio-economy, the intersection of life sciences technology with the global economy. Broad interest in bioenergy and its economic potential is prominent in Minnesota and beyond. Biotechnology and allied approaches are enabling the sustainable engineering of new 'green' materials and products from plants and microbes. Medical biotechnology also has a presence on the St. Paul campus, especially as concerns animals as vectors of infectious disease and as models for human medicine. The campus' strengths in basic biological sciences support innovation in production and utilization of bioenergy and bioproducts. Genomics, systems biology, metabolomics, bioprocessing, computational biology, and bioinformatics are common tools that provide the means to enhance synergy among related disciplines based in St. Paul.

***Products from the land and living sources: a safe and healthy food supply.*** Production of high quality foods for a growing population is an important challenge and a focus of the St. Paul campus. Our faculty has the expertise to provide scientific solutions to immediate and future problems of plant and animal agriculture, and will participate actively in implementation of advanced technological solutions for improvement of animal and plant health. St. Paul research also addresses food safety, nutrition, health-promoting effects of food, and the economics of food supply systems. Pursuit of a safe and healthy food supply further integrates common discovery and dissemination activities of the University in the areas of health and well-being, and capitalizes on the St. Paul campus international strengths that will be critical in the future, as the food supply becomes increasing global.

***Environmental sustainability: supporting healthy ecosystems in the face of competing needs.*** Many academic units in St. Paul already have environment-related missions at their core, addressing fundamental questions on environmental function and developing new strategies for a changing world. In addition to production of new sources of energy and materials, mentioned above, conservation and wise use of resources are key tactics to meeting the global challenges identified. These approaches include watershed management; soil and water conservation; utilization of wastes; and conservation of biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides. Natural, developed, and managed ecosystems are all addressed. The Twin Cities campus is novel among Land Grant institutions that deal with many of these issues in that it is in an urban setting. This provides an excellent opportunity for the St. Paul campus to address special issues such as healthy urban landscapes and the rural/urban interface.

***Education and human development across the spectrum of life: childhood and family education to professional development, continuing education and public engagement.*** St. Paul campus units have broad expertise in education that includes the spectrum of life and touches many external constituents. The recent college restructuring provides an opportunity for a unified focus on human development, family and early childhood education in St. Paul. Opportunities for K-12 outreach, both school-based and time spent outside of school, are strong in St. Paul. With CEHD units, Extension, and CCE already based here, outreach and adult education have a strong base for further growth. Collaboration of education and life sciences units in St. Paul also enables possible joint efforts such as work force training in emerging fields in the bio-economy, integrated learning opportunities in multidisciplinary areas, and partnering to attract young students, especially from under-represented groups, to life science and other disciplines related to St. Paul strengths.

***Healthy communities.*** The St. Paul campus is home to diverse expertise that together constitutes an integrated, interdisciplinary approach to improving the physical, emotional, and mental health of families and communities. The work of two departments in CEHD – Family Social Sciences and School of Social Work – will be instrumental in promoting healthy communities. This theme also relates to above-mentioned campus strengths in food and nutrition, and in the health of ecosystems, animals and plants that support and benefit communities.

***A global campus with international ties.*** The challenges outlined above are global in scope, so it is appropriate to emphasize and build on St. Paul's global connections. Researchers in many disciplines

have international research projects and collaborations. Conversations with campus leaders revealed that many academic programs based here have large numbers of international students. In addition, the Commonwealth Terrace family housing cooperative enriches the international flavor of the campus as home to student families from more than 70 countries. Elevating these strengths to a focus on an international theme will create synergy where connections have not previously been fully realized.

### **Concepts and approaches for bringing new vitality to the St. Paul campus**

**1. Research.** The St. Paul campus once was nearly self-contained, with a focus on agriculture, forestry, and home economics. Today, St. Paul-based disciplines have important ties to the Minneapolis campuses. A majority of St. Paul colleges also have a footprint in Minneapolis. Moreover, CVM forms the east end of an extended corridor for the Minneapolis-based Academic Health Center. In general, ties to colleagues in Minneapolis-based units are important for interdisciplinary scholarship in existing programs and around emerging themes. As a result, several recommendations emphasize means to foster interdisciplinary interactions. Recommendations under Teaching and Outreach also address the St. Paul/Minneapolis split of the University.

**1.1 Develop facilities to support integrated, interdisciplinary research around the identified themes.** To support such interdisciplinary research, flexible research space is needed to accommodate changing teams from multiple areas of expertise. In addition to St. Paul-based faculty, team members should include those drawn from Minneapolis units for the duration of projects. New types of spaces are needed to facilitate interdisciplinary research interactions that would otherwise not occur. A model based on the Cargill Building for Microbial and Plant Genomics would be functional for problem-oriented scholarship in many areas.

**1.2 Foster collaboration with external colleagues through on-campus facilities.** The Twin Cities is beset by ‘intellectual sprawl’, where industry professionals, government agencies, and NGOs are scattered around the metropolitan area and separated from academic expertise. Effective collaboration requires more frequent interactions, such as occurs for some other universities and their industrial partners, such as M.I.T. Ways to bring these groups into closer proximity should be explored, such as leasing of university space or creation of collaborative think-tanks. Such arrangements would facilitate public/private partnerships around the themes.

**1.3 Increase molecular biology/biotechnology space to support cutting edge research in changing disciplines.** Several units need an increase in this type of research laboratory space. While some of this space could be developed to be discipline-specific, other space of this nature could be interdisciplinary, as described in 1.1. Moreover, the University must continue to add cutting-edge research support facilities in St. Paul<sup>1</sup>, to support a vibrant research community with the flexibility to address emergent issues. Such facilities will contribute to full realization of the St. Paul campus potential for global leadership in its core areas of strength.

**1.4. Conserve the campus as a ‘living laboratory’ for research on the environment, agriculture, animal health, land use and landscape design.** Retaining open spaces, fields, and animals on campus is key to research that addresses the themes<sup>2</sup>. Long term planning is required to balance the need for new construction with the optimal use of these spaces. Evaluation of outdoor space needs should integrate

---

<sup>1</sup> An example of such a facility is the recently completed Bio-safety (BL3 level) Laboratory and Glasshouse. See [http://plpa.cfans.umn.edu/Plant\\_Pathology\\_Bio-Safety\\_Lab\\_Glasshouse.html](http://plpa.cfans.umn.edu/Plant_Pathology_Bio-Safety_Lab_Glasshouse.html).

<sup>2</sup> See <http://wrc.umn.edu/outreach/stormwater/pdfs/draftecologicalplan.pdf> for a draft of an Ecological Master Plan for the St. Paul Campus. This report is an excellent source of information on use of open spaces and prospects for green design in St. Paul. A summary in Powerpoint format is available at [http://fwcb.cfans.umn.edu/courses/FW5603/Lecture\\_2\\_Sept\\_07\\_Campus%20Ecology%20Plan.pdf](http://fwcb.cfans.umn.edu/courses/FW5603/Lecture_2_Sept_07_Campus%20Ecology%20Plan.pdf).

facilities planning with academic strategic planning, and take into account needs for teaching and outreach, in addition to research.

**1.5 Explore the St. Paul campus as a home for focused scholarship on the family and early childhood.** The newly restructured CEHD brings several departments addressing early childhood into one college. Redistribution of departments could enable new collaborations within CEHD and with researchers outside the college, such as nutrition experts (Department of Food Science and Nutrition). In addition, the proposed environmental focus and outreach units based in St. Paul (see below) could provide an exciting context for the Lab School.

**2. Academic Programs.** St. Paul campus leaders agree that undergraduate programs are key to campus vitality, and that students in majoring in St. Paul-based disciplines should be proximal to research activities in their disciplines. Therefore, because these undergraduates also have many classes in Minneapolis, it is necessary to surmount the separation of the campuses. For a vibrant learning environment and sense of community, it is necessary to achieve a greater critical mass in St. Paul. Several mechanisms are proposed to increase vitality and utilization of the St. Paul campus for undergraduate programs. These solutions would impact not only St. Paul-based majors, but also students in other majors who may take courses in St. Paul to satisfy Liberal Education or other requirements.

**2.1 Bundle classes for convenient scheduling.** To avoid frequent trips between Minneapolis and St. Paul, course offerings could be organized so that classes frequently taken concurrently would be offered conveniently in St. Paul. This could include not only courses in St. Paul-based degree programs, but also in supporting programs. St. Paul-based offerings could afford convenience for faculty from Minneapolis-based units who engage in collaborative, interdisciplinary interactions in St. Paul, as described in 1.1, above.

**2.2. Develop flexible teaching spaces for collaborative learning among students.** Just as cutting-edge, collaborative research needs a new kind of space, so do new approaches to teaching. Unlike standard lecture courses, collaborative learning around projects needs flexible space for discussion, peer interactions, and digital or laboratory investigations as well as lecture. Courses of this sort could be scheduled for half-day time slots, resulting in fewer between-campus trips. The St. Paul campus could lead the U in developing such courses. CBS has recently taken a step in this direction by remodeling space on the St. Paul campus to accommodate collaborative learning. By next year, all incoming CBS majors will participate in a collaborative class addressing the foundations of biology that is currently being taught in this space on a pilot scale.

**2.3. Explore opportunities for increasing interdisciplinary instruction.** Integrated programs that draw on interdisciplinary assets could be signature strengths of the academic environment of the campus. The CVM and School of Public Health MS degree in Public Health is an example of an integrated, interdisciplinary program that offers students opportunities to explore interfaces between humans, animals and the environment. The construction of integrated research facilities, described above under 1.1, will provide new educational opportunities, as will recent and planned moves of departments within colleges.

**2.4 Increase availability of living/learning communities tied to campus themes.** Living/learning communities around campus themes could draw students from many majors and enhance the knowledge of and participation in St. Paul programs. As an example, a living/learning community based on sustainability could build on the Environment and St. Paul Honors living/learning communities to include students from colleges in addition to CFANS and CDES. The student organic farm on campus, Cornercopia<sup>3</sup>, serves as an example of an extracurricular activity related to campus themes that could complement academic programs.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Cornercopia's web site at <http://sof.cfans.umn.edu/> for more information on programs.

**2.5 Upgrade facilities for virtual interactions.** Video links between campuses and other infrastructure to support virtual interactions could support distance education and research interactions, as well as diversifying delivery of teaching materials for on-campus instruction. Adoption of innovative technology will advance collaborative learning and distance education. The university library and CCE can help develop and implement specific strategies.

### **3. Outreach and public engagement.**

**3.1 Establish the St. Paul campus as a key public face of the University.** As home to Extension and the College of Continuing Education, the St. Paul campus already excels in outreach and public engagement, not only to greater Minnesota, but to the Metro area as well. Many features draw the public to campus, including the heavily used Continuing Education and Conference Center, the Veterinary Clinics, the Raptor Center, the Horticultural Display Gardens and Recreational Sports facilities. These features, as well as research facilities, make the campus a destination for school groups. The new Equine Center and the Bell Museum will add substantially to the attractions for youth and adults. The beauty of the campus, access to major roads, and sufficient parking support its capacity to attract the public. Additional programming around translational research demonstration and personal enrichment programs could further increase outreach activities in St. Paul. This must be done in a way that also protects potentially vulnerable research areas, such as animal facilities and experimental fields.

**3.2 Create demonstration sites for renewable energy, 'green buildings', and sustainable urban land use.** Establishing a research and teaching focus around sustainability would create a strong opportunity for translational research demonstrations projects for professionals, school groups, and the general public. Similarly, instituting such demonstration projects would provide opportunities for integrated, experiential learning for students.

**3.3 Establish a hub for distance education in St. Paul.** Facilities that are needed for inter-campus communication for research and teaching could also support distance education. Creating a hub for these activities will contribute to efficient management and uniform support services. One suggestion is to establish this hub through CCE.

**4. Improving campus life: transforming the St. Paul campus into a village.** Almost all participants indicated that the St. Paul campus is relatively lacking in many of the amenities that are more available in Minneapolis. All agreed that these amenities are important to increase campus community and vitality, and to make the St. Paul campus a destination attractive to students, visiting scholars, and the public. It is important when considering campus development to consider that the St. Paul campus neighborhood is residential on the north and west sides.

**4.1. Increase and improve dining options on campus.** Alternatives to fast food are needed, especially because there are few off-campus dining options in close proximity. Notably, the St. Paul campus lacks a location with a campus club-like atmosphere. This is needed for special events, for fostering interactions among faculty and staff, and for entertaining visiting scholars. Given St. Paul campus interests in nutrition, food production, and sustainability, developing a venue for high quality, locally produced food on an institutional scale would be an extension of our research and classrooms. These goals are consistent with the current efforts in sustainability of the University Dining Services. Yale University's sustainable food project<sup>4</sup> provides an example for what campus food services could be.

**4.2 Assure excellent transportation options into the future.** Rapid and frequent linkages are important to enhancing connections among the Twin Cities campuses, and between the St. Paul campus and the surrounding metropolitan area. As light rail expands its distribution, it is essential to plan for mass transit connections to the St. Paul campus via hubs at the new stadium and/or elsewhere. Befitting the

---

<sup>4</sup> See information about Yale's sustainable food project at: <http://www.yale.edu/sustainablefood/>.

themes of renewable energy and the environment, options for progressive, efficient vehicles should be explored for the transit way.

**4.3 Locate more housing in St. Paul during future construction projects.** Having more resident students in St. Paul would increase the utilization of campus and enhance community on campus. New housing could include conventional residence halls and more residential “swing space”. The latter would provide flexible space that could be available to graduate students, post-doctoral research associates, and visiting scholars.

**4.4 Encourage development of hotel space on or near campus.** Hotel space near the St. Paul campus would be advantageous for conferences and short term stays of visiting scholars, much the way the Radisson Metrodome is in Minneapolis. One potential location for a hotel could be along the east side of campus along the interface with the State Fairgrounds. This would direct noise and traffic away from residential neighborhoods, as well as benefit events at the State Fairgrounds.

**4.5 Encourage more commercial development on or near campus** to serve the needs of resident students and the campus community in general. To avoid negatively impacting residential neighborhoods near campus, shops and restaurants could be located in residence halls or parking structures at or below ground level, as has been done at some other campuses. As with a hotel, other commercial development could occur along the interface with the State Fair. The University should work with the cities of St. Paul and Falcon Heights to explore options that would serve these communities, as well as the U.

**4.6 Bring more cultural activities to the St. Paul campus.** This would enliven the campus in evenings and also benefit the surrounding communities. Such activities could make use of existing performance spaces, including the St. Paul Student Center Theater and Ballroom.

**4.7 Connect the campus to adjacent communities through greenways and a bicycle path network.** Pedestrian and bicycle corridors make additional use of open space and deepen the campus’ connection to the community. Means to connect the St. Paul campus, on multiple scales, to its surroundings have been explored in the St. Paul Campus Master Ecological Plan<sup>5</sup>.

## **5. Supporting opportunities**

**5.1. Proximity to State Fairground.** Our neighbor, the State Fair, provides an excellent delivery mechanism to reach the public on a grand scale. Moreover, the State Fair has communicated with the College of Design about means to ‘green’ their operations. A partnership with the State Fair would provide an excellent opportunity for collaboration around renewable energy demonstration, green building design, and sustainable landscape use. As described above, the proximity to the State Fairground also provides the possibility for development of a hotel and commercial area away from neighboring residential neighborhoods.

**5.2 Proximity to the intercampus transit way.** The University Enterprise Laboratories, Inc. (UEL) was established along the eastern end of the transit way to be an incubator facility for biotech start-up companies. This area has potential to be a research and development corridor that would enhance prospects for University/Industrial partnerships. Encouraging related high-tech industries to develop new facilities in the vicinity would not only address the ‘intellectual sprawl’ issue of the Twin Cities, it would also enhance the connection between the disciplines divided between the campuses.

## **NEXT STEPS FOR CREATING A STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE ST. PAUL CAMPUS**

**1. Convene public forums to discuss the draft recommendations for the St. Paul campus.** Faculty, staff, students, and external constituents should all be invited to take part in the discussions. The final report should take into account these discussions.

---

<sup>5</sup> See <http://wrc.umn.edu/outreach/stormwater/pdfs/draftecollogicalplan.pdf>



**2. Evaluate options for future use of animals, and agricultural and open space on campus.** A committee should be charged with evaluating the needs of CFANS, CVM, Extension and the Experiment station for future use of animals and agricultural space on campus. The committee should evaluate alternatives for off-campus animal facilities and crop space. The committee should also develop guiding principles for making balanced decisions concerning competing needs for animal use and crop space versus development on campus. Similarly, a committee should be tasked with developing guiding principles for use of open space on campus, including landscaped and natural areas.

**3. Convene discussions in CEHD to consider reallocation of space to college units.** The college should engage in a discussion to:

- evaluate the proposed educational theme for the St. Paul campus,
- identify opportunities for new interactions in St. Paul, and
- suggest the optimal apportionment of departments between Minneapolis and St. Paul.

**4. Define an action agenda.** An overarching goal is to define a process that will integrate core planning activities of academic units, interdisciplinary activities that cross colleges, and service and support units. This integrative process should align academic and capital planning with strategic positioning. To assist development of an integrated strategic and capital plan for the St. Paul Campus, there are several specific priorities that need attention, including:

- definition of campus precincts.
- estimation of the needed critical mass (e.g. number of students based in St. Paul) needed to merit infrastructural changes on the St. Paul Campus.
- evaluation of the ramifications of bringing more people to campus. This study should evaluate both the means to attract students and the public vs. the impact on the neighborhood and research areas.
- envisioning upgrades of the St. Paul Student Center that would support increased utilization.
- development of a comprehensive business strategy for increasing adult education.
- evaluation of parking and transportation needs to support plans for increased utilization of the campus.
- evaluation of opportunities to enhance campus amenities, emphasizing those that support the mission and themes of St. Paul.
- continuing inventory of current uses of the campus as a living classroom<sup>6</sup>.
- development of a strategy to evaluate collaborative opportunities with the State Fair, in collaboration with the city of Falcon Heights.
- development of a strategy to create a research and development corridor along the transit way, in collaboration with the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Existing campus entities have expertise in many of these areas. The appropriate entities should be tasked with these priorities to avoid redundant efforts.

---

<sup>6</sup> This inventory was initiated during the preparation of the Ecological Master Plan for the St. Paul Campus, and has been continued by the Stormwater Management Committee.