

**Carolina North University Uses Advisory Group**  
**March 27, 2003**  
**120 Vance Hall**

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by the chair, Steve Allred. Members present were Don Bailey, Flicka Bateman, Dean Bresciani, Tim Burnett, Margie Crowell, Joe DeSimone, Linda Dykstra, Sue Estroff, Tommy Griffith, Doug Kelly, Terry Magnuson, Cass Miller, Bill Snider, Sherry Suttle (for Dhiren Thakker), Anna Wu, and Steve Zeisel. Also present were Mark Crowell, Margaret Dardess, Dan Herman, and Peter Krawchek

Absent were Jen Daum, Jack Evans, Jim Hirschfield, Gene Orringer

The meeting began with a discussion of the summary of the homework assignment from the February 4, 2003 meeting, in which members were to suggest criteria on recommended programs and a potential list of units to be located at Carolina North. Bill Snider commented that given the current budget situation and the lack of immediate need to put something at Carolina North, it would be more important to look at criteria than specific buildings or units. Turning to the criteria discussion, the group agreed that it would not be sufficient justification to move units simply based on a lack of space, but that units must be integrated into a long-term plan.

Sue Estroff encouraged an interdisciplinary approach. Others wondered if it was possible to have both an interdisciplinary and stand-alone approach. Sue noted that we currently have centers on campus like the Sheps Center or the Carolina Population Center, and wondered if they would function the same way if they were at a greater distance from the main campus. It is important to think about our constituents and beneficiaries, about both the Town and campus.

The discussion then turned to the question of what our boundary conditions are. Is there a certain size for businesses? Could we have a Red Hat? Bell labs? It is too early to say no to very much. The principle that has emerged from our discussion so far is that as long as you can justify these types of partnerships and they meet the mission of the University, its fine, Carolina North could have room for that. Other programs are not as big. Do we have some programs that are big enough to help underwrite others but advance our mission?

Don Bailey cited the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute as an example of a unit that would be appropriate for Carolina North. The key criterion is that units must further the academic mission of the University. When we consider the possibility of interaction with commercial enterprises, we need to ask, "Why would this need to be here instead of at RTP? What is academic so that it needs to be here? "

This is a campus that values teaching, learning, research and service. We need to set a conservative boundary about Carolina North's connection to the mission of the campus. What doesn't fit? A company with one patent from a faculty member, not otherwise engaged in education, training post-docs, or other activity, would not be an appropriate

unit for Carolina North. Rather, we need to select companies that will further the University's mission. One idea is to include in the documents for leasing space a proviso that they must provide a certain percentage for students, post docs, research. One example that makes sense is a company engaged in text analysis, where the University has a piece of the company. In that case, the ongoing research development is part of larger software development that leads to faculty involvement.

We need to provide temporary space for companies linked to the University—the business incubator idea. This relates to our need to promote economic development.

The group then had a discussion about travel and using Airport Road as a corridor. Planning group felt that it's a great route to campus. Good for express service. Can't rely on what we have now. Peter Krawchek noted that his office is in the Giles Horney building, and that traffic and congestion is not bad between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. Airport Road is only congested between 7:40 and 8:30 in the morning, and after 5 in the afternoon. The traffic flows to campus in the morning and away at night.

Part of undergraduate experience is being on main campus, thus no undergrads should be at Carolina North. But one resource that undergrads could use is recreational facilities. If we project undergrad population is there a place where growth forces us to go out there?

Sue Estroff noted that we also need space for university archives. History of science is sitting in our offices, labs and homes. Of central concern is the quality of programs. Need and merit both need to be met.

The group then turned to a discussion of what units should go to Carolina North in the first wave. Don Bailey reiterated support for moving the FPG Child Development Institute. This would consolidate operations, save on rent, and provide potential for community partnerships with public schools. We do a lot of non-traditional training. Requires a space people could go to. Bringing together maternal and child health, pop center, graduate training.

What is the campus of the future? Is it what it looks like now or something different? We need a clear vision of what it looks like.

FPG is poster child for CN. Has all the benefits.

Joe DeSimone nominated the Institute for Advanced Materials, Nanoscience and Technology. The new Science complex provides only a modest amount of growth space. The Institute will pull in science, social science, and faculty from other disciplines.

Linda Dykstra suggested the placement of grad student housing for international students. Campuses with big international grad students have them in close proximity. Better accommodations for grad students. Dan Herman echoed his interest in grad student housing, noting that Carolina North is a logical place to put housing. Dean Bresciani

agreed. We offer married student housing, but not grad student housing. Post doc, young faculty pose different issues, more complex.

Sue Estroff noted that we offer low stipends for grad students and rising tuition. We can compete with private universities if we offer housing. Keeps us competitive with other schools. Linda Dykstra added, however, that the Wall Street Journal ranks us high for health insurance for grad students.

Other housing questions: Would the University own this and rent it? We want to do it like we do Odom Village now? We tore down Victory Village and didn't replace it. Anna Wu asked what kind of housing stock we would provide, whether townhouses or single-family housing. Duke has built Trinity Heights community. Density issues. Co ownership of homes. Stanford has done a lot. UC Davis has done this. There are models we could use.

Mark Crowell suggested that we support units at Carolina North that are related to NC economic development, such as a for-profit R&D Center tied in with the educational mission of the University. This would be tied more strongly than at Centennial campus. Place for spin-off campuses located in incubator facilities. Facilities that enable us to recruit targeted R&D partners. Example: Intel University. If Intel were to place a dozen employees with support for faculty to tie in to business school, we could do a dozen of those. Lot would be short term.

Interactions with biotech companies in the triangle. Where would you actually work? Lab space is cramped. Where would you do this? Do this initially on a small scale.

Anna Wu suggested a balance between units like FPG, which will stay, and centers where folks come and go. Not exclusively one or the other. Avoid transitory nature.

There is some literature on this. Mark Crowell will provide it to the group via the web page.

The group then discussed possible recreational facilities. We asked if these would be shared with the Town, and Flicka Bateman replied that one of the Town's objectives for Carolina North was that the University absorb its impacts. Therefore, the primary goal of recreational facilities should be for students, although allowing townspeople access would be welcomed. This would provide an opportunity to do some special types of research, with units like exercise science.

Town gown relationship. We have to have it fit in with the community. Transit. Providing services to the town vs. state. Perception that Chapel Hill is wealthy and they don't want to help the broader state needs.

Casey Miller asked about a conference center. But there are a lot already, with plans to develop more. Sigma Psi now full. How about the national academy? For current exercise, criteria to partner with nonprofits related to academic programs of the

university. Ex international science center with science centers. What about technology and conference facilities. Need videoconferencing facilities.

How is the process for Carolina North different from process for the main campus? Anna Wu stated that it should be a similar process. The process we have in place now connects constituencies at multiple levels. Mark Crowell added that the Centennial campus process had a secondary level of review. Once you have mixed use, we had a process with VC for Research, VC for Finance controlling who goes there. Once incubator approved, process for filling it.

Recruiting function to deal with identified potential partners. No reason to differentiate with CN and main campus. Full range of development process. Some will be state appropriated. Some self-liquidating, some private developers.

The group spent the last fifteen minutes of the meeting considering how the process for selection should be developed. It was agreed that suggestions from faculty at large should be obtained early on, using a combination of direct solicitation, through department chairs, and through a web site. Faculty can submit comments and suggestions. We need to bring in neighbors, and the town. We need to use the same process we did for the development ordinance. Campus master plan process is the template. We made presentation to Town Horace Williams committee, other groups. We are laying groundwork now. Want to see it as a transparent process. Late spring early summer, meeting with neighborhood groups. Community looks at the website. Town's Horace Williams committee was happy with the planning we're doing. Evidence is that it is paying off.

We need to get faculty and staff on board. Open website. Meet with schools. Alumni association. State legislators. Employee forum. DTH. University Gazette Meetings with schools.

Tim Burnett stated that the group has to do a couple of things. If we took all the suggestions thrown out today, we'll have about 10,000 acres. We're actually looking at 250 acres. Process in this committee is to review and winnow down the suggestions. Second, there are things that we want that don't have to go at Carolina North. We may not need soccer fields at Carolina North. Housing is an issue, we need some, but how much is still an issue. It took 200 years to put the current campus together. We can't do this all at once. Lots of space designated.

Anna Wu differed with Tim Burnett, stating that we do need soccer fields. We could build them on the waste site, which would not otherwise be suitable for buildings.

Don Bailey added that the campus of the future will be engaged in tech transfer, a high tech environment, perhaps a university without walls. There is also a trend among nontraditional learners, using interdisciplinary approaches. Our planning must accommodate those trends.

Summary: The overriding criterion for determining units that should go to Carolina North appeared to be the ability to tie them directly to our academic mission. Partnerships with commercial entities must directly support our teaching, research and service mission. Units that were suggested included the FPG Child Development Institute, graduate student housing, and university recreation facilities.

Uses Group members are to consider these suggestions for criteria and units, and use the list serve to refine both. Our goal is to have a good list to bring to our next meeting, which is April 24, 2003 in 120 Vance.