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Campus Master Planning

Overview:

- Campus master planning is now under way at the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Twin Cities campuses. The plans will set the framework for long-range physical development of campuses in ways that will support the University 2000 vision and guide the capital program.

- In June 1993 the University's Board of Regents adopted four major principles to guide the preparation of campus master plans. They are:
  - creating and maintaining a distinctive vision for each campus
  - enriching the campus experience
  - maximizing the value of existing physical assets while responding to changing needs
  - using an inclusive, accountable, and timely process to create and implement the master plan

- Issues to be explored in the campus master plans include academic program requirements, transportation and open space needs, accessibility and safety concerns, environmental interests, and relationships with neighboring communities.

- The University president and chancellors have appointed master planning advisory committees for each campus, consisting of University faculty, students, and staff and community representatives. Private consultants will assist in preparing the campus master plans.

Benefits:

- Establishes a vision that enhances the distinct qualities of the physical setting of each campus and makes them an integral part of the educational experience.

- Creates a coherent campus land use pattern and organizes a circulation system that offers a sense of welcome, orientation, and presence for the campus community.

- Ensures the fullest utilization of existing and proposed physical resources.

- Encourages stewardship of all campus features, both heritage and new.

- Provides an open and inclusive forum for campus and community participation.

(over)
Contacts:

- Office of Master Planning and Real Estate: Clinton Hewitt, associate vice president, Master Planning and Real Estate 612-625-7355
- Twin Cities campus: Harrison Fraker, chair, Campus Master Planning Advisory Committee, 612-626-1000
- Crookston campus: Wendell Johnson, chair, Campus Master Planning Advisory Committee, 218-281-8262
- Duluth campus: Kirk Johnson, chair, Campus Master Planning Advisory Committee, 218-726-8821
- Morris campus: Lowell Rasmussen, chair, Campus Master Planning Advisory Committee, 612-589-6113
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CROOKSTON MASTER PLANNING

SUMMARY OF EVENTS THROUGH MAY 1994

1993
  o June - Regents resolution adopting Principles for Planning, and mandating Campus Master Plans be drawn up for each of the University's campuses
  o Oct. - Team from Master Planning Office visits Crookston for overview of facilities
  o Nov. - Chancellor Sargeant appoints Campus Master Planning Advisory Committee
  o Nov. & Dec. - Initial introductory meetings held at Crookston, between Master Planning Office and University administration, and core group of Advisory Committee
  o Dec. - Advertise request for planning consultant proposals

1994
  o Jan. - Initial meeting of Full Advisory Committee; introduction of planning process, schedule
  o Feb. - Received eight planning proposals from prospective consultant teams; reviewed proposals according to criteria set out in RFP; selected three firms to interview for further consideration
  o Feb. - Advisory Committee meeting; introduction of planning issues, review of consultant selection process
  o March - Committee interview of consultant teams; recommend selection of Rafferty Tollefson Architects, out of St. Paul to be contracted to conduct Master Planning process
  o April - Initial discussions held between Master Planning Office and Rafferty Tollefson Architects; letter of intent drafted to allow RRTA to begin planning process
  o April - RRTA's first visit to campus as planning consultant; meetings held with Master Planning Advisory Committee, campus grounds crew, and Civil Service representatives; basically introductory and "reconnaissance" visit
  o May - RRTA on campus for two consecutive days as continuation of introductory and data gathering/reconnaissance; meetings with AURI, Residential Life Committee, Student Affairs Directors, Kent Freberg, Student Association Forum, MES, and Chancellors Cabinet; open forum conducted for University community at large

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES AND SCHEDULE

Summer, 1994
  o Approx. monthly meetings with Advisory Committee
  o Continuation of inventory, data gathering, on-campus interviews and meetings
  o Continuation of planning issues identification and analysis
  o Exploration of various planning options and scenarios, based on information gathered

Autumn, 1994
  o Presentation of planning issues, analysis and options to University community and public
o Solidify planning direction, and proceed with drafting planning documents

Winter, 1995

o Present selected planning direction, as developed into Master Plan for approval by University community and public

o Finalize Master Plan documents, submit to Regents

c: Wendell Johnson, UMC; Clint Hewitt, UM - MP&RE; Chip Lindeke, RRT
PROJECT  University of Minnesota Crookston #9425.01
TO  Dan Peterson
FROM  Chip Lindeke
SUBJECT  Master Planning Advisory Committee @ UMC - Noon
DATE  28 April 1994 (REVISED W/DAN PETERSON COMMENTS 5/9/94)
PRESENT  Brian Norman, Carol Windels, Rita Meyer, Ray Ecklund, Ann Heinze, Bill Brinkman, Don Sargeant, Marilyn Grave, Wendell Johnson (Chair), Dan Peterson, Edward Wene, Larry Smith, Gordon Shafer, Eric Amel, Lec Tollefson, Chip Lindeke

1. Dan P. and Lee T. briefly introduced the design team, and the Master Planning process and schedule.

2. Wendell J. reviewed the meeting schedule for today, and RRT's campus visit on 9,10 May.

3. RRT will prepare meeting notes that will be sent to Dan P. and Wendell J.; for distribution to the committee or others.

4. Collaboration, storage, laboratories (broad range), classroom technology - these are issues raised by Marilyn G.. These need to be addressed.

5. There was discussion about the common use of facilities by groups - city, N.W.E.S., AURI, Academic Divisions, etc.. - (issue is perceived territories and boundaries).

6. Parking is an issue.

7. The coming and going physically and electronically (video, etc.). Different needs for methods, different teaching?

8. Strengthening cooperation and physical ties between city, UMC, school district, etc.. Last 2 referendums for a new school voted down.

9. The City of Crookston public schools are in drastic need of facility improvements. They are interested in combining, sharing, collaborating with UMC as much as possible.

10. There is a desire to build collaboration in student life between regional institutions. Students from other institutions going to school here and vice versa - via I-TV, etc.. There is a wide mix of students involved in UMC - quite varied and complex. The original building
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complex was built as a high school. (Issue is outdated facilities, given current student and academic needs.)

11. Polytechnic Concept:

Technological Career-Oriented Programs.
The way students learn hands on learning environment.
Active learning - do not want to be limited by facility issues.
Media, connect into information networks - telecommunications.
Connectiveness, collaboration.

12. Flexibility is an important issue to deal with - issue is ability to adapt to new technologies, methods, etc.

13. Don S. notes that there has to be a certain amount of organization within the institution, though clear "Divisions" should be down played.

14. The school must move out beyond the local region in order to exist. It must reach out in order to survive. Telecommunications is seen as key to success in this effort.

15. Brian N. notes that there is a difficulty creating a sense of student community locally, with the amenities of nearby Grand Forks - which has shopping, entertainment, social life, etc., drawing students away from Crookston. Brian also sees that with the new proposed technical emphasis, there will be fewer elective classes available, which will result in fewer students interested in the college. Rita M. confirmed there will be fewer electives initially, with the concentration on technically oriented programs. Elective offerings will evolve and increase as new programs become more established.

16. There is a need for campus housing. Apartment style dormitories are in demand. Short term visitor (summer or otherwise) housing should also fit into the formula. There is a concern about faculty housing in the city. Housing is a critical issue in the City of Crookston. Student Life Committee is currently looking at adding 48 beds on campus.

17. The separation between college and town is an issue. Off campus housing is located some distance away, beyond convenient walking distance, no sense of connection to campus. Housing in proximity to campus would be desirable - even fraternity housing.

18. Fraternity/Sorority organizations are an important part of traditional baccalaureate institutions.

19. Alternative vehicular circulation (bikes) should be considered - like a bike path between school and town. This would provide connection between school and town.

20. Library - this will be an important resource. Current facility limits ability for long term storage keeping periodicals longer than 5 years will be important. The library needs to be addressed.
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21. How do you find other ways to manage space as it relates to the school work day and year - and find efficiencies for space use.

22. Territoriality is important issue - faculty offices, work space. Office space needs should be identified.

23. Wendell will provide updated versions of the 2002 document to committee members who have not yet received them.

24. Athletics/Recreation/Wellness is intended to be fully a part of the 2002 plan. Student life issues are also to be fully a part of the plan as well.

25. M.E.S. - The presence on campus may flatten out. However, there could be consolidation such that it may create a larger impact on campus. It will continue to be an outreach for UMC. The current county offices probably will remain as they are.

26. N.W.E.S. - Larry S. questions how this fits into the Master Planning effort.

27. The committee prefers the longer of the two suggested schedules for the Master Planning process, due to difficulty of coordinating committee schedules over summer months.

28. Committee challenged RRT to look at a "new way to build community" on campus.

29. Don S. noted that innovations in educational access creates a non-traditional college education in the future. What does this mean in terms of campus identity, student and faculty recruitment? Challenged RRT to envision a new type of campus.

30. Current housing development in the City of Crookston is occurring to the north of town (near the U) due to flood plain issues closer to the river.

31. Rita M. discussed the need or innovative planning during this time of transition at UMC.

This summary is part of the permanent record for this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.

END

AWL/sjk

xc: Bill Sanders, Len Lundquist, Eric Amel, Lee Tollefson, Wendell Johnson, File

CROOKSTON\M0042894.MPC
PROJECT

TO

FROM

SUBJECT

DATE

PRESENT

University of Minnesota Crookston #9425.01

Dan Peterson

Chip Lindeke

Meeting with Faculty Consultive Committee @ UMC 11:00 am

28 April 1994 (REVISED W/DAN PETERSON COMMENTS 5/9/94)

Dan Peterson, Sharon Stewart, Larry Leake, Bill Paradise, Bill Peterson, Dan Svedarsky, Gary Senske, Lee Tollefson, Chip Lindeke

1. Lee T. briefly introduced the design team and the Master Planning process.

2. Scope of this committee - liaison between/amongst faculty members and administrators, and as a forum to discuss campus issues. No formal relationship with student organizations.

3. The Master Plan is targeting a 5-10 year period. The Master Plan is a living document that can be flexible and adaptable to changes.

4. This committee did not have direct involvement with development of the UMC 2002 strategic plan.

5. The implementation of the 2002 plan would involve changes of interior spaces, i.e. classrooms - modernization remodeling, computerization, etc.

6. The three academic divisions now consist of business, agriculture, and technical studies. These are more or less centralized. Faculty are not necessarily officed at division locations.

7. The new degree programs will probably require a new division organization. Currently, the new program elements have been assigned to each of the existing divisions. It is anticipated that additional programs would be added in the future as well.

8. There was discussion about having a central faculty gathering place, like a faculty dining space. There used to be one of these. This would function as a social place, but would foster communication and interchange.

9. Athletics - it is important to consider the collaborative aspect between city and school communities.
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10. Gary Senske notes that the athletics is separated and isolated from the academic divisions. He is concerned about this isolation and would like to see physical education be a part of the overall program.

11. Personal fitness is a developing issue that could be incorporated into student center type functions.

12. Swimming Pool Facility - Can it be modified to accommodate human performance research type programs, classrooms, conference, etc.?

13. Athletics were not really addressed in the 2002 plan. Gary Senske would like to push to see that it is incorporated.

14. Existing Science Labs are not currently up to date for proposed programs.

15. Typical existing classrooms commonly adequate for 15 students. New programs would need classrooms more for 40-50 students - which currently do not exist.

16. It would be very useful if there would be a list of classrooms as they are currently and projected to be needed.

17. Dan S. requested that there be a "sunroom" possibly added to the Trojan Inn. The issue here is daylighting, especially during winter months.

18. The existing computer help room is very popular, but much too small. This should be a dedicated space, and the students really use it.

19. The committee needs to push for what the reorganization will become, because the Master Plan needs to respond to this.

20. The Food Service program needs should be addressed.

This summary is part of the permanent record for this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.
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MEMO

University of Minnesota - Crookston

MEMO

TO

Dan Peterson

FROM

Chip Lindeke

SUBJECT

Meeting w/Civic Service Bargaining Committee 2:00 p.m.

DATE

28 April 1994 (REVISED W/DAN PETERSON COMMENTS 5/9/94)

PRESENT

Don Wieland, James Kaiser, Del Wright (chair), Dan Peterson, Lee Tollefson, Chip Lindeke

1. Lee T. introduced RRT Architects and Master Planning process.

2. Del W. (media resources) described the function of the civil service bargaining committee. The committee includes non-faculty staff, supervisory positions, etc. - service providers. Committee is representation and liaison with university administration.

3. Existing campus heating system is high pressure steam and delivered to buildings at low pressure.

4. Much of the campus has utility tunnels.

5. Heating plant crew consists of 5 people. There is also one plumber. There is a master electrician on campus.

6. Majority of work is maintenance, but a certain amount is remodeling construction.

7. James K. (janitorial staff) asked about future of janitorial services. Staff has been reduced by more than half in recent years. It is harder to get the work completed. (M.P. issues is material selection guidelines for construction projects.)

8. James K. notes that he prefers hard surfaces over carpet - hard surfaces are easier and faster to clean.

9. Painting work is (no longer) done by this group - not enough time given staff reductions.

10. There are many different systems in different buildings. Lee T. notes that criteria/standards can be created for the future in the way of materials, systems.
11. The school currently does not have computerized HVAC control systems.

12. 2002 Strategy - the expanded technology base will probably require expanded civil service personnel and training for maintenance and operations. It would have to accommodate changing needs in the future as well.

This summary is part of the permanent record for this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.
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MEMO

PROJECT: University of Minnesota Crookston

TO: Dan Peterson

FROM: Chip Lindeke

SUBJECT: Meeting with Residential Life Committee at UMC - noon

DATE: 9 May 1994

PRESENT:
Glenice Johnson  Faculty
Bob Nelson  Student Affairs
Kent Freberg  Plant Services
Gary Willhite  Residentail Life
Dan Peterson  Master Planning
Mike Burns  MJB/A/Moorhead
Chip Lindeke  RRT
Eric Amel  RRT

1. Dan P. and Chip L. introduced RRT Architects and the Master Planning process.

2. There is information about housing facility needs - various housing type options.

3. Survey: Younger upperclassmen prefer apartments style housing. Older than average students prefer single room, apartment suite type units, private. Family type students need family type facility. Underclassmen are guided to more traditional dormitory housing.

4. Enrollment growth will expand by about 200 over next 5-10 years due to 4 year program.

5. About 50% of full time students housing on campus live in. Remainder live within 30 mile radius. Change to 4 year could affect percentage. Change of where students coming from is an issue - may need more housing on campus on locally.

6. Lee and Brink intended as temporary housing.

7. Skyberg is about 25 years old - traditional type dorm. Renovations to building may be done to upgrade look to be more marketable. Building now is quite institutional looking. Needs a sense of entry and identity.
8. Demand is high for local off campus housing. Students interested in this are directed to the city.

9. McCall Hall has an international student community. About 2/3 of students at McCall are sophomores and older. McCall is more homey, simpler than Skyberg.

10. This committee does not deal with faculty/staff housing.

11. There is a possible need for a hotel guest house type of facility for people here on a part time basis. This would have to have an academic tie in, so that it does not complete with the city housing stock. This could depend upon what the needs are.

12. Robertson will have housing on third floor this fall. It used to have housing in the past.

13. There was discussion about site options for the new housing project.

14. Goals for housing: Near parking, fitness, food service, others?

15. Existing housing on campus - 400 beds with growing student body. Growth in beds is projected to be 50 + 50 - build 50 now and 50 more later. Housing should be added on an as needed basis.

16. Existing community is building new housing units.

17. There is an issue of linking buildings, even for housing, for climate control.

18. Separate residential buildings require additional staffing - versus adding to existing facilities.

19. Child care is an issue - related to a child care laboratory. There is in mind a facility for this program - it is in the capitol budget. It is expected to be west of gymnasium.

20. An addition to Skyberg could help accessibility to Skyberg. Utilities are already in place for an addition to Skyberg. An addition could really enhance Skyberg.

21. Housing on campus is an auxiliary use must stand alone, pay for itself.

22. Faculty/staff housing would be available only if there was surplus student housing available.

23. There was discussion about allowing private developers create and manage student housing. Sorority/fraternity housing could fit into this. This is down the road. There have been some discussions about this.

24. There is a conflict of housing with noise and some smell from sheep barns.
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1. Kent is responsible for grounds and buildings maintenance. He notes that he has very good employees.

2. Dorms have hot water heaters.

3. Heating plant is coal fired with high pressure steam.

4. Custodial crew - down to about 4-5 people. Staff is not able to keep up with the work load.

5. Hard to keep up with painting.

6. Preventative maintenance work is done on a project basis by maintenance crew generally. This work comes out of repair and betterment funds.

7. Student housing has its own half time maintenance and custodian person. Kent's people fill in where they can.

8. Vehicle fleet - Kent manages and maintains 30-40 vehicles - tractors, fork lifts, cars, etc. Needs for fleet probably will not grow with 2002 Vision. People will probably rely more on their own vehicles. Kent does not make ends meet with vehicles, based on mileage received. A handicapped transport vehicle may be needed in future - small van, bus with lift.

9. Kent can supply the building code assessment sheets. There is also a recent H.C. survey for the campus. Ron Holden can also supply this data.

10. Robertson - Needs new plumbing, electrical, exit stairs, elevator, wood floor structure not in very good shape, masonry bearing wall was fixed in 60's maybe not too bad now, new windows, new finishes, new insulation. Child care program needs space - would have to be relocated.
11. Library/Kiehle - expand library at 2nd floor to the south. Build Kiehle addition at south side - band practice?

This summary is part of the permanent record or this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.
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PROJECT
University of Minnesota Crookston

TO
Dan Peterson

FROM
Chip Lindeke

SUBJECT
Meeting with student affairs directors at UMC @ 2:15 pm

DATE
9 May 1994

PRESENT
Dan Peterson  Master Planning
Don Cavalier  UoFM Crookston
Gary Willhite  Residential Life
Mario Prado  Multi International Office
Debbie Stumblingbear
Man Balmeir  Athletic Director
John Bywater  Admission
Dale Heotek  Student Activities & Registrar
Barb Ricord  Registrars, Continued Ed, S.A.
Bob Nelson  Student Affairs
Eric Amel  RRT
Chip Lindeke  RRT

1. Physical Education:
   a. Outdoor facilities are needed, develop jointly with city schools. Outdoor track/football complex - bleachers, toilets, concessions, track, field lights, press box. This is a marketing effort. Improvements could allow for attracting larger crowds. Booster club facilities are also needed. This is a one-five year time frame.
   
   b. Renovation of old swimming pool complex. The old pool is no longer useable - fill in. What does this become? New pool downtown.
   
   c. Need for coaching offices - 2-3 offices.
   
   d. Fitness/wellness center has not been fully developed. About 3000 s.f. might be needed - go into old pool facility.
   
   e. Sense of disconnection to rest of campus is an issue.
   
   f. It was agreed that it is a goal to have a physical interior connection to the gym complex from the academic part of campus.
2. Child Care:
   a. Supports academic offerings. This planned to be a degree program shared with Bemidji State.
   b. Relates to an on campus need.
   c. Good example of 2002 Vision - collaboration.

3. Student Center Facility:
   a. There is really no facility now.
   b. Dining
   c. TV Lounge
   d. Bowling
   e. Shops
   f. Access room for computer network.
   g. Food service would be a part of the facility.
   h. Book store more visible.
   i. Post Office - student mail facility.
   j. Student government/organization area - shared services.
   k. Copy center.
   l. Food Service - doubles as conference center, this is a problem. Business in small store is growing. Kitchen is in good shape. Academic tie in - Food Service kitchen at second floor classroom kitchen is at first floor.
      - Service is difficult - trash room?
      - Short of storage space.
      - Recycling is also an issue.
   m. Student health center.

4. Student Services:
   a. Counseling/Career Center
   b. Consolidation is a goal.
   c. Thought is to locate in Hill/Bede/Selvig buildings.
d. Most existing spaces are in adequate physically, mechanically, electronically - acoustical problems also.

e. Office area needs - inadequate support staff. This is a special problem with services.

f. Bob N. will provide student services organization chart.

g. Student services has a strong relationship with student center.

h. Career development will be a very important element related to 2002 Vision. It will probably grow - need more space. One stop shop assessment center - Federal program starting 1995-96.

i. Use of computers/technology has a variety of impacts on students. However the human contact element will still be an important part of the process.

j. Bottom line is to be able to communicate with students.

5. Parking Issues:

a. Geographic location - parking where it is needed. More probably needed due to growth.

b. Conference Center - parking not available at time it is needed.

6. Conference Center:

a. Tied to Food Service by convenience.

b. Not necessarily related to Student Center otherwise.

7. Housing - see previous meeting notes.

This summary is part of the permanent record for this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.
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PROJECT  University of Minnesota Crookston
TO  Dan Peterson
FROM  Chip Lindeke
SUBJECT  Meeting with Student Association Forum at UMC
DATE  9 May 1994
PRESENT
1. Dan P., Chip L. and Eric A. introduced the Master Planning team and the process.
2. Concern about walking outside from dormitories in cold weather to academic buildings.
3. Parking problems - Lots A, C, H, where off campus students park, are the worst case. Lot E wide open, further from dorms, vulnerable to security problems. No plug-ins for cars anywhere - would be good to have. There is a car starting service. Parking not a problem for on campus students.
4. H.C. accessibility to buildings is a problem - McCall Hall. H.C. dorm rooms in Skyberg - but far away from campus.
5. Housing - there was discussion about new dorm project. It was pointed out that housing should be closer to the academic buildings - where? Robertson?
6. There was discussion about the university providing land for sororities/fraternities.
7. Computer network accessibility on campus - need more plug-ins around campus. Housing locations also. Video access as well.
8. Students need multi media access even at home. But, they still need to socialize and do other human type things. Classroom interactive TV, but not in home interactive TV.
9. Concern about participation by students on campus creating collegiate atmosphere, school spirit, etc..
10. Higher priority to get a degree and then a job. Free time more often spent on job to pay for education.
11. Need to address all student types.
12. Need for student union facility.
13. This year's freshman class has very low G.P.A. right now.
14. Library does not flow, quite lacking. It is not open on weekends - only 6-9 pm Sundays.
15. There is a need to feel a sense of belonging.
16. There is a desire to keep the old buildings - yet few felt a connection to Robertson Hall (never been in).
17. Dining Service - would like real restaurant on campus. Would like existing facilities open longer time periods. Lack of variety.
18. Grounds - people like the atmosphere on campus. Concern that the sidewalks get shoveled.
19. Concern about loss of pool. Hard to access new city pool - cost also.
20. The mall is considered an asset. Too bad that you can not appreciate it 12 months a year, and not during best time - summer. Everyone likes it. Build student center in middle of mall???
21. Concern that atrium locked at night - after hours you have to walk all the way around buildings to get to your car.
22. Security - it is quite dark at night north of conference center. There is no escort service on campus this year.
23. Popular places on campus - Bede main floor.

This summary is part of the permanent record for this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.
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PROJECT: University of Minnesota Crookston
MEMO

TO: File

FROM: Chip Lindeke

SUBJECT: Meeting with MN Extension Services (M.E.S.) @ UMC

DATE: 10 May 1994

PRESENT: Bob Quinlan (MES), Russ Severson (MES), Dan P., Eric Amel, Chip Lindeke

1. M.E.S. uses the interactive classroom in Agricultural Operations for programs.

2. M.E.S. extends resources to the people of the state. Bring educational programs to the people.

3. Highly involved with technology transfer. Getting information out to the farmer.

4. Extension funding comes from:
   Local/County Government
   State Government
   Federal Government

5. County rents space from UMC for MES.

6. Bob works primarily with 4H programs, working with children.

7. There is a second MES in Polk County in Mackintosh. Bob works at both. There is programming throughout county. He does teaching in area schools.

8. M.E.S. uses UMC facilities a great deal—Kiehle, gym, classrooms and arena at Agricultural Operations.

9. The winter shows use UMC facilities. M.E.S. gets involved.

10. Barb (M.E.S.) works with families—food and nutrition programs.

11. M.E.S. gets involved with county fairs (2).

12. M.E.S. had six staff in Polk County—now at four. Now consolidated east and west Polk County services.
13. M.E.S. operates within a cluster of counties. Russ will take a specialization into the cluster counties. Other agents will bring in specializations into Polk and use UMC facilities.

14. Russ notes that he would like to see a computer hookup in the ITV classroom - microscope camera as well.

15. Russ interacts with the agriculture division on campus.

16. Roger Wagner teaches horticulture at UMC. Russ talks with him to get information he may need.

17. M.E.S. does get involved with research on a limited bases.

18. M.E.S. wants to be a part of the future of UMC, and work closer together.

19. M.E.S. has part time people who are involved with grant programs. There is also summer student help as well.

20. M.E.S. anticipates continuing the use of the computer network.

21. Russ feels that UMC and UM Twin Cities need to coordinate quarter schedules - does not currently happen.

This summary is part of the permanent record for this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.
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PROJECT
University of Minnesota Crookston

TO
Dan Peterson

FROM
Chip Lindeke

SUBJECT
Meeting at A.U.R.I. Offices - UMC 10:30 a.m.

DATE
9 May 1994

PRESENT
Richard Nelson, Steve Frendin, Keith Sannes, Mary Jo Crystal, Dan Peterson, Eric Amel, Chip Lindeke

1. Dan P. and Chip L. introduced RRI Architects and the UofM Master Planning office.

2. A.U.R.I. helps to bring new products to market - foster business. Creating new markets for old products. Applied research. Better use of skills and farmland for the future. Trying to translate technology and research into income - generate wealth in rural agricultural economy. Provide access for rural areas to technology and modern methods. This ties into student development.

3. A.U.R.I. works with companies - small and start up organizations. A.U.R.I. will let go after the organization is on their way.

4. A.U.R.I. provides a sounding board, services and expertise to develop an idea. Online literature searches can be provided. Testing facilities can be provided. They help people learn about business strategy.

5. Try to understand the problem and create a program to solve the problem.

6. Some experts on board, but ability to bring in experts or find experts to solve problems. They can help with networking.

7. A.U.R.I. is a nonprofit, statewide organization (Crookston, Morris, Waseca). It does not want to pit one region/local against another.

8. A.U.R.I. can put together different businesses that can work together.

9. Businesses can be given loans, or even some grants. Basic assistance is given for no fee. Special projects are arranged on a contract fee basis. Projects selected that fit A.U.R.I. mission - product that add value, and have a degree of success.
10. Keith notes that over past 5 years, they may have discussed possibly 5000 ideas. Degree of success not necessarily measured by projects that were successful. Success can be measured by turning away a bad idea as well.

11. Big success stories are great, but small successes are very important.

12. Organization made up of offices and labs. They do not have classrooms, or practical application programs, but can recommend use of school and experiment station.

13. Translate theoretical education to practical applications.

14. New building satisfies a long standing need for office space. No immediate needs for new space - except for a business incubator. A facility resource for growing/start up business - provides, space, clerical, etc. at below market rates.

15. Business incubator facilitator would not be a part of A.U.R.I. - developed by, managed, etc. A.U.R.I. endorses this idea but can not be a part of it. The incubator would take advantage of A.U.R.I.

16. Original image on campus has been much improved but it still needs some work, related to visitor parking and "front door". There is a daily pattern of visitors/clients - the level of traffic.

This summary is part of the permanent record for this project. If there are concerns or discrepancies please notify RRT within 7 days.

END
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1. Dan P., Chip L. and Eric A. introduced the M.P. team and spoke briefly about the process. General discussion of issues followed.

2. People enroll in courses and programs and not departments.

3. Central organization may not be needed. Interdisciplinary.

4. Housing not well served by computer network.

5. Sense of community is important.

6. Focal points that exist: Important student clubs, athletic programs, social groups networks. Not everyone wants to be involved. Need focal points related to the individual programs - students are generally more interested in their program areas.
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7. Spring is an evaluation time – Fall an anticipation time. Input from students is slanted in this way.

8. Need pockets on campus for socialization. Use of lockers for students can affect socialization.


10. Computer cabling issues – always changing, and will continue to change.

11. Library – storage facilities needed, student work stations. A place for students to work together. Is growth needed? Use of computers at home that can access library separately. Maybe there are pods around campus, where information access can occur. Use of the library as a study center is important.

12. Need better use of space from Kiehle to Robertson. Low use of auditorium. Problem with important spaces on the second level.

END
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