

APPENDIX B – COLLECTED COMMENTS.

Ad Hoc Committee on the Site of the Research Park

From Bridget Rummele, who was originally intended to speak to the Ad Hoc Committee on Wednesday but had some unexpected conflicts that prevented her attendance:

To the Research Park Site Committee:

Faculty in the Plant Sciences Department have the following concerns related to consideration of any alternate sites to the currently proposed research park site:

1. The agricultural land west of Flagg Road in sod or research contains some of the best soil in Rhode Island and merits preservation from any development.
2. If the currently proposed site is used, no access road to that site should pass through the area described in number 1.
3. If the currently proposed site is rejected, the area described in number 1 should not be considered as an alternative.

Regarding the currently proposed site, although I am not directly affected by development there, I do appreciate the unique nature of that site. I know Drs. Killingbeck and Golet raised the issue of the site being so valuable for student education and that no other site exists in Rhode Island.

As the state's land grant institution, the university has the obligation to set a good example for the rest of the state regarding non-development of agricultural land, as was our department's concern, and with non-destruction of unique forested land that is irreplaceable. Should either site be disrupted by the development of the research park, the message sent to the people of Rhode Island would be that preservation of sites like these is inconsequential. Why should they support preservation of any other unique sites around the rest of the state? Future generations would be deprived of experiencing these irreplaceable locations.

An alternate site that is available is the area between the freshmen parking lot and the closed dump. I am aware that this was proposed already and is not supported by some, because it would not be as attractive a site as the wooded area. Using this alternate site would be another way the University can set an example for the rest of the state's population. By making use of sites that might seem less desirable, the university would be supporting development of sites that would otherwise remain undeveloped, while avoiding use of sites meriting preservation.

The University's landscape architecture program has its students work on designing landscaping for actual sites in New England. This would be a perfect challenge for the students - to create designs to make this alternate site's surroundings an attractive background to the research park. The students would gain valuable experience in designing for an existing site, and at the same time, the university would be able to use the best design to showcase the talents of landscape architecture students educated at the University of Rhode.

I urge the committee to consider my department's concern about not putting the research park on prime agricultural land and my personal opinion on not

placing the research park on the North Woods site.

Thank you for allowing me to present these issues to the research park site committee.

Bridget Ruenmele, Professor, Plant Sciences Department

(From Peter Alfonso emails below)

Thank you Gary. I will share your comments with the faculty/student ad hoc committee.

Celest and Stephen: Mr. Shaw is with Perkins and Will, a nation-wide design and build research facility and research park company. I commissioned Perkins&Will to build the first building in the U North Dakota research park. Please share with the ad hoc committee.

Celest: You asked for some document that would address the proximity issue in regard to site selection for research parks. Mr. Shaw refers to the Battelle report on the AURP website (Association of University Research Parks). I provide the URL to the link below. It may be more than you want or need but here it is. On page 13, please note that "physical proximity to main university campus was cited as of high or very high importance to success." These data are from a survey conducted by Battelle of 134 university research park directors. Also see Figure 7 on p. 14.

<http://www.aurp.net/more/FinalBattelle.pdf>.

Peter Alfonso, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research and Economic Development
The University of Rhode Island
Carlotti Administrative Building
75 Lower College Road, Suite 001
Kingston, RI 02881
401-874-4576

-----Original Message-----

From: Shaw, Gary [mailto:Gary.Shaw@perkinswill.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 3:50 PM

To: peteralfonso@URI.EDU

Subject: RE: proximity in research parks

Yes.

From: Peter Alfonso [mailto:peteralfonso@URI.EDU]

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 3:39 PM

To: Shaw, Gary

Subject: RE: proximity in research parks

Gary: Do I have your permission to share your email with the ad hoc committee?

Peter Alfonso, Ph.D.

Vice President for Research and Economic Development
The University of Rhode Island
Carlotti Administrative Building
75 Lower College Road, Suite 001
Kingston, RI 02881
401-874-4576

-----Original Message-----

From: Shaw, Gary [mailto:Gary.Shaw@perkinswill.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 2:54 PM

To: peteralfonso@uri.edu

Subject: RE: proximity in research parks

Hi Peter:

Proximity is very important and often can be different than direct adjacency. The key issues are viable and convenient 'access' for the park tenants to university faculty and PI's for intellectual property opportunities and access to students for employment. Access also for Faculty who are looking for a nearby location to launch business ventures of their own but that need to be 'off campus'. I've attached a copy of a Battelle Study and you might want to read the Executive Summary where some of the historic and current 'trends' are discussed including these issues of connection to the University. The overall report has a lot of interesting material in it as well. You can also go to the AURP website for other reports and information. (www.aurp.net).

Regarding the tree issue and faculty/student concerns, unless the Park's defined area is quite small, I would think that creative site/master planning could readily achieve the campus proximity, access and 'connectivity' that you need while preserving the campus 'feel' – including the landscape and forest elements. Couldn't the Research Park be seen as an extension of the campus and it's character? It seems that many 'tenants' would be attracted to a research park with mature trees and a campus feel. It would help them attract young talent who are used to the academic campus environment.

I have not seen the Research Park plan so I'm speaking more conceptually right now. I'll have some time later this week to check out the Park Website and may have some more specific thoughts then. I'd be happy to share some ideas if you'd like.

Coincidentally, several of our team are attending the pre-proposal meeting for the URI Chemistry Building today. If you're participating you might look for Leslie Sims. Thank you for the note and let me know if you'd like to talk about the Park.

Regards,
Gary

Gary C. Shaw, AIA, LEED® AP

Principal

Regional Market Sector Leader

55 Court St., 2nd Floor, Boston, MA 02108

t: 617.406.3535 m: 617 515-5060 e: gary.shaw@perkinswill.com www.perkinswill.com

Perkins+Will. Ideas + buildings that honor the broader goals of society

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the addressee. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute, copy, or alter this email.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Peter Alfonso [mailto:peteralfonso@uri.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 2:25 PM
To: Shaw, Gary
Subject: proximity in research parks

Hello Gary: I wonder if you have information that might be of help to me. We're about ready to break ground on our research and tech park, actually by putting in infrastructure such as roads, power, sewer, etc. And at the 11th hour some faculty and their students are opposing the site (lots of trees they want to protect). I'll spare you the details unless you persist. Main point is this – I met with the ad hoc faculty/student committee to argue that proximity matters; in this case, I want the park immediately across the street from our brand new 140K sqft bio tech facility, and our new Pharmacy college, and our proposed nursing and chemistry buildings. The committee is looking for some sort of documentation that proximity matters in this respect. Do you know of such a report or document that I can cite?

Peter Alfonso, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research and Economic Development
The University of Rhode Island
Carlotti Administrative Building
75 Lower College Road, Suite 001
Kingston, RI 02881
401-874-4576

Thank you for your perspective Bill. I am forwarding this to the ad hoc committee.
Celest and Stephen: Mr. Tente is the manager of the start-up company currently located in the NC Research Triangle Park and is considering moving to RI that I referred to at today's meeting.

Peter Alfonso, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research and Economic Development
The University of Rhode Island
Carlotti Administrative Building
75 Lower College Road, Suite 001
Kingston, RI 02881
401-874-4576

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Tente [mailto:btente@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 4:28 PM
To: peteralfonso@uri.edu
Subject: RE: URI R&T Park site location

Hello Peter,

In terms of establishing a site for the R&T park there are a number of factors to consider. From my perspective, I believe the proximity of the proposed site on the North Campus to research and development buildings is a critical issue that will influence the attractiveness of the site to businesses and investors.

- In terms of recruiting businesses, as beautiful as Kingston is, it has a number of factors going against it. Unlike the greater Providence area, URI is not close to route 95 nor the airport and the Kingston train station is not an Acela Amtrak station. Frankly, Kingston would rank low on anyone's list that is considering locating their business in RI (as we know, there are not a lot of companies moving businesses to RI). Therefore, it is more probable that a prospective tenant is going to be interested in locating their business at URI because they want access to faculty at the University, or equipment/specialized facilities that exist at the University. So right from the beginning, to be competitive from a business development standpoint, this must be kept in mind. Anything that erodes at the primary reason tenants would consider locating their business at URI will hamper recruitment of tenants.
- For these prospective tenants, rapid access to faculty and/or equipment/specialized facilities is a major issue. Company executives and employees in start up mode work at a pace that is significantly different from that of academic types (no offense). Having the ability in real time to walk across the street for a meeting or to discuss laboratory findings, to use a piece of equipment, to sit in on a seminar, etc.-these are important to these people. Many CEO's of start up companies are recent products of academia and would look at the proximity of their business to the Life Science and Engineering buildings as a big plus. Conversely, to have to drive or walk a significant distance represents a big hassle (especially if parking is a problem close to these buildings or weather is bad) and would significantly diminish cross-fertilization activities between the R&T park tenants and faculty. Additionally, in many cases the R&T park tenant may have samples they want analyzed quickly due to stability issues (common in the Life Science fields). Proximity again is an important consideration in this regard.
- One of the major attributes of the new Life Science building is its aesthetic attractiveness-it draws people to it and makes people comfortable when they are in it. As business tenants are being courted they will undoubtedly be toured through this building and other newer ones on the North end of campus. Prospective tenants will be drawn to this building and will want to be near it.
- For faculty that are considering spinning out a company, this becomes even more important. A faculty member would be more inclined to take on the challenge of participating in technology transfer or starting a new business if they knew they could walk across the street to the company rather than drive or walk a distance.
- Ambiance of a site is an important driver for a new business. Undoubtedly the North Campus site beats that of the Flagg Road site (adjacent to a treeless turf farm and ancillary university buildings that are architecturally "dull" and clearly away from the daily hustle and bustle of campus life). Investors are sophisticated people and will be impressed by the North Campus' site lines and surrounding buildings and landscape.

The success model for geographically delineated start up business development is Kendall Square in Cambridge. Within Kendall Square, Harvard and MIT professors started hundreds of companies in IT, biotech, telecommunications and other areas. Proximity of the faculty to office and laboratory space had a big influence on the overall success of Kendall Square. Polaroid, Genetics Institute, Biogen, Millineum – many others, all started as small operations in Kendall Square, literally walking distance from the founding scientists' laboratories.

In conclusion, locating the R&T park in any other area other than the proposed North Campus site adjacent to the Life Sciences and Biotech facility will severely hamper the ability to find tenants.

Please feel free to pass on my comments and call me if necessary.

Bill Tente

From: Peter Alfonso [mailto:peteralfonso@uri.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 1:59 PM
To: Bill Tente
Subject: URI R&T Park site location

Hello Bill: When you and I met on Monday I had not imagined that I would be contacting you again so soon but an issue has arisen that bears on your experience in these matters and I wonder if you might be willing to offer your opinion. You probably recall the front page article in Monday's ProJo on the controversy related to the proposed site of the R&T park in the area immediately across from the new CBLS building and soon to be constructed Pharmacy building and the proposed Nursing and Chemistry buildings; that is, the area that I refer to as our new North Campus. An ad hoc committee of faculty and students is meeting to offer their opinion as to the park site. I met with them this morning and it is clear that the major issue is that of proximity of the park to the North Campus. I argued that to best leverage for maximum success of the park that we need to be across the street. I was asked to provide evidence/support for this point of view. I thought of you given your long history of company formation particularly those companies that collaborate with universities, such as your current work in the NC Research Triangle Park. Would you please comment on site location; for example, the proposed site adjacent to the North Campus as opposed to the site on Plains Road near the super fund site, or any other site on or off the URI campus. And, please indicate if you would agree to my sharing your comments with the ad hoc committee.

Thanks again, Peter

Peter Alfonso, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research and Economic Development
The University of Rhode Island
Carlotti Administrative Building
75 Lower College Road, Suite 001
Kingston, RI 02881
401-874-4576

Dear Dr. Swallow,

Thank you for your note. I think the issue really comes down to the " uniqueness" of the forest lab setting, and can it be recreated a short distance away from where it is now. I can't believe a reasonable person could argue that in all of Rhode Island, even in all of Kingston a short walk away, there is no possible alternative. These students are learning valuable information and experiencing fine things, no doubt. It will matter not one bit to them, or to the curriculum at issue if it were 5 minutes further away.

That distance WILL matter to the BioPark, and when companies and professors look for an entrepreneurial setup, as is envisioned, the solution you propose would look rather silly. I don't mean to

dismiss your point of view, but from a business perspective, your solution is not supported by logic. The immediate access to the park is essential for its success. Any indication from my message that there was flexibility in that was not intended. Every meter you move the park away greatly reduces its impact. Full stop.

I know I'm just a biotech entrepreneur, but it seems to me that most environmental settings would ideally NOT sit across the street from some large buildings. Even if the BioPark was not contemplated, isn't there some concern that this environmental setting is already compromised? Has anyone raised the point that maybe there would be a better quality environmental lab site close by, but not hemmed in by construction? As I sit here, all I can think is that I'm not getting something, or that there is an argument going on up there that is not based in logic. Perhaps you can enlighten me.

Ed Rudnic

From: Stephen Swallow [swallow@uri.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 3:34 PM
To: Rudnic, Ed
Cc: peteralfonso@uri.edu; ronjordan@uri.edu; celestmartin614@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Research Park Location

Dear Dr. Rudnic: (cc: P. Alfonso, R. Jordan; adding Celest Martin, Chair of the URI Faculty Senate)

This is a very helpful perspective, and I will be sure our committee receives it, with your attached biographical sketch.

In the interest of our short time, I will attempt this follow-up: I believe many faculty favor close proximity to the campus and URI science facilities you mention and other facilities as well. In your message, you strongly recommend "as close as possible" and "across the street," advantages to the research park that the faculty do acknowledge. In Baltimore's case, at least some neighboring residents were relocated. But this did not create an irreversible loss of a research or teaching facility for some other portion of the university (as I understand your message). Here at URI, the concern is perhaps less about the environmental impact itself as it is about the unique loss of a research and teaching "outdoor natural laboratory" that is argued by faculty to be critical to the character of education for more than 1200 students each year, as well as specific, often multi-year, research projects outside formal coursework. At URI, the discussion has, in part, focused on weighing the advantages of the location about 1600 feet away, down Flagg Road (west) at the relatively new parking lot and current turf field North of Flagg Road. This would make a longer walk (some portions of that site might be up to a half-mile to the URI biotech building), but a walk that current students are asked to make daily and with an existing shuttle system offering public transport; it would also be a half-mile drive in a non-urban setting. For example, we learned today that some companies, like Amgen, use a shuttle service within their own complex (although we do not know the character of their collaborative set up). The issue is whether "as close as possible" necessitates the loss of this research and teaching area for the environmental science disciplines that are one of URI's strengths, with a strong employment-placement record. So the question becomes one of whether the additional advantage of an ideal proximity is worth the permanent sacrifice of a significant teaching and research facility that is already producing graduates, in respectable jobs, and even serving traditional economic development by providing, for example, expertise and work-force for firms in need of assistance with environmental compliance.

In no way do I intend this follow-up to overlook your perspective. I am attempting to be sure the issue at hand is crystal clear.

Stephen.

Stephen Swallow

URI-environmental economics
swallow@uri.edu
office: 401-874-4589

From: Rudnic, Ed [mailto:ed@rudnic.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 3:14 PM
To: swallow@uri.edu
Cc: peteralfonso@uri.edu; ronjordan@uri.edu
Subject: Research Park Location

Dear Dr. Swallow,

I understand there is a discussion about the appropriateness of locating the research park across the street from the Pharmacy building, and in very close proximity to the Bioscience Center and other life sciences facilities.

I believe that I am in a good position to offer guidance on this issue, as I have extensive experience in shaping and developing Maryland's life sciences industry, which now ranks as the third largest state for biotechnology, just behind California and Massachusetts. I enclose a brief bio summary, since I'm sure you are not familiar with me. I am a URI alum (Pharmacy, class of 1978, MS, '80, and PhD '82) and have contributed significant time and money to the university, and the College of Pharmacy through teaching, direct personal donations, corporate donations, research grants and graduate student support. Although I am an Adjunct Professor with the College of Pharmacy, and have taught several lectures this year, I have not asked, nor accepted remuneration, or even reimbursement for expenses. Just to complete the thought, I don't have now, and will not have in the future, any financial or business interest in the BioPark.

I am on the board of directors for the University of Maryland at Baltimore BioPark. This park was deliberately located across Martin Luther King Blvd, directly across from the school of Pharmacy at Univ. of Maryland at Baltimore, and the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute. The current set-up at URI is almost the exact formula as the one at Univ. of Maryland at Baltimore. There were some differences, to be sure, but the discussion back six years ago was reminiscent of the one that is occurring now at URI. There were quite a few lower-income housing units that would get displaced, and many feared that this was an unjust and forced relocation of the neediest in the city. Environmentalists worried that an industrial-based endeavor would cause more pollution, traffic and congestion in the area. Then Mayor of Baltimore, Martin O'Malley (now our Governor) supported the transformation of the area as a way to improve the economy of a woeful neighborhood, and people got behind the idea.

Since the decision was made to build an initial building, five buildings in total were built. These buildings supply over two hundred high paying jobs to the city, and have caused many other support and service jobs to be created. In an interesting development, one of the tenants of building two runs a training academy that certifies biotechnology technicians. Over three hundred disadvantaged youth have graduated from this institute, and have found meaningful work. Before this park, these kids would have probably dropped out of high school and been unemployed, or unproductive. Many residents in that neighborhood praise the efforts of the BioPark, as a vehicle for the betterment of their community. It has supplied jobs, a better future for their families, and it has greatly improved the looks of the area. In the truest testament of how successful this park is, almost every politician in Baltimore, and many in Maryland, claim to have had a role in its creation. Not one politician that was against it six years ago serves today.

I am also the Chairman of the Technology Council of Maryland, and have been quite active in the development of the life sciences sector in Maryland. I know that the Johns Hopkins BioPark is located just across the street from the Medical School, the University of Maryland at College Park Sloan Biotechnology Institute is located

adjacent to the new Smith School of Business building, and the University of Maryland Baltimore County Biomanufacturing center is on campus there as well.

It is essential that the research park be as closely located to the academic center it is associated with as possible. There are incredible synergies that one can anticipate, but also others that one can't today. I have seen this firsthand in Maryland, and believe if the goal is economic development, jobs creation and improving the vibrancy of the university, there is no other option than putting the BioPark across the street from the College of Pharmacy and the Biotechnology center. I am available to answer any questions, or discuss this further if you believe my participation would be helpful. My phone number is (301) 869-4622, and my e-mail is ed@rudnic.com.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Edward M. Rudnic, Ph.D.

Christine Muller
5 Carriage Lane
Kingston RI 02881
789-5336

Kingston, April 15, 2009

Dear Dr. Swallow:

I just heard that the university is planning to cut down a significant section of the Old North Woods, the forest north of Flagg Road, to make space for a new biotech research park. I think that this is a wrong decision.

Scientists all around the world including scientists at URI agree that climate change is a huge threat to people and ecosystems throughout the world, that its effects are accelerating at a rapid pace endangering the survival of civilization as we know it. One of the measures absolutely necessary to avert catastrophic and irreversible climate change is to preserve the remaining forests, especially the rainforests. How can we blame poor nations for cutting down their forests if an enlightened university like ours is cutting down its oldest trees?

From a local perspective: Kingston has already lost a lot of forests and other habitats for plants and animals in the past decades. The research park would fragment the forest compromising the whole ecosystem. Moreover, the park is planned right where the oldest part of the forest is situated. These trees have been there for about 100 years. That's why this area is biologically the richest. This forest is of great value to the university. Classes are being held there and many students conduct their research there. What an asset for the university to have these woods in such close proximity!

Preserving the old trees of the Old North Woods would honor the "Presidents' Climate Pledge" and show a long-term vision for the benefit of URI and for the well-being of the planet.

Yours sincerely, Christine Muller

Dear Ms. Bladgett, Thank you for your view. One of the problem is that the parcel in question entails some 314 acres, 125 of which we purchased in 2006 for the purpose of siting the research park, student and alumni housing, etc. This land was previously in the hands of a farm family, and the cost of purchasing the land was over \$1M. Some of the "century forest" is on that land. We have proposed putting some 200 acres of the total parcel into a conservation trust. The park would use 11 acres of the remaining land. We are having trouble finding a compromise that makes everyone a little unhappy.

The University must generate more of its own revenues as the state of Rhode Island continues to cut its support. The alternative is to keep raising tuition, and thereby excluding more students. That's not the way we want to go either. The research park is one way to generate some of those resources, but it is a dicey proposition at URI. Many other research universities are nearby, e.g., MIT is the same distance from Providence as URI. So what we establish has to have a distinct nature, but it has to be one in which companies will invest. The proximity to the CBLS building, the new Pharmacy building for which we will break ground later this month, and the new Chemistry building current being designed seems to be the advantage we have. Frankly, if we can't work something out on this property north of that cluster, it will not make sense to build the park at all. And so it goes. Thanks for your concern for your alma mater. RLC

Robert L. Carothers
President
The University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881
401-874-2444

Building a New Culture for Learning

From: Courtney Blodgett [mailto:courtneyablodgett@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 3:54 AM
To: muskrat@uri.edu
Cc: swallow@uri.edu; celestmartin614@gmail.com
Subject: North Woods

Dear Dr. Carothers,

I attended URI from 2000-2004, majoring in Environmental Science and Management and graduating Summa Cum Laude with entry into both Oxford and Cambridge, among other universities, for my master's degree. Although I graduated on the top of my class and excelled on my SATs in high school, I chose not to attend an ivy league university; I choose to attend URI because of it's fantastic environmental program and the facilities it had to offer. These facilities included Alton Jones and the nearby North Woods.

I realize the reasons for wanting to put the research park in North Woods. However, I also know that putting the park in North Woods will result in the destruction of an area that is not only a wonderfully biodiverse habitat but

is also a playground where students can explore and learn about the wonders of the natural world, right in their backyard. I entreat you to put the research park in one of the alternatives to the North Woods.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Courtney Blodgett

Dear Sheryll Travers:

Thank you for offering your input. I am providing your note to the committee

Stephen
URI-environmental economics
swallow@uri.edu

From: sheryll travers [mailto:sattrav5@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 7:35 AM
To: swallow@uri.edu
Subject: North Woods

Please reconsider the North Woods site. It needs to be preserved before we have nothing left of nature. People in RI are spoiled with everything being right at our fingers. Why can't the new building be built on another parcel of land?? So you have to walk a bit. Big deal. It isn't like it is in Boston. The North Woods needs to be saved.
Please Help

Sheryll Travers

----- Forwarded message -----
From: Sheila Black Grubman <SheilaFS@uri.edu>
Date: Wed, Apr 15, 2009 at 3:18 PM
Subject: Fwd: Open Letter to President Carothers
To: FSEC-L@listserv.uri.edu

FYI if you don't receive THEFORUM-L

Date: Wed, 15 Apr 2009 14:52:45 -0400
Reply-To: drpegueros@cox.net
Sender: URI General Discussion List <THEFORUM-L@LISTSERV.URI.EDU>
From: Rosa Maria Pegueros <drpegueros@cox.net>
Subject: Open Letter to President Carothers

As important decisions for the university affecting the library and the Century Forest await President Carothers' pen, I ponder whether it is worth it to throw in my two cents. After all, in my 16 years at URI, I have offered my opinion on many issues but feel that I have had as much effect as a robed figure carrying a sandwich board that says, "The End is Near."

Every university has internal critics who, frustrated by the slow grinding of the wheels of change in the committees and ruling bodies, write, speak and harangue, hoping that someone will listen. Universities supposedly operate under a principal of shared governance: We, the administration and faculty, supposedly share the important decisions about the functioning of the university.

Perhaps eleven years ago, I spoke informally with President Carothers. We were awaiting the beginning of an event at the President's house. He talked about the many constituencies to whom the president had to answer: The governor, the Board of Governors, the public, the alumni, the students, the faculty, etc. I had never thought of it that way and felt I had gained a valuable insight. It made me give him more room, to be less critical of his decisions, conscious of the fact that my constituencies were far fewer than his.

But over time, I have become disillusioned with the so-called shared governance at URI. I have served on committees only to have the reports we created effectively discarded in the circular file. I have often felt that instead of wasting our time and efforts, the administration should just hand each committee a big rubber stamp that reads: APPROVED BY THE FACULTY. Skip the middle step; go straight to approval.

While the faculty still has some clout in curricular matters, anything involving money is governed by the bottom line, faculty be damned. In another conversation with President Carothers, he told me that "We can't be everything to all people." I understand that but doesn't the faculty have anything to say in those decisions?

I am not making a blanket criticism of President Carothers. He has done a great deal to add to the physical beauty of the campus, added many new buildings, and his efforts led the school to be named one of the top 15 schools in the country for "return for tuition" by Smart Money, the Wall Street Journal Magazine. Moreover, he has raised millions and created an endowment. We must give him his due.

But there are problems with other aspects of the university.

We spend millions of dollars on a football team that should be called, "The Gang that Couldn't Shoot Straight." They have not had a winning season in all my years here. Football players are among the

worst of our students. They are absorbed with their football practice to the exclusion of almost all else. When was the last time that one of our football players made it into the NFL or any other professional entity? If the administration believes that a football team is a necessary component of the aura of a New England university, then admit they are here for window dressing and make the academic achievement of its players paramount. Stop the sham that funnels them through forcing them to spend all their energies on football and only what's left over for their studies. How many of our players graduate? How many graduate with a "B" average?

We've spent millions upon millions on the basketball team, if you count the construction of the Ryan Center which, as was reported in a small item in the Providence Journal some months ago, has not lived up to the expectations of it for bringing money to the University. At least the basketball team has a stronger record of wins. It should, considering the appalling amount of money we spend on the basketball coach, more than President Carothers or the governor make.

In the meantime, the two most academic -and essential- dimensions of the university, the library and the faculty are declining and in need of revival.

In the years that I have been here, I have seen appropriations for the library slide into the dust; library staff cut; appropriations for monographs and journals wither away. My students complain of its truncated hours, particularly during exams. It is incredible to me the library at the Graduate School of Oceanography has no professional librarian at the helm. The GSO is the jewel in our crown and one of the premier oceanography institutes in the world. How is that possible? To me, this is comparable Walmart cutting costs by allowing pharmacy assistants to fill prescriptions.

As for the faculty, we have 598 full-time tenured and tenure track faculty according to this week's Sunday Providence Journal. That number has diminished since I came in 1993 (two years after President Carothers started). We have lost tenure-track faculty lines. We have a huge number of adjunct faculty members who exist on the edges of our community: They are second-class citizens who work as hard as anyone, have no security, and are paid less than regular faculty. They worked as hard as any regular faculty to earn their PhDs but it is cheaper to engage them than to open the tenure line. A few years ago, one of my contingent colleagues had patched together nine courses taught at colleges in the area to make his living. NINE! Not nine units; nine classes! I couldn't imagine how the poor man was still standing at the end of a week.

Now as President Carothers ends his presidency, he is faced with two decisions that could be made on principle or on the bottom line. He can choose to cut down the Century Forest and replace it with a business park whose value, it is said, would be considerably diminished if it were to be moved a block away.

Really? The business types can't walk an extra 500 feet? If we install a shuttle, can we keep the forest? Why is this such an uncompromising choice? What are the values of the university here? We build the new biosciences building but can't spare the space for the living laboratory? This is not a decision to be made solely on monetary grounds. Pretend that there is a new building already on the site of Century Forest, and make the next best choice. It is a small compromise to make. If the last decade has taught us anything, it is that the decisions that put business first leave devastation in their wake.

As for the "Learning Commons" for the library, I have no objection to the revitalization and renovation

of parts of the library to make it more attractive to and usable for the students. The influx of laptops, netbooks and other electronic devices certainly calls for the creation of more electrical outlets. But these things are secondary to the revitalization of the library itself: The restoration of a decent budget, the restoration of sufficient qualified faculty and staff; the expansion of library hours for the sake of the students; and most importantly, the restoration of the library as the heart of the university.

I may be a bit of a crank with my sign, but I know I speak for many of the faculty in offering these recommendations. "The End is Near."

Dra. Rosa Maria Pegueros
Department of History
& Women's Studies Program
University of Rhode Island, RI 02881-0817
Phone: (401) 874-4092
E-mail: drpegueros@cox.net
BLOG: <http://heartofskycafe.blogspot.com/>
<http://tinyurl.com/doxno>
<http://drpegueros.googlepages.com/home>

"I don't give them hell. I just
tell the truth and they think it's hell."

--President Harry Truman

Originally to Dr. Carothers)

Dear Drs. Martin and Swallow,

I have recently been alerted to the impending plan to destroy (= remove and/or fragment) the woods along the north side of Flagg Road. This is extremely disheartening, especially given the rapid 'subdivisioning' of the same forest parcel along Old North Road, not to mention the subdivisioning of so many other forested areas in the vicinity of campus, and 'rural' RI as a whole. As a teaching assistant in plant science and entomology over the years, I have brought classes out into these woods, and used the woods for immediate, easy-access, field laboratory sessions, and they provided everything--a real natural environment, with real plants and animals to observe, discuss and analyze.

Regardless of the validity of the argument for retaining some useful, natural habitat alongside campus (not to mention the integrity of the relatively old forest ecosystem), the whole campus atmosphere will be changed forever-- from the 'rural-esque', land-grant school, to just another college within suburbia. I think it is unwise to remove (or fragment) the Flagg Road woods.

Maria Aliberti Lubertazzi