Rochester Higher Education Development Committee
Flipchart notes from September 22, 2005 meeting
Meeting facilitated by Judy Grew, Management Analysis & Development

Following are flipchart notes taken during the committee’s September 22 meeting. The group went through its list of statutory duties and, at a high level, delineated the areas in which they were already in agreement, areas where they need to continue to discuss issues, and areas where they believe they need more research or information before they can make a recommendation. This work was being done in preparation for the committee’s future research and legislative report drafting. The list of statutory duties is provided at the end of these notes.

**Topic 1: Mission and focus of the programs or institutions**

**Responses from the committee:**

**We are in agreement on the following points:**

- This is in the vision statement – already discussed. Back to the world class signature programs idea. Rochester higher education would focus on specialties rather than the full panoply of programs. It would not offer all aspects of engineering, for example.
- The statutory duties 1, 2, and 8 were related and discussed in the vision statement. These were:
  - 1. the mission and focus of the programs or institutions;
  - 2. the nature of undergraduate and graduate programs to be offered; and
  - 8. mechanisms to ensure that the expanded programs are aligned with the unique needs of the Rochester area and that programs take advantage of opportunities presented by regional business and industry
- We are not trying to duplicate RCTC or WSU – those two institutions are meeting workforce needs. The signature programs should not duplicate what is already there. Bio-medical offerings at the UofM, for example.
- We are not focusing on liberal arts – that is not related to the economic model we have been discussing
- We are not creating a traditional 4-year college. We are creating hybrids and cross-functional arrangements between elements of business education, entrepreneurship and getting education delivery away from the traditional model.
- Smart kids follow smart professors. The challenge is how to attract faculty that will draw good students. Joint appointments, research, creativity and respect are things that draw faculty – not just pay. We should be a magnet for that.
- At this point, we do not think we should focus on teaching or educational administration.
Items we need to continue to discuss:

- The continued discussable is the issue of undergraduate programs. Specific questions are:
  - Do we rely on a community or other college “feeder” for lower division undergraduate courses?
  - How do we handle the liberal arts courses recommended to round out a more technical undergraduate degree (e.g., English for engineers?)
  - What will be the participation of private higher education?
- An issue/point related to this is a sense that students may not come from this area – we need to think about how to serve their needs. Some of the best students will be coming here, and likewise, some of the best students in this area leave the area for college.

Areas where we need more information/data:

- How do area institutions see their focus – what would they say they are good at? What do they want to build on? The committee should ask them that question.
- Ask UT-Dallas about their reasons why they delayed offering undergraduate programs for a number of years.
- We want to hear from Mayo and IBM (perhaps more so IBM) on their strategic plan and how it relates to Rochester.
Topic 2: The nature of undergraduate and graduate programs to be offered

Responses from the committee:

We are in agreement on the following points:

- Although the committee cannot enumerate a list of specific programs, the nature of the programs in the areas of: Allied Health (see the list of specifics offered by UMR under their BA degrees), bioinformatics, engineering (including biomedical engineering and computational biology).
- There are core opportunities for research and skills – hybrids between areas. We cannot delineate these programmatically at this time, since they haven’t been specifically identified and created.
- “Business” is one the programmatic areas. However, we do not mean “business” in the business school sense. We would not be doing some elements of business programs.
- We are focusing on entrepreneurship and extracting models from business education and integrating them into other areas. Rather than sending engineers to business school, we are integrating business education into the engineering curriculum as a subset under its programs. If we are working with an economic model, we are asking how business underlays things. As an outcome, we want people who can launch things.
- Examples of elements of business education that were brought forward included:
  - an “MBA for propeller heads” program in the management of technology, offered by many institutions such as MIT/Sloan, UofM/Carlson School
  - project management and program management for business and engineering
  - The MIT Sloan School and Johns Hopkins programs that were started in the mid-90s.
  - Babson College’s specialized MBA program to launch a company
- Students are seeing the relevance of these kinds of programs and are already making the connections

Items we need to continue to discuss:

- We are not sure how far we as members can delineate programmatic detail – it is out of our areas of expertise. We can list some general areas.

Areas where we need more information/data:

- We need to get key faculty and they are the draw. How do existing institutions do this? The UofM’s relationship with the Federal Reserve Board may be instructive
- We need more fact finding on the specifics within the general categories
- We need to identify the right people at the UofM to talk to about new hybrid ideas
- We need to think more (and for a longer amount of time) about hybrids and opportunities for hybrids – the China Center at the UofM is an example. We need to think strategically about this.
Topic 6: Alliances or other types of cooperative arrangements with public and private institutions

Responses from the committee:

We are in agreement on the following points:

- As noted during the programmatic discussion, we do not want to duplicate what is already there.
- Alliances have been mentioned throughout our discussion and have threaded through most of our conversations. Those that have already mentioned in previous discussions today are:*
  - Existing industry in the area (Mayo, IBM, Pemstar, others)
  - The UofM (Institute of Technology, the China Center, Veterinary Medicine, Medicine
  - RCTC
  - Winona State
  - Other private colleges
  * Note: this is not a final list of alliances – just those that had been mentioned at this meeting up to this time.

- Cooperative arrangements, joint appointments and internships would be core and central to our uniqueness. We need to articulate something compelling with the uniqueness of these institutions and how they can help drive the model.
- Industry alliances – in addition to considering existing industry, we need to think about how to get industry to locate in Rochester, and work with the associations that help bring research to the marketplace.
- We would access research dollars to create programs. Bigger institutions would be helping smaller ones. There are federal programs such as SBIR (Small Business Innovation Research) that are looking for small businesses to provide seed dollars.
- Research at this institution would be translational – not science for science’s sake. It would focus on applications and delivery to the marketplace. It would focus on bringing research from the bench to implementation. We would like to recognize this research component from the very beginning.
Topic 4: Funding sources and opportunities

Responses from the committee:

We are in agreement on the following points:

- To some extent, we need to wait for the results on Topic 2 (programs) and Topic 7 (governance structures) to say more about funding sources and opportunities. Decisions in these areas influence the funding structure.
- There is a subgroup that is considering how to fit this into the existing model of support. The subgroup that is working on this topic is not envisioning a change in the system of higher education funding. There is agreement that it would take state support to get it up and running – but that is something that would fall away. Then financing would move more into the model of having a base appropriation and appropriations for other initiatives.
- Other funding sources discussed have been community and national foundations.
- Conversations with Mark Yudof have emphasized the value of chaired endowments from private and local contributions.
- There are potential local sales tax revenues.
- If the university attracts “rock star” faculty, they have supporting staff and they need facilities. But they may come with money, also. This relates to facilities and bonding. The Governor gets about 95 percent of what he wants in bonding. The focus is on building super staff. Bonding for facilities is almost easier to do than that.
- Funding from the state can be viewed as a zero-sum game. How it is presented and sold is important. Some money needs to come from the state, but it is not a zero-sum game. That’s a tough sell. The committee needs to make this case compelling.
- The Governor is the only one who can make the pie bigger. This requires framing and leadership from the Governor.
- The legislature has to be there, but the rest of the funding from community and national sources.
- The funding should be viewed as an investment, not an entitlement extension. But politics isn’t zero-based budgeting.

Areas where we need more information/data:

- We need to develop a summary roll up of funding sources in our business case:
  - Federal
  - State
  - Local
  - National foundations
  - Community foundations
  - Endowed chairs
- Our consultant could help us identify national foundation sources.
- A business case/model should make the case for higher education in Rochester on the specifics of economic growth and local contributions.
The statutory duties list follows:

1. the mission and focus of the programs or institutions;
2. the nature of undergraduate and graduate programs to be offered;
3. site and facility needs;
4. funding sources and opportunities;
5. operational needs;
6. alliances or other types of cooperative arrangements with public and private institutions;
7. governance structures; and
8. mechanisms to ensure that the expanded programs are aligned with the unique needs of the Rochester area and that programs take advantage of opportunities presented by regional business and industry.