

Northeast Ohio
Universities
Collaboration &
Innovation Study
Commission

Cleveland State University
Kent State University
Northeastern Ohio Universities
College of Medicine
The University of Akron
Youngstown State University

Minutes from November 1, 2007 session of the
Academic Workgroup of the
Northeast Ohio Universities Collaboration & Innovation Study Commission
Held at the offices of the GAR Foundation, Fairlawn, Ohio

Attendees: Committee Chair, Jane Timken; Commission Chair, Ted Boyd, Dorothy Baunach, Bruce Beeghly, Richard Pogue, Dr. Luis Proenza, Dr. David Sweet, Dr. Lester Lefton, Dr. Michael Schwartz, Dr. Lois Nora

Guests: Dr. Robert Frank, Jon Allison, Kimberly Chapple, Tom Maraffa, Dr. Chand Midha, Dr. Mary Jane Saunders, Dr. Peter Kasvinsky, Dr. Laura Davis, Dr. Beth Stroble, Kathleen Ruff, Ann Womer Benjamin, Pat Myers, Rich Lewis, John West

Staff: Monica Turoczy, Amy Sabath, Lynne Woodman

Opening Comments of Committee Chair Jane Timken:

- Ms. Timken welcomed everyone.
- Dr. Portch gave an overview of the process for the workgroup to finish approving the recommendations which will then be sent to the full Commission for adoption and ratification.
- Mr. Boyd noted the window for Big Ideas to be introduced is now closed.

Presentation by Dr. Sweet to Encourage Northeast Ohio's Urban Universities:

NOTE: Big Idea is attached

- Dr. Sweet gave an overview of the recommendation of the urban universities playing a major role in the revitalization of the cities they are in.
- Dr. Portch referred everyone to review the actual recommendation he recently wrote for this Big Idea:
- **University-based Urban Redevelopment Initiative:** The Commission recommends that the legislature provide targeted ongoing funding (primarily but not exclusively capital) for the urban universities of Northeast Ohio to implement an urban redevelopment initiative that will have a

coordinated and focused strategy of place-based economic development in the immediate off-campus districts that surround each campus. Such targeted ongoing funding might include:

- A land acquisition fund
 - A parking development fund
 - An urban amenities fund
 - An affordability fund
 - An Academic Urban Opportunity Fund
- Ms. Timken noted she liked the affordability fund and the academic urban opportunity fund. She also noted she had concerns about creating a land acquisition fund, parking development fund, and urban amenities fund when the focus of the recommendations should be on the students.
 - Dr. Sweet noted that YSU needs to be competitive and attract students and provide a safe environment. It's expensive to acquire land to do this, but to remain competitive and to contribute to the revitalization of Youngstown, YSU will need help.
 - Mr. Pogue asked if this was a one-time targeted funding. Dr. Sweet suggested this be ongoing if possible. Dr. Portch added to insert this is primarily capital funding.
 - Dr. Frank mentioned all universities face similar challenges. He suggested this recommendation be made broader so as to serve all students.
 - Dr. Lefton noted all universities, regardless of their location, are involved in economic development. He supports this recommendation but would be more supportive if the recommendation were made stronger for all institutions.
 - Mr. Boyd asked if this issue is about urban redevelopment. KSU is involved in urban redevelopment though their architecture program. Dr. Portch noted this is definitely for the focus of urban redevelopment.
 - Dr. Portch added the final report would indicate several of these recommendations could have statewide implications, but Northeast Ohio could also serve as a pilot.
 - Dr. Portch will re-draft this recommendation to add KSU, take out "pilot" (per Mr. Beeghly) and add in more general language. Rationale will be added to support this recommendation.
 - Ms. Timken asked for a motion for the recommendation to be adopted by this Workgroup. Dr. Lefton made the motion, Ms. Baunach second the motion. The vote was unanimous for adoption.

North Shore Graduate & Research Alliance:

NOTE: Handout attached

- Dr. Portch noted there were two parallel recommendations of the Graduate Council and the Northshore Alliance. These have been merged together.
- Dr. Portch noted changes to this recommendation: (1) each institution would contribute \$10,000; (2) an Executive Director would be hired to oversee the Alliance, possibly from within one

institution. This recommendation formalizes governance structure and provides more of a consortium activity; (3) common graduate degree proposals go to the Presidents and appropriate Boards of Trustees.

- Dr. Proenza suggested three areas to look at: (1) add an appropriate legislative appropriation be made; (2) some of the functions are part of the Third Frontier Advisory Board; (3) Northeast Ohio has a process, through NorTech, to involve appropriate groups and develop industry. We should be sure to not duplicate efforts.
- Ms. Baunach noted there may be a difficult time getting industry money. She also noted the budget for the \$10,000 contribution is a point of controversy, but this Alliance cannot happen without having someone coordinate this effort. NOCHE and NorTech do not have capacity to do this, but maybe time could be purchased from someone at one of the universities.
- Dr. Kasvinsky noted the need to structure a staff person to cross the bridge between NorTech and the universities, as well as the research institutions. He added the importance to bring appropriate companies to the table and to try to focus on deliverable programs.
- The Commission members agreed on a dedicated staff person. The Council will develop the mission and goals statement for the Alliance.
- The motion to adopt this recommendation was made by Ms. Baunach and second by Dr. Proenza. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of remaining recommendations:

NOTE: Handout of updated recommendations was included in meeting materials.

- **Technology Transfer** – this was added to the agenda. Changes were made to the language of the recommendation including replacing “that include” with “may include,” and striking “each of the” before the words “participating universities.”
- Dr. Nora asked if this was pertaining to a new research foundation. Dr. Portch noted that it could be an existing foundation.
- Ms. Baunach asked what is meant that the University of Akron would be the lead institution. Dr. Proenza said they will convene and work out the process among the participants.
- The motion to adopt the recommendation as written was made by Dr. Proenza and Mr. Beeghly second. The Adoption passed unanimously.
- **Modification to Statute 3345.06** – Mr. Beeghly suggested re-wording of statute to cross out the “any university” and “be permitted to” and change to “shall establish.”
- Dr. Proenza noted we are trying to raise the preparation of students and suggested we frame requirements that the Ohio core has put forward and appropriately satisfy those which substitute those with open admission since community and technical colleges and four-year colleges have this

goal in common. Mr. Beeghly noted this suggestion is simply that anyone who meets the Ohio core be admitted.

- Dr. Proenza noted open enrollment is anyone who finished a high school degree and they may not have completed the core.
- Dr. Portch will make edits regarding “be permitted.”
- The motion to adopt the recommendation was made by Dr. Nora and seconded by Dr. Sweet. The Adoption passed unanimously.
- **Increasing Graduates** – Dr. Portch noted that you could increase your graduation and retention rates and still reduce the number of degrees you produce. Since we want more graduates, we set a target to increase the number of graduates. This will be reported on annually.
- Dr. Schwartz noted that we can increase the number of graduates but not be assured they know anything. This is a national issue right now. There should be outcome assessment programs tied to this.
- Dr. Saunders noted this is simplistic with a funding formula directly related to a head count and the state needs to move away from this. Mr. Pogue added the last paragraph indicates we want to add another factor onto the SSI policy. Dr. Portch noted this is intended to have an element to the revised SSI and indicate a change to reward institutions who increase the number of graduates, but not reward the production of enrollment. This was not intended to be the only change proposed to the funding formula.
- The motion to adopt the recommendation was made by Dr. Proenza and Ms. Timken second. The Adoption passed unanimously.
- **Academic Program Review and Expansion** – Mr. Pogue asked if this was an ongoing process. Dr. Portch noted this is intended to be a one-time process, but an ongoing process could be decided down the road.
- The motion to adopt the recommendation was made by Dr. Proenza and Mr. Beeghly second. The Adoption passed unanimously.
- **Mission Distinctiveness** – Dr. Portch noted it was decided at previous meetings that there needs to be a level of specificity. He noted he did not edit what was submitted. The Commission would endorse these areas of distinction of these universities.
- Mr. Pogue asked if the universities are stating these are their missions. Dr. Portch noted these are the starting points with regard to the Study Commission and the institutions’ missions. Dr. Lefton said it is the Board of Trustees of each institution which determines the mission. Dr. Portch noted the Commission has the right to opine on what they think the missions should be.

- Dr. Schwartz noted these look like five very different universities. Dr. Portch will add language to note these are the words of each institution describing their distinctiveness. Dr. Lefton asked to indicate these are “self-described statements by each institution.”
- The motion to adopt the recommendation was made and carried. The Adoption passed unanimously.
- **NEO Regional Medical and Health Professions Education Workgroup** – Dr. Portch noted there are ongoing discussions outside of this Commission on this topic.
- Mr. Pogue noted substantial top tier hospitals are mentioned in the recommendation but the second tier hospitals are not. These are competitive issues.
- Dr. Nora noted the Workgroup was only charged with discussing pros and cons and financials, but not beyond those issues. Dr. Proenza suggested we accept the Workgroup report as it is. He also suggested it be noted that the group was not charged with making any recommendations.
- Dr. Portch noted the Commission needs to provide some recommendations in these areas, but it will not be the final word on this topic. Given the range of recommendations, the stakes, emotions and realities, we will not come out with a consensus on a recommendation. There are fundamental areas we can have a consensus on.
- Mr. Boyd added the Commission is not capable of making this decision. We attempted to respond to Dr. Nora’s White Paper. If we can agree on a statement about this, then we should make it; if not, then we should indicate that.
- Dr. Nora added there may be one or two of these recommendations we will all agree on. Dr. Portch added the Commission should indicate we agree on the importance of expanding Medical Education and Health Sciences in the region.
- Dr. Lefton suggested we forward information on in a portfolio of information to the Chancellor to provide useful information and background information for him to decide how to reorganize NEOUCOM.
- The Workgroup members agreed on the following recommendations: Medical Education and Academic Health Sciences are worthy of expansion in the region for a number of reasons; changes in the present governance structure need to be revisited; add CSU to BS/MD collaboration.
- The motion to adopt the recommendation was made by Dr. Proenza and Ms. Baunach second. The Adoption passed unanimously.

Adjourn

Big Idea:
Encourage Northeast Ohio's Urban Universities
to Act as
Urban Redevelopers

- Cleveland State, Youngstown State, and the University of Akron are all located on urban campuses in their respective downtowns. All have been adversely impacted over several decades by disinvestment in their surroundings. These three universities are truly “urban” in so far as they occupy prominent sites in the downtowns of their cities and face similar challenges as a result of their central city locations.
- All three “urban universities” were established as community-supported institutions in the late 19th century or early 20th century to meet the needs of the growing industrial economies of Cleveland, Akron, and Youngstown. Each became part of the state system in the 1960’s and were identified as “urban universities” endowed with a unique and specific mission to catalyze economic and physical development in their respective cities.
- Kent State, by contrast, occupies a suburban-style campus in a small town setting. Its relationship to its host community, though clearly different than the other three truly “urban” universities, is no less important to its long term attractiveness as an institution. In addition, Kent State houses the Urban Design Center of Northeast Ohio, an unique asset available to assist the three “urban” universities by providing targeted design services. The UDC recently completed campus master plans for the CSU and YSU campuses and has established relationships with the planning and development staffs of the three universities.
- The States’ commitment to stimulating urban economic development through its urban state universities is a well articulated—but modestly supported—policy. On a biennial basis, the State, through the Board of Regents, invests \$5 to \$6 million in “urban centers” in each of the State’s eight urban universities through the Ohio Urban University Program.
- By contrast with the State’s modest commitment to stimulating urban economic development through the urban universities, the State invests \$63.4 million per year (FY08) in rural and agricultural economic development through The Ohio State University College of Agriculture (Cooperative Extension and R and D Center). The State’s long standing commitment to growing the agriculture industry and rural development has produced significant results. The largest industry in the state is agriculture.
- Throughout this country’s urban areas, city governments and university administrations are coming to understand the critical role urban universities can and should play in stimulating private urban reinvestment and promoting broad based economic development. Prominent private urban universities with major endowments, such as Harvard, Yale and Columbia have long understood that controlling or otherwise influencing the development of their immediate off campus neighborhoods is essential to their ability to attract students, recruit faculty and establish a compellingly “cool” identity.

- In recent years colleges and universities as diverse as the University of Pennsylvania, Marquette University, Ohio State University, the University of Cincinnati and Trinity College have pursued aggressive efforts to spur reinvestment in their off campus neighborhoods, often by collaborating with their host city, establishing separate neighborhood development organizations or supporting existing community development corporations
- The motivation of these universities and their community partners goes beyond securing “turf” and focuses intentionally on an overt regional economic development agenda: These universities intend to create around them the sort of well-designed, high-amenity pedestrian zones that will attract and retain Millennial students and knowledge workers, key drivers of innovation in the global knowledge economy.
- The results of many of these more recent initiatives are described in the recent publication, *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*, co-published in 2005 by M.E. Sharp and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Despite the increasing urgency with which the administrations of the state’s urban universities view the need to improve their immediate off campus districts, the State of Ohio in the past has provided little support or encouragement, either directly or indirectly. By contrast, the State of Pennsylvania, through its Keystone Innovation Zone program has provided targeted incentives for high tech industries to locate in proximity to that state’s institutions of higher education. As a result of these incentives, cities like Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, home of Lehigh University, have seen a significant influx of new, high tech industries to replace the steel industry that once fueled the local economy.
- The Northeast Ohio Universities Collaboration & Innovation Study Commission proposes that the State position Northeast Ohio’s three “urban” universities to catalyze urban economic development in the region’s most prominent downtowns by funding a coordinated strategy of focused, place-based economic development in the immediate off-campus district that surrounds each campus.
- The three “urban” universities are actively involved with other institutions in revitalization partnerships targeted on stimulating place-based economic development in their immediate off-campuses, which generally are within one-half mile of each university’s core campus as designated by the Ohio Board of Regents:
 - **University of Akron:** University Park Alliance, a partnership with the City of Akron, Summa Health System, the Akron Beacon Journal, Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority, Greater Akron Chamber, Akron Public Schools, and the University Park Development Corporation. Target Area: a 1000-acre area immediately surrounding the campus.
 - **Cleveland State:** The Quadrangle, a partnership of CSU, Tri-C, St. Vincent Charity Hospital and other smaller institutions. Target Area: a 500-acre area centered on Euclid Avenue. Within this target area, the University recently commenced a public-private partnership to develop “College

Town,” a collaboration with Heartland Development to create a compact urban precinct with 300 apartments and 100,000 square feet of retail.

- **Youngstown State:** Youngstown 2010, a partnership between the City of Youngstown and Youngstown State University, St Elizabeth’s Hospital, Youngstown Metropolitan Housing Authority, Park Vista, Wick Neighbors, the North Side Citizens’ Coalition, the Andrews Avenue Business Association, Mahoning Commons and the Central Youngstown Community Improvement Corporation. Target Area: Center City Youngstown, including Downtown Youngstown the University campus, Smoky Hollow, Arlington Heights, Mahoning Commons, and the Wick Park Model Neighborhood.
- The three “urban” universities are engaged in planning and catalyzing mixed use development in their respective off-campus districts. Each has established a professionally-staffed area development organization to carry out this work.
- Each university has completed campus master plans which propose more closely integrating their core campuses with their immediate off-campus. Each realizes that focusing solely on traditional campus development while ignoring the surroundings makes their campus less desirable to prospective students and faculty and diminishes the opportunity for leveraging the university’s principal strength—concentrated brainpower—by creating “cool places” that attract young knowledge workers and stimulate entrepreneurship, innovation and wealth creation.
- Each university faces considerable challenges in executing its vision. Principal among these are land acquisition, structured parking, urban amenities, and affordability.
- Each university operates in a municipal context that is characterized by limited public dollars and competing demand for funds from city neighborhoods. The ability of each to compete for limited public funding is always an issue.
- Each university has urban centers and academic departments that would benefit from engagement in the process of urban revitalization. The opportunities for applied research and service learning exist on each campus.
- Based on these observations and on preliminary discussions with each of the three urban universities, consider the following initiatives to support concentrated, place based economic and physical development:
 - **Land Acquisition Fund:** In the face of limitations on the use of eminent domain, provide funding that will allow each university to acquire sufficient property to engage the development community for specific projects.
 - **Parking Development Fund:** In the face of the need to achieve density in weak market cities, provide funding to underwrite part of the capital costs of developing structured parking.

- **Urban Amenities Fund:** In the face of competition from neighborhoods for limited amenity budgets and recognizing the need to have funding to leverage local, state, and federal funding, provide matching funds to leverage enhancement funding from other sources.
- **Affordability Funds:** Recognizing that costs drive affordability and that the urban neighborhood each university wants to create around itself must be economically diverse, provide funds to encourage affordable housing.
- **Academic Opportunity Fund:** Recognizing that the development programs of each university offer unique opportunities for applied research and service learning, provide catalytic funds to buyout teaching time, underwrite research and provide service learning and internship opportunities.

The State of Ohio invests over \$60 million per year in successful rural development and agriculture related initiatives. The Commission urges that similar funding be provided to the state's urban universities in order to enable each institution to serve as a major driver of the redevelopment of their respective off campus districts. The universities will collaborate in preparing strategies, share lessons learned and serve as models for the urban universities in Ohio and beyond.

Submitted by:

President Luis Proenza, The University of Akron
President Michael Schwartz, Cleveland State University
President David C. Sweet, Youngstown State University

NSGRA

NORTH SHORE GRADUATE & RESEARCH ALLIANCE MISSION AND GOALS STATEMENT, *as of 10/24/2007*

PREFACE:

The public and private research institutions of Northeast Ohio recognize the collective strength they can wield as partners in a collaborative graduate and research organization. In fact, they have collaborated for years on academic programs, research projects, grant applications, tech transfer opportunities, and other common endeavors, all to the benefit of the research enterprise of the region, such as the State of Ohio's Third Frontier initiatives. This North Shore Graduate and Research Alliance Mission and Goals Statement formalizes the Alliance as the venue for organizing these ongoing collaborations.

MISSION:

The mission of the North Shore Graduate and Research Alliance shall be to expand the research enterprise of Northeast Ohio.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES:

- Support research expansion, collaborative research, and education at public and private institutions
- Eliminate barriers to research
- Advance Northeast Ohio's economy by enhancing research and graduate education

GOALS:

1. Expand the funded research base

Objectives:

- a. Develop faculty incentive programs to obtain new research funding and promote interdisciplinary applied research
- b. Support intra- and inter-institutional faculty collaborations to pursue federal grants and contracts
- c. Substantially increase the region's research grants in 5 years
 - i. 25 to 30% increase using planned facilities and staffing
 - ii. Identify investments required to double the research funding over this time period
- d. Substantially increase research grants in 10 years
 - i. 50 to 70% increase using existing or currently planned facilities and staffing
 - ii. Identify investments required to double the research funding over this time period

2. Attract graduate students and research faculty

Objectives:

- a. Recruit research faculty who will bring, or have high potential for attracting, new research funding and directions to the region
- b. Develop collaborative graduate programs that will serve to integrate regional research programs and support collaborations.

3. Enhance and coordinate academic and industry partnerships in research and innovation

Objectives:

- a. Coordinate infrastructure and intellectual assets within and among institutions
- b. Identify funding that would encourage collaborations among partners and with other research-oriented institutions
- c. Collaborate to develop institutional strengths that complement each other, rather than compete with each other
- d. Share core technologies

