

**Rochester Higher Education Development Committee**  
Meeting Minutes for September 8, 2005

Time: 7 a.m. – 10 a.m.

Location: Edina Realty Rochester, 1301 Salem Road SW, Rochester, MN

**Members Present:**

Al Berning	Marilyn Stewart
Al DeBoer	Dr. Claire Bender
Dwight Gourneau	Michael Vekich
Jayne Rankin	
Bob Hoffman	
Dr. Wendy Shannon	

**Members not Present:**

Dr. David Metzen  
Drew Flaada

**Others Present:**

Dr. Cheryl Maplethorpe	Alison Good
Dr. Christine Barajas	Jay Lee
Bruce Luce	Jane Campion
Don Supalla	Jim Clausen
Dick Westerlund	Valerie Pace
Nancy Brataas	Rev. Bruce Buller

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 by Marilyn Stewart. The PowerPoint presentation and the report used in this meeting is available on the Rochester web page:

<http://www.ohe.state.mn.us/rochester/>

The September 2 minutes were approved with a minor correction. Moved by Member Vekich, seconded by Member Shannon. Passed unanimously.

Chair Stewart said she would set up fact-finding work groups to make recommendations to the Committee concerning the various legislative assignments for the report. At the time of the meeting those work groups were:

Program and Operation Needs	Funding Resources
Chair – Member Wendy Shannon	Chair – Member Mike Vekich
Member Claire Bender	Member Jayne Rankin
Member Drew Flaada	Member Dwight Gourneau
Member Dwight Gourneau	Nancy Brataas

Governance  
Chair – Member Al DeBoer  
Member Bob Hoffman  
Member David Metzen  
Cathy Meyerle  
Jim Campbell

Facilities and Location  
Chair – Member Al Berning  
Member Marilyn Stewart  
Member Wendy Shannon  
Jim Clausen  
Gary Smith

Chair Stewart asked member to give Cheryl Maplethorpe the names of consultants who might be interested in the Rochester Higher Education Development committee RFP.

Member Hoffman said that the University of Colorado in Colorado Springs had a non-traditional campus similar to the UCR. He thought the Rochester committee should get information on that arrangement.

Chair Stewart wanted to locate a futurist to talk to the Committee. Joel Barker was suggested. Chair Stewart shared clippings from the local newspaper about the Committee's work. She reminded the Committee that Judy Grew would be back on September 22 and September 30 to continue to help the Committee work through some of the issues.

Chair Stewart introduced Louellen Essex who gave an update of her earlier report on Rochester higher education ...University Center Rochester (UCR).

Dr. Essex presented her findings which are contained in her report and a PowerPoint presentation that is on the Rochester page web site for the Office of Higher Education. Dr. Essex had produced a 1999 report which said that the governance role of UCR needed greater definition. In 2002 she reviewed the situation and found that the governance system was not working, therefore, the agreement between Rochester Community and Technical College, Winona State University, and the University of Minnesota was revised to give the University of Minnesota the principal leadership role. Her presentation at this meeting was a review of the collaboration.

She found that the "pathway" approach did help more students move through many programs combining courses from many educational providers until they reached their degree goal.

Member DeBoer asked how many students actually go on to a four-year college from Rochester CTC. Dr. Essex said about 400 students transfer to a 4 year institution. Member DeBoer wanted more data on the topic to see which college the students transferred to. He did not think that they all transferred to Winona State University. Dr. Essex commented that 23 had transferred to the UM.

Dr Essex reported that the University of Minnesota entity reported dissatisfaction with the collaboration. There are two services that work well, scheduling class rooms and the information desk. The University didn't emphasis these services because their students don't use them as much. The UM students don't use the library, they go on-line. They don't use the book store, they buy books from Amazon.com. They don't use the cafeteria because it closes a t 6 p.m. and their classes start later than that.

Member Bender asked if students were interviewed. They were not because of the short timeline for the report. A previous survey showed that the students were satisfied.

Dr. Essex then reported on the Barriers to Effectiveness. She said the UM was not distinctive enough. The RCTC has 6,000 students Winona State has 1,307 students and the UM has only 400 students.

Member Vekich asked why having no identity was a barrier.

Dr. Essex said that students want to feel that they are getting a UM degree and they don't feel a part of the UM. That creates a problem with recruiting students and faculty.

Member Hoffman reminded the Committee that Randy Johnson, Executive Director of Work Force Development said that the local 18 year olds would not want to attend a 4 year institution in Rochester. They would want to "leave home" to go to college.

Dr. Essex said that they would attend in the Health Sciences.

Member Vekich asked why the UM was not aggressive enough to develop its own identity. He wanted more data.

Dr. Essex said her study was "capturing perceptions."

Member Hoffman asked if Winona State also wanted its own identity. He asked if Winona had its own building on the UCR campus.

Dr. Essex said Winona State did not have its own building.

Member Hoffman summarized that two educational entities thought the relationship at UCR was working and one did not think it was working.

Dr. Essex said that the UM was attempting to merge into the MnSCU operation and it didn't seem to be working well. She said there was an issue of transfer of courses from RCTC to the UM. Also, RCTC fills their courses with RCTC students first and sometimes there is not room for the UM students. She used an example of pre-requisite chemistry courses. Also, the UM does not think the counseling process is adequate for the students that attempt to transfer to the UM.

Member Shannon asked how many additional classes a student had to take because of inadequate counseling.

Dr. Essex said two to three courses but it is still time consuming and expensive for the student.

Member DeBoer asked if it was an institutional issue or a student issue. Students don't focus. The extra course work could be a student issue.

Member Bender said that the counseling issue is vital. The student can "get lost."

Member Rankin said that Inver Hills Community College draws students who are headed towards the UM. The students meet with counselors at the UM. The two institutions have worked this out.

Dr. Essex commented that in the Rochester situation the issue is “hard sciences” so the first two years are critical. It is a tough degree. She said, “I am not sure that any community college could serve these students.”

Member Berning comments that they needed more facts. What specifically has worked? What programs do the students try to transfer into? The three institutions have three different missions but they are trying to work together. This is a limited market. “The next step is how can we take advantage of the other opportunities here in Rochester?” We may have reached our limits on this model. We need more data.

35% of the students need remedial courses. The students aren’t ready for college.

I look at this as a management issue. Two of the three work well together. The UM is not working well. If you are not a part of the solution, you are a part of the problem.

Dr. Essex said it is difficult to work together because there are three different missions. There are different platforms for technology. Perhaps the course content issues can’t be resolved.

Member Hoffman reminded the committee that Dr. Essex was really just talking about the health sciences area.

From the audience Dr. Christine Barajas asked if the UM-TC students didn’t also have problems with counseling.

Dr. Essex commented that this is a smaller system so solutions should be easier.

Continuing with the presentation on “Barriers” she said that the UM struggles with funding because there are no undergraduates to fund the upper division and graduate programs. Next “barrier” was technical support – the RCTC staff can’t handle the technical support for UM research.

With the facilities request, the UM does not get what it wants. As an example, it took five years for the UM Provost to get his five administrators co-located offices on the same hallway.

The next problem identified was that the RCTC doesn’t think the shared facilities are properly funded. The UM wants to only pay for what they use – no overhead. They only want to pay for what the faculty use. Shared funding isn’t well defined. The UM acts as a renter. Sometimes Winona also acts as a renter.

Chair Stewart asked if there was three-way sharing in the past when buildings were built.

Dr. Essex said there was no three way sharing. Don Suppalla may know.

From the Audience, Don Suppalla said in 1993 when the building was first built there was three-way sharing but just on that one building, not on the other buildings. Because they paid debt service on that one building, they thought that was enough including the extension services. Now there is a debate on replacing equipment.

Question from the audience from Nancy Brataas – Does the UM use the technical equipment one-third of the time?

Don Suppalla – not a third of the time.

Dr. Essex explained another barrier in that the UM has slow growth research. IBM and Mayo want to partner with the UM for the international world class “brand name.” Other partners do a good job but don’t have the name. Area employers find it difficult to recruit without a four-year institution in Rochester.

Member Hoffman reminded the committee that a past presenter for local planning said that the current system can meet the future employee educational needs. When you say it must be the UM you are talking about the health sciences.

From the audience – Doesn’t the UM believe that the collaboration can work?

Dr. Essex said some form of the collaboration had been tried for the past 33 years. In 1972 there was a report recommending that the UM have a greater presence in Rochester. The UM has tried to make it work. In fact it might have been more workable in the past than it is now.

Member Rankin said we need to hear from the UM about how they develop programs and facilities requests for the legislature. Rochester was not part of the UM’s request to the legislature this last session. It wasn’t in their 6 year plan.

Chair Stewart said that Rochester was in their request.

Member Rankin asked if the UM requested money for a building.

Chair Stewart said no, not yet. The whole effort has been to try to make UCR work.

Member Vekich reminded the committee that the UM has not said that they wanted to increase its presents in Rochester. They need to step forward now. They need to make a capital investment. We said we want them. They don’t say they want Rochester. IBM and Mayo need to step up and say they will support this so we know what the gap is. The legislature now would just say to fix the management model. We need a funding model.

Dr. Essex continued with her presentation. The strategic planning is not integrated in Rochester because each institution makes its own plan. They forward the institutional plan to their own home system and they don’t coordinate. In addition, the institutions are competitive when they are developing programs. There is not integrated strategic plan. The private schools are filling the gaps.

Member Hoffman said the timing is a management issue. They need to work collaboratively. The UM has not said that it wants to be here.

Dr. Essex went to her next point. Community advocacy needs to work. GRAUC needs to stay. There is a need for a continual push.

Data is not collected through the same data base. Things are not reported in the same way. Data is hard to find. It will be hard for this committee to get data. That is why she did not put a lot of charts into her report.

Member Vekich reminded the committee that without data, any change will be hard to sell.

Dr. Essex said that “data” is a piece of the infrastructure that hasn’t pulled together.

The management agreement is not a document for the future. It may have outlived its usefulness. It manages what “is.”

Member DeBoer agreed. “We need a system for the future. Collaboration is too slow and not for the future.

Member Hoffman agreed. “All three partners need to come to the table.”

Member Vekich said they all have to show all their cards.

Member Berning said collaboration is important but the current system can’t handle the future. We have to serve explosive growth so RCTC and Winona will not be hurt. The UM has not wanted to be too forward but we need to ask the UM to step up.

Member DeBoer said the legislature won’t fund anything unless the UM says it wants to be here. Politically, they can’t look at just Rochester.

Dr. Essex conclusions and recommendations-

1. The UM should be granted autonomy. It needs to be distinct. It won’t happen with the management agreement. Winona State should also be given an opportunity. It should be released from the management agreement, too.
2. There needs to be more collaboration with Mayo and IBM and UM.
3. There should be a funding model for the UM

From the audience Dr. Barajas asked why it would be a funding model for just the UM.

Dr. Essex said it could be a funding model for all three institutions.

4. Natural collaborations will form. It is possible to collaborate with competitors. The private colleges in the twin cities sponsor a bus that carries students between their campuses.

Member Berning said the current collaboration in bionomics can be accelerated with the creation of those programs at the UM.

Dr. Essex said it needs more investment to make it work.

Member DeBoer said we need to preserve the base so the current institutions in Rochester are not hurt and can continue to serve the community and workforce development. WE have a critical mass and we need to build on that in Rochester.

Rev. Buller, from the audience – This isn’t hard to draft but we must have the UM come and say that they want to be here. As chair of the Rotary, I asked the three institutions to come and speak about the future. The UM refused.

Dr. Bill Luce from the audience – Don’t forget the need for liberal arts in Rochester. High tech may be where the money is but you still need liberal arts.

Member Bender agreed that health science needs critical thinking. We need decision making skills on top of hard science.

From the audience Nancy Brataas – This discussion of the UM at Rochester has gone on longer than 1973. I was on a Rochester committee in 1961. We were the third committee that was formed at that time. I am 77 years old now. Back then Dean Hill said the UM was doing a survey in Rochester for a branch campus. Dean said the idea was killed by the community college devotees – faculty and citizens. Also, we built a building for Winona State. They proposed a nursing program. The Chair of the committee hated the UM because he thought the UM mistreated his wife in the nursing program so he thought Winona should have the nursing program. I don't know how that building is used now.

Don Suppalla from the audience – It is the East Building now and is a shared building.

From the audience Valerie Pace - IBM is a huge investor in Minnesota. Mayo is a little different. Mayo could offer bachelor degrees if it chose but it has decided to partner instead. We are stronger if we work together. There is too much turf fighting to make collaboration work. These are complex issues. The reason we are here is not because the UM does not want to be here. We have created an environment where the systems themselves can not navigate beyond this management agreement. There is too much of a political issue around it. It makes it impossible for them to reach out and do the work that is necessary. We haven't been able to work our way out of a brown paper bag. We need something creative and innovative.

Chair Stewart said the management agreement was the problem.

From the audience Nancy Brataas asked “how do we get rid of it?”

Chair Stewart said it was an agreement between the two systems. Thanks for Dr. Essex's report.

Member Shannon could you give us a timeframe for the work groups?

Chair Stewart have an initial meeting before Sept. 22.

Member Shannon asked if they could get some initial data on the 2+2 programs and data on students who transfer.

From the audience Don Supalla said they could have the number of 2+2 programs and who moves where and which degrees.

Member Berning wanted data on all the community colleges including the metro area to look at paths that students take to the UM.

Member Hoffman said the data could come from Linda Baer.

Member BeBoer asked Don Supalla if he knew where students went after they graduated, Mr. Supalla said he could get that data.

From the Audience Dick Westerlund said a student who took only one course at RCTC should not count. The student should be at RCTC for at least a year.

Member Berning commented that the Committee needed testimony from the UM.

There were no formal public comments since the audience joined in the discussion of the University Center Rochester report written by Louellen Essex.

**9:00** - meeting adjourned.

**FUTURE MEETINGS** will be 7 a.m. to 10 a.m. (unless noted) on Thursday, Sept. 22; Friday, Sept. 30; Friday, Oct. 14; **9 a.m. to noon** Friday, Oct 28; Thursday, Nov. 10; Monday, Nov. 21; Thursday, Dec. 8; **9 a.m. to noon** Friday, Dec. 16; Friday, Jan 6, 2006 **at Edina Realty Rochester, 1301 Salem Road SW, Rochester, MN.**