



# Higher Education Task Force

Meeting Summary July 27, 2011

*Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 & 2 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.  
311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678*

The first meeting of the Higher Education Task Force was held Wednesday, July 27, 2011 at 6:00pm.

HETF Members in attendance:

John Allard (Chairperson)  
Tim Herman (Vice Chairperson)  
Howard Rudd  
Holly Tiche  
Tina Treis  
Dr. Robert Waste  
Kirk Uhler  
Paul Frank  
Robert Dugan  
Bob McCarthy  
Julie Hanson  
Willy Duncan  
Dr. Paul Blezien

Staff in attendance:

Mike Isom  
Rob Jensen  
Bob Schmitt  
Kelly Wickline

Task Force Facilitator:

Paul Downs

Public in attendance:

George Phillips

**I. Introductions**

Welcome and introductions started off the meeting followed by the schedule for future meetings. Future meetings will be held at 6PM in the Public Meeting Rooms at the Martha Riley Library on: August 24, September 28, November 30, 2011, and January 25, 2012.

**II. Task Force Overview: Presentation and Discussion**

The economic and fiscal benefits of having higher education in Roseville were discussed with the task force. Higher education would provide educational opportunities to Roseville's residents while fostering a shift to a more metropolitan community. The intent of the task force is to create a clear and concise strategy on ways to attract higher education facilities to Roseville. A needs assessment, list of priority sites, and implementation recommendations will be the three major outcomes of the task force.

**III. Needs Assessment**

There was a strong sense of urgency to move quickly with a stronger emphasis on attraction. There was also a strong desire to be strategic about what types of institutions to approach. The task force discussed the merit of a proactive "Red Team" approach to facilitating university attraction and development, similar to the State of California's efforts during the energy crisis. Red Team suggested to include representatives from local government, businesses, etc.

Opportunities & Challenges

Task Force members discussed external factors to better understand the needs of the target audience of higher education institutions.

- Collaborative facilities & colocation
  - Discussed trend toward satellite campuses or shared facilities (e.g., West Sacramento library adjacent to City Hall, or shared Sac City College and UC Davis facilities)
- Access/transportation
  - Discussed drive time requirements
  - Underserved public transportation & facilities, need for location adjacent to transportation routes
- Diversity of education options
  - Need for all levels of higher education – 2 year, 4 year, focused vs. liberal arts programs, etc
- Need for hometown options
- Sense of community & history
  - Discussed the need for a facility that creates community identity and builds on community history
- Increasing costs to public institutions – private schools becoming more competitive
  - Public tuition costs are rising due to state budget problems. Private universities are becoming more competitive by comparison, as the cost gap narrows between public and private. Especially considering availability of classes.
  - Private facilities becoming more of a safety valve as public costs increase and student enrollment availability decreases
- Cuts to public funding
- High capital costs to start-ups
  - All comes down to cost. Group agrees that higher education would be a good thing, but how do you pay for it?
  - Requires large up-front capital to start a campus. Same for public or private facilities.
  - Cities/Counties can help incentivize or subsidize through various financial mechanisms, or through significant approval process streamlining.
- Technology & online courses (national & international)
  - Discussed trend toward on-line courses. Discussed Mr. Duncan's experience with Taft College and its 40-50% online enrollment.
  - On-line or distance works for some, but face-to-face instruction still predominant. Also, desire for college experience remains important facet of learning.
- How to engage millennials
  - Discussed challenge of engaging Millennials when they don't want to be engaged.
- Age of future students
  - Important to understand demographics and current/future student composition to target right type of facility.
  - The regional Blue Print projects that 1/5 households will have members younger than 20 years old.
  - Many returning to school during bad job market.
- Residential life/collegiate experience - CSUS attempted
  - Discussed how some schools are destined to be commuter schools and how a south Placer university would likely be a commuter school.
  - Sac State has taken great strides to provide a residential campus experience, but isn't quite there yet.

- Target approach
  - Avoid RFP (sit back and wait) approach
  - Be aggressive - staff/red team should target specific institutions offering targeted educational programs
- Effective marketing – What do we offer? How do we sell it? What are universities looking for?
  - What's the goal? Who are we trying to court, and who are the suitors? Target efforts accordingly. Should have a commuter focus.
- Type of Institution – How and who to attract (“small ball,” commuter, etc)
- Best location for city
- Need a regional draw
  - Proximity to corporate headquarters is desirable, which is lacking in Northern California.
- Sacramento offers a great location to those outside CA
- Lack of Generational Wealth
  - The region lacks the generational wealth support (“blue blood”) enjoyed by many campuses in larger metropolitan areas or east coast.
- Group requested an invitation be sent to Dr. Jonathan Brown and President Gonzalez to come speak at the next meeting regarding market dynamics for colleges and experiences with start-up campuses.

### Regional Demand

- Significant current demand, future demand high
  - Discussed Regional Blueprint population projections – only expected to grow.
  - Regional universities are bursting at the seams – relief valve would be welcomed by existing facilities (not viewed as competition)
  - Comparison drawn between Sacramento metro and Atlanta metro areas. The Atlanta metro area has 14 colleges, vs. Sacramento's ?.
- Specialized degree programs in demand regionally
  - Nursing, engineering
- High demand at CSU
- Sierra College impacted
- 5,000 CSUS students driving from Placer Co
- Statewide need for additional higher education
- Emotional need to be close to home
- Public funding not available, limited

### Assets

- Look to SACTO materials for comprehensive inventory of regional assets
- Access to Sierra/Bay Area
- Housing
- Quality of Life for faculty, staff, students (although this is subjective based on where you come from. Many communities could claim high quality of life)
- Safety
- Educational Support / K-12 Quality
- Industry partnership opportunities

- Comparatively low land costs (depends on where institution is coming from)
- Access to airports, rail, & other transportation
- Diverse regional community
- Regional cultural opportunities
- Proximity to industry clusters – health care, government, high-tech
- Affordable housing
- Low utility rates
- Pro-business community
- Strong, collective community leadership and desire for higher education
  - However, the leadership needs to quantify the desire. What’s going to turn people’s heads?
  - What incentives are we willing to offer?
- Predictable development process in Roseville
- Gateway to Pacific Rim – links to international trade
- “California Appeal” – California still has an appeal based on innovation, technology, climate, creativity, etc.
- It will be important to know who are Roseville’s competitors in seeking higher education facilities
- Any incentives can be put in the context of the potential value added, for example, the \$253 million for a major residential college.

#### Draft Siting Criteria

- Roads
- Utilities
- Telecom
- Reinvestment sites
- 3-5 quality sites to suit specific universities and their needs
- Specific sites identified
  - Placer Co Fairgrounds
  - Stone Point (3M Property)
  - Placer Ranch
  - Regional University
  - Look at Corporate Center sites
  - Undeveloped Specific Plans (Sierra Vista, Creekview, etc.)
  - H.P. (existing campus & vacant property)
  - Reason Farms Panhandle

#### **IV. Summary and Next Steps**

##### *Key conclusions and group consensus points:*

- Develop a marketing packet and plan, including what Roseville offers and a list of high-priority sites.
- Create proactive implementation mechanisms, such as a team of dedicated staff to pursue opportunities.
- Use a flexible approach that recognizes higher education projects may start out as centers or niche players.
- Examine what Roseville’s competitors are doing.

- Clarify the tangible benefits that Roseville can provide, given that the major barrier to locating is cost (both capital and operating).
- Invite Dr. Brown and Dr. Gonzales to August meeting to shed light on market conditions and the process of developing a CSU campus.

*Action Items & Follow Up*

- Staff to create a list and map of potential locations including vacant sites, existing sites, and potential reinvestment sites for the Task Force's review at the August meeting.
- Invite Drs. Brown and Gonzales to meeting #2

**V. Public Comment**

- George Phillips noted that Cordova Hills is back at the university search and McClellan AFB site in Sacramento County is also searching for colleges to come to their location. He also suggested reviewing the UC Davis innovation hub request for ideas.

**VI. Close – 9 PM**