I. PRINCIPLES IN COMMON

A. Things we agree on (Tina’s slide)

- Education of the next generation of leaders
- Teach skills and inspire innovation
- Build networks within our own universities
- Create relationships with industry
- Develop sustainable programs within our schools

B. Additional points:

- Don’t measure according to company involvement
- I don’t see “entrepreneurship” in any of the bullets – bullet one “leaders and entrepreneurs”
- Policy efforts (eg. Support local economic development efforts)
- Use of “centers” – programs instead
- Simulating entrepreneurs and their commercialization
- This slide is too generic! What does it really mean?
- Bullets 3 and 4 are great – teaching students how to network is valuable

II. HOW DO WE DESCRIBE OURSELVES?

A. From Tina’s slide:

- University-wide vs. one dept
- Location within university
- Emphasis on teaching vs. research
- Etc.

B. From Group brainstorming exercise:

- Business – engineering
- New economy – old economy
- Robust – emerging economic environment
- Grad – UG focus
- New org – old org (maturity of firm)
- Fast – slow pace (sense of time and rate)
- International – national focus
• Faculty – student focus
• Private – state university
• Entrepreneurship – intrapreneurship
• Education – venture development
• University based – independent org or institution (institutional structure)
• Stand-alone – integrated approach (curriculum)
• High intensity – low intensity (curriculum)
• One university – multi university
• Cognitive – behavioral approach
• Early – late engagement (year of students when engaged)

C. How to use the tool:

• What are all variables to consider regarding similarities and differences?
• These characteristics are not either/or, but meant to be a continuum
• These aren’t necessarily a continuum
  o Could be bi-modal (eg. high tech and low tech)
  o Multiple methods for filling out the map
• Are these characteristics or measures? Measures become goals (repeated comment)
• Is this strategic v. tactical?
• You should have multiple constituencies fill out a survey to see if they match
  o Faculty, students, deans, associates
  o How granular should you get?
• Analysis of results
  o We could do a PCA or cluster analysis if they are on a continuum
  o Plotting a program or your desired profile – need common metrics
  o Next step is benchmarking)
  o Tina: thinking of trying to set up some type of Myers-Briggs mapping
    of schools to systematically represent different centers

D. How to improve the tool

• Definitions of entrepreneurship vary
• You can have different profiles for different programs in the same school (eg. grad v. undergrad programs)
  o Center focus v. university focus
  o Distributed characteristics v. university level hierarchy
• We need a key for interpretation
  o Some type of low-high or other consistency for ease of reading map
  o The dots should not be connected
  o But we want to avoid value judgments
• Comments section in addition to the key would be helpful so that people can fill in comments based on their own interpretations of the characteristics
• What about sense of external context?
  o Set up 2x2 with internal and external dynamics
  o Richness of entrepreneurial economic environment

E. Requested next steps:

• Maybe we can create a website
• Survey section
  o simple and short to capture data of centers would be highly beneficial
  o challenge is to ask questions that are relevant to all
• Create a new, updated key to send out to all
• Make sure website is updated – having an accessible network is so useful
• Is there a message board?
• Develop systematic directory for easy, connected learning environment
  o Same format as poster sessions (go on website)

III. SUMMARY

This comparison allows you to:
Observe, communicate, identify, define, determine

Final Word:
Despite our different models, our core values are the same
Despite our different approaches, we have a lot to learn from one another