

MINUTES

Whitewater University Technology Park

Board of Directors Meeting

Wednesday, February 17, 2016

Whitewater University Technology Park Innovation Center

1221 Innovation Drive, Whitewater, WI 53190

PRESENT: Beverly Kopper, Jessica Bonjour, Kevin Brunner, John Chenoweth, Cameron Clapper, Bud Gayhart, Stephanie Goettl, Mark Johnson, Jeff Knight, Richard Moyses, Nathaniel Parrish, Crystal Singer

GUESTS: Pat Cannon, John DeGraff, Tom Duffy, Rachel Tripp, Karen Willard, and Kristen Burton

1. **Call to Order:** With a quorum present, Kopper called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

2. **Guest Speakers:** John DeGraff, adjunct Marketing professor at UW-Whitewater and founder of the Whitewater Innovatrium, and Rachel Tripp, Communications/PR/Marketing intern at UW-Whitewater, presented the Innovation Center Comprehensive Marketing Plan. The mission would remain the same, to create and foster durable businesses. DeGraff proposes the Innovation Center function as an innovation training hub. He outlined the differences between incubators and accelerators. An accelerator undertakes business development projects of 6-18 months, focuses on small business and corporate innovation acceleration, creates access to significant capital, and increases student placement opportunities. It is highly selective and leverages networks and knowledge. Incubators develop businesses over 3-5 years and business incubators generally charge 25-50% less than commercial space. The best facilities do both business incubation and acceleration. We have 41 incubators/accelerators in Wisconsin, so there is a great deal of competition. Whitewater is in a good location; we serve this area very well, but we can also serve businesses in Illinois, Milwaukee, and Madison.

The marketing objective is to build awareness of the UWW innovation brand. This can be achieved through innovation summits, events, webinars, chat boards, web advertising, social media, spotlighting student and client business successes, creating awareness of available funding, and meeting with the right people. Offering space, in-house and virtual workshops and coaching (connect what the business school is doing to the Innovation Center), and encouraging UWW COBE faculty and student involvement will increase participation.

The Innovation Center could be positioned as a place to come with a prototype and leave with a business. Pillar #1 for establishing this program is capital. Innovation means growth. A rigorous vetting process will also need to be in place. We can help corporations find alternative funding and help investors find suitable investments. Knowledge is another key component. Whitewater has the academic knowledge and hands on business experience to assist with business plan reviews, technical assessment, marketing advice, and other areas of development. The third pillar is connections. We have great networks at UW-Whitewater and can connect corporate sponsors, entrepreneurs, and angel investors.

The target areas are Beloit, northern Chicago, Janesville, Madison, Milwaukee and Whitewater. Onsite marketing would include guides, articles, infographics, whitepapers, and video. Offsite marketing would include social media, display media, link building, email, and traditional media. Events like trade shows

would be another source of marketing, as well as having trade events at the Innovation Center. The media plan flow would include 1) venture capital, 2) business and 3) university; one area per month would be highlighted, and then the cycle would repeat.

There is a discovery phase for each client. The project is designed, delivered, and evaluated. The iHub has a number of tools available to assess development needs and implement improvements, including Growth Wheel and the Wendy Kennedy program.

The price per square foot in the Innovation Center seems high at \$19, but it is all inclusive. The plan is to build a virtual community over the course of this year, and provide cooperative space, space for start-ups, nights and weekend usage, and space for students. Workshops can also be held here. Businesses will pay between \$250 - \$2500 for Wendy Kennedy, \$25 - \$250 for Growth Wheel, and \$5000 - \$10,000 for Innovation Jumpstart. Consulting fees would be \$100 per hour.

Mark Johnson will talk to Tom Still about holding a Wisconsin Innovation Network event here in late spring or early summer to create awareness. He will also offer in-kind space here for winners of the Governor's Business Plan Contest. It will provide great exposure, and if the Madison winner comes to the Innovation Center and experiences the great resources available, it may bring more business.

In summary, the plan will strengthen UWW's brand, increase funding, create a total turnkey process, create jobs, and place more students in Wisconsin.

Chenoweth commented that the plan proposes the Innovation Center serve a different function than it does now. Brunner inquired if DeGraff had spoken with the firms that are here now, and DeGraff indicated he had spoken with CESA 2, Johnson, Basu, and Dougan.

3. Approval of Minutes of January 27, 2016 Meeting: Knight/Moyse moved to approve the January meeting minutes as presented. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

4. Review/Acceptance of January 2016 Financial Reports: Goettl/Chenoweth moved to approve the January 2016 financial reports. Johnson spoke with Doug Saubert about rolling the remaining 2015 funds over to 2016, but those funds need to be held in reserve. Brunner inquired if we are trying to establish a reserve. Johnson responded that he needs more discussion with Saubert; he will meet with Saubert and Clapper and report back to the Board next month. A suggestion was made to allocate monthly for a reserve fund, and to have Saubert attend the Board meeting next month. Chenoweth cautioned that we need to make sure we have access to those funds; if they are reserves, they should not be included on the budget, or we need to explain why they are being spent. The motion to approve the January 2016 financial reports was approved by unanimous vote.

5. Review/Acceptance of 2016 Tech Park Budget: Goettl/Clapper moved to approve the Tech Park Budget as presented to the city. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

6. Review/Acceptance of Director's Report: Goettl/Gayhart moved to approve the Director's Report as written. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

7. Tech Park Marketing:

- A. **Marketing Letter Follow up:** Johnson reported receiving no additional responses to the marketing letter other than Black Line Consulting. A follow up letter with a nicer presentation

will be sent, accompanied by the CDA's brochure. Once these go out, additional follow up calls will be made.

- B. **Joint Marketing Strategy:** Cannon and Johnson met with Rob Olson, Liz Eversoll, and Joe Scanlin regarding the development of a technology cluster. They recommended not developing new sensors, but rather developing embedded uses for existing ones. They have several ideas, but need a prototype lab, packaging, and machine shops that will produce small quantities. Often small quantities can't be produced because the price point goes up rapidly. It was recommended that local resources be brought to the table, including Whitewater Manufacturing and Universal Electronics. Turn-around time is also part of the issue. When they are working on a new idea, they want to get a prototype as soon as possible to keep the momentum going. It would be helpful to have access to 3D printers on a regular basis and experts to help produce the 3D printed prototypes. They also do not have supply chain available. Knight noted that Tom Harrigan could perhaps create that network when doing the annual report. Moyses added Rob Olson indicated the need to purchase efficient equipment to produce a prototype, but it drives the cost up. He referred Olson to companies in Beloit. If they spend the money on the equipment, and then the product doesn't sell, then there is no use for the equipment. Chenoweth recommended MSOE or Blackhawk Tech as potential partners because they have the appropriate facilities. Knight noted a relationship should be established with other institutions, and Singer added that Whitewater Manufacturing has produced some small batches. Chenoweth and Johnson had discussed bringing in UW-Platteville as a partner.

8. **Tech Park Development Update:** Johnson reported there were no further updates.

9. **Update on Prospective Clients/Tenants and Available Space:** Rob Olson has expressed interest in taking over Dan McGuire's lab. McGuire will vacate 124 at the end of June. Blackthorne has discussed vacating 221 because they will not be running the Summer Institute this year. Blackthorne has been asked to present at the Board meeting next month. 221 could become a university space/co-lab. The changes should result in a net positive gain. Johnson will bring a proposal to next month's Board meeting.

10. **Future Agenda Items:** Future agenda items include: proposal for space request from tenants, a partnership with Platteville and area resources, resource directory, Blackthorne, the next phase of the marketing plan, and creating the reserve fund. Johnson will distribute the marketing plan presentation in advance; it will address the Board's questions about schedule, scope, resources, and cost.

11. **Future Meeting Dates:** Spring dates are March 30th, April 27th, May 25th, and June 22nd.

12. **Adjournment:** Brunner/Clapper moved to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Kristen Burton for Cameron Clapper
Secretary of the Whitewater University Technology Park Board