APPENDIX A

TO THE TESTIMONY OF DAVID J. SKORTON

BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY HEARING ON THE GLOBALIZATION OF R&D AND INNOVATION: THE UNIVERSITY RESPONSE

JULY 26, 2007

FORGING LONG-TERM ACADEMIC ALLIANCES WITH FOREIGN ENTITIES

James J. Mingle University Counsel and Secretary of the Corporation Cornell University

Key questions:

- 1. What makes the relationship worth pursuing?
- 2. What will make the relationship work?

Main features of proposed program:

| degree granting program? |
|--|
| □ both? |
| major research collaboration? |
| |
| U.S. university degree? |
| 📋 joint degree? |
| dual degrees by U.S. and foreign universities? |

| | long-term or □ short-term relationship? | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Guiding p | Guiding principle governing the evaluation, planning, negotiation, approval, establishment and operation of an academic alliance abroad: | | | | | |
| 1. | the benefits must be compel | lling, and | | | | |
| 2. | the risks must be manageab | le | | | | |
| Three-phased approach: | | | | | | |
| I. | exploratory phase | | | | | |
| II. | due diligence and planning phase | | | | | |
| III. | decision and contract forma | tion phase | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| I. EXPLOR | RATORY PHASE | | | | | |
| | identify potential benefits | | | | | |
| | check with other U.S. universities who have programs in the foreign country (or considered, but declined) | | | | | |
| | gauge university's negotiating leverage | | | | | |
| | visit the foreign venue and meet the potential partners | | | | | |
| | determine the principal players: who will commit financial resources to the project, and who will contract on the foreign entity's behalf: | | | | | |
| | the government? | governmental agency? | | | | |
| | a university? | private organization, foundation? | | | | |

| | combination of these entities? | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | take stock whether "distance," "climate" or different "culture, customs are positives or possible impediments | | | |
| | deal with the "deal breakers" upfront — threshold conditions, commitments before launching the due diligence phase: | | | |
| | ownership of capital assets? | | | |
| | academic freedom and non-discrimination? | | | |
| | • nature of degree (sole, joint or dual)? | | | |
| | academic autonomy (standards, curriculum, admissions)? | | | |
| | • operational control (complete or shared)? | | | |
| | financial resources? management fee? | | | |
| | accrediting and licensing implications? | | | |
| | legal relationship (subsidiary corp'n, management contract)? | | | |
| | • use of university name? | | | |
| | • governance arrangement? joint advisory board? | | | |
| | • term and exit strategies? | | | |
| | • other? | | | |
| | settle on planning costs (who pays?) and due diligence timetable | | | |
| | craft, sign "fundamental principles" letter | | | |
| | brief president, board and faculty leadership | | | |

II. <u>DUE DILIGENCE AND PLANNING PHASE</u>

| map things out: | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| drawing from "fundamental principles" letter, outline key "academic," "business/finance," and "legal/risk" issues | | | |
| form internal project team and assign areas of inquiry; designate chair | | | |
| e.g., business, legal, security, architects) | | | |
| enlist a few board members as advisory group | | | |
| anticipate and address "daunting" aspects of project: | | | |
| attracting ample pool of prospective students | | | |
| developing or adapting curriculum | | | |
| faculty and administrative recruiting, staffing | | | |
| dilution of home campus management time/energy | | | |
| dealing with distance, climate, different cultures | | | |
| immigration, local sponsorship issues | | | |
| probe, protect against "main risks": - academic control? - governance oversight? - oversight? | | | |
| •no real property ownership? ☐financial risk •operational costs covered? | | | |

| | | •tax exempt status? | | | |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | •legal safeguards? | | | | |
| | | •exit strategies? | | | |
| | □geopolitical risk | • dependability of partner? | | | |
| | | •education a priority? | | | |
| | | •hospitable, stable environment? | | | |
| | develop budget, business plan for full term of relationship brief governing board and invite suggestions negotiate detailed "term sheet" with foreign partner, confirming all le "academic," "business/financial," and "legal/risk" elements | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | is project team convinced concerning "compelling benefits" and "manageable risks"? Is university leadership on board? | | | | |
| III. <u>DECI</u> | ISION AND CONTRACT PHA | <u>.SE</u> | | | |
| | review, approval of appropriate faculty governance groups | | | | |
| | school/college faculty | | | | |
| | university faculty senate? | both? ate? | | | |
| | review, approval of university governing board | | | | |
| | standing committee? | PP | | | |
| | executive committee? | 🗂 full board? | | | |
| | craft comprehensive contract covering all points in "term sheet' specific legal safeguards: | | | | |

| _ | 1 | - (| |
|---|---------|-----|--------|
| • | letters | Ot | creant |
| | | | |

- indemnification and insurance
- early termination for "cause" or "emergency"
- disengagement costs
- monetary damages limitations
- internal dispute resolution and international arbitration
- U.S. law controls
- intellectual property ownership
- local (foreign venue) "liaison office"
- contract signing and press releases
- \Box appoint program director \rightarrow program implementation