Notes from Blueprint 2.0 conversation 2/16/2017:

Opening: collaboration among the regional campuses—put aside?

Whittle down 2.0 (2-page summary). Volunteers nominated sample sentences that are interesting for us and our future: values, goals, projects, programs. We will see how much agreement (or not) there is about goals and values moving forward. Strength of a university depends on strength in faculty governance—this is an invitation for greater assertiveness and strength in mission. What do you see in this language that might take us forward if there are things we can agree upon regarding what a university is?

Share Vision Responses:

* Sounds goods; thumbs up; received some vindication from a past chancellor and a present chancellor. Confusion between “earning a living” and “having a life” becomes a tension in the document?
* Our students (first-generation) talk about the job they will have at the end of their education. That “job” is a stand-in for the dream of a better future for themselves and their families. If there’s a disconnect there between a well-paying job and meaningful work that brings a fulfilling life that’s something we should address. That wording may leave out a sense of growth and self-reflection we want students to have. “Meaningful work” reaffirmed.
* Who are we “distinguishing” ourselves from? Other campuses?

Section 1 Responses:

* Sounds great but partly because it’s banal niceties.
* Last and third from the bottom seem like the foundation for online programs that threaten to undercut what we can do. Try to prevent online courses from usurping faculty control of the curriculum.
* Threatens the mission of preserving and celebrating what makes IU South Bend distinct.
* Maybe because online policies were put into motion so quickly it might be a good time to revisit. For instance the residency requirement. Let’s not assume that they are written in stone.
* Seems like most of the research references are to faculty presenting or sharing research with students rather than creating new knowledge and working in larger scholarly communities. No section on creating scholarship in addition to teaching. Maybe because this document was originally a “blueprint for student attainment” so focused on students/teaching more?
* In reference to the final bullet point—speaks to faculty. Another area to grow might be “expert” staff in student affairs and others on campus.
* Exciting thing right now are colleagues who are bringing students’ lives into the learning. Faculty acknowledge students as whole beings and try to bring full lives into the classroom.
* Document is not written in ways that speaks well to the general public.
* Document raises the question of whether we should think about ourselves as a “regional” campus and what that means. Are our distinctive areas of specialization/uniqueness changing?

Section 2 Responses:

* Carnegie lays out the intention mentioned in that second bullet point and is mentioned in the last section.
* Creating student success involves creating an environment where all students feel welcomed.
* This doesn’t preclude us look at our own best practices as well.
* Student affairs and extra-curricular/co-curricular sides of the house could come together more.
* We have a vibrant campus life, but this activity may not be represented in the postings on walls, buildings. Can we make the environment better reflect that vibrancy. A commonly accessible calendar would help. Updated facilities would help. Better access would help (to buildings and common spaces after hours).

Section 3 Responses:

* The first bullet point is undercut by the aggressive online push to help students achieve degree completion through marketing practices amounting to piracy.
* We need to think about literal accessibility for students with disabilities including how we build our facilities and how we teach.
* Bullet point three: our campus has a better ratio of succeeding in retaining first-generation college students than other campuses.
* Does a 12 month curriculum work without faculty 12 month contracts.
* Nothing about tutoring and peer mentoring.
* Don’t just throw programs at a campus for greater diversity and inclusiveness. Assess and then adopt.
* Re advising: the first round of advising needs to be accurate. When a student is incorrectly advised they should have money refunded.
* (Chancellor: We did have an assessment of our diversity and inclusion practices. That grew out of this document. We do have our diversity team on campus. Academic programming and student-led programming were our strengths. We did not do as well with recruitment.
* Is there a budget for marketing? Every campus is responsible for its own marketing.
* “Accessible” and “affordable” might come into conflict with full-year programming since summer doesn’t fit under banded tuition.

Section 4 Responses:

* Second to last bullet: missed opportunity for community engagement. There should be a more active, service-learning program. Do that explicitly rather than just letting it happen. “Wherever possible” should be eliminated—every student should be included.
* If we really want to leap ahead of other campuses. We need to talk about meaningful work for our students. Our students will have more than one career, entrepreneurs, self-employed, multiple callings. Our career services could work more for that.
* Document is vague on how these values get actualized. There are two separate conversations: one we’re having with our students and among ourselves and the other legislative and institutional policies that come down to us.
* What does a “meta” major actually mean? What would a meaningful “pathway” to a major look like? (Example might be a 1-credit seminar where faculty in a discipline + related fields all present on what they do so students get a sense of what it might be to become a professional scientist.
* Stuck in 20th century rhetoric implying that when you study specific things it leads to a specific career.

Section 5 Responses:

* Second bullet point is already an area of strength.
* Student problem-solving and innovation: example of looking at high lead blood levels in children, housing, industrial infrastructure and how it impacts us: health, advocacy, history, sustainability all involved in addressing these relevant community problems and opportunities for improvements.
* This section is where IUSB has the chance to be distinctive. Most of our students come from the region and stay in the region. If we were going to pick one of these to really shine this section might be our opportunity.
* This is one of the few areas where research is mentioned: faculty research is focused upon and includes a clause that emphasizes original disciplinary research. Hope it’s not restricted to regional research.
* If “region” could be redefined with broader implications.
* We get caught up in a division between regionally applied research and research that broadly applies global examples to constructing the meaningful life/experiences of this city and community.

Closing:

We could say just keep polishing the bumper,

We could choose few things we could use moving forward

Use area 5 as a goal/focus for moving forward

* Where does the PTR process and the redefinition of faculty work fit in this process moving forward?
* Focus on “meaningful work” and use it to elevate our students. Includes meaningful care of oneself (through health literacy, for example). Take #5 and connect it to this concept of meaningful work.
* If we focus on #5 we can’t leave out the work and involvement of students in places outside this region (like Africa).
* Involving the campus in healthcare initiatives would put us ahead of the curve.
* Section 2 is important too.
* Framework of meaningful work is available as an online resource (EB for specifics of resource).