

Review of: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS  
For the Campus Directions Committee  
By the Professional and Bi-Weekly Staff  
Reviewed April 7, 2003

In response to the request to review and respond to the Campus Direction Committee (CDC) report, Professional and Bi-Weekly staff members from the following units submit their collective comments: Arts, Business, Community Links, Continuing Education, Education, Instructional Media, LAS, and the Library. The time allowed for this directive gave us opportunity for only one meeting, diminishing the possibility of a more thorough report. We are quite pleased to be asked to review such an important endeavor, and trust our comments will be helpful.

In advance of this meeting, all representatives were asked to review the CDC website, and in particular the Phase II Report on Community Partnerships, February, 2003.

The goals of the CDC Strategic Planning Process were reviewed and carefully considered in our evaluation, and we gratefully acknowledge the tremendous amount of work that has been devoted by faculty and staff to this important task. Of primary consideration to this committee's effort was the review of the goal as stated by Eileen Bender, which is to:

*...”formulate a plan, congruent with IUSB’s mission that is operational with a clear strategy for implementation and assessment, and clear delegation of responsibility, and a procedure for continuous monitoring of progress...”*

Our review of Phase II, the latest submission of the Community Partnership portion of the CDC, was performed in light of that stated goal. Other documents on the web were reviewed for background understanding, as well. Several important points came from this meeting, and they are presented in no particular order for further consideration.

A. The effort of dividing out the six task areas in the overall strategic plan seems to highlight how very much they overlap. Although it is outside the scope of this committee's task, we believe it is imperative to the success of the strategic plan that this task area, Community Partnerships, be linked directly to the responsibility of what was formerly called External Affairs. While we do not know the scope of responsibilities that will fall to the new Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs and University Advancement, it is our belief that this, or an office like this, is needed for leadership and responsibility for campus success of the mission and for expanding partnerships within our community. Without the collection of partnership data and the redistribution of it through marketing, IUSB remains unable to achieve the recognition deserved within the community. It is often said that IUSB is one of the best kept secrets around. We have an outstanding university and a wide base of established and successful partnerships, yet few know about these good efforts even within our own campus.

B. A department to collect and organize the data and make it available to the various units would facilitate the task of evaluating and expanding community partnerships and make it less burdensome on the individual units. The suggestion of a director of institutional research was mentioned as a way to achieve this goal, coupled with the marketing efforts of the office of External Affairs. Without that force, efforts are scattered and achieved only through the dedication of some who see the vision rather than a campus wide initiative.

C. The purpose of Phase II (“to recommend institutional and programmatic partnerships—both existing and new – and identify priorities”) may fall short of its mission. It mostly delineates existing partnerships rather than providing a strategic plan incorporating a vision for creating new ones and has no time line.

D. The Statement of Purpose in Phase II is not as clear as it was in Phase I’s report . While it encompasses a broad overview of terms, some definitions are lacking. The second paragraph of Phase II is especially confusing because terms such as “programmatic” and “service learning” are not clearly defined. We realize the purpose of the Phase I report was to “track and evaluate partnerships and community needs,” but while it is apparent in the Phase I report that the CDC worked diligently to catalogue all existing partnerships on campus, still some are missing. However, it is not apparent that the Phase II report reflects its stated purpose “to recommend institutional and programmatic partnerships-both existing and new-and identify priorities.” Priorities do not seem to be mentioned in the Phase II report.

E. The reason for the inclusion of The Office of Community Links, UCET, the Schurz Library and Business and Economics in the Phase II report, while omitting the other units mentioned in the Phase I report is unclear. Specifically, there is no mention of a strategic plan for existing and new partnerships for Off-Campus Programs, Office of Diversity, Offices of Alumni Affairs/Alumni Association, Continuing Education, School of the Arts, School of Education, CLAS, School of Nursing & Health Professions, SPEA, and the School of Social Work. If it is the intention to omit these units as no further development of new partnerships is needed at this time, a statement to this effect needs to be included in the Phase II report. Otherwise, the reader is left wondering whether their omission was accidental or intentional. It is also unclear as to how community partnerships will be implemented and assessed, as is the goal of the directive. There are no timelines or assessments. The need for campus wide assessment of existing and new community partnership again justifies our recommendation for a centralized office that includes campus research to compile this information for both completeness and accuracy.

F. The plan would be enhanced by a more focused look toward the future to expand and move forward with a vision, rather than just stating that lack of resources hamper efforts to expand upon community partnerships. The more obviously stated reasons of needed policy changes to reward faculty and shortages of both funding and staffing that hamper expansion efforts in the community will only hold us back. Certainly these are important

aspects, but we are not convinced these statements draw us closer to the goal of the project.

G. The important leap to a plan of action does not happen in the Phase II report. One of the best resources in our community is our businesses, both profit and nonprofit, as well as education and service industries, such as hospitals. There are overlaps in units that partnership with these organizations regularly, i.e. Continuing Education, Business & Economics, Nursing, SPEA, Arts, LAS, Labor Studies, Community Links, and others. The Development Office should work regularly with these various units on campus to determine high-value targets for giving. Service-learning and internship opportunities could be broader thereby expanding opportunity for partnership within the community, and strengthening the image and financial support to the campus. A partnership, by definition, benefits both parties. While this might fall in the scope of marketing, it seems a strategic plan of action and assignment of responsibility for who is supposed to do what is lacking.

It is obvious the CDC's work has been enormous in scope and its members have put wonderful effort toward the mission's goal. Thank you for inviting us to review and submit comments, we trust they will be helpful and would like to be included in projects of this scope in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Chmielewski  
Zone Leader, Professional Staff Council  
April 23, 2003

Committee Members

Tasha Browning, Community Links  
Christine Chmielewski, LAS  
Kathy Coleman, Business & Economics  
Carolyn Fermoye, Continuing Education  
Marie Harrer, LAS  
Josephine Johnson, Library  
Randy Jones, Instructional Media  
Sue Lefevre, Library  
Michele Morgan-Dufour, Arts  
Linda Young, Education

*Recommendations by Biweekly Staff Council*

*Strengthening Partnerships Within The Community*

1. *Bring more high profile speakers / events to the campus.*

*Implementation: Form a diverse committee from the IU South Bend community and members of the community at large to advise us in this area. The committee could seek input also from outlying communities with IU ties.*

2. *Offer more web-based learning opportunities which would enrich the people in the community.*

*Implementation: A standing committee to advise us in this area. The committee, would work with the deans, directors and department chairs, and be asked to assess the current status of opportunity to develop programs and classes for web-based learning and to make recommendations for the future.*

3. *Consider more dependable ways to promote communication to the community about student mentoring and internship possibilities.*

*Implementation: Gather input from the varying schools on how they are currently promoting this information to both the students and to the community. Gather information as well from the community on their mentoring / internship programs. Promote throughout.*

*Additional Recommendation by Biweekly Staff Council*

*A. Invite businesses and other community entities to allow students involvement in their problem solving and problem avoiding processes. Student participation would qualify for class credit and would be monitored by instructor.*