

## **JOINT MEETING ON CAMPUS STRATEGIC PLANNING**

**Campus Assessment Committee  
Campus Budget Committee  
Campus Directions Committee  
Campus General Education Task Force  
Deans' Council**

**May 10, 2002  
Wiekamp 1001  
10:00 a.m. until Noon**

### **I. Welcome and Introductory Remarks (Alfred Guillaume):**

Alfred Guillaume welcomed and thanked the committee members for their participation in this first joint meeting on strategic planning. The challenge is for committees to continue their work but for us to find ways to integrate the work of these important committees. For example, the campus planning, assessment, and general education all have budget ramifications.

The campus needs an office of institutional research so that data can be provided on an ongoing basis to these and other campus committees. The North Central Association (NCA, now the Higher Learning Commission) has mandated that we have a campus plan to them by January 2005. This plan will affect the work and future of all aspects of the campus.

### **II. Review of the mandate from the Fall 2000 NCA Team visit (Linda Fritschner):**

Fall 2000, the six member NCA team, now called the Higher Learning Commission, visited our campus. At the conclusion of their visit, team members issued a report which contained their rationale for our continued accreditation. That report identified our strengths (new facilities, community outreach, publications, commitment of faculty and staff to students, number of programs with specialized accreditations, etc.). It also identified challenges which the campus must meet before the next re-accreditation visit fall 2007. These challenges need to become a part of our campus strategic plan.

The challenges include:

1. **Strategic Plan:** IUSB needs a strategic plan and this plan needs to be submitted to the Higher Learning Commission by January 2005.

2. **Assessment:** The NCA team was concerned about assessment. IUSB needed to focus on student learning outcomes. The team said that “while the faculty concern that assessment data will be misused to evaluate instructors rather than learning outcomes is understood, the campus must seek out assessment processes that eliminate this concern.”

The NCA team also said that we need to develop strategies for **assessment of general education**. We cannot begin this agenda until we have more clearly specified general education goals.

3. **Communication Flow:** A third challenge that we must face is partially the result of administrative and staff changes and temporary appointments. The campus needs better communication flow. We need to develop mechanisms and structures to improve communication up and down the hierarchy.

4. **Graduate Education:** The fourth concern focused on graduate course delivery. Here the NCA team noted two problems: 1) Graduate education is more than an extra paper in an undergraduate course and it is more than an extra course or two; 2) The accreditation team was also concerned about the requirements for instructors teaching graduate courses. What are the qualifications that apply for those who teach graduate courses at IUSB?

The team recommendation as a result of these concerns was that IUSB provide the Higher Learning Commission with a strategic plan. The preparation of our Self-Study for the next re-accreditation visit (fall 2007) is to be based on our strategic plan and it must address communication flow, assessment, and graduate education. At the time we are addressing these challenges, we also need to be aware of the changes in criteria for re-accreditation which take effect January 2005.

### **III. Presentation of the new Higher Learning Commission Standards (Eileen Bender):**

The proposed new criteria are:

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity

Criterion Two: Preparation for the Future

Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

Criterion Four: Discovery

Criterion Five: Engagement

Based on these new criteria, IUSB needs to refocus data that we need to collect. In our next Self-Study we not only need to show that we have the resources to fulfill our mission but we also need to show how we use those resources. The criteria suggest that IUSB needs to be mission driven, future oriented, and accountable (decisions are informed by assessment and evaluation). The work of various campus committees needs to be mutually reinforced one committee with another.

What follows is a brief description of each criterion and the patterns of evidence needed to document each of the criterion listed above. (Please see the handout from the May 10 meeting for more details.)

**Criterion One: Mission and Integrity**

The organization operates with integrity and ensures the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff and other constituencies who understand and support that mission. The patterns of evidence include: 1) evidence about mission, 2) evidence about institutional commitment to integrity, and 3) evidence about structures and processes.

**Criterion Two: Preparation for the Future**

The organization is capable of fulfilling its mission and responding to new challenges or opportunities through its allocation of resources to sustain and improve educational quality and its processes for continuous evaluation and comprehensive planning. The patterns of evidence include 1) evidence about future orientation, 2) evidence about resource base, and 3) evidence about evaluation and planning.

**Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching**

Consistent with its mission, the organization assures and advances student learning, recognizes and promotes teaching effectiveness, and evaluates the currency and relevance of its curricular offerings. The patterns of evidence include 1) evidence about assurance and accountability, 2) evidence about support for student learning, 3) evidence about support for teaching effectiveness, 4) evidence about promoting improvement, and 5) evidence about curricular currency and relevance.

**Criterion Four: Discovery**

Consistent with its mission, the organization supports its constituents to engage in a life of learning by providing an environment that supports research, scholarship, creativity, applied practice, and/or other forms of discovery. The patterns of evidence include 1) evidence about organizational support of life-long learning, 2) evidence about program and curricular innovations that support discovery, and 3) evidence about valuing scholarship (broadly defined).

**Criterion Five: Engagement**

Consistent with its mission, the organization identifies its communities of shared interest, engages them, and serves them in ways they value. Patterns of evidence include 1) evidence about commitment to engagement, 2) evidence about engagement with other education sectors, and 3) evidence about effective engagement.

### **Time Line for Implementation**

The Higher Learning Commission has set forth a **time line for the implementation of these new criteria**. This time line is as follows: April 2002, comments about the guidelines from the annual meeting were posted on the commission web site; May 2002, the board met and discussed a revised draft of the criteria; September 2002, public comment will be solicited at the regional meetings; October 2002, the first formal reading of the guidelines will occur at the Board Meeting; November 2002, the guidelines will be submitted to the membership for comment; February 2003, the guidelines will be adopted by the Board; Spring 2003, a new handbook detailing the criteria and the patterns of evidence for each criterion will be published; April 2003, the guidelines will be presented at the annual Higher Learning Commission meeting; Fall 2004, the optional implementation cycle will begin; and **January 2005, the new criteria will be implemented for all institutions**.

### **Six Advisory Focus Groups**

Six advisory focus groups have been set to discuss issues that do not fall neatly into the five criteria listed above. These include: 1) institutional governance including shared governance, 2) changing trends in financing, 3) general education, 4) global and national diversity, 5) impact of digital technology on learning environments, and 6) relationships between missions and service to the common good.

## **IV. IUSB Campus Committee Reports: Campus Directions Committee**

Task Force members (names in parenthesis) reported on the work of their group, accomplishments to date, and future plans.

### **1. Diversity Task Force (Scott Sernau and Charlotte Pfeiffer)**

This task force is gathering data from all of IUSB's schools and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and from students. The work of the committee who attended the IUKokomo "Enhancing Minority Attainment" Conference consists of gathering and analyzing campus data which will inform the diversity task force. The goals of the task force are to increase awareness of diversity on campus and through the curriculum. There are plans for diversity workshops for faculty, staff, students, and alumni. By the end of the year, this task force will have a snapshot of campus diversity and will begin discussions of a campus wide diversity plan which may include and affect hiring decisions, the curriculum, and courses (greater appreciation of diversity in the curriculum, etc.)

### **2. Community Partnerships (Joann Phillips)**

This task force is concerned about what IUSB is doing to enhance community partnerships and with what IUSB is NOT doing, with the barriers to partnerships with the community. The task force has audited the current state of community partnerships. A forty page document can be found on the Campus Directions Committee web site. The results of the audit are organized into three levels: institutional partnerships, programmatic partnerships, and individual connections with the community. The committee members view the results of their work as “a living document” which will suggest the ebb and flow and change in community relationships at each of the levels mentioned.

### **3. Academic Excellence (Rebecca Torstrick)**

This task force is gathering information on program excellence (standards and goals), student excellence, and faculty excellence. The committee is wrestling with a definition of academic excellence. What is academic excellence”? What are the standards used to measure excellence—grading, remediation, availability of resources, programs to maintain excellence (UCET, FACET, undergraduate research, SMART awards, Honors Program, etc.) Now the committee is gathering information. The committee is also needs to initiate a discussion of graduate education.

### **4. Global Perspective (Paul Herr)**

This committee plans to submit a proposal to the faculty and then to the larger campus community. They would like these groups to identify goals, specific objectives, and resource needs in order to implement and encourage a global perspective. The task force is summarizing what we currently do: activity to internationalize the curriculum, study abroad opportunities, faculty exchanges, recruitment of international faculty, international field placements, etc.

### **5. Image (Paul Joray)**

The plan is to heighten recognition of IUSB’s image in the community. The work of the task force is data driven. The task force foresees the continuous improvement (as new data is added to the base). The data will affect campus reports and publications. Tony Proudfoot of IU marketing will be on campus to assist the task force and all of us with improvements in the manner in which IUSB markets its image.

### **6. Student Learning, Access, and Success (See the CDC web site for a status report)**

### **IUSB Committee Reports: General Education Task Force (Jerry Hinnefeld)**

This report reviewed the history of the General Education task force which was convened in March 2000 by Alfred Guillaume. Since that date the task force has held a series of first Friday discussion. Spring 2001, the task force met with each academic unit and presented three models for General Education. Task force members asked for input on these models from each academic unit. Spring 2002, the task force has found that some themes have emerged in these discussions: concern with retention, concern with flexibility of scheduling, etc. Fall 2002, the task force will present a scaled back version of the core curriculum model (32 or 33 credit hour requirement). This core curriculum, once adopted, would be the nucleus for all general education at IUSB. Any college or school could expand on the core or may find the core sufficient. The aim this summer (2002) is to generate some prose to describe the goals of the core curriculum and its structure in the areas of science and mathematics, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, and arts.

### **IUSB Committee Reports: Assessment Committee (Linda Fisher)**

The assessment committee is to monitor, evaluate, and work toward improvement in student learning outcomes. The committee reviews annual reports from every academic department and program and conducts third year reviews. In the third year reviews, the committee is most interested in the outcomes, including student learning outcomes, of assessment activity within the department or program. (Seventeen third year reviews were conducted spring 2001, twelve in 2002.) This year the committee altered the annual report form. The committee hopes that faculty will “take ownership” of the form and relay to the committee the work of the faculty—what activities work in the department, what is being done well, what needs improvement, etc.

Besides the annual and third year reviews, the assessment committee sponsored attendance at assessment conferences, purchased books on assessment, and awarded eight grants for assessment proposals. Next year the committee plans another round of grants and plans to develop a web site. The site will feature departmental assessment plans and other information related to the work of the assessment committee.

### **IUSB Committee Reports: Academic Senate Budget Committee (Paul Herr)**

There were no budget hearings this academic year. There were, however, many meetings with Paul Herr, chair of the Academic Senate Budget Committee and the Dean’s Council to discuss ways to trim the budget. The results of these discussions were presented at the Academic Senate meetings.

Budget and planning need to be linked. The campus plan needs to be linked to the budget process. The budget committee cannot be just a reactive group.

### **General Discussion (Moderator: Alfred Guillaume)**

There was general discussion about the amount of data that the various committees are collecting. Once again the need for an institutional research office was

suggested.

What are the next steps. We need periodic reviews of the work of these campus committees. The work of these committees needs to be linked and integrated. There was a suggestion that the campus direction task force members meet with the deans. Committee work could be shared in the VCAA Newsletter. Another suggestion was to include a retreat for planning.

Notes submitted by  
Linda Fritschner  
May 14, 2002