

MEMORANDUM

To: Provost Biermann
From: Integration Taskforce
Re: Proposals
Date: April 19, 2017

This is the final report of the Law School Integration Taskforce. It represents a year of collaboration, discussion, and inquiry by the Taskforce members. The Taskforce included: Kristi Bugajski, Jim Brodzinski, David Cleveland (chair), Christina Grabarek, Derrick Howard, Emily Janoski-Haehlen, Steve Probst, James Old, and Nicole Niemi. The Taskforce was charged with examining and envisioning a wide variety of academic partnerships across the University and identifying both immediate and long-term opportunities.

Our written charge was:

- (a) Review the status of existing academic partnerships between the Law School and other units on campus. The purpose of the review is to determine the current activity within those partnerships and to provide recommendations regarding the long-term viability of those partnerships. In short, the task force should address the question, “Should we continue a given existing partnership?”
- (b) Identify opportunities for immediate development of new joint programs or coordinated offerings.
- (c) Identify opportunities for longer-term development of joint programs or coordinated offerings.
- (d) Develop and provide recommendations regarding mechanisms for maintaining and enhancing the cross-campus dialogue regarding the programmatic integration of the Law School into the wider campus.
- (e) Develop and provide recommendations regarding how to promote the generation of these joint programs, and then to provide positive communications regarding these joint programs to appropriate audiences.

At the initial meeting, of the Taskforce, it became clear that the charge included all areas of collaboration or potential collaboration, including academics, programmatic, administrative, student and faculty experiences, and University culture. We were instructed to identify all areas where the University could leverage its resources and improve teaching, learning, and the VU experience. Some initial research was performed by the Educational Assessment Board (referenced below as “EAB Report”) to provide information on peer schools’ use and perception of various kinds of joint programming. Early meetings of the Taskforce used that information to inform our work. Through the Taskforce’s work and later communications from University administration, we believe the work of this Taskforce in fostering communication and collaboration across units might become a model for broader cross-campus integration.

Review of Programs and Recommendations

This section of the memo addresses parts (a)-(c) of the charge. It is organized by academic partnership/connection (existing or envisioned). Each section provides: A) brief statement of reason to continue or pursue the partnership; B) challenges or weakness of the current structure; and C) specific steps that should be undertaken to improve it. As a preliminary matter, the Taskforce sees great potential in collaborations between the Law School and other parts of the University. The items listed are presented in the order suggested by the charge and the Taskforce's discussion and not on the basis of importance or priority.

I. The Overall Goal and Priority of Integration

- A. The Taskforce recommends that all members of the University community, particularly its employees in all roles, be informed of the importance of the Law School to the University, the current goal of integration, and the purposeful pursuit of cooperation. The Law School has, at times throughout its history, been closer to or farther from the rest of the University, both physically and metaphorically. The Taskforce believes that the University as a whole, and the Law School as a unit, would benefit from a drawing together, relationship building, and integration on a variety of levels. What follows are mostly tangible programs, proposals, and recommendations, but this overall perspective should also be communicated.
- B. Obvious challenges include the existing distance between the University and the Law School, physically and in other ways. In addition, many personal connections between the Law School and other parts of the University were lost with the recent law faculty reduction.
- C. The Taskforce specifically proposes communication of its yearlong efforts as the first step in an ongoing process, one which will involve specific actions but also, hopefully, a more unified University, particularly if this work leads to or creates a model for integration across other (or all) units.

II. 3+3 Program

- A. The Taskforce recommends continuing and strengthening the 3+3 program. It provides a useful marketing tool for undergraduate admission and a potential pipeline for Law School admissions. The EAB report indicates the peer schools do offer and value these programs, despite the low enrollment numbers.
- B. The program currently suffers from low internal awareness of the program, lack of support by undergraduate faculty advisors, and difficulty with course sequencing for students.
- C. The Taskforce offers these specific proposals:
 - 1. Create planning checklists for all majors showing students how 3+3 program can be completed
 - 2. Target to low-credit majors, who can fit UG credits into 3 years more easily
 - 3. Identify specific majors with substantive connection with law
 - 4. Create an audit for these students that tracks their requirements

5. Communicate incentives for Valpo students to do 3+3 and dual-degree programs
 - a. Lower overall tuition
 - b. Financial aid availability (esp. for UG 3+3)
 - c. Flexibility (a student who begins down a 3+3 path can leave it if they elect not to go to law school)
 - d. Early counseling on preparing for law school and law career success
6. Communicate internally with colleges/departments on benefits of 3+3
7. Develop specific PR aimed at faculty and professional advisors
8. Develop specific marketing and communications aimed at students

III. Dual Degree JD/Masters Programs

- A. The Taskforce recommends continuing and strengthening the joint degree offerings. It also recommends expanding them into other areas including additional joint degrees and certificate programs. The EAB report indicates the peer schools do offer and value these programs, despite the low enrollment numbers.
- B. The program currently suffers from curricular changes having muddled the course of study required, lack of recent coordination of requirements, and lack of a forum for collaboration and development of new joint programs.
- C. The Taskforce offers these specific proposals:
 1. Continue collaboration between the Law School, Graduate School, and College of Business to:
 - a. Clarify and advance Premier Dual Degree programs (JB/MBA; JD/MS (sports administration); JD/MA (psychology/clinical mental health))
 - b. Develop new student-facing documents like bulletins, marketing, and advising materials
 - c. Develop new internal documents like Memoranda of Understanding and audit procedures, as needed
 - d. Explore creation of additional joint degrees (such as a JD/CPA)
 - e. Create and publish a list of eligible masters or JD/masters degrees beyond Premier programs
 - f. Develop a framework for a generic JD/masters into which any non-premier combination can be plotted
 2. Continue collaboration between Law School and College of Business on certificate programs
 3. Explore the possibilities for certificates for students who come with credits from elsewhere, such as in paralegal programs
 4. Develop opportunities outside joint academic programming for the Law School to provide benefits to graduation programs, such as providing a field placement setting for Masters in Social Work students or providing physical space for a complementary program of students
 5. Explore the creation of joint degree cohorts through joint orientation, courses, and social events

IV. Pre-Law Advising Program

- A. The Taskforce recommends continuing and strengthening Pre-Law Advising. It acknowledges and generally agrees with the movement away from a “pre-law major,” but finds significant value in undergraduate academic advising specific to students who identify in any way as interested in a law-related career. Such advising would provide students a richer undergraduate education, a wider view of law-related careers, and a path to VU Law School, even outside the 3+3 program. It may also provide a pipeline for law school admissions, with the benefit of those students possessing Valpo character.
- B. Pre-Law advising currently suffers from low staffing, *ad hoc* assignment of pre-law advisors within departments, formal or informal advising of students against pursuing a law degree, particularly at VULS, and lack of expertise.
- C. The Taskforce specifically proposes:
 1. Increased use of professional advisors
 2. Create student (and parent)-facing marketing on “why law?” “why law school?” and “why VULS?”
 3. Create advisor-facing marketing on “why law?” “why law school?” and “why VULS?”
 4. Recruitment of pre-law advisors who appreciate law school training, law as a career, and the strengths of Valpo law.
 5. Require all faculty and advisors with students interested in law or 3+3 to direct those students to James Old (who can help them or refer them to another pre-law advisor)
 6. Create a director or head of pre-law advising
 7. Improve technical aspects of identifying pre-law students
 8. Increase programming for pre-law students
 9. Increase coordination and joint programming and communication with law school
 10. Revive courses like “Field of Law” offered by undergraduate colleges and departments to create contact points for potential 3+3 students and other law-interested students

V. Center-level Proposals

- A. The Taskforce recommends exploring center-level opportunities. The Taskforce sees value in fostering large-scale collaborations between the Law School and other units in the form of new “centers” or “programs” that call for significant collaboration between units. For example, the newly formed Entrepreneurship Center is one such collaboration between units. The Taskforce sees a place for the Law School in existing plans and the possibility for developing new center-level partnerships. Such partnerships provide

marketplace differentiation, richer student experiences, effective leveraging of existing resources, and potentially advance the service mission of the University.

- B. Center-level proposals face the challenge of requiring significant vision, planning, and potentially a larger commitment of resources than course, department, or administrative initiatives.
- C. The Taskforce specifically proposes:
 - 1. Law School engagement with the proposed Entrepreneurship Center.
 - 2. A call for proposals or strategic development of center-level collaborations.
For example:
 - a. Social Justice Center (law and social work)
 - b. Children and Family Services Center (law, social work, nursing/health professions, business)
 - c. Law and Justice Center (connecting the University's law and religious aspects)

VI. Co-teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels

- A. The Taskforce recommends increasing the opportunity for co-teaching across the University. Some degree of co-teaching and guest lecturing already occurs, and it is generally viewed as enriching and community building.
- B. This type of cross-campus collaboration is limited by lack of: awareness of faculty areas of expertise; knowledge about the opportunities for co-teaching; or purposeful creation of cross-listed or co-taught courses with University-wide goals in mind.
- C. The Taskforce specifically proposes:
 - 1. Creation a photobook/sheet identifying the expertise areas of the faculty, particularly the law faculty
 - 2. Identify all the law-related courses in the UG/Grad catalog where law faculty guest lecturing or co-teaching would add value
 - 3. Identify or consider creation of "field of law" course within undergraduate colleges or majors that have a significant intersection with law
 - 4. Encourage the creation of new courses with legal component where current limiting factor is lack of legal expertise
 - 5. Enhance majors where applicable with law content (ex. forensics)
 - 6. Facilitate development of capstone courses in law-related majors
 - 7. Facilitate co-teaching and cross-listing courses with the Law and Grad Schools
 - 8. Examine, improve, and publicize (internally) the process for cross-listing courses between the law school and other units

VII. Facilities and Services

- A. The Taskforce recommends integration of the Law Center through University-level facilities and services decisions. While the Law School is geographically remote, it is still part of the campus. It should be included in campus maps,

- signage, marketing, and tours. Similarly, transparent and vigorous advancement efforts should be made on behalf of the law school and law school input and aid should be sought regularly. Finally, campus facilities should be available to law students.
- B. Some of the challenges of facilities and service inclusion are physical location, scheduling, and resource issues. There may also be issues of communication and “siloining” issues.
 - C. The Taskforce specifically proposes:
 - 1. Inclusion of Law School on University-level signage and maps
 - 2. University-level marketing, like campus tours, should include the law school
 - 3. University-level messaging to students, such as welcome letters should account for the law students
 - 4. University services like Health Center, Fitness Center, OneCard, Parking services, bookstore, and ARC should to be available to law students when they arrive
 - 5. Greater collaboration, communication, and transparency regarding advancement and greater emphasis on Law School advancement
 - 6. Creation of a shared social space for all faculty on campus, perhaps in the form of a faculty dining room

VIII. General proposals

- A. The Taskforce recommends the following proposals, though they do not fit into any particular category above.
- B. The Taskforce did not identify any particular challenges or difficulties with undertaking these proposals.
- C. The Taskforce specifically proposes:
 - 1. Improve communication processes. Add all Law School events to the appropriate University calendar and communication, such as the Cultural Arts Calendar. Distribute the Law Connection to all, or at least interested, University community members
 - 2. Improve University/faculty knowledge of good news and positive developments. The negative news makes its way across the grapevine, but the many accomplishments and developments tend to stay within their own units. Mechanisms for, and a culture of, sharing good news is needed
 - 3. Increase shared social programming. The professorial lectures and Gaudeamus are examples of the kind of programming the Taskforce finds beneficial. This proposal was viewed as one that would increase collegiality and connections not just with the law school but across colleges and departments
 - 4. Add representation of pre-law society and/or law school at freshman orientation and similar events

5. Create a venue to inform people about the positive aspects of law school with sessions on “why law/law school/VULS?” perhaps at the Spring (or next Fall) Faculty Forum

Recommendations for Implementation and Continuation of Integration

This section of the memo addresses sections (d) and (e) of the charge. Having generated the proposals above, the taskforce then considered what mechanisms could put those into practice and fostering future integration efforts.

I. Implementation

The Taskforce recommends the creation of a successor taskforce to serve in AY 2017-18. The Taskforce determined that some person or entity needs to implement the proposals above. The use of current institutional offices and entities was considered. Creation of new institutional positions or entities was also considered. This work may need to be a standing committee or permanent administrative post, but for now, the Taskforce prefers a more focused, limited-term approach. Ultimately, the Taskforce believes that the current taskforce, with some specific additional members, could effectively pursue implementation of the proposals. The Integration Implementation Taskforce would then work with the various University units to actually implement the proposals. This body need not be a taskforce, if some other structure is preferable.

That Taskforce should include: Kelly Anthony, Anne Brandt, Jim Brodzinski, Kristi Bugajski, David Cleveland, Rick Gillman, Christina Grabarek, David Herzig, Derrick Howard, Steve Probst, Nicole Niemi, James Old, and Anna Stewart. We may also want to include someone with a broad overview of the undergraduate course offerings and someone who supervises professional advisors for undergraduates. Other program directors and individuals may be useful additions depending on the work of this successor taskforce.

The Taskforce envisions next year’s taskforce breaking into smaller work groups and tackling the proposals above. A preliminary assignment of those groups, organized by proposal category is:

- I. The Overall Goal and Priority of Integration (Taskforce Chair TBD, Nicole Niemi, Anne Brandt)
- II. 3+3 Program (Kelly Anthony, Kristi Bugajski, James Old, Anna Stewart)
- III. Dual Degree JD/Masters Programs (Jim Brodzinski, Christina Grabarek, David Herzig, Derrick Howard)
- IV. Pre-Law Advising Program (Kelly Anthony, Kristi Bugajski, James Old, Anna Stewart)
- V. Center-level Proposals (David Cleveland, Rick Gillman)

- VI. Co-teaching (Anne Brandt, Kristi Bugajski, Steve Probst, someone with broad overview of the UG catalog and academic units)
- VII. Facilities and Services (Anne Brandt, Rick Gillman, Nicole Niemi, Steve Probst)
- VIII. General proposals (Jim Brodzinski, Christina Grabarek, Derrick Howard, Steve Probst)

These smaller working groups would meet as needed to implement the proposals in those areas. Some may be combined for efficiency. Working groups would identify the individuals necessary to accomplish integration tasks within their area and would be responsible for facilitating that implementation. The taskforce as a whole would meet less frequently throughout the year to address overall issues and give progress reports. We anticipate an initial planning meeting, a mid-year check-in, and an end-of-the-year assessment of what has been accomplished, what remains to be accomplished, and what is needed to continue the work. This group should be charged with assessing their progress and proposing a mechanism or body to succeed it.

II. Fostering Future Implementation

The Taskforce also considered what mechanism or process needed to be in place to continue to foster integration. First, communication about the purposes, goals, and institutional importance of integration should be widely communicated to enable the successor taskforce to succeed. Second, the successor taskforce should be empowered to bring individuals and groups together, with the Provost's support, to take specific actions toward integration. Third, the successor taskforce should reassess near the end of its term how effective it has been, what remains to be accomplished, and what person, entity, or processes should succeed it.