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University of Minnesota Office of Public Engagement Issue Area Networks (IANs)

The University of Minnesota Public Engagement Issue Area Networks is a University-wide initiative designed to strengthen the internal alignment of the various public engagement activities focused on a particular societal issue, but which are currently operating independently across various offices, units, and departments.

With more than 200 units that conduct community-engaged work across a broad range of topics, there are many opportunities for the University to play a greater leadership role in making substantial and significant impacts on important societal issues. Because societal issues are inherently complex and multifaceted, no one office, unit, or center alone can address them fully.

This Issue Area Networks initiative is intended to link and encourage synergy among existing engagement projects, partnerships, and activities in ways that can leverage greater collective action and overall impact. A primary goal of this initiative is to encourage the building of a more coordinated, systems approach to public and community engagement by networking existing community-engaged research, teaching, and public service efforts that are focused on large-scoped societal challenges and issues.

The Issue Area Networks are focused on key societal issues including: arts, economic development, youth & education, health, poverty, environment & sustainability, transportation, food, and diversity & inclusion. Any individual (or unit) affiliated with the University who is involved in community-engaged research, teaching, and/or public service/outreach work on the issue area is welcome to participate in the networks.

Design Thinking

Design Thinking is an emerging field applying the tools and processes from the design disciplines to complex, system-wide problems. It applies design processes to engage individuals and groups on specific creative problem solving, and changing the status quo by making systems change while having fun with human creativity!

Design Thinking @ College of Design is a collaborative that provides design thinking research and outreach services across sectors, including within the university. Our audacious goal is to unleash the creative potential of individuals and organizations across all sectors to innovate in fulfilling their mission at the local, regional, national and international level. We are located at University of Minnesota’s College of Design on the Twin Cities campus and can be found online at: dt.design.umn.edu.
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Public Engagement Issue Area Networks Design Thinking Series

The goal of the design thinking workshops is to continue to build the Issues Area Networks, as a next step to the meetings hosted by the Office for Public Engagement on the issue-focused themes with community-engaged faculty, staff, students, and others who are interested in taking action in shaping and advancing a University-wide agenda for each issue area.

The design thinking workshops offer a process/means and a space for creative synthesis and production by each IAN themed group to set goals based on needs and users and create their vision and work plan. The outcomes of the design thinking work over the three sessions are intended to accomplish goals of the initiative by networking existing research, teaching and public service efforts, setting the agenda for collective action and creating a design for assessing cumulative overall impact over the various individual engagement efforts.

The Public Engagement Issue Area Networks Design Thinking Series is composed of three sessions, which together, are intended to advance the building of a more aligned institutional approach to addressing challenging societal issues through community engagement.

The first session (December, 2013) focuses on “network building”. This session will engage participants in envisioning and designing what an internal public engagement “network” for each of the nine societal issue area might look like. The expectation is that each issue area network will be unique and look different.

The second session (February, 2014) focuses on “agenda building”. With the network conceptualized, what are the key issues, questions, and goals that each issue area network will address. The agenda for each area network will form the basis for funding support that will lead to the implementation of activities that will help the network achieve its identified goals and secure the network’s strength as an internally aligned collaborative composed of many units but all contributing to and working toward a common set of overarching goals.

The third session (April 2014) focuses on “action planning and implementation”. With the network conceptualized and the designs for each network’s goals designed, the third design thinking session address focuses on building a design for the community engagement activities, the internal alignment efforts, and other activities that will form the basis for action to move the agendas forward in ways that will achieve the network goals identified in session two. The action planning and implementation” work will identify specific steps that each network will take to move the network’s work forward. These action plans will be eligible for funding support.
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Issue Area Networks (IANs) - Office for Public Engagement Issue Area Networks (OPE IANs)
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Public Engagement Issue Area Networks; Design Thinking Work Session 1
PROTOTYPE PRESENTATIONS
TEAM 6: YOUTH & ED 2  PROTOTYPE 1 - Separate and Silo

Team members: Cathy Jordan, Scott McConnell, Ross VeLure Roholt, Judith Conway, Makeda Zulu-Gillespie, Peg Wolff, Tex Ostvig, Mary Buschette, & Terri Sutton

The prototype shows that in the current system good works occur in isolated pockets. The problems in the current system are absence of connections, fuzzy path to the common goal and barrier between research and service.

**Design Features**
- Foam = the silos
- Fuzzy ball dashed line = disconnects
- Green sticky wall = barriers
- Green sticky wall = dichotomy of research + service
- Ball of string = the current mess
- String = connection to impact, clarity etc through connection to infrastructure, funds etc
- $ cut up = frayed, poorly coordinated funding
TEAM 6: YOUTH & ED 2  PROTOTYPE 2 - Passionate Action

Team members: Cathy Jordan, Scott McConnell, Ross VeLure Roholt, Judith Conway, Makeda Zulu-Gillespie, Peg Wolff, Tex Ostvig, Mary Buschette, & Terri Sutton

This prototype explains how it raises expelling public questions that draw people from diverse (geographical) group together in conversation and action.

(For additional material generated by the team, see Appendix page 00-00)

Design Features
- Designated time and space, and facilitator to have conversation
- Time to work away and think and have to come back
- Multiple perspectives and careers
- “Round” table metaphor
- Bring authentic self, our privilege, experiences, and understanding
TEAM 11 - YOUTH & ED 1

PROTOTYPE 1 - ‘Chrysalis u’

Team members: Shoghig Berberian, Julie Sweitzer, Merrie Benasutti, Susan Weller, Jessica Jerney, Grace Machoki, Jacquie Lonning, Dorothy Freeman, Noro Andriamanalina, Thorunn Bjarnadottir, & Laurel Hirt

This prototype takes the metaphor of the ‘Chrysalis’ stage in which the insect is transforming. Here, all the materials are there but they are being reassembled and so it is very disorganized. The prototype shows all the parts for success, but they are not fully formed or connected. One of the main problems identified is the inconsistent support from administration. As administrative leaders change, their priorities change along with it. So, communities may be reluctant to work with the university because they are not able to trust the university’s commitment in a changing administrative environment.

Design Features
- Independent silos, disconnected
- Scattered funding
- Some have dedicated mission and connection to U while others’ commitment shifts as leadership changes
- We keep our candies (program) to ourselves, even though occasional collaborations
- Messy
TEAM 11 - YOUTH & ED 1

PROTOTYPE 2 - Bug Brain U

Team members: Shoghig Berberian, Julie Sweitzer, Merrie Benasutti, Susan Weller, Jessica Jerney, Grace Machoki, Jacquie Lonning, Dorothy Freeman,

The prototype takes the metaphor of “Bug Brain U”, which is a semi-autonomous nervous system. Here, small brains report to the big brain, meaning there can be local adaptation and local solutions to the problem yet be connected to the centralized big bug brain. The university can be a central platform where communities and their different programs are heard. In this system, resources are more dedicated and focused in the work with youth outside the university. Units and community partners are connected and working towards a unified mission.

(For additional material generated by the team, see Appendix page 00-00)

Design Features
- Ears take in community partner ideas
- Connections expand and show interactions with diverse community
- Students, faculty/staff and community youth dancing in the center within a common vision/goal
- Like a bug brain, semi-autonomous in action and perception: Create solutions in unexpected ways and spaces. Communication/technology grid keeps participants in communication.
TEAM 6: YOUTH & ED 2

TEAM MEMBERS
Cathy Jordan
Scott McConnell
Ross VeLure Roholt
Judith Conway
Makeda Zulu-Gillespie
Peg Wolff
Tex Ostvig
Mary Buschette
Terri Sutton

And now part two of education and youth

Networking is about marketing and information
There is so much around us we don’t know where to go
A dividing line between research and service

A compelling question emerged that captured us!
How do you start to support passionate action?
Prototype is real people having conversations
In a space with our authentic selves.

-Jennifer Hegland

Design Thinking
@ COLLEGE OF DESIGN
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TEAM 6: YOUTH & ED 2

MATERIALS

TEAM NO: 12-YOUTH & ED 2

PROTOTYPE 1

CREATIVE TITLE:
Separate and silo -

1-2 SENTENCE DESCRIPTION:
Good work occur in isolated pockets.

DESIGN FEATURES:
- Foam: the silos
- Fuzzy ball: dashed line = disconnects
- Green sticky wall: barriers
- Ball of string: the current mess
- String: connection to impact, clarity, & impact connection to infrastructure needs
- Engraved: framed, proudly mentioned: Cause

PROTOTYPE 2

CREATIVE TITLE:
Passionate Action

1-2 SENTENCE DESCRIPTION:
Raise compelling public questions that
draw people from diverse (geographic)
grup together in conversations & action.

DESIGN FEATURES:
- Designated time & space
- Time to walk away & think
- Multiple perspectives & contexts to come back
- Round table
- Facilitator
- Authentic self - bring on the exp.
- Empathy understanding
TEAM 6: YOUTH & ED 2

FEEDBACK

I LIKE
- The “path” idea and the importance of networking
- Passionate action idea
- Your moving model for prototype and prototype two being people and conversations around a table
- Dynamic representation of the path to resource
- Description of being on a dotted line rather than a solid line
- Like the image of “path”. Like emphasis on compelling question. Like the “walk away and think”
- Networking is marketing. You make to road by walking
- “We are already in agreement. We just need to figure out how to work together”

I WISH
- Networking was given a higher priority — resources were broadcast instead of hoarded
- I could have the time to build relationships with individual youth — I love that work
- Time to back you away and reflect

WHAT IF
- You could have built prototype 2?
- We could be free to bring our authentic selves
- Passionate attitudes/desires can be translated into action
- Bringing people together isn’t enough to move the needle
- How do you start to support passionate action?

THIS MAKES ME THINK OF
- Passionate Action on campus and in life
- Kids that I know + care for
- How do we work collectively and determine common goals
Let's not forget our youth and education

We have similar silos to elsewhere
We have a dedicated place with 4H
Along with many other successful progress, and shifting priorities too.

We envision a bug-brain U (with mini and big bug brains)
Our funnels are our ears
Our resources are more dedicated
With new ideas flowing both out and in.

-Jennifer Hegland
PROTOTYPE 1

CREATIVE TITLE: "CHRYSALIS" 

1-2 SENTENCE DESCRIPTION:
These are all the parts for success, but they are not fully formed or connected.

DESIGN FEATURES:
Individually isolated, disconnected. Sustained funding. Some have dedicated missions/connections to Unit. While others' commitment shifts as leadership changes. (We keep our centers programs) to encourage even through occasional collaboration. Messy.

PROTOTYPE 2

CREATIVE TITLE: BUG BRAIN U

1-2 SENTENCE DESCRIPTION:
Unified idea renewables focus + pub & info. concerted effort. Units can connect, so are community partners.

DESIGN FEATURES:
TEAM 11: YOUTH & ED 1

FEEDBACK

I LIKE
- Bug analogy. Transformation from youth to adult
- “Bug Brain” — literally fed by knowledge of smaller brains
- Recognition that changing U leadership with their changing priorities makes communities reluctant to depend on university as trusted partner
- To think about “Focused” work “Together”
- Metaphor of chrysalis/bug brain
- The bug brain!

I WISH
- K-12 ed was better supported at the U
- We could get K-12 students from across our communities into the U, with support
- The value of the localized brain feeding into and benefiting back from big brain
- Silos would be eliminated
- I knew more about the actual work taking place
- Marketing? Information culture or dissemination

WHAT IF
- We could connect resources
- Humans embraced their social connectedness—like ants
- These systems were integrated. How would the system change?

THIS MAKES ME THINK OF
- What we as a U entity can do to contribute
- How does sustainability connect to achievement group — big important question
- The logic and strength in the bug brain concept for youth work around state and how can generalize to university outreach work
- How much work there is to do
- Being more receptive and working towards a more unified mission
- Networks don’t have “unified” missions to separate missions — sharing resources more efficiently to create outcomes that are bigger than sum of parts
- Barriers to collaboration-based models are highly efficient systems (linear and hierarchical). Collaboration is expensive but innovative! Need growth of benefit to justify costs