Community Engagement Council
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, 16 April, 2012
2:00 PM, KT 178

Members in attendance: Jihad Al-Bayyari, Carol Sternberger, Irene Walters, Sean Ryan, Linda Finke, Carol Lindquist, Charles O’Connor, George McClellan, Gail Rathbun, Bill Shustowski

Meeting called to order at 2:04 PM

Minutes from the February meeting were reviewed and approved.

CE website

- Email any feedback or suggestions about the website to the Office of Research, Engagement, and Special Programs.
- A link is needed which originates outside of website, possibly as a related link on other web pages, to assist in creating more traffic to the site.
- Similarity of names for the Office of University Engagement and the Carnegie Community Engagement might cause web search confusion.

Update on 2012 Database entries

- Currently, there are 141 entries on the database.
- Try to solicit database entries from other units for this calendar year.
- In order to make database updates a habit, try to make the continuous process a part of every project’s workflow and check for updates at the end of each semester.

Engagement assessment progress

- There has been good growth in the establishment of engagement assessment.
- Keep as a reminder to check on each academic unit’s progress.

2015 Community Engagement Classification Timeline (attached)

- Add to the timeline a date during spring 2013 to name a committee which will be trained and ready to receive applications by Sept 9, 2013.
- J suggested adapting the existing Community Engagement survey presentation and also volunteered to speak any group about it.
- Carol S. will share a Qualtrics form concerning student projects.

Discussion of ways to more effectively include the community members

- Rather than having community representatives at each meeting, it was suggested to request them at specific meetings. Possible groupings include health-care, non-profits, small
business entrepreneurs, large business employers, and education. The meeting setting would be informal, convenient, and include refreshments and a parking pass.

- Existing publication processes such as Inside IPFW can be utilized to spread the word about the Carnegie Community Engagement Project and available opportunities.
- For future meetings it was suggested that the direction of discussions be on what the council is doing rather than the logistics of a project.

Round table discussion (see attachment for Call for Applications, IPFW Chancellor’s University Engagement Awards Overview)

- A small committee is needed to evaluate the applications and identify the award winners by June.
- To increase awareness, suggestions were made to put this document on the AOC agenda and encourage deans and chairs to spread the word.

Meeting adjourned at 2:58 PM.
2015 Community Engagement Classification Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Announcement 2015 process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2013</td>
<td>Deadline for registering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 2013</td>
<td>Release of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2014</td>
<td>Applications Due/Reviewing begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Review Process completed/ campuses notified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>2015 classification results announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 2010 selection process, even among the most effective applications, there were categories of practice in need of continued development. Those areas include: (1) assessment, (2) reciprocal partnerships, (3) faculty rewards, and (4) integration and alignment with other institutional initiatives:

- (1) The assessment practices required by the Community Engagement Classification must meet a broad range of purposes: assessing community perceptions of institutional engagement; tracking and recording of institution-wide engagement data; assessment of the impact of community engagement on students, faculty, community, and institution; identification and assessment of student learning outcomes in curricular engagement; and ongoing feedback mechanisms for partnerships. That range of purposes calls for sophisticated understandings and approaches to achieve the respective assessment goals. We urge institutions to continue to develop assessment toward those ends.

- (2) Partnerships require a high level of understanding and intentional practices specifically directed to reciprocity and mutuality. In the 2010 applications, we noted that institutions have begun to attend to processes of initiating and nurturing collaborative, two-way partnerships, and are developing strategies for systematic communication. Maintaining authentically collaborative, mutually beneficial partnerships takes ongoing commitment, and we urge institutions to continue their attention to this critical aspect of community engagement.

- (3) With regard to faculty rewards for roles in community engagement and community-based achievements, we see little change in institutional practices related to the scholarship of engagement. This year’s applications reveal two common approaches to conceptualizing community engagement for promotion and tenure. The first is to place the engagement achievements in the categories of teaching or research and to require traditional forms of scholarship (articles, presentations, and grants). The second is to consider community engagement in a broad category of service along with campus-based and discipline-based professional service, and community service that ranges from volunteerism to consultation; this second approach may or may not carry expectations of a scholarly approach. We urge Community Engagement institutions to initiate study, dialogue, and reflection to promote and reward the scholarship of engagement more fully.

- (4) Community engagement offers often-untapped possibilities for alignment with other campus priorities and initiatives to achieve greater impact—for example, first-year programs that include community engagement; learning communities in which community engagement is integrated into the design; or diversity initiatives that explicitly link active and collaborative community-based teaching and learning with the academic success of underrepresented students. There remain significant opportunities for campuses to develop collaborative internal practices that integrate disparate initiatives into more coherent community engagement efforts.