

The Community Engagement Committee is a new committee of the Senate. In the face of a fairly stagnant last year, the Committee has worked, over the course of this semester, to re-orient itself to the changing environment of CE work on campus (see attached document).

For the first time, the CE Committee was included in the membership election list of the Senate.

This spring two meetings were held to discuss and strategize. In addition to the faculty who have traditionally participated in the CE Committee faculty who have not previously been active on the Committee - but who are active in CE work - were also recruited to participate in the discussions.

The discussions focused on two major areas. First, the overall organization of CE work on campus and, specifically, how faculty see the role of the CE Office. Second, what the priorities for the re-oriented CE Committee should be.

As detailed in the attached analysis, the two areas are clearly interdependent; when CE work was first being formalized as a campus priority, the Committee took on much of the necessary administrative work. With the formalization of the CE Office (and the termination of the faculty CE grants offered by IMRP which the Committee administered), and, importantly, with the tremendous expansion of the work of Community Central in New Britain, the role of the Committee has shifted.

In terms of overall organization of CE work on campus, there is a general lack of clarity about the function and resources of the CE office. The office has been in a state of transition for several years and, while the work of Community Central in downtown New Britain has developed in leaps and bounds under the direction of Hanah Hurwitz and in collaboration with a wide range of faculty and students, the Office itself is not perceived as offering support to faculty whose CE work is not focused in New Britain. Faculty do not have the perception of the Office as the clearinghouse and facilitator of connections which it has been expected to be.

Specific tasks which Faculty feel the Office should address include, maintaining connections with community partners, identifying opportunities for collaboration, assisting with identifying and obtaining financial support for CE work (including collaboration with Grants office), maintaining a database of ongoing CE work, maintaining the CE website (including FAQs and sample documents), facilitating logistical needs such as transportation, legal permissions, insurance, etc.

In terms of appropriate priorities for the CE Office, faculty articulated the following main functions:

- 1) Recruiting and training new faculty to participate in CE.
- 2) Identification and dissemination of best practices for faculty

- 3) Creating events and mechanisms which showcase CE work and facilitate connections on campus between faculty around this work, for example, an annual CE Faculty Day, a faculty listserv, etc.
- 4) Supporting faculty involved in CE work in their promotion and tenure processes
- 5) Stimulating and supporting CE Scholarship through a CE Learning Community, dissemination of helpful resources and, possibly, a collective book project.
- 6) Supervising the CE minor, including recruiting students.

In order to more accurately reflect these priorities, it is necessary to modify the Committee's By-Laws. The current By-Laws describe the Committee's Purpose as follows:

- 1) Provide opportunities for faculty, students and staff to develop greater capacity to participate in community engagement activities.
- 2) Create student leadership opportunities;
- 3) Build sustainable partnerships with community groups and organizations;
- 4) Work with offices on campus to offer grants and provide resources to develop new Community Engagement courses and programs;
- 5) Partner with all offices on campus that provide or facilitate engagement opportunities for students, faculty or staff;
- 6) Develop Community Engagement curriculum as well as consider issues regarding the Community Engagement minor and CEN course designation;
- 7) Propose to the Curriculum Committee and Senate policies and practices that will enhance our mission as a Community Engagement University, including but not limited to the Community Engagement minor and CEN designation.

While specific modifications and language need to be finalized, it seems that several items in this list a) are now - in this stage of campus CE work - more appropriately the work of the CE Office and should be removed from the Purpose of the CE Committee or b) need to be restated to more accurately reflect a more faculty-centric priorities of the Committee (for example, it does not seem that it is a purpose of the Committee (as a collective) to "build sustainable partnerships with community groups and organizations" - although that is certainly a goal of all CE work, a priority of individual faculty members in their CE work and a best practice the CE office wants to promote.

The CE Committee therefore proposes to modify the Purposes section of the By-Laws.

Similarly, the designation of Sub-Committees no longer seems appropriate. Currently three Sub-Committees are listed in the By-Laws:

- 1) Curriculum
- 2) Grants and Awards
- 3) Policies and Practices.

Again, modifications need to be finalized but it is generally proposed that the areas of the Sub-Committees be as follows:

- 1) Scholarship
- 2) CE Minor
- 3) Campus-wide CE events
- 4) Policies and Practices

The Committee will elaborate specific proposals of changes to the By-Laws for approval in the fall, 2013.

The Committee expects that the process of self-examination and re-orientation of this semester, in conjunction with the addition of new members and new leadership and in collaboration with what we hope will be a revitalized CE Office, will result in a much more productive Committee in 2013-14.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sarah Stookey, Chair of CE Committee  
4/25/13