FEEDBACK SUMMARY STATEMENT
THEME 3: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Student Response Summary
Although students tended to be less specific in their feedback (22 responses were received), there was general support expressed for the proposal, particularly with regard to a core curriculum service learning requirement, establishing an Office of Community Engagement, and incentivizing participation in civically engaged activities. One student encouraged expansion of these efforts into a civic engagement major, additional service learning classes, and departmental partnerships. Another student highly commended her freshman experience in Volunteer Day and was disappointed that dedication and spirit was not sustained through other opportunities offered by the campus (i.e., tutoring of children in low-income areas, clean-up projects, volunteering, or donating time and/or services). There was agreement about the university’s obligation to contribute to the betterment of the community as a vital part of our mission statement (which should be reflected by our actions), and to place greater institutional emphasis on civic engagement; however, some felt that such service should not be deemed mandatory or rewarded. In addition, revising UCLA’s mission statement should be a deliberative process with broad involvement, and the city’s pressing social problems (cost of living, housing, harassment, discrimination, labor issues, etc.) need to be addressed. One final response was in the form of a question: “Where's the effort for AANAPISI and HSI designation?”

Faculty Response Summary
There were 24 responses submitted by faculty which included the following key recommendations/feedback:

• Appreciation for the work of the committee: good and thoughtful recommendations.
• Enhance funding for existing centers/programs already engaged in community service and increase coordination and networking of those efforts. Ethnic Studies, with their longstanding community partnerships, should be an integral part of any comprehensive community engagement effort.
• Community partnerships and engagement directly tied to the idea of a downtown campus requires integration with the city and its diverse communities, as well as new satellites to launch socially relevant research.
• Stated resistance to creating another administrative office, to hiring additional administrators, and to adding service mandates. A service learning requirement for undergraduates – not a full course requirement – was recommended.
• Civic engagement/university service by faculty would increase if it was fully recognized during academic reviews for promotion or advancement. Non-senate faculty also need to be rewarded for their contributions.
• The report should address the question of how to enhance civic engagement while mitigating the burden of additional time consuming activities for young faculty that will detract from research and teaching.
• Information related to costs and resources to support the proposal is lacking.
• General agreement with revising UCLA’s mission statement and to pursuing a bi-directional flow of information approach; however, community engagement needs to be more clearly defined and have substantial social impact.
• Both students and faculty expressed a desire to engage in volunteer work and community service but face obstacles of available time, lack of information, and incentives.
• The background statement included two questions that were not addressed, "How can we keep UCLA affordable and accessible?" and "In what ways should UCLA strive to increase its economic impacts through, for example, licensing inventions, promoting innovation and entrepreneurism, partnerships with the private sector, and the like"? The route from rewards and incentives to making UCLA more affordable needs to be mapped out. Do other institutions (i.e., USC) provide rewards? With respect to economic impact, licensing and entrepreneurism, how will the proposed new Vice Provost of Community Engagement coordinate activities with the leadership of TDG?
• Examples proposed for improving community partnerships: (1) cover course tuition for staff to earn degrees; (2) foster relationships between academic departments and industry so that students understand opportunities beyond academia and receive a more well-rounded education; and (3) encourage faculty to share insights, research findings, and the important work taking place at UCLA with larger audiences by offering writing workshops.

Staff Response Summary
A total of 58 responses from staff were varied and thoughtful and included the following key points:
• UCLA needs to do a better job of telling our comprehensive story as a public institution to more effectively impact our community and market our efforts.
• Flexible scheduling (4/10 or 9/80) would reduce UCLA’s carbon footprint and provide time for employees to engage in community service, which should also be a mandate for
performance review purposes. In addition, rewards and incentives (which can take many forms) will be critical to enhancing participation and visibility.

- Rather than creating another layer of bureaucracy and risking redundancy, invest funding in existing resources, such as the Center for Community Learning, established community partnerships and campus stakeholders, which includes the multitude of medical outreach community programs.

- The plan should specifically address and define social change as well as areas of greatest impact for UCLA instead of simply mandating more engagement and participation. A more forward thinking and strategic approach is needed, and a culture of individual social responsibility needs to be fostered along with an understanding of the value of our “collective impact.”

- Support was expressed for establishing an Office of Community Engagement, under the purview of a Vice Chancellor or Vice Provost, to coordinate and encourage communication across campus, harness and promote existing disjointed efforts through one central location, and provide a knowledge base of established and emerging programs, as well as support for priority community initiatives.

- Confusion was expressed over the role of the Volunteer Center and the exclusion of campus entities already fully engaged in civic engagement activities as partners in this vision. In addition, it was proposed that Government and Community Relations be restructured, strengthened, and housed under the Vice Chancellor for Research in order to strategically align advocacy and funding efforts.

- The campus should establish satellite offices/hubs within existing UCLA entities operating in the greater Los Angeles region (UCLA Health, UCLA Community Schools, UCLA Extension, William Andrews Clark Library, etc.). These regional hubs would serve to support community engagement efforts across all five strategic themes.

- A more strategic approach is needed and best practices adopted with regard to the identification of specific partners for in-depth and substantive engagement and to more effectively centralize partnership navigation, data collection, and updates. APLU’s HIBAR research program was noted as a model for engaging societal partners.

**Alumni Response Summary**

Nine alumni responded with overall support for the plan – with the exception of one who claimed that it would be a waste of money. The focus for community engagement cannot be singular in its approach, but must encapsulate the entirety of the diverse Los Angeles community; in addition, providing time to engage in these efforts needs to be taken into consideration. More concrete actions that effectively engage UCLA with community stakeholders is encouraged and
leadership positions should include community partners. The plan is a great opportunity to reframe UCLA's relationship with the community and alumni should be actively and effectively used to help facilitate this effort.

**Donor Response Summary**

Three donors weighed in with specific recommendations:

1. With adding bureaucracy will an evaluation be done to avoid duplication of services, streamline the process, and eliminate waste?
2. Add a number of civic leaders to the task force.
3. While civic engagement is important, industry engagement is more critical to connecting students and faculty with drivers of the economy. There is no focus on building relationships with direct links to employment, mentorship, etc.