Leveraging Community Partnerships in Los Angeles: A Proposal for Enhancing Civic Engagement at UCLA

UCLA Task Force on Civic Engagement
June 29, 2017
Background

On February 22, 2017, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh charged this Task Force with generating specific recommendations for “three to five actionable items that will seek to enhance UCLA’s social impact and civic engagement.” Several questions were posed to guide the Task Force’s work:

- What types of targeted efforts and signature programs can help UCLA amplify its positive social impacts? What types of engagement will best serve the community and enhance UCLA’s academic quality?

- How can UCLA enhance access for students, faculty and administrators from under-represented minority groups? How can we keep UCLA affordable and accessible?

- What educational programs and/or co-curricular opportunities will best prepare students for a lifetime of civic and community engagement?

- In what ways should UCLA strive to increase its economic impacts through, for example, licensing inventions, promoting innovation and entrepreneurship, partnerships with the private sector, and the like?

- How can we best communicate UCLA’s work and bolster its image to the public and policy makers? How do we build support for UCLA as an outstanding public research university?

- How should the university best position itself to take advantage of the new media environment and also to use technology to enhance its social impact?

The Task Force — which was composed of 17 members representing the faculty, staff, and student body¹ — met on four occasions between March 13 and May 22 to complete its work

¹ Task Force members included Natalie Bagaporo (undergraduate student); Youlonda Copeland-Morgan (Vice Provost, Enrollment Management); Sharon Farb (Associate University Librarian); David Gere (Professor, World Arts & Cultures); Lynn Gordon (Senior Associate Dean, Academic Diversity, David Geffen School of Medicine); Eric Greene (Associate Director, Diversity & Campus Climate, Communication & Public Outreach); Darnell Hunt (Task Force Chair, Department of Sociology Chair, Ralph J. Bunche Center for African American Studies Director); Ty Ingram (Senior Strategic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning & Budget); Daryl Johnson (Chair of the Annual Fund Committee, Advisory Board School of Nursing); Rahim Kurwa (Graduate Student, Sociology); Pedro Noguera (Distinguished Professor, Graduate School of Education & Information Studies); Kathy O’Byrne (Director, Center for Community Learning); Stephanie Pincetl (Director and Professor-in-Residence, California Center for Sustainable Communities at UCLA); Ellen Scott (Professor, School of Theater, Film & Television); Julie Sina (Associate Vice Chancellor/CFO, Alumni Affairs/UCLA Foundation); Abel Valenzuela (Professor,
with respect to these questions. During the first meeting, the Task Force considered in-depth the Executive Vice Chancellor’s charge, the university’s mission, and key university stakeholders and their corresponding expectations. Three breakout groups were formed to organize the balance of the Task Force’s work:

- Culture, Administration & Communication
- Rewards & Incentives
- Assessment

The following six recommendations are the result of a rich discussion of this background, which was framed by four central considerations: 1) What UCLA is currently doing with respect to civic engagement, 2) how this work is perceived by key stakeholders, 3) best practices from peer institutions, and 4) UCLA’s unique position as the only elite, public institution of higher education rooted in a global city. Our recommendations are organized into three categories, corresponding to the Task Force’s three breakout groups: Culture, Administration & Communication; Rewards & Incentives; and Assessment. For each recommendation we offer a discussion of the proposed action/intervention — the what — why we recommend this specific action/intervention, how UCLA may enact the action/intervention, and when the proposed action/intervention might be implemented.

________________________________

Chicano Studies and Urban Planning, Institute for Research on Labor and Employment Director); Maite Zubiaurre (Professor, Spanish, Portuguese and Germanic Languages, Associate Dean for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Humanities Division).

2 The Task Force considered several key stakeholder groups and their likely expectations: Students and potential students (quality education; fair admissions process; engaging campus life; research opportunities; career opportunities); Faculty and potential faculty (academic reputation; student quality); Staff and potential staff (opportunities for career growth; welcoming campus climate); UC Regents (academic excellence; California student access; fiscal responsibility); California Legislature (California student access; faculty and staff productivity; policy-relevant research); California Governor (California student access; faculty and staff productivity; policy-relevant research); U.S. Congressional Representatives and Senators (policy-relevant research); Underrepresented Communities (URM student access; welcoming campus climate; student, faculty and staff diversity; civic engagement); Community-based Organizations (civic engagement; policy-relevant research); Alumni Groups (academic access; academic reputation; civic engagement); Donors and potential donors (civic engagement; academic reputation); Media (access to researchers).

3 For an overview of the University of California’s unique history and mission with respect to the people of the state, see Pelfrey, Patricia A., 2004, A Brief History of the University of California, Regents of the University of California.
1. Revise UCLA Mission Statement.

What?

Founded as the Southern Branch of the University of California in 1919, UCLA has grown in less than a century to become one of the most renowned research universities in the world. The largest campus in the State of California today, UCLA is the only elite public university situated in a global city. UCLA’s mission statement should be revised to better reflect the campus’s unique status, in order to underscore the idea that community partnerships are absolutely essential to research, teaching and service at a special place such as this. The opportunity here is to reshape the culture at UCLA by more clearly articulating for campus stakeholders the strategic value of civic engagement.4 The biggest challenge will involve framing this statement in ways that uniquely resonate with UCLA’s brand, thus sufficiently distinguishing it from the statements of peer institutions.

Why?

This recommendation emerged from a recognition of the need to more clearly articulate the values undergirding UCLA’s civic engagement efforts and to infuse this understanding into the very structure of campus operations and, ultimately, campus culture.

UCLA’s current mission statement begins as follows: “UCLA’s primary purpose as a public research university is the creation, dissemination, preservation and application of knowledge for the betterment of our global society.”5 The issue of civic engagement is addressed directly in the fourth and final paragraph: “Civic engagement is fundamental to our mission as a public university. Located on the Pacific Rim in one of the world’s most diverse and vibrant cities, UCLA reaches beyond campus boundaries to establish partnerships locally and globally. We

4 This proposal uses the terms “civic engagement” and “community engagement” interchangeably. The meaning of the terms as used herein is fleshed out in a January 2012 article by University of Pennsylvania President Amy Gutmann about a Zócalo Public Square conference on what universities “should do for their cities.” The article summarizes insights from several scholars and university presidents about how universities can become more civically engaged: “They should avoid being monastic...They should do everything they can to fix urban America...They should improve the quality of life in their communities...They should apply their resources toward real community engagement...They should help prepare our cities for the future...They should help build civic infrastructure...They should make local engagement a strategic priority.”

seek to serve society through both teaching and scholarship, to educate successive generations of leaders, and to pass on to students a renewable set of skills and commitment to social engagement.”

Though affirming the importance of civic engagement, this statement fails to highlight the value of community-based knowledge and expertise and thus implies the primacy of a top-down, one-way flow of information from UCLA to its stakeholders. True partnerships depend upon the negotiation of a shared understanding of values, needs and preferred practices.

How?

To underscore this reality, UCLA’s mission statement should be revised to:

- Highlight the idea that meaningful community engagement is based on a bi-directional flow of information between campus and local communities;\(^6\)

- Avoid words like “outreach,” which implies a one-way flow of information and expertise, and affirm words like “partnership” and “collaboration;”

- Establish criteria for what does (and does not) meet the minimum standards for "civic engagement" in teaching, research and service, and underscore the ways in which this engagement is part of UCLA’s DNA;\(^7\)

- Ground the statement with references to UCLA’s unique history in the region and beyond.

When?

A diverse committee of campus stakeholders should begin the process of revising UCLA’s mission statement immediately, as a precursor to implementing this Task Force’s remaining recommendations.

\(^6\) For example, Syracuse University, which is widely recognized for its civic engagement activities, describes its “vision” as follows: “...[T]he University recognizes that its greatest strength is based on the interactive and collaborative nature of its many programs. Through active engagement with practitioners and communities around the world, Syracuse University faculty and students learn, discover, and create. We are dedicated to faculty excellence and scholarly distinction, attracting and supporting enterprising students, and a close interaction and engagement with the world — locally, nationally, and globally.” See, http://provost.syr.edu/faculty-manual/1-1-mission-and-vision/.

\(^7\) The University of Southern California, which receives considerable praise for its engagement in the region, frames its history as an institution in terms of key campus/community partnerships. See “Powered by a Commitment to Community,” https://communities.usc.edu/about/.
2. Create new Vice Chancellor (or Vice Provost) position and Office of Community Engagement.

What?

In an effort to infuse a holistic commitment to campus/community partnerships into the very structure of campus operations, a new office should be created to coordinate campus civic engagement efforts. The opportunity here is to leverage these efforts such that the overall impact is greater than the sum of individual campus initiatives, which should aid in raising public awareness of UCLA’s contributions on the civic engagement front. The biggest challenge will involve finding ways to establish reporting lines such that duplications of effort and related inefficiencies are minimized. For example, the relationship of the proposed new office to External Relations (particularly to Government and Community Relations) and Equity, Diversity and Inclusion will have to be fleshed out.

Why?

A review of UCLA’s administration organization chart reveals that there is currently no administrative position with either the reach or focus necessary for accomplishing the proposed coordination and support of civic engagement activities across such a broad range of campus stakeholders — students, faculty, administrators, and staff. Yet, there is a pressing need for precisely this type of coordination, packaging, and communication.

In March 2016, UCLA’s Brand survey found that the gap between alumni perceptions of the university and those of the general public was quite significant. While 64 percent of alumni perceived UCLA as an “excellent educational institution” and 76 percent felt “connected” to the campus, only 36 percent of the broader Los Angeles community rated UCLA as “excellent” and just 35 percent felt “connected” to it. Meanwhile, the survey also found that the general public takes it for granted that UCLA should contribute to the surrounding community and attract diverse students, faculty and staff. UCLA is diminished in the eyes of the general public to the extent that the campus fails to achieve these goals. For our alumni, however, the survey found that recognition of UCLA’s contributions to the surrounding community and to diversity is a considerable plus factor — as alumni awareness of these achievements increases, the campus’s distinction only grows in their eyes.

Chancellor Block has identified civic engagement as one of the campus’s four strategic initiatives, aligning UCLA with other universities throughout the nation that have affirmed the

---

8 There are 187,832 UCLA alumni residing in Los Angeles County.
9 An emerging civic engagement movement with respect to universities has generated a nascent literature on best practices, practical considerations, and philosophical underpinnings. One prominent work on civic engagement argues that “[t]he pursuit of knowledge itself
importance of nurturing partnerships with key community stakeholders. According to the Chancellor’s statement of priorities:

As a public university, UCLA must make a difference in the civic life of Los Angeles and positively impact people around the world. Through our students, faculty and staff, our campus already is deeply invested in this effort. Moving forward, we will bolster initiatives in community-based, applied and translational research—innovations that can be brought to the marketplace to improve the quality of life.

Reflecting this strategic priority, UCLA applied for and was successful in receiving the Carnegie Foundation’s 2015 Community Engagement Classification. But the letter notifying UCLA of this distinction highlighted four areas in need of attention with respect to state-of-the-art conceptions of university civic engagement:

- Developing adequate assessment practices;
- Emphasizing reciprocity and mutuality in community partnerships;
- Establishing faculty rewards for community engagement;
- Integrating disparate initiatives into more coherent campus community engagement efforts.

How?

In order to address the shortcomings identified in the Carnegie letter, the proposed Office of Community Engagement and new Vice Chancellor (or Vice Provost) position would:

- Keep an inventory of campus community engagement efforts, and undertake regular assessment of such efforts;
- Offer faculty development workshops on community engagement;
- Coordinate with Equity, Diversity and Inclusion to ensure that campus-based efforts align with and are informed by community partnerships;
- Coordinate with Government and Community Relations and participate in meetings with elected officials;


10 See https://www.chancellor.ucla.edu/priorities.

• Administer seed funding for student-, faculty- and staff-initiated campus/community partnerships;

• Establish a community advisory board to help keep the Office for Community Engagement in touch with stakeholder perspectives and priorities;

• Hold regular meetings with community stakeholders in order to track changing community needs and gauge the effectiveness of UCLA’s community engagement efforts;

• Work with Communications and Government and Community Relations to develop strategies that can positively influence community perceptions about the university;

• Identify those in Los Angeles who are doing inspirational work and help to establish partnerships with the university that could support those efforts in a variety of areas e.g., housing, environmental justice, education);

• Link undergraduate students with community organizations for internship opportunities, and make service learning integral to their education;

• Work with Deans to help form opportunities within their schools/divisions for engaged teaching and research, especially at the undergraduate level;

• Support Community Engagement Advisors in each school and/or division (based on Equity Advisor model). This would be a “point person” on the ground in each academic unit who is aware of existing community engagement work and positioned to support the development of new, meaningful engagement efforts.

When?

Within the next year, the new Vice Chancellor (or Vice Provost) position should be filled and the Office of Community Engagement established so that the remaining recommendations can be implemented.

Rewards and Incentives

3. Reward students, faculty, staff and administrators for contributions to campus civic engagement efforts.
What?

A consideration of contributions to campus civic engagement goals should be a prominent part of student, faculty, staff, and administrator performance evaluations. The opportunity here is to better integrate an appreciation for the importance of civic engagement into day-to-day campus activities, in ways that resonate with UCLA’s revised mission statement. The biggest challenges will revolve around defining clear and compelling metrics for evaluation and creating buy-in among the various campus stakeholders for changes to existing evaluation processes. 12

Why?

This recommendation emerged from the Task Force’s recognition that sustained, meaningful engagement with community partners will require a substantial commitment of time and energy on the part of UCLA students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Given that civic engagement is not currently defined as an integral activity for most of these campus stakeholders (despite the Chancellor’s existing strategic initiative on civic engagement), rewards must be established that incentivize either participation in new activities that contribute to the campus/community partnerships or the rethinking of existing activities so that they may do so as well. It should be noted that with respect to faculty, in particular, this recommendation addresses one of the areas identified by the Carnegie Foundation as in need of attention at UCLA when it awarded the campus with the 2015 Community Engagement Classification.

How?

The new Vice Chancellor (or Vice Provost) for Community Engagement, in collaboration with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel and the Center for Community Learning, will coordinate the review process for campus stakeholders.

For undergraduate students:

There is currently no requirement that students engage in service learning as a condition of their graduation from UCLA. UCLA’s existing Center for Community Learning should be relocated to the new Office for Community Engagement and enhanced so that the opportunity is provided for all students to meet a service learning requirement modeled after UCLA’s recently instituted diversity course requirement.

• Require all undergraduate students to successfully complete one service learning course.

12 For example, securing the support of the Academic Senate would be key to successfully implementing this recommendation with respect to faculty reviews. The Task Force recommends revisiting the successful campaigns for establishing the diversity course requirement and holistic review in undergraduate admissions at UCLA as models.
For graduate students:

• Recognize civicly engaged, graduate student research with seed funding.

For faculty:

There is currently no provision in the CALL that rewards faculty for contributions to the campus’s civic engagement goals. It should be noted that Syracuse University, considered a leader on the community engagement front, includes specific language in its tenure and promotion guidelines about how to assess faculty contributions in this area.¹³

• Amend CALL to include community engagement as one of the criteria for consideration in academic personnel reviews (as diversity was recently¹⁴);

• Review in a holistic fashion faculty community engagement projects that bring about specific results or that create particular resources for community partners;

¹³ Syracuse University guidelines identify civic engagement activities as a third category of intellectual productivity, placed on an equal footing with more conventional notions of “scholarly production” (i.e., publications) and “creative work.” The specific item on intellectual productivity reads as follows: “Departmental evaluative summary about the quality and quantity of (1) the candidate’s scholarly production, including specific comments about refereed publications that include (for monographs) the suitability of the press, how well known in the field and (for journals) rating in the field and acceptance rate; and the work’s impact on the field; and/or (2) creative work produced and the quality and suitability of the venues in which the work is presented and the impact on the audience and genre of production; and/or (3) public scholarship and engagement projects, including comments on the project’s significance, and its impact on the publics, communities, industries or other partners or audiences.” See, http://provost.syr.edu/faculty-support/teaching-research-and-service/tenure/. For a list of resources on principles for evaluating engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure reviews, see https://compact.org/resource-posts/trucen-section-b/#B,%20Rationales%20for%20Giving.

¹⁴ The CALL’s new diversity language, which could serve as a model, reads as follows: “The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population, or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.” See https://www.apo.ucla.edu/policies-forms/the-call/appendices/appendix-5-instructions-to-review-appraisal-committees.
• Reward faculty work that addresses complex local and regional issues equally with work that might have a more global reach;

• Reward faculty work that integrates inquiry and discovery with teaching and service;

• Reward faculty for teaching service learning courses;

• Recognize the excellence of creative work by faculty that connects across different domains of knowledge.

For administrators:

In order to align unit priorities and practices with broader campus goals concerning civic engagement, administrators should be held accountable for their efforts to promote campus/community partnerships within their units.

• Reward administrators in the review process for managing successful community engagement projects;

• Reward administrators in the review process for effectively establishing standards for customer service with respect to unit stakeholders.

For staff:

As a public institution “owned” by the people of California, UCLA has an obligation to establish and maintain high standards of customer service with respect to its multiple stakeholders. Staff should be rewarded for their efforts to contribute to a welcoming campus environment for their peers, which would serve as a model for how other campus stakeholders are to be treated. The idea that UCLA “is the best place to work” should be established as a cornerstone for a “Culture of Service” that frames how staff interact with stakeholders on campus and beyond.

15 For example, UCLA Enrollment Management recently established a set of “Blue & Gold” service standards that are meant to create the type of engagement with campus stakeholders that establish UCLA as a welcoming and responsive partner “owned” by the people of California. These standards include: Displaying welcoming behavior, including friendly body language, a smile, use of positive body language and tone, patience, and empathy (“Hospitable”); delivery of service in the same manner every time (“Consistency”); knowledge of service, processes, and options that are up-to-date and relevant to the individual’s needs and expressed with clarity (“Accuracy”); consistently accessible in person, on-line, or over the phone (“Availability”); within the established time frame, respond accurately and insightfully
• Reward staff for successfully meeting the community service and engagement standards set by their respective units.

For all campus stakeholders:

In order to remind campus stakeholders of the centrality of civic engagement to UCLA’s mission, and to present them with a menu of related best practices, periodic training of the sort currently offered for the issues of sexual harassment, conflicts of interest, and cyber security should be required.

• Provide required on-line training concerning the principles of community engagement and a culture of service.

When?

Efforts to implement this recommendation should begin immediately after UCLA’s mission statement has been revised, but within one year at the latest.

4. Provide incentives for existing and new campus/community partnerships to scale up.

What?

Funding should be made available to scale up innovative campus/community partnerships that clearly map onto established community needs and campus goals with respect to civic engagement. The opportunity here is to extend the university’s geographic footprint into underserved communities in ways that maximize visibility and impact, without having to build a satellite campus from the ground up. The biggest challenges include successfully identifying from among UCLA’s many campus/community partnerships the candidates best suited for scaling up, and committing a pool of funding for this initiative that is large enough to seed and maintain synergies between promising partnerships over time.

Why?

For decades, UCLA has supported hundreds of partnerships with community-based organizations throughout the Los Angeles region. These activities have been documented in a bi-annual directory produced by UCLA Government and Community Relations since shortly after the 1992 Los Angeles uprisings. For several years in the early 2000s, the UCLA in LA initiative sought to leverage these partnerships with seed funding. But the Office of UCLA-Community Partnerships, which administered the initiative, was eventually phased out, leaving the campus with no central entity to coordinate related activities in ways that might build giving guests and colleagues what they need, want, and what they may need (“Responsiveness”); being well organized and highly productive (“Efficiency”).
stronger partnerships with local communities. Though UCLA continues to support a myriad community-based projects throughout the region, neither the impact of these activities, nor public awareness of them, are what they could (and should) be.

How?

The new Vice Chancellor (or Provost), through the Office of Community Engagement, should:

- Establish an ongoing RFP program for new and existing campus-community partnerships to receive awards for enhancing off-campus activities and sites in ways that maximize impact for community partners and UCLA;

- Reward projects that epitomize the fundamental “bi-directional” flow of information characteristic of the best community engagement endeavors;

- Encourage two or more strong projects that would benefit from a location in a similar part of the city to work together in developing a larger, more visible overarching concept.16

When?

The new Vice Chancellor (or Vice Provost) should initiate the RFP process in Year 2 of the Office of Community Engagement.

Assessment

5. Regularly collect uniform data on campus/community partnerships.

What?

Clear evaluation metrics for engagement activities must be defined in partnership with community stakeholders so that the actual value of campus/community partnerships can be evaluated over time. Partnerships supported by the Office for Community Engagement and/or considered for community engagement “credit” in performance evaluations should be required to regularly collect data on their impact. The challenge will be establishing metrics uniform enough to facilitate reliable measurement across time but flexible enough to reflect the varying needs of different community partners.

16 For example, UCLA Extension and the Institute for Research on Labor and Employment (IRLE) already occupy facilities in downtown Los Angeles. A collaboration between these two entities could anchor a new, larger facility that would greatly increase UCLA’s presence and visibility downtown. Similar collaborations between existing campus/community partnerships could be supported in other underserved areas of the Los Angeles region in which UCLA lacks visibility.
Why?

The challenge UCLA faces with respect to increasing general public connectedness to the campus likely has less to do with the number of campus/community partnerships and more to do with the quality and visibility of these partnerships. Only by establishing a reliable set of metrics by which to evaluate the efficacy of existing campus/community partnerships can meaningful conclusions be reached about which partnerships should be prioritized for campus support and/or which partnerships would benefit from rethinking.

How?

The Office for Community Engagement should:

- Establish review protocols that facilitate the ongoing collection and input of data on the impact of campus/community partnerships.

- Conduct annual evaluations of campus/community partnerships based on key indicators emerging from established data collection protocols.

When?

The new Vice Chancellor (or Vice Provost) should establish assessment protocols in Year 2 of the Office of Community Engagement.

6. Feature bi-directional flow of information in all assessment protocols.

What?

An interactive data collection system capable of (near) real-time display of campus/community partnership outcomes must be developed, maintained and promoted to campus and community stakeholders. The opportunity here is to establish an accessible conduit for maintaining regular contact with campus partners so that the degree to which partnership activities are meeting community and campus needs can be assessed on an ongoing basis. The biggest challenges will be designing and funding the infrastructure necessary to host this system, as well as securing the regular input of meaningful assessment data by members of each partnership.
Why?

The dominant ideology of the academy, as one scholar put it, “runs counter to the civic engagement agenda.” That is, the academy’s valorization of specialized, expert knowledge routinely encourages a top-down flow of information that often misses the mark with respect to the issues that animate social life in our communities. An important corrective to this tendency is to ensure that we privilege a bi-directional flow of information in our campus/community partnerships so that the very questions asked have a better chance of providing solutions that align with our respective needs. Without a shared definition of problems, approaches, and benchmarks for success, meaningful assessments of whether our partnerships have made a difference will remain elusive.

How?

The Office of Community Engagement should:

• Devise evaluation metrics with ongoing input from community partners;

• Incorporate established evaluation metrics into faculty, administration and staff reviews (see above);

• Produce and promote simple and accessible "report cards" that address key dimensions of community engagement;

• Develop and maintain an interactive public accountability web portal that includes up-to-date information on the following: campus/community partnership outcomes/impact; student (undergraduate and graduate), faculty, administration, and staff diversity data; and student retention.

When?

The new Vice Chancellor (Vice Provost) should establish a public accountability web portal in Year 2 of the Office of Community Engagement.

---

17 See, John Saltmarsh, 2009, “Democratic Engagement White Paper,” http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1252&context=gse_pubs&sei-redir=1&referer=https%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Djohn%2Bsaltmarsh%2Benagement%2Band%2Bepistemology%26hl%3Den%26as_sdt%3D0%26as_vis%3D1%26oi%3Dscholart%26sa%3DX%26ved%3D0ahUKEwjju0qvR49HUAhVJlmMKHUGxB3oQgQMIIjAA#search=%22john%20saltmarsh%20engagement%20epistemology%22
Conclusion

The specific recommendations presented in this proposal are motivated by our Task Force’s conclusion that UCLA needs to 1) more effectively leverage and package the contributions of its existing campus/community partnerships in order to 2) enhance their impact and to 3) do a better job of telling its story as a civically engaged institution of higher learning in Los Angeles. UCLA’s success in realizing this goal, the Task Force concludes, will ultimately depend upon establishing an ongoing, bi-directional flow of information between campus/community partners that facilitates the identification of shared goals and reliable assessment metrics. It will also rest on UCLA’s ability to incentivize campus-based stakeholders to participate in civically engaged activities as a matter of course.