**Academic Engagement Ad Hoc Committee Meeting**

**4/26/2016**

**MINUTES**

*Members present:*  Jaclyn Canas (Arts & Sciences), Jessica Carrillo (Business), Sarah Dodd (Human Science), Claudia Cogliser (Graduate School), Kelley Coleman (International Affairs), Pat DeLucia (VPR), Jerod Foster (Media & Communications), Craig Morton (OPA), Otto Ratheal (World-wide e-learning),. Jill Hoffman (Museum?), Gary Elbow (Honors College), Robin Lock (Education), Laura Heinz (Libraries), Venki Uddameri (Engineering), Birgit Green (office of the Provost)

*Members absent:*  Dustin Benham (Law),Paul Frazier (Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement), Scott Longing (CASNR), Justin Louder (eLearning), Andrew Vernooy (Architecture), Jacqueline Henninger (Visual & Performing Arts), Steven Maxner (Vietnam Center), Nicky Ladkin (Museum).

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. Birgit Green provided the welcome followed by introductions. The committee then reviewed and approved the minutes from the meeting on 3/22/16. Green and Craig Morton from TTU’s Office of Planning and Assessment then provided an update on the status of Raiders Engaged 2016. Work on the annual assessment instrument had continued throughout the spring to enhance the usability and streamline data input. Morton highlighted the following improvements for the 2016 administration:

Under “geographic location” of projects, respondents will no longer have to identify specific counties in Texas that had been impacted by their project, but will be able to do so by simply clicking on a Texas map and specific regions in the state to identify the geographic impact area.

Respondents will also no longer have to go through a lengthy menu of organizations to identify their project partners. Instead, organizations will be categorized by type, such as “business & industry,” “non-profit,” ”K-12,” etc., and respondents will be able to simply click on the specific category that their partner organization falls under and select from a more condensed listing of organizations.

Green added that content improvements had also been made based on committee members’ feedback at its March meeting. Committee members proposed adding the category of “Economic Development” to the listing of various Forms of Engagement that respondents choose from. Steve Maxner further suggested to expand the listing of program examples under “Engaged Instruction - Noncredit Classes and Programs” to clarify that this Form of Engagement also encompasses conferences hosted at Texas Tech University.

Green added that the 2016 Raiders Engaged Survey is scheduled to open for input during the summer and will remain open for input until December. This will allow faculty and staff a longer time period to report data on their respective engagement activities. Morton clarified that the long term goal is to have the survey open all year round to allow respondents to input data on their activities as soon as a particular activity has ended. Venki Uddameri questioned whether Raiders Engaged would be integrated with Digital Measures. Morton confirmed that it was already integrated and that data entered into Raiders Engaged would automatically be loaded into Digital Measures. Faculty would then have a window of time to review and edit any information preloaded into Digital Measures by the Office of Planning and Assessment.

Green noted that as soon as Raiders Engaged 2016 was open for reporting, a message would go out to all TTU administrators and full time faculty and staff. She also noted that since filling out the survey was a voluntary process, members of the committee should try to encourage their colleagues to participate in the survey.

Each committee member then received a copy of the report of findings from the 2015 Raiders Engaged Administration. Morton clarified that the document was still being finalized and that the final copy of the report would be posted to the OPA website over the next week. Green added that she was also working on an e-mail to each college dean to provide them with a dashboard of their individual college-level data as well as a link to the final summary report. She noted that presentation of findings at Academic Council and Provost’s Council meetings were also planned.

Green then shared the draft of an Operating Policy for an Annual Awards program designed to recognize faculty, staff, students, and community partners for outstanding contributions to community engagement. There would be one award given in each category. Faculty would receive $2500, staff $1500 and less than those amounts would go to community partners and students. When asked about the funding source of these awards, Green noted that her budget would fund these awards. She asked the committee for feedback on the draft and whether these awards were similar to any other already existing TTU awards. The committee confirmed that there weren’t such awards in place. Green stated that her goal was to get the policy approved and implemented this fall, and launch the annual awards program in spring 2017.

Robin Lock suggested to consider pairing this award with Texas Tech’s annual Faculty Awards for Excellence in Teaching and Research program which recognizes award recipients during the annual Faculty Convocation held during the 1st week in May. Green agreed that the community engagement award would tie in very well with these recognitions since Engagement represents another aspect of research and teaching, specifically involving community partners in the process. Lock added that the faculty convocation always attracts a good crowd and that the inclusion of the Community Engagement awards in the awards ceremony would elevate the profile of community engagement at the institution and reflect its importance to the university. TTU staff, students and community partners would, however, need to be recognized in some other ceremony. Green proposed that staff awards could potentially be tied in with the “Distinguished Staff Awards” program administered annually by the Human Resources Department. Currently existing ceremonies that recognize students could be identified as well. Claudia Cogliser suggested the idea of an engagement banquet.

Green then asked the committee to take closer look at the O.P. draft for the Excellence in Community Outreach and Engagement Awards program and share any comments questions, or concerns. She specifically invited the committee’s feedback on the evaluation criteria, which provided a break-down of the awards categories. Jerod Foster commented that in the student category there might be a need to differentiate between graduate and undergraduate students. The committee agreed. Venki Uddameri then asked whether the student category applied only to individual students or also student organizations. Green clarified that this section currently was designed to recognize an individual student’s engagement work. Venki recommended to add a student organization category. Under the community partner category, Laura Heinz questioned whether there should be a differentiation between large organizations and local community partners. In response, Green asked whether there potentially needs to be a differentiation between international and local partners. Kelley Coleman mentioned that the Office of International Affairs administers an annual awards program to recognize faculty for international outreach. Pat DeLucia suggested that it might be helpful to look at the applications from the first submission cycle and then decide on specific subcategories for community partners.

Green next asked whether there were any specific needs for resources that are currently missing but would be useful to support faculty engagement. Gary Elbow stated that there are many, foremost missing are financial resources. Cogliser added the need for networking within the university, where the Office of Academic Engagement could act as a central unit to foster networking between university departments to prevent duplication of efforts. Robin mentioned that faculty might need help in grant proposal submissions that specifically focus on community outreach projects. Jill Hoffman underscored the need for information sharing to help proposers identify potential internal collaborators. She mentioned that the Museum on a recent grant proposal was not able to identify a potential internal collaborator for the grant. She observed that it would be helpful to have a directory where professors could register and submit their engagement projects. Green stated that the ultimate goal of the Raiders Engaged assessment was to create a searchable database of specific faculty, projects, or community organizations. However, she also noted that not all faculty members report in Raiders Engaged and, therefore, many of the engagement activities taking place across campus would not be captured in the database.

Moreover, the need for professional development programs was discussed. Committee members suggested a series of short seminars – face-to-face or in webinar format to address the basics of how to work with communities. The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation was mentioned as a model for promoting practices in working with communities to solve problems.

Lastly, Green shared her plans to provide information about the Office of Academic Engagement during New Faculty Orientation in August. She also informed the committee that this year, the K-12 Global Education Outreach Program at the Office of International Affairs was chosen as TTU entry for the national APLU W.K. Kellogg/C. Peter Magrath Awards.

Green lastly stated that there would not be any meetings of the committee during the summer and that the next meeting will take place in mid-September. She thanked everybody for their feedback and attendance. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

07/21/2016