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In this chapter, we present a comparative analysis of the case studies. These studies show that policies and practices at the national, regional, institutional (HEI) and community level will impact whether and how HEIs integrate CURPs into their mandates. All of the case studies, while coming from a diversity of socio-economic, political and cultural contexts, highlight the idea that for CURPs to succeed, governments’ and HEIs must support the ideas and philosophies of community engagement (CE) and community-based research (CBR). In addition, specific funding and knowledge sharing structures at all scales must be created that support this philosophical engagement.

We found that on the national scale in most countries, policies for higher education do not situate the contribution of higher education within the framework of socio-economic transformation. This impacts the readiness of HEIs to accept community engagement as part of their mandate. Inclusion of CE in national policies will encourage individual HEIs to adopt it, as has been shown in countries that have begun this formalization process.

In addition, national policy statements on CE often exclude the role of research, whereas other forms of engagement are more common. Some of the case studies show that national funding councils and schemes can encourage HEIs to integrate research into their community engagement.

We also observed that funding mechanisms often fail to incentivize principles of mutuality and co-construction of knowledge with communities, including valuing indigenous and practical knowledge. This may explain why the principle of mutuality is not always practiced in CE at HEIs. National or provincial networks that promote CBPR methodology in research can help address this issue. We suggest that governments can support the emergence of CURPs through targeted research funding, particularly that which emphasizes CBPR methodology.

At the HEI level, we found that several aspects of policy and practice facilitate the adoption of CURPs. This includes the clear institutionalization of practices
and criteria around funding. Leadership at HEIs plays an important role in these decisions and should be made aware of the importance of CURPs.

In addition, HEI structures such as Centres, Shops and Institutes play a critical role in CE. These structures include the human capacity to facilitate linkages inside and outside HEIs, and improve the visibility of CE efforts. However, while these structures do facilitate CE, they tend to be dominated by HEI administration. We feel that adopting co-governance practices with communities and civil society could strengthen their work.

Often led by the work of such centres and institutes, we found that several networking opportunities exist for HEIs. It also becomes clear that similar networks based in civil society are rare. Development of civil society networks could promote CE by providing collective voices, practical experiences and solidarity.

An important aspect of CE at HEIs is the provision of incentives. These take the form of awards, recognitions and accreditations, and can further incentivize CUE.

In terms of training, we feel it is problematic that centres and institutions actively promoting CUE, including CURPs, do not commonly provide for any systematic capacity building to their own staff. A critical form of training for CUE is to build student and researcher capacity in CBPR and mutual learning, yet most HEIs world wide do not focus on CBPR as an essential component of the broad CE framework. Learning to value local community knowledge as the basis on which new knowledge is developed is challenging for students and faculty in HEIs. Structured training in CBPR can facilitate such learning, and can help prepare both students and faculty to work in partnership with communities in an effective manner.

Although communities and CSOs are often a part of CBR projects at HEIs, they do not have access to the research funds allocated to the universities. As a result, civil society has to depend on its own skills of fund-raising and mobilization of local/national/international resources. This causes an erosion of capacity and resources in civil society and community. There is an urgent need to address this challenge in ways that enable civil society and community to work in partnership with universities to undertake joint research.

We conclude finally that recognition must be given to the overall importance of CE activities to the implementation of social responsibility at HEIs. As this area of concern emerges, there is also a need to disseminate the ideas widely, so they gain popularity, clarity and credibility.

We will now discuss these ideas and recommendations at greater length, drawing from the specific examples that emerged from the case studies.
CHAPTER 5 | Comparative Analysis

NATIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORKS

When overall policy frameworks at national/provincial levels position Higher Education (HE) as contributing to socio-economic transformation, there is greater readiness to accept community engagement (CE) as an integral part of the mandate.

In this volume, Lepore and Herrero suggest that Argentina’s education policy explicitly recognizes S-L (service learning) as an approach through which universities can bridge theory and practice, and integrate the extension, research and teaching functions that contribute to the university’s social responsibility and academic excellence. This policy focus resulted in three initiatives at the national level which aimed at developing and consolidating CURP structures and practices in HEIs. These are the national programs of S-L, the University Volunteers Program, and socio-technological development projects. The National Education Act incorporated two pillars of the S-L approach as key objectives of education policy: civic and academic participatory education and advanced learning goals, combined with conscious reflection and critical analysis (Lepore & Herrero). This policy focus on fostering social responsibility for social transformation has played a crucial role in the integration of S-L, as a form of CE, into the higher educational mandate in Argentina.

In Brazil, the ‘Citizen Constitution’ of 1988 promoted the rights to education, work and decent wages, and social security. It allowed public funds to be allocated to private, community, religious or philanthropic schools that link teaching, research and service to the community—called extensao (Tremblay et al., this volume). A constitutional focus at the universities played a key role in the integration of CE into the educational mandate of the HEIs. In addition, university extension services have been emphasized (Tremblay et al.). This illustrates the importance of a university’s mission to meet its social obligations and duties.

In Indonesia, Wardhani and Asri (this volume) explain that the higher education policies here have been very clear on the incorporation of community engagement as a part of regular HEI activities. The term Tri Darma Perguruan Tinggi points to the three obligations of higher education: education, research and community service. The community engagement focus of HEIs in Indonesia also comes out through the often used term Pengabdian Masyarakat—servitude towards the community.

In India, Singh and Tandon assert that a focus on HE as central to socio-economic transformation has been clear since independence. For instance, the most important post-independence document on education, the Kothari Commission Report (1964-66), called for the expansion of higher education to meet the requirements of the nation, as well as the social ambitions and expectations of the people. The National Policy on Education in 1986 aimed not only on developing human power for serving the economy, but also on developing crucial values (Singh & Tandon). The focus on HE as key to overall development
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also extended to the structuring of the Five Year Plans (FYP) in India. The 12th FYP (2012-2017) proposed to further the quality of higher education by strengthening community engagement in HEIs, and promoting social responsibility. For this purpose, a National Initiative to Foster Social Responsibility in Higher Education would be launched.

Although Jordan has a strong education policy, there is no official strategy towards CURPs. The Law on Higher Education and Scientific research states that HE aims to support scientific research which aims at community service and development, and to create an institutional link between the public and private sectors, and institutions of higher education (Feinstein & Rabai, this volume).

Luescher-Mamashela et al. (this volume) suggest the promotion of CURPs in South African must be seen in terms of the mandate of HEIs to respond to the social, political and economic transformation of post-apartheid society. For example, the National Research Foundation established a number of funded South African Research Chairs (SARChI) dealing with matters of social responsibility in higher education. The higher education policies in South Africa saw overall development of the society as being one of the important objectives of higher education. This, as a result, led to easy and effective integration of CE, in the HEI mandate, as an important criterion for fostering social responsibility.

In Uganda, the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act (UOTIA) of 2011 requires universities to include in their teaching and research programs solutions to social and economic problems in the community (Openjuru, this volume). This positions HE as important to socio-economic development, and mandates them to include some attention to the community in relation to curriculum. While the nationwide student field attachment policy is implemented by all private and public universities, the Act does not mandate HEIs to incorporate CE in the regular course curriculum, nor does it lay down any specific monitoring or evaluation mechanisms.

In this context, it is interesting to note that the European and the North American policies remain silent on this front. In the UK there is an emphasis on public engagement in research with no overarching policy mandate on higher education. In the U.S., there are no clear policies on higher education or community engagement, with the exception of Land Grant Universities (LGU) which have created vast numbers of community-university partnerships. These CURPs usually follow extension methodology, but sometimes implement CBR principles that use a co-constructed framework (Tryon et al., this volume). In Canada, higher education is a provincial government mandate, not federal. This has placed the Association of Universities & Colleges in Canada (AUCC) in a crucial agenda setting role through which they have encouraged their members to deepen community partnerships (Brown et al., this volume).

We conclude that national policies for higher education in most countries do not necessarily situate the contribution of higher education within the framework of socio-
economic transformation. Where public policies embed HEIs in national reconstruc-
tion efforts, readiness to accept CE as an integral part of the functioning of HEIs is
demonstrated. CE is then viewed as one of the vehicles through which such roles for
HEIs can be realized.

NATIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORKS

Explicit inclusion of CE in national policy is a more recent phenomenon in
most countries and it encourages HEIs to institutionalize CE.

In Argentina, S-L learning goals have been explicitly included in legal and
normative frameworks of HEIs since the early 2000s. The economic, social and
political crisis of 2001 saw increased efforts to engage education institutions with
community partners (Lepore & Herrero). Solidarity Education (Edusol) encour-
gaged community services and the institutionalization of CE in HEIs. The Edusol
program also played a crucial role in the enactment of the National Educational
Act in 2006, which sees the S-L approach as one of the key objectives of educa-
tional policy.

In Brazil, the concept of extensao refers to the linking of teaching, research
and service to the community. The Brazilian Educational Law (1996) states that
HEIs should develop extension activities alongside teaching and research. These
extension services have been emphasized with the National Forum of Extension’s
of Vice-Chancellors of Brazilian Public Universities (Tremblay et al.). The Citizen
Constitution of 1988 also calls for universities to develop extension policies as well
as institutional frameworks to facilitate their involvement with communities.

The institutionalization era for CBR in Canada was from 1998 to 2012, fol-
lowed by the current national engagement period. It began with the Canadian
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council’s (SSHRC) Community-
University Research Alliances (CURA) funding which was inspired by the partici-
patory research traditions and the Dutch Science Shop movements of the late 70s
& 80s. As Canadians have institutionalised community-based research, they have
drawn on practices from other parts of the world as well as developed their own
home-grown strategies of CUE. An important national space for CURPs is the
Community University Exposition or CUExpo. Many institutions have adopted
the language of community engagement including Simon Fraser University. The
University of Victoria launched the first Office of Community Based Research in
English speaking Canada in 2006 and has continued to build the institutional
infrastructure to support this work (Brown et al.).

In Indonesia, although community engagement activities can be traced back
to independence in 1945, it was only in the 1980s that the state obligated the HEIs
to run village adoption programs. In the beginning, the meaning of the term CE
encompassed a varied number of community service activities or extension pro-
grams. However, around the year 2000, the meaning narrowed to programs that
initiate or drive social change as well as solve problems in community using a
partnership approach. Such community service activities in Indonesia have been institutionalized nationally under a structure known as *Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat* (Institute of Research and Community Engagement).

In India, the focus on HE as a contributor to overall national development culminated with it being incorporated as a crucial element in the 12th Five Year Plan. Following this, the Planning Commission set up a Sub-Committee on “Strengthening Community Engagement in Higher Education”, whose recommendations led to the UGC scheme on fostering community-university engagement in HEIs in 2014.

In Ireland, there are three national level policy instruments that have played a crucial role in envisioning community engagement as an important component of the academia. They are the National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030, the Higher Education System Performance Framework 2014-2016, and the University Act. The policy vision in Ireland broadly offers support for Community Based Research (CBR). However, there is no requirement for CBR practices to be implemented within the HEIs, or for designated funding for supporting such efforts.

The policy environment in South Africa changed after the first phase of post-apartheid higher education restructuring drew to a close. The South African Council on Higher Education became a key driver in the process of conceptualizing and promoting community engagement, and the National Research Foundation (NRF) launched a community engagement funding program in 2010. At almost the same time, the Department of Science and Technology created the Community University Partnerships Program, while the Minister of Science & Technology established a review committee for developing strategies for the advancement of social innovation. In addition to this, since 2009 the Department of Higher Education & Training has been focusing on the inclusion of social responsibility and community engagement as one of its policy instruments.

In conclusion, while several national policies on HE have included a general reference to societal good, explicit inclusion of mandates for CE is a relatively recent phenomenon. As international recognition for CE has been gaining momentum, many countries and HEIs have begun to formalize policies for CE.

**HEI POLICIES**

Policy statements on CE in HE do not mention research explicitly; in its absence, other forms of engagement are more common.

In Argentina, institutional practices that promote community-university partnerships (CURP) in HEIs of Argentina are commonly framed within the pedagogical approach known as Service-Learning (S-L) (Lepore & Herrero). This is a form of experiential education in which the students engage in organized service activity that addresses varied community needs, and also reflect on it to achieve the desired learning outcomes, and an enhanced sense of personal value and civic
responsibility. These authors suggest that S-L is a key mechanism for engaging faculty and students with community partners.

As per the Citizen Constitution enacted in 1988 in Brazil, the HEIs have adopted the concept of extensao, a process that establishes the integrated relationship between university and society. In accordance with the Brazilian Educational Law and the National Forum of Extension’s of Vice-Chancellors of Brazilian Public Universities, the HEIs deliver extension services as a primary function of providing practical experience to the students (Tremblay et al.).

CE activities in Canada are broadly manifested under the umbrella of community based research (CBR), which explicitly provides for joint research with the communities for mutual benefits. As per its Canadian definition, CBR is a research methodology which is community situated, collaborative, and action-oriented. The process and results are designed to be useful to community members in making positive social change and promoting social equity (Brown et al.). CBR in Canada also tends to embrace the principles of OCAP (Ownership, Control, Access and Possession).

The Indonesian case presents one of the few examples wherein community engagement explicitly includes the term ‘research’. The nationwide institutionalized structure for community engagement is known as Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian. In some HEIs, research is separated from community service through the establishment of both a Lembaga Pengabdian Masyarakat (Institute of Community Engagement) and Lembaga Penelitian (Institute of Research) (Wardhani & Asri).

The latest policy level developments in India have provided a fresh focus to social responsibility and community engagement in universities. The UGC’s latest scheme provides for the establishment of a Centre for Fostering Social Responsibility and Community Engagement in Universities. This provides an overarching framework which includes service learning, participatory research, and knowledge dissemination/transfer (Singh & Tandon).

In South Africa, a number of common elements that characterize community engagement have been identified. These include research oriented forms such as participatory action research and community-based research, and teaching oriented forms such as service learning, clinical service, continuing education courses, and the collaborative production of popular educational materials. All operate at local, regional, national and sectorial levels. Therefore, according to Luescher-Mamashela et al., research partnerships between communities and universities have a high profile in South African public higher education.

In Uganda, the absence of broad national policies allows HEIs to create their own policy guidelines for CUE. Accordingly, most universities include CUE in their mission statements (Openjuru). Often known as the “third mission” in the language of engagement, community outreach takes the form of undertaking
research and community development projects in the community, and of developing relationships with external stakeholders in industry and commerce. Beyond this, universities such as Makerere University describe CUE in terms of knowledge transfer, partnership, and networking. Here, knowledge production and transfer between the university and the community is considered a two-way process which calls for a closer collaboration between the two actors. This follows the school of thought that regards both the communities and the universities as knowledge generators and knowledge recipients.

In the UK, a fresh and renewed focus was given to public engagement in research in 2008 through the “Beacons for Public Engagement” initiative. It provided for the capacity building of institutions, creating networks within and across institutions, and enabling HEIs to test different methods of supporting public engagement. According to the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE), public engagement is the myriad ways in which higher education and research can be shared with the public. Engagement is by definition a two-way process with the goal of generating mutual benefit (Duncan & Manners, this volume).

From these examples, we conclude that CE is being prioritized differently in different contexts. Most CE efforts focus on students’ learning opportunities, sometimes with credit, and often without. A common practice in CE is extending the knowledge and expertise of HEIs to nearby villages and slums, based on the assumption that such extension efforts will benefit the community. Unless explicitly mandated and resourced, research activities do not readily become a part of CE efforts in most HEIs. It appears to be a common assumption amongst HEIs that knowledge production is entirely an ‘in-house’ activity.

FUNDING FOR RESEARCH

Where explicit focus on research in CE is encouraged through funding councils/schemes, HEIs include research as a part of community engagement plans/activities.

The main source of research funding for HEIs in Brazil has been through the National Secretariat for Science and Technology along with several agencies under the secretariat. In addition, the federal government in Brazil has substantially increased programs and investments in innovation. As a result, there has been an increase in business dynamics in this field and greater interaction between universities, private industry and civil society (Tremblay et al.). Such agencies and mechanisms, by providing research support, play an important role in incentivizing HEIs to integrate research in their community engagement activities. Tremblay et al. discuss the incubator model, which is a hybrid organization supporting interactions between university, industry and government. A premise of this model is that research and teaching activities should contribute to economic and social development as well as to the education of students and advancement of knowledge.
In Canada, the creation of Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Community University Research Alliances (CURA) funding window created a foundation of engaged scholarship. Funding agencies in Canada such as SSHRC helped to create a favorable policy climate for mainstreaming community based research and institutionalizing partnership principles. SSHRC recognized that if social sciences and humanities research was to have the most impact, community groups, businesses and academics would have to find new ways to work across disciplines and sectors (Brown et al.). In 2014, SSHRC made $337 million worth of grants to 8674 projects. Two federal granting councils, the National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) have also been making progress towards engaged scholarship.

Jordan experiences low academic research output, especially in the social sciences, despite being renowned in the Arab world for its education standards and efforts to develop a knowledge economy. The absence of cohesive strategies contributes to the low level of academic research, as does an emphasis on applied science research over social science (Feinstein and Rabai). Apart from the absence of a research culture, the prevailing conditions in the country and region, such as an ongoing refugee crisis, diminishes the scope for community engagement and CURPs.

The National Research Foundation (NRF) in South Africa is mandated to promote and support research in HE. This includes objectives to facilitate the co-creation of new knowledge in CBR projects by providing funding to emerging and established researchers. The NRF established a number of funded South African Research Chairs (SARChI) dealing with matters of social responsibility in higher education. This suggests an explicit focus on research in community engagement initiatives in the South African HE policy (Luescher-Mamashela et al.).

In the UK, the NCCPE has made efforts to broaden the range of public engagement. A consortium of research funders came together to develop a “Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research”. In 2001, the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) was established to provide funding to universities to facilitate the exploitation of research (Duncan & Manners). Although bulk of this funding is directed towards industrial/commercial activity, community activities and public engagement have also been supported. Additionally, the UK Research Councils have been involved in funding the “Catalysts for Public Engagement”, under which universities have been funded to embed strategic support for public engagement. The UK research funding uses a ‘dual support’ system which involves regular retrospective assessment exercises conducted by the HE funding councils, who then provide institutions with a block grant on the basis of the performance in the last assessment period. In parallel, the Research Councils have competitive funding available to universities (Duncan & Manners).

In the Netherlands all universities are public and obtain their core funding from the national government. These universities then fund individual engage-
ment efforts between the universities and the communities. Additional funds are available from research councils and governments, companies and the European Union. Community contributions are also pursued if the costs of a particular project surpass that of a regular student project. In some cases, subsidies can be obtained by the university or the community organization (Mulder & Straver, this volume). This window for research funding opens avenues for the universities to integrate CURPs as part of their broader community engagement agenda.

In federally funded research in the U.S., the academic granting mechanisms revolve around two major players: the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institute for Health (NIH). Since 1997, the NSF has placed increased importance to community outcomes by using a review process that incorporates intellectual merit and broader benefits to society (Tryon et al.). Recent NSF grant proposal guidelines follow a translational approach towards the recognition of community knowledge, and a desire for funding proposals which include participatory research.

These cases illustrate that research-based community engagement is encouraged by funders as a distinctive part of CE in HEIs. In some cases, community-based participatory research methodology as a driver of such CE, is explicitly recognized. This legitimizes the use of CBPR methodology in research partnerships between communities and HEIs.

FUNDING FOR PRINCIPLES OF MUTUALITY AND INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE

Principles of mutuality and co-construction of knowledge with communities, and valuing indigenous and practical knowledge, are not explicitly incentivized in funding mechanisms.

The broad funding mechanisms and agencies providing funding grants in Brazil have been mainly aimed at increasing business dynamics in this field and have resulted in greater interaction between the university, private industry and civil society. Although networking between different actors has been achieved, incentivizing mutuality with the community has been underemphasized. In the process to achieve larger gains, the funding mechanisms have neglected the essence of research partnerships between the universities and the communities, which is the sense of mutuality and co-construction of socially relevant knowledge. Similarly, the NRF in South Africa does not explicitly support community engagement, although it does offer adequate assistance to community based research projects.

While the NSF granting facility in the U.S. tends to encourage community-based participatory research, it does not explicitly incentivize the mutuality or the co-creation of knowledge. It is important to recognise this general trend which cuts across funding agencies and funding mechanisms, in which the principle of mutuality and the importance accorded to indigenous knowledge in
CBR/CBPR processes tends to be overlooked. According to Tryon et al., despite institutional structures or centres labeling themselves ‘community-based’, only a small percentage reported that research challenges originated in the community.

In contrast, the basis of consideration for SSHRC-CURA funding in Canada is the co-construction of knowledge produced from alliances of university and community based scholars (Brown et al.).

In the Netherlands, the community engagement carried out in research is mostly done as commissioned or co-operative research. At the University of Groningen, the key provision to enable community based research is the Science Shops. Some individual projects have engagement built in, such as some projects of the Science & Society Group and the Energy Academy Europe. Even though there is no obligation to work with community organizations, the Law on Higher Education is used as a justification for cooperative research. Moreover, the Dublin Criteria supports community-based research as part of the curricula. Since the Science Shop model is based on the premise of co-operative research, done with and for community organizations, it can be said that the principle of mutuality is given attention. Also, the Wageningen UR approach favours participation of civil society and other societal partners in research projects executed by its researchers.

The Connected Communities funding program in the UK was launched by the Research Councils in 2010, and is led by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC). The vision for the program is to connect research, stakeholders, and communities (Duncan & Manners). The program supports research across a number of core themes including community health and wellbeing, creative and digital communities and civic engagement and social innovation. It provides an example of funding councils giving adequate importance to the crucial parameter of mutuality in community based research projects.

We conclude that the critical question in all research engagements with communities is the actual practice of co-construction of knowledge. In most examples, the principle of mutuality is not necessarily required or adhered to in practice. Greater attention needs to be paid to making research partnerships mutually beneficial and co-constructed.

NETWORKS FOR KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND MONITORING

National platforms for knowledge sharing and regular monitoring of CE with focus on research generate greater momentum at national/provincial levels.

In Canada, there are five national networks that support CBR efforts: Research Impact; the Community Engaged Scholarship Partnership; the Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning and Community Based Research Canada (CBRC). CBRC, in particular, has been playing a strong role in harnessing research resources and assets to build collaborative research partnerships. It also organizes biennial gatherings of the national CBR commu-
nity—the CUExpos, which offer opportunities to share practices and ideas, meet funders and promote learning. CUExpos have been a key part of the CUE movement in Canada (Brown et al.).

In Indonesia, many faculty members running community engagement programs have recognized the need for interaction and networking with different universities. There are 27 regional fora for community engagement practitioners, which are referred to as *Forum Layanan Ipteks bagi Masyarakat* (FlipMas). In November 2014, the UI also co-organized the 2nd Asia Engage Regional Conference for scientists, ASEAN universities, and community engagement practitioners. It provided a collaborative environment to present and discuss issues relating to community empowerment in ASEAN, Asia and beyond. Such platforms for knowledge sharing play an important role in furthering the cause of community engagement and providing it with further momentum. Evaluation processes for such programs are an integral process of community engagement initiatives in Indonesia. Every year, the university conducts monitoring and evaluation programs during site visits. The university representatives would take feedback from the community, and the feedback is discussed with the reviewers and the program evaluated accordingly. Such monitoring mechanisms play an important role in establishing the credibility of such CE activities amongst the community.

New policies in India have mentioned the need for an Alliance for Community Engagement (ACE) which would function as a platform for sharing and learning amongst universities, practitioners and community activists. It is also being proposed that a national Centre for CE be set up to support the functioning of the Alliance.

Although there are no monitoring mechanisms in India to ensure community engagement in universities, one of the latest initiatives at the policy level streamlines this process in academic circles. The Ministry of Human Resources Development has a scheme on national university rankings for HEIs in India. This ranking scheme will include a university’s social contribution and responsibility as a crucial parameter. The idea is to devise more relevant rankings beyond the usual focus on international students/research collaborations, and publications (Singh & Tandon).

Although legal frameworks in the Netherlands do not provide for monitoring mechanisms, the universities are expected to come up with indicators for measuring “valorization”. This term denotes the creation of added economic and/or societal value from research (Mulder & Straver). In the coalition signed by Dutch universities (VSNU) and the Deputy Minister of Research in 2012, it was agreed that universities will develop indicators for measuring effort/input and results/impact of valorization in an open and experimental form. This will make “impact” measurable, thereby legitimizing and incentivizing engagement.

In South Africa, new regulations for annual institutional reporting require the university councils to report on how public HEIs positively and negatively impact the economic life of the community in which they operate. Some of the substan-
tive matters are the inclusion of stakeholders, innovation, fairness, collaboration, and social transformation (Luescher-Mamashela et al.).

The publication of the 2007 *Warry Report* in the UK played a role in triggering a major shift in the UK research policy from looking at how relatively small scale investments in innovation funding might trigger greater knowledge exchange, to questioning the extent to which the total research budget and infrastructure was delivering social and economic value as well as academic excellence. Prior to this, mainstream research funding was based on academic excellence, assessed by peer review. The report recommended a major shift in which all research funding would include considerations of social and economic impact (Duncan & Manners).

In terms of measuring the impact of CE activities, the new Research Excellence Framework (REF) retrospectively assesses the quality of a research units’ work, including an assessment of the impact of the research beyond academia. This is a radical departure from the former practices which focused only on the quality of the research outputs as judged by academic peers. Such mechanisms have brought community engagement into the mainstream of university research cultures.

PACEC outlines a conceptual framework for the different ways in which university knowledge and research contributes to communities, one of which is knowledge networks and diffusion, through, for example, holding events that bring academics and external organizations together to share ideas and knowledge (Duncan & Manners). This provides for greater stimulation and momentum to community engagement efforts at the national/international levels.

*It becomes clear that research networks as well as regular monitoring can stimulate greater mutuality between communities and HEIs in designing and conducting research. Such networks and monitoring can influence the practices of individual HEIs, and provide exemplars of good practices in the co-construction of knowledge in research partnerships.*

**ROLE OF GOVERNMENTS**

*When government asks for annual reports and creates a focal office on CE to support and monitor progress, practices get institutionalized in HEIs.*

This is best illustrated in the case of Indonesia, where the government has instituted a full-fledged directorate of research and community engagement, through which the government provides Community Engagement Grants (CEGs). This focused approach of the national government in Indonesia has played a role in getting community engagement institutionalized in HEIs. Additionally, there is a plan in the future for decentralization of community engagement programs. The HEIs would manage funds provided by the government for their community engagement programs. For this purpose, the HEIs would be required to submit a Community Engagement Master Plan, which will then determine the amount of funds received. Along with this, all HEIs which
are recipients of the CEGs from the government would be required to submit progress and final reports.

Similarly in India, a new UGC scheme has provided for the establishment of a centre to oversee community engagement activities. This will also encourage institutionalization of scattered pieces of community engagement work by bringing them under one framework. The UGC also includes monitoring mechanisms and has requirements to submit annual progress reports. Such monitoring mechanisms help to ensure the proper institutionalization of practices and activities.

In South Africa, the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) has followed up on the 1997 White Paper commitments and considerations on how to include social responsibility and community engagement as part of policy instruments. The new regulations for annual institutional reporting to the Ministry include requirements for university councils to report on how public HEIs impact the communities in which they operate (Luescher-Mamashela et al.). Whether this reporting will eventually lead to the development of indicators that can inform funding decisions remains to be seen.

In the UK, the main governmental policy instrument is the Beacons for Public Engagement (Duncan & Manners). This instrument has played a key role in integrating public engagement in research into the higher education agenda. It was a unique attempt by the national research funders to address cultural and professional issues cutting across a wide range of research areas.

From these examples, we suggest that if ministries of higher education at national or provincial levels have a nodal unit and/or officer focusing on CE, the institutional responses from HEIs are more direct and timely. If such a nodal officer and/or unit requires regular reports from HEIs supported by government, then it is likely that production of documents related to CE will increase. In the absence of such a requirement, HEIs do not necessarily produce annual reports and responsive documentation.

FUNDING SCHEMES FOR CE

Separate and explicit funding schemes for CE in research enable use of resources in building CURPs at institutional levels.

In Canada, the creation of the SSHRC-CURA granting facility marked the beginning of institutionalization of CBR. The focus has been the partnership between the university and the non-university actors in facilitating CBR, wherein the both the actors are eligible to apply for funds, although in most cases the university partner provides administrative support (Brown et al.). This focused funding support has resulted in stipulated resources for building CURPs at the institutional level. Examples are the Service aux collectivities (SAC) at UQAM and the Office of the Community Based Research (OCBR) at the University of Victoria. Both have utilized the designated funding for CBR projects and building capacities.
In South Africa, the key national policy actors in community engagement policy and strengthening community-university partnerships is the Department of Science & Technology (DST) and the National Research Foundation (NRF) (Luescher-Mamashela et al.). Such focused funding towards CBR generates momentum for the overall community engagement framework, thereby strengthening the institutional structures in the various HEIs.

In the UK, designated funding for public engagement in research via the channel of UK Research Councils and the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) have helped to consolidate engagement activities across the HEIs, along with contributing to the institutional structures. An example is the UK Community Partner Network, which launched in 2013 following a consultation with community based organizations working with universities.

In Ireland, the national Higher Education Authority awards statutory funding for community based research and other areas aligned to civic engagement. One such initiative has been Campus Engage, which has been promoting civic engagement in general, CBR, and other research partnerships. Statutory funding was also offered to the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT) to develop the Community Learning Program (CLP) (McIlrath, this volume). Philanthropic funding has also been used to establish the Community Knowledge Initiative at the National University of Ireland, Galway, which has allowed for the mainstreaming of civic engagement (McIlrath).

We conclude that incentivising CURPs requires targeted funding, and that research funding to HEIs can be an effective vehicle for the promotion of CURP. Further, inclusion of CBPR methodology as an approach to research by HEIs can support the emergence of CURPs.

FUNDING AT THE HEI LEVEL

Decentralised allocation of resources at the HEI level from pooled funds to universities do not get adequately channeled to CURPs. In the absence of clear institutionalization of practices and criteria these allocations and priorities remain dependent on the top leadership of HEIs.

In Argentina, the federal education framework directly regulates the HEIs that depend on the national government, while the provincial HEIs are covered under provincial jurisdiction. Therefore, the Ministry of Education does not provide public universities a specific budget for S-L (Lepore & Herrero). Interestingly, these funds are administered by the Ministry of Science and Technology, and not the Ministry of Education.

In Brazil, although broad research funding comes from the National Secretariat of Science and Technology, focused allocation of funds for CE activities at the HEI level is missing. For instance, in the University of Sao Paulo, funding of CUE activities has been a major challenge. Although efforts are made to secure funding
through the local governments, not many projects are funded through this channel. On the other hand, in the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, the case study talks about the funding received by ITCP from the FINEP and Fundacao Banco do Brasil. Therefore, it is quite evident that in the absence of focused allocations, and institutionalization of practices, allocation and priorities remain dependent on the university leadership.

In Canada, the provinces fund higher education. Additional funding sources include partnership grants by SSHRC, grants by community foundations, and two other federal granting councils (National Science and Engineering Research Council & Canadian Institutes of Health Research). However, the funding received from SSHRC-CURA granting facility remains focused on targeted priority areas under CBR/CURPs.

In India, funding is received mostly through the channel of the grants provided by the UGC to the recipient universities. The latter then decides on issues related to fund disbursement towards different CE activities. However, a bright pointer in the Indian case has been the newly launched UGC Scheme, which provides focused funding towards development of CURPs. Additionally, the scheme clearly outlines the criteria for fund disbursement, which includes evaluation and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that the funds are used for the stipulated purpose.

Similarly, in Indonesia, the government provides funding through the channel of National Community Engagement Grant (CEGs), managed by the Directorate General of Higher Education (DGHE), Ministry of Education and Culture. These funds are disbursed via institutional structures at the universities, such as the Directorate of Research and Community Engagement at the University of Indonesia (UI) and the Institute of Research and Community Engagement at the University of Gadjah Mada (UGM).

In Ireland, individual institutions are required to allocate funding for CE initiatives. However, the Science Shop at Queen’s University, Belfast has been funded by the Department of Employment and Learning through the Higher Education Innovation Funding Scheme (McIllrath). In the Netherlands, funding for CE activities is received from university budgets, which are funded by the government.

In Jordan, the Deanship of Academic Research at the University of Jordan and the Deanship of Scientific Research and Graduate Studies at Yarmouk University are primarily responsible for the management and funding of research projects. However, the funds available often prove to be inadequate. Apart from this, bureaucratic problem results in long delays in getting funds for the projects. This is a clear example of mismanagement of funds in the absence of institutionalization of activities and practices.

In South Africa, the National Research Foundation (NRF) launched the community engagement funding program in 2010. Although the stipulated funds are disbursed to the universities under the broad framework of CE, they are not
adequately channeled to the specific CURPs. Absence of clear cut allocations and priority areas under this overarching framework, results in the funds being utilized in an unfocussed manner, and as determined by the university leadership. At the university level, the UCT has seed funding for supporting new CE initiatives, such as the Vice-Chancellor’s Strategic fund. Further, the University Council also allocates funds for coordinating partnerships between internal and external stakeholders. Similarly, Rhodes University provides *Sandisa Imbewu* (Growing the seed) funds for CE activities. In both South African universities, the institutional structures depend on seed funding from the universities. The disbursement of funds then depends on the top leadership of the universities, and the designated officials sitting in the Social Responsiveness Committee in UCT and Community Engagement Management Committee in Rhodes University. Therefore, the approach may be considered decentralized yet within an enabling environment.

In Uganda, the limited public funding available for community-university engagement activities is primarily through a presidential initiative. Additional government funding is provided for field attachment activities of government sponsored students. Other than this, the funding available for research is mostly decentralized at the university level.

In the UK, research funding towards CURPs is invested using a ‘dual-support’ system, involving assessment exercises conducted by HE funding councils, who then provide a performance based block grant to institutions. In parallel, research councils run a competitive funding round to which universities can bid. The Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) also provides funding to universities. The funding provided by the councils is, however, focused and remains targeted towards funding public engagement in research.

*In many countries, decisions about application of resources to CE activities in general, and research partnerships in CE in particular, are designed to be made at the level of HEIs. In such cases, allocation of scarce funds to CE depends a great deal on institutional leadership. What proportion of that CE budget is utilized for CURP is even more difficult to determine. Leadership of HEIs can make that happen if they see the value of CURP.*

**HEI STRUCTURES**

**HEI level structures that enable building of CE across the disciplines/faculties.**

In Argentina, at the Universidad Catolica de Cordoba (UCC), outreach activities were institutionalized with the Secretary of University Outreach & Social Responsibility (SUOSR). Along with the Research Secretary, SUOSR has also established an evaluation system to assess the relevance of S-L projects submitted by faculty members (Lepore & Herrero). The Centre depends on the Rector’s office, a subordinate position which limits the Centre’s decision making capacity and scope. It is left with fewer possibilities to formalize and institutionalize CURP.
practices within the university. The Service Centre integrates the S-L initiatives presented by UNGS professors that have an impact on training, technical assistance and research.

In Brazil, CUE activities at the University of Sao Paulo are coordinated by the Office of the Dean of Culture and University Extension, under the Vice-Chancellor’s Office. Its objective is to foster CUE through research and outreach activities. This office is mandated to organize, strengthen and regulate community-oriented activities within all faculties. Joint projects between the community and the university are undertaken by different faculties. The Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) in Brazil has a strong institutional commitment to civic engagement with the Dean of Extension reporting to the VP for academic affairs (Tremblay et al.).

In Canada, at the University of Victoria, CURPs are institutionalized with the creation of the Office of the Community Based Research (OCBR), which enjoys an important institutional status within the university. Additionally, a new research centre, the Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement (ISICUE), plays the role of a ‘think-tank’ to extend the work of OCBR, nurture innovation in community based research and to study community engagement. OCBR builds capacities for CURPs, with an objective to enhance the quality of life and economic, environmental and social well-being of communities. On the other hand, ISICUE networks with other research centres and community partners and helps build capacities and collaborative initiatives. It seeks to develop insights into the practices of community engagement and to support regional, national and global networks.

At the Université du Québec à Montréal in Canada, The Service Aux Collectivities (SAC) builds capacities for CURPs. Additionally, a Board of Community Services provides recommendations on CUE and evaluates research and training projects for institutional support (Brown et al.).

In India, the Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishwavidyalaya has institutionalized community engagement initiatives through a formal operational structure known as the Centre for Society University Interface & Research (CSUIR). It functions as an independent and stand-alone unit in the university. This centre reports directly to the Vice-Chancellor.

Another Indian university, the Gauhati University’s Department of Political Science had institutionalized a structure known as the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, as the main co-ordinating channel which oversees a number of community engagement initiatives. The centre is losing its resources as it is not mainstreamed into the university’s administrative hierarchy.

Community engagement at the University of Indonesia is managed by the Directorate of Research and Community Engagement operated under the co-ordination of Vice Rector for Research, Development, and Industrial Co-operation. This sub-directorate is a specialized structure managing community engagement
activities. Along with this, community engagement at the University of Gadjah Mada is managed by the Institute for Research and Community Engagement. It is under the co-ordination of Vice Rector for Research and Community Engagement (Wardhani & Asri).

At Queen’s University in Ireland, CE activities take place under the banner of Science Shops, based within the Academic and Students Affairs Unit. These function as a separate, independent entity within the university. CE programs at the Dublin Institute of Technology are coordinated by the Directorate of Student Services, which is a part of the university’s Access and Civic Engagement office. Additionally, the Students Learning with Communities Program supports community based learning, or service learning, as well as CBR.

At the University of Jordan, the Women’s Studies Centre’s priorities in research include producing new knowledge about women’s and gender issues. For this, the Centre engages with CSOs involved in women’s advocacy such as the Arab Women Legal Network. Along with the WSC, the university is also home to several other research centres. At the Yarmouk University, although there is no specialized structure which promotes CE, the Um Qays Community Based Tourism Project is an exemplary example of community engagement.

In the Netherlands, at the University of Groningen, co-operative research with and for community organizations are taken care of by Science Shops at six different faculties. The Science Shop coordinates various community based research projects, in addition to organizing public lectures and science cafes. At Wageningen University, the Science Shop is also the key provision to enable community based research. Another structure promoting CBR is the Onderwijsloket. It matches community projects with various courses in the University (Mulder and Straver).

In South Africa, the University of Cape Town Senate’s Social Responsiveness Committee is responsible for promoting and strengthening CE activities. Rhodes University’s current policy on community engagement is executed by the Community Engagement Management Committee, which includes a broad representation from each faculty, students and staff, as well as external CE partners/NGOs. The Rhodes University Community Engagement Directorate was established as a separate entity in 2009. Its role is to support community engagement as a core responsibility of the university by developing a CE strategy and coordinating CE activities (Luescher-Mamashela et al.).

At Gulu University in Uganda, community-university engagement is termed as Community Outreach Services, and is placed under the Dean of Student’s Office. The Outreach Services Committee formulates CUE policy under the guidance of Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs. The Committee is also responsible for developing quality assurance criteria for assessing CUE activities. Objectives of the Community Outreach Services include the development of community outreach programs. The university promotes traditional conflict resolution, training of trainers in peace building and conflict transformation.
Also, CUE activities form part of the third mission of the university. The academic staff engages in a number of community outreach projects such as the Community Outreach Peace Project, the Capacity Building for Local Government project, and the Epilepsy Project.

In contrast, Makerere University has a decentralized structure for the provision of CUE. Different schools and colleges implement various CUE activities without reference to any university wide coordinating centre (Openjuru).

Although the University of Wisconsin-Madison in U.S. has no formal office for community engagement, or other centralized support structure, it has developed multiple centres across campus that focus on community based learning (CBL) or CBR. Loyola University has instituted a Centre for Urban Research and Learning, a non-traditional, collaborative university-community research centre housed within the university.

*It is clear that a designated structure, differently called a Centre, Shop, or Institute, is critical at each HEI to enable CE. Such structures have human capacity to facilitate linkages inside and outside HEIs. When such structures report to senior leadership levels, they tend to get greater visibility and support for CE efforts including CURPs. Carefully designed and reasonably resourced structures can play critical enabling roles in partnerships between HEIs and communities.*

### HEI LEVEL CE STRUCTURES

**Very few CE structures within HEIs are co-governed with community representatives, and mostly remain within the unilateral control of HEI administration.**

At the University of Sao Paulo, representation of recycling coops in the Management Council of the PWSM project has been ensured. Comprising of representatives from the university and the local government, this council is responsible for the overall management of the project. Likewise, at the University of Victoria (Canada), the OCBR is jointly steered by university and community leaders who also sit on its advisory council. Similarly, at the UQAM, SAC mandates the execution of joint research projects with the NGOs. The board of Community Services is also jointly steered by community and university leaders.

At Rhodes University in South Africa, the Community Engagement Management Committee has representation from academic and external CE partners and NGOs. However, similar representation of civil society and community is not evident at the University of Cape Town.

In India, the latest UGC scheme seeking the establishment of the Centre for Fostering Social Responsibility and Community Engagement includes the establishment of an advisory council. This council is mandated to have a minimum of two representatives from local civil society.
In exception to these examples, institutional structures providing for CE/CURPs in most universities remain within the control of HEI administration. For instance, in Argentina, the institutional structure coordinating CE activities at UCC (SUOSR) is officiated by the university administration, and headed by the Academic Vice-Rector. Likewise, at the University of Indonesia, the Directorate of Research and Community Engagement operates under the coordination of the Vice-Rector for Research, Development and Industrial Cooperation.

In the Irish and Dutch Universities, the Science Shops remain under the purview of the university administration. University staff function as CBR project coordinators in association with graduate students and local CSOs. Although the CSOs play a major role in the conception of projects with the Science Shop, they remain outside the purview of the structure.

At Gulu University in Uganda, community-university engagement functions are placed under the Dean of Student’s Office. The outreach services committee which formulates CUE policy is guided by the Deputy Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. As in other cases, CE activities in Uganda remain under the purview of HEI administration, with no representation of community/civil society.

Similarly in the U.S., centres promoting CE activities at the University of Wisconsin-Madison remain tied to their academic staff. Although CBR projects are given a lot of credence at such centres, co-governance mechanisms have been absent. Similarly, the Loyola University Centre for Urban Research and Learning is comprised of university staff, and managed by the university administration.

We conclude that while the separately mandated structures in universities do facilitate interface with community, most such structures are managed from within the HEI administration. In order to build and nurture CURPs, we suggest that such interface structures are co-governed and co-managed with active representation of the communities and civil society.

NETWORKS FOR CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENTS

Networks at local, national and international levels are effective in knowledge sharing and mutual learning by HEIs; however, similar networks for civil society engagements with HEIs rarely exist.

In Argentina, the Red de Comunidades Rurales (RCR) network was created to coordinate efforts and mobilize resources to promote education and community development in poor rural areas (Lepore & Herrero). Its work has two main axes: knowledge management and coordinating different social sectors facing similar problems. Similarly, CLAYSS, the Latin American centre for service-learning in Argentina, works in partnership with social organizations, educational institutions, government agencies and companies that promote service-learning in America and around the world.
In Brazil, the national mobilization network, ‘The Committee of Entities in the Struggle Against Hunger and for a Full Life (COEP)’, has more than 1000 member organizations, and mobilizes institutional and public action.

There are several networks in Canada that support knowledge sharing and mutual learning. For example, the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (AUCC) encourages its members to deepen community partnerships (Brown et al.). The Community Based Research Canada (CBRC) network is, open to universities and non-governmental organizations involved in CBR, has emerged as the national champion and facilitator for collaborative CBR and CUE (Brown et al.). The Global Alliance on Community-Engaged Research (GACER), is comprised of representatives from universities, networks and civil society organizations. On an international scale, the IDRC has supported international networking which led to 14 countries developing a Declaration of Global Alliance. The Declaration focused on sharing effective practices of community engagement; supporting communities build healthier societies; developing new generations of community engaged scholars, measuring the impact of CE activities and advocating for policy/resource support.

UNESCO, the United Nations University (UNU) and the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP) created a network called the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi). GUNi is currently composed of 208 members from 78 countries, which include the UNESCO Chairs in Higher Education, higher education institutions, research centres and networks related to innovation and the social commitment of higher education. It plays a crucial role in strengthening the role of higher education in society, and orients the latter towards public service, relevance and social responsibility.

In India and parts of Asia, Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) has acted as a networking and knowledge sharing institution for the past 33 years. It has built extensive programs of capacity building in participatory research which include both civil society and academia. The Alliance for Community Engagement (ACE), currently being developed, will be comprised of higher education (including students) and civil society. Along with serving as a platform for community engagement by HEIs, it will act as a steering mechanism and a vehicle for sharing knowledge and good practices.

Likewise, AsiaEngage is a regional platform created to maximise the strengths of the Asia-Talloires Network of Industry and Community Engaged Universities (ATNEU), the ASEAN University Network (AUN) Thematic Network on University Social Responsibility and Sustainability (AUN-USR&S) and the ASEAN Youth Volunteer Program (AYVP).

Another South Asian regional network is the Asia-Pacific University-Community Engagement Network (APUCEN). APUCEN is a network of academic institutions of higher learning, which promotes community-university engagement.
Their vision of community engagement goes beyond the traditional practices of outreach, extension and service and asserts that HEIs and the communities can co-create socially relevant knowledge. Similarly, the Service Learning Asia Network (SLAN) is a forum of universities, colleges and institutions interested in service learning in the South Asian region.

In Ireland, an initiative of the Higher Education Authority (HEA) has been Campus Engage, a platform to promote civic engagement broadly, including CBR partnerships. It currently includes twenty-two HEIs. Additionally, the Science Shops at Queen’s University in Ireland have been developing the field of public engagement at UK and at international levels. They have provided support and mentoring to CBR initiatives across Ireland informally, and through European Commission (EC) funded projects. The membership based Living Knowledge Network (LKN) in Europe is also known as the International Science Shop Network. It facilitates information exchange on CBR, and science and society in general. It is also involved with the Public Engagement in Research and Research Engagement in Society (PERARES) project, funded by European Community’s 7th framework program in 2010 (McIllrath).

The South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum (SAHECEF) is a network of university staff responsible for community engagement. Its executive committee liaises with the Council of Higher Education, the Higher Education Quality Committee and the Ministry, to highlight the importance and challenges of community engagement (Luescher-Mamashela et al.). The Social Responsiveness Unit at the University of Cape Town implements the Western Cape Higher Education Consortium, which includes collaborative research around social inclusion, digital innovation, and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

At the Makerere University in Uganda, CUE emphasizes research, innovation, knowledge transfer and networking, sometimes through a partnership between the university, an international development organization and community based organizations (CBOs). In this relationship, while the funding comes from development partners, the university raises grant proposals which are developed in collaboration with CBOs.

The National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement in the UK, hosted by the University of Bristol and the University of West of England, is associated with the Beacons for Public Engagement Project. It works to create a culture within higher education where PE is a valued and recognised activity for staff and students (Duncan and Manners).

At the campus level, the ISICUE at the University of Victoria in Canada hosts initiatives such as Indigenous Child Wellbeing Network, Pacific Housing Research Network and the Mapping Collaboratory. At the UQAM Canada, academics and NGOs have established a knowledge dialogue based on scientific and practitio-
ner views. NGOs are treated as equal partners in such networking processes for mutual learning and knowledge sharing.

Similarly, the PASCAL International Observatory, founded in 2002, is a global alliance of decision makers, academic entrepreneurs, researchers, policy analysts, and local practitioners from government, higher education, civil society and the private sector. It aims to connect policy makers, practitioners and researchers. One of its major initiatives has been the PASCAL Universities on Regional Engagement (PURE) Project, which has been in operation in 17 regions in different parts of the world. It looked into what higher education is offering to their regions, in the form of economic/social/cultural and environmental benefits.

The Uganda Adult Education Network (UGAADEN) has the responsibility of promoting the teaching and practice of adult education in Uganda. UGAADEN, in association with a number of universities, works on community development intervention projects in which the university provides expertise for the network members who are engaged in skills training and adult literacy education (Openjuru).

In the U.S., the Talloires Network is an international association of institutions committed to strengthening the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education, and is hosted by the Tufts University in Massachusetts, U.S. The Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN), one of the initiatives of the Campus Compact, works to advance civic engagement and engaged scholarship among research universities and to create resources and models for use across higher education.

Founded in 1996, Community Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) in the U.S. is a non-profit organization, which aims to promote health through meaningful partnerships between communities and HEIs. Having more than 1800 CSOs, universities, colleges and individuals as members across U.S. and Canada, CCPH facilitates networking, exchange and mutual learning on service learning, in addition to CBPR and other partnership strategies. Likewise, the Engagement Scholarship Consortium (ESC) in the U.S. comprises of higher education member institutions, works collaboratively to build strong university community partnerships and community capacities.

In sum, we argue that the emergence of national and/or thematic networks that promote community based participatory research, community-university engagement and CURPs may be valuable in sustaining the engagement efforts at national and institutional levels. They provide collective voices, practical experiences and shared solidarity.
INCENTIVES

Provision of awards, recognitions and accreditations of universities for engaging in CE activities further incentivizes CUE.

In Argentina, the National Ministry of Education created a ‘Solidarity School’ prize, which awards sustainable and quality S-L practices. At the UCC, SUOSR provides monetary incentives to faculty who have successfully completed annual S-L projects. The Brazilian government uses tax exemption to motivate universities to play a civic role in society. At the UFRJ, the extension plan of the University provides for issuing participation certificates to project members, and certificates of recognition to teachers/professors.

In Canada, in general, institutional collective agreements remain silent on recognizing and awarding CBR initiatives. An exception is the University of Victoria’s Engaged Scholar awards.

In India, the latest scheme on national university rankings includes the social contribution of universities as one of the prime assessment criteria. At the BPSMV, courses offered under the centre are accorded the status of an audit course. Similarly, at the Gauhati University, the programs offered under the centre provide an additional qualification.

In Indonesia, CE is an important element in the national accreditation of HEIs and in faculty member career development. UI awards for lecturers with high involvement in community engagement. At the UGM, students are awarded academic credits for their community engagement activities.

Since the Irish policy does not mandate CBR within HEIs, it appears that there is no system of accreditation or rewards in place. The same goes for Jordanian universities.

Similarly, in the Netherlands, there is no reward for universities for CE activities. At the University of Groningen, almost all projects of community based research are included within the curricula. The students receive course credits for such projects, while the project’s supervision contributes towards the teaching hours of the respective professors. At the University of Wageningen, most community based research projects are included within the curricula. Supervision of such projects is also counted in the teaching hours of the professors. Apart from regular course credits and the obligation to undertake such projects, Wageningen University and Research Centre does not specifically encourage students to undertake such work.

In South Africa, The Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) will design a national system of quality assurance which will involve ‘knowledge-based community service’ as one of the three areas relevant in program accreditation and institutional audits. At the campus level, the UCT’s approach includes incentivizing academics and students by means of a system of recognitions and rewards (Luesc-
her-Mamashela et al.). It has established a ‘Distinguished Social Responsiveness Award’, which recommends that faculties include SR in the categories assessed in staff promotions. At Rhodes University a major merit award was established called the “Vice-Chancellor’s Distinguished Community Engagement Award” (Luescher-Mamashela et al.). Apart from this, community partners, student organizations, and student researchers are honoured annually at the Community Engagement Gala dinner. Finally, for academic staff, community engagement is a consideration in the promotion process (Luescher-Mamashela et al.).

In Uganda, CUE is not part of the qualifying criteria for accreditation. However, university-wide requirements for the involvement of faculty in community activities does contribute to their promotion. At the Gulu University, engagement in CUE activities contributes to the professional growth of the academic staff. Additionally community university participation is considered in promotion.

In the UK, rewards are in the form of funding provided by the Research Councils for a variety of public engagement projects. Similarly, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in U.S., many of the CommNS’s community engagement projects have been integrated into the department’s for-credit curriculum. Programs at the Morgridge centre also include both credit-based and co-curricular volunteer coordination.

In summary, we feel that the provision of awards and recognitions greatly encourages CE efforts, along with generating enthusiasm and interest amongst faculty and students. Additionally, its contribution towards accreditation of universities provides incentives which facilitate the integration of such activities in the regular curriculum.

CE ORIENTATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING

There is a lack of CE orientation and capacity building for HEI staff.

With the exception of Argentina, where the students are exposed to proper orientation with respect to experiential learning under the S-L approach, there is little explicit training or capacity building for HEI staff engaged in CE activities. For instance, in the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil, community outreach/community-based research activities are initiated by groups of professors/students whose research agenda is participatory in nature. However, no separate staffing or capacity building provisions are present. In India too, the BPSMV accords the coordination of courses to a regular faculty member in addition to his/her routine responsibilities, with no provision for any separate staffing or dedicated capacity building. At the Gauhati University as well, while there was no separate staffing arrangement for the Centre, the faculty at the Department of Political Science took over the responsibility of research activities. Even here no special capacity building in CBPR or CUE was provided.

The same holds true for the University of Indonesia, Rhodes University in South Africa, and Gulu and Makerere Universities in Uganda, which involves
routine faculty members in developing community engagement project proposals, along with the students, with no deployment of separate staff or training for this purpose.

The Science Shops operating in the Ireland and the Netherlands Universities have full time equivalent staff to function as coordinators. Likewise, the University of Wisconsin-Madison in the U.S. uses separate full time academic staff for the community engagement projects, while the research team at the Centre for Urban Research and Learning at the Loyola University, comprises of faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and community partners. None of these universities provide any special training to such staff in CUE.

Canadian Universities, however, have emerged as a model example in this context. For instance, the Service aux collectivités (SAC) at the Université du Québec à Montréal is mandated to promote, coordinate and facilitate community-based training and CBR activities to be carried out by Faculty members in collaboration with NGOs (Brown et al.). Similarly, the Office of Community Based Research (OCBR) at the University of Victoria seeks to build capacities for community-university research partnerships (Brown et al.).

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison capacity building of students/faculty is carried out through dedicated programs under the Morgridge Centre for Public Service. One is the Community University Exchange, a collaboration between the School of Human Ecology and the Morgridge Centre. It links resources to priorities gathered by communities in CSO meetings. Additionally, it has offered workshops and courses that focus on CBL/CBR methodology and pedagogy. Topics include grant writing, conflict resolution, facilitation, evaluation, and strategic planning (Tryon et al.).

The bulk of the capacity building interventions in CBPR in India have been provided by PRIA. It has worked with several universities in training students and faculty in CBPR methodology over the past three decades.

*In conclusion, we feel it is problematic that centres and institutions actively promoting CUE, including CURPs, do not provide for any systematic capacity building for their own staff. In this absence, many centres will ‘reinvent the wheel’ through trial and error.*

**CBPR**

*Use of CBPR is not acknowledged as critical to CURPs. Very few HEIs build student and researcher capacity in CBPR.*

Most HEIs world wide do not focus on CBPR as an essential component of the broad CE framework. For example, the HEI structures in Argentina primarily focus on training, outreach and broad research activities as an inherent component of S-L. In the Indian universities, there is no recognition of CBPR as critical to CURP in existing community engagement activities.
Building CBPR capacity in students and researchers is essential. In Indonesia, although community based research projects are quite common, this capacity needs to be strengthened. At the University of Cape Town in South Africa, the Social-Responsiveness Unit engages in knowledge dissemination and broad collaborative research, but does not integrate CBPR into CURPs. Similarly, the Community Engagement Management Committee at Rhodes University engages in service-learning and outreach programs, but there is no focused approach towards CBPR or capacity building. At Gulu University in Uganda what drives community engagement efforts and initiatives is the concept of applied research rather than CBR. Similarly, the decentralized structure for CUE activities at the Makerere University engages in broad collaborative ventures such as the Infectious Diseases Institute, but does not focus on CBPR or capacity building as essential to CURPs. Likewise, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Loyola University in the U.S., joint projects are carried out in association with community leaders. However, they are not acknowledged as being critical to CURPs and neither is any capacity building done. In a small measure, some universities in India do teach CBPR, but more as a part of research methodology than as a part of CUE.

At the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil however, the Participatory Sustainable Waste Management Project there is collaboration with groups of organized recyclers, local governments and NGO representatives. At the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, CUE activities are taken up as department/faculty initiated joint projects with the community. Likewise, at the University of Victoria and the Universite du Quebec a Montreal in Canada, CBR projects are mainstreamed into the university structure and are considered critical to CURPs. A similar emphasis on building CBR capacities in CURPs is seen at the OCBR and ISICUE at the University of Victoria. Similarly, SAC at the Universite du Quebec a Montreal facilitates training and research activities to be carried out by the faculty members in collaboration with NGOs. The Science Shops operating at the Irish and Dutch Universities also engage in CBPR as part of student degree programs.

We believe that mutual learning is a critical requirement for effective CURPs. While learning to value local community knowledge as the basis for new knowledge is challenging, structured training in CBPR can facilitate such learning, and can help prepare both students and faculty to work in partnership with communities.

INVESTMENTS IN CIVIL SOCIETY AND COMMUNITIES

Investment in civil society (CS) and communities to engage with HEIs in co-construction of knowledge is non-existent; research funds accessed by HEIs for CURP are rarely shared with CS and community.

There is much evidence of collaborative ventures/CBR projects carried out in association with communities. However, financial investment in the co-construction of knowledge is rare in almost all HEIs, even when they receive financial
support for such activities from the government, as in Indonesia, or from Research Councils/Schemes, as in the UK, South Africa, and Canada.

An exception is the University of Cape Town Knowledge Co-Op, which builds capacity of community based organizations through research and skills development (Luescher-Mamashela et al.). Similarly, in Canada SSHRC-CURA funding is utilized for the execution for CBR projects and capacity building efforts.

Nonetheless, in most countries, civil society depends on its own sources of funding for its joint projects with the universities, such as public and private sector contributions. In Argentina, civil society organizations receive funding from public and private sector donations. Despite partnerships with academia, obtaining resources continues to be one of the major challenges for the work of civil society organizations (Tremblay et al., 2014).

The Centre for Community Based Research (CCBR) in Canada has been involved in initiating partnership development grants with faith based scholars and communities. Likewise, the British Columbia Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centres, faced with resource constraints, has partnered with universities and networks such as the Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network and the Indigenous Child Wellbeing Research Network for building its capacities.

In India, PRIA receives project based funding from a number of national and international donors. South African civil society also faces resource constraints. For example, Biowatch receives funding from a variety of international donors for its advocacy and lobbying work, and the Ubunye Foundation partners with Rhodes University, which receives external funding.

Similarly in Indonesia, NGOs play a major role in community engagement initiatives. They work jointly with the universities in engagement programs, yet sharing of research funds with such NGOs on part of the universities seems to be missing.

Jordanian civil society faces major issues such as unsustainable funding and mistrust by the HEIs in relation to the motivations and research capacities of CS organizations. As a result, the CSOs here struggle for recognition and funding (Feinstein & Rabai).

Although UGAADEN in Uganda does not have independent financial sources, it mobilizes financial resources from development partners for CUE and CBR. In the U.S., the Community Campus Partnerships for Health is funded through member dues and contributions from organizations as diverse as the National Campus Compact and Environmental Protection Agency.

In India, the Centre for Fostering Social Responsibility and Community Engagement specifically outlines that the importance of working in alliance with community based organizations in the planning and execution of projects. This emphasis on joint partnerships with CSOs opens avenues for resource sharing
opportunities from the funds disbursed under the new scheme. In this way, the scheme also formalizes the partnerships with universities and civil society, which until recently have been scattered efforts often unrecognized on the regional/national platform.

It can be inferred that although communities and CSOs are a part of CBR projects in some HEIs, they do not have access to research funds allocated to the universities. As a result, civil society has to depend on its own skills of fund-raising and mobilization of local/national/international resources. This causes an erosion of capacity and resources in civil society and community. There is an urgent need to address this challenge in ways that enable civil society and communities to work in research partnerships with universities.

Lastly, recognition must be given to the importance of CE activities to the implementation of social responsibility at HEIs. As this area of concern emerges, there is also a need to disseminate the ideas widely, through channels of institutions and networks so that the issue gains popularity and clarity amidst a wider audience at the global level. This will also contribute to its popularity and will win acceptance and credence worldwide.
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