EUROPE ENGAGE

DEVELOPING A CULTURE OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT THROUGH SERVICE-LEARNING

WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION IN EUROPE



Report

EUROPE ENGAGE SURVEY
OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT & SERVICE-LEARNING ACTIVITIES
WITHIN THE PARTNER UNIVERSITIES

2016







Report written by Lorraine McIlrath in partnership with Pilar Aramburuzabala, Héctor Opazo, Guillaume Tuytschaever, Wolfgang Stark, Nives Mikelic Preradovic, Lucas Meijs, Natalija Mažeikiene, Bruna Zani, Maria Vargas-Moniz, Juliet Millican, Simon Northmore; Reinhard Altenburger, Katrien De Bruyn, Anne Hopia, Anne Birgitta Pessi, Henrietta Grönlund and Stephanie Maas.

This report offers an independent analysis of the "Europe Engage - Developing a Culture of Civic Engagement through Service-Learning within Higher Education in Europe" [Reference 2014-1-ES01-KA203-004798].

This project was funded in 2014 by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union. The final publication only reflects the author's view and the Agency and the European Commission are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Europe Engage logo designed by Miguel Ángel Tejedor

Report designed by Héctor Opazo

Typeset in Garamond

CONTENT

Section	Page Number
Introduction	4
Section 1 - University Culture and Identity	7
Section 2 - Service-Learning Activities	11
Section 3 - National Context	14
Section 4 - Conclusion	16
Appendix	19



INTRODUCTION

The Europe Engage project was established to promote and support service-learning within universities in Europe. The project is an Erasmus+ KA2 three-year funded project (2014-2017, Reference 2014-1-ES01-KA203-004798) and brings together twelve universities from twelve European countries. These include universities in Spain, Ireland, Germany, England, Finland, Italy, Portugal, Lithuania, Croatia, Belgium, Netherlands and Austria¹. As detailed in the project proposal the "overall aim of 'Europe Engage' will be to promote Service-Learning (S-L henceforth) as a pedagogical approach that embeds and develops civic engagement within higher education, students, staff and the wider community" (2014, p.28). The project aims to identify existing S-L practice, promote S-L as a pedagogical approach, and create a network in Europe, where much remains to be done in terms of civic engagement and S-L within higher education. To this end, one of the main tasks of the project was to map existing work in the area.

The proposal articulated the following:

Mapping and Evaluating Service-Learning as a Pedagogical Approach – from an institutional and national approach a mapping exercise will be undertaken to highlight policy, practice, funding and strategic vision for civic engagement and service-learning within each of the partners project countries. It is anticipated that this exercise will allow for the project to benchmark existing practice and track progress made over the lifecycle of the project. In addition, it will cast light on a repository of knowledge and data not now know in terms of S-L activity within Europe. Europe Engage will develop an appropriate on-line tool that project universities will be encouraged to complete and share with other universities in the country, the results will be analysed and a report developed that will be published and disseminated in each of the partner institutions and countries. (Results: Online survey tool and Europe Engage Mapping Report, 2014, p. 31)

EUROPE ENGAGE PARTNER DEFINITION, SURVEY TOOL AND PROCESS

To the end the Europe Engage Partner Survey was designed and administered in 2015 to map policy, practice, funding and strategic vision for civic engagement and S-L within each of the partner universities. The survey provided the partner universities with an opportunity to reflect, document and review the nature of their civic engagement and S-L activities within and across the university and to gauge national interest in these activities within each country from their institutional perspective, from strategy, policy, resource and practice domains. This 'snapshot' is useful to the Europe Engage Project and gives a baseline from which to set targets for future planning and growth of activities. It also acts as a point of information that will inform national debates in the area.

The project at the outset recognised the challenges associated with defining S-L collectively and acknowledged that it is a term open to interpretation and multiple definition, as also denoted in the scholarly literature. For the purposes of this survey, the Europe Engage

^{1.} Europe Engage Project Website http://ww.europeengage.org



partners in January-February 2015 individually defined S-L through an online survey, which was then analysed to develop a collective term that resonated with all partners. Following analysis the collective Europe Engage definition was crafted to include common aspects and characteristic as detailed in the data and is as follows:

Service-Learning (sometimes referred to as community based or community engaged learning) is an innovative pedagogical approach that integrates meaningful community service or engagement into the curriculum and offers students academic credit for the learning that derives from active engagement within community and work on a real world problem. Reflection and experiential learning strategies underpin the process and the service is link to the academic discipline. (Europe Engage, 2015)

This definition was adopted as the basis on which to assess institutional commitment, or otherwise, to civic engagement and S-L. This survey was conducted through an online questionnaire that was largely based on the Campus Engage Survey that was developed and undertaken among 24 institutions of higher education in Ireland in 2010 (Lyons and McIlrath, 2011)². The survey was significantly adapted by the Europe Engage Survey Sub-Committee that was formed in January 2015 to develop the tool³. The Sub-Committee took into consideration the aim and objectives of the Europe Engage project and information needed for the purpose of the project. In light of this, a shorter and more culturally appropriate version of the Irish survey was eventually to be adopted that focussed predominately on S-L as a pedagogical expression of civic engagement⁴. In addition, we have also included new elements in our survey to reflect new theoretical developments related with S-L. We included specific questions about the intersections of purpose and S-L⁵.

Using SurveyMonkey as the online platform, the twelve project partners were invited to submit the self-reflective surveys between May and December 2015. The survey design constituted an institutional self-assessment process with one survey returned for each of the partner institutions. The questions included open-ended questions looking for qualitative type data and scaled response-type questions of a more quantitative nature.

Guidelines on the survey data gathering process was offered by the Sub-Committee to each university. It was suggested to the partners that a working group be established in each institution to complete the survey for two reasons;

- 1. To make the task easier;
- 2. To generate more information than if it were completed by one person.

^{2.} The Carnegie Foundation's Classification Framework was a particularly influential in terms of the Campus Engage Survey Tool and methodology. See the following website for further information. http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92

^{3.} The Survey Sub-Committee contained representatives from the National University of Ireland, Galway (lead), Erasmus University, Ghent University, Autonomous University Madrid, University of Zagreb and Vytautas Magnus University

^{4.} The Irish survey also address other civic engagement expressions such as community based research, volunteering, outreach, access and widening participation

^{5.} We appreciate the collaboration of Dr. Seana Moran (Clark University; MA, USA), PI of the project "How Service-Learning Influences Youth Purpose Around the World". Moran has shared with Europe Engage a survey of "University/Institution Commitment to Service-Learning Influences on Youth Purpose" (2015). See the following website for further information http://learning4purpose.org



It was advised that this working group should be representative of the range of people involved in or responsible for, civic engagement activities in the partner university. For example, it was recommended that the groups could include academic and administrative staff, senior management, and students.

The survey was divided into four sections with both qualitative and quantitative type questions in each section:

Section 1 - University Culture and Identity

Section 2 - Service-Learning Activities

Section 3 - National Context

Section 4 - Conclusion

12 institutions and partners of Europe Engage have participated and completed the survey. (See table 1)

Table 1.

Partner Countries and Universities

1 ariner Countries	una Universities
Country	Partner University
Austria	IMC University of Applied Sciences Krems
Belgium	Ghent University
Croatia	University of Zagreb
Finland	University of Helsinki
Germany	University Duisburg-Essen
Ireland	National University of Ireland, Galway
Italy	Università di Bologna
Lithuania	Vytauto Didžiojo Universitetas (Vytautas Magnus University)
Netherlands	Erasmus University
Portugal	ISPA University Institute
Spain	Autonomous University of Madrid
UK	University of Brighton

Overall the picture of S-L within the project universities is optimistic but at a European level this may be the exception rather than the norm. As documented in the project proposal, the 12 selected partners had to; "demonstrate practice in the area of engaging student learning through S-L; have direct experience of facilitating and embedding S-L courses at their institutions; bring expertise to the project; highlight a willingness to share knowledge and practice with other universities." (Europe Engage, 2014, p. 29) The following report structure mirrors the structure of the actual data and will be presented in terms of four sections.

Section 1 - University Culture and Identity

Section 2 - Service-Learning Activities

Section 3 - National Context Section

Section 4 - Conclusion



SECTION 1 - UNIVERSITY CULTURE AND IDENTITY

Formal Acknowledgement of S-L and Civic Engagement

9 university respondents indicate that S-L and civic engagement are included in the university's mission statement and university marketing materials. This acknowledgement moves from some to substantial with the remaining 3 institutions indicating that S-L is not formally acknowledged. There is also evidence of formal acknowledgement in terms of university strategic plans with 8 institutional responses highlighting a commitment through university strategic plans, university websites and university publications. In addition at the local level, 7 respondents indicate that programme or disciple specific strategic plans have formal acknowledgment of S-L and civic engagement. 10 indicate that S-L and civic engagement is acknowledged formally in public lectures. In addition, 8 respondents indicate that that there is community member representation on university boards.

There are few institutions incentivising civic engagement and S-L activities to be embedded by faculty as just 4 provide training opportunities for faculty and 3 providing faculty awards. However, 6 report on dedicated civic engagement and S-L centralised offices.

In terms of student recognition, 3 institutional responses note that S-L is a gradation requirement for students, 4 note that it a requirement for some disciplines or programmes and 5 institutions reward students in some way for civic engagement or community service. (See Table 2 for a full overview)

Table 2. Formal Acknowledgement of S-L and Civic Engagement

Activity	Number of Institutions
University Strategic Plans	8
Programme/Discipline Specific Strategic Plans	7
University Websites	8
University Publications	7
University Marketing Materials	9
Public Lectures	10
Community Member participations on university boards	8
Centralised university office for civic engagement and S-L	6
Training for Faculty	4
Specific Learning Activities Provided to Faculty to include in	6
Modules	
Awards to Faculty for inclusion of S-L or civic engagement	3
components within modules	
Graduation Requirement for Students	3
Requirements for some majors/disciplines/programmes	4
General academic awards to students include civic or service	5
component	
Awards to students	5



Mission Statements

Out of the 12 respondents, 6 institutions indicate that S-L and civic engagement is included in the university's overall mission statement. However, civic engagement as an explicit term is mentioned in just 2 of these institutional missions while S-L as a tool or method is not referenced within any mission statement provided in the data.

One university "profiles itself as a civic engaged and pluralist university" and another sees itself "boosting civic engagement and supporting local organisations". So this term (civic engagement or civically engaged) is the exception rather than the norm. Language adopted to evidence a mission's commitment to S-L and civic engagement varies greatly as an indicator of civic engagement and S-L. Language evidenced in the survey that indicates or nuances a commitment to civic engagement and S-L includes: "contributes to global cultural and academic development"; "is to be a community-based research, art and study institution"; "creation, development, transmission and criticism of science, technology, culture and art . . . toward freedom, sustainable human development, justice, peace, friendship and cooperation among communities"; "offer higher education that contributes critically to citizenship and the public good"; the university student as a "global citizen: socially aware, distinctive, highly skilled and well-rounded" to mention a few statements or terms typically adopted.

Formal Documents

In terms of formal documents, the respondents were asked to highlight a series of dimensions related to service learning that are emphasised, mentioned or otherwise within formal documents. 9 out of 11 respondents indicate that students academic development is mentioned, described, emphasises or promoted in formal documents and another 6 state that this is articulated in terms of specific service learning or civic engagement module activities within formal documents, while just 3 state this civic dimension is not addressed. 9 respondents out of 10 note that student engagement in university is described, emphasised or promoted with 1 respondent unable to assess. Also, student contribution to the university is contained within formal documents with 9 respondents indicated this contribution within formal documents.

Senior Management Support

Overall from the 12 responses gathered it seems that there is, in the majority, support from senior management for civic engagement and S-L moving from some to moderate to substantial support. With just 2 institutions indicating that there is no support to create a coordinating unit, no provision of posts or funding for civic engagement events. Another 3 institutions indicate there is no support to become members of advisory boards or steering committees related to civic engagement. While 9 institutions indicate that there is support for coordinating units and the provision of posts, and optimistically almost a half of these responses (4 of these responses) acknowledge that this support is substantial. (See Table 3)

However, there is some divergence within the data as two particular institutions, while acknowledging that there is a civic engagement coordinating unit or university-wide project,



evidences that the activities underway within are extra-curricular which fall outside the Europe Engage project definition of S-L, as well as scholarly definitions. Another institution acknowledges the existence of a centre for civic engagement but the work at this centre does not include a remit or responsibility for S-L. However, in marked contrast, 3 institutions indicate the existence of S-L as a core responsibility of a centralised coordinating unit with funds centrally provided and its work reflected in the university strategic plan.

Table 3.

Senior Management Support — Some to Moderate to Substantial Support

Activity	Number of Institutions
Creation of a Coordinating Unit	9
Provision of posts which include responsibility for civic	
engagement and S-L	9
Attendance at civic engagement and S-L events	11
Funding of civic engagement and S-L events	9
Memberships of advisory boards or steering committees related	
to civic engagement	7

Staff Awareness of Civic Engagement and S-L

Overall there seems to be support, from some to moderate to substantial, for efforts adopted to make staff aware of civic engagement and S-L activities. 10 institutions indicate that staff are made aware through conferences and public lectures but 6 institutions highlight that no efforts are made to fund staff to attend conferences on this theme with a further 4 stating that only some effort is made to fund participation in these events. One institutions makes the point that staff are only funded to attend conferences abroad that directly relate to research activities, as is the case in general for most universities regarding participation at any conference. This institution also highlights that events organised by NGO's and students on civic engagement issues are only occasionally attended by university staff. A myriad of activities were highlighted by 5 institutions to support staff awareness of civic engagement and S-L and some of these include: dedicated websites and social media outlets, development of tools and best practice guides, seminars and keynote addresses, newsletters, professional development credit bearing courses, civic engagement college representatives, funding to attend events and conferences, mentoring – peer to peer on S-L, library resources and access to international databases on the topic, research and dissemination. (See Table 4)

Table 4.

Staff Awareness — Some to Moderate to Substantial Efforts

Activity	Number of Institutions
Conferences/Public Lectures	10
Training Events	9
Dissemination of Information (online/offline)	9
Funding for Attending Conferences	6
Dedicated Websites	8



Provision of Professional Development Opportunities

The provision of professional development opportunities from which to nurture, create and develop civic engagement and S-L activities is perhaps worrying. 7 institutions indicate that there are no training and funding opportunities to develop activities. 6 indicate that there is no peer-to-peer support through mentoring and another 3 indicate that libraries contain no resources related to the area. Unfortunately only a small number of institutions indicate significant opportunities, with one indicating substantial support for training and funding, another 2 highlight the library as a substantial resource and none indicate any form of substantial support for mentoring. While 1 university recognises that peer-to-peer mentoring in the area of S-L exist this is undertaken on the initiative and interest of the lecturer involved rather than from senior management or centrally organised and administered. Another university notes that the library takes advice and suggestions in terms of recommended resources to purchase but there is no guarantee that resources aligns with civic engagement and S-L within higher education will be purchased. Another institution notes that regular training sessions are offered to staff in the area with another planning to develop training opportunities based on a S-L tool developed by that institution. (See Table 5)

Table 5.

Professional Development from Some to Moderate to Substantial

Activity	TI IKO	120	Number of Institutions
Funding			5
Mentoring			6
Training			5
Library Resources			7

Career Promotional Policies

Only 4 institutions indicate that career promotion policies explicitly take civic engagement and S-L into account with 8 disagreeing. One institution indicates that these activities can enhance promotion and evidences one particular recent senior promotion to illustrate this point. Another university relates that this is a contentious issue at that university that is regularly discussed and debated but indicates positively that "there is a widespread sentiment in that they [civic engagement and S-L activities] are looked on favourably". Another institution while indicating that civic engagement and S-L activities don't count in terms of promotion but faculty can gain access to reduced lecturing time. However these responses do not represent the majority of responding institutions. (See Figure 1)



Figure 1. Promotion Policies for Civic Engagement and S-L



Organisations Structures for Coordination

In terms of dedicated organisational structures to coordinate civic engagement and S-L, 3 universities state that there are no organisational structures; 6 say there are some structures but not dedicated; and 3 institutions say they have dedicated structures. Where there are organisational structures the position or location and type of these structures vary greatly. Some indicate location within an academic discipline or department, another is located in a careers area with responsibility for employment and internships, another is a strategic project of the university and part of emergent university policy, with another located in student services responsible for extracurricular activities.

SECTION 2 – S-L ACTIVITIES

Incorporated into all programmes

Incorporated into programmes - Master and Bachelors

One institution states that S-L is never incorporated into programmes with a further 9 stating that S-L is infrequently incorporated. One institution indicated that it is often incorporated with 1 highlighting that the approach is incorporated into all programmes of study. (See Table 6)

Table 6. S-L within Programmes

Activity	Number of Institutions
Never incorporated into programmes	
Infrequently incorporated into programmes	9
Often incorporated into programmes	

There is great diversity in terms of the disciplines that do incorporate S-L as a pedagogical approach into Masters and Bachelor programmes and these span the disciplines. These include; Education and Teacher Training, Theology, Community Development, Anthropology, Sociology, Sociology, Social Work, Health Promotion, Sceince, Occupational Therapy, General Practice, Primary Health Care, Business Studies, Civil, Biomedical and Mechanical Engineering, Industrial Design, Communication, Marketing, Management, Philosophy, Law, Languages, Medicine, and Nursing.

Community Partners Collaboration in S-L

None of the responding institutions report on substantial collaboration with community partners with 7 indicating a small to moderate amount of collaboration in terms of design and delivery of the curriculum. 3 institutions indicate small to moderate collaboration in the area of assessment with community partners. Given the nature of S-L as a pedagogical approach that underpins community university partnership it is worrying when 4 institutions indicate that there is little or no collaboration by community partners in terms of design and delivery of the curriculum with a another 4 indicating little to no collaboration on assessment. (See Table 7)



Table 7.

Community Collaboration

Collaborative Activity	Number of Institutions
Design of curriculum	7
Delivery of curriculum	7
Assessment	8

However, other evidence provided by the respondents do indicate community partnerships but in a range of different areas. One respondent mentioned that community's partners role is to accept students into the community and decide on a service activity that aligns with the aims of the academic course and curriculum. Another collaborates with community partners in the area of evaluation of the community experience of students but this is dependent on the course. One respondent notes that a lack of human resources makes it difficult for collaboration to be central to S-L but that there is a willingness among the lecturing staff to become more collaborative with the community. Meanwhile another respondent highlights that community partners teach and guest lecture in many of the S-L modules. In one instance another respondent suggest that collaboration is typified when lecturers assess the community parents needs and levels of satisfaction with the student in a range of areas including communication skills and academic knowledge. Another respondent highlights that levels of collaboration varies from college to college within the university and from course to course moving from thin to thick levels. In some instances, according to this respondent, community partners are members of programme boards, delivery of content, training students for engagement (e.g. child protection training), consultation on student research projects, hosting students, assignment assessment and feedback to students, but this varies across the institution.

Service-Learning Courses

In terms of the number of S-L courses offered within the Europe Engage partner universities, 8 responses indicate the existence of 97 courses with 6 acknowledging that 3323 students engage in these S-L courses which is a average of 537 students in each of these 6 universities engaging with 364 community partners. 7 institutions acknowledge that over 263 university staff contributes to the courses. The lowest number of courses offered at any institution is 1 with highest being 40 S-L courses. (See Table 8 for a full breakdown)

Table 8.

Numbers of Courses, Students, Staff and Community

Activity	Valid Responses	Maximum	Mean
SL Courses (2013-14)	8	97	12.12
Students Enrolled	6	3223	537.16
Staff Contributing	7	263	37.57
Community Partners Involved	6	634	105.66

Service-Learning Courses that no longer offered

Out of 11 responses, 4 mention that S-L courses that were delivered in the past are no longer offered for a variety of reasons. In one instance the courses were piloted as a result of European funding and when the project funding expired the courses were no longer sustained or offered. One course offered while it has undergone serious changes over time it still is in principle a S-L course. In another institution a well-regarded service course is no



longer offered as it was part of a MA programme now not offered by the university due to reduced demand for this programme.

Community Partners

8 institutions acknowledge that community partners collaborate with the university in terms of delivering content, supervising students and act as teachers in the S-L process. There is a broad spread of community partner typology ranging from formal education centres, NGOs, government entities and health centres. (See Table 9 for a detailed breakdown)

Community Partners Typology

Type of organisations	Yes	No
Formal Education Centre	10	1
Informal Education Centre	11	2
Government Entities	7	2
Business and Enterprise	9	0
Foundations	8	1
NGOs	11	0
Health Centres	9	1
Associations	9	1

An additional range of organisations were evidence and presented in the data that related to other types of organisations that S-L modules collaborate with. These include: Political Parties; Religious Communities; Local community workers: health care- and welfare organisations: primary schools; mental healthcare organisations, youth welfare organisations, disability organisations, child care organisations, community health organisations, migrant support organisations, organisations for homeless, poverty organisations, charity organisations; social movements; libraries and museums.

In addition to the type of organisation, respondents were also asked to indicate the area of activity that their community partners work in. 10 responses indicated the area of health, 11 work in education type partnership, and 7 work on migrant rights, with the elderly and on international cooperation type partnerships. (See Table 10 for a detailed breakdown). Other collaborative areas evidenced in the data include: people with drug and alcohol abuse/rehabilitation; human rights, children's welfare, women's rights, religious education; child protection; adoptions; community development and organising.

Table 10. Area of Activity

Area	Yes	No
Health	10	0
Education	11	0
Leisure	6	4
Sports	5	4
Homelessness	8	1
Scouting	5	4
Natural Environment	5	3
Diversity/Disability	9	1
Migrant Rights	7	2
Elderly	7	2
International Cooperation	7	2



SECTION 3 – NATIONAL CONTEXTS

The Europe Engage survey also tried to also capture country data related to higher education and its relationship with civic engagement and S-L. Out of ten respondents gained, an overwhelming 10 indicated that other universities in their country are involved in S-L. (See table 11)

Table 11. Number of Universities in Each Country

Country	Number of Institutions
Belgium	5
Croatia	24
Finland	39
Germany	330
Ireland	7
Italy	96
Lithuania	23
Netherlands	54
Portugal	34
Spain	76
UK	109

When asked if other universities have practice in the area of civic engagement and S-L, 3 of the partners were unable to offer an answer as there is insufficient information on this area of work. However, in Lithuania Siauliai University has significant experience in S-L with several related projects implemented there. Within Spain, the Spanish University S-L Network has 41 members universities, with various levels of institutionalisation underway. In the Netherlands, only a small proportion of the Dutch universities are currently committed to civic engagement and S-L. For example, besides a S-L business course related to consultancy and social entrepreneurship at the Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University⁶ only Leiden University College has embedded S-L opportunities. At Leiden University College the S-L opportunities connect classroom knowledge to practical, hands-on experiences while developing skills in leadership, reciprocity, and intercultural sensitivity, and fostering the values of social justice and responsibility. Nevertheless, various Dutch Universities of Applied Science have offered S-L programmes and activities in the past. Furthermore, several Dutch Universities are considering and working on providing S-L activities in the near future. In addition, several Universities of Applied Science have offered S-L programmes and activities in the past. In Portugal the Nova University of Lisbon hosts a programme of Civic Engagement. Within the context of Ireland, service or community based learning is seen nationally as a new and innovative approach towards engagement within the higher education curriculum. Many universities have S-L courses or units to support the creation of service/community based learning courses. Growth and expansion of these programmes is ongoing. Recently Campus Engage, the Irish network for civic engagement within higher education, rolled out a capacity building programme entitled the Participate Programme and over 175 academic staff have participated in the programme⁸. Within Germany there is a national university network and according to a survey undertaken in 2012, 56 higher education institutions adopt S-L as a pedagogical approach⁹. In Croatia, 4 universities are committed

^{6.} http://www.eur.nl/minor/minoren/faculteit/rsm/explear/

^{7.} http://www.lucthehague.nl/academic-programme/global-citizenship/global-citizenship.html

^{8.} http://www.campusengage.ie

^{9.} http://www.bildung-durch-verantwortung.de/mitglieder



and these include: University of Zagreb (several courses), University of Rijeka (several courses), University of Osijek (1 course), University of Zadar (diploma-based projects).

National Network

5 out of 12 respondents indicated the existence of a national network to support S-L and civic engagement in universities in their country. In Lithuania 2 universities Vytautas Magnus University and Siauliai university have close cooperation on S-L and problem-based S-L. The Spanish Network was created in 2010 with the purpose of strengthening collaboration and exchange of S-L experiences, disseminating projects and promote research, and supporting institutionalization processes. Annually the network organises a conference hosted by a different university each year. In the UK the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) offers advice and support to universities to engage with the public and hosts an annual conference in Bristol¹⁰. In Ireland, Campus Engage is a national network of Irish higher education institutions responding to and implementing national and institutional higher education policies on civic and community engagement and knowledge exchange. It was established by NUI Galway in 2007 and mainstreamed by the Irish Universities Association in 2014. The Campus Engage Steering Committee members are nominated by HEI Presidents. Since early 2013 the network has scaled up from 5 to 24 HEIs, to include all 7 Universities and all Institutes of Technology, DIT, RCSI and NCAD. Campus Engage strives to work collaboratively and cost effectively across the sector, providing shared services and products informed by the relevant expertise and experience at home and abroad.

National Policy

When asked if national university policy and legislation governing universities are supportive of civic engagement and S-L only 3 from 11 responses indicate support. In two of these cases, Ireland and Spain there is strong reference to engagement in a number of policy documents and legislation.

In Spain, the Royal Decree 1791/2010 of 30 December (Article 64.3) states that universities should promote practices of social and civic responsibility that combine academic learning with the provision of community service, aimed at improving the quality of life and social inclusion. In addition, the Royal Decree 1027/2011 of 15 July (amended by Royal Decree 96/2014 of 14 February) on the Spanish Qualifications Framework for Higher Education states that both Bachelor and Master studies should include as a learning outcome the ability of students to make ethical reflections of nature in their field of study. The Conference of Rectors of Spanish Universities (2001) has stated that the University must take a leading role in the processes of human development, by exploring and implementing new strategies to build a more just and participatory society. In addition, the working group on Curricular Sustainability of the Conference of Rectors in 2015 approved a declaration on support of the institutionalization of S-L as a strategy for attaining sustainability in the curriculum. The "University 2015 Strategy" (Ministry of Education, 2010) that frames the modernization of the Spanish university, urges universities to be prepared for contributing to the promotion



of a new social model, and to incorporate into its educational model, teaching and learning practices that adequately integrate preparation for professional practice and for the exercise of social responsibility of students and graduates. S-L is mentioned at the new Law on Volunteering that will be soon approved by the Parliament.

In Ireland, the National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 (Section 5) names engagement with wider society as 'the third of the three interconnected core roles of higher education'. It calls on higher education institutions to 'engage with the communities they serve in a more connected manner—identifying community, regional and enterprise needs and proactively responding to them'. An ambition to be achieved through 'greater inward and outward mobility of staff and students' between institutions and organisations in the wider community; through flexible programme provision which meets continuing professional development (CPD) needs; through accreditation of students' civic engagement activities; and through the establishment of mechanisms that foster external engagement in a range of activities, 'including programme design and revision' (2011, 77). The National Strategy argues that this enhanced engagement 'will help [institutions] become more relevant and responsive, and will also enhance their diversity and distinctiveness' (2011, 77). The National Strategy recommended that a steering and performance based framework for the system governance of higher education in Ireland be put in place. In 2013 the Department of Education and Skills published the Higher Education System Performance Framework. The HEA uses this framework as the context for conducting strategic dialogue with individual institutions and for setting and reviewing Performance Compacts, reflecting their contribution to overall higher education system objectives. Section 5.5 of the Higher Education Performance Compacts covers community and industry engagement and knowledge exchange. Compacts require higher education institutions themselves to propose the qualitative and quantitative indicators. The agreed indicators of success will be measured and will influence the allocation of funding. The Universities Act 1997 governs the university sector and while it doesn't specifically make reference to service learning, however the language adopted underpins the concept. Under the Object and Functions Chapter 1, the Act references that universities exist 'to promote the cultural and social life of society', 'foster a capacity for critical thinking amongst its students', 'contribute to the realisation of national economic and social development', make 'provision for adult and continuing education' and to 'promote gender balance and equality of opportunity among student and employees' (1997).

In Lithuania national higher education policy supports civic engagement but makes no reference to S-L. In Italy there are no legislative restrictions or obstacles to organise studies with service learning and civic engagement and national policy supports the development of practical skills, experiential and problem-based learning.

SECTION 4 CONCLUSION

In terms of completing the survey 8 institutions state that they had the necessary resources of complete the survey with 3 indicating some difficulty or complexity.

In terms of answering the questions many encountered difficulty as information is not centralised in any one institutional repository and involved the evaluation of many resources (mission and strategic plan, websites, university documents etc.) and engagement activities



across the institution. In some instances where S-L is not institutionalised by the university it was very difficult to access information on number of staff and students participating. In terms of accessing national information, it was difficult to ascertain if policy and legislation are aligned to civic engagement and S-L and it was also difficult to ascertain if other institutions offer S-L. There is a lack of clarity in some institutions as to differences between internships, S-L and volunteering and this level of definitional confusion made data gathering difficult. Positively in another instance was report when it was indicated that they had both the time and space to gather data. Another indicated that new information on S-L across the universities was accessed through this process.

Significant Supports to establish Service-Learning

When asked what are the most significant support in establishing S-L in the university 6 respondents indicated a dedicated unit or group of designated individuals committed to S-L with an annual budget or funding was fundamental. 2 respondents indicated that an understanding of S-L and a commitment from senior management is key. Another mentioned the necessity of enthusiastic individuals. Another specified recognition in the form of national and international awards. A sense of endurance was mentioned as key. Another highlighted a multi-faceted set of supports and activities including a coordinating unit with funding, formal training and education opportunities, institutional and national policy and legislation development and alignment, the existence of a national network and support function, scholarly underpinning to civic engagement and S-L activities, and internal and external communication on activity.

Main barriers to establish Service-Learning

A large set of barriers to establishing S-L as an approach was documented by 11 respondents with many commonalities between all responses. The main barriers can be categorised into 6 groups namely; time; knowledge and expertise; funding, national and institutional prioritisation; coordinating unit; and, reward and recognition.

Time - Almost all respondents mention time as a major barrier towards the implementation of S-L. All acknowledge the need for time and energy to establish partnerships and coordinate logistics related to S-L. Release time from other duties was one possible solution offered towards the implementation of S-L.

Knowledge and expertise – in some responses a lack of knowledge and expertise in S-L was acknowledged as a barrier. It was also detailed that the name S-L is a barrier.

Funding - A deficit of funding, cuts in university funding and the recession are acknowledged as having a negative bearing on the adopting of S-L as an approach.

National and Institutional Prioritisation – it was noted in some responses that other areas such as research or key new national and institutional priorities such as employability overshadowed the importance given to SL. There was a concern that as a result S-L will remain on the periphery.



Coordinating Unit – it was acknowledged that the absence of a dedicated coordinating unit or team of people designated to S-L is a major barrier.

Reward and Recognition – a lack of internal and external rewards and recognition are seen as major barriers towards the embedding of S-L.

In terms of the use of the data 9 out of 11 respondents indicated that the institution data gathered would be shared with relevant contact on campus, 8 aim to use the data to inform strategic planning and 6 felt it could be used to work with current or prospective funders.

Concluding Remarks - Opportunities and Limitations

A diverse picture of civic engagement and S-L is presented here in terms of this 12-university sample of partners in the Europe Engage project. Some countries and residing universities have made strong headway in terms of growth and development, others are at nascent stages of development with a desire for deeper support and adoption of this pedagogical approach. All are at different stages of institutionalisation with some universities with dedicated centres, mainly in the minority, and others with no support infrastructure. This mapping exercise has allowed the project to map existing practice with a view towards benchmarking future growth and practice, or otherwise. Thus this mapping exercise has been an opportunity for the participating universities. However, this exercise in itself has had limitations, and given the nature of any survey, it has not allowed for deeper data to be mined as might be done through a qualitative approach using interviews or focus groups to attain deeper knowledge.



APPENDIX 1

EUROPE ENGAGE SURVEY OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT & SERVICE-LEARNING ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE PARTNER UNIVERSITIES



University Details

Please enter your university details below.	
1. Name of University	
2. Full Address	7
3. Contact Person	
4. Contact Email	
5. Telephone Number (including country code)	1
6. Name of Senior Manager Responsible for Service-L	earning and Civic Engagement (if applicable)
7. Position in University	
8. Contact Email	



Section 1 - University Culture and Identity

	No formal acknowledgment	Some formal acknowledgment	Moderate formal acknowledgment	Substantial formal acknowledgment	Unable t assess
niversity mission statement					
niversity strategic plans					
rogram or discipline specific trategic plans					
niversity website					
niversity publications					
niversity marketing materials					
ublic lectures					
community member articipation on University oards	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
centralized university office r centre for service- learning r civic engagement	0	0	0	0	
raining for faculty				\bigcirc	
pecific learning activities rovided to faculty to include in nodules	0			0	
wards to faculty for inclusion f service-learning or civic ngagement components rithin modules	0	0	0	\circ	\circ
Graduation requirements for tudents	\bigcirc		\circ	\circ	
lequirement for some najors/disciplines/programmes					
deneral academic awards to tudents include civic or ervice component					
wards to students specifically or civic engagement or community service	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
ner (please describe):					

2. Is civic engagement	and Service-Le	arning included	in your university's	s overall missior	1?
Yes					
No					
2.a) Please provide de	etails of your univ	versity's mission	statement		
In formal documents following objectives for the state of the sta					are the
Tollowing objectives tol	Not addressed	Mentioned or noted, but not described	Described in some	Emphasized or promoted	Unable to assess
Students' general academic achievement					
Students' academic achievement within the specific service-learning or civic engagement module or program	0	0	0	0	
Students' engagement in the current service- learning or civic engagement module	0	0	0	0	0
Students' engagement in university	\bigcirc	\bigcirc			\bigcirc
Students' engagement in communities outside the university	\circ				
Connection/reflection related to students' career goals	\bigcirc				\bigcirc
Connection/reflection related to students' life goals outside career/work		\circ	0	\circ	
Connection/reflection related to students' future plans	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Connection/reflection related to students' future decisions	\circ	0	\circ	\circ	
Connection/reflection related to students' past or current decisions					\bigcirc

	Not addressed	Mentioned or noted, but not described	Described in some detail	Emphasized or promoted	Unable to assess
Connection/reflection related to students' past or current actions or behaviours					
Connection/reflection related to students' general intentions for their own lives	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		
Connection/reflection related to what students consider personally important			0	0	
Connection/reflection a addressing how students personally understand the service or civic situation					
Students' contributions to the module or program					
Students' contributions to the university					\bigcirc
Students' contributions to the beneficiaries of the service students provide			0		
Students' contributions to a more generalized "common good"	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	
Students' own life purpose (their own conception of their life's aims)			0	0	
Learning academic skills (e.g., reading, writing, critical thinking)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Learning social skills (e.g., perspective- taking, interpersonal communication)				0	
Learning "good citizenship" skills					\bigcirc
Learning other skills (please	e describe):				

4. To what extent is the senior management of your university supportive of civic engagement and service-learning activities?

	No support by senior management	Some support by senior management	Moderate support by senior management	Substantial support by senior management	Unable to assess
Creation of coordinating unit					
Provision of posts which include responsibility for civic engagement and service-learning	\bigcirc				
Attendance at civic engagement and service-learning events	\circ				0
Funding of civic engagement and service-learning events					\bigcirc
Membership of advisory boards or steering committees related to civic engagement					
Other (please describe):					
4.a) Please provide ev	idence:				

5. What efforts are muniversity?	nade to make staff	aware of civic e	ngagement and s	service-learning a	ectivities in your
	No efforts are made to make staff aware	Some efforts are made to make staff aware	Moderate efforts are made to make staff aware	Substantial efforts are made to make staff aware	Unable to assess
Conferences/public lectures					
Training events					
Dissemination of information online/offline (e.g. email, minutes of meetings, etc)					
Funding for attending conferences					
Dedicated websites					
Other (please describe):					
5.a) Please provide 6	evidence:				
6. To what extent doe	No support	Some support	Moderate support	Substantial support	ce-learning?
	provided for development	provided for development	provided for development	provided for development	Unable to assess
Funding					
Mentoring					
Training					
Library resources					
Other (please describe):					
6.a Please provide e	vidence:				

7. Do career promotion policies in your university explicitly take into account civic engagement and service-learning activities?
Yes
○ No
7.a) Please provide evidence:
8. Are there organisational structures in place to co-ordinate civic engagement and service-learning activities in your university?
No organisational structures to co-ordinate civic engagement and service-learning activities
Some organisational structures but none dedicated exclusively to civic engagement and service-learning activities
Some organisational structures dedicated exclusively to civic engagement and service-learning
A dedicated organisational structure which works across the university
Unable to assess
8.a) Please provide evidence of the organisational structures:



Section 2 - Service-Learning Activities

o what extent is service-learning incorporated into programmes Bachelor and Masters curricula red by your university?
Never incorporated into programmes
Infrequently incorporated into programmes
Often incorporated into programmes
Incorporated into all programmes
Unable to assess

10. To what extent do	o community part	ners collaborate	with regard to the	curriculum of ser	vice-learning
	Little or no collaboration by community partners	collaboration by	A moderate amount of collaboration by community partners	A substantial amount of collaboration by community partners	Unable to assess
Design of curriculum					
Delivery of curriculum					
Assessment					
Other (please describe):					
I0.a) Please provide	evidence:				
1. How many Service	_	ses did your unive	ersity OFFER in th	ne 2013-2014?(P	lease leave
olank if Unable to As	sess)				
12. Please list the dis	sciplines to which	the numbers abo	ove refer?		
13. Please list the na	ames of courses o	offered?			
13. Please list the na			iated with service	-learning at your	university?

16. How many ACADEMIC STAFF contributed to Service-Learning courses in the academic year 2013-2014? (Please leave blank if Unable to Assess)
17. What was the number of community members involved in service-learning in academic year 2013-2014? (For example, as working group member, member of an advisory panel. Please leave blank if Unable to Assess)
18. In the past has your university offered Service-Learning courses that no longer exist? Yes No
18.a) Please provide evidence:
19. Do community partners deliver content, assess student work, supervise or act in any teaching capacity in service-learning courses?
Little or no collaboration by community partners
A small amount of collaboration by community partners
A moderate amount of collaboration by community partners
A substantial amount of collaboration by community partners
Unable to assess

		Yes		No	
ormal education ntres					
formal lucation centres					
overnment entities					
Business and nterprises		\bigcirc			
oundations					
NGO´s					
Health centres					
Associations					
ther (please specify)					
			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning	area of activity Yes	of the organization	ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
1. Please provide the arning Health Education			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning Health Education			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning Health Education Leisure			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	chip, in serv
arning Health Education Leisure Sports			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning Health Education Leisure Sports Homeless			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning Health Education Leisure Sports Homeless Scouting			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning Health Education Leisure Sports Homeless Scouting Natural environment Functional diversity (Disability)			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
Health Education Leisure Sports Homeless Scouting Natural environment Functional diversity Disability) Migrant rights			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning Health Education Leisure Sports Homeless Scouting Natural environment Functional diversity			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv
arning Health Education Leisure Sports Homeless Scouting Natural environment Functional diversity (Disability) Migrant rights Elderly			ons with which yo	ou are in partners	ship, in serv



Section 3 - National Context

22. How many universities are there in your country?
23. Are other universities in your country involved in service learning?
Yes
○ No
23.a) Please provide evidence:
24.ls there a national network in your country to support service learning and civic engagement in universities?
Yes
○ No
24.a) Please provide evidence of its remit.
25. Is national university policy and legislation governing universities supportive of service learning and civic engagement?
Yes
○ No
25.a) Please provide evidence:



Section 4 - Conclusion

26. Did you have the necessary resources available to you to complete all questions in this survey on behalf of your university?
Yes
○ No
27. Which question(s) were most difficult to answer, and why?
28. Please list what you consider to be the most significant supports in establishing service-learning activities in your university.
29. Please list what you consider to be the main barriers to establishing service-learning activities in your university.

Many thanks for taking the time to complete this survey.