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*A picture containing graphical user interface

Description automatically generated*  
 *Note: The template below provides the shortest approach to carrying out a quick scan. However, universities and communities can carry out a more thorough quick scan by using the Mapping Report template (Template 3) instead, which also allows to make preliminary assessments of the level of engagement.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **Sub-dimensions** |
| **Icon  Description automatically generated I. Teaching  and learning** | I.1. The university has study programmes or courses to respond to societal needs that are specific to the university's context and its external communities.  I.2. The university has study programmes or courses that include a community-based learning component for students.  I.3. The university facilitates the participation of community representatives in the teaching and learning process (in a curricular or extra-curricular context).  I.4. The university has study programmes or courses that are created, reviewed or evaluated in consultation/cooperation with the university’s external communities. |
|  | |
| **Icon  Description automatically generated II. Research** | II.1. The university carries out research focusing on the societal needs of the university’s external communities.  II.2. The university carries out collaborative/participatory research in cooperation with the university’s external communities. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Icon  Description automatically generated III. Service and knowledge exchange** | III.1. University staff contribute to debates and initiatives that address societal needs of the university’s external communities.  III.2. University staff provide their knowledge to support and/or build the capacity of the university’s external communities.  III.3. University staff community-engagement activities have resulted in demonstrable benefits for the university’s external communities. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Icon  Description automatically generated IV. Students** | IV.1. Students deliver community-engagement activities independently through student organisations or initiatives.  IV.2. The university facilitates and supports partnerships between students and external communities. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Icon  Description automatically generated V. Management (partnerships and openness)** | V.1. The university has a track record of mutually beneficial partnerships with its external communities.  V.2. The university makes learning and research resources accessible to its external communities.  V.3. The university has facilities and services that are jointly managed and/or accessible to its external communities. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Icon  Description automatically generated VI. Management (policies and support structures)** | VI.1. The university provides support and/or incentives for community-engagement achievements by its staff, students and external communities.  VI.2. The university has a support structure (e.g. committee, office or staff) for embedding and coordinating community-engagement activities at the university level.  VI.3. The university has staff-development policies (e.g. recruitment, tenure, promotion) that include community engagement as a criterion.  VI.4. The university has a mission, strategy, leadership and (funding) instruments that specifically promote community engagement. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A close up of a sign  Description automatically generated VII. Supportive peers** | VII.1. The university has prominent academic staff members that have a strong track-record of community engagement and that advocate for its further advancement.  VII.2. The university’s academic staff are acceptive of the idea of university-community engagement and of the value and rigour of community-engaged teaching and research. |
|  | |

*A picture containing text

Description automatically generated  
Case title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

*Case study provided by: name, surname, institution*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Description of community-engagement practice | | |
| **Brief description of practice**  (*Please use the sub-questions, if relevant.)* |  | | |
| *What are the main goals of the practice?* |  | | |
| *What are the main activities?* |  | | |
| *Who is organising the practice?* |  | | |
| *Who initiated it?* |  | | |
| **Web link** |  | | |
| **How is the community/target group with which you engage involved in the implementation of this practice?** |  | | |
| 2. Support for community engagement | |
| **How does the university support this community-engaged practice?** |  | | |
| *Does the organizer have a formal budget? Does the university provide facilities and/or administrative support?* |  | | |
| *Does the practice fit in a broader strategy or framework of the organizer (the university)?* |  | | |
| *Is it a continuous or a ‘one-off’ collaboration?* |  | | |
| *Does the university give any form of recognition or promotion of the practice?* |  | | |
| **How do partners from the community support and value this practice?** |  | | |
| **How do your peers (university staff and management) and students support and value this practice?** |  | | |

# 

# ***Logo Description automatically generated***

# **Icon Description automatically generated**DIMENSION I: TEACHING AND LEARNING

# Sub-dimension I.1. The university has study programmes or courses to respond to societal needs that are specific to the university's context and its external communities.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university has study programmes or courses that ….** | | | |
| Level 1 | …make general references to their relevance to the societal needs of the university's external communities. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … include specific content or make specific links with the societal needs of the university's external communities. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … are developed in cooperation with the university’s external communities to address a societal need. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension I.2. The university has study programmes or courses that include a community-based learning component for students.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **Community-based learning is included in study programmes and courses at the university and…** | | | |
| Level 1 | .. benefits students to develop their knowledge and skills, although there is little evidence yet of their benefit for the community. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … has demonstrated benefits for students and supports community partners to address a short-term problem or need. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … builds capacities of community partners and bring equal benefits to the students, teaching staff and university as a whole. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension I.3. The university facilitates the participation of community representatives in the teaching and learning process (in a curricular or extra-curricular context).*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **External community representatives that cooperate with the university …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … have a partnership role that does not involve the delivery of teaching and learning. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | ... are included occasionally in teaching and learning processes (e.g. extra-curricular guest lectures). | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … are included continually in teaching and learning processes (e.g. working with students on projects or research). | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension I.4. The university has study programmes or courses that are created, reviewed or evaluated in consultation/cooperation with the university’s external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **External community representatives that cooperate with the university …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … are not formally consulted regarding the design of the programmes or courses with which they cooperate. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … are formally consulted regarding the design of the courses with which they cooperate and their voices are taken into consideration. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … co-design and co-evaluate the programmes or courses with which they cooperate. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Synthesis: Community-engagement heatmap for Dimension I: Teaching and learning*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics of engagement | Heatmap level | | | | | Heatmap levels criteria |
| Lowest level |  |  |  | Highest level |
| Authenticity of engagement |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: superficial; no evidence yet of mutual benefits  Higher: authentic; tangible benefits for communities |
| Societal needs addressed |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: needs of labour market and industry  Higher: ‘grand challenges’ (e.g. climate), social justice |
| Communities engaged with |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: well-resourced partners (e.g. business)  Higher: low-resourced partners (e.g. schools, NGOs) |
| Institutional spread |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: only at one or two university departments  Higher: across the entire institution |
| Institutional sustainability |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: engagement through short-term projects  Higher: engagement institutionalised, adequate funding |
| *[For each characteristic of engagement, mark with an X the heatmap level of the dimension as a whole, based on the findings of the mapping report. Insert a brief narrative explanation of the heatmap findings].* | | | | | | |

# **Icon Description automatically generated**DIMENSION II. RESEARCH

## *Sub-dimension II.1. The university carries out research focusing on the societal needs of the university’s external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The research projects at the university that address societal needs….** | | | |
| Level 1 | … focus on community-specific needs and include community representatives as respondents. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … include structured consultations with community stakeholders at different phases in the research process. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … are developed based on a structured partnership, in which the community can co-determine the research agenda. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension II.2. The university carries out collaborative/participatory research in cooperation with the university’s external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **Collaborative/participatory research projects at the university…** | | | |
| Level 1 | … actively include community stakeholders in the process of data collection. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … actively include community stakeholders’ views relating to the interpretation of research results and implications for policy and/or for the community. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … result in co-creation with community stakeholders (joint defining of research agenda, joint implementation and interpretation). | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Synthesis: Community-engagement heatmap for Dimension II: Research*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics of engagement | Heatmap level | | | | | Heatmap levels criteria |
| Lowest level |  |  |  | Highest level |
| Authenticity of engagement |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: superficial; no evidence yet of mutual benefits  Higher: authentic; tangible benefits for communities |
| Societal needs addressed |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: needs of labour market and industry  Higher: ‘grand challenges’ (e.g. climate), social justice |
| Communities engaged with |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: well-resourced partners (e.g. business)  Higher: low-resourced partners (e.g. schools, NGOs) |
| Institutional spread |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: only at one or two university departments  Higher: across the entire institution |
| Institutional sustainability |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: engagement through short-term projects  Higher: engagement institutionalised, adequate funding |
| *[For each characteristic of engagement, mark with an X the heatmap level of the dimension as a whole, based on the findings of the mapping report. Insert a brief narrative explanation of the heatmap findings].* | | | | | | |

# **Icon Description automatically generated** DIMENSION III. SERVICE AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

## *Sub-dimension III.1. University staff contribute to debates and initiatives that address societal needs of the university’s external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **University staff contribute to debates and initiatives that address societal needs of the university’s external communities…** | | | |
| Level 1 | … through academic publications, public presentations and media articles. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … through including community partners in university-led development projects (non-research) related to community-relevant issues. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … through joint initiatives or advocacywith community groups, in which community groups are equal partners. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension III.2. University staff provide their knowledge to support and/or build the capacity of the university’s external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university contributes to building the capacity of external community groups through …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … occasionally including external community groups in joint projects (as partners). | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … regularly providing expertise to external community groups to resolve societal needs or issues that they are faced with. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … continually supporting external community groups to develop their knowledge and skills and strengthen their ability to resolve challenges that they are faced with. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension III.3. University staff community-engagement activities have resulted in demonstrable benefits for the university’s external communities*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The ways in which external communities benefit from service and knowledge exchange activities are …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … assumed, but not explicitly evaluated (quantitatively or qualitatively). | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … acknowledged through positive feedback from community stakeholders. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … proven through tangible changes and improvements to public policy and/or to the communities involved. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Synthesis: Community-engagement heatmap for Dimension III: Service and knowledge exchange*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics of engagement | Heatmap level | | | | | Heatmap levels criteria |
| Lowest level |  |  |  | Highest level |
| Authenticity of engagement |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: superficial; no evidence yet of mutual benefits  Higher: authentic; tangible benefits for communities |
| Societal needs addressed |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: needs of labour market and industry  Higher: ‘grand challenges’ (e.g. climate), social justice |
| Communities engaged with |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: well-resourced partners (e.g. business)  Higher: low-resourced partners (e.g. schools, NGOs) |
| Institutional spread |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: only at one or two university departments  Higher: across the entire institution |
| Institutional sustainability |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: engagement through short-term projects  Higher: engagement institutionalised, adequate funding |
| *[For each characteristic of engagement, mark with an X the heatmap level of the dimension as a whole, based on the findings of the mapping report. Insert a brief narrative explanation of the heatmap findings].* | | | | | | |

# **Icon Description automatically generated** DIMENSION IV. STUDENTS

## *Sub-dimension IV.1. Students deliver community-engagement activities independently through student organisations or initiatives.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **Students deliver community-engagement activities through…** | | | |
| Level 1 | … awareness-raising campaigns to address community needs. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … organising direct assistance to community groups in need (e.g. fundraising; organising charitable events; volunteering in schools). | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … partnerships with community groups to jointly address problems in the community. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension IV.2. The university facilitates and supports partnerships between students and external communities*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university facilitates and supports partnerships between community groups and students …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … by providing information on extra-curricular activities to address community needs. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … by supporting students in organising extra-curricular activities for community engagement. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … by jointly designing extra-curricular opportunities to support students' community engagement. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Synthesis: Community-engagement heatmap for Dimension IV: Students*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics of engagement | Heatmap level | | | | | Heatmap levels criteria |
| Lowest level |  |  |  | Highest level |
| Authenticity of engagement |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: superficial; no evidence yet of mutual benefits  Higher: authentic; tangible benefits for communities |
| Societal needs addressed |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: needs of labour market and industry  Higher: ‘grand challenges’ (e.g. climate), social justice |
| Communities engaged with |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: well-resourced partners (e.g. business)  Higher: low-resourced partners (e.g. schools, NGOs) |
| Institutional spread |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: only at one or two university departments  Higher: across the entire institution |
| Institutional sustainability |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: engagement through short-term projects  Higher: engagement institutionalised, adequate funding |
| *[For each characteristic of engagement, mark with an X the heatmap level of the dimension as a whole, based on the findings of the mapping report. Insert a brief narrative explanation of the heatmap findings].* | | | | | | |

# **Icon Description automatically generated**DIMENSION V. UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT (PARTNERSHIPS AND OPENNESS)

## *Sub-dimension V.1. The university has a track record of mutually-beneficial partnerships with its external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university has partnerships with external stakeholders through ….** | | | |
| Level 1 | … occasionally providing resources to community groups in need and through short-term collaborations relating to community needs. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … agreements on continual areas of cooperation relating to community needs. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … inclusion of community groups on university bodies that make key decisions about community engagement activities (steering groups, committees, etc). | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension V.2. The university makes learning and research resources accessible to its external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university makes learning and research resources open and accessible to its external communities…** | | | |
| Level 1 | … by making educational materials open to the public via downloads and videos and by allowing open access to selected research. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … by organising regular public events targeting the university’s external communities (e.g. science festivals). | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … and can demonstrate that external communities make regular use of the university’s educational/research resources. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension V.3. The university has facilities and services that are jointly-managed and/or accessible to its external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university has facilities and services that are ….** | | | |
| Level 1 | … accessible to the public, but rarely used by the non-university community. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … accessible to the public, widely promoted and regularly used by community. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … jointl -owned, shared, managed with relevant community groups and are regularly used by community- | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Synthesis: Community-engagement heatmap for Dimension V: University management (partnerships and openness)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics of engagement | Heatmap level | | | | | Heatmap levels criteria |
| Lowest level |  |  |  | Highest level |
| Authenticity of engagement |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: superficial; no evidence yet of mutual benefits  Higher: authentic; tangible benefits for communities |
| Societal needs addressed |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: needs of labour market and industry  Higher: ‘grand challenges’ (e.g. climate), social justice |
| Communities engaged with |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: well-resourced partners (e.g. business)  Higher: low-resourced partners (e.g. schools, NGOs) |
| Institutional spread |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: only at one or two university departments  Higher: across the entire institution |
| Institutional sustainability |  |  |  |  |  | Lower: engagement through short-term projects  Higher: engagement institutionalised, adequate funding |
| *[For each characteristic of engagement, mark with an X the heatmap level of the dimension as a whole, based on the findings of the mapping report. Insert a brief narrative explanation of the heatmap findings].* | | | | | | |

# **Icon Description automatically generated** DIMENSION VI. UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT (POLICIES AND SUPPORT STRUCTURES)

## *Sub-dimension VI.1. The university provides support and/or incentives for community-engagement achievements by its staff, students and external communities.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university provides support and/or incentives for community engagement …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … through occasional statements relating to the relevance of community engagement to the societal needs of universities' external communities. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … regular and/or structured efforts to increase the visibility of achievements of the university’s community engagement (via web sites, social media and/or through a dedicated office/body). | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … by providing formal recognition/awards for community engagement and/or through high-profile conferences or media promotion. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension VI.2. The university has a support structure (e.g. committee, office or staff) for embedding and coordinating community engagement activities at the university level.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **There is a university structure that addresses/ supports community engagement in the form of…** | | | |
| Level 1 | … a working group or advisory body that covers “university engagement” in its broadest sense (third mission, business engagement, civic role, etc.) | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … a university committee specifically focused on improving university-community engagement. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … a high-level university body incorporating community partners to jointly oversee and plan community-engagement activities. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

Sub-dimension VI.3. The university has staff development policies (e.g recruitment, tenure, promotion) that include community engagement as a criterion.*[[1]](#footnote-2)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **University policies relating to recruitment, tenure and promotion…** | | | |
| Level 1 | … do not yet include evaluation criteria specifically related to community engagement. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … does include evaluation criteria specifically related to community engagement, although not within the evaluation criteria relating to the categories research and teaching. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … prioritise community engagement by providing additional weights for community-engagement achievements in recruitment and evaluation processes, including within research and teaching. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension VI.4. The university has a mission, strategy, leadership and (funding) instruments that specifically promote community engagement.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **The university’s mission, strategy and leadership …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … indirectly support community engagement through a general reference to the university’s role in addressing societal needs. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … specifically emphasise the university role in addressing societal needs and serving the local community (without specifically mentioning community engagement). | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … explicitly prioritise community engagement as within its mission and have concrete engagement initiatives in place. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions *(300 words per sub-dimension)* | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

# A close up of a sign Description automatically generated

# DIMENSION VII. SUPPORTIVE PEERS

## *Sub-dimension VII.1. The university has prominent academic staff members that have a strong track-record of community engagement and that advocate for its further advancement.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **Academic staff at the university play a prominent role in advocating and advancing community engagement and have a strong track-record of community engagement…** | | | |
| Level 1 | … in at least one university department. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … at several university departments. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … at most university departments. | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

## *Sub-dimension VII.2. The university’s academic staff are acceptive of the idea of university-community engagement and of the value and rigour of community-based teaching and research.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of engagement | | | |
| **Academic staff both within and outside the unit(s) where community-engaged activities are organised …** | | | |
| Level 1 | … have little understanding and/or express little support for community-based teaching or research. | | |
| Level 2 |  | | |
| Level 3 | … express limited support for community-based teaching or research. | | |
| Level 4 |  | | |
| Level 5 | … express strong support for community-based teaching or research and recognise the value and rigour of community-based teaching and research | | |
| Achieved level and conclusions | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of achieved level (1-5) | |  |  |

# Graphical user interface, text, application Description automatically generated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  | **Characteristics of community engagement** | | | | |  | |
| **Dimensions of community engagement** | Authenticity | Societal Needs | Communities | Spread | Sustainability | |
| I. Teaching and learning |  |  |  |  |  | |
| II. Research |  |  |  |  |  | |
| III. Service/knowledge exchange |  |  |  |  |  | |
| IV. Students |  |  |  |  |  | |
| V. Management (partnerships) |  |  |  |  |  | |
| VI. Management (policies) |  |
| VII. Peer support |  |

*Instructions: Using the Excel sheet template table (available upon request at iro@iro.hr), enter for each dimension and for each characteristic of engagement a value from a scale 1-5 corresponding to the colour selected from the 5-level colour scale in the mapping report. The colour of each cell will change depending on the value entered, but the actual values in the final table will remain hidden.*

*The heatmap is focused on the dimensions of community engagement activities. The dimensions that relate to the supportive environment for community engagement (Dimensions VI – Management/policies; and Dimension VII - Supportive peers) are only subject the ‘Authenticity’ characteristic of the heatmap since those dimensions relate to ensuring the institutional conditions for engaging with communities rather than on engagement activities.*



# Graphical user interface, application Description automatically generated

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Areas of **S**trength | Areas of **L**ower **I**ntensity | | Areas with **P**otentia**l** for **D**evelopment |
| *Areas where the university is doing particularly well in terms of community engagement.* | *Areas of community engagement that are not highly developed at the university (due to it not yet being a priority, due to limited capacity or other reasons).* | | *Areas of community engagement that the university could realistically improve in the future.* |
| **O**pportunities | | **T**hreats | |
| Internal: *e.g. Level of support among leadership and academic staff* | | Internal: *e.g. Level of support among leadership and academic staff* | |
| External: *e.g. Level of community support; in line with national policy; availability of funds and programmes (at the national and European level)* | | External: *e.g. Level of community support; in line with national policy; availability of funds and programmes (at the national and European level)* | |

A picture containing graphical user interface
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Title page

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   
RESULTS OF TEFCE TOOLBOX IMPLEMENTATION

LOGO OF UNIVERSITY

# PREFACE

Consider the option for a senior management member to provide a preface supporting the conclusions of the report.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One-two page summary of the report’s main content with primary focus on the SLIPDOT recommendations.

# INTRODUCTION

Local team to provide more info below on how the TEFCE Toolbox was implemented.

***About the TEFCE Toolbox for community engagement***

The TEFCE Toolbox is both a reference tool to understand the dimensions of community engagement in a university context and a framework for universities to determine how well they perform according to each dimension and to identify define where they can improve. The TEFCE Toolbox allows universities to:

* **better understand** the different dimensions and levels of community engagement;
* **discover and map** their existing community-engagement practices;
* **identify and raise the visibility** ofgood practices of community engagementat the university;
* **reflect** upon how community-engaged the institution as a whole currently is by determining what kind of community engagement is taking place and its level of development;
* **plan** future improvements for furthering university-community engagement.

Community engagement in higher education refers to a wide variety of activities.The TEFCE Toolbox maps five thematic dimensions within which university-community engagement activities can take place:

* Teaching and learning
* Research
* Service and knowledge exchange
* Student initiatives
* University management (partnerships and openness).

The TEFCE project also identifies two dimensions of a supportive environment for community engagement:

* University management (policies and support structures)
* Supportive peers.

The TEFCE Toolbox is thus structured around a total of 7 thematic dimensions of community engagement (each with 2 to 4 sub-dimensions, thus resulting in with a total of 20 sub-dimensions).

The Toolbox itself is applied through a series of steps to be undertaken by participating universities:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Quick scan** | Initial discussion by university/community team on the type and extent of community engagement at the university. |
| **2. Evidence collection** | Collecting stories of community-engaged practitioners throughout the university. |
| **3. Mapping report** | Using a TEFCE Toolbox matrix to map the level of community engagement of the university and to identify good practices, resulting in a background report. |
| **4. Participative dialogue** | Open discussions among university management, staff, students and the community on strengths and areas of improvement. |
| **5. Institutional report** | Promoting good practices and impact, and critical self-reflection for planning improvements to university-community engagement. |

***Toolbox piloting methodology***

***Acknowledgements***

# INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

## About the University of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Introduction to the university, its profile and its history of community engagement.

## Selection of flagship community engagement practices

Selection of 3-4 practices from the case studies that illustrate different ways in which the university is community-engaged. These are not „best“ practices, just an illustration of the diversity of innovative practices that exist.

We recommend to place the content as separate boxes with content that can be copy-pasted from the „brief description“ section of the case studies included in the Annex.

# MAPPING PRACTICES

**Main part of report.** Copy-paste final version of Mapping Report completed in Stage 3 of the TEFCE Toolbox process, showing results dimension by dimension and the overall institutional heatmap.

# SELF-REFLECTION

Based on the mapping report prepared above, a series of workshops and structured discussions were organised with stakeholders at the University of \_\_\_\_ . The purpose of the discussions was to ascertain whether the mapping report captured the reality of community engagement at the University and to reflect upon both the achievements and the areas for improvement in terms of the University's community engagement.

The framework for the self-reflection was a so-called 'SLIPDOT analysis'. Developed by the TEFCE project, the SLIPDOT analysis follows the core structure of a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) but replaces the term 'Weaknesses' by two categories: 'Lower Intensity' and 'Potential for Development'. It also re-frames Opportunities and Threats as not only being external (as in a SWOT analysis), but also as encompassing elements that are *internal* to the university, but that are outside the control of community-engaged practitioners (meaning that they mostly refer to university management).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Areas of **S**trength | Areas of **L**ower **I**ntensity | | Areas with **P**otentia**l** for **D**evelopment |
| *Areas where the university is doing particularly well in terms of community engagement.* | *Areas of community engagement that are not highly developed at the university (due to it not yet being a priority, due to limited capacity or other reasons).* | | *Areas of community engagement that the university could realistically improve in the future.* |
| **O**pportunities | | **T**hreats | |
| Internal: *e.g. Level of support among leadership and academic staff* | | Internal: *e.g. Level of support among leadership and academic staff* | |
| External: *e.g. Level of community support; in line with national policy; availability of funds and programmes (at the national and European level)* | | External: *e.g. Level of community support; in line with national policy; availability of funds and programmes (at the national and European level)* | |

The participants of the SLIPDOT workshop were the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Local stakeholders***   * … | ***International experts***   * … |

The conclusions of the SLIPDOT analysis are presented below and provide a basis for further discussions about how to improve the community engagement at the University of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

## Strengths

* **…**
* **…**

## Lower intensity

* **…**
* **…**

## Potential for Development

* **…**
* **…**

## Opportunities

*Internal opportunities*

* **…**
* **…**

*External opportunities*

* **…**
* **…**

## Threats

*Internal threats*

* **…**
* **…**

*External threats*

* **…**
* **…**

# APPENDIX: CASE STUDIES

## **…….**

*Case study provided by: name, surname, institution*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Description of community-engagement practice | | |
| **Brief description of practice**  (*Please use the sub-questions, if relevant.)* |  | | |
| *What are the main goals of the practice?* |  | | |
| *What are the main activities?* |  | | |
| *Who is organising the practice?* |  | | |
| *Who initiated it?* |  | | |
| **Web link** |  | | |
| **How is the community/target group with which you engage involved in the implementation of this practice?** |  | | |
| 2. Support for community engagement | |
| **How does the university support this community-engaged practice?** |  | | |
| *Does the organizer have a formal budget? Does the university provide facilities and/or administrative support?* |  | | |
| *Does the practice fit in a broader strategy or framework of the organizer (the university)?* |  | | |
| *Is it a continuous or a ‘one-off’ collaboration?* |  | | |
| *Does the university give any form of recognition or promotion of the practice?* |  | | |
| **How do partners from the community support and value this practice?** |  | | |
| **How do your peers (university staff and management) and students support and value this practice?** |  | | |

1. Assuming that the university is able to add complementary criteria to those that are set through national legislation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)