COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Higher education institutions (HEIs) have a longstanding tradition of teaching, research and service. Of these, ‘service’ remains the most undefined and the one least considered in institutional policies, planning, and resource allocation processes. It is moreover a highly challenging area to the extent that the nature, scope and disciplinary application of service activities must be defined; that different agents must participate in service partnerships and broach attendant political and knowledge interface issues; and that institutionalising aspects of service in academic environments may in some circumstances necessitate change management.
Irrespective of these perennial complexities, in recent years in South Africa the spotlight has fallen increasingly on the role of service in higher education, as an overarching strategy in the transformation of higher education in relation to community development priorities. This is in line with expectations that higher education will fulfil its contribution to the reconstruction and development of civil society,\(^1\) as well as to scholarly activity,\(^2\) and that it will provide a complementary alternative to the marketisation of higher education, so strengthening the mission of HEIs to contribute to the public good.\(^3\) These concerns are not South Africa's alone: in 1982 the President of Harvard University, Derek Bok, called on universities to function as genuinely civic, socially and morally engaged institutions in order to fulfil their educational mission: 'If we could teach our students to care about important social problems and think about them rigorously, then clearly our institutions of learning must set a high example in the conduct of their own affairs. In addition to responding to its students, a university must examine its social responsibilities if it wishes to acquire an adequate understanding of its proper role and purpose in present-day society'.

Since the mid-1980s, discourse and practice regarding community service in higher education have shifted from the notion of 'outreach' towards 'community engagement'. The latter term implies a less paternalistic, more mutual and inclusive community–higher education relationship. The focus of this chapter will be on 'service', not as an end in itself, but as a vehicle for engaging the other primary functions of higher education (teaching and learning, and research) in a more reciprocal relationship with the social and economic development priorities of South Africa, for the public good.

It can be noted that the boundary between the public and private good is sometimes blurred in higher education. Beyond their community service functions (emphasised in this chapter), HEIs also perform services in meeting the needs of industry, government and civil society, for example through HEI–industry partnerships which are increasingly recognised as a necessary condition for innovation and competitive engagement with the global economy. This aspect of higher education is more fully examined in Chapter 9 (Responsiveness).

### 7.1 A Typology for Community Service in Higher Education

An possible obstacle to integrating community service as a core function of the academy is the way ‘service’ is understood (or misunderstood), and applied within higher education. It is therefore helpful to clarify some of the interpretations and applications of ‘service’ at the outset, in order to reflect more meaningfully on its development in South African higher education after ten years under democracy.

Terms used to describe forms of community service in higher education are illustrated in Figure 30. The forms of community service are differentiated along a continuum determined by two important distinctions: (i) who the primary beneficiaries of the service are (i.e. community or student); and (ii) what the primary goal of the service is (i.e. community service or student learning). Figure 30 also shows that categories are neither necessarily discrete nor mutually exclusive. First, a characteristic common to all categories is that they include a measure of experiential learning. Second, boundaries between volunteerism and community outreach; internship and cooperative education; community outreach and service-learning; and cooperative education and service-learning, are often blurred and programmes may shift one way or the other on the continuum. Discussion in this chapter will focus on categories of community service that fall on the left of the continuum.
7.1.1 Volunteerism

Volunteerism engages students in activities whose primary beneficiary is the recipient community and whose primary goal is to provide a service. Although students may learn from the programmes, these are generally not related to, or integrated into, the student's field of study. Volunteer programmes are essentially altruistic, extra-curricular, non-credit-bearing, small in scale, and funded by external donors and through student fund-raising.

7.1.2 Community Outreach/Extension Service

As with volunteerism, community outreach/extension service engages students in activities whose primary beneficiary is the recipient community and whose primary goal is to provide a service. However, these programmes are initiated from within the HEI by a department or faculty, or as an institution-wide initiative. They involve more structure and commitment from students and may give recognition in the form of academic credit or research publications. Where service activities become more integrated with academic coursework, the programme may move closer to the centre of the continuum to become more like service-learning.4

7.1.3 Internships

On the other end of the continuum, internships ('practicum') engage students in activities where the primary beneficiary is the student and the primary goal is student learning. Internships are generally fully integrated with the curriculum and are intended to provide students with hands-on practical experience that enhances their understanding of the area of study, achieves their learning outcomes and provides them with vocational experience. Internships are used extensively in many professional programmes such as social work, medicine, education, and psychology.
7.1.4 Cooperative Education

The primary beneficiary of cooperative education programmes (also called field education) is the student and the primary goal is student learning. Cooperative education provides students with co-curricular opportunities that are related to but not always fully integrated with the curriculum. The primary purpose of cooperative education is to enhance the student’s understanding of the area of study. Cooperative education has been used extensively in technikons throughout South Africa.

7.1.5 Service-learning

South Africa’s Joint Education Trust (JET) has defined service-learning as ‘a thoughtfully organised and reflective service-oriented pedagogy focused on the development priorities of communities through the interaction between and application of knowledge, skills and experience in partnership between community, academics, students, and service providers within the community for the benefit of all participants’.

Service-learning programmes (also called academic service-learning, academic community service and community-based learning) engage students in activities where both community and student are primary beneficiaries and where goals are to provide a service to the community and, equally, to enhance student learning through provision of this service. Reciprocity, mutual enrichment and integration with scholarly activities are central characteristics of service-learning.

Unlike other categories of community service, service-learning is entrenched in a discourse that proposes the development and transformation of higher education in relation to community needs. Proponents of service-learning argue that it reconnects higher education to society by making its academic mission more responsive and relevant to the pressing contemporary problems of society.

7.2 The Inheritance in 1994

Prior to the White Paper of 1997, there were no policy mandates or directives for community engagement in South African higher education.

Given a dearth of empirical research and social science literature on community engagement in South African higher education prior to 1994 and immediately thereafter, much of the information presented in this section is based on a survey undertaken by JET during 1997 and 1998. The survey sought to develop some understanding of community engagement and its potential role in South African higher education and to stimulate informed debate around the issue. It included studies of historically advantaged and historically disadvantaged universities and technikons in urban and rural settings and analysed programmes identified in terms of their goals, design, scale, participants and beneficiaries, costs and financing, partners and institutional support, and relationship between the programme and the curriculum. Key findings of the research were:

- The mission statement of most HEIs included the notion of community service.
- No HEIs had a policy to operationalise the community service component of their mission statement.
- Most HEIs had a wide range of community service projects.
- Most projects were initiated by students and academics attempting to address specific community needs, rather than as a deliberate institutional strategy.
- Few projects embraced all three traditional functions of higher education (i.e. teaching, research, and service).
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- Few projects included any form of partnership model in their conceptualisation and implementation.
- In the few instances where projects included teaching, research and service, and where a partnership had developed between participating constituencies, the benefits to community, academics, students and service agencies had been significant.

JET’s research identified five categories of community service programmes (links between these categories and the typology already provided are indicated).

Volunteer programmes identified in JET’s research (as defined in the typology) included activities organised by the University of Pretoria-based Southern African Student Volunteers (SASVO) and the University of Cape Town-based Students Health and Welfare Centres Organisation (SHAWCO).

Work-study programmes were initiated by external donors during the 1980s with the primary goal of providing disadvantaged students with financial aid. The programmes introduced participating students to on-campus (e.g. library, administration, research) and off-campus (e.g. advice offices, non-governmental organisations) work opportunities that would enhance their knowledge and skills in a variety of contexts. During the 1980s and early 1990s the universities of Cape Town, Natal, and Stellenbosch and the Cape and Peninsula Technikons had well-developed work-study programmes; some were discontinued after needy students gained better access to financial aid.

Community outreach and extension service programmes were probably the major category of higher education–community engagement prior to 1994. In the main, these programmes were initiated by innovative and progressive academic staff in response to the social, economic and political needs of communities at the time. As programmes were coordinated through on-campus ‘service organisations’ attached to, or formalised in, HEIs, they provided a ‘safe haven’ during the apartheid years and a conduit for academic staff to apply the expertise of their discipline to community development initiatives. The approach tended to view social responsiveness as an integral part of academic functions: the University of the Witwatersrand’s Rural Facility and the University of the Western Cape’s Community Dentistry initiative served as examples of this kind of programme. Sadly, it appears that many of the campus-based service organisations that emerged during the apartheid era were ‘forced’ to close or switch their focus to serving industry and the private sector in order to survive in the new democracy. This is because sources of funding available to these organisations dried up or were directed elsewhere. Only those organisations with strong ties to the mainstream teaching and research initiatives of HEIs managed to keep their community focus and remain sustainable.

‘Placements’ were similar to cooperative education. In JET’s 1997 research, curriculum-related programmes generally referred to ‘internships integrated into the curriculum which have been a feature of mainstream professional education for many years’. The primary purpose was learning and skills development rather than financial aid or provision of service to the community.

Although the term service-learning (as already defined) was seldom used in South African higher education prior to 1997, JET’s research suggested that several of the programmes surveyed incorporated most if not all the principles of service-learning.
7.3 Key Developments Since 1994

During the past ten years, perceptions of the nature and role of community engagement have shifted significantly in a more favourable policy environment.

7.3.1 National Policy Initiatives

The *White Paper* laid the foundations for making community service an integral part of higher education in South Africa, calling on institutions to ‘demonstrate social responsibility … and their commitment to the common good by making available expertise and infrastructure for community service programmes’. It stated that one of the goals of higher education is ‘to promote and develop social responsibility and awareness among students of the role of higher education in social and economic development through community service programmes’. It showed receptiveness to ‘the growing interest in community service programmes for students’ and gave in-principle support to ‘feasibility studies and pilot programmes which explore the potential of community service in higher education’.9

Early national policy initiatives included the Green Paper10 (1998) on National Youth Service developed by the National Youth Commission (NYC) which calls for the integration of community service into mainstream academic programmes in HEIs throughout South Africa. In 1999, the Southern African Student Volunteers (SASVO) released a Position Paper calling for mandatory community service in higher education. In early 2000, the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) formed a Task Group and commissioned a Discussion Document on community service. This aimed to stimulate debate and action within a framework of key conceptual and implementation issues.

As yet, no national policy for community service in higher education has been finalised. However, in December 2000, the Department of Education (DoE) commissioned the development of a policy framework to give expression to the community service mandate of the *White Paper* and to provide direction for the growing interest in, and proliferation of, service-learning programmes in higher education. The policy, still in draft form in mid-2004, was informed by research data generated through more than 200 accredited pilot service-learning courses (see Section 7.3.4.4); and interviews with numerous higher education stakeholders including Vice-Chancellors, DoE officials and student bodies.

Finally, an important support for academically based community service going forward is the link that has been established between this and conceptions of quality in higher education. The Founding Document11 (2001) of the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) identified community engagement as a key area of quality assurance (QA), along with teaching and research. During 2003, a collaborative effort between the HEQC, a number of HEIs and JET generated comprehensive criteria for the QA of service-learning at an institutional and programmatic level.12 These serve as useful implementation guidelines for the final HEQC criteria published in April 2004.13 The HEQC audit criteria call on HEIs to have ‘quality related arrangements for community engagement (which) are formalised and integrated with those for teaching and learning, where appropriate, and are adequately resourced and monitored’. In order to meet this requirement, examples of what might be expected include:

- Policies and procedures for the quality management of community engagement.
- Integration of policies and procedures for community engagement with those for teaching and learning and research, where appropriate.
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• Adequate resources allocated to facilitate quality delivery in community engagement.
• Regular review of the effectiveness of quality-related arrangements for community engagement.

7.3.2 Joint Education Trust Initiatives

Since 1997, the JET has been a major force supporting the development of ‘feasibility studies and pilot programmes which explore the potential of community service in higher education’ called for in the White Paper. During 1997 and 1998, JET conducted a survey of community service in South African higher education, and published its findings in two monographs. Indicative of the importance of this work, the Steering and Research Committees for this survey included a number of senior officials from the DoE, as well as the Minister of Education.

Building on the results of the survey, JET launched its Community–Higher Education–Service Partnerships (CHESP) project in 1999. The purpose of this project has been to support the conceptualisation, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and research of pilot service-learning initiatives and to use the data generated through this process to inform higher education policy and practice at a national, institutional and programmatic level. The initiative was launched with the development of a graduate programme in Community–Higher Education–Service Partnerships registered through the Leadership Centre at the then University of Natal. It has also assisted a number of HEIs to conduct an institution-wide audit of community engagement; develop an institution-wide policy on community engagement; develop a strategy for implementing this policy; and conceptualise and implement a range of accredited academic courses that incorporate the principles of service-learning across a variety of disciplines.

7.3.3 Vice-Chancellors Meeting

In July 2000, the Minister of Education chaired a meeting on community engagement, convened by JET and with participation by Vice-Chancellors, and representatives from the DoE, the CHE and the South African Universities Vice-Chancellors Association (SAUVCA). A range of key issues emerged from this meeting, as follows:

• Purpose of higher education: Concern was expressed about the overemphasis on ‘education for the market place’ and the need for this to be balanced with ‘education for good citizenship’. It was suggested that HEIs should revive the notion of civic responsibility through their teaching, research and service programmes.

• Compliance or serious engagement: It was suggested that community engagement should not be optional in South African higher education. However, given the current constraints within HEIs, compliance could be counterproductive. Instead, HEIs should be encouraged and supported to take seriously their responsibility to inculcate the notion of citizenship in students through integrating community service into mainstream academic programmes.

• Add-on or integrated approach: It was agreed that community engagement should not be an ‘add on’ or purely philanthropic exercise. It should be an integral part of the mainstream teaching and research business of every HEI.
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- Faculty roles and rewards: The dominant paradigm of scholarship focuses on and rewards teaching and research. It was agreed that if higher education is to take its reconstruction and development role seriously, its leaders will need to promote, support and reward a scholarship of community engagement.

- Opportune moment: Given that HEIs are currently facing significant challenges in terms of their own transformation, it was suggested that this might be an opportune moment for institutions to reflect on their own mission and purpose and integrate community service into their teaching and research programmes.

- Resources: Given the current resource constraints experienced by HEIs, it was recommended that consideration be given to the allocation of national resources towards a reconstruction and development agenda within higher education. These resources should encourage and support the development of academic programmes that engage in the reconstruction and development of poor communities through teaching, research and service.

- The role of national higher education stakeholders: Although government should not necessarily drive the role of HEIs in reconstruction and development, government should provide the necessary encouragement, support and direction. The role of HEIs in reconstruction and development should be reflected in the agenda, plans and policies of government. For example, HEIs’ three-year rolling plans should reflect their community engagement agenda.

- Leadership support: For the reconstruction and development agenda to take effect in higher education, it would need the vocal, visible and tangible support of top leadership within HEIs.

- Institutional audits: All HEIs should be encouraged to do an audit of existing community engagement activities linked to their institution. This audit would contribute towards a national audit on community engagement in South African higher education.

7.3.4 Higher Education Institution Initiatives

During the past few years, numerous HEIs made significant progress in integrating academic service-learning into the mainstream academy. Initiatives have fallen primarily into the categories discussed below.

7.3.4.1 Institutional Audits on Community Engagement

Numerous HEIs conducted an audit of their community engagement initiatives while others are in the process of doing so. Generally, the results of these audits have concurred with the results of JET’s 1997 survey. Most HEIs have a wide range of community engagement initiatives, although these may not be integrated with curricula, and tend to be ad hoc and driven essentially by interested and innovative academics and/or students.

7.3.4.2 Institutional Policies and Strategies for Community Engagement

Several HEIs developed institution-wide policies, guidelines and strategies for community engagement and service-learning. While some policies have been approved by the senate of a given institution, others are still in the process of approval. Generally these policies include issues such as: a rationale for community engagement and service-learning; a definition of the HEI’s interpretation of community engagement and service-learning; objectives to be achieved through the policy; mechanisms for implementing the policy; staff promotion and rewards pertaining to community engagement; organisational structures and staffing required for implementation; risk management in terms of student placements; and the allocation of resources towards implementation. A number of institutions have identified community engagement through service-learning as a strategic priority and have allocated resources from their central budget towards its implementation.
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7.3.4.3 Organisational and Staffing Structures

Most HEIs that have made significant progress in terms of community engagement have dedicated physical space and financial and human resources towards the implementation of their community engagement policy and strategy. Several institutions have established a central office dedicated to community engagement and service-learning. In most cases, the office falls under the auspices of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Academic. The primary functions of these structures are to represent the community engagement agenda at appropriate institutional committees (e.g. academic planning, teaching and learning, research); to facilitate engagement between neighbouring communities, service agencies and the HEI; and to support academic staff with the conceptualisation and implementation of academic programmes that embrace service-learning.

7.3.4.4 Academic Service-learning Courses

Between 2000 and 2004, JET supported the conceptualisation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of approximately 200 accredited academic courses including 39 academic disciplines across nine HEI campuses involving more than 6,000 students ranging from first year to master’s level. All courses were designed to incorporate the principles and practice of service-learning. Academic disciplines included agriculture, architecture, botany, business science, construction management, dentistry, drama, economics, education, engineering, environmental health, fine arts, information technology, language and linguistics, law, library science, medicine, nursing, pharmacology, political science, psychology, radiography, sociology, theology and zoology. Each course was designed to apply the theory of its discipline to an identified community development priority. These included child and adolescent development, dental technology, entrepreneurship, environmental education, HIV and AIDS education, human rights, information technology, job creation, literacy, local government, rural development, school improvement, skills development, small business development, sport and recreation, sustainable construction and the prevention of violence.

An extensive monitoring and evaluation programme of these courses identified factors that determine the success or failure of academic programmes that include service-learning. In the conceptualisation phase, the critical factors are: the extent to which the course addresses a need perceived as important by the recipient community; the extent to which the course is designed collaboratively with the recipient community and participating service agency; and the initial feasibility analysis in terms of finances, logistics and readiness of community members and service providers to participate. In the implementation phase, critical factors include student readiness and preparation; appropriate placement of students; preparation of the community for service-learning intervention; alignment of student capabilities and community needs; proper logistical and resource-planning and allocation; integration of the theory of the discipline with the service provided by students; and structured time for critical reflection on both theory and practice.

Student responses to questionnaires distributed before and after the courses show an overwhelmingly positive attitude towards service-learning. Table 23 summarises the students’ attitudes towards and experiences of service-learning. Large percentages of the nearly 400 students surveyed indicated that their course helped to improve their relationship skills, leadership skills and project planning abilities. The fact that these courses also made them aware of cultural differences and opened their eyes to their own cultural stereotypes is just...
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as significant. The responses summarised in the table were supported by a large number of rich comments of which the following are a few:

• I acquired important life skills through this course. Through the facilitation skills acquired I have become empowered to such an extent that I now no longer fear to facilitate workshops.

• Community visits empowered me in project planning. The course gave me more training and skills in community development facilitation.

• In a community setting the course made me aware of some of my own stereotypes and prejudices. The work I performed in the community enhanced my ability to communicate my ideas in a real world context.

• I think it is vitally important that courses include learning outside the university. It is the only way to gain some form of experience. It is satisfying to be able to help others with the tools of knowledge that we have gained in engineering.

• I was given a great chance and I am grateful for it. The chance I was given has definitely taught me a lot about myself and my own abilities. I was awakened to the link between the community and learning. I would say that is the best way to learn.

### Table 23: Student Experiences of and Attitudes towards Service-Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All university courses should involve a community component</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course helped to develop my relationship skills</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation helped to improve my leadership skills</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course helped me to learn how to plan and complete a project</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I benefited with community members from a different cultural background</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community work made me aware of some of my own stereotypes</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.3.4.5 Criteria for the Quality Assurance of Service-Learning

In addition to collaborative work done with the HEQC and JET on the development of comprehensive criteria for the QA of service-learning, some HEIs have developed – or are in the process of developing – their own criteria for meeting the broad community engagement criteria contained in the HEQC Criteria for Institutional Audits.

#### 7.3.4.6 Community Engagement and Service-Learning Research

The monitoring and evaluation of service-learning courses identified a number of areas requiring more in-depth research to further inform the implementation of community engagement and service-learning in higher education. Current research initiatives include questions about what factors promote or prohibit the institutionalisation of service-learning; what criteria, standards and methods could be used to measure good practice of service-learning; what kind of organisational/partnership structures best facilitate the implementation of service-learning; what are the respective roles of the course convener, community and service partner in service-learning; how is student-learning best assessed in service-learning; what are the
cost implications of service-learning; what are the benefits of service-learning; and how does service-learning contribute to knowledge production?

7.4 The Situation in 2004

Ten years on from 1994, a good number of HEIs have developed an understanding of the potential of community engagement for transforming higher education in relation to societal needs, and for generating graduates with a sense of civic responsibility and an ability to apply the theory of their discipline to local development issues. Many volunteer and community outreach programmes are in operation, while some HEIs have recognised that, if the primary function of higher education is to generate and disseminate knowledge, then service-learning in particular provides the context to inform and enrich both.

National policy initiatives in process have flagged the importance of community engagement and have encouraged feasibility studies and pilot programmes which explore the potential of community service in higher education. Spurred by these initiatives, their own convictions, and assistance from agencies such as JET, numerous HEIs have developed, monitored and evaluated a range of pilot programmes identifying the potential of community engagement as an integral and necessary part of academic scholarship – particularly in the South African context.

As a result of this work, HEIs have at their disposal research instruments to conduct audits of their community engagement initiatives; examples of institution-wide policies and strategies for community engagement; guidelines for good practice of community engagement through service-learning; instruments to measure good practice at an institutional, faculty, departmental and course level; and a wide range service-learning case studies in a variety of academic disciplines as exemplars.21

7.5 Critical Issues and Key Challenges Ahead

After ten years of higher education under democracy, the achievements with respect to community engagement are relatively small in relation to the overall potential of the contribution that community engagement can make in South Africa. The challenge of enhancing community engagement will require more settled and enabling conditions in higher education. In addition, a key step will be the finalisation of the pending DoE policy framework on community engagement, to provide the necessary impetus and direction to take community engagement to scale.

A perception that community engagement and service are merely add-on, nice-to-have, and philanthropic activities remains a key challenge to its integration as a core function in the academy. Yet, increasingly, scholars who engage their teaching and research practices with community are encouraged and enthused by the new energy and insights that community engagement infuses into their endeavours. This may be the key to finding approaches that meet the challenge of capacity-building for community engagement. The expertise and materials developed by HEIs who have made significant progress in academically based community engagement, can benefit other HEIs as they endeavour to advance their community engagement agenda. This may be especially true given that the knowledge, skills and experience required to conceptualise

“A perception that community engagement and service are merely add-on, nice-to-have, and philanthropic activities remains a key challenge to its integration as a core function in the academy.”
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and implement a community engagement agenda are different at times from those required to drive other processes within the institution.

The reconstruction and development mandate of South African local government facilitates HEIs’ partnering with local government to implement local and regional social and economic development plans. The potential knowledge contribution of HEIs to the implementation of these plans is enormous and, conversely, HEIs can benefit; first, from having a local community context for integrating teaching and research programmes with development priorities and, second, from having access to a wider pool of resources. Yet, as noted at the beginning of this chapter, implementing community engagement poses a range of conceptual and practical difficulties which can render the process slow and painful – even if ultimately liberating. As a first example, effective and sustainable community engagement must rely on partnerships between communities, the academy and service agencies – yet achieving these is complex and time-consuming.

Identifying appropriate partners is one challenge, and building the notion of community is another. Thus, each partner group comes to the table with different histories, values, capacities, power and expectations and will see the proposed service-learning programme through a different lens. While this makes for rich dialogue and potentially transformative discourse and actions, it requires patience, and careful and sensitive brokering and mediation. Frequent turnover of participants at community-based sites may impact on the continuity of the programme and necessitate sustained capacity-building within the community.

As a second example, engaged institutions are often confronted with the need to make decisions they may not have encountered before. Should they appoint community leaders and service providers who contribute to student learning and research as adjunct faculty? Should they provide participating community leaders, local authorities and service agencies with access to campus facilities, such as the library? As a third example, logistical challenges are numerous. Commuting between community-based sites, service agencies and the HEI can be time-consuming and costly for students. Placing students in the community may be difficult when faced with an inflexible academic timetable. Ensuring the safety of students at community-based sites is yet another challenge.

In conclusion, it needs to be said that, unlike in some other academic endeavours, HEIs cannot ‘go-it-alone’ when it comes to community engagement. Community engagement implies and necessitates ‘engagement’ with recipient communities, local authorities and service agencies. If the traditional ‘boundaries’ of the academy are not challenged and stretched through community engagement, this may be a sign that insufficient engagement has taken place.
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