

IV.4

KNOWLEDGE, ENGAGEMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

*Carol Hok Ka Ma and
Rajesh Tandon*

The role of higher education institutions (HEIs) has historically been recognized as a public good, with unique social responsibilities in producing knowledge for societal development and sustainability. In Asia, a region with so much disparity between rich and poor, between rural and urban, and with such diversities in religion, language and culture, inequality, poverty, insecurity, social exclusion and impropriety, the re-emphasis of principles of community engagement and participation should become the priority agenda for existing education.

However, the increased attention being paid to principles and strategies of community engagement and participation has occurred in a context in which universities are no longer the only producers of knowledge, and where they appear to be more focused on private gain rather than community benefit, on research rather than on teaching, and on raising private revenue (Boyer, 1990; Colby et al., 2003; Calhoun, 2006). In addition, competition for world-class excellence has propelled HEIs into entrepreneurial institutions commoditizing knowledge for commercialization rather than the service of humanity. Over the past decades, global development agendas and the initiatives of civil societies have increasingly challenged HEIs to develop partnerships and co-create knowledge for addressing social issues in the community.

In order to understand knowledge, engagement and higher education (HE) in the Asia-Pacific region, this paper provides an overview of the current practice of HE engagement, with reference to the need for civic education in the new economy of the Asia-Pacific region. The concept and discourse of engagement in relation to outreach/service, knowledge transfer and knowledge co-creation are then summarized, followed by a delineation of the various frameworks and approaches for HE engagement in the region. An examination, with illustrative examples, of the policies and structures or mechanisms that have emerged to support HE engagement is also presented in order to understand more about the emer-

gent issues and challenges to the development of HE engagement. Future possibilities for HE engagement in the Asia-Pacific region will be discussed at the end of the paper.

INTRODUCTION

HEIs play a critical role in creating educated and responsible citizens. With diverse characteristics in the Asia-Pacific region, including inequality, poverty, insecurity and exclusion amidst abundance and prosperity, more HEIs have been pressured to develop partnerships and co-create knowledge that serves humanity. Thus, education is merely no longer transference and learning, but also emphasizes how teachers and students engage in the community through various learning methods, such as community participatory research, civic engagement activities and service-learning programmes, to build a better community.

NEEDS FOR KNOWLEDGE AND ENGAGEMENT IN THE NEW ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

Education is undoubtedly a key for developing human capital. With rapid economic development in Asia, a sustainable social and welfare system is demanded by the public. However, corporatization and competition for world-class excellence have propelled HEIs into becoming entrepreneurial institutions, commoditizing knowledge for commercialization, and training students for the demands of a globalized capitalist economy. Throughout Asia, including China, technological advancements have become a priority for universities since the turn of the millennium, and by default human developments or positions of morality tend to be neglected. A good example is the rapid adoption of human reproductive technologies (for example, sex selection) without mindfully considering the future ramifications on society. The former President of Lingnan University, Professor

Edward K.Y. Chan (Chan et al., 2009), mentioned that the modern world is facing a new economic situation, which can be characterized by digitization, globalization and a monopolization of capitalism, implying our eager preparation to face the new economy.

Rapid economic growth in the region has made some communities, regions and households substantially improve their economic status over the past two decades. Yet the region is also home to half the poor of the world (living on less than \$1.25 per capita per day) as well as half of those who are illiterate (nearly five hundred million people in the region). There is also great diversity in the region in terms of basic indicators of health, education and access to drinking water, sanitation and secure livelihood. Rapid economic development has also resulted in rapid urbanization as first-generation youth come to the cities from rural areas. Serious challenges of environmental degradation afflict many parts of the region today. As a result, inequalities characterize the region. It is in this scenario that the development of HE and community engagement has to be situated.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE ENGAGEMENT IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Asian societies are very old settled communities; the economic, technological and educational development in these Asian societies goes back several millennia, the oldest residential universities having been located in the Indian sub-continent.

Takshila in Western region (now Pakistan) was a residential university with nearly ten thousand students and two thousand faculty between the sixth century BC and the fifth century AD. Likewise, Nalanda, in the eastern region of India, was a residential university between the fourth century BC and the sixth century AD, with several thousand students and half a dozen specializations. These universities were set up with extensive community support, and their students and faculty returned to their communities to engage with them (Tandon, 2008).

Without doubt, most Asian countries had their own traditional educational systems, for example the Confucian academies in China, the traditional *pathshalas* or *madrasahs* in India, and similar institutions in Vietnam, Cambodia and Thailand. In the 19th century, changes in the educational systems were fundamentally influenced by the colonial powers, especially during the modernization period. At that time, most of the Asian region was colonized by a few European countries, and

these exported their university ideas to Asia. Those universities with colonial administration and emerging economic interests became more popular than the historical academic institutions in Asia (Altbach, 2004). For non-colonized Asian countries, too, Western culture was introduced into their education system, examples being via the Meiji Restoration in Japan and the Hundred Days' Reform in China. These marked the era of Western-style HE development in Asia.

In the 20th century, new educational philosophies evolved in the region. Nobel Laureate Rabindranath Tagore established Shantiniketan University to emphasize that HE must promote universal understanding and peace, and Mahatma Gandhi established Gujarat Vidyapith to link HE to village industry and agriculture. The societal linkages of HE were widely manifest in their educational philosophies.

With the Western cultures spreading in Asia, Christian missionaries played a significant role in education. Although these missionaries had less success in converting people to Christianity, Christian organizations set up many colleges and universities in India, China, the Philippines, Korea, and so on. Christian universities and colleges remain important in some parts of Asia. Since 1922, the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia has been working with HEIs in 13 countries and regions of Asia to express values such as justice, reconciliation and harmony between ethnic and religious communities, gender equity, care for the environment and civil society. The United Board has so far shown great passion in community engagement and works in partnership with over 80 HEIs in Asia.

In addition, religious influences on HEIs have been found in Indonesia since the middle of the 19th century. Unlike the private Christian universities in China (nationalized in 1949), the Islamic universities in Indonesia are public HEIs. In 1945, the year of independence for Indonesia, the Sekolah Tinggi Islam (Islamic College) was set up by the government, and the Islamic University of Indonesia was then established in 1947 (Assegaf et al., 2012).

With their government and religion background, Islamic HEIs often have the vision and mission of contributing to the community. One of the objectives of the IAIN Sunan Ampel institute is to conduct research in Islamic, social and humanities studies relevant to the needs of the community and to promote community empowerment based on religious values. Similar approaches are reported by UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta: 'Developing research, either quantitative or qualitative, and contribute to enhancing the quality

of life of the whole community through professional duties' (Assegaf et al., 2012). With approximately 150,000 students – 18% of all public university students – state-administered Islamic HE has considerable influence in Indonesian society (Kraince, 2007). The engaging university vision creates opportunities for intellectuals and students to actively participate in the community.

Another popular belief is Confucianism. Many Asians see Confucianism as one of their cultures, especially as it has been greatly emphasized in the field of education. Confucian education is all about the humanistic and the universal. As the Master said: 'A gentleman is not a tool (「君子不器」)', meaning that his capacity should not have a specific limit, nor his usefulness a narrow application. What matters is not to accumulate technical information and specialized expertise, but to develop one's *humanity*. Education is not about *having*; it is about *being* (Leys, 1997). This echoes the educational philosophy of a liberal arts education with an emphasis on whole-person development instead of specific technical knowledge. Humanist ethics are the essence of Confucianism and also give life to Chinese culture: 'With its affirmation of humanist ethics and of the universal brotherhood of man, it inspired all the nations of Eastern Asia and became the spiritual cornerstone of the most populous and oldest living civilization on earth' (Leys, 1997, p. xvi). Although the Chinese government has been promoting 'social practice' among students in HEIs since the 19th century, both teachers and students see this practice as a kind of extra-curricular activity and not necessary as fully addressing the need of the community.

Korea also holds Confucian values and strives to provide a leading edge for HEIs and regions to develop knowledge-based industries as a basis for wider engagement in HEIs. The Korean national New University for Regional Innovation (NURI) project has motivated educators to believe that HE should integrate its advanced knowledge and skills with larger social concerns.

Similarly, Indian educationists emphasize the importance of students being aware of social issues from their indigenous knowledge (Tandon, 2012a). The university was referred at *Gurukul* or 'family of the teacher' in ancient India. Students lived together with their teachers and studied grassroots knowledge related to day-to-day living (Narang, 1996). The Indian government then started the National Service Scheme in 1969 to promote the societal engagement of HE students. Although the scheme has continued, it is merely an extra-curricular activity and not inte-

grated into the core functions of HEIs. These kinds of knowledge can be seen as belonging to 'public intellectuals', including writers, artists, traditional scholars and religious leaders, all of whom have had different kinds of role in influencing public opinion, religious and social reformation, and so on. In other words, the cultural resources, such as 'the heritage of vernacular knowledge, contemporary politics and social needs' were linked in the societies, and thus 'that tradition of intellectual and social life has not allowed Western-style universities to dominate intellectual and social life' (Nandy, 1996, p. 297).

However, the role of 'public intellectuals' began to be replaced by Western knowledge as the latter 'began to be regarded as "modern knowledge" and to be considered as superior to indigenous knowledge' (Narang, 1996, p. 259). Take India as an example. Fewer people want to acquire indigenous knowledge because of the influence of Western power. Now, most curricula only include some components of indigenous knowledge.

In this social context, the role of HE in enhancing indigenous knowledge has become important. The university can be seen as 'a key site of struggle, where local knowledge meets global knowledge in a battle to represent different worlds in different ways', since 'how we view universities around the world, and their relationships with each other, clearly depends fundamentally on how we understand culture, knowledge, education and international relations' (Pennycook, 1996, p. 64). Based on the nature of universities, the concept of 'extension work' has been introduced into the Indian social context. 'Extension work' can be seen as 'the application of classroom knowledge from the university within the community and for the community's benefit' (Narang, 1996, p. 260). Students can understand the socio-cultural reality of local communities and obtain indigenous knowledge from them.

In this Asian social and cultural context, HEIs could be a powerful tool, not only to teach the conflict between social transformation and the attainment of social justice, but also to develop teachers' and students' intellectual knowledge in order to support society's needs.

HE, COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Traditionally, the common teaching method in HE has been academic tutorial teaching and research knowledge learning. Such traditional modes of teaching do

not seem plausible in Asia, a region with an enormous economic disproportion between the rich and poor, especially in the rural and urban areas, as well as great diversities in religion, language and culture. Many often ask questions on how one can provide the ideal and necessary form of education across the region and how a giving culture can be cultivated among HEIs.

Examining historical cases in the 20th century, Hollander and Meeropol (2006) identified that there were four milestone movements that had begun in the late 1980s in the USA. We can find similar developments in Asia but in a different time frame: (1) the era of student volunteerism in the mid to late 1980s; (2) the rise of service-learning in the early 1990s; (3) the birth of the ‘engaged campus’ in the late 1990s; and (4) the rapid expansion of the idea of the engaged campus in the early 2000s. Universities started to focus on their civic responsibilities as well as public contributions in the areas of research and scholarship, teaching and learning, and outreach and partnership. Different terms related to the engagement of HEIs, including community participatory research, service-learning, volunteerism, science shops, civic engagement and corporate social responsibility, have become popular among HEIs in different countries as they are re-emphasizing their responsibilities to prepare students to be active and engaged citizens for contributing to our ever-changing global society (Dragne, 2007).

Alongside teaching and research, cultivating social responsibility within Asian universities is the third mission of contemporary HE. According to ISO 26000, the institution’s level of social responsibility is measured by whether it has considered the impact of social and environmental outcomes. The university is one of the stakeholders in society and should bear its ‘university social responsibility’ (USR). Sawadikosol proposed that the USR framework should prioritize the quality of graduate students, emphasize a sense of social awareness and resolve global warming, as well as advocate for a transparent and sufficient economy. All stakeholders, including community partners, students and teachers, and service targets, are value members for pursuing the new knowledge. Their partnership can improve the locality, society and mankind through raising, strengthening and transforming community and national potential, as well as developing local human resources, and nurturing creative and entrepreneurial leaders with quality and virtue in a society of learning and wisdom.

Obviously, the partnership between the university and the community is a very important indicator of the building and application of knowledge, which are

related to how and what institutions and communities support. Tandon and Hall (2012) have stated that there are both internal and external concerns in promoting USR. Internally, USR depends on how institutions are being governed, how their values and principles of citizenship are integral to education and how institutions demonstrate respect for diversity and human rights, which are equally important in promoting USR among institutions. Externally, USR greatly depends on two-way learning, mutual respect and shared influence among different stakeholders, including academia, communities, practitioners, government and the private sector.

Many institutions in Asia are governed by the government, which also has a mission to train young people to be responsible and caring students. For example, one of the priority agendas in China is always promoting the moral and social development of university students (Wang, 2008). This shows that the government pays great attention to the development of social responsibility in HEIs. In October 2004, the government of the People’s Republic of China even issued an official document titled *Guidelines on Further Intensification and Updating of Moral and Citizenship Education of University Students* to provide a national framework for the moral and social development of university students (Wang, 2008). This framework encourages HEIs to restructure their study programmes according to the country’s social and economic needs. In 2013, the Chinese government has also been rethinking the mode of ‘social practice’, and some universities, for example South China University of Technology and South China Normal University, are even starting to integrate the concept of social practice into their curriculum. Given this opportunity, many grassroots organizations also look for partnership with HEIs in China. However, there are still some barriers as the civil society and welfare infrastructure is just starting to develop rapidly in China. Thus, many HEIs in China are still exploring effective ways to address the needs of the country.

In Hong Kong, with its relatively well-developed social welfare system and mixture of Western and Eastern cultures, another mission of HEIs alongside teaching and research is knowledge transfer. The University Grants Committee has incorporated knowledge transfer into its mission statement and institutional mission statement. Knowledge transfer means that ‘the systems and processes by which knowledge, including technology, know-how, expertise and skills are transferred between higher education institutions and society, lead to innovative, profitable or economic

or social improvements' (University Grants Committee, 2012). With funding support from the government, universities in Hong Kong are also willing actively to demonstrate outreach and show responsibility for the dissemination of knowledge in to society.

In Japan, the Central Council for Education has stated clearly that it is highly desirable to offer a social contribution within university-level education in order for students to become citizens who can live creatively in the 21st century. The report *A Vision for the Future of Higher Education in Japan* also expects many universities to realize the mission and integrate its content into their curriculum, including promoting human rights and peace (Todani, 2008). This movement encourages different stakeholders to rethink their partnership with the HEIs in Japan.

In South Korea, the growth and contributions of social responsibility in Korean HE started with different social movements from the 1930s to the 2000s. First was the rural enlightenment movement, which encouraged Korean universities to fulfil their social responsibility for rural community development, for instance by providing professional support towards labour services and knowledge-based activities. Second, there was a political/social movement in which professors issued a statement suggesting a constitutional amendment, which triggered the national democratization movement in June 1987 and gained a direct election for the president. Finally, Korean universities are contributing to the global movement by beginning overseas outreach through global social services in, for example, the medical, educational and cultural areas (Kim and Cho, 2008). Overall, the response from the community has been very positive as universities have addressed the community's need and are working together with the community to create a strong civic responsibility within the country.

According to UNICEF 2008, there are other examples in Asia that are supported by different stakeholders, for example different government-sponsored service programmes in Fiji, the Philippines, Malaysia, Mongolia and China; non-governmental organization (NGO)-sponsored programmes including Youth Star Cambodia, Village Focus International (Cambodia) and not-for-profit programmes in China; neighbourhood public safety campaigns supported by community and youth groups; national service projects supported by Fiji's National Youth Advisory Board, Singapore's National Youth Council and the Asian Youth Council, and so on; and youth camps with a leadership component supported by private foundations as part of the corporate social responsibility portfolio.

In preparation for the 12th Five Year Plan, the Planning Commission of the Government of India set up a committee to recommend the policies and practices necessary to further promote and deepen community engagement in HE. As a result, the current Plan (2012–2017) contains a clear emphasis on HE's social responsibility:

In the face of growing isolation of HEIs from society, there is a need for renewed effort for HEIs for genuinely engaging with community, conduct[ing] socially relevant research and education and foster[ing] social responsibility amongst students as part of their core mission. For this purpose, a National Initiative to Foster Social Responsibility in Higher Education would be launched. An Alliance for Community engagement, an independent association of practitioners, academics and community leaders would be created to support its implementation. (Planning Commission, Government of India, 2013, p. 111)

FRAMEWORKS AND APPROACHES IN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Given the diversity of approaches and practices in the region, it is rather difficult to summarize all of them in one neat framework. However, one framework that has evolved from the perspective of actual practice on the ground is described below. This is an attempt to equate community engagement in HE with a set of principles that are holistic and synergistic (Tandon, 2012b):

- The mutually agreed interests and needs of both communities and institutions should be articulated and respected.
- Engagement must encompass all the three functions of institutions of HE – teaching, research and outreach/practice.
- Institutional engagement cutting across disciplines and faculties, including natural sciences, should be mandated and should not be restricted to the social and human sciences alone.
- Students' participation in community engagement projects should earn them credits and partially meet their graduation requirements, and should be integrated into their evaluation systems.
- Performance assessments of teachers, researchers and administrators in such institutions should include this dimension of community engagement.

The forms of engagement that Tandon (2012a) has described tend to capture that diversity:

- linking learning with community service;

- linking research with community knowledge;
- knowledge-sharing and knowledge mobilization;
- devising new curriculum with community;
- inviting practitioners as teachers;
- social innovations by students.

LINKING LEARNING WITH COMMUNITY SERVICE

In Madras Christian Collage, India, chemistry students participated in a service-learning programme aiming to preserve water resources. On the one hand, students' knowledge of water chemistry was applied within the programme; on the other, 'the residents of the local community were invite to discuss the progress of the project and their view regarding the restoration process were incorporated in the project' (Sugumar, 2009, p. 84). The involvement of local people in the programme helped as their knowledge of using a particular tree gum to remove excess iron from the water inspired the students when tackling the problem of poor water quality. The spot at which to sample the water was also suggested by the local community, which led to mutual learning between the students and the local people inhabitants.

LINKING RESEARCH WITH COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE

The Centre for Society–University Interface and Research at Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishwavidyalaya University and the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA)/Garhwal University Mountain Research Centre in India are examples of partnerships in sharing community knowledge through various research approaches (Planning Commission, 2012).

KNOWLEDGE-SHARING AND KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION

These can take the form of enumerations, surveys, camps, training exercises, learning manuals and films, maps, study reports, public hearings, policy briefs, engagement with urban homeless shelters, teaching and health services in poor communities, legal aid clinics for those undergoing prosecution, and so on. The Pamulaan Center for Indigenous Peoples' Education in the Philippines is another example demonstrating how indigenous spiritual knowledge can be learned in student–community engagement process. 'Research, studies, documentation and publication of indigenous knowledge systems, stories, history, folk tales, songs, and arts' are published for both formal and non-formal education programmes (Pamulaan Center for Indigenous Peoples' Education, 2013). By conducting such research, indigenous heritage, cultures, values and customs can be learned by non-indigenous communities.

DEVisING NEW CURRICULUM AND COURSES

In consultation with local communities, local students, local community-based organizations and local government agencies, HEIs can develop new curricula for existing courses as well as design new courses. This can not only enrich the curriculum of existing courses by using locally appropriate subject matter, but also create new, locally appropriate educational programmes that will interest new generations of students (Planning Commission, 2012). The Treaty of Waitangi Research Unit, New Zealand, is an example of creating a curriculum to use traditional Maori *rongoā* (healing and medicines) to advance research aiming to change the situation of a large amount of Maori knowledge being lost in New Zealand.

INCLUDING PRACTITIONERS AS TEACHERS

Local community elders, women leaders and tribal and civil society practitioners have enormous practical knowledge on a wide variety of issues – from agriculture and forestry to child-rearing, micro-planning and project management. For example, teachers of social sciences at Lingnan University Hong Kong invited prostitutes and elderly members of the population to tell their stories to widen understanding of the social welfare of Hong Kong.

SOCIAL INNOVATIONS BY STUDENTS

In consultation with student unions, associations and clubs, students can initiate learning projects with a social impact. Shantou University in China arranged for science students to use their creativity to create a product that would help elderly people living alone in mountainous areas.

To sum up, different strategies can be employed to achieve the objectives of civic responsibilities and public contributions, including community-based research, participatory action research, knowledge creation and mobilization, educational opportunities for community members (continuous education, workshops, presentations, and so on), outreach and lifelong learning. Also used is social advocacy (which provides citizens and leaders with dependable knowledge and reliable information for reaching responsible and well-informed public judgements and decisions, and to serve as a trusted voice in public debates over controversial issues). Another approach is service-learning, which links into athletics, sports and recreational activities, health education, innovation and business/employment development, and working with special interest groups such as women, aboriginals, youth, and so on (Dragne, 2007).

HEIs can design appropriate learning curricula and facilitate lifelong educational processes through partnering with civil actors, community elders and practitioners. They can systematize the practical insights of human and social development for creating new theories and practical applications (Tandon, 2007). Meanwhile, joint research projects with civil society actors could apply for joint research funding, which is another concrete approach to producing and mobilizing knowledge .

Thus, based on the above rationales, two main community engagement approaches can be seen in Asia: community-based research and community service-learning (CSL).

The practice and promotion of *community-based participatory research* in the region dates back to the 1970s, with a regional network of participatory research active in the 1980s and 90s. PRIA grew out of this network in the early 1980s and has since been a major force for promoting the practice of participatory research in several HEIs. A recent survey indicated that participatory research as a methodology of enquiry and community engagement is being taught in nearly 40% of HEIs in the developing part of the region. This addresses real issues related to social justice, such as inclusion, poverty alleviation, environmental sustainability, gender justice, and so on. The practice facilitates the co-creation of knowledge in ways that synthesize local experiences with professional expertise (Tandon and Hall, 2012).

Community-based research can be interpreted as one kind of participatory research, challenging the hegemonic nature of knowledge and its underlying epistemology, as well as its superstructure of HEIs (Tandon, 2007). Participatory research originates from adult education. It focuses on the negative human and societal consequences of monopolistic approaches to knowledge production, which means ‘knowledge-in-action and knowledge for action were important for finding solutions to the problems of societies and communities’ (Tandon, 2007, p. 4). By using these methodologies, HEIs can learn from reality and mobilize academic knowledge to address social problems with or without external help.

The other approach is *service-learning*. There is much confusion over the terms ‘service-learning’, ‘community service’ and ‘academic service-learning’ (ASL). Two terms have been generated by experiences in some HEIs: CSL and ASL. Providence University in Taiwan has adopted these latter terms in order to create a clear understanding of what service-learning is. The definition of CSL is similar to that of service-learning and is also ‘a form of experiential learning that integrates service in the community with academic courses and/or extra-curricular programmes (Angeles, 2007, pp.

78–87). Students engage in CSL work for community needs and thus have a deeper understanding of specific social issues and a higher sense of civic responsibility.

ASL is driven by the learning objectives of the course and the needs of the community (Howard, 2013). It makes sense of lives, which transforms what people learn and how information can be learnt. Both types of service-learning also include the process of mutual learning instead of the traditional approach of one-way, top-down learning. ‘Reflection’ is therefore emphasized in this kind of programme, in which involved participants need to go through a self-critic process.

No matter which model is employed, ‘university education and research should harness specific economic and social objectives, by means of exchanging knowledge and sharing resources with mutually beneficial outcomes’ (Dragne, 2007, p. 11). To demonstrate the diversity and richness of actual practices on the ground today, Table IV.4.1 illustrates various approaches and nomenclatures that have evolved in the region in community–university engagement.

Religious-based HEIs obviously remain important in some parts of Asia. There are different religious networks that also encourage and support civic engagement programmes in the region. In addition to the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia, mentioned earlier, the Association of Christian Universities and Colleges in Asia has organized different conferences and activities focused on service-learning, whole-person development or civic engagement. In 2012, one of its constitutional objectives was changed to foster cooperative research projects, service-learning projects, quality assurance projects and Christian character development activities among different members of the Association as well.

Other than these networks, there are also key networks and associations supporting ‘engagement’ exercises in Asia by emphasizing the responsibilities of HEIs to address regional challenges and generate regional knowledge and engagement programmes. For examples, the Service-Learning Asia Network (SLAN) consists of over 10 universities from the region to develop different regional service-learning programmes and research projects (International Christian University, 2009) and a Science Shop in Shanghai to motivate faculty and students to use their scientific knowledge to address the need of the community. The Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (or National University of Malaysia) has worked with the global Talloires Network to develop a regional partner known as the Asia–Talloires Network of Industry and Community Engaged Universities, which brings together key regional stakeholders

TABLE IV.4.1

Various types of community–university engagement

Countries/city/region	Name of HEI	Nature of HEI	Project nature/terms	References
<i>Private not-for-profit HEIs</i>				
Taiwan	Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan	Private and Catholic university	Local and international voluntary service programmes, institutional advocacy and course-based service-learning programmes	http://slc.mission.fju.edu.tw/idea01.aspx
Taiwan	Chung Yuan Christian University, Taiwan	Private Christian university	ASL and CSL programmes	Ma (2012)*
The Philippines	Silliman University, the Philippines	Private, non-profit, Protestant university	Community engagement and international service-learning programmes	http://su.edu.ph/page/10-History
Indonesia	Petra Christian University, Indonesia	Private university	Institutional advocacy, discipline-related service-learning programmes and community-based outreach programmes	http://ppm.petra.ac.id/ppm/sl/serve_learn.html
Thailand	Payap University, Thailand	Private university	Course-related service-learning programmes and volunteer work	http://ic.payap.ac.th/graduate/mdiv/curriculum.php#
India	Madras Christian College, India	Government-aided Christian college	Course-based service-learning programmes and community engagement	Sugumar (2009); http://mcc.edu.in/
India	Lady Doak College, India	Christian university	Project-based service-learning programmes and community-based and credit-bearing outreach programmes	http://www.ladydoakcollege.edu.in/node/coslp/02
Japan	International Christian University, Japan	Private, liberal arts and Christian college	Local CSL/ASL and international service-learning programmes	http://subsite.icu.ac.jp/sl/c/e/about_isl.html
Korea	Seoul Women's University, Korea	Private university	Credit-bearing, community-based service-learning programmes	http://www.swu.ac.kr/english/
<i>Public universities</i>				
Taiwan	National Taichung University of Education, Taiwan	National public university	Community-based service-learning programmes and community-based, international and voluntary activities	http://www.ntcu.edu.tw/eng/052.htm
China	Nankai University, China	National public university	Service-learning as a public elective course, bearing 1.5 credits and lasting for one semester. The content is revised and updated each semester to maintain lasting vitality	http://www.nankai.edu.cn/english/
China	Sun Yat-sen University, China	Public university	Philanthropy courses, service-learning courses, social innovation	http://www.sysu.edu.cn/2012/cn/index.htm
China	East China Normal University	Public university	Science shop and volunteer programme	http://english.ecnu.edu.cn/
Australia	Charles Darwin University, Australia	Public university	Community-based projects	Campbell and Christie (2008); http://www.cdu.edu.au/
India	Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishwavidyalaya, India	Government-funded women's university	Community-based research	Planning Commission (2012); http://www.bpswomenuniversity.ac.in/
India	Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, India	Public university	Community-based research	Planning Commission (2012); http://hnbgu.ac.in/
*Carol Ma Hok Ka (2012), visiting scholar at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) of the University of Massachusetts, Boston, USA, developed the table for the seminar presentation in April 2012.				

from universities, industries, NGOs, communities and governments to catalyse sustainable partnerships for improving the quality of life in the region.

PRIA is an NGO that focuses on capacity-building, knowledge-building, participatory research, citizen-centric development and policy advocacy to command the strategic direction of interventions in the community. These all provide a platform to promote the engagement

of HEI in Asia. For example, SLAN is formed from over 10 universities in the region to promote the common interests and networks of student exchanges, faculty research, curriculum development and programme evaluation among colleges and universities interested in service-learning in Asia. SLAN members share ideas about the development of service-learning and have united to encourage cross-national collaborations.

The Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA) is a national example formed by 10 Australian universities under the leadership of the University of Western Sydney. AUCEA also aims to promote a recognition of the scholarship of engagement and facilitate collaborative research between members and their communities (Temple et al., 2005). Finally, the Service-Learning Higher Education Network in Hong Kong is a local example formed by 10 Hong Kong colleges and universities to exchange ideas on civic engagement and service-learning. These kinds of partnership also involve non-profit organizations, foundations, corporations and government as key stakeholders in civic participation.

ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

The rapid growth of enrolment in HE in the region is bringing with it a wide variety of new practices and international linkages. As a consequence, community engagement and social responsibility in HE has now begun to gain the attention of policy-makers and university administrators. However, with the rush towards economic models of capital formation for productive purposes in the economy, it is a big challenge to adopt this as a priority agenda within the region.

One of the first sets of issues relates to the need for explicit and supportive policy and the resources to achieve this. As has been described before, several countries in the region have now put in place policies that mandate community engagement, but in reality much more needs to happen. A clear need is for more resources to be made available to position this kind of work as mainstream. Where governments have funded some innovative programmes in this direction, results have been very encouraging.

From the national experience in Thailand, the Ministry of University Affairs initiated a government-funded programme called Strengthening the Grass-roots Economy. Under this programme, 'participating institutions were funded to promote networking with local communities, conduct research on economic opportunities, and provide local training on public administration, business management, community development, etc.' (Boothroyd and Fryer, 2004, p. 15). In 2003, an avian influenza research programme was initiated as a collaboration among the different faculties from Chulalongkorn University and the University of Minnesota, with support from the Thai Government, the US National Institutes of Health and the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The programme upgraded virus laboratories

to P3 bio-safety levels, and developed training activities for doctors, veterinarians, scientists and researchers, officers at the Department of Livestock Development and district officers in areas where there were repeated outbreaks. The programme also encompassed studies on surveillance in Thailand and Southeast Asia, the natural history of disease in ecosystems, animal and human genetic transformations and the development of coping measures (Suwanwela, 2007). This kind of joint government initiative in Asia is very encouraging.

In addition to the Thai case, the NURI project in Korea is another national mechanism that supports HE engagement. The Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development was responsible for a project that recruited the participation of 109 HEIs. In this project, partnerships were built between local authorities, research institutions, business and industries.

At the university level, the institutionalization of HE engagement policy is one of the key issues among different institutions in Asia. Promoting and supporting university-wide engagement from the top and among the faculties is extremely important. It is a good strategy to align the learning objectives with the university's mission (Chan et al., 2009; Xing and Ma, 2010). For example, the mission of Lingnan University in Hong Kong is 'Education for Service', the mission of Silliman University in the Philippines is 'To be of Service to Others', and the mission of Payap University in Thailand is 'Truth and Service'. Many HEIs, especially private universities with a religious background that engage widely in the community, also have mission statements driving towards civic improvements.

Meanwhile, to encourage HEI engagement, the university can set up an office to facilitate faculty and departments to have scholarship-based engagement with communities, organizations and agencies. There are several examples of central facilities that provide leadership and coordination for other departments and also are good examples for other universities to follow, especially those that want to fully engage in the community; these include the Experiential Learning Center at the University of Hong Kong, China; the Service-Learning Center at International Christian University, Japan; the Service-Learning Center at Fu Jen Catholic University in Taiwan; the Center for Professional Ethics and Service-Learning at Assumption University in Thailand; the Center for Outreach and Service-Learning Program at Lady Doak College in India; and the Community Outreach Center at Petra Christian University in Indonesia.

As has been analysed above, HEIs need to create policies and structures to promote community-university engagement efforts institution-wide. Clear incentives for

teachers, researchers and students need to be evolved so that engagement becomes everybody's business all the time. Performance assessment mechanisms for students and faculty have to integrate indicators of engagement.

Another issue presently gaining great attention is the question of the public accountability of HEIs. Most of them are supported by public resources, and many have been allocated significant visibility in the country's educational programmes. Therefore, the social relevance and impact of HEIs in their neighbourhood communities is being examined. Given the growing inequality and exclusion in many parts of the region, this issue gains further significance because metropolitan locations and communities seem to benefit far more than those in the hinterland and in areas where the population is poor.

The contentious issue of indigenous knowledge and its space in the system of HEIs continues to be relevant in the region. Several HEIs have begun to showcase indigenous knowledge in courses related to health, well-being and ecology. Yet much more needs to be done to promote a coherent mutuality between these various epistemologies of knowledge that the region is known for.

One of the obstacles is that 'participation in collaborative action-research has neither the scholarly respectability of pure research nor the commercial allure of contracted research as it studies problems with the local people' (Boothroyd and Fryer, 2004, p. 17). For the same reason, the facilitation of collaborative action research is usually not recognized as teaching in academia as it does not fit well with a systematic and cumulative programme of specialized study because conventional teachers do not control the learning process. In addition, young scholars may feel uneasy acting as co-participants in social development processes when they have little power when doing such kinds of research. It seems that this kind of research is a very inefficient way to establish a scholar's publication record.

To cope with these challenges, participatory research needs to be mainstreamed in HEIs and more funding should be given to faculty members for conducting community-based research as many people would like to engage in it or are already engaging in without informing the authorities. In addition, more support and dissemination research on the impact of youth civic engagement should be encouraged.

In the region, there has been quite some debate on USR (similar to CSR). In this debate, governments have promoted university-industry engagement much more than community-university engagement. Community structures, networks and resources are rather weak. Governments need to invest in these if meaningful partnerships of engagement between

communities (especially more marginalized ones) and HEIs are to be built and nurtured.

To encourage the partnership between HEIs and community agencies, greater support is also suggested. Community partners can also act proactively to engage universities to achieve good communication and make them understand the needs of the community, provide feedback or exchange information between the community and universities, and work together to conduct research for and with the community. PRIA is one of the examples of organizations that could take up this role.

On the other hand, it is not easy for a community to build relationships and partnerships with HEIs as both may have unrealistic expectations of what the partners can achieve in a certain period of time (Baum, 2006). Thus, it is suggested that universities should 'institutionalize' partnerships with the community and recognize the mutual benefits that will lead to effective and sustainable collaborations.

A major issue in the region is inadequate systematization, documentation and dissemination of practices in community engagement. As has been illustrated throughout this paper, many interesting and diverse forms of engagement are taking place, but there is not much research on this theme. A strong body of knowledge needs to be built in the future.

In addition, building on the HEI typology included in the study, we should also develop a portfolio of detailed case studies giving examples of different HEIs in the region. There are no databases or detailed case studies for reference when promoting HEI engagement. If we can also highlight the pros and cons of each approach and its appropriateness for different contexts, goals, implementing agencies and service targets, it would help stakeholders (including the government and civil society organizations, teachers and students, and so on) to decide which approaches they could considered to promote engagement exercises better.

CONCLUSION

Universities play a vital role not only in shaping the future by educating tomorrow's professionals, but also in creating a research base for sustainability efforts and in providing outreach and service to communities and nations, especially in relation to difficult sustainability issues (McKeown, 2006). According to the former President of Korea University, Sung-Joo Han, who presented at the 2005 Talloires Conference:

universities can teach better, and students can learn better as a result of social and public engagements.

They can do better research. We have many purists who say scholars should be in an ivory tower, should not come out into the street and be involved in society. Perhaps there are different roles, depending on whether society is at a developing or developed stage, but in both cases the university (faculty and students) is an important agent of modernization and globalization, both in teaching and research. So we shouldn't worry about the conflict or competition among these three elements of teaching, research, and civic engagement. (Perold, H. & Associates, 2005, p. 21)

Greater attention to diversity of knowledge and knowledge systems and a greater focus on issues of inequality, especially gender inequality, need to be adopted in efforts to promote and deepen community engagement in the region.

In the future, HE investment in knowledge transfer, knowledge-building, knowledge application and civic/community engagement will be constantly increasing through internationalization and globalization, and the Asia-Pacific region will not be an exception to this. There are undoubtedly different cultures, different educational systems, different political systems and different stages of civic development in various countries across Asia, so it will take time for HEIs to fully accept university engagement as pedagogy or even as a curricular consideration. Since its theoretical framework and research is still in an infant stage, academia and communities need to create more joint platforms to learn and exchange each other's concerns and success stories.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P.G. (2004) 'The past and future of Asian universities'. In: Altbach P.G. and T.U. Baltimore (eds), *Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, p. 13.

Angeles, L.C. (2007) 'The scholarship of international service learning: implications for teaching and learning participatory development in higher education'. In: *Reinventing Higher Education: Toward Participatory and Sustainable Development*. Bangkok: UNESCO, pp. 78–87.

Assegaf, A.R., Zakaria, A.R.B. and Sulaiman, A.M. (2012) 'The closer bridge towards Islamic studies in higher education in Malaysia and Indonesia'. *Creative Education*, 3(26), 986–92.

Baum, H. (2006) 'Challenges in Institutionalizing University–Community Partnerships'. *Conference on Leadership and Sustainability for Community/University Partnerships*, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of University Partnerships, Baltimore, Maryland, March 31, 2006, p. 4.

Boothroyd, P. and Fryer, M. (2004) 'Mainstreaming Social Engagement in Higher Education: Benefits, Challenges, and

Successes'. Presentation to the Colloquium on Research and Higher Education Policy: 'Knowledge, Access and Governance: Strategies for Change', December 1–3, 2004, UNESCO, Paris. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 15 and 17.

Boyer, E.L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Calhoun, C. (2006) 'The university and the public good'. *Thesis Eleven*, 84, 7–43.

Campbell, M. and Christie, M. (2008) 'Questionnaire summaries'. In: *Indigenous Community Engagement @ Charles Darwin University*. Australia: Charles Darwin University, pp. 6–12.

Chan, C.M., Lee, K.M. and Ma, H.K. (2009) 'Service-learning model at Lingnan University: development strategies and outcome assessment'. *Hong Kong New Horizons in Education*, 57(3), 57–73.

Colby, A., Ehrlich T., Beaumont E. and Stephens J. (2003) *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Dragne, C. (2007) *Background document for the University of Victoria Task Force on Civic Engagement*. Canada: University of Victoria.

Hollander, E. and Meeropol, J. (2006) 'Engagement in teaching and learning.' In: Percy S.L., Zimpher N.L. and Brukardt M.J. (eds), *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing, p. 6990.

Howard, J. (2013) 'Academic Service-Learning: Myths, Challenges, and Recommendations'. Retrieved March 25, 2013 from <http://data.ohr.umn.edu/protected/service1.pdf>.

International Christian University (2009) *Lessons from Service-learning in Asia: Results of Collaborative Research in Higher Education*. Japan: Service-Learning Center, International Christian University.

Jun Xing and Ma, H.K.C. (eds) (2010) *Service-learning in Asia: Curricular Models and Practices*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kim, E.U. and Cho, Y.H. (2008) 'Social Responsibility: A Critical Role for Korean Universities in the 21st Century'. Paper presented to the Asia-Pacific Sub-regional Preparatory Conference for the 2009 World Conference on Higher Education 'Facing Global and Local Challenges: the New Dynamics for Higher Education', September 25–26, 2008, Macao, PR China. Bangkok: UNESCO.

Kraince, R.G. (2007) 'Islamic higher education and social cohesion in Indonesia'. *Prospects*, 37(3), 345–56.

Leys S. (1997) *The Analects of Confucius*. New York: W. W. Norton.

McKeown, R. (2006) Reorienting colleges and universities to address sustainability. In: Wong L. (ed.), *Globalization and Education for Sustainable Development – Sustaining the Future*. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 94–7.

Nandy, A. (1996) 'The politics of indigenous knowledge and contending ideas of the university'. In: Hayhoe, R. and Pan, J. (eds), *East–West Dialogue in Knowledge and Higher Education*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, p. 297.

Narang, R.H. (1996) 'The integration of modern and indigenous knowledge through nonformal education'. In: Hayhoe, R. and Pan, J. (eds), *East–West Dialogue in Knowledge and Higher Education*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 259–60.

Pacific Economic Cooperation Council Conference (2007)

- 'Rethinking international education engagement in the Asia-Pacific region', p. 9.
- Pamulaan Center for Indigenous Peoples' Education (2013) 'The Living Heritage of Philippine Indigenous People'. Retrieved March 14, 2013 from <http://pamulaan.org/programs-and-services>.
- Pennycook, A. (1996) 'English, universities, and struggles over culture and knowledge'. In: Hayhoe, R. and Pan, J. (eds), *East-West Dialogue in Knowledge and Higher Education*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, p. 64.
- Perold, H. & Associates (2005) *Strengthening the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education. A Report on the Talloires Conference 2005*. Medford, MA: Talloires Network, Tufts University, p. 21.
- Planning Commission (2012) 'Fostering social responsibility in higher education in India'. Panel Discussion at the launch of UNESCO Chair on Community-based Research and Symposium on 'Social Responsibility in Higher Education'. India: PRIA.
- Planning Commission, Government of India (2013) 'Education'. In: *Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-2017), Social sectors Volume III*. India: SAGE Publications India, p. 111.
- Sawasdikosol, S. (2009) 'Driving Universities. Collaboration toward the New Era of Sustainable Social Responsibility'. Paper presented at the University-Community Engagement Conference 2009, November 23-26, 2009, Penang, Malaysia). San Francisco: University Social Responsibility Alliance.
- Sugumar, R.W. (2009) 'Role of service learning in water quality studies'. *New Horizons in Education*, 57(3), 82-90.
- Suwanwela, C. (2007) 'Roles of universities in sufficiency economy'. In: Haddad, C. (ed.), *Reinventing Higher Education: Toward Participatory and Sustainable Development*. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Tandon, R. (2007) 'In search of relevance: higher education for participatory research and sustainable development'. *Reinventing Higher Education: Toward Participatory and Sustainable Development*. Bangkok: UNESCO, pp. 42-50.
- Tandon, R. (2008) 'Civil engagement in higher education and its role in human and social development'. In: Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI), *Higher Education in the World 3, New Challenges and Emerging Roles for Human and Social Development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tandon, R. (2012) *Fostering Social Responsibility in Higher Education, Planning Commission*. (UNESCO) www.unescochair-cbrsr.org/.
- Tandon, R. (2012) 'Fostering social responsibility in higher education in India'. India: PRIA, pp. 5-7, 11-13.
- Tandon, R. and Hall, B. (2012) *UNESCO Chair on Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education: A Framework for Action 2012-2016*. New Delhi: PRIA.
- Temple, J., Story, A. and Delaforce, W. (2005) 'AUCEA: an emerging collaborative and strategic approach dedicated to community-university engagement in Australia'. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Engaging Communities*. Brisbane, Australia.
- Todani, K. (2008) Country Report - Japan. Paper presented to the Asia-Pacific Sub-regional Preparatory Conference for the 2009 World Conference on Higher Education 'Facing Global and Local Challenges: the New Dynamics for Higher Education', September 25-26, 2008, Macao, PR China. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- University Grants Committee (2012, December 27) 'Knowledge Transfer'. University Grants Committee. Retrieved March 12, 2013 from: <http://www.ugc.hk/eng/ugc/activity/kt/kt.htm>.
- University Social Responsibility Alliance (2009, November) 'Driving Universities' Collaboration toward the New Era of Sustainable Social Responsibility'. Paper presented at University-Community Engagement Conference 2009.
- Wang, L.B. (2008) 'A Country Report of the People's Republic of China'. Paper presented to the Asia-Pacific Sub-regional Preparatory Conference for the 2009 World Conference on Higher Education 'Facing Global and Local Challenges: the New Dynamics for Higher Education', September 25-26, 2008, Macao, PR China. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Xing Jun and Ma, H.K.C. (eds), (2010) *Service-learning in Asia: Curricular Models and Practices*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Inside View IV.4.1

The nexus between knowledge, engagement and higher education in Australia: responding to the complex challenges of our time

Michael Cuthill

The nexus between knowledge, engagement and higher education in Australia has, in one form or another, been on the national agenda for several decades now. Much of the initial discussion was informed by leading international scholars including Boyer (1990, 1996), Gibbons and associates (1994) and Holland (2005). This discussion was largely built around a deceptively simple question asked by Boyer (1996, p. 19) as to how we might best connect 'the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic and ethical problems'. A

TABLE IV.4.1.1

Key characteristics of an engaged approach to knowledge production

Traditional concepts of scholarship	Engaged scholarship
Disciplinary	Transdisciplinary
Hierarchical	Participatory
Pure or applied	Applied
Linear	Reflexive
Quality is academically defined	Quality is academically defined and socially accountable

strong argument for a more engaged approach to scholarship was articulated. Some of the key characteristics of this new engaged scholarship are shown in Table IV.4.1.1 (Gibbons et al., 1994; Cuthill, 2011, p. 24).

Engagement Australia (formerly the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance) is the lead advocate for community-university engagement in Australia. Well over half of Australia's public universities are members of Engagement Australia. Collectively, they have presented a broad argument