Community engagement as one of the core functions of universities: revisiting the idea of a university

Abstract:

More than two hundred years ago Newman (1852) developed and advanced his idea of a 'university as a place of teaching universal knowledge', whose underlying objectives are 'intellectual and not moral, … and the diffusion and extension of knowledge and not advancement'. Newman's idea of a university included his conviction that it ought to be fiercely independent from external influences, including from the Church which used to be the principal stakeholder of the university he (Newman) was part of.

Over the last three centuries the idea of a university has evolved, and the contemporary university is, in many respects, the diametrical opposite of a university envisaged by Newman (1852). Universities are not only involved in the generation, diffusion and extension of knowledge, but they also strive to advance it. The principle of absolute independence has also gradually been tapered by the principle of responsiveness to society. These developments have resulted in universities, almost globally, adopting community engagement as the 'third mission' or core function, to cater for the advancement of knowledge in response to societal needs.

This paper looks at the developments related to community engagement as a core function of universities, with particular emphasis on universities in South Africa. After highlighting the conceptual complexities, the paper examines the possible reasons for the continued poor development and implementation of community engagement programmes, and recommends a rethink of community engagement so that it can be developed to the level of the other two 'missions' or core functions of universities, namely teaching and learning, and research.

Key words/terms
Communities, community engagement, third mission, universities, knowledge, teaching and learning, research

Introduction

The development of higher education was initially driven by the need to train the ruling, priestly, military and other service elites in medieval Europe (Perkin, 2007). Only then did an institution identifiable as a university emerge. The medieval university combined teaching and scholarship, and was characterised by its corporate autonomy, academic freedom and a certain level of internal unity (Perkin, 2007; Alemu, 2018). Society used to view the medieval university as an ivory tower, far detached from the communities it was meant to serve (Butterfield & Soska, 2004).

Centuries later, the university has retained much of the characteristics of the medieval university.

The primary activities remain the production of knowledge and scholarship through teaching and research (Alemu, 2018). However, the university has since then, increasingly taken community engagement as its 'third mission', adding to the other two 'missions' of teaching and learning, and research. Among the most common definitions of community engagement, as it relates to universities, is that it refers to the initiatives and processes through which the expertise of universities in the areas of teaching and research are applied to address issues relevant to their communities (CHE, 2004). In other words, it is about the advancement of knowledge in the service of communities. Through community engagement, the university is expected to apply the knowledge generated from its research activities for the economic, cultural, social and political advancement of the local, national or international communities. The aim is to link the university more closely to the communities and help to address their challenges.

In Africa, as in many developing countries, the majority of universities are funded by governments as part of their national social development budgets. A larger proportion of these governments wish to see universities taking active role in stimulating and facilitating socio-economic development in their regions and advancing the realisation of the Millennium Development Goals (Raditloaneng, 2013). To this end, the governments have development and are implementing higher education policies that place the 'third mission' of universities at par with the other two 'missions' of teaching and learning, and research (Mugabi, 2014).

Against the background provided above, it is rather ironic that the evidence from different parts of the world suggests that community engagement is still not yet considered as part of the mainstream activities of many universities, and that it continues to lag behind the other two 'missions' of teaching and learning, and research in terms of advancement, prominence and stature as a component of the core functions of universities (Pinheiro, Langa and Pausits, 2015). This paper looks at the conceptions of community engagement and examines the possible reasons for the continued poor development and implementation of community engagement programmes globally, and in Africa and South Africa, in particular. The paper also recommends a rethink of community engagement and offers a new perspective in this regard. Furthermore, it briefly discusses the role of the Council on Higher Education (CHE) in the promotion of community engagement across the higher education sector in South Africa.

Conceptual complexity

There are numerous definitions of the term 'community engagement' as it relates to the work of universities. It is apparent that the definitions have been influenced by the histories, cultures, and community contexts of the different universities that have formulated them. The result is that there is less consensus on the meaning of community engagement as a core function of universities. This state of conceptual complexity is compounded by the existence of other terms that are often used interchangeably with the term 'community engagement'. These terms include 'engaged scholarship', 'scholarship of engagement', 'community impact', 'community outreach', 'social impact', and 'social responsiveness' (Pinheiro, Langa & Paustis, 2015). Closer to home, the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) of the Council on Higher Education (CHE), for instance, has used two related terms in its framework documents. In 2001 in its Founding Document it used the term 'community service' (CHE, 2001), but in 2004 in its Framework for Institutional Audits it used the term 'community engagement' (CHE, 2004), to refer to the same phenomenon. The CHE later organised a conference on 'community engagement) in 2006 (CHE 2006), and published a Kagisano on the same theme in 2010 (CHE, 2010).

Upon closer analysis, the different terminologies belie the unexplored (mis)perceptions surrounding not only community engagement, but also how universities conceive of their role and responsibility in relation to both 'community' and 'engagement'.

While there are conceptual complexities in relation to 'community engagement', a common denominator is still discernible among the numerous definitions, and also among the related terms including 'engaged scholarship', 'scholarship of engagement', 'community impact', 'community outreach', 'social impact', and 'social responsiveness'. The common denominator is that they all, either explicitly or implicitly, refer to the activity of deploying the intellectual and technical resources of universities in search for solutions to societal challenges, and in the quest for making a positive difference to society. They are all about continuous engagement between universities and the communities within their local, national and/or international environments. These engagement activities may be formal or informal, and may include establishing relationships, collaboration initiatives, joint business ventures, conferences, sports events, research projects, and numerous other activities (Jacob, Sutin, Weidman & Yeager, 2015: 1).

Perspectives adopted by universities

Universities conceive of community engagement in different ways. Some see it as service to communities through the dissemination of knowledge and transfer of technology (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). This perspective has, since 1990s, been boosted by the development of online repositories and other digital media that have tremendously enhanced universities' ability to share information with communities, and thereby significantly expanding the reach and impact of the universities' community engagement.

Other universities believe that community engagement should be about mutual and collaborative processes of knowledge exchange between the universities and communities, with a strong emphasis on establishing partnerships around such processes (Holland & Ramaley, 2008). Jacob et al. (2015:1) assert that mutual relationship between universities and communities is essential because the communities help provide the universities with human resources that are necessary for higher education systems to foster and carry out their purposes. Community engagement therefore becomes programmes through which the universities plough back into the communities that are critical for their sustainability. This perspective locates universities within communities and societies, with an agenda of serving a public good. It follows, therefore, that in engaging with communities, the universities would not only advance their epistemological function, but they would also ensure their relevance by reflecting on their own practices.

Research indicates that in majority of universities community engagement is rarely considered as a stand-alone function. It is rather designed and implemented as an offshoot of teaching and learning, and research (Bhagwan, 2017). For example, in the health sciences, students are required to undertake community service related to their studies for specified periods before they qualify to graduate. They undertake community service work in hospitals, clinics, hospices for the old-aged people or orphans, and other care-giving facilities as part of their studies. This form of community engagement is an integral component of the curricula of these disciplines.

In South Africa, universities have, with no exception, embraced the three 'mission' structure of their core functions, with community engagement as the 'third mission'. The majority of them have couched community engagement within the context of transformation, and they take it as a core medium for the advancement of social

responsibility and redress. Bender (2008: 83) observes that a number of universities 'have developed an understanding of the potential that community engagement holds for transforming higher education in relation to societal needs, and for producing graduates with a sense of civic responsibility and an ability to apply the theory of their disciplines to local development issues'. They have institutionalised community engagement as it serves as a vehicle for enriching the generation and dissemination of knowledge (Bender, 2008).

Higher education policy framework for community engagement

As alluded to in the preceding section, in the post-apartheid era, community engagement is located within the context of transformation. The National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE, 1996), which laid down the policy framework for higher education in democratic South Africa, identified increased participation, greater responsiveness and increased cooperation and partnerships, as the three vital principles for transforming the hitherto unequal higher education landscape. The principle of greater responsiveness, in particular, was seen as the lever for promoting a more dynamic interaction between higher education and society, which would, in turn, promote development and accountability.

Building on the general vision of a transformed higher education provided by the NCHE (1996), the Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education (DoE, 1997) envisioned a reformed and integrated higher education system – a 'single, national co-ordinated system that would ensure diversity in its organisational form and the institutional landscape, mix of institutional missions and programmes commensurate with national and regional needs in social, cultural and economic development' (DoE 1997, 2.3). Badat (2010:3) explained that this vision reflected the core roles of higher education – that is, disseminating

knowledge and producing critical graduates, producing and applying knowledge through research and development activities and contributing to economic and social development and democracy through learning and teaching, research and community engagement. In the White Paper 3 (DoE 1997:10), universities are called upon to 'demonstrate social responsibility … and their commitment to the common good by making available expertise and infrastructure for community service programmes'. They are also called upon to promote and develop social responsibility and awareness amongst students by actively designing, developing and implementing community service programmes. In the final analysis, the policy calls on universities to be accountable not only to their own governing bodies and the institutional community but also to the broader society.

The White Paper for Post-School Education and Training (DHET, 2013) entrenches the policy position that requires universities to be responsive to the needs of the communities they are established to serve. It urges universities to, for instance, undertake research to meet the economic and social needs of society, and build knowledge-generating partnerships with public and private enterprises. It believes that expecting and requiring universities to be responsive to the social, economic and cultural challenges of society, does not necessarily mean advocating them to become purely instrumentalist in their approach to their key functions. The latter approach is not desirable because it would result in universities losing their cutting edge in the areas of 'blue sky' research, formulation of theories, and philosophical discourses which have been, from time immemorial, the distinguishing features of any institution that is referred to as a university (De le Rey, 2015).

The National Development Plan (NDP) envisions by 2030 'an expanding higher education sector that can contribute to rising incomes, higher productivity and the shift to a more knowledge-

intensive economy' . It is unequivocal in linking the purpose of universities to national development and it points to three main functions for universities: high level skills, knowledge production and application, and providing opportunities for social mobility and strengthening equity, social justice and democracy (National Planning Commission, 2012). Furthermore, the National Plan for the Post-School Education and Training System (DHET 2019) urges universities to develop and strengthen their focus on community engagement, as the third pillar of their core business, and commits to support them in this regard. The plan further states that the Council on Higher Education (CHE) will be requested to advise on policy guidelines, and reporting requirements for monitoring and measuring community engagement; and advise on ways of stimulating the sharing of engagement criteria, guidelines and institutions at national level, including possible national awards system and specific forms of funding. The latter point is vitally important because the current higher education funding frameworks do not have block grants or earmarked funding for community engagement.

The current state of community engagement in higher education and the contributory factors

Despite the policy initiatives that encourage universities to mainstream community engagement into their core business in order to advance transformation and social responsibility, and pockets of initiatives in this regard across a number of universities, research has revealed that community engagement and service continue to be regarded as merely add-on, nice-to-have, philanthropic activities (Bender, 2008:83). Among the academic communities, in particular, there is still significant resistance to accepting community engagement as a core function of universities, notwithstanding the increasing number of incentives that include moral affirmation for contributing to social and economic justice (Hall,

2010:7). While universities have mission statements that reflect that community engagement is one of their core functions, their more visible activities, outputs and outcomes remain predominantly in the areas of teaching and learning, and research. Community engagement activities, on the other hand, remain, by and large, ad hoc and small scale in nature, and not well designed and run. Not surprisingly, they have little, if any, impact on the communities (Hall, 2010).

There are a number of factors that contribute towards the state of community engagement in higher education in South Africa, as described above. The first of these factors is that the majority of universities were established before the dawn of democracy and they owe their internal and external legitimacies from decoupling or delinking their activities from external influences, including societal affairs. They are guided by the maxim that universities have to be autonomous and completely free in pursuit of knowledge without being influenced by vested interests of society around; and their belief that the notion of community engagement contradicts this tenet. They further believe that the notion of community engagement also contradicts excellence as a value. Accordingly, the idea that knowledge generated by the universities should necessarily be of instrumental value to society at large, is treated with utter disdain among the traditional academic communities (Pinheiro, 2012).

The conceptual complexity discussed earlier is also a significant factor that has contributed to the poor translation of the idea of community engagement into workable programmes. There is no consensus on what community engagement entails, how it can be pursued, and how its outcomes can be measured. External and internal efforts to come up with precise definition of community engagement has, so far, not borne tangible fruits because the different academic communities and knowledge domains have varying conceptions of the term (Pinheiro et al., 2015). If an activity cannot be properly defined, it

surely then cannot be properly designed and developed; and if it cannot be properly designed and developed, it then cannot be satisfactorily translated into operational programmes.

Butin (2007: 34) posits that another possible factor that has contributed to the marginalisation of community engagement in universities is that it has not been properly resourced as compared to teaching and learning, as well as research. The design and development of excellent academic and/or scholarly programmes demand immense amount of time and energy. Unfortunately, academics find no motivation nor incentive to invest enormous amounts of time and energy in developing programmes for community engagement because, with few exceptions, the majority of institutions have no performance indicators and targets for community engagement. Furthermore, there is no consequence for the academics that neglect community engagement in their day-to-day academic activities. And yet, it is a fact that to develop excellent community engagement programmes, academics in universities need to establish local contacts, build trust with them, create collaborative relationships, listen carefully, learn about real community needs, and integrate students' engaged work into course content. And all of this must be 'front-loaded' weeks or months before the programme in question is operationalised (Butin, 2007).

Besides the challenges of developing community development programmes of acceptable quality and impact, community engagement in general is a different kettle of fish as compared to teaching and learning, for example. As such, academics may be reluctant to shift into 'an existentially precarious pedagogy' – one which moves them from the controlled environment of a classroom, where they are the experts, to a messy, chaotic world in which they are not the only source of knowledge'. Butin (2007:34 - 35) thus continues to argue as follows:

Faculty may have to watch the theories in the textbook contradicted by the reality on the ground. They may have to face the fact that their lectures do not speak to the situation that students encounter in their community organizations. Or they may realize that their expertise, built up over many years of graduate school and teaching, may be next to useless in situations requiring different skills or more interdisciplinary knowledge than they have developed. Community engagement, in short, forces faculty members to confront the limits of their identity as productive and effective scholars…the pedagogies of community engagement may affront more traditional colleagues who have been teaching the same course in the same way for a long time. Senior faculty also may view the investment of time and energy required to teach this way as an escape from the more important task of publishing, which is so crucial to gaining tenure and promotion.

Butin (2007:35) further observes that, even among the most compelling applications, few institutions describe promotion and tenure policies for academics that recognise and reward the scholarship associated with community engagement. If one considers the South African example of promotion to the professoriate, for example, then the criteria that would be taken into account in order of priority would be research productivity, postgraduate student throughput at the levels of a master's and the doctorate, the National Research Foundation (NRF) rating, international networks and funding opportunities. Seldom, if at all, are there requirements or questions regarding community engagement (Waghid & Davids, 2020). In other words, the emphasis placed on community engagement by the Education White Paper 3 (DoE 1997) and the HEQC (2001; 2004; 2006) is not reflected in the professional criteria of the academy, and as such, academics do not consider it with any serious thought or time. At best, it is viewed as a supplementary activity, often submerged in an existing empirical body of research, but with no clear objectives.

Albertyn and Daniels (2009) contend that the poor and/or underdeveloped state of community engagement programmes in South African universities results from the tension between the need for transformation and global competitiveness, and the conflicting interpretations of these imperatives. As already alluded to in a number the preceding paragraphs, transformation requires more responsiveness to local circumstance whereas global competitiveness demands more academic freedom, autonomy and independence from the influences of local environmental factors. Such interpretation therefore juxtaposes these two imperatives as inherently contradictory, and which cannot be pursued simultaneously. Thus, according to this perspective, an institution can elect to either be more responsive to local circumstances, or to be globally competitive in terms of academic excellence. Since the latter is the hallmark of reputable universities, the result is that the majority of universities tend to deliberately gravitate towards the pursuit of global academic competitiveness at the expense of being responsive to local issues.

Kruss (2012) supports the view that there is an inherent tension in this formulation because excellence in knowledge production and technological innovations require unbridled academic freedom and independence from the influences of surrounding communities; whereas being more responsive to social and economic needs requires the university to be 'embedded' within the communities, taking its cues for its activities from politicians and others community leaders.

Consistent with the arguments of Albertyn and Daniels (2009) presented above, Hall (2010) indicates that the gap between policy and practice in community engagement in South Africa needs to be seen also within the context of 'a confused and incomplete theorisation of the ways in which new knowledge is constructed.' He opines that this

has been complicated by the intersection of two political discourses, both of which originated from the creation of the newly democratic state in the early 1990s. One discourse is concerned with the reform of education and, in particular, with the fierce arguments about outcomes-based education and the valorisation of new forms of knowledge in classrooms. The second discourse is on the challenge to the 'ivory tower' characterisation of the university and the call to incorporate the community in the higher education enterprise. These discourses are not necessarily complementary, but they have been conflated and thereby resulting in total confusion and chaos on the ground. Not surprisingly, therefore, the recent rejection of out-come based education in the school system had the inadvertent effect of casting doubts of the significance of integrating community engagement with the other core functions of universities: teaching and learning, and research. By and large, instead of exerting more efforts towards mainstreaming community engagement into the core activities of universities, community engagement as a function is increasingly being pushed to the periphery. According to Butin (2007) this means that community engagement is not being properly framed pedagogically, politically and institutionally. Pedagogically, community engagement has been designed, and is implemented, as an extra-curricular activity which students and academics take part in as add-on to their core academic functions. Politically, it is presumed to be synonymous with a liberal and activist worldview which is loathed by those who position themselves within the non-liberal and non-activist schools of thought; and institutionally, it is seen as an overarching institutional programme that does not find much expression at the department or discipline level.

Some agelong academic traditions also pose a challenge to the development of community engagement to the level of the other core functions of universities. One such tradition is the self-imposed exclusion of the academy. To many academics the prestige of the academy is created

and sustained through its exclusionary and exclusive persona. There exists, therefore, a clearly defined wall between the rest of the world and the academy which is a significant barrier to community engagement initiatives. Community engagement suggests a connection with the world beyond the proverbial 'ivory tower', which is unappealing to most academics (Waghid and Davids, 2020).

The financial constraints that are facing universities, and the way the universities have responded to such constraints have not helped the cause for community engagement. As Giroux (2015) observes, the universities have responded to the financial constraints by adopting corporate ways of running the institutions which place more emphasis on vocational and economic considerations while increasingly moving away from the notions of academic knowledge production and application for democratic values and social responsibility projects. Aronowitz and Giroux (2000) opine that the corporatisation of higher education has reformulated social issues and cast them as largely individual or economic considerations. It has also either cancelled out democratic and social responsibility impulses or repackaged them within the imperatives of the marketplace. Aronowitz and Giroux (2000) further contend that, as corporate culture and values shape university life, corporate planning replaces social planning, management becomes a substitute for leadership, and the private domain of individual achievement replaces the discourse of public politics and social responsibility. As a result, numerous academic staff members co-exist peacefully with a corporate university in which chasing after grants is more important than producing socially relevant research. 'Faculty now advance their careers by producing research that is either politically irrelevant, impenetrable, or increases the bottom line for financially strapped universities' (Giroux, 2015:143).

Rethinking community engagement

It is important that there is a rethink on community engagement so that universities should not only claim it as one of their core functions, but that there should be programmes to that effect on the ground. It is vitally important that there is renewed considerations on the conceptualisation, design, development and implementation of community engagement programmes in universities.

An important premise for a renewed perspective on community engagement is an appreciation of the need to bring the different forces that act on universities into the state of perfect balance. As Cloete, Bailey, Pillay, Bunting and Maassen (2011: 54) assert, the key issue for a good relationship between higher education and economic development is to establish a productive balanced relationship between knowledge and connectedness. They explain that, on the one hand, if there is an overemphasis on the basic knowledge activities of teaching and research – in other words, an excessive inward orientation towards strengthening the academic core – this results in the university becoming an 'ivory tower'. On the other hand, Cloete at al., (2011: 54) contend that 'an overemphasis on connecting the university to development activities weakens the academic core and the university has little new or relevant knowledge to offer in the exchange relationship'. In other words, if the academic core is weak, an undue emphasis on knowledge application results in the university assuming an 'ancillary' role. Rather, the state of equilibrium between the pursuit of basic knowledge activities of teaching and learning, on one hand, and connecting the university to development activities, on the other, is the key towards developing community engagement as a core function of universities at par with teaching and learning, and research.

There is a similar need to bring into balance the emphasis on community engagement, on one

hand, and academic neutrality and objectivity, on the other. Overemphasis on community engagement would normally be perceived as undermining the academic elitism of a university; while unbridled pursuit of academic neutrality and objectivity creates the perceptions of community engagement as liberal or radical social activism that has no place in academia (Cloete at al., 2011). The balanced approach requires that universities conceive of themselves as much part of the communities in which they are situated (Derrida, 2004: 148). Universities, therefore, cannot be inwardly focused on their own desires and scholarship, as their worth equally reside in the extent of their outward reach and impact. When universities act in an insular fashion, it creates a distorted picture of education as something that is disconnected from the communities and society, and of knowledge production as a passive and uncontested process, which has no bearing on communities and society.

Universities have to accept the responsibility of responding to the needs of society – whether political, economic, social, or ethical. Giroux (2017) states that education is vital to the creation of individuals capable of becoming critical social agents, willing to struggle against injustices and develop the institutions that are crucial to the functioning of a substantive democracy. As such, the meaning and purpose of education cannot be detached from the struggles of the broader communities. Universities therefore have to create public spaces for students to address how knowledge is related to the power of self-definition and social agency. This suggests providing students with not only the skills, ideas and values necessary for them to be knowledgeable across a number of traditions and disciplines, but also preparing them to confront and contest social injustices and inequalities (Giroux, 2017).

Hooks (2003) makes the observation that the currently prevailing practice of constructing community engagement as separate from teaching and learning, and research, serves only to alienate both academics and students from the ethical purpose of higher education. It leads to the loss of a closeness among those with whom the academics work and also with their students. Ultimately this leads to the loss of a feeling of connection and closeness with the world beyond the academy.

Role played by the CHE in promoting community engagement in higher education

The Council on Higher Education (CHE) has been part of ongoing conversations in the sector about community engagement in terms of what it is, what forms it takes, and how best it should be undertaken (CHE, 2010). As part of facilitating such discourse, the CHE organised conference on 'Community Engagement in Higher Education' in 2006 which was held in Cape Town. The conference sought to promote an enabling environment for the conceptualisation and implementation of community engagement in South African higher education (CHE, 2006).

In addition, the HEQC of the CHE was established to ensure that providers of higher education effectively and efficiently deliver education, training, research and community service which are of high quality and which produce socially useful and enriching knowledge as well as a relevant range of graduate skills and competencies necessary for social and economic progress (CHE, 2004). The Founding Document (2001) of the HEQC of the CHE identified 'knowledge-based community service' as one of the three areas for the programme accreditation and quality assurance of higher education. The HEQC has since incorporated community engagement and service-learning components into its national quality assurance processes. This is evident in the Criteria for Institutional Audits, which includes service-learning (Criterion 7) and community engagement (Criterion 18); and the Criteria for Programme Accreditation, which

includes minimum requirements for service-learning (Criterion 1).

The institutional audits conducted by the HEQC during the period 2004 to 2011 required that each university to be audited provide self-assessment of its performance including in the area of community engagement. The intention to include community engagement in the institutional audits was to underscore the need to ensure that the engagement with the local and broader community was underpinned by quality considerations, and that it was linked to teaching and learning, as well as to research (CHE, 2004). Evidence from the institutional audits indicates that some institutions have a narrow understanding of or are grappling with the concept of community engagement and how it should be operationalised. A contributing factor to this issue relates to the fact that some institutions do not have formal policies or structures accountable for the aligning and implementation of community engagement as stipulated in the institutions strategic plans and policies.

Conclusion

All universities in South Africa state that teaching and learning, research and community engagement are their core functions. However, it would seem that universities do not take community engagement as seriously as the other two key functions. Consequently, its programmes are under-developed, its activities are often ad hoc in nature, its outcomes are less visible, and its impacts are negligible (Hall, 2010). It is therefore vitally important that universities pay more attention to developing and practising community engagement as one of their fore functions. To do this, universities need to invest substantially in the scholarship and praxis of community engagement. The scholarship should result in common conceptualisation, understanding and design of the activities that constitute community engagement.

Universities may have to pool their community engagement resources together, and work collaboratively on designing and implementing large scale community engagement projects not only to reap economies of scale, but to also increase the level of impact on communities. Such collaboration and cooperation should also be encouraged internally within universities, so that several departments and faculties can work together on large-scale, multi-dimensional community projects. Externally, the collaboration and cooperation may go beyond universities per se, to include private sector industry, civil society and not-for-profit organisations.

It would be beneficial if Universities South Africa (USAf) were to look into the possibility of establishing consortia, independent bodies and/or or agencies to assist universities to structure their community engagement initiatives. This model has proved successful in other parts of the world. Examples of international higher education community engagement agencies include the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC), International Association of Universities (IAU), World Federation of Colleges and Polytechnics (WFCP), and the United Nations University (UNU) (Jacob, et al., 2015). At the regional level, community engagement programmes may span multiple countries within a geographic region of the earth. Examples of regional communities include the European Union, East African Community (EAC), Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL), and the regional accreditation agencies in the United States (Jacob et al., 2015). According to Jacob et al (2015: 6), the European Union (EU) has had tremendous influence on shaping the face of higher education, especially in terms of how higher education institutions engage with local, national, and regional communities within Europe and beyond.

References

Albertyn, R. & Daniels, P. (2009). Research within the context of community engagement'. In Bitzer, E. (Ed.) Higher education in South Africa, pp. 409 – 428. Stellenbosch: Sun Press.

Alemu, S.K. (2018). The meaning, idea and history of university/higher education in Africa: A brief literature review. FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education, 4(3), 210-227.

Aronowitz, S. & Giroux, H.A. (2000). The corporate university and the politics of education.
The Educational Forum, 64: 332 – 339.

Badat, S. (2010). The challenges of transformation in higher education and training institutions in South Africa', paper commissioned by the Development Bank of Southern Africa. Retrieved from
https://www.ru.ac.za/.../The%20Challenges%20of%20Transformation%20in%20High

Bhagwan, R. (2017). Towards a conceptual understanding of community engagement in higher education in South Africa. Perspectives in Education, 35(1): 171-185.

Bender, G. (2008). Exploring conceptual models for community engagement at higher education institutions in South Africa, Perspectives in Education, 26(1): 81 – 95.

Boyer, E.L. (1996), The scholarship of engagement, Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 49 (7): 18-33

Butterfield AKJ, Soska TM. (2004) University-community partnerships: Universities in civic engagement. New York: The Haworth Social Work Practice Press; 2004.

Butin, D.W. (2007). Focusing our aim: Strengthening faculty commitment to community engagement, Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 39(6): 34 – 39.

Butin, D.W. (2012). Rethinking the "Apprenticeship of Liberty": The Case for Academic Programs in Community Engagement in Higher Education, Journal of College and
Character, 13 (1): 1 – 8.

Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2001). Higher Education Quality Committee Founding Document. Pretoria: CHE.

Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2004) Criteria for Institutional Audits. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.

Council on Higher Education (CHE) Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC), JET Education Services (JET) & Community – Higher Education – Service Partnerships (CHESP). (2007). Community Engagement in Higher Education. Cape Town: CHE.

Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2010). Community engagement in South African Higher Education, Kagisano No. 6

Cloete, N., Bailey, T., Pillay, P., Bunting, I., & Maassen, P. (2011). Universities and
economic development in Africa: pact, academic core and coordination. Cape Town:
CHET.

De le Rey (2015) The changing idea of a university, The Journal of the Helen Suzman Foundation, 76: 4 – 7

Derrida, J., Porter, C. & Morris, E.P. (1983). The Principle of reason: The university in the eyes of its pupils, Diacritics, 13 (3): 2 – 20.

Department of Education (DoE). (1997). Education White Paper No. 3: A programme on the

transformation of higher education transformation. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education (DoE). (1998). Higher Education Amendment Act. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education (DoE). (2001) National plan for higher education. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) (2013) White Paper for Post-School Education and Training: Building an Expanded, Effective and Integrated Post-School System, Pretoria: DHET

Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) (2019) National Plan for the Post School Education and Training, Pretoria: DHET

Derrida, J. (2002). Without Alibi (trans. Peggy Kamuf). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giroux, H.A. (2015). Education and the crisis of public values: Challenging the assault on teachers, students, and public education. New York: Peter Lang

Giroux, H.A. (2017). Thinking dangerously: The role of higher education in authoritarian times. Retrieved from www.truth-out.org/…/41058-thinking-dangerously-the-roleof- higher-education-in-a…

Hall, M. (2010). Community engagement in South African higher education. In Kagisano No. 6. pp. 1 -52. Pretoria: CHE

Holland, B., & Ramaley, JA. (2008). Creating a Supportive Environment for Community University Engagement: Conceptual Framework. Engaging Communities. Proceedings of the 31st HERDSA Annual Conference, 2008.

Hooks, B. (2003). Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jacob, W. J., Sutin, S.E., Weidman, J.C. & Yeager, J.L. (2015) 'Community engagement in higher education: International and Local Perspectives'. In Jacob, W. J., Sutin, S.E., Weidman, J.C. & Yeager, J.L. (Eds.) Community engagement in higher education policy reforms and practice, pp. 1-30. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers

Kruss, G. (2012). Reconceptualising engagement: a conceptual framework for analysing university interaction with external social partners, South African Review of Sociology, 43(2): 5-26,

Mugabi, H (2014) Institutionalisation of the 'Third Mission' of the University: The Case of Makerere University. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Tampere University, Finland.

National Planning Commission (2012) National Development Plan: Our Future – Make it Work, Pretoria: The Presidency.

NCHE (National Commission on Higher Education). 1996. An Overview of a new policy framework for Higher Education Transformation. Report submitted to the Minister of Education on 22 August 1996 [Online]. Retrieved from: http://www.llnw.creamermedia.co.za/articles/attachments/04394_higher educationtransformation.pdf

Newman, J. H (1852) The Idea of a University, Dublin: Christian Theology Books, Aertene Press

Perkin, H. (2007). History of universities. In J.J.F. Forest & P.G. Altbach (Eds.), International Handbook of Higher Education (pp. 159–205). London, UK: Springer.

Pinheiro, R (2012) Is the Region for the Region? A Comparative Study of the Institutionalistion of the Regional Missions of Universities. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Oslo, Norway.

Pinheiro, R., Langa, P. V & Paustis, A (2015) The institutionalisation of universities third mission: introduction to the special issue. European Journal of Higher Education. DOI: 10.1080/21568235.2015.1044551

Raditloaneng, W. N. (2013) Impact of Implementing the Third Mission of Universities in Africa (ITMUA) Collaborative Project, 2020 -201. International Journal of Peace and Development Studies, 4(5): 90 – 99.

Waghid, Y. & Davids, N. (2020). The Thinking University Expanded: On Profanation, Play and Education. New York & London: Routledge.

Weerts, DJ., & Sandmann, LR. (2008). Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities, The Review of Higher Education, 32(1): 73 - 106.