STAGE 3

MAPPING AND ANALYSIS

Purpose

Following the collection of practices, case studies and other evidence of community engagement, the university team analyses the collected evidence and produces a 'mapping report' that provides a comprehensive overview of the range of community-engagement practices of the university and a critical assessment of the level of mutually beneficial community engagement that has been achieved.

Timing

Months 4-5 of the TEFCE Toolbox implementation.

Tool: Levels of engagement

The second tool provides a rubric defining different levels of engagement (from beginner to advanced) for each sub-dimension of the TEFCE Toolbox. Its purpose is to allow users to critically analyse the practices they have mapped with the previous tool and to reach conclusions regarding the level of engagement.

During the quick scan, a range of activities are identified involving various forms of cooperation with the community. But this, in itself, tells us little about what role the community has in such activities and the extent to which the practices follow the principle of 'authenticity' that is central to the TEFCE Toolbox, defined as ensuring mutual benefits. Using the Levels-of-Engagement tool, users can compare the collected practices to descriptors of different levels of engagement, organised in a 1-5 level rubric. An example from the TEFCE Toolbox is provided below for one of the sub-dimensions of Teaching & Learning.

TOOL 2

LEVELS OF ENGAGEMENT

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

The process of assigning each sub-dimension with level of engagement is focused on a critical examination of collected practices only, rather than on considering to what extent these are widespread throughout the whole university or are sustainable (this will be a subject of analysis in the following Tool 3). In short, Tool 2 helps answer the question: *"To what extent are the community-engagement practices mapped at the university advanced and mutually beneficial?"*

Illustrative example

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

- *Many of the university's study programmes point to careers that focus on social needs, partly in the region (teacher training, local government, health/medical technology), partly global (energy transition, environment), partly in the Global South.*

- *Social studies at the University are intended to be linked to technological problems to address societal needs holistically. For example, the Philosophy department offers courses focused on ethical issues of technology and hence the courses "include specific content or make specific links with the societal needs of the university's external communities" although the focus is often placed on a global future citizen.*

- *Boards of several study programmes at the University also include representatives of local businesses, meaning that many study programmes respond to needs defined by the university's external community.*

Good practice: Master's programme Geo-information science and natural resource management: this joint programme between Faculty of _____ and _____the University of _____. The hub of the course is the application of geo-information and earth observation techniques in support of natural resources management. The curriculum concentrates on methods for assessing the state of the resource base and the changes that occur and progresses to the assessment of impacts and, finally, societal response.

Other examples of practices: Master's programme _____; Bachelor programme _____; Course _____

Tool: Institutional community-engagement heatmap

The third tool provides a colour-coded matrix to synthesise the findings for each dimension and to further determine the extent to which community engagement is multifaceted and embedded at the university. Its purpose is to allow users to reach conclusions on the level of community engagement for each dimension and for the entire university, based on the previously mapped and analysed practices.

The heatmap also applies a five-level scale, but uses colours in order to provide a clearer visual presentation of the overall results at the end of the TEFCE Toolbox application process. The heatmap:

- syntheses the findings regarding the **authenticity** of engagement for each of the dimensions as a whole;

- assigns levels regarding how **multifaceted** the engagement of the university is (regarding the types of social needs addressed and the communities engaged with);

- assigns levels regarding how **embedded** the engagement of the university is (reflected in how widespread and sustainable the practices are).

The assignment of heatmap levels is flexible, rather than being a precise score determined by a corresponding indicator. Levels are assigned by the university team based on discussions acknowledging the collected evidence and that are then validated by stakeholders, based on the following guidelines:

TOOL 3

INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT HEATMAP

Characteristics of engagement	Heatmap level		
	Lowest level		Highest level
1. Authenticity of engagement	A level is assigned based on a syntheses of the findings of the previous levels of engagement for each sub-dimension, to reach a conclusion for the dimension as a whole.		
2. Societal needs addressed	Lower levels: engagement that meets the traditional notion of 'use to society', such as law, medicine, public administration, industry, etc.	Middle level: engagement that responds to needs such as digitalisation, innovation, smart cities, 21st century skills, etc.	Higher levels: engagement responding to pressing global challenges such as climate change or migration and to local social problems.
3. Communities engaged with	Lower levels: large, highly-structured and well-resourced institutions such as corporations, central government, hospitals.	Middle level: institutions with less capacity for engagement such as local authorities, SMEs, cultural institutions, public bodies.	Higher levels: engagement with partners with the least capacity for engagement, such as schools, NGOs, social enterprises and citizens.
4. Institutional spread	Lower levels: community-engagement practices being only present at one or two university departments.	Middle level: community-engagement practices taking place at several different departments.	Higher levels: community-engagement practices that take place across the entire university.
5. Institutional sustainability	Lower levels: community engagement that is primarily the result of short-term projects or collaborations.	Middle level: community-engagement initiatives that have seen continuous implementation.	Higher levels: community-engagement practices that have been institutionalised, with adequate funding.

The result is a heatmap for each dimension, which are then combined to form a single institutional community-engagement heatmap. This provides a visual guide to the areas in which the university is strongest and the areas which could be further improved (depending on the university's areas of priority).

Illustrative examples

Dimension-level heatmap:

Synthesis: community-engagement heatmap and conclusions					
Characteristics of engagement	Heatmap level				Heatmap levels criteria
	Lowest level			Highest level	
Authenticity of engagement			x		Lower: superficial; no evidence yet of mutual benefit Higher: authentic; tangible benefits for communities
Societal needs addressed		x			Lower: needs of labour market and industry Higher: 'grand challenges' (e.g. climate), social justice
Communities engaged with			x		Lower: well-resourced partners (e.g. business) Higher: low-resourced partners (e.g. schools, NGOs)
Institutional spread				x	Lower: only at one or two university departments Higher: across the entire institution
Institutional sustainability				x	Lower: engagement through short-term projects Higher: engagement institutionalised, adequate funding

Institution-level heatmap[1]

Characteristics of community engagement

Dimensions of community engagement	Authenticity	Social Needs	Communities	Spread	Sustain-ability
I. Teaching and learning					
II. Research					
III. Service/knowledge exchange					
IV. Students					
V. Management (partnerships)					
VI. Management (policies)					
VII. Peer support					

Heatmap colour legend:	Lowest level				Highest level

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

Instructions

Step 1: Categorising/'coding' the collected practices	Practices are sorted into corresponding dimensions and sub-dimensions of the TEFCE Toolbox. Importantly, however, most practices can be sorted into more than one sub-dimension. • <u>E.g.</u> The presence of a university-level centre for service-learning will belong to Dimension I: Teaching and learning and to Dimension VI. Management (policies and support structures).
Step 2: Analysing practices and assigning level of authenticity	Each sub-dimension is assigned a level of engagement (from a 1-5 scale) based on level descriptors provided in the tool presented below. The assignment of levels is not approached as a narrow 'scoring exercise' but is intended as a framework for universities to reflect critically on where their practices fit in a set of given criteria. • <u>Important</u>: Taking into account the context-specific nature of community engagement, the process of assigning a numerical level of engagement is intentionally designed to be flexible and based on internal, qualitative discussions rather than as precise 'scoring' mechanism based on a precise equivalence between the collected evidence and the level descriptors. For this reason, only three of five levels are provided with descriptors. Additionally, the context-specific nature of community engagement means that not all universities should necessarily be expected to achieve Level 5 and may not even wish to aspire to a Level 5. Each university can determine which sub-dimensions should be the highest priority.
Step 3: Synthesising results and assigning dimension 'heatmap' levels	Results for each dimension are synthesised by the university team using the 'heatmap' tool, which considers to what extent the community-engagement practices are multifaceted and embedded at the university. The assignment of heatmap levels is flexible, rather than being a precise score linked to an indicator.
Step 4: Creating institutional heatmap	The result of this stage is a comprehensive 'mapping report', containing a narrative for each subdimension detailing the characteristics of the mapped practices and concluding with assigned levels and a completed heatmap. This report is the subject of discussion and validation in the next stage of the TEFCE Toolbox process.
Step 5: Drafting mapping report ('background report')	The result of this stage is a comprehensive 'mapping report', containing a narrative for each subdimension detailing the characteristics of the mapped practices and concluding with assigned levels and a completed heatmap. This report is the subject of discussion and validation in the next stage of the TEFCE Toolbox process.

Templates

A template for the mapping report and an Excel template for creating the institutional heatmap are available in the Appendix to this report.