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Abstract

Community-engaged Learning (CEL) is an intentional and structured pedagogical approach, which links learning objectives with community needs. Most of the existing literature is centred on Service-learning practice in the United States. To date, there have been no in-depth studies on the experiences and perspectives of practitioners who engage with CEL in a UK or more specifically, a Scottish Higher Education context. The thesis presents data collected from a qualitative study utilising documentary analysis of government and institutional literature and 23 in-depth interviews with University practitioners, managers and leaders. I explored factors which influence the perspectives and experiences of CEL practitioners at one Scottish, research-intensive Russell Group university. Adopting a research ontology informed by Margaret Archer’s Morphogenetic, Critical Realist approach, I analyse the data collected through the lens of an emancipatory Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics framework and argue that CEL practice at this university contributes to, what the evidence suggests is, its ultimate purpose: promoting and cultivating individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good. Focussing on university-community engagement, the findings suggest that there are some inconsistencies between how the University is portrayed in public-facing literature compared to the level of institutional support individual practitioners of CEL report receiving. I conclude that failure to adequately support CEL activity in the future could negatively impact the sustainability and quality of community engagement at Alba University.

Lay Summary

This study focuses on a specific type of university-community engagement called Community-Engaged Learning (CEL), at one Scottish, research-intensive Russell Group university – Alba University. I argue that CEL makes a crucial contribution to a university’s Third Mission: the application of university capabilities and knowledge beyond academic contexts. The findings set out in my thesis highlight the structural, institutional, and individual factors that impact on the experiences of academic staff who work on CEL projects. Using a virtue-ethics informed approach, my study
focusses on the character of the individual and the feelings and motivation behind their actions, rather than the activity of CEL itself.

Community-engaged Learning (CEL) is an intentional and structured way of teaching that connects student learning with the needs of communities outwith the university. Most of the research on this topic focuses on a practice called Service-learning, which is a specific type of CEL done for academic credit, mainly in the United States. However, at this point, there have not been any comprehensive studies on the experiences and perspectives of CEL practitioners in the context of UK or specifically Scottish higher education.

This thesis presents findings generated using qualitative methods to gather and analyse data. I examined government and institutional documents and conducted in-depth interviews with 23 university practitioners, managers, and leaders. The study looked at various factors that influence CEL practitioners’ experiences and perspectives: the larger societal and policy context, the institutional and departmental context, and individual factors.

I analysed the data using Reflexive Thematic Analysis, using research methodology influenced by Margaret Archer’s Morphogenetic, critical realist approach. Archer’s theory of Morphogenesis draws on Roy Bhaskar’s critical realism in order to focus on the social world. According to Archer’s theory of Morphogenesis, agents (individual people), culture and social structures experience change which is linked to the passage of time in complex ways. So, while Archer recognises that culture and social structures are created and maintained by agents, they are embedded in such a way that change is possible, but not immediately effected. This study focusses on the experiences of academic staff and what this tells us about the underlying forces that influence them: the culture of their institution and social structures. At the same time, I examine ways in which these individuals take action to try to change the status quo and transform their cultural context.
The theoretical framework of my thesis is informed by Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics, an approach which puts an emphasis on virtues of character. These are defined as traits that reliably promote an agent's own flourishing; virtuous actions are defined as the kinds of actions a virtuous person consistently performs under the relevant circumstances. I argue that the ultimate purpose of universities should be to promote individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good. Critical thinking is emancipatory when it empowers and enables individuals to challenge and question tradition and the status quo. CEL contributes to the Third Mission of a university which is important to realising its ultimate purpose. However, when it comes to university-community engagement at Alba University, the findings suggest that there are important discrepancies between how the university presents itself in public-facing literature and the level of support that CEL practitioners actually receive.

Through this study, findings confirm that academic staff see the ultimate purpose of universities as more than just generating income, preparing students for employment, or enhancing the national economy. They believe universities should also address community needs, promote individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good. I also identified how government policies can negatively impact the experiences of academic staff involved in CEL. These policies influence institutional priorities and create a culture where practitioners feel pressured to prioritise their job duties over their moral principles.

The findings also show how personal experiences and moral frameworks interact with cultural and structural factors within institutions. Based on an extensive review of the literature, I argue for a shift towards a virtue-based ethical commitment that encourages emancipatory critical thinking, long-term action for the common good, and personal and collective flourishing.

The research also examines the historical evolution of Alba University, showing its transition from meaningful community-university engagement in the past via
University settlement projects, to a more recent interest in the University's Third Mission. The study suggests that for this renewed interest to have a meaningful and lasting impact, structural and institutional changes are needed. If CEL activities are not adequately supported in the future, it could have a negative impact on the University's ability to engage with communities effectively and sustainably.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1 Positionality Statement and Thesis Introduction

1.1 Statement of Positionality

As a researcher, I feel it is important to situate myself and my experiences in order to explain how they have influenced this thesis' topic and methodology. As this is a thesis for a professional doctorate in education, it is important to identify my current position and give a brief account of my biography. The focus of my study has been shaped by both my professional role and personal biography.

The position I currently hold is a Head of Subject Area within a centre for lifelong learning at Alba University where I have worked since 2011. The centre I work in is unique in that it is largely self-funded through student fees and not required to produce research which is eligible for the Research Excellence Framework (REF). In contrast, most academic units in the university are committed to and dependent upon this to some extent. Our centre is teaching-focussed and I currently manage in excess of 40 teaching colleagues across hundreds of courses. The majority of our students are on foundation programmes or members of the public taking on learning for personal development. Working in this context has been influential in choosing a research topic. Within a higher education institution, working in a lifelong learning centre, which is not subjected to the same restrictions and dependence on research activity has given me a unique perspective on the possibilities for community engagement and widening participation and how this can be embedded across an institution.

As a researcher, working and conducting research in the same site necessitates discussion about my objectivity and insider-outsider status (Kanuha, 2000). Kanuha's (2000) insider and outsider perspective in research refers to the concept of conducting research as an individual who is either closely connected to the community being studied (insider) or distanced from it (outsider). I consider myself an insider because I am an academic employee of Alba University who is familiar with the institution and has current working knowledge of its policies regarding
employment, work allocation and promotion. However, I also consider myself an outsider, because as I detail above, I do not work in a school which is involved with research and I am not a practitioner working involved with CEL.

My insider-outsider perspective was an important factor to acknowledge from the very beginning of my research process. I recognised advantages to being an insider-outsider: participants were very responsive to my invitations to interview and even if they were not acquaintances of mine, it felt easy to build rapport and trust was implicit in the way participants were willing to express a range of views, some of which directly criticised Alba University. However, Kanuha (2000) warns that biases attributed to researchers with an insider perspective can be sources of insight as well as error. To mitigate for this, I utilised strategies to navigate my dual insider-outsider role in interviews for example, consciously interrogating participants’ “coded” responses. A coded response (Kanuha, 2000, p.442) refers to a situation where a respondent in an interview or research study uses indirect or implicit language, assuming that the researcher already understands the intended meaning without explicitly stating it. Relying on an assumption of shared meaning can lead to misinterpretations, lack of clarity and unintended bias. For instance, one strategy I used to directly challenge their views without seeming to be confrontational was to say “Let me play Devil’s Advocate for a minute…” . This allowed me to interrogate some of the assumptions behind their views and where these had originated from.

As partial insider and within my own biographical context, I found myself responding very emotionally to some of the participants accounts of their frustrations and feelings of injustice. While I make no claims to objectivity, as I detail in Section 5.5, participating in supervision meetings and utilising a reflective journal was key to maintaining a dialogue with my own “Devil’s Advocate” to interrogate the assumptions and beliefs that foregrounded my interpretation of participants’ accounts and my analysis of the data set as a whole.
Widening participation to education is a long-standing interest for me. I was born in Scotland to Hong Kong Chinese immigrants and grew up in a fishing town on the east coast of Scotland. Today, I know the neighbourhood to be an area of multiple deprivation by its SIMD (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation) decile which places it in the 20% most deprived areas in Scotland. In the mid-1980s as a child, I knew this by the iron grills my father had installed on the windows of our house (to keep the bricks out) and the kinds of interactions I had with children in the local primary school, who expressed racial prejudice openly. Following several incidents of bullying and harassment, my parents enrolled me into an independent school in a nearby city on The Assisted Places Scheme. This was a government scheme which ran from 1980 to 1997 offering free and subsidised places to fee-paying independent schools. While I welcomed the fact that I was no longer the only non-white pupil in class, it was also clear that there was a clear social class difference between where I was and where I had come from. These differences were manifested in many different ways, connected with wealth, social class and others, both explicit and hidden.

Although removed from an environment of overt racial prejudice, my primary school years were still punctuated by periods of anxiety and underachievement. My parents were not academic; they had both left school in their early teens, worked in the evenings and spoke English as a second language. They were unaware of the demands of homework and learning for class tests. Most teachers mistook this for laziness and a lack of intelligence on my part. On my first day in my new school aged seven, I admitted that I did not know what a New Year’s Resolution was. My teacher laughed and then told my classmates so they could laugh at me too. During first months at my new school the tangible and intangible differences between my peers and I became apparent to me. My uniform, although symbolising wealth and privilege to onlookers, was from the school “thrift shop”; I often didn’t have materials and resources required for class projects and I had acquired a strong regional accent from my four years at my previous primary school. The pervasive feeling of “not fitting in” has remained with me through my life but I now reflect that I have flourished not only despite of this but also because of this. This an important reason why I have chosen to focus on pedagogical methods which contribute to common good aims.
I acknowledge that research cannot be value-free. Our study interests, how we approach the research and participants, the questions we ask, and how we interpret the data are all influenced by how we see the world around us. I agree with Jacobson and Mustafa (2019) that class, citizenship, ability, age and gender are just a few of the many dimensions that make up our social identities. I also agree that these factors influence how we perceive and interpret the world around us, as well as how the world perceives and interprets us. Reflexivity and practising explicit positionality are considered reasonable ways to account for and explore researcher bias and subjectivity (Mertens, 2009; Griffiths, 2009). As a novice researcher, however, reflective self-critique that contributes to quality assurance can be a novel and daunting task as the facets that contribute to our social identities can be hidden, intangible and abstract. As a starting point for this discussion, I utilised Jacobson and Mustafa (2019) Social Identity Map which they describe as a “reflexivity tool for practicing explicit positionality in critical qualitative research"(Jacobson and Mustafa, 2019, p.1). Using the Social Identity Map allowed me to consider the facets of my social identity in a more systematic and structured way than would have been otherwise possible. The Social Identity Map is intended as a starting point for further exploration and this a tool which I found to be helpful.

My Social Identity Map (below) represents a snapshot in time. In reality, whilst following a critical realist approach, I accept that social identities are complex, fluid and mercurial (Day, 2012); they do not remain static. Therefore, an approach towards quality assurance using reflexivity and positionality is not a one-off act or declaration. Reflexivity requires continuous consideration and awareness of how dimensions such as class, race, education and gender have influenced my research on this project.
Figure 1-1 shows the three-tiered Social Identity Map which I completed. Following the recommendation of the authors, I replaced several items on the first tier with social dimensions I found to be more pertinent to me and my position as a researcher on this project. The second tier identifies how these dimensions have impacted my life and the third tier identifies emotions which I association with these details of my social identity. In the account above, I have attempted to highlight and unpack the facets of my social identity which I believe to have been most influential so far in my decision making on this project.

Aspects of my social identity and my formative experiences have shaped my world view. I believe they have also inspired a commitment to anti-oppressive education and education that contributes to emancipatory critical thinking and individual flourishing for the common good. While I identify as a progressive, left wing feminist and a politically active individual, recent, controversial debates around, for example, academic freedom have forced me to question my world view. I question whether these political labels can have significance if they are not considered alongside one’s
ethical framework and being able to think for oneself in dialogue with critical friends and those who oppose our views. In other words, without a commitment to act ethically and being able to think for oneself for the good of all, even those unlike ourselves, political views across the spectrum can potentially oppress.

1.2 Introduction: Defining key concepts

The key objective of my research project is to explore the phenomenon of Community-engaged Learning and the perspectives of academic staff involved in this practice. In this section, I will introduce and define the main concepts discussed in my Critical Literature Review. My research will focus on one research-intensive, Scottish Russell Group university which has been selected as the site of study. I have chosen to use the pseudonym: “Alba University” in order to maintain, as far as possible, the anonymity of university managers, leaders and academic staff who acted as participants in this study.

Throughout this thesis, I refer to the institution of Alba University as having an ultimate purpose. While this is synecdochical, (it is the human persons within that institution that decide its purpose, which institutional policies and infrastructure can support or disrupt) I treat the institution as entity which has a separate existence from the individual persons who are associated with it. Similar to the way in which in law, a legal person or entity is “any individual, firm or government agency with the right to enter into binding agreements” (Kornhauser and MacLeod, 2010, p.1), a university can express things such as values and ethical commitments, and be held accountable for upholding them.

1.3 How do the ultimate purpose, mission, and experiences interact?

My review of existing literature supports the argument that universities should support individual flourishing and critical thinking for the common good. This is its ultimate purpose and the reason for which it exists. This is a concept I argue for strongly in detail in the second part of the literature review. In Figure 1-2 Figure 1-2: The Purpose and Missions of a University below I present the ideal of a university
deeply rooted in its ultimate purpose, which provides foundational stability and guides institutional growth and development accordingly.

The idea of a university supporting an ultimate purpose stems from Aristotle’s (2002) concept of *telos* (purpose or end). According to Aristotle, *eudaimonia*, or flourishing, is the *telos* of all humans. Intellectual and moral virtues are behaviours or attitudes that allow people to act in ways that advance their own flourishing and the flourishing of others (Hughes, 2013b). A university’s ultimate purpose is the reason for its existence. So, while being income-generating, internationally renowned, and having the intellectual potential to solve global issues may be important for achieving a university’s unique function, i.e., its missions, they do not constitute supporting an ultimate purpose or its reason for existence. For example, being an income-generating institution alone does not guarantee the quality of teaching, research or community engagement activity in the same way that being able to contribute solutions to global issues does not guarantee fair and ethical means to achieving this end. On the other hand, I argue that supporting an ultimate purpose can be manifested in the way an institution organises and defines its missions. In other words, in this example, income generation may be pursued for very different and conflicting purposes. Therefore, the way in which an institution prioritises and organises its missions is manifested in its policies; in the previous example, policies...
which are associated with pursuing income generation are therefore heavily influenced by the ultimate purpose supported by an institution.

1.4 The University’s Missions

The institutional function of the university is characterised by three interrelated missions namely research, teaching and the “third mission”. In Figure 1-2: The Purpose and Missions of a University, I describe the university’s missions as its institutional function; a function that MacIntyre (1990, p222) considers to be unique: “that function which, were it not to exist, no other institution could discharge”. Compagnucci and Spigarelli (2020) found that the majority of previous research characterised UK universities as having two conventional missions: teaching and research. University initiatives in the third mission area have received less attention when it comes to identification and research analysis. Debates about a third set of activities that would better connect UK higher education institutions with the community at large i.e., the third mission (also called the “third stream” or “third leg”), began only recently. The third mission of universities is considered a “complex and evolving phenomenon” (Compagnucci and Spigarelli, 2020, p. 161) but is broadly as being:

concerned with the generation, use, application and exploitation of knowledge and other university capabilities outside academic environments. In other words, the Third Stream is about the interactions between universities and the rest of society. (Molas-Gallart et al., 2002, p.4)

The third mission is also closely linked with the idea of including social responsibility in the curricula of higher education students.

Around the world, the third mission has recently been thrust to the centre of education policy deliberations due to calls for the university to be re-engaged in assisting with the significant difficulties facing societies and local communities (Pinheiro, Langa and Pausits, 2015). Nevertheless, there is a fundamental tension in the idea of a third mission, which unlike teaching and research, is rarely integrated into the core structures of institutions. Benneworth, de Boer and Jongbloed (2015, p.281) argue that universities run the risk of becoming "overloaded" with missions,
which forces them to decide whether to dilute their strategic emphasis or simply concentrate on a select few of these missions. The third mission, which does not contribute to world university rankings or direct income generation, runs the risk of being seen as a “desirable” to have but not an essential obligation, consequently making it unlikely to become a priority for higher education institutions.

According to Goddard (2016), a civic university is one which meaningfully integrates its three missions in a responsive way. In Goddard’s model Figure 1-3 below, the uncivic university, there is a clear demarcation between the “core” work of the university in which the missions of research and teaching are housed, and the “periphery” where the third mission sits. Core activity concerns maximising, facilitating and incentivising success in teaching and research and thus infrastructure to support and reward for staff, are shaped by these priorities. This contrasts with the “periphery”:

where activities happen in spite of and not because of central support. Achievements that take place within this periphery tend to drift away as there are no mechanisms in place to embed learning or good practice back into the core. (Goddard, 2016, p.7)

Figure 1-3 - The “un-civic” university (Goddard, 2016, p.6)
In contrast, in Figure 1-4: The “civic” university (Goddard, 2016, p.6) shows overlapping missions with the third mission being fully embedded and not relegated to a peripheral space. Goddard contends that the model of the civic university invites reciprocal benefits for those involved in all three missions.

I do not attempt to offer a thorough review of the different models of the third mission available here, but merely illustrate the disadvantages of segregating the three missions or relegating the third to the periphery. A university which considers its three missions to be interlinked and interdependent, generates opportunities for meaningful university-community engagement, through widening participation, knowledge exchange, public engagement, CEL and outreach etc. These are opportunities which could contribute to the ultimate purpose a university supports, in a sustainable and reciprocal way. Rather than just sitting alongside the first two missions, third mission objectives are meaningfully interweaved with the other two.

Socially excluded and underprivileged communities have historically had few and limited relationships with universities in the UK. Robinson and Hudson (2013) argue that most often in universities, class and power are reflected and reinforced. For example, Oxbridge colleges were originally established to encourage academic
retreat and have helped to perpetuate privilege and the elite (Robinson and Hudson, 2013). However, this was not exclusively the case; the idea of a university engaged with communities is integrated into the foundations of some of the UK’s oldest universities. Far from the “ivory tower” status associated with other ancient Russell Group universities, according to Watson (2009), these medieval universities were founded with benefiting the local communities in mind. Quoting Elizabeth de Burgh, Lady Clare, founder of Clare College Cambridge in 1359 and the Papal Bull of Innocent VIII at the University of Aberdeen in 1495, Watson highlights the use of the metaphor of “the pearl of learning” to emphasise the multi-faceted value of university-produced knowledge to “promote the well-being of the kingdom” (Watson, 2009, p.10). Whether the third mission is being realised in universities today, depends significantly on how the government incentivises this kind of community engagement activity and to what extent institutions support them.

1.5 What is Community-engaged Learning?

My definition of Community-engaged Learning (CEL) places it in the overlap between the third mission and the teaching mission, specifically between the concepts of University-community Engagement which forms part of the third mission (Doberneck, Glass and Schweitzer, 2009) and Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) (Kolb, 1984).
University-community Engagement is a broad category which Doberneck, Glass and Schweitzer (2009) define as encompassing all interactions between a university and its local communities including all aspects of publicly engaged research, creative activities, instruction, service and commercial activities. ELT was first defined by Kolb in 1971 (Kolb, 2015), who based his work on foundational scholars such as John Dewey, Paolo Freire, Kurt Lewin, Jean Piaget (and latterly also William James Kolb (2015, p. xviii)). Kolb defined learning as "the process whereby knowledge is formed via the transformation of experience"(Kolb, 2015, p.67). ELT was conceived as a counter to more traditional types of learning which emphasised information transmission or what Freire (2005, p.72) called the “banking concept of education". ELT outlines a method for arranging a curriculum's lessons in a certain order and shows how a lesson or an entire course can be taught to enhance student learning. In this research project, I define CEL as Experiential Learning carried out for the purposes of University-community Engagement.

1.5.1 Defining “Community” in University-community engagement

In Doberneck, Glass and Schweitzer’s (2009) typology of University-community Engagement, CEL falls under the categories of both publicly engaged instruction and publicly engaged service, where students interact with agencies or organisations external to the university, usually on a placement. While it is often assumed that this includes only organisations in close geographical proximity to the University (i.e., staff from community organisations, service users, members of the public), writers such as Kagan and Diamond (2019) have chosen to define “community” in looser geographical terms with a stronger focus on the nature and purpose of the interaction. For example, work placements that are primarily focussed on economic growth and wealth creation are not considered community engagement, rather this term is reserved for activity which is primarily connected with social development as part of their learning, which directly or indirectly contributes to attaining academic credit. Shaw (2008) argues that “community” is ambiguous, theoretically contentious and historically positioned and can be used to support or defend a variety of political stances that would otherwise be seen as irreconcilable. Shaw (2008, p.24) also contends that community can be interpreted through liberal and communitarian
lenses: on the one hand, the liberal tradition prioritises the person over all other facets of social life, holding that contract and reason, rather than tradition and practise, serve as the foundation for all social experience. Contrarily, the communitarian tradition emphasises that the only way to achieve individual liberty and equality is through a sense of belonging, of locality, identity of interests, brotherhood and co-operation, and collectively mediated identity.

In analysing the communitarian interpretation, Kagan and Diamond (2019, p.3) warn that we must be wary of:

assuming an entity that is united, homogenous and cohesive, rather than one in which the diverse differences and conflicts within and between groups play out in a myriad of ways.

Somewhat in contrast, the idea of communitarianism is espoused by sociologist Amitai Etzioni (2007) who argues that:

because communitarians consider shared formulations of the good essential, these formulations *ipsos factos* entail particularistic moral obligations to and for the members of the communities involved. (Etzioni, 2007, p.7)

Etzioni argues that “particularistic moral obligations” are ethical duties and responsibilities that are specific to particular relationships and communities, which contrast with more universal or general moral obligations that apply to all individuals. He defends concerns about a shared understanding of morality that Shaw (2008) warns against within communitarianism by arguing that contrary to what Libertarians might fear, undermining a shared concept of the common good will increase state control of individuals rather than reduce it. Etzioni (2007) argues that because individuals cannot be relied upon to fulfil societal duties purely of their own volition, they must be encouraged to do this by fellow members of society. Applying these informal forces to undergird the common good, he argues, is preferable to the alternative, which is increased government intervention and enforcement of the common good.

While MacIntyre (2007, XIV) also warns against over-idealising the notion of community, he does espouse a shared understanding of the common good within communities:
I see no value in community as such - many types of community are nastily oppressive – and the values of community [...] are compatible with and supportive of the values of the liberalism that I reject.

MacIntyre (2007) has written of communities as social groups in which members cooperate for a shared goal and adhere to moral principles. He contends that communities provide people with a feeling of identity and place in the world, both of which are necessary for leading meaningful lives. Additionally, MacIntyre emphasises the importance of tradition, continuity, and the members' shared history in forming their identity and building a shared moral framework. Indeed, it is this shared moral framework, MacIntyre concedes, that guides the actions of the members and provides a sense of meaning and purpose. Crucially, MacIntyre (2007) contends that a community's collective experience leads to a shared concept of morality; it is not something that can be objectively determined. However, it is also important here to consider Etzioni's (2007) distinction between universal and particularistic obligations where:

rights take precedence over communal bonds and values. Thus, a good society does not tolerate honor killing, forced marriages, or racial discrimination simply because such practices are part of the moral culture of a particular community. (2007, p.11)

Finally, Tett and Fyfe (2010) describe community, in three ways: place or locality, interest and function. With the caution noted above, my interpretation of community, gleaned from participants’ and Alba University’s use of the term in the context of university-community engagement, aligns closely with:

Place or locality—this is the most frequently used meaning and refers to people who have in common that they live in a particular geographical community such as a neighbourhood or village. (Tett and Fyfe, 2010, p.11)

Whilst Alba University’s public-facing strategy document and community plan do not explicitly define “community”, it does reference activity and beneficiaries who live within the Alba City Council region. Its Community Grant Scheme, which invites non-profit organisations to apply for grants of up to £4,500 (in 2023), is also restricted to organisations from the Alba City Council and five neighbouring council regions. While there are references to community engagement projects which might benefit individuals originating from outside of these regions, for example a refugee project,
the focus is clearly on community groups within the geographical vicinity of Alba City. Therefore, unless otherwise stated, I will use the word “community” to refer to groups situated in the local vicinity of Alba City and idealistically, as MacIntyre’s definition of social groups which provide its members with a feeling of identity and place in the world and contextually determined shared moral values.

Gaining an insight into how academic staff experience and understand community engagement will be crucial to understanding their perspectives on types of CEL particularly those associated with building meaningful, reciprocal relations with and contributing to communities and the type focussed on the needs and wants of the student and institution (e.g., better employability outcomes).

1.5.2 Why CEL is distinct from Service-learning

CEL is a term closely associated with and often, I would argue, conflated with, the concept of service-learning (SL) and while there is no detailed definitional consensus on SL, Bringle and Hatcher’s definition is widely used and accepted:

> a course-based, credit-bearing, educational, experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service-activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service-activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. (Hatcher and Bringle, 2012, p.114)

SL originated in, and is widely associated with academic activity in the United States of America (USA). Theoretically, it is considered an “action-orientated pedagogy” (Kreber 2016) and a form of learning originally conceived by John Dewey (1966) in “Experience and Education”. Although Dewey’s work did not explicitly describe or promote SL, “Experience and Education” is often cited as the theoretical basis which undergirds SL (Giles and Eyler, 1994; Deans, 1999; Billig and Waterman, 2012).

The practice of SL originated in the USA in the late 1960s (SREB, 1973) where it has grown and increased in popularity in the fifty years since its inception. Campus Compact, a US-based higher education association dedicated to campus-based civic engagement, started with a membership of six institutions in 1985 and has now
grown to a membership of 1000 plus institutions (Campus Compact, 2019). California State University, Monterey Bay is an example of a university which houses its own Service Learning Institute and students from every discipline area, from STEM to the humanities, is required to incorporate SL into their studies. Service-learning is well-established and increasingly popular in the Asia-Pacific region (Deeley, 2014, p.53) and countries such as Mexico have already established a form of service-learning as part of its higher education system (McIlrath and MacLabhraisn, 2007, p.76). However, service-learning is historically much less well established in the UK and Europe; it was only in 2018, that Europe Engage held its first conference with funding from the European Union (Europe Engage, 2019).

The educational and political context of the UK, and indeed Scotland, are distinct from that of the USA. Therefore, the roots and history of SL in the UK and Scotland are also distinct. According to Kagan and Diamond (2019, p.90), SL as it is understood in the US, is different to its incarnation in the UK. They argue that the UK versions of SL are primarily driven by skills and outcomes required by the student to complete their course. This is distinct from “community based learning” which is based on a reciprocal relationship between the university and the community where both parties’ needs are met (Bryson and Pipe, 2015). This is the closest to the US and internationally recognised model of SL, or at least to early models of SL.

This generalisation that UK-based SL prioritises student learning over reciprocity can be challenged. Writers engaged in UK-based SL teaching and research have argued that this can be a key priority: “service-learning involves mutuality and reciprocity […] although reciprocity may vary in degree” (Deeley, 2014, p.18). Similarly, highlighting the situation in USA, writers such as Seth Pollack argue that the conservative political environment of the USA in the 80s steered the movement towards what is currently, a more “pedagogified” approach, which focusses on SL as an apolitical mode of learning rather than an opportunity to promote social justice, student civic responsibility and activism (Pollack, 2015).
Literature pertaining to SL is highly relevant to this study on CEL. In accordance with Chmelka et al. (2020), I argue that there are advantages to drawing on the literature on SL in a study on CEL because:

Service-learning is not only more represented than Engaged Learning in the literature, but also has distinct and stable definitions and accepted standards.” (Chmelka et al., 2020, p.11).

Therefore, I argue that Service-learning is a *subset* of CEL, so CEL can include SL but not vice versa. Although I agree that CEL and SL are inexorably linked, they are not necessarily interchangeable terms, for three main reasons.

First, SL and CEL are distinct both in their scope and perceived intentionality: while SL focuses on providing a service to communities, I argue that CEL goes beyond this and includes various forms of engagement such as research and collaborative projects with the overarching aim of fostering meaningful engagement and relationships between universities and communities. Second, the word “service” denotes an action where one is helping or doing something on behalf of others. In an Irish HE context, Boland and McIlrath (2016) argue that while “service” may have positive associations in the US, this is not the case in their context. Regardless, this does not imply a necessarily negative connotation. The word “service” misleadingly highlights the unilateral benefits that university-community engagement holds for the community rather than promoting reciprocal, collaborative learning. Third, my research project focuses on how one university engages with communities through its staff and students for the purposes of learning and community engagement. This incorporates a broader range of learning activity than what current literature (Hatcher and Bringle, 2012; Deeley, 2014; Deeley, 2022; Aramburuzabala, McIlrath and Opazo, 2019) defines as Service-learning.

To expand on my third reason, examples from my research project which would otherwise be excluded by a strict definition of Service-learning include participatory research carried by undergraduate students and local patient groups; student-assisted teaching in the context of local prisons; and student volunteers engaging in discipline-focussed outreach activity in local primary and secondary school classrooms. Therefore, references I make to SL in my research project refer to the
original US model while Community-engaged learning (CEL) refers to all types of CEL and includes service-learning activity in the UK.

1.5.3 Discussing CEL in the literature

In my research project I made the decision to focus on Academic Staff perceptions of CEL at a large, Scottish, research-intensive Russell Group University. Research on CEL or Service-learning more specifically, in Europe, is sparse but on the rise. However, in the UK and Ireland specifically, there remains a paucity of literature on the subject of CEL arguably because this type of pedagogy is still considered on the fringes of traditional learning and teaching in Higher Education institutions. Back in 2003, Annette argued that:

> The problem with many of these [service learning] programmes is that they only involve a comparatively small number of students. The debate about the need for universities to provide the opportunity for developing key skills and also for providing an education for active citizenship raises the possibility that citizenship education and community service learning could be an important feature of the core education experience in higher education in Britain. (Annette, 2003, 120)

Two decades on, it seems that limited progress has been made in this area; aside from some notable examples (McIlrath, 2012; Deeley, 2014; Annette, 2003; Deeley, 2022) and compared with the United States, relatively little research on this type of pedagogy has been carried out in the British Isles, let alone Scotland.

Looking at “Community Service Learning” as a search term, the number of academic papers published in English around the world, including peer-reviewed journal papers, accounts of practice, and conference papers, has steadily increased in the last two decades with significant growth in the last two years. However, the number of publications which explicitly reference CEL is still very low compared to more popular search terms such a “service-learning” and “experiential learning”.

Using Google Scholar, no search results of academic papers relating to “Community-engaged Learning” can be found prior to 2007, however, this has increased to
around 80 results since the beginning of 2020. Using “Service-learning” as a search term, results number in their thousands over the last two years; the term first appearing in publications in the United States of America (USA) since the late 1960s (SREB, 1973). The 80 papers published on CEL since 2020 vary in their definition of the term: most do not attempt to define the term at all, some use it synonymously or interchangeably with the terms “service-learning” and/or “experiential learning” either explicitly or implicitly. Few attempt to justify their use of the term “community-engaged learning” over other, more widely used terms.

In three papers published in 2022 (Harrell, 2022; Brubaker et al., 2022; Sweet, Sayre and Bohrer, 2022) for example, there is no attempt to define the term “community-engaged learning” or why this term has been chosen over other more popular terms. In other articles, which included empirical, qualitative research and accounts of practice (Rivera, Foley and Strauch, 2022; Kostell et al., 2021; Sweatman et al., 2021; Berard and Ravelli, 2021) SL, experiential learning and community engaged learning were used interchangeably. Those articles that do offer a definition of “community-engaged learning” do not clearly distinguish CEL from SL or experiential learning. For example Mollica, Kajfez and Riter (2021) state that:

Community engaged learning, which grew out of general community service by universities, allows for bidirectional collaborations between the university and the community which are mutually beneficial (Mollica, Kajfez and Riter, 2021, p.1)

Finally, Chmelka et al. (2020) do distinguish between what they term “engaged learning” and service-learning. They argue that engaged learning is a derivative of SL and is characterised by a broader definition: one which combines the activities of teaching, learning and civic engagement:

We chose to use ‘Engaged Learning’ as an umbrella term for the pedagogical approach that enables students to derive learning from meaningful community engagement while working on real-world problems. (Chmelka et al., 2020, p.101)

Throughout my research project I have referred to CEL as the activity to be researched. This aligns with the “Engaged Learning” distinction made by Chmelka et al. (2020) but with a further emphasis on the communities as the partner of engagement.
CEL constitutes the kind of action-orientated pedagogy which contributes to supporting individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good. Moreover, the need to explore the ethical foundations of CEL is important. Dan Butin (2003) invites a more critical reflection from practitioners who instigate SL projects; these ideas are highly relevant to CEL more broadly. Butin’s four conceptualisations of SL: technical; cultural; political; and poststructuralism derive from a belief that SL should not be viewed as a social movement but an intellectual one with a focus on SL as a methodology and target for research (Butin, 2010b, p.74). Butin’s (2003) typology highlights current conceptualisations (in research and practice) as falling under the first two categories “technical” and “cultural”. Technical conceptualisations of service-learning include research and accounts of practice which discuss practical issues such as “efficacy, quality, efficiency, and sustainability of both the process and the outcome of the innovation” (Butin, 2003, p.1679).

The cultural perspective focusses on individuals’ meaning-making processes through the context of service-learning with the ultimate goal to “extend civil engagement [and] foster a democratic renewal” (Butin, 2003, p.1679). Butin (2003) argues that it is common for these two major strands of enquiry to be interwoven. The latter two strands of Butin’s typology concern the “political” and “poststructuralism”. Here is a distinct departure from the overwhelmingly positive attitudes towards service-learning which are housed within the technical and cultural strands.

Butin asserts that the tendency amongst practitioners of SL to view it as solution to engage students in issues of social justice, leaves it vulnerable to being, at best, viewed as undisciplined mode of learning and at worst, co-opted for unintended means (Butin, 2007 p.178.). For Butin (2007), SL should be instigated from an “anti-foundationalist” basis. He argues that while few people would admit to being “against” social justice, this labelling of SL practice leaves it susceptible to being closed off to further debate and refinement. For example, Butin (2007) and others have argued against SL performed uncritically as it can exacerbate the proliferation
of stereotypes. For example, Deeley (2022) challenges unreflective practices that can lead to a kind of “poverty tourism”. Instead, she discusses:

how democratic, dialogic, and relational practices may be implemented within the service-learning classroom through a teacher-student partnership in learning and assessment (Deeley, 2022, p.4)

However, Butin, instead of purporting to engage students in SL as a means to enact social change, or advance the cause of social justice, espouses an anti-foundationalist standpoint which only claims to deny us “the (seeming) firmness of our commonsensical assumptions” (Butin (2007) p.179):

This position argues that there is no neutral, objective, or content-less “foundation” by which we can ever know the “truth” unmediated by our particular condition. In contrast, I argue that the foundation on which decisions are made by individuals and communities at a structural, institutional, and individual level, around university-community engagement, is an ethical one. (Butin, 2007, p.179)

Butin’s standpoint presents a refreshing viewpoint in a canon of literature dominated by positive accounts of community partnerships and student learning. The most common form of published literature on CEL are focussed on accounts of practice as opposed to more philosophical considerations of the merits of this kind of pedagogical activity. There is also a paucity of literature around how those engaged with CEL think about it: as contestable, performed within contexts of class, social positioning and economics, and how practice is influenced by our assumptions and biases. Ultimately Butin proposes that engaged pedagogy should not be thought of as a social movement, but rather as an intellectual movement, an academic discipline in itself, and “as a methodology and focus of inquiry” (Butin, 2010b, p.74)

While espousing Butin’s so-called “anti-foundationalist” stance toward CEL and encouraging a sense of doubt may be intellectually satisfying, I have two main objections to this argument, especially in the context of my study. First, proposing an apolitical and disinterested mode of learning is possibly naive and, from a practical point of view, unlikely to inspire prospective students or other academic colleagues. Second, healthy scepticism and intellectual curiosity can be encouraged without completely rejecting the idea that we operate from a basis of shared principles. Deeley’s (2022) detailed discussion on the kind of scaffolding that can guide
students through reflection and critical thinking seems a reasonable way to mitigate against uncritical thinking and unconscious bias.

For the reasons I have stated, a structured, reflective approach is preferred to the kind of anti-foundationalist approach to CEL as suggested by Butin (2007). This kind of pedagogy emphasises individualism where no authority has the ability to use rational standards to justify its own moral actions and policy decisions.

1.6 Conclusion

This rough sketch of the landscape of the CEL literature serves to highlight significant gaps: there is limited literature about CEL in a UK context, and even less in a Scottish education context. Although Butin (2010b) offers a distinctive and critical perspective on the foundational and political aspects of CEL, this and other existing typologies do not significantly explore the ethical foundation on which CEL is built. The literature on ethics-informed approaches to CEL is also very sparse.

Therefore, although service-learning is well established in the USA, a lack of definitional uncertainty means that it is not universally understood or enacted in the same way. This issue is further pronounced in the UK because there is no national organisation similar to Campus Compact, which has some oversight for these programmes across higher education institutions. Within Alba University, staff may be highly engaged with academic activity which would be considered CEL but be completely unaware of the term. For me, as a researcher, it was necessary for clear parameters and inclusion criteria to be defined in a way that is appropriate to this specific university context.

1.7 Rationale for study

The literature on CEL, in general, abounds with positive accounts of student experiences, and discusses the need to address the power dynamics between
community and institutional partners. Susan Deeley summarises the benefits for students in three categories:

Firstly, effects can be an enhanced sense of citizenship. In this category, increased civic engagement and greater potential for socio-political activity are included. Secondly, the effects may involve accelerated intellectual development. Thirdly, personal development may occur. (Deeley, 2014, p.24)

Apart from some notable exceptions, including Deeley above, most of this literature is centred on cases in the United States, where service-learning originated; the movement towards incorporating CEL in European universities has only begun to emerge in the last decade (Aramburuzabala, McIlrath and Opazo (2019).

Apart from a studies in the UK by Susan Deeley (2014; 2010; 2022), and some in Ireland, most notably from Lorraine McIlrath (2012; 2007), there is a dearth of literature on student, community and institutional perspectives on service-learning, or CEL more generally, in the British Isles, let alone how perspectives and attitudes may be influenced by individual, institutional and structural factors. Furthermore, following a comprehensive search of the literature on CEL in the UK, I was unable to find any which framed it within a Scottish Higher Education policy context. In some cases (Chmelka et al., 2020), Scotland is brought under the umbrella of UK HEIs despite the fact that in Scotland, education is a devolved entity and is not subject to the same policies as England.

Within the field of CEL research, studies which do focus on differences in attitude to types of CEL, compare staff who facilitate CEL and those who do not. There are no in-depth studies of the academic staff who engage with service-learning or CEL more generally, in the UK and the range of understandings and attitudes amongst this group. My research project addresses this gap by investigating the phenomenon of CEL at one research-intensive, Scottish Russell Group university (Alba University) across several discipline areas. While previous studies on CEL have focussed on staff choice to engage with CEL, my project is concerned with staff who do engage with CEL, and the variation amongst this group in terms of their experiences and perspectives.
The purpose of my study is to understand how different factors might influence academic staff experiences and perceptions of the aims and values of CEL, and how these attitudes align or deviate from a virtue-ethics informed account of for whom and what universities ought to exist. Following a critical documentary analysis of relevant university publications and interviews with academic staff, the influence of, institutional and structural level factors on the perceptions and experiences of academic staff will be investigated.

1.7.1 Developing Research Questions

The goal of this study is to explore the perspectives of academic staff, who are involved with CEL focussed on the aims and values of CEL at one, research-intensive, Scottish Russell Group university. The purpose of my research is to understand which factors influence academic staff attitudes to CEL, how these impact on their practice, and whether these findings align with the extant literature.

**Overarching central research question:** How do individual, institutional and structural factors influence the perceptions and experiences of academic staff involved with community-engaged learning at one research-intensive, Scottish Russell Group university?

**Research Q1:** What are academic staff (practitioners’, university leaders’ and managers’) perceptions and experiences of community-engaged learning?

**Research Q2:** What do academic staff perceive to be the benefits of higher education institutions and community-engaged pedagogy for their students and their communities?

**Research Q3:** What are some of the individual, institutional and structural factors which shape the perspectives and experiences of academic staff and in what ways do they influence them.
1.8 Overview of the thesis

The thesis comprises 10 chapters, including this introduction. Chapter 2 outlines the theoretical foundation of this thesis as laid out in the critical literature review. I chose to divide the literature review into two parts. First, I examine the current literature and arguments around CEL and trace the historical and theoretical roots of this pedagogical practice in Scotland. In the second part, I examine the literature around Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics and use this as a lens to discuss the current-day education policy context and attitudes towards higher education. I explain why this is relevant to understanding ultimate purpose of a university, its function, and the potential for CEL in contributing to this. To conclude the critical literature review, I summarise the main concepts and themes from the literature and argue why a Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics approach is a fruitful one for research on CEL.

In the following Methodology Chapter 3, I discuss why adopting Archer’s (1982; 1995) development (Morphogenesis) of Bhaskar’s (2008; 2016) critical realist (CR) approach, and qualitative data collection was apposite for my research study. I detail how using Reflexive Thematic Analysis (TA) as a method, was compatible with Bhaskar’s CR approach and detail my own account of how I progressed through each stage of the Reflexive TA process.

In Chapter 4, I present findings and analysis of the data. This section uses participant quotes and documentary evidence to illustrate common and salient themes generated from the data with my interpretation of the meaning of the text and refer to existing theories with reference to the theoretical concepts relevant to this study.

The discussion Chapter 9 will summarise the most salient findings and presents a broader discussion on the implications of these findings with reference to the existing literature. Finally, the concluding Chapter 10 reflects on the entire study by addressing the original research questions and other significant findings and setting out recommendations for changes to practice based on these. I discuss the
limitations of my research, make suggestions for future research and detail an argument for the contribution of my research to the wider body of literature on CEL.

I now move to a presentation of the critical literature review which has shaped the research design and theoretical framework informing my research project.
2 Critical Literature Review Part 1 - Community-engaged learning

2.1 A brief history of CEL in the United Kingdom

While service-learning originated in the United States (US) in the late 1960s (SREB, 1973) where it has grown and increased in popularity in the fifty years since its inception, CEL in the UK can be traced back to the movement of volunteerism which was popular in the nineteenth century. According to Deeley (2015, p.12) philanthropy and humanitarianism were crucial components in keeping charity organisations alive in Britain during this period. Furthermore, the government during the nineteenth century, did not involve itself in the wellbeing of its people. However, the effects of industrialisation, subsequent urbanisation, and two World Wars fuelled the spread of collectivism as a political ideology.

From the late 1990s, CEL gained increasing attention in the UK with its links to the New Labour government’s endorsement of the idea of Education for Citizenship (Chmelka et al., 2020) and two influential reports on education in the late 1990s. The Dearing Report (1997) made recommendations on how higher education should change to meet the demands of the UK over the next 20 years, including suggestions on its objectives, structure, size, funding, and student support. This report marked a significant turning point by recognising community engaged learning as a means for students to acquire essential skills (Deeley, 2014; Chmelka et al., 2020):

This may be achieved through work experience, involvement in student union activities, or work in community or voluntary settings. We have seen examples of a range of excellent opportunities for students. (Dearing, 1997, p.134)

Similarly, the Citizenship Advisory Group report (1998) (often referred to as the Crick Report) recognised the need for citizenship education in schools in order to secure a strong, dynamic democracy as well as the need for a significant change in public policy knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour. Political literacy, moral responsibility,
and community service were interrelated components. Public service was recommended as a key component of developing civic responsibility:

> our understanding of citizenship education in a parliamentary democracy finds three heads on one body: social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. ‘Responsibility’ is an essential political as well as moral virtue, for it implies (a) care for others; (b) premeditation and calculation about what effect actions are likely to have on others; and (c) understanding and care for the consequences. (Citizenship Advisory Group, 1998)

Despite these recommendations and the effort that some UK higher education institutions made to establish partnerships with local and regional communities, CEL continues to occur sporadically in the UK, and only a small number of HEIs have integrated this community partnership approach extensively across their curricula (Chmelka et al., 2020, p.85).

### 2.1.1 University settlements

Focussing on the university as a facilitator of a specific kind of volunteerism, Kagan and Diamond (2019, p.43) credit the settlement movement, which began towards the end of the nineteenth century, as being specifically instrumental to instigating the practice of community engaged student activity. The settlement movement was borne out of a concern for the widening gap between the different classes of society and espoused a model of cross-class friendship (Kagan and Diamond, 2019), which would benefit both parties.

Students would be resident in settlement buildings within the local community volunteering and living among community members in poor urban areas. The university under investigation in my research project was associated with its own settlement project. The Alba University settlement, which was established in 1905 and continued until 2010 (Ragged University, 2020), envisioned nurturing a reciprocal relationship with mutual benefits between the “academic and industrial” groups of society:
It has long been the aim of social reformers to unite the energies of difference classes of a society, and to bring into closer touch the learning and culture of the University and the numerical power and practical knowledge of the working people. The separation of the hand and brain is an evil for both. University life has a tendency to produce a certain detachment from the great problems of life which present themselves to those who are bound hand and foot to our industrial system; while, on the other hand, the working classes who feel, sometimes sorely enough, the pinch of the social problem, lack the needful historical and economic knowledge to see that problem in all its ramifications, and are led to welcome every ill-considered scheme of so-called amelioration that is offered to them. (The Scotsman, 1905)

In this article, there is an emphasis on reciprocal learning and the utility and validity of different types of knowledge which could be offered by both parties. Also, evident here is a wish to empower local community members who may not have been equipped to criticise and debate issues and policies affecting their lives. Finally, rather than promoting these experiences as a way to improve the employability of their graduates, there is criticism of the effects of industrialisation and urbanisation.

After the settlement movement peaked in 1920s, there was a gradual decline in volunteerism in general after the Second World War and the establishment of the Welfare State which was designed as a comprehensive system designed to care for its citizens “from the cradle to the grave” (Deeley, 2014, p.12). With this new welfare state in place, it made the need for volunteerism seem less imperative. Interestingly, the Prime Minister who managed the creation of the National Health Service as part of the Welfare State was Clement Attlee, a former student settlement resident volunteer. In his book The Social Worker (Attlee, 2019), first published in 1920, Attlee argued that many of the “evils of society today are due to this segregation [of classes]”(2019, p.144) and that settlements were a way to encourage active cooperation and relationship-building between the classes.

2.1.2 Communities and their Universities– A Scottish perspective

This idea of university engagement, or at least education institutions engaging with the wider community has a rich historical tradition in Scotland, rooted in Scottish Enlightenment philosophy. The Enlightenment was a Europe-wide phenomenon; however, while in Scotland the universities were central to its occurrence and development, this was not the case in England or in France. Jean Barr (2006) notes that “in Scotland, unlike England (and France), the universities were central” (2006,
In Scotland, ‘improvement’ was a central goal of Enlightenment via economic growth. It was believed that the wealth of nations would facilitate higher living standards and thus moral improvement in society as a whole. Although Scottish economist and philosopher Adam Smith argued that while division of labour was desirable for economies of scale, he also warned that in a civil society, boredom from repetitive tasks was dangerous (Barr, 2006, p.234).

The man whose life is spent in performing a few simple operations, of which the effects too are, perhaps always the same, or very nearly the same, has no occasion to exert his understanding, or to exercise his invention in finding out expedients for removing difficulties that never occur […] and generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become. (Smith, 1843 p.327)

Smith further argues that in some more primitive societies:

the varied occupations of every man oblige every man to exert his capacity […] every man, too, is in some measure a statesman, and can form a tolerable judgement concerning the interest of the society, and the conduct of those who govern it. (Smith, 1843 p.327)

Since then, Scottish philosophers such as Alasdair MacIntyre (1987) and George Elder Davie (1981; 1986) have discussed the ideas of an educated public and the democratic intellect. Jean Barr (2006) however, warns that it is important to exercise caution in order to avoid confusing the idea or ideal of the Scottish university of the eighteenth century, as depicted by MacIntyre (and Davie), with its actual history. Davie’s account has been challenged historically for exaggerating the size and significance of the educated public and underplaying the similarities between Scottish and English universities (Barr, 2006). These reservations aside, both ideas of an educated public and the democratic intellect offer a communitarian view of university-community engagement and this is relevant to how we view these relationships today.

In Davie’s book, *The Democratic Intellect* (Davie, 1981) first published in 1961, he argues that the primary accomplishment of the Scottish Enlightenment was to create an "educated public" rather than an exclusive cohort of academic specialists. According to Davie, the primary characteristic of Scottish higher education was the prominence given to philosophy within a larger general education curriculum.
compared to the more specialised higher education offered in England. He claims that the Scottish universities of the eighteenth century were crucial in establishing a new type of education based on Enlightenment principles. According to Davie (1981) “The Democratic Intellect” seeks to enable the lay public to be involved in critically evaluating the opinions of experts and professionals and thereby reclaim power from an elite and exclusive group. This idea of collaboration between experts and lay people and those who have traditionally undergone more vocational training and those who engage in abstract thinking, is key to a democracy where a greater majority share control and power, instead of an exclusive and powerful elite. Davie (1986) argues that, for learners and the public to acquire such an ability is key to democratic intellectualism. Here, lay people, through critical mutual discussion, are able to unearth fallacies and issues with experts’ and professionals’ perspectives and therefore share control about decision making.

Scottish philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre’s idea of an educated public (1985) was influenced by Davie’s (1986) work. In “The Idea of an Educated Public” (1987) MacIntyre argues that the two main goals of contemporary educational systems are to prepare students for specific social roles and occupations, and to provide them with the skills necessary to think independently. Importantly, both of these overarching goals can only be achieved in environments where there is an educated public and when entry into that educated community is the goal of education (1987, p.17). MacIntyre claimed that Scottish Universities were especially crucial for developing a new sort of education based on Enlightenment ideas which Davie interprets as respecting

the instincts of the farmer as against the sophistication of the philosopher and seeks to initiate a sort of dialogue between the vulgar and the learned, instead of talking down to the farmer from the standpoint of the philosopher. (Davie and Macdonald, 1994 p.41)

MacIntyre’s notion of an educated public has evolved since its initial publication in 1986. Current interpretations of his ideas highlight the inclusiveness of this educated community which would be receptive to various modes of knowing, being, and acting, and through which discoveries and discussions are open to the introduction of new points of view and possibilities (MacAllister, 2016a, p.533).
Therefore, democratic engagement with the wider society is arguably one aspect of a civil society that seeks to cultivate compassionate and critical individuals. This was considered essential by Davie in fulfilling the critical and communitarian role of education. Such an idea could be transferred to the context of Scottish Higher Education Institutions, which could be transformed as sites of critique and debate on social problems involving both students and the wider public, respecting the potential of both the well-educated and those from less educated backgrounds to engage in reasoned deliberation. In principle, this would allow power to be shared more equally amongst those who are privileged enough to acquire a high level of education and qualifications and those who are less traditionally qualified but are equally entitled to meaningful representation for their needs.

This section serves as an introduction to two historical philosophies on the nature of the relationship between education institutions and wider society in Scotland. It is not my intention in this literature review to offer a close analysis of either philosophy but to highlight the focus that both lend to the question of how education institutions relate to their wider communities. More broadly, MacIntyre’s and Davie’s ideas also draw attention to the fact that the significance of university-community relationships has been debated for centuries. It is to the present day, specifically the policy and political context of existing community-university relationships through CEL that I now turn.

2.2 Framing CEL within a UK Higher Education context

2.2.1 The wider political context of CEL

As a whole, the United Kingdom voted in favour of a bureaucratic and political departure from EU membership European Union (EU) on 23rd June 2016 (The Electoral Commission, 2019), commonly referred to as “Brexit”. This was despite 62% of Scottish voters wishing to remain in the EU. Despite leaving the EU, the UK has remained a full member of the Bologna Process/European Higher Education Area (EHEA) since 1999 (EHEA, 2023). Analysis of voters’ decision to leave the EU
largely concluded that concerns around immigration rather than the economy were the key motivation (Kaufmann, 2017). In particular, cultural anxieties, factual misperceptions around nationalism and lack of demographic literacy contributed to a reticence towards immigration. (2017, p.185). Therefore, a narrow perception of nationalism without acknowledging that people identify with the nation in different ways, such as civic, ethnic, or ideological is antithetical to common good aims and the idea that a just and inclusive society should accommodate various viewpoints and identities.

The UK was signatory to the Bologna Declaration in 1999, a pact aimed at fostering comparability and harmonisation among higher education systems within a European Higher Education Area encompassing approximately 55 countries (Bologna Declaration, 1999). Later in 2012, ministers reaffirmed their commitments and priorities in the context of higher education in the EU, especially in the wake of increasing economic challenges (EHEA, 2012). While the declaration primarily addresses broader European higher education concerns, its emphasis on employability, widening participation, the social dimension of education, student-centred learning, and critical thinking align with the principles of CEL in Scottish universities whilst emphasising the importance of preparing students to be responsible and active citizens engaged in their communities.

These key EU higher education policies highlight the Third Mission and active citizenship of universities as central to their institutional purpose. However, McIlrath (2018) argues that its commitment to employability also reinforces the entrepreneurial or economic imperative by equally emphasising the importance of cooperation with local and national employers in the development of education programmes that enhance workplace skills to increase student competitiveness. How universities continue to respond to these seemingly antithetical ideological goals is a contentious issue that is difficult to reconcile. (McIlrath, 2018, p.169) This conflict between competition and cooperation and the promotion of the economistic model of education is mirrored in UK and Scottish Government policies on higher education which are detailed below.
2.2.2 National policy, funding, institutional and societal drivers

Scottish higher-education institutions are subject to distinct policies and funding models. Nevertheless, current research and literature do not make this distinction clear and the Scottish context has been conflated with that of England and the rest of the UK (see Chmelka et al. (2020). The following section links closely with one of the key questions in the second part of this critical literature review: Who and what are universities for? In the second part, I frame Alasdair MacIntyre’s (2007) argument that institutions need practices as a relationship of symbiotic mutualism. This means that institutions such as universities cannot exist without practices in the same way practices are upheld by institutions. The term “practice” refers to MacIntyre’s (2007) concept of:

any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended. (MacIntyre, 2007, p.187)

MacIntyre uses the game of football, architecture, farming, painting, music and chess as examples of practices as well as “the creation and sustaining of human communities” (2007, p.188). The constituents which help practices resist influences such as market forces and the nation state, are the virtues. Before this, I examine some of those institutional influences at play and how government policy can support or sabotage CEL activity within higher education institutions. At the time of writing, there is a gap in the literature relating to CEL in a Scottish education context. Regardless, in this section I will explore how this forms a distinct context from the English and UK context, with which it has been conflated by some writers (Chmelka et al., 2020) and the impact this may have on community-engaged activity in higher education institutions.
2.2.3 The Scottish Funding Council

In Scotland, all universities are public, funded by the Scottish Government who exercise devolved power through the Scottish Funding Council, and represented by Universities Scotland. The Scottish Funding Council (SFC) is the national funding authority that invests £1.9 billion every year in tertiary education, research and knowledge exchange through Scotland’s 19 universities and 26 colleges, which are obliged to meet outcome agreements as a condition of this funding i.e. what they agree to deliver in return for their funding (Scottish Funding Council, 2022a). Additionally, the SFC facilitate the Research Excellence Framework (REF) which purports to:

- To provide accountability for public investment in research and produce evidence of the benefits of this investment.
- To provide benchmarking information and establish reputational yardsticks, for use within the HE sector and for public information.
- To inform the selective allocation of funding for research. (Research Excellence Framework, 2022)

While in England, Research Excellence Framework (REF), Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), and the new Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) are the three assessment criteria to which UK higher education institutions must adhere to, Scottish universities do not participate in the TEF as they have their own systems of evaluation and an existing commitment to outcome agreements with the SFC (Universities Scotland, 2022).

The KEF, which was first carried out in England in 2021, aims to improve the efficiency and efficacy of public funding for knowledge-sharing initiatives. KEF includes Public and Community Engagement and Working with the Public and Third Sector as two of its seven equally weighted “perspectives” (UKRI, 2022); as a result, it may offer financial incentives for CEL and research in the future (Chmelka et al., 2020, p.86). However, while Universities Scotland contributed to KEF consultation carried out by Research England on the proposed design and implementation of the first iteration of the KEF (Universities Scotland, 2019), it does not currently participate in this exercise.
In addition to incentives offered by the newly established KEF, some English universities have also included community engagement in the promotions criteria for academic staff who support students in CEL (Martin et al., 2016, p.100). Knowledge exchange between higher education institutions and the wider world, which aims to benefit both society and the economy, is also supported by Higher Education Innovation Funding with a budget of £230 million (UK Research and Innovation, 2022). This funding is not applicable to Scottish Universities who have access to the University Innovation Fund, which “provides incentives to universities to work collaboratively to exploit their research to improve Scotland’s economy” (Scottish Funding Council, 2022b).

2.3 The Third Mission in Scotland

Within a Scottish context, the concept of the third mission of higher education institutions was historically focussed on universities and the well-being of their communities. University settlements, such as the Alba University Settlement, as detailed in section 1.2.1, sought to highlight the value and legitimacy of various types of knowledge that might be generated by community members and academics; desirable outcomes such as reciprocal learning were stressed. There is also a clear desire to provide local community members with the tools they need to critique and discuss policies and issues that would have an impact on their lives.

The Scottish Government has repeatedly claimed that “Scotland is leading the way as a progressive nation” (Scottish Government, 2017b) however, its higher education funding policies and structure prioritise enhancing national economic wealth rather than other markers of a progressive nation such as social equality, life satisfaction, and democratic citizenship. Furthermore, the current funding model for third mission activity in Scottish Higher Education prioritises the commodification of innovation founded within higher education institutions. Unlike England, with its top-down drivers such as the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF), Scotland’s universities are subject to a different model
of funding for third mission activities. In 2016 the Scottish “Knowledge Transfer Grant” (KTG), which had been based on a formulaic distribution of knowledge transfer funds, was deemed inadequate for supporting public “economic and societal goals that Government expected external engagement by universities with business and other stakeholder [sic] to deliver” (Scottish Funding Council, 2019, p.2)

The replacement Scotland University Innovation Fund (UIF) (Scottish Funding Council, 2022b) contributes to exacerbating the differences between strategies for policy incentives and funding allocation mechanisms in Scotland and England. These differences have stemmed from the “‘asymmetric’ devolution processes of higher education, and the UK national research policy objectives and structures” (Kitagawa and Lightowler, 2013, p.1). One crucial difference is that the UIF is driven by outcomes rather than activity:

For AY2016/17 the sector signed up to the delivery of ‘priority actions’ with an emphasis on collaboration where appropriate. These outcomes were agreed in partnership with the sector and key stakeholders and aligned with Universities Scotland 5-point Action Plan and the broader Innovation Scotland Forum Action Plan. [emphasis added] (Scottish Funding Council, 2019, p.3)

While the Scottish Funding Council states that these changes were made to support economic and societal goals, analysis of the two policy documents mentioned above would suggest that the focus is heavily on improving economic wealth rather than non-economic societal goals.

The Universities Scotland “Five Action Plan for Innovation” (2015) ostensibly sets out a plan for additional work that could be done in partnership with business and public sector agencies. However, each of the five points explicitly prioritises entrepreneurship, industry needs and business partnerships; the plan promotes an economistic model of innovation of Higher Education with no mention of public sector agencies:

1. Engage in sustained dialogue with each of Scotland’s priority economic sectors through Industry Leadership Groups to ensure barriers to effective partnership are systematically identified and tackled.
2. Harmonise and simplify contract, project and partnership negotiations through the development and adoption of business-friendly template contracts and agreements.

3. Simplify business access to university knowledge and support an informed understanding of the knowledge exchange process.

4. Raise awareness of the opportunities for business arising from university knowledge, including advocating the potential contribution to product and process innovation, in order to help stimulate the demand for innovation and problem solving from Scotland’s company base.

5. Expand our role in company formation through enhanced start up and spin out programmes which draw on the intellectual assets and skills within Scotland’s universities. (Universities Scotland, 2015)

Similarly, the “Innovation Scotland Forum Action Plan” (Scottish Government, 2017a) introduces the overall economic ambition of Scotland to be ranked “in the top quartile of OECD countries for productivity, sustainability, equality and wellbeing” (Scottish Government, 2017a, p.1). Improving living standards is also mentioned in the introduction but then the rest of the action plan focusses heavily on business innovation and the desire to maximise knowledge exchange through the UIF with the goal of boosting Scotland’s economy. Out of the four goals introduced, “productivity, sustainability, equality and wellbeing”, only productivity is highlighted and discussed in the action plan with its conclusion being that the goal of the plan is to:

[build] on the progress we have made, working together, to boost Scotland’s innovation performance. It sets out important first steps the Scottish Government will take with partners and businesses to improve Scotland’s innovation offer and drive up business innovation [...] we will identify further steps to increase the level of business innovation active businesses over the long term to create a world class innovation system which moves Scotland toward being in the top quartile of the OECD for innovation and, thereby, matching the best performing countries in the World.” (Scottish Government, 2017a, p.6).

In the absence of any direct reference to sustainability, equality and wellbeing and no explicit links made between how innovation correlates with these three goals, the implication here is perhaps that sustainability, equality and wellbeing are automatically achieved through an enhanced national economy.
Extrapolating from these Scottish policies, it would appear that only university 
research and knowledge exchange, which contributes directly to Scotland’s 
economy, is prioritised. The UIF model is set out in a way that suggests that outwith 
teaching and research, Scotland’s universities’ third mission should be focussed on 
knowledge exchange which results in national economic growth. This interpretation 
of the third mission focusses on monetising innovation founded within higher 
education institutions.

The monetization of higher education contributes to a neoliberalist agenda. Giroux 
(2017) argues that neoliberalism in higher education specifically supports the terms of

> a free market economics wherein all individuals and institutions are conceived of as market actors whose objectives are to maximise their capital value, and whose values rest on enterprise and investment. (Giroux, 2017, p.25)

Prioritising this neoliberalist agenda within higher education impedes the ability of Scotland to flourish as a progressive nation and neglects the role of higher education’s role in the cultivation of civic-mindedness an active citizenship.

Other aspects of a progressive nation and a human being’s quality of life such as social equality, life satisfaction, and democratic citizenship are not afforded the same level of prioritisation. This is problematic if Scotland’s claim to be a leading progressive nation is to be accepted; development economists such as Drèze and Sen (2010) have demonstrated that economic growth correlates poorly with political liberty, stable democracies, health and education. This view aligns with Diener and Seligman (2004) who argue that:

> although economic output has risen steeply over the past decades, there has been no rise in life satisfaction during this period, and there has been a substantial increase in depression and distrust. (Diener and Seligman, 2004, p.1)

As Nussbaum (2010) argues, economic growth and wealth are means to an end but cannot be ends in themselves. In other words, nations strive for economic wealth *in order* to achieve certain goods in life that are of intrinsic value. The writers above express resistance against the dominance of neoliberalism within higher education and contribute to what Kreber (2016a) describes as a “counter discourse” which
highlights the social and common good purposes of higher education as opposed to the economic.

The contemporary interpretation of the third mission in the Scottish policy landscape appears to prioritise an economistic model of education where indicators of a progressive nation, which Scotland claims to be, are assumed to be automatic products of enhanced economic, national wealth. In the next chapter, I will explore what might constitute the kinds of goods Scottish universities could offer their communities including communities within their own institutions (learners and academics), as part of a broader third mission. I now shift focus to a review of the literature related to academic staff perspectives on CEL.

2.4 Current literature on academic staff perspectives on CEL

There are two main bodies of literature on academic staff perspectives on CEL. The first concerns how factors on an individual level (personal characteristics) can influence academic and the second focusses on factors on an institutional level (disciplinary context), including factors that motivate institutions to support CEL. All of the studies are focussed on CEL activity taking place outwith a UK context, which is not surprising since, as I have discussed above, there is a paucity of literature about CEL in the Scottish and UK education contexts in general.

2.4.1 Personal characteristics and value orientation of academic staff

There is a considerable body of literature spanning the last two decades in the US that focuses on the institutional and individual levels of inquiry into CEL. Antonio et al. (2000) argue that personal characteristics (e.g., humanistic orientation, personal commitment to community service) is the most influential factor in determining an academic staff member’s commitment to CEL and specifically service-related activity. This is closely followed by the disciplinary context. Subsequent research, (Buzinski et al., 2013; Doberneck and Schweitzer, 2017) has built on this, and lent
force to the argument that disciplinary context and personal characteristics are the most influential variables.

In their 2000 research paper, Antonio, Astin and Cress (2000) identified two personal characteristics or value orientations to be predictors for positive and negative engagement and commitment with civic engagement. A high “Humanistic Orientation” was defined as “helping to promote racial understanding, influencing social values, helping others in difficulty, developing a meaningful philosophy of life, and becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment.” (Antonio, Astin and Cress, 2000, p.379) whereas “a high “Status Orientation” consisted of “obtaining recognition from colleagues and becoming an authority in one’s field.” While both values reflected motivations for choosing an academic career, a Humanistic Orientation correlated with the individual espousing and involving themselves with civic engagement pedagogies while Status Orientation reflected the opposite. There are strong links here between the values within the Humanistic Orientation and the concept of civic mindedness.

Antonio, Astin and Cress (2000) identified distinct personal characteristics and values as well as types of institutions that foster academic staff interaction with and commitment to community service. Several studies in the last two decades have built upon the findings of Antonio et al.’s (2000) research paper by exploring how these factors (individually and in combination with others) influence academic staff commitment to service-learning. O’Meara et al. (2011) reviewed more recent literature on the factors that influence academic staff engagement in community service. They provided broader categories of influential factors:

- *Demographics, Identity, and Life Experiences*
- *Epistemology and Personal Goals*
- *Institutional Contexts*
- *Disciplinary and Department Contexts* (O’Meara et al., 2011)
Neither of these studies, however, consider the broader context of the local, national and international perspective. I propose that this wider perspective is relevant to my research on CEL at the individual level of the academic staff member. These influential factors can then be broadly categorised into a stratified analysis on three levels: structural, institutional, and individual.

2.4.2 Stratified analysis

At the institutional level of analysis, the relationships between different disciplinary groups with their governing institution (the university), is of great significance. Current literature implies that some applied disciplines, for example, education and health sciences, are more likely to participate in community-engaged pedagogy (Antonio, Astin and Cress, 2000; Vogelgesang, Denson and Jayakumar, 2010). By contrast, academics in mathematics and the humanities were less inclined to involve such activity in their courses. As my research focuses on a single institution where CEL is not a well-established, pedagogical practice, I did not consider the institutional level of analysis to be a helpful. Instead, consistent with Archer’s Morphogenetic, critical realist approach (2020; 2013a; 1982; 1995) (see section 5.4.2), I will analyse how the individual level interacts with the institutional level and broaden this out to the wider political and social context.

Demb and Wade (2012); Boland and McIlrath (2016) support the need for a multidimensional approach to analysing CEL within institutions; simply exploring engagement and commitment to CEL at a disciplinary level is insufficient. Demb and Wade’s study in 2012 acknowledged the importance of disciplinary context but also placed responsibility on institutions to incentivise, support and reward civic engagement. In their qualitative study, Boland and McIlrath (2016) found diverse reasons influencing senior management and individuals within institutional settings to support and embed CEL:

Enhancing student learning, creating an engaged campus, countering the drift from the public to the private domain, getting the edge over competitors in the higher education market, all feature. Particular local contextual factors also prove significant.(Boland and McIlrath, 2016, p.92)
This is relevant to section 2.2, which suggests that defined analysis at an institutional level is necessary; institutions on their own cannot change national policies on research and funding, or determine the criteria for university league tables. Of course, underpinning any drive for policy change at an individual level, as Demb and Wade (2012); Boland and McIlrath (2016) and Buzinski et al. (2013) have argued, requires institutional and departmental support. Underpinning this change are individual staff members whose role includes being involved with civic engagement through CEL and those who engage with this kind of activity on an elective basis. In the next section, I review literature that considers Community-engaged activity to be part of a longer-term strategic third mission, institutional commitment and its relationship with existing processes such as the staff development and promotions process.

2.4.3 Institutionalisation, staff recognition, and the sustainability of CEL

Many recent research papers on university-community engagement conclude that embedded engagement must be a core component of the institutional mission for it to be taken seriously (Chmelka et al., 2020; Robinson and Hudson, 2013). Moreover, to properly acknowledge and convey the importance of this type of work, it must be recognised by the employee appraisals and promotions process (Robinson and Hudson, 2013; Zlotkowski, 1996; Antonio, Astin and Cress, 2000). In the US, where CEL is practised widely, this pedagogy can appear to be more institutionalised and established within a university.

In order to reconnect with and build upon the CEL goal of creating meaningful linkages between institutions and communities, and the idea of a scholarship of engagement, Butin (2010a) makes the case for reframing the movement as an intellectual one. This calls for the creation of an "academic home" (Butin, 2010a, p.20) or academic programmes like majors, minors, and interdisciplinary programmes, as well as the critique and discussion that can flourish in these
academic contexts. According to Butin, the academic department is the primary unit of analysis within higher education, and hence such an academic home can foster and sustain constructive criticism that can advance the community engagement movement:

At the heart of this argument is the notion that the disciplining of a movement is a necessary precondition for its ability to work within and through the context-specific mechanisms of higher education. My departmental status, to put it bluntly, allows me a voice at the higher education decision-making table. (Butin, 2010b, p.109)

In a systematic review of CEL in higher education institutions across Europe, Chmelka et al. (2020) found variation in the degree of institutionalisation of this type of pedagogy. Generally, there were no permanent infrastructures for this type of learning activity and projects were largely ad hoc, fragmented and dependent on the enthusiasm, capacity and goodwill of individual staff members. However, the review comments that:

British universities are increasingly becoming more socially responsible and are looking for opportunities for their students and researchers to be able to respond to local societal challenges. (Chmelka et al., 2020, p.104)

Even in a US higher education context where CEL is more established, institutionalisation of this practice is not prevalent across all universities. Zlotkowski (1996) describes this lack of established practice whereby:

these overt manifestations of interest have often seemed to float, as it were, in a kind of professional vacuum, unconnected to the defining constructs of academic life. (Zlotkowski, 1996, p.22)

These findings support Goddard’s (2016, p.6) criticism of the un-civic university model where the third mission is relegated to the periphery of university priority.
2.4.3.1 Recognition of academic staff engagement

One important result of pushing CEL to the periphery, is the impact on academic staff engaged in this kind of pedagogy. In an anecdote about academic staff promotion and CEL, Zlotkowski (1996) shares an example of a respected colleague with pioneering and award-winning accomplishments in service-learning across undergraduate and postgraduate programmes applying for professorship.

as I reviewed the particulars of the glowing departmental recommendation, I found not a single reference to service-learning: not as an example of innovative pedagogy, not as an example of professional initiative, not even as an example of some kind of service. Indeed, what was cited as an example of wider community involvement was participation in a country dance group! (Zlotkowski, 1996, p.23)

In this example, the applicant for professorship is clearly dedicated and enthusiastic about CEL and yet does not consider this work to be relevant to academic promotion. In a UK university context, Robinson and Hudson argue that this is because CEL-type activity is not appropriately acknowledged by their institution:

many university staff who get involved in community activity do so without encouragement or support from their university. In fact, they can feel as if they are getting involved in such activity despite the institution; It is often not valued, or recognised, and is certainly not seen as part of the university’s mission or remit.(Robinson and Hudson, 2013, p.192)

Robson and Hudson (2013) assert that embedding community engagement is essential and could be accomplished in part by including these activities in staff appraisals by formally acknowledging engagement work with communities.

2.4.3.2 Sustainability of CEL practice

In their literature review of global university social responsibility initiatives, Sharma and Sharma (2019) found that a lack of internal organisation, specific measures and agreement on commitment to ethical approaches hindered the growth of social responsibility work in universities.

Social responsibility ought to be embedded into the core values and functions of universities’ practices at each level. Sustainability reporting in higher education is still in its immaturity considering quantity and quality […](Sharma and Sharma, 2019, p.33)
Scottish universities were not included in the data, however the review concludes that within the current context of higher education funding, initiatives that need extra resources such as CEL, are in constant danger. Chmelka et al. (2020) also concluded lecturers were often not given any institutional incentives to use an engaged approach in their instruction.

One example of institutional commitment to CEL in the UK is the Community Engaged Learning Service (CELS) at University College London (UCL, 2023) which is a dedicated consultancy service to support staff to develop CEL within their own pedagogical practice. The CELS website hosts information for prospective community partners as well as students and offers staff guidance on embedding CEL into their programmes as well as case studies and accounts of practice. Training and mentoring are available for staff as well as available funding for CEL projects and a service to “match make” potential community partners with academic staff. While parallel services exist to support researchers at Alba University, there is no such service for CEL practitioners.

Therefore, it would appear that institutionalised support, coordination, and strategic planning are needed in a top-down framework to assure the sustainability of community-engaged programmes. It stands to reason that, if a university is serious about engagement, it will need to invest in relevant staff development and outreach. If that commitment is to be sustained, it must also be mainstreamed, integrated into how the university operates, and reflected in its strategy and budget. University-community engagement ought to be more than a series of projects with short-term funding. For teaching staff in higher education who take the initiative to integrate an engaged learning method into their pedagogy, formal acknowledgement, incentives, or even awards (financial or promotion-based) are necessary. This is a gap in the knowledge that my research project sets out to examine.

In the next chapter, I investigate how a virtuous professional might be conceived in the context of a higher-education institution. As part of this, I explore the idea of professional authenticity, which is conceived by Kreber (2016a) as: adhering to
person choice and committing oneself to a community’s shared beliefs and traditions. In being inauthentic, professionals heavily prioritise one dimension over another. This includes a propensity for self-sacrifice and self-abnegation where professionals, in this case academic staff, are vulnerable to hegemonic oppression (an idea originated by Gramsci (1971)) where staff are complicit in their own oppression (Brookfield, 2005b). In other words, in an institutional context that promotes external goods e.g., power, status and wealth, and under-recognises the efforts of staff who initiate and foster CEL activity, staff may unknowingly compensate for a lack of financial and professional recognition by making their own sacrifices in these areas: they will work without financial reward, and sacrifice their career progression.

From my interpretation of the existing literature, I argue that the institutional context has a significant impact on the experiences and perspectives of academic staff on an individual level. In institutions where the third mission has been interpreted as an optional activity with little or no institutional support, academic staff who do wish to take on CEL activity are vulnerable to vocation hegemony (Brookfield, 2005b) (complicity in one’s own oppression for the sake of one’s perceived vocation) within a culture of inauthenticity Kreber (2016b). In such an environment, continued CEL activity, which can benefit students, the wider community and the reputation of the institution rely on the goodwill and sacrifice of individual academic staff, which is often unsustainable and unethical.
3 Critical Literature Review Part 2 – The Ultimate Purpose of a University

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I critically reviewed current and relevant literature around Community Engaged Learning (CEL) and framed it within a United Kingdom (UK) and Scottish Higher Education context. In this chapter I will use an emancipatory, Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics approach to explore the question of what kind of ultimate purpose a university should support, and locate these within the policy and political context of Scotland within the UK. Education in the UK is a devolved power and each of the countries in the UK (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales) are subject to different education systems overseen by their own devolved governments (The Scottish Parliament, n.d.). Therefore, Alba University exists within a Scottish education context and is subject to a distinct but related system of funding and governance from England and the other nations within the UK.

Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics is fundamentally concerned with the value of human flourishing and the cultivation of virtues such as bravery, honesty, compassion, and wisdom. The relevance of reason and practical wisdom in forming moral and ethical ideas and practises is also emphasised. Also, it seeks to understand what the good life entails and how our values and beliefs are shaped by our communities and traditions. Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics can be viewed as the root of key concepts which are highly relevant to exploring the potential of Higher Education for its students, academic staff and society, including the local community. These key theories include conceptions of the common good, authentic professionalism, and human flourishing.

My research project focusses on one institution: Alba University, which is located in Scotland. Alba University is a specific kind of higher education institution: a multi-faculty, multi-disciplinary research university (Facer, 2019). From here on, my reference to “university” will refer to this specific type of higher education institution. My study as a whole will analyse the existing literature and the data collected across
three levels of analysis: structural (local, national and international contexts) institutional (institutional, disciplinary and department contexts) and individual (individual characteristics and experiences of academic staff). Therefore, alongside considering who and what higher education institutions should be for, I will then explore how academic staff and higher education institutions can contribute to this ultimate purpose. Crucial to this exploration is the policy and political context of Alba University; I will argue that these structural level factors influence how higher education institutions can and wish to respond to the questions of what their ultimate purpose should be on an institutional level. This in turn influences how their academic staff are able to contribute to this on an individual level.

Finally, retaining the focus on universities, I explore the literature on how these types of institutions purport to contribute positively to wider society including local communities and also how these affirmations interact with the experiences of academic staff. The literature on the sustainability of CEL practices will be evaluated in order to explore whether current practices in CEL, and the level of support institutions give these practices, are consistent with an emancipatory, Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics approach.

### 3.2 Neo-Aristotelian Virtue-Ethics and CEL

In this section, I clarify my use of terms such as “morals”, “ethics”, “values” and “virtues” in my study and discuss the relevance to my research context. This serves as the foundation of my argument for adopting a Neo-Aristotelian, virtue ethics approach to CEL.

#### 3.2.1 Morals, ethics, values and virtues

In this study, I make a distinction between “morals”, “ethics”, “values” and “virtues”. I will attempt to explain my use and interpretation of these terms here. Values are commonly expressed within organisational mission statements (Keohane, 2006). D’Andrade (2008, p.121) describes institutionalised values as:

> values that people agree should be valued in enacting some role or performing in some group [...] world. However, it is commonly recognized that
often people have values that are incongruent with the institutionalized values of their roles. Therefore, institutional values express what is important to that group of individuals. Related but distinct, is the idea of ethics and morals which express the rightness and wrongness of actions. The phrases “right” and “wrong” are typically used to refer to actions taken in accordance with some established norm. For example, an institution might declare “excellence” and “ambition” to be values but this may or may not be fully compatible with accepted understandings of ethical virtues such as integrity and honesty. Some scholars have used morals and ethics interchangeably because etymologically, both words have different linguistic roots but a similar meaning: the word “moral” is derived from the Latin word *mos* which means custom or habit. “Ethics” is a translation of the Greek word *ethos* (Hare, 2019). However, while “ethics” and “morals” are related terms, I do not use these terms interchangeably because they may express incompatible ideas within the context of my study. I interpret “morals” as an expression of personal principles whereas “ethics” are the expression of the commonly accepted principles of social group or a community.

An individual might hold moral views which may or may not clash with the ethical views of their social group. The recent leadership campaign within the Scottish Government is a good example of this where one candidate attempted to explicitly separate her moral views (based on conservative Christian values) and the ethics of the progressive political party which she sought to lead. Virtue ethics tends to be indexed to a particular culture (see Archer’s definition in section 5.4.2) and its customs, therefore it is necessary to consider the question of what constitutes virtuous conduct in a particular culture.

Finally, my use of the word “virtue” derives from the Aristotelean concept of a moral virtue which Aristotle described as a kind of habitual disposition; it is something we do not automatically develop but are naturally capable of developing through habit (Aristotle and Taylor, 2006, 1103a). Within a virtue-ethical framework, ethical principles are dependent on (but not determined by) context. A virtue is described as “a trait of character manifested in habitual actions that is good for a person to have”
(Rachels and Rachels, 2022, p.171) in other words, virtues are needed to conduct our lives well; a virtuous person will fare better in life.

### 3.2.1.2 The relevance of virtue-ethics for CEL

Aristotle’s virtue ethics is considered a type of consequentialist or teleological approach to ethics. The latter refers to judgements on the rightness or wrongness of actions based on the consequences or ends of those actions. Virtue ethics emphasises that the ethical end of action is the cultivation of virtue and excellence in a person which Aristotle described as *eudaimonia* and is often translated as “flourishing” or “happiness” (Aristotle, 2002, p.454). In other words, human beings have a function and performing that function with excellence is definitive of *arête* or virtue.

Virtue-ethics can be compared to other consequentialist approaches such as utilitarianism which defines as ethical, approaches that bring about the greatest happiness for the greatest number (Bentham, 2000) and approaches which place an emphasis on rules or duties (deontology):

> Imagine a case in which it is obvious that I should, say, help someone in need. A utilitarian will emphasize the fact that the consequences of doing so will maximize well-being, a deontologist will emphasize the fact that, in doing so, I will be acting in accordance with a moral rule such as ‘Do unto others as you would be done by’, and a virtue ethicist will emphasize the fact that helping the person would be charitable or benevolent. (Hursthouse, 1999, p.1)

A virtue-ethics approach requires consideration of both the means and the ends of the action with the recognition that performing the action can contribute to the agent changing as a result.

In my study, I argue that there is an important distinction to be made between a utilitarian and a virtue-ethics approach. The former permits self-sacrifice in ways the latter does not. For example, a member of academic staff may choose not to pursue appropriate reward, recognition or work allocation for CEL work because they consider this to be a selfish pursuit which might compromise the financial sustainability of their CEL course and negatively impact students and local community partners. Not pursing reward etc. would be consistent with a utilitarian approach to ethical action. Similarly, a deontological approach might encourage the
individual to defer action because of established rules around the vocation of teaching e.g. *I must act for the benefit of my students and local community, even if it negatively impacts my career.* (The idea of vocation hegemony is discussed further in Section 3.4.1.). With virtue-ethics however, an act of self-sacrifice would be considered unethical as it compromises the possibility of individual flourishing. Furthermore, where two virtues come into conflict, generosity and truthfulness in the example above, *phronêsis* or practical wisdom would help the individual to decide the most appropriate course of action.

According to Aristotle in *The Nichomachean Ethics* (Aristotle, 2002), every object has a *telos* or ultimate purpose, such as a chair or a person, and is "good" when it fulfills that ultimate purpose well. The ultimate purpose of a human, according to Aristotle, is to live a life characterised by *eudaimonia*. This Greek term has been translated as flourishing or fulfilment or simply “living a worthwhile life” (Hughes, 2013a, p.21). Another quality of *eudaimonia* is that it is sufficient of itself:

> sought after for its own sake and not for the sake of anything else as well. We don’t need, and could not in any case find, any further explanation of why we should wish for a fulfilled life. (Hughes, 2013a, p.30)

Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics is a school of thought that builds on Aristotle's idea of virtue (Aristotle and Taylor, 2006, 1103a) and places a strong emphasis on developing moral character and virtues as the path to living a flourishing life. Written in the 4th Century BCE, Aristotle’s account of teleological ethics lacks an egalitarian element which contemporary Neo-Aristotelian philosophers such as MacIntyre (2007), Nussbaum (1997; 1992) and Hursthouse (1999) have clearly incorporated. In distinct but related ways, they have applied the idea of individual flourishing to all humans in society. Two prominent, contemporary Neo-Aristotelian thinkers also differ on how they derive their conception of virtue theory. MacIntyre, for example, argues that an individual cannot manifest their personal good if they do not also pursue common goods:

> Whereas traditional Aristotelian doctrine identifies a being’s good, its *telos*, only with the actualization of its innate potential, MacIntyre locates human goods also within shared practices. It is in acting for the sake of such common goods, he argues, that humans achieve real excellence. (Knight, 2007, p102)
Virtue-ethics is an approach which can focus on both individual flourishing and the common good and therefore, it is this ethical theory which I have judged to be the most appropriate approach in the theoretical framework of this study.

In Figure 1-2 I suggest that the missions, practices, behaviours and ultimately, experiences of a university, stem from an institution supporting an ultimate purpose. Using an emancipatory, neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics approach, I argue that this ultimate purpose is to promote individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good. This ultimate purpose informs the unique function a university is intended to fulfil; the three integrated missions which mirror Goddard’s model of a civic university (Figure 1-4) are what I argue to be the function of a university. MacIntyre argues that universities are required to justify themselves in terms of their unique function:

> When it is demanded of a university community that it justify itself by specifying what its peculiar and essential function is, that function which, were it not to exist, no other institution could discharge. (MacIntyre, 1990, p222)

I argue that this ultimate purpose is consistent with an emancipatory, neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics approach and indeed, an institution explicitly pledging support for an ultimate purpose, entails making a shared ethical commitment to cultivating certain virtues.

One of the most relevant characteristics of neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics to my study is the focus on the importance of different kinds of knowledge and the part they play in ethical decision making. This includes the aforementioned *phronēsis* or practical wisdom (knowledge of ethics) (Snow, 2017). *Phronēsis* is an intellectual and practical skill that enables people to decide what is right to do in various circumstances. Hursthouse (1999, p.123) asks the question “What is it to act virtuously, or well, on a particular occasion?” and describes four conditions for acting virtuously which I paraphrase below:

1) The action itself must be good and virtuous
2) The actor must know what she is doing so that the act is carried out intentionally and not by accident.
3) The actor acts for a reason/s and for the right reason/s.

4) The actor has the appropriate feeling(s) or attitude(s) when she acts. (Hursthouse, 1999, p.123-125)

Regarding the third condition, Hursthouse (1999) argues that, for virtuous act to be 'morally motivated' it must be done from a settled state of character (i.e., not a spontaneously uncharacteristic act). This should sufficiently resemble the state of character that a virtuous person acts from. In other words, an individual cannot be said to possess a virtue if they only demonstrate it on occasion and in an uncharacteristic fashion.

These four conditions align with MacIntyre’s four questions which he sets out in his work (1999a) “How to Seem Virtuous Without Actually Being So”. The four questions draw a useful distinction between genuine virtues within “any tolerably systematic and coherent understanding of the virtues” and “commonplace rhetorical usage of the virtue-words” or in other words, counterfeit virtue (MacIntyre, 1999a, p.119). Similar to Hursthouse (1999), MacIntyre argues that genuine virtue involves not only carrying out a virtuous action but also that the action is motivated by virtuous reasons. MacIntyre also agrees that pleasure is gained from acting virtuously not because it pleases others but because the actor recognises the action to be virtuous. Finally, Hursthouse (1999) argues that attributing "moral motivation" to someone because he/she believed it was right, is actually attributing something that extends well beyond the moment of action, it makes a claim about the kind of person he or she is. It is about their character which concerns possessing the virtues; a person who is virtuous acts from virtue and this in turn is informed by *phronēsis* or practical wisdom.

Earlier in section 1.3, I presented my ideal of a university firmly rooted in supporting an ultimate purpose, which is related to the Aristotelian concept of *telos*. This thesis examines how structural, institutional and individual factors influence academic staff experiences and perceptions of CEL. Initiatives for CEL can be supported by a neo-Aristotelian account of virtue-ethics or an ethical commitment of the practitioner to act virtuously.
3.2.1.3 Literature on virtue-ethics and CEL

There is an established body of literature on virtue ethics and education, specifically in compulsory schooling, including notable contributions by Carr (2006), Bohlin (2005); Wringe (2006); Higgins (2011). However, there are very few studies involving virtue ethics where the field is narrowed down to CEL activity.

Using Google Scholar, through Harzing’s Publish or Perish application, and adopting different combinations of search terms “civic engagement, virtue ethics, ethics, service learning, community engaged learning, education” fewer than fifteen publications were found from the last 22 years (from 2000 - 2022). Research centred largely on ethics or philosophical approaches to SL, CEL and civic engagement. A virtue-ethics informed approach to studying CEL focusses on the character of the individual and the feelings and motivation behind their actions, rather than the activity itself. Additionally, it has also been argued that “[r]estoring to its central place the question of the flourishing of the practitioner is the first step in constructing a virtue ethics of teaching.” (Higgins, 2010, p.10)

From a student perspective, Rodmon King (2015, p.5) makes a compelling argument that virtue ethics informed approaches to CEL bring to light concepts such as power, privilege, bias, and ignorance, which can be particularly problematic for CEL activities. For students, CEL activities could constitute nothing more than meaningless tick box exercises or shallow CV boosters if students are unable to confront and fully understand these problematic concepts. Worse yet, it’s possible that projects for service-learning that fall short in addressing these issues could lead to the reinforcing of ethically dubious attitudes and ideas (e.g., paternalism, racism, and classism). Since virtuous people, King (2015) argues, must encounter, understand, and sensitise themselves to these concerns as part of the development of their character, virtue ethics is well adapted to support CEL in addressing the aforementioned problems. I argue that this extends to academic staff too, through processes of critical reflection and value exploration.
3.2.2 A shared understanding

In this section, I examine in detail the argument that universities should contribute to non-economic ends: to support individual flourishing and critical thinking for the common good. First, it is important to be explicit about what this entails and how this might be realised in practice.

As MacIntyre (2007; 1999a) argues, a shared moral vocabulary is important and requires a communal effort and a return to traditions that have a history of reflection and practice. Before the Enlightenment, MacIntyre (2007) argues, moral choices were dictated by religion. The goal of the Enlightenment was to ground morality in rational and non-religious principles but by doing so, philosophy was relegated to a space beyond the public sphere. MacIntyre argues that the Enlightenment goal failed for a number of reasons; the most important one being that there was no teleological basis for this new way of thinking:

Since the whole point of ethics—both as a theoretical and a practical discipline—is to enable man to pass from his present state to his true end, the elimination of any notion of essential human nature and with it the abandonment of any notion of a telos leaves behind a moral scheme composed of two remaining elements whose relationship becomes quite unclear. (MacIntyre, 2007, p.57)

Therefore, MacIntyre (2007, ch.3) argues that ethics enables people to understand how to transition from human nature in its natural state to the state human nature could be in if it had attained its telos. MacIntyre suggests that pre-modern societies would have intentionally advanced towards a given end or purpose (telos) and removing this did, in some sense, liberate the individual because they could now adopt any role. However, with an emphasis on individualism, and the emergence of an “emotivist” culture (basing moral judgements on emotional or affective states), . MacIntyre argued, in modern times, no authority has the ability to use rational standards to justify its own moral actions and policy decisions. If the practice of ethics, as MacIntyre (2007, p.57) suggests, should be instructive in a way that would encourage the virtues and restrict the vices, then people also need to be taught how to progress from potential to action, how to realise their true nature, and how to
arrive at their telos. Without a shared moral vocabulary, individuals are reduced to making moral decisions based on their emotional or affective state, rather than a shared understanding of what is good. He argues that this leads to a disjointed and relativistic morality, in which individuals are unable to understand and critique one another's moral beliefs.

In the context of higher education, without constructive debate and understanding around what and for whom universities should exist, institutions are vulnerable to continued influence and decision-making reflecting the dominant political imperatives of the state. In the following sections I will argue why promoting individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good, should be the ultimate purpose of a university. I will explore Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics informed arguments about what and for whom universities should exist.

3.2.3 Human Flourishing: expanding capabilities and cultivating humanity

In the previous chapter, I argued that a university should not prioritise economic ends and that “third mission” activity should work towards non-economic goals which are also indicators of a progressive nation. As Nussbaum (2010) argues, economic growth and wealth are means to an end but cannot be ends in themselves. In other words, nations strive for economic wealth in order to achieve certain goods in life that are of intrinsic value. I will now consider two key ways of thinking around non-economic goals, specifically human flourishing, in the context of Higher Education.

The idea of human flourishing stems from Aristotle’s concept of eudaimonia which he defines in The Nichomachean Ethics, is often translated as “‘happiness’, or ‘fulfilment’ or ‘human flourishing’”, a state of being that arises from living a virtuous life (Hughes 2013, p.11). I will use the term “human flourishing” to refer to this concept from now on. While both Nussbaum and MacIntyre focus on a Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics approach, Nussbaum focusses on capabilities expansion, an individualist interpretation on Aristotelianism, while MacIntyre emphasises the role
of tradition, and the cultivation of virtues within a community, as the key to pursuing human flourishing.

Within her writings on cultivating humanity (1997) and capabilities expansion (2007) (2011), Martha Nussbaum explores the promotion of human flourishing through higher education and, more broadly, international development. Two of the main claims in Martha Nussbaum’s book *Cultivating Humanity* (1997) are that 1) the humanities, as an area of academic discipline, has the potential to shape our students’ thinking, cultivate their humanity and influence the future of democracy; 2) this quality is unique to this discipline area. The first claim, is in some ways, compatible with what MacIntyre argues educational institutions should be for: supporting students to flourish by thinking for themselves (MacAllister, 2016b). Accepting these arguments would obligate academic staff within universities to bear some of the responsibility for creating environments that cultivate this way of thinking amongst students.

Following Amartya Sen’s pluralist view of well-being, Nussbaum (2011) is credited with further developing Sen’s “Capabilities Approach” to justice:

> Sen’s theory has become extremely important in development economics, influencing policy within organisations such as the United Nations Development Programme (2005), encouraging a move away from income measures of poverty, to ‘lack of basic functioning’. (Wolff, 2008, p.6)

According to Sen and Nussbaum, capabilities are the things that people can do and be if they so choose; having such capabilities can determine whether someone can convert a set of means (resources and public goods) into what Sen (1974) describes as a “functioning”. Nussbaum and Sen’s capabilities approach recognises that someone’s ability to convert resources to functionings is highly dependent on their personal, sociopolitical, and environmental context. In Nussbaum’s version, she proposes ten essential capabilities, which she argues are necessary and sufficient conditions for living a good life. She argues that “Aristotle believed that political planners need to understand what human beings require for a flourishing life” (Nussbaum 2011, p.125). Of course, in today’s context, Nussbaum (2007) adds that these basic capabilities are due to individuals regardless of their social or economic circumstances.
It could be argued then that Nussbaum's (1997) concept of cultivating humanity therefore links understanding of what is required for a flourishing life, and believing that people (even those unlike ourselves) are worthy of achieving this. The intention of “cultivating humanity” (1997) is to broaden the experience and thinking of individual students through academic study while with the ten capabilities (2011), Nussbaum attempts to offer a universally applicable account of essential human functionings. Nussbaum’s belief that there could be a universally applicable list of capabilities has been criticised (MacAllister, 2019) with MacIntyre (2007) arguing that, moral understanding cannot be objectively determined, but rather deliberated within the context of communities and their traditions.

Therefore, while both Nussbaum and MacIntyre offer a modern account of Aristotle’s human flourishing as an end of political and moral philosophy, MacIntyre’s focus is on deliberation within a community in the context of its traditions, while Nussbaum’s focus is on implementing a universal list of capabilities. Intertwined with MacIntyre’s idea of communities where one could cultivate virtues, is the concept of the common good. This will be discussed below as contributing to supporting the ultimate purpose of a university. First, I will examine how highlighting the emancipatory potential of critical thinking is also a key part of this ultimate purpose.

3.2.4 The Emancipatory Potential of Critical Thinking

There is a wealth of literature on incorporating Critical Theory into education with Paolo Freire (1998) and Henry Giroux (2011) recognised as key scholars in the area of Critical Pedagogy. Supporting students to think critically in this sense involves challenging dominant narratives and power structures as well as challenging their own assumptions and beliefs. The emancipatory potential of Critical Pedagogy is complemented by a Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics approach to critical thinking which focuses on developing character and moral virtues. In this section, I discuss why the emancipatory potential of critical thinking is a crucial part of imagining the ultimate purpose of a university.
Supporting students, as future citizens and professionals, to think for themselves in a critical way, involves cultivating certain types of knowledge. Instrumental knowledge, which is often the focus of vocational degrees, describes knowledge or abilities that are required to accomplish a certain outcome. This kind of knowledge is frequently applied in real-world situations with a clear objective in mind, for example, learning to use software to do a task. While instrumental knowledge is crucial to cultivating graduates who reflect on the outcomes of their university study, it is inadequate on its own. Kreber (2016) argues that, alongside instrumental knowledge, communicative knowledge and emancipatory knowledge are also crucial:

Instrumental knowledge does not protect us from ethical misconduct. The problem with instrumental knowledge is that it does not ask, and therefore does not respond to, questions of ideals, values or ethics. It is not interested in whether something is desirable, or ethical; it only asks ‘Does it work?’ Instrumental knowledge in isolation, and in the absence of other personal qualities, dispositions and types of knowing, then is insufficient for professional practice. (Kreber, 2016a, p.85)

Emancipatory knowledge, Kreber argues, is deeply connected to transformative education experiences. According to Kreber (2016a, p.8) that transformation extends beyond mere change; it encompasses a profound reorientation and carries an emancipatory essence. Students undergo transformation as they increasingly recognise and confront the evident injustices prevailing in the world, compelling them to take action and amplify the voices of those who are marginalised. Simultaneously, they cultivate greater acceptance and openness towards individuals who differ from them. Moreover, they discover a sense of personal and communal purpose within their endeavours.

In *Cultivating Humanity* Nussbaum (1997) argues there are three tenets of cultivating humanity, which is valuable for a healthy democracy:

- **Socratic Self-examination** – the ability to examine one’s own assumptions from first principles.
- **Narrative Imagination** – the ability to see a situation from another person’s perspective despite that person’s situation being very different from your own.
- **World citizenship** – the ability to have in in depth appreciation of another culture or religious perspective (Nussbaum, 1997).
The first tenet accords with aspects of MacIntyre’s (1987) purpose of an educated public where young people should be enabled to think for themselves: “To be enlightened is to be able to think for oneself” (MacIntyre, 1987, p.24). As an educator developing and delivering courses in a higher-education institution, the term “critical thinking” has become almost a cliché and, as a term, is widely used in course proposals, learning outcomes and graduate attribute statements with, in my experience, little or no discussion about what we mean by the term.

Critical thinking can be realised in many different ways. The word “critical” can be interpreted as intellectually sceptical and questioning, but this can be interpreted in an apolitical manner, taking into account only the psychological and cognitive mechanisms and without due consideration of the political or social context in which the learning takes place. Kincheloe (2000) calls this type of critical thinking “Uncritical, Critical Thinking”:

In its reductionism this uncritical critical thinking removed the political and ethical dimension of thinking. Students and teachers were not encouraged to confront why they tended to think as they did about themselves, the world around them, and their relationship to that world. In other words, these uncritical critical thinkers gained little insight into the forces that had shaped them. (Kincheloe, 2000, p.26)

Catherine McCall, who developed the Communities for Philosophical Inquiry (COPI) method by training lay people to reason and argue logically within a group setting, argues that with COPI, the benefits of philosophical education go beyond teaching learners to deliberate, reason and think critically. She uses the example of human experimentation in concentration camps in Nazi Germany and argues that the doctors involved in designing and carrying out those experiments:

used logical procedures to further their inquiry. They discovered more about their subject matter under investigation. (Information which is still used by the scientific community today). They communicated with each other. No doubt they even agreed and disagreed with each other (McCall, 2007 p.25)

Therefore, these doctors engaged in logical, analytical and critical thinking, but the key difference is that they engaged in such thinking within a restricted and defined
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problem. They did not challenge their basic assumption that the individuals that they experimented on were sub-human.

Kreber also suggests that critical thinking requires connection to personal meaning and “questions such as what ought to be done here and perhaps even how should I live” (Kreber, 2016a p.15). Furthermore, in “The Idea of an Educated Public” Alasdair MacIntyre argued that a goal of education institutions should be to support students to think for themselves but in collaboration with other individuals in an educated community: “it is a familiar truth that one can only think for oneself if one does not think by oneself” (MacIntyre, 1987, p.24). Clearly there is an ethical and social dimension to critical thinking which must also be employed. Nussbaum’s first tenet of “Socratic Self-examination” already suggests critical reflection (analysis of one’s assumptions and first principles), but requires what Kreber, McCall and MacIntyre have argued, deliberation within an educated community.

Nussbaum’s argument for “Narrative Imagination” extends the idea of cultivating humanity beyond potentially isolated, individual thinking by inviting empathy with others unlike ourselves through the reading of literature. Similar arguments are made about the tenet of “World Citizenship”. The idea of exploring empathy through art has been explored by MacAllister (2018) in the area of educating the emotions where philosophers such as Ronald Hepburn are considered valuing both the sciences and the arts and humanities in the education of subjectivity and objectivity:

Hepburn thought engagement with works of literature, such as Tolstoy’s Anna Karenina, can enable such emotion education. According to Hepburn, Tolstoy can educate as he can enlarge emotional experience. He can do this by taking his readers out of everyday life, where emotions are generally liable to be cliched and hackneyed, and into an imagined world that has precise, authentic accounts of individual human feeling […] engagement with works of literature can help readers to better understand and relate with others. (MacAllister, 2018, p.4)

However, as MacAllister offers a fuller account of Hepburn’s argument it seems that exploring emotions solely through art-works is incomplete without educator-facilitated critical reflection.
Just because literature might help readers understand fictional characters better does not mean that readers will automatically be better able to understand and relate with others in real life. Fiction is fiction and life is life. The two can meet and enrich each other, but they need not. (MacAllister, 2018, p.6)

Therefore, while I agree with Nussbaum (1997; 2011) that individual flourishing through expanding capabilities and cultivating the humanity of students is worthwhile, academic staff should also complement philosophical contemplation with critical reflection and the opportunity for experiences within the wider community.

In order to create conditions where students can flourish as individuals by extending their practice of empathy through narrative imagination and world citizenship, and challenging their own assumptions, students need opportunities for critical reflection within a community. My view is influenced by MacIntyre’s definition of community, which I referred to in the first part of the literature review, as a social group in which individuals share an understanding of what is good and which provides individuals with a sense of belonging and an understanding of their place in the world. According to MacIntyre (2007), this is essential for a meaningful life. I argue next that students and staff may achieve this through encounters with communities and individuals with whom they might otherwise not have had any meaningful connections previously. By extension, academic staff within institutions would be largely responsible for creating those opportunities and those activities would take place outwith the traditional classroom.

Meaningful encounters with communities beyond the university are necessary for gaining emancipatory knowledge. Kreber (2016) specifies the three kinds of knowledge a graduate needs to gain in order to become a civic-minded professional: “(1) instrumental, (2) interpretive (or communicative) and (3) emancipatory knowledge” (Kreber, 2016, p.80). Instrumental knowledge is technical knowledge that may be employed to complete tasks and solve problems with a fixed outcome in mind. Kreber draws parallels between “instrumental knowledge”, Aristotle’s concept of “techne” and Arendt’s concept of “work” (Kreber, 2016, p.84). Interpretative knowledge concerns character, relationships, and social knowledge which allow for
practical reasoning with others. Here, again, Kreber draws parallels with Aristotle, this time with his concept of *phronēsis* (practical wisdom), and Alasdair Maclntyre’s concept of “practical reasoning”. Finally, “emancipatory knowledge” is critical reflection on tradition, ideologies, power dynamics and structures that allow the status quo to remain. The purpose of critical reflection, ultimately, is to challenge this. (Kreber, 2016, p.88).

For Kreber (2016) it is not enough for the student to be technically competent (instrumental knowledge); to have only instrumental knowledge does not allow questions about ethics and values to surface. Therefore, there is also a need to foster communicative and emancipatory knowledge. Only then, argues Kreber, can graduates be prepared to face the unpredictable and unknowable challenges that they will face as future professionals.

In *How to Seem Virtuous without Actually Being So*, Maclntyre (1999a) discusses the dichotomy of genuine vs. counterfeit virtues. Maclntyre poses the idea of appealing to a “façade of moral consensus” where moral disagreement between individuals and groups can be hidden with regard to values:

> In order to function effectively that rhetoric must be able to make use of sentences that both command widespread assent and yet which are at the same time available for the expression of sets of quite different and incompatible moral judgements. Thereby an illusion is created of agreement in valuing such virtues as courage, generosity and justice, while at the same time disguising the range of alternative and conflicting conceptions of such virtues, and of the nature of virtue in general, which in fact informs the attitudes and actions of different individuals and groups. (Maclntyre, 1999a, p.122)

Therefore, Maclntyre argues that terms such as “values” and “virtue” are often used by policymakers in a rhetorical manner without endorsing any particular notion of virtue or offering any clear explanation of how such virtue may be achieved. Higher education institutional documents which are public facing, are possible examples of such rhetoric.
Kreber (2005, p.77) agrees that mission statements can be seen as “vague, evasive, or rhetorical”. However, she also argues that being explicit about the values, ideals and goals of an institution necessitates actively reflecting on these concepts as part of the process and positions this as a “moral responsibility to identify the values and ideals by which they choose to orient themselves”. Chapter 6 of this dissertation will include a documentary analysis of institutional literature regarding university-community engagement to explore how ideas relating to virtues and values are presented, and for what strategic purposes.

3.2.5 Acting for the common good

In this section, I argue that acting for the common good, is a crucial element of what constitutes the ultimate purpose of a university. Again, MacIntyre’s (2007) argument that a shared moral vocabulary is important to consider here; it is important to be specific about “the common good” to which I refer here and why it is a crucial part of whom and for what universities should exist.

I have attempted to demonstrate that promoting individual flourishing is part of the ultimate purpose universities should support. However, one key criticism of Sen (1985; 1974) and Nussbaum’s (2011) capabilities approach to development theory is that of “atomism” where:

society is conceived as a large number of distinct individuals, or atoms, each pursuing their own conception of the good life. They may see this in hedonist terms, as a matter of maximising pleasure, or in libertarian terms, as a matter of maximising individual free choice, or in ‘expressivist’ terms, as a matter of each individual giving full expression to what is unique within him or her. (Deneulin, 2007, p.18)

This argument identifies the ultimate purpose of human development or political action to be that of expanding individual freedoms. This criticism could also be applicable to the three tenets of “cultivating humanity” in that it is largely centred on the freedoms of individuals. That is not to say that Nussbaum’s two sets of principles do not espouse empathy or consideration of others, but I agree with Deneulin (2007) that what is lacking is a teleological account of the good that societies should progress towards, beyond expanding individual freedoms. This accords with similar
arguments which warn that, without the dimension of the common good, this way of thinking is rooted in an individualistic ethic, in which the idea of “a good life” is reduced to self-affirmation. Mortarti argues that one of the greatest threats to democracy is this self-serving perspective on life’s meaning, which is made worse by our educational system (Mortari and Ubbiali, 2021, p.116). In the following section I will consider the argument that universities should exist and operate for more than economic ends and the expansion of individual freedoms and also involve the idea of the “the common good” as a purpose.

In a similar vein, Etzioni (2007, p.28) posits that human flourishing requires balanced relationships with community members to which one has moral obligations. He emphasises that these obligations are not self-serving, utilitarian or consequentialist but rather enable the functional potential of an individual to be fulfilled because of common good outcomes. I argue that this comports well with the Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethical informed notion that a university’s purpose should contribute to individual flourishing for the common good.

In “The Concept of the Common Good” Jaede (2017) surveys competing conceptions of “the common good” from its inception in ancient Greece to its use in the present day. Jaede notes that today, terms such as “public good” and “public interest” are often used synonymously with “the common good”, but that:

> the concept of the common good, as it evolved in the Aristotelian and Thomistic traditions, was understood to refer to a good that is objectively valuable in a moral sense. Specifically, the phrase signified the conditions for developing and perfecting distinctively human virtues, rather than merely promoting material wellbeing. (Jaede, 2017, p.6)

The common good is, as Etzioni (2007) argues, much more than a collection of private or personal goods rather it includes goods that may not obviously, immediately or directly benefit any particular group or individual. However, despite this, he argues that we still invest in the common good and facilitate its cultivation because, in and of itself, it is “the right thing to do” (2007, p.1). This demonstrates clear alignment with virtue-ethical principles. Similarly, MacIntyre’s concept of “the common good” is useful in considering how a university’s ultimate purpose, could involve more than expanding individual freedoms.
MacIntyre’s (1998; 2016) comparison of “common good” and “public good” similarly highlights the importance of benefiting from the act of collaboration, rather than the fruits of that activity. In “Philosophy, Politics and the Common Good”, MacIntyre (1998, p.239) criticises the nature of modern political debate as lacking in rational enquiry but yet instrumental in creating decision and policies which affect public life. MacIntyre argues that contemporary politics leaves no space for enquiry into the politics of the common good. Later, MacIntyre (2016) presents a consistent account of the difference between public goods, common goods and the common good:

Public goods can be understood as goods to be achieved by individuals qua individuals, albeit only in cooperation with other individuals, and to be enjoyed by individuals qua individuals, while common goods are only to be enjoyed and achieved [...] by individuals qua members of various groups or qua participants in various activities. (MacIntyre, 2016, p.168)

MacIntyre asserts that the consumption of a common good cannot be separated from the production of a common good. A common good cannot be created by individuals on their own and it is not a jointly generated resource bank from which individuals can benefit on their own. MacIntyre uses the example of an investment club where individuals are able to access more investment opportunities by acting together than if they would by investing on their own. This is not an example of acting for the common good because the ultimate goal of acting together is to achieve individual ends, not ends for the good of the community. In contrast, acting for the common good, MacIntyre argues, leads to a notion of human freedom that is concerned with a telos which comprises both the good of individuals and the good of the communities in which they live.

In the same way that MacIntyre (2016, p.222) claims that the way in which we collectively deliberate on what should constitute a good life is more important than which conditions comprise the list itself. MacIntyre does not suggest that there is a shared and universally agreed idea of what the common good should be or exactly what the good life should comprise. However, MacIntyre argues that there should be meaningful deliberation about these matters in the public sphere (MacAllister, 2016b, p.11) and that this deliberation should promote and cultivate the virtues which are required to sustain practices.
Truthfulness about their shared practical experience, justice in respect of the opportunity that each participant receives to advance her or his arguments, and an openness to refutation are all prerequisites of critical enquiry. And it is only insofar as we all of us treat those virtues as constitutive of our common good, and ascribe to the standards that they require of us an authority that is independent of the interests and desires of each of us, that we will be able to engage in genuinely critical enquiry. Moral commitment to these virtues and to the common good is not an external constraint upon, but a condition of enquiry and criticism. (MacIntyre, 1999b, p.161)

Above, MacIntyre argues that within a community, moral commitment to certain virtues and the common good is a condition of critical enquiry and is required in order to deliberate effectively and expose one’s ideas to critique. This is an important concept that ties together the strands of emancipatory critical thinking and acting for the common good. MacAllister (2016a, p.531) also emphasises that MacIntyre’s concepts of social movements and communities are distinct; local communities are better equipped to challenge unfair social and economic structures (such as capitalism) than formal social movements.

So far, I have positioned students’ individual flourishing as part of the ultimate purpose higher education institutions should support. This purpose is enacted through teaching, learning and research activity facilitated by academic staff. I have agreed with Nussbaum (2007; 2010) and Sen (1975) that universities should not consider the economic ends as ends in themselves but rather a means to ends which involve the expansion of individual freedoms. However, I have argued that supporting individual flourishing alone is insufficient if we wish to avoid an atomistic (Deneulin, 2007) conception of a university’s ultimate purpose. Incorporating MacIntyre’s (2016) notion of “the common good” creates a concept of human freedom that is orientated towards an ultimate purpose which necessitates the cultivation of common goods over a sustained and indefinite period of time, for the good of individuals, and the good of those communities in which they live.

3.2.6 Institutions, practices and genuine virtues

For MacIntyre, the common good is to be found:
in the activity of communal learning through which we together become able to order goods, both in our individual lives and in the political society. Such practical learning is a kind of learning that takes place in and through activity, and in and through reflection upon that activity, in the course of both communal and individual deliberation. (MacIntyre, 1998, p.243)

Therefore, practices are a primary arena where such communal learning can occur. I have interpreted this as practices and institutions existing within a symbiotic dynamic, specifically one which is grounded in mutualism. To elucidate, mutualism denotes a symbiotic relationship which benefits all parties. In this same way, institutions, according to MacIntyre, cannot exist without practices in the same way practices are necessarily upheld by institutions. However, practices are also vulnerable to what MacIntyre describes as the corrupting influences of institutions. In the political context of this research project, institutions include the University and UK and Scottish Government institutions. In Section 2.3, I discuss the Scottish and UK Government’s preoccupation with interpreting the University’s Third Mission in economistic terms or community-engagement activity in pursuit of what MacIntyre (2007) describes as “external goods” (e.g. wealth, power and status). The constituents which help practices resist the corrupting influences, for example, neoliberalism (see Section 2.3), of institutions, including the nation state, are the virtues and specifically for MacIntyre (2007), the virtues of courage, truthfulness, and justice. In After Virtue, MacIntyre argues that virtues are necessary for reaching standards of excellence associated with a “practice” which he defines as:

any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended (MacIntyre, 2007, p.187)

A MacIntyrean practice can therefore be summarised as something that takes place within a community and leads its practitioners to recognise internal goods and eventually achieve them through the virtues. Goods are defined by MacIntyre (2007) as being internal or external to a practice and engaging in a practice helps us to understand these goods in a particular way. Although teaching is an essential component of all social activities, it is not considered by MacIntyre (2007) to be a practice in and of itself but rather something that involves multiple practices.
There is consensus between MacIntyre’s concept of internal and external goods and intrinsic and extrinsic value except that additionally, internal goods are also characterised as being good for the whole community who participate in the practice. Examples of external goods are goods that have extrinsic or instrumental value: fame, wealth, power, status which MacIntyre (2007) considers to be the concern of institutions. It is important to note that external goods are still considered “goods”. As I have noted above, MacIntyre (2007) asserts that practices can only survive if supported by institutions. MacAllister (2016a, P.534) highlights that MacIntyre does not consider dominant institutions to be wholly associated with vice:

because of their limited resources local communities may often need to seek support from the institutions of the state if their particular needs are to be properly attended to. He says there ‘are numerous crucial needs of local communities that can only be met by making use of state resources and invoking the intervention of state agencies

I have likened this to a symbiotic relationship of mutualism, which is delicately balanced by the exercise of the virtues:

The integrity of a practice causally requires the exercise of the virtues by at least some of the individuals who embody it in their activities; and conversely the corruption of institutions is always in part at least an effect of the vices. (MacIntyre, 2007, p.195)

MacIntyre’s concept of the interaction between goods, institutions and practices provides an interesting lens for my research project. If institutions are necessarily concerned with external goods such as wealth, status and power, then parallels can be drawn with the political context that troubles Higher Education and its staff and students today. Within the narrative of higher education institutions obliged to demonstrate “value for money” and instrumental accountability to taxpayers and students in order to achieve outcomes concerned with increased individual and economic wealth, is an expectation that higher education institutions will compete with each other. The competition is always for external goods which, in the context of higher education institutions, translates as world university rankings and income gained through student fees and research grants.
Therefore, if higher education institutions wish to maintain their practices by resisting the corrupting influence of external goods through exercising virtues such as courage, justice and truthfulness, it is relevant to consider an institution rather than just the individuals within institutions as having the capacity to exercise virtues. Highly relevant to this discussion will be the perceptions and experiences of individual practitioners and it is to this concept of the virtuous professional that I now turn.

3.3 Policy Context: Higher Education and CEL

3.3.1 The Higher Education and Research Act (2017): Promoting the consumer-producer dynamic.

In 2018, the Conservative UK Government published the “Higher Education and Research Act (2017)”. Two of the aims of this proposal were: to create a market in Higher Education and to merge nine research councils, UK wide, into a single public body, namely, United Kingdom Research and Innovation (UKRI). The Conservative Government sought to create competition between providers by enabling alternative providers to enter the university sector with the rationale that:

Competition between providers in any market incentivises them to raise their game, offering consumers a greater choice of more innovative and better quality products and services at lower cost. Higher education is no exception. (UK Government, 2016b, p.8)

It was argued that creating competition would, boost “social mobility, life chances and opportunity for all, and enhance the competitiveness and productivity of our economy”(UK Government, 2016a, p.1). The Conservative UK government sought to promote the establishment and expansion of private universities along with tripling university tuition fees to £9000 a year for undergraduate degrees in England. Jo Johnson, the Minister of State for Universities at the time, alluded to this with explicit language used to describe higher education institutions as competitive businesses:

Students’ perception of value for money is continuing to fall. In the Higher Education Policy Institute student experience survey published last month, just 37% of student respondents felt that they received good value for money. That was down from 53% in 2012. We need to address the fact that many students are starting to ask whether university is worth it. Many employers have similar questions when they look at the labour market mismatch in our
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economy. While employers are suffering skills shortages, especially in high-skilled STEM areas, at least 20% of graduates are in non-professional roles three and a half years after graduating. If the students who are paying for the system and the taxpayers who are underwriting it are not completely satisfied, the market needs help to adapt. (Hansard HC Deb, 2016)

Jo Johnson’s comments make many assumptions: more graduates need to be in professional roles (presumably so they may earn enough to begin to pay back their student loans); more students need to be studying STEM subjects so they may fill skills shortages in the UK; universities in their current form are not trusted to offer the kind of quality education that taxpayers and students expect for their money; and more generally, distilling the relationship between societies and their universities to a simple consumer-producer dynamic is desirable. All of these assumptions are highly problematic and would be likely to affect certain academic disciplines and university programmes more acutely than others. The impact of enacting such attitudes and beliefs into law has a detrimental impact on Higher Education: the value of university programmes which are not explicitly vocational is depreciated because their economic value is not explicit enough; trust between communities and their universities are further eroded; anxiety around “experts” heightened; and expectations, appropriate only in a market relationship, are applied to universities and their students.

As education is a devolved power in Scotland (Riddell, 2022; The Scottish Parliament, n.d.), the Act’s reach in Scotland was limited to the effects of merging of the research councils into the UKRI. Tuition for Higher Education in Scotland remains free of charge for all students. However, convincing arguments have been made which question the effectiveness of this policy for widening participation to universities and promoting social mobility (Blackburn, 2022; Minty, 2022) Attitudes and expectations towards value for money and Higher Education do not cease at the border between Scotland and England, and if markers of success focus heavily on employability, then taxpayers in Scotland may likewise wonder whether greater competition would not similarly help Scottish higher education institutions to “up their game”. The accountability of universities to the communities around them, and specifically students and taxpayers, is an important dynamic to explore. The next
section will consider this through the concepts of the “third mission” and the Civic University.

3.3.2 The Civic University

I have already identified that “third mission” of universities has been interpreted in different ways but is broadly defined as “the engagement of university with societal needs: a role to be added to the two traditional missions of teaching and research” (Molas-Gallart, 2004, p.75). In the previous chapter, I explored how the “third mission” of universities alongside the other two missions (teaching and research), in the current policy context of Scottish education, is being interpreted within a more economistic model than has been the case historically. Top-down drivers for knowledge exchange, including the Scottish University Innovation Fund, interpret the “third mission” as the kind of knowledge exchange which can be translated into short-term national economic profit. This is a narrow interpretation which also conflates the ideas of national economic health with the well-being of its citizens. As I have argued, following Drèze and Sen (2010); Diener and Seligman (2004), economic growth correlates poorly with variables such as zero carbon initiatives, political liberty, stable democracies, and health and education.

Stefan Collini (2012, p.7) proposes that the modern university should retain at least the following four characteristics:

1. That it provides some form of post-secondary-school education, where ‘education’ signals something more than professional training.

2. That it furthers some form of advanced scholarship or research whose character is not wholly dictated by the need to solve immediate practical problems.

3. That these activities are pursued in more than just one single discipline or very tightly defined cluster of disciplines.

4. That it enjoys some form of institutional autonomy as far as its intellectual activities are concerned.

With reference to Collini’s list, Kagan and Diamond (2019, p.4) argue that the “Third Mission” of universities has been omitted along with any activities which encourage knowledge-based interactions between HEIs and groups in the business, public, and non-profit sectors, as well as the general public.
These interactions, according to Kagan and Diamond, are necessary for contributing solutions to immediate societal issues, which is also a necessary characteristic of a modern university.

Echoing this attitude of university accountability, the Civic University Commission (2019) report highlighted the fact that, directly or indirectly, over half of university funding comes from taxpayers and so universities should be made more accountable to their local communities and make more effort to justify the benefits that they bring (2019, p.6). How this is enacted in practice is important: will this mean universities “giving back” or “giving to” communities in top-down initiatives that can potentially patronise? Furthermore, the language used at the institutional level is potentially problematic. Crowther (2004) of lifelong learning seems applicable in this context too:

lifelong learning contributes to redefining citizens as consumers in the market place rather than political actors in the public arena. To meet these challenges, public services are being reorganized along the lines of the private sector and market-driven systems of performance. (Crowther, 2004, p.129)

In this context, universities, or more specifically academic staff within universities, will be required to commodify their activity, thus justifying what they do against largely economic criteria. This kind of rhetoric amplifies public concern about whether HEIs present good value for money with “value” firmly focussed on outputs that translate to economic value.

The Civic University Commission (2019) report, which was commissioned by the UPP Foundation (a charity promoting partnership and innovation between the higher education sector and communities) criticises universities’ tendencies to prioritise their status in the national and global arena first, but local last. The report encourages institutions to not only consider becoming civically engaged but also committing to becoming a “Truly Civic University” which requires more strategic planning towards clearly defined goals which will benefit the local community.
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Another point of concern broached by the Civic University Commission (2019) report is the warning of an uncertain future:

[W]e now stand on the cusp of another industrial revolution. If estimates on the job shifts from automation are correct, this will have seismic effects around the country – particularly when combined with an ageing population. How are universities going to help people adapt? (Civic University Commission, 2019, p.7).

This extract presents two critical points: first, acquiring skills to make progress in science and technology may well lead to job shifts in automation, especially if the UK follows the USA and Japan in the shrinking of their humanities departments (Churchwell, 2014; Preston, 2015).

The UK and the Scottish Governments’ drive to increase the uptake of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) subjects has led to the decline in the uptake of humanities and social science subjects at school followed by a decline in applications for these subjects at university (Busby, 2018; The British Academy, 2018). Second, if education policy changes are principally driven by a government’s prioritisation of short-term economic profit, then this may be damaging for democracy:

Education based mainly on profitability in the global market magnifies these deficiencies, producing a greedy obtuseness and a technically trained docility that threaten the very life of democracy itself (Nussbaum, 2010 p. 142).

Stefan Collini (2012) echoes this in his work “What are universities for?” by arguing that:

A society does not educate the next generation in order for them to contribute to its economy. It educates them in order that they should extend and deepen their understanding of themselves and the world, acquiring […] kinds of knowledge and skill which will be useful in their eventual employment, but which will no more be the sum of their education than that employment will be the sum of their lives. (Collini, 2012, p.91)

One can imagine the impact on the landscape of Higher Education should policy call for focus on short-term economic profit. Activities that are deemed to be unprofitable or to have impact which is not immediately quantifiable, might be downgraded. Funding for activities such as widening participation, increasing diversity, and promoting inclusion might no longer be seen as a priority.
One issue arising from the requirement to justify public spending might be the problem of measuring impact and how this may favour non-humanities subjects which may have more quantifiable research outputs and may consequently find it easier to evidence impact. Furthermore, if there is a strong bias towards research that is “useful”, immediately practical, and able to be installed and applied, then once again humanities subjects may seem obscure, esoteric and not “useful” in the same way that, technology or applied medical science, for example, might be.

In this section I have attempted to demonstrate some of the challenges facing universities today. Combined with the pressure to generate income, universities are increasingly positioned within a consumer-producer dynamic with the need to demonstrate value for money to tax-payers and prospective students. I have argued that this value is defined by market-orientated objectives; the outputs of higher education institutions that are valued by the current government focus around increasing short-term economic profit. Public perception of the value of Higher Education calls into question whether higher education institutions are spending taxpayers’ money wisely. While a cost benefit analysis is a rational way to evaluate the effectiveness of institutions, without carefully considering all of the costs and all of the benefits, the benefits of a higher education will be reduced to only those which are market orientated. My argument is for the promotion of instrumental skills and knowledge as well as the intrinsic value of studying all degrees in the same way that there is intrinsic value to studying degrees which lead more directly to vocational employment. Here I use “intrinsic” in the sense of non-instrumental value (O’Neill, 1992; Phemister, 2016). Reflecting on applicable skills in a CEL placement might be one effective way of achieving such balance.

Universities which are heavily focussed on economic ends, are not sufficient for individual students, academic staff, or the communities of which they are a part. For a socially just democracy, and a functioning society, there are more profound reasons for teaching and learning at a higher education institution than just supporting students to gain employability skills to contribute to the national economy.
In the next section, I will explore the role of practitioners in a university and how they might contribute to a university supporting an ultimate purpose for the common good.

### 3.4 The virtuous professional

Imagine the fate of the teacher struggling to be self-full in the midst of a task that is overwhelming, an environment that can be deadening, and a professional culture that secretly prizes self-abnegation. (Higgins, 2010, P.189)

In order to resist the corrupting power of institutions and the prioritisation of external goods, MacIntyre argues that we require the guidance of virtues which include “justice, courage and truthfulness” (2007, p.194) in our professional practice. The relationship between professional practices and institutions is very relevant to a discussion on who and what universities should be for. I have already argued that a university which makes (virtue) ethically sound decisions must first reflect on the ultimate purpose it supports.

### 3.4.1 Self-abnegation and vocation hegemony

In the following section, I develop my argument for a virtue-ethical approach (section 3.2.1.2) by maintaining that supporting individual flourishing should include academic staff supporting their own flourishing too. I will also explore how the idea of the virtuous professional could be conceived within the specific context of a university. This section will discuss how the abstract concepts of the common good, supporting individual flourishing and the virtuous professional could be realised in practice. I will discuss the concept of civic-mindedness and how this might comprise part of the practice of a virtuous professional. In other words, if we wish to support students to act for the common good and flourish as individuals, what would this mean in terms of the kinds of knowledge we value in our institutions?
As I have argued above in section 2.3, on a structural level, there are few top-down drivers that might incentivise higher education institutions in Scotland to engage with third mission activity that is not restricted to research innovation and knowledge exchange that can be monetised to boost the national economy. On an institutional being a virtuous professional or a good teacher can be conceived within a false dichotomy.

Teachers, Chris Higgins argues (2010, p.190), must move beyond a false dichotomy of either being selfless, dutiful and caring or selfish and pursing their own personal agenda rather, that they:

> must bring to the table their own achieved self-cultivation, their commitment to ongoing growth, and their various practices, styles, and tricks for combating the many forces that deaden the self and distract us from our task of becoming. (2010, p.190)

Kreber (2016b) argues that a heavily target-orientated work environment contributes to creating a culture of inauthenticity. For Kreber (2015, p.99), in an education context, the virtues of authenticity and *phronēsis* are also required alongside courage, justice and truthfulness. Authenticity, Kreber (Kreber, 2016a, p.16) argues involves two dimensions: adhering to personal choice *and* committing oneself to a community’s shared beliefs, values and traditions. In being inauthentic, professionals heavily prioritise one dimension over another. This includes a propensity for self-sacrifice and self-abnegation where professionals, in this case academic staff, are vulnerable to hegemonic oppression (Brookfield, 2005b).

Philosopher Daniel Farnham (2006), has written on the subject of self-sacrifice and questions the commonly held belief that a commendable and virtuous person is one who is concerned for others even at the sacrifice of their own well-being. This is because they may be indirectly harming the very people for whom they are supposed to be caring by losing a sense of themselves.

> To be commendable, one’s service to others must be performed in a way that fully recognizes one’s own worth and distinctiveness [...] Self-sacrifice cannot be commendable if it springs from self-abnegation [...] Real care for others
looks and feels much different from any socially encouraged, self-damaging imitation (Farnham, 2006, p.66-67).

For Farnham, commendable, authentic altruism is morally permissible because it stems from a kind of love which unites the individual with the people they are trying to help; the individual believes that what is good for them will also be good for others. In other words, their service to others is borne out of a profound sense of unity with their fellow human beings and their actions do not involve thoughtless sacrifice. This is similar to the way in which MacIntyre (1999b) describes the task of education as cultivating an inclination towards both the common good and our individual goods, so that we become neither self-rather-than-other-regarding nor other-rather-than self-regarding, neither egoists nor altruists, but those whose passions and inclinations are directed to what is both our good and the good of others. Self-sacrifice, it follows, is as much of vice, as much of a sign of inadequate moral development, as selfishness. (MacIntyre, 1999b, p.160)

We have described MacIntyre’s location of human goods within shared practices where he argues that by acting for such common goods, humans achieve real excellence (Knight, 2007, p102) but he also places the importance of pursuing goods for oneself. MacAllister (2016a, p.534) argues that rather than promoting pure altruism, MacIntyre advocates “just generosity” which requires identifying who in a community is most in need and what meaningful assistance might entail.

Writers such as Stephen Brookfield (2005a) have highlighted this kind of colluded conformity as hegemonic because staff feel that they are working out of a sense of duty rather than as a result of critical reflection. Brookfield (2005b) discusses the inner conflict of an individual who views their employment as a teacher not only as a means to generate income but also as a professional fulfilling a vocation. This notion is accompanied by a sense of selflessness by aiming for commendable goals such as helping others, accomplishing a duty or railing against global capitalism. On the other hand, Brookfield (2005b, p.100) argues, the idea of fulfilling a vocation can become hegemonic if it promotes self-sacrifice and self-abnegation and leaves the individual vulnerable to exploitation and manipulation:

Vocation becomes hegemonic when it is used to justify workers taking on responsibilities and duties that far exceed their energy or capacities and that
destroy their health and personal relationships. In effect their self-destruction
serves to keep a system going that is being increasingly starved of resources.
If educators will kill themselves taking on more and more work in response to
budgets being cut and if they learn to take pride in this apparently selfless
devotion to students, then the system is strengthened (Brookfield, 2005b,
p101)

Brookfield challenges vocational hegemony through the lens of feminism by arguing
that female academic staff are more likely to internalise this ethic of vocation and be
expected to nurture their students more than their male colleagues. As a result, they
spend less time devoting themselves to the kind of activity that might strengthen their
chances of promotion or other institutional recognition.

3.4.2 Civic-mindedness across disciplines

So far, I have argued that the ultimate purpose of universities should be to support
individual flourishing, critical thinking and acting for the common good, then one way
of putting this into practice could involve academic staff cultivating their own
identities as civic-minded professionals as well as, and through, cultivating civic-
mindedness in their students. The concept of civic-mindedness in graduates and
professionals has been defined in various ways but common to most, is the idea of a
will to be involved in the community combined with notions of responsibility and
acting for the common good (Bowes et al., 1996, Bringle and Steinberg, 2010). The
concept of developing civic-minded graduates aligns with what I have argued is the
ultimate purpose a university should support.

Kreber argues that universities i.e., their staff, should support students in developing
their “authentic professional identities” (Kreber 2016, p.8) which necessitate self-
cultivation, as opposed to thoughtless self-sacrifice, whilst becoming enablers of
democracy. This is compatible with Walker and MacLean’s idea of the public-good

My use of the term “professionals” and students as future “professionals” is broad
and inclusive. Naturally it includes students studying on vocational programmes
which can directly result in qualifications, which allow them to practice a profession such as medicine, law, education or social work, for example. However, all degree programmes have the potential to prepare students for positions that are influential in their communities, for example community activists, local business leaders, politicians, and academics. In the next section, I will consider how the current policy and political context of a higher education institution influences how some discipline areas are prioritised over others. I will argue that within the framework of cultivating civic-mindedness, this prejudice undermines contributions towards the ultimate purpose a university should support.

Within a context of the consumer-producer dynamic supported by policies such as the Higher Education Research Act (2017) it becomes necessary to justify the existence of non-vocational arts and humanities degrees which do not obviously lead to a profession. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the UK Government illustrated this explicitly in their poster of a ballerina with the text “Fatima’s next job could be in cyber. (she just doesn’t know it yet)” (Thomas, 2020). With this campaign, during a global health crisis, professionals who did not directly support the national economy or security were encouraged to retrain. This undermined the 257 million pounds of Covid-19 support funding for arts organisations that had been confirmed at that time. The campaign sought to fill a cyber-security talent gap in the UK, but instead became symbolic of the stark juxtaposition of professions and training that were immediately “useful” to the state, and those which were not. A campaign like this further feeds the sentiment that arts and humanities degree do not offer students “value for money” in the long or short term.

Earlier in this chapter, I highlighted Kreber’s (2016, p.33) argument that critical being, as opposed to critical thinking on its own, is the prerequisite for cultivating social responsibility and moral obligation in graduates. For Kreber (2016), expertise, rooted in scientific knowledge that is made up of specialised knowledge and skills, is needed to perform tasks associated with predetermined outcomes. The recent prioritisation of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) education to the detriment of humanities subjects (Busby, 2018, The British
Academy, 2018), highlights the valuing of instrumental knowledge over communicative and emancipatory knowledge, which Kreber associates with the discipline areas of the humanities (Kreber 2016, p.2).

It has been reported recently that the UK Government’s drive to increase the uptake of STEM subjects, and for greater advances in science and engineering, are largely motivated by the prioritisation of short-term economic profit (Busby, 2018). For some authors however, debates about arts and STEM education exist within a false dichotomy: Perignat and Katz-Buonincontro (2019) and Colucci-Gray et. al. (2017) argue for “STEAM” education the “A” of which represents the arts. While what the “arts” encompasses exactly in this context has not been agreed upon “‘arts’, ‘art’, ‘arts-based’ and ‘creative’ in education without conceptual clarity”, Colucci-Gray et. al. argue that arts should be integrated into STEM education for three main reasons: Firstly, there are arguments that the arts and creative approaches will contribute to the effectiveness of STEM education. Secondly, that the inclusion of the arts emphasises the possibility of multi and trans-disciplinary practices, reflecting long-held, historical, social, and educational views of the arts and sciences as naturally connected. This supports Davie’s argument from *The Crisis of the Democratic Intellect*:

> The most important side of any department of knowledge is the side on which it comes into contact with every other department. To insist on this is the true function of humanism’ (Davie, 1986, p.15)

Thirdly, it identifies the value of the arts in promoting an engagement with ‘the human condition’, the values we collectively espouse, and the productive exploration of controversial issues. (Colucci-Gray et. al. 2017, p.13)

Similarly, authors such as American philosopher Martha Nussbaum (1997, 2010) and Richard Pring (2015) emphasise the promotion of the humanities. "Cultivating humanity" is a concept promoted by Nussbaum (1997) who argues that, if we continue to prioritise other discipline areas such as science, technology and engineering, over the humanities, then we are failing to safeguard that which is imperative to establishing a fair, compassionate and equitable society: democracy.
Nussbaum agrees that a modern democracy requires a strong economy, which is a means to human ends but cannot be an end in itself (Nussbaum, 2010). Therefore, according to Nussbaum, a disproportionate emphasis on education, as a means to acquiring economic profit, is short-sighted, and damaging to society in the longer term.

Studying the humanities, Nussbaum (1997) contends, is a way to help graduates foster empathy through narrative imagination, critical thinking through Socratic self-examination, and understand their responsibility as a citizen of the world. Thus, Nussbaum argues that, in the classroom, we can foster critical thinking; an in-depth appreciation of other religions and cultures; and the ability to empathise with someone who is different to ourselves. Therefore, Nussbaum upholds the humanities as the most appropriate discipline area to bring about and/or sustain a healthy democracy.

Regarding the education of children, Pring (2015, p.2) similarly argues that, pursued in an appropriate way, classical subjects can educate on “what it means to be human and how that humanity at its best can be pursued”. More broadly he argues that education in general should have a moral dimension:

the possession of particular values, the exercise of certain virtues, and a moral seriousness - which should shape and direct their learning as engineers, as physicians, as nurses and as college graduates (Pring 2013, p.44)

These skills align closely with Kreber’s (2016) concept of cultivating civic-mindedness, and indeed the majority of the members of parliament within the UK parliament have always traditionally studied humanities subjects:

The ruling elite have humanities degrees because they can do critical thinking, they can test premises, they can think outside the box, they can problem-solve, they can communicate, they don’t have linear, one-solution models with which to approach the world. You won’t solve the problems of religious fundamentalism with a science experiment (Preston, 2015).
Preston’s (2015) argument seems to align with Kreber’s (2016) by arguing that instrumental knowledge alone is not enough for students to face challenges in an unknown future.

Kreber (2016, p.154) also argues that when civic-minded educators bring students face to face with ambiguous and multifaceted problems, it allows students and staff to reflect on the status quo and question dominant ideology- emancipatory knowledge. This argument also supports Nussbaum’s (1997) assertion that the humanities along with other more obviously vocational disciplines, are required for a healthy democracy, as they can in cultivate future leaders who can be compassionate, empathetic, and civic-minded. Unfortunately, in the UK, there is very little evidence that this is the case.

Even with a ruling elite who has been schooled in the humanities, the UK is unequal by international standards and has one of the highest Gini coefficients in Europe (Joyce and Xu, 2019). One only needs to examine the consequences of austerity-induced welfare reforms enacted by the Conservative government since 2010 (Fetzer, 2019), to question whether the ruling elite could be considered civic-minded despite most of them having studied the humanities. Kreber (2016) agrees that studying the humanities alone prepares graduates inadequately to deal with real-world issues:

[H]umanities programmes tend to be too one-sidedly concerned with the critical and abstract and often neglect making explicit how the critical, analytical and interpretive skills they help develop are of relevance to the world, let alone the varied work contexts many of our graduates will enter into (Kreber 2016, p.2).

To complement instrumental knowledge and the study of the humanities, Kreber (2016) argues that “action-orientated pedagogies” should be considered.

3.4.3 Action-orientated pedagogy and The Third Mission

In this section, I highlight CEL activity as pedagogy which can make a significant contribution to the third mission of universities and therefore support its ultimate
purpose. Boland (2014, p.181) describes Service-learning as a “pedagogy for civic engagement” which aims to actively involve students in the learning process by encouraging them to reflect and engage critically with the community or civic domain, fostering an active exploration of broader civic and social concerns within the context of their academic studies. More specifically, writers such as Doberneck (2007) and McIlrath (2018) conceptualise CEL as a kind of “border pedagogy”, a term originated by Giroux (1991, p.51) who argued that the this pedagogy promotes the idea of “boundary-crossing” which implies acts of transgression, where established borders rooted in domination can be questioned and redefined. It also highlights the necessity of creating educational conditions that encourage students to become boundary-crossers, which involves empowering students to explore beyond the confines of established boundaries.

Part of the appeal of a professional doctoral degree in education is exploring the linkages between abstract concepts and principles and my own professional practice as an educator within Higher Education. For me personally, it is important not only to consider the ultimate purpose universities should support, but also how this might be achieved practically, in my own institutional context, and within the wider policy and political context of Scottish education. CEL has the potential to offer experiences and opportunities which students are far less likely to experience in a traditional delivery setting. In *Experience and Education* (first published in 1938) Dewey (1966, p.89) argues that “education in order to accomplish its ends both for the individual learner and for society must be based upon experience”. This idea of education and action crosses different theoretical paradigms. I will not attempt to explore these concepts in depth but merely highlight what may be a common thread running throughout them.

As Dewey (1966) contends merely offering students experiences without reflection or structure does not constitute progressive education. This idea is compatible with Butin’s assertion that some forms of CEL may do more harm than good: some experiences offered in an educational setting may only serve to enforce negative stereotypes and fail to challenge students’ taken-for-granted assumptions (Butin,

> the ancient vita activa has become unrecognisable: action has been all but forgotten, work has largely become an extension of labour, and labour itself, once held in contempt, is now valorised. (Higgins, 2011, p.92)

According to Kreber, professional education within action-orientated pedagogy means “not just a matter of performing at a certain level of technical proficiency but has ethical and social dimensions” (2016a, p.139). Arendt distinguishes between three types of thinking: “abstract reasoning, technical reasoning and representative thinking” (Arendt, 2003). Thinking and judgement without Arendtian action involves limited forms of isolated thinking, which do not account for the opinions of others. It is only through real encounters and conflicts with the opinions of others that prudent judgements can be made. This idea of encountering the wider community, of deliberating with individuals outside of the walls of one’s institution is important here. While similar to Nussbaum’s (1997) idea of “narrative imagination” in its focus on empathy, representative thinking involves Arendtian-action and real-life encounters and cannot be achieved merely by reading a book.

Based on this literature, my interpretation of action-orientated pedagogy is one which necessitates learning beyond textbooks and classrooms. By facilitating encounters that disrupt students’ assumptions about concepts such as social justice and fairness, spaces where there is irresolution and ambiguity about ethical decision-making, can be created.

In the contemporary world, with its brutal geography of increasing inequality it has become too easy to know others by watching a film, reading a book, sitting next to them on the subway, wearing another’s style of clothes, vacationing in foreign country, or taking on an alternative identity in an online chat room. Community service is an embodied encounter, noisy and “morally
ambiguous" (cf. Duneier)-a noisy encounter that often does and should agitate us, teachers and students. (Himley, 2004, p.433)

Similarly, in The Nicomachean Ethics Aristotle argues that theoria (theoretical or contemplative activity) is the best use of our minds but his consideration of phronësis (practical wisdom) and praxis (action) strongly suggests that theoria alone is not enough for humans to live a fulfilled life. Hughes (2013) reconciles these apparently opposing ideas thusly:

[T]he principles which we use in our moral decision-making are theoretical, even though the use to which those principles are put is practical (Hughes 2013, p.48).

From this reasoning, I once again infer that contemplating a fulfilling life for ourselves and others, and empathising with others is not enough, one must take action. Hughes (2013 interprets Aristotle’s definition of action as:

how the agent describes or sees their behaviour at the time, and draws no particular line between an action and its consequences. […] The good person knows what to have in mind when acting, and why to have precisely those considerations and no others in mind (Hughes 2013, 120).

Therefore, I maintain that a capacity for contemplating a flourishing life for oneself and one’s community for the common good, must be complemented by practical experiences and messy encounters on which students can reflect critically.

Nussbaum’s (1997) argument that teaching humanities subjects is uniquely placed to support the cultivation of humanity in students is overstated, but perhaps purposefully so. Such an argument provides a counterbalance against the overwhelming narrative that frames some degrees and professions as useful (STEM) and others (Arts and Humanities) as much less so. Following a very broad consideration of different theories of action in education, I assert that purely theoretical contemplation in any discipline area is inadequate. Evidently there is a gap between philosophical contemplation and forging a plan to take action.

The importance of cultivating civic-minded students traverses discipline boundaries. Within a university, cultivating civic-mindedness which relates to supporting flourishing and the acting for the common good, is relevant for academic staff across
all disciplines. However, I agree with Kreber that, regardless of the discipline, fostering instrumental skills and practical know-how is not enough; a critically reflective, experiential approach is also required.

As an education professional it is important, according to Kreber (2016) to cultivate graduates who not only have an awareness of, and inclination towards being involved in one’s own community, but also an “openness to experience and moral commitment” and “responsible community engagement”. Furthermore, future professionals facing real-world challenges will also require the capacity to cope with “uncertainty, unpredictability, challengeability and contestability” (Kreber 2016, p.46). The need to be able to deal with uncertainty and complexity echoes the report by the Civic University Commission (2018) mentioned above, which highlights the fact that universities have responsibility to prepare students for future challenges.

The complexity of these challenges, Kreber suggests, is exacerbated by the realisation that “instrumental knowledge” alone is inadequate. We could infer from this that problems facing society have always been complex, and have always been multifaceted, but they carried with them the hope that more advanced technology and the fruits of “instrumental knowledge” would resolve them. Certainly, as Kreber contends, there have been advances resulting from “instrumental knowledge” that have improved lives, in healthcare for example. Yet many difficult issues remain that cannot be addressed by instrumental knowledge alone and cannot satisfactorily account for how students, as future professionals, will cope with moral dilemmas, confront injustice, and if necessary, challenge the status quo.

As academic staff, virtuous practice, which resists the corrupting tendency of institutions to prioritise external goods, requires more than designing degree programmes which have a primary focus on producing employable citizens who can directly contribute to enhancing the national economy. It is also not helpful to prioritise fostering students’ instrumental knowledge over communicative and emancipatory knowledge. In order to cultivate individual flourishing and critically
reflective thinking for the common good, the approach taken should be multi-disciplinary and action-orientated.

These ideas support my argument that there is a need to offer opportunities for students to experience what Himley refers to as “embodied encounters” (Himley, 2004) through CEL activities. I argue that this kind of activity is valuable in both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, so that learners can reflect on the multi-faceted challenges of the modern world and the effect their actions may have on it.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented the current higher education policy context of Scotland and the UK and argued that this has highlighted a consumer-producer dynamic between higher-education institutions and their communities (specifically students and tax payers). This presents a narrow view of what universities are for and how they can be useful to their wider communities. Aside from the primary missions of research and teaching, the third mission is then largely relegated to a form of knowledge exchange and innovation which is measured by economistic means and contributes to short term economic profit. I have argued that this trend is damaging to the aims of a progressive nation which do not only include economic goals but also social equality, life satisfaction, a stable democracy, individual well-being and political liberty for all its citizens.

Universities should support individual flourishing and critical thinking, with the focus on its emancipatory potential, for the common good. I have explored two main views on what human flourishing might entail from Nussbaum’s capability theory to MacIntyre’s idea of cultivating virtues within a community with a shared moral understanding. In arguing for the importance of supporting independent, critical thinking and acting for the common good, I have emphasised the emancipatory potential of this action by highlighting that emancipatory knowledge (as well as instrumental and communicative knowledge) gives individuals the means to critique
and challenge the status quo. From a review of the literature, I have demonstrated that current institutional and national policy aims do not align with this ultimate purpose.

As reflected in the priorities of UK and Scottish Government education policy, universities are in danger of veering ever further off course towards a future which compromises the aims of a progressive nation. If we are to challenge this mindset, institutions need to support individuals and communities to develop a clear teleological basis for their decision-making. They need to support civic-minded professionals and graduates across all disciplines, acknowledging the potential of action-orientated pedagogy, such as CEL, to contribute to a university’s third mission and therefore supporting an ultimate purpose. A university supporting an ultimate purpose is of course underpinned by authentic professionalism. Imposing economic aims on higher education institutions undermines authentic professionalism. As such, institutional support of staff and action-orientated pedagogy becomes crucial if authentic professionalism and the ultimate purpose is to be effectively supported.
4 Critical Literature Review Summary

4.1 Introduction

My aim in this research project is to investigate the individual, institutional and structural-level factors which shape the experiences and perceptions of academic staff who are involved with CEL activities. Consistent with Margaret Archer’s theory of Morphogenesis within critical realism (see section 5.4.2), I argue that the experiences and perceptions of academic staff influence and are influenced by underlying causal mechanisms. These mechanisms are both cultural and structural. To use Bhaskar’s critical realist terminology, the experiences and perceptions occupy the “empirical domain” (events that are actually observed and experienced) (Bhaskar, 2008, p.46). As my research project forms part of a professional doctoral thesis, it is rooted in practice and has a transformative intention as well as being personally intellectually satisfying. Therefore, I am compelled to find the “emancipatory potential” (Bhaskar, 1986) of my research findings; it is necessary for me not only to describe the experiences and perceptions of academic staff but also to explore these events and their underlying causal mechanisms with transformative intent: to contribute to positive change in institutional policy.

In the following section I synthesise the preceding literature review representing three analytical levels: individual, institutional and structural. This will foreground the experiences and perceptions explored in the data collected from academic staff and inform the ensuing analysis and discussion of the findings.

4.2 Summary of Critical Literature Review

From my review of the literature, it is clear that SL is widely practised and researched in the United States (US). Related to this, CEL is increasingly used as a term both synonymous and distinct from SL. Following a literature search on CEL (including SL) since 2000, I established that there was a paucity of research on CEL in the United Kingdom (UK). On one hand, this was unsurprising given that CEL was
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not widely practised within the UK, in contrast to the USA where national SL
organisations (Campus Compact) have existed since the 1960s. On the other hand, I
expected a more widespread, national commitment to CEL in the UK, and
specifically Scotland, given its historical commitment to university-community
engagement and the Scottish Government’s claim that it is a progressive nation.
However, this expectation was not met.

I explored Scottish university-community engagement through the lens of ideas such
as an Educated Public and the Democratic Intellect as conceived by Scottish
respectively. Following MacIntyre and Davie, I argued that democratic engagement
with the wider society is an aspect of a civil society that seeks to cultivate
compassionate and critical individuals and that this could be applied to the context of
Scottish Higher Education Institutions.

Universities have emancipatory potential, operating as sites of critique and debate
on social issues, respecting the potential of both the well-educated and those from
less educated backgrounds to engage in reasoned deliberation. Doing so would
allow power to be shared more equally amongst those who are privileged enough to
acquire a high level of education and qualifications and those less traditionally
qualified but equally entitled to meaningful representation.

I explored the literature on CEL in a Scottish context and argued that there is a clear
gap. For policy and historical reasons, Scotland offered a related but distinct context
from the English and UK context, with which it has been conflated by some writers.
Historically, the founding of some ancient Scottish Universities was grounded in
achieving its “third mission”. In Scotland today, structural and institutional-level
influences have created a contemporary interpretation of the third mission which is
much narrower and prioritises an economistic model of education. With this,
indicators of a progressive nation, which Scotland claims to be, are assumed to be
automatic products of enhanced economic, national wealth.
Analysis of source literature suggests that a university’s ultimate purpose is not just to enhance a nation’s short term economic wealth but also to support individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good. I concluded that CEL could be a key contributor to a university’s third mission and that Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics aligns well with this. Other ethical theories such as utilitarianism, and deontological approaches are less appropriate: utilitarianism reflects the prevailing culture in our society which has left the third mission largely neglected while deontological approaches promote the kind of professional self-sacrifice that virtue-ethics, with its emphasis on individual flourishing for the common good, does not.

Using the MacIntyrean (2007) notion of an institution, I identified that external goods (such as wealth, status and power) were necessary to sustain the practices within an institution, however a balance was needed. Evidence from the literature indicates that neglecting this ultimate purpose in favour of prioritising profit-orientated goals was potentially damaging to democracy and the aims of a progressive nation. Within this argument, supporting individual flourishing and critical thinking for the common good appears to be relevant to all discipline areas. Complementing the ideas of Critical Pedagogy (Giroux, 2011; Freire, 1998; Freire, 2005), this ultimate purpose was underpinned by the emancipatory dimension of teaching and learning and in turn, rooted in Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics through some of the ideas discussed by philosophers such as Martha Nussbaum (1997; 2011; 2010; 1992) and Alasdair MacIntyre (1987; 1990; 1999a; 1999b; 2007; 2016).

A virtue-ethics informed approach brings attention to the character of the practitioner and the feelings and motivation behind their actions. This paradigm therefore matches well with the overall aims of my study. It also is worth clarifying my stance on the need for an institution to pursue external goods without designating it as part of its ultimate purpose. Supporting an ultimate purpose as I have conceived it here is connected with Aristotle’s (2002) concept of telos and in the context of an institution, the reason for its existence and the fulfilment of its unique function. So, while pursuing wealth may be beneficial for the national economy, and perhaps ultimately
support individual flourishing etc., it itself is not the reason for a university to exist. For example, in cases where a university pursues wealth, which does not wholly support its ultimate purpose, I would argue that the action is ethically unsound.

A university’s ultimate purpose necessitates the cultivation of civic-minded graduates as well as the self-cultivation of university staff. Following Carolin Kreber (2016b), action, as opposed to theory on its own, was necessary in order for a university to realise its ultimate purpose. From the Critical Literature Review, I conclude that action-orientated pedagogy, such as CEL, could be key to this project.

Using MacIntyre’s schema of goods, practices and institutions, structural and institutional-level influences can be positioned as powerful factors in the success of a university supporting an ultimate purpose. Crucially, I have demonstrated how a lack of support, on these levels could severely undermine the progress of cultivating civic-mindedness and the goal of supporting individual flourishing and critical thinking for the common good.
5 Methodology and theoretical assumptions

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss the broad philosophical perspectives which informed this research project and how it aligns with my underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions about reality and knowledge. The purpose of this chapter is to justify decisions made about methodology for this research project. I will attempt to outline my process towards making decisions about which philosophical approaches to adopt and how this influenced practical decisions about research methods used in selection, data collection, and analysis. Finally, I will discuss how the philosophical approaches I aligned with allowed me to design a project and carry it out in a way that was as robust and methodologically congruent as possible.

5.2 Considering available research paradigms.

It is important from the outset to reflect on the nature of enquiry and the aforementioned assumptions which I was bringing to this research project, albeit in a limited way. Not doing so affects the quality of research: Mertens (2014, p.8) argues that, whilst it is very possible to conduct research whilst ignorant of our philosophical assumptions, this does not mean that we are free of assumptions, only that the assumptions are unobserved and undeclared. Working with assumptions which have not been subjected to scrutiny affects issues of truth, values and ethics which will be discussed later.

There are various approaches to taxonomising the various types of quantitative and qualitative research (Mertens, 2014; Guba and Lincoln, 1982; Crotty, 1998). While there is variation between these different taxonomies, Mertens (2014) and Guba and Lincoln (1982) agree that there are four paradigms: post positivism, constructivist, transformative/critical theory and pragmatic although other authors have named these categories in different ways. Mertens (2014, p.8) argues that “transformative” is a more appropriate umbrella term for a paradigm that includes theories such as critical theory and feminist theory, for example. In order to justify the approach used in this research project, it is necessary to map the journey towards making these
decisions first, by offering an initial overview of the continuum of paradigms I have inferred from the available literature.

One of the broadest conceptualisations of research paradigms can be found in Richard Pring’s (2000) paper on “False Dualism”. Here he simplifies the continuum with his nomenclature of Paradigm A and Paradigm B, which is useful here for highlighting those basic differences which are significant for this research project. I have summarised Pring’s (2000, p.251) distillation of opposing paradigms in the diagram below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paradigm A</th>
<th>Paradigm B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td>Reality is objective, single and independent.</td>
<td>Reality is a social construction of the mind, multiple and infinite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>Researcher and researched are separate.</td>
<td>Researcher and researched interact to produce findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truth</strong></td>
<td>Correspondence between research account and what is the case independent of researcher</td>
<td>Matter of consensus amongst informed and sophisticated constructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generalisability</strong></td>
<td>Assuming validity, results can be transferred from one setting to another.</td>
<td>Neither problem nor solution can be generalised from one setting to another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Pring’s simplified model there are two extremes: Paradigm A, often referred to as the positivist paradigm, with its naïve realist ontology and Paradigm B, often referred to as the social constructivist paradigm with its naïve idealist ontology (Mertens, 2014; Guba and Lincoln, 1982; Crotty, 1998).
On the extreme end of “A” is the positivist paradigm, which separates the researcher from the research, and where truth is defined as the correspondence between the research account and what is true in the absence of the researcher. As a result, some consider positivism to be closely associated with empiricism (Hammersley, 2013, p.25) with its refusal to develop knowledge claims beyond what can be completely substantiated by a specific type of evidence: that which is based on sensory experience that has been subjected to systematic control (Pring, 2000). It would be difficult to justify adopting this paradigm for my research project: as the researcher in this project, I am inexorably connected to the research participants as a colleague working in the same institution. Furthermore, with this qualitative study, it would be impossible to impose the level of systematic control considered necessary within the positivist paradigm.

On the very extreme “B” end of the continuum is the deconstructionist and postmodernist paradigm which Danermark, Ekström and Karlsson (2019, p.21) summarises as “all knowledge is infinitely relative and so it is meaningless to search for generally valid and true knowledge”. Therefore, within this world view, speaking or wishing to speak about "the real world" is either naïve or purposeless, and that we must only speak of how we comprehend or organise the real world. Porpora (2015, p.65) asserts that postmodernists are similarly dismissive of an overarching truth:

> many liberal thinkers are hostile to any kind of Truth with a big T, religious or otherwise. They see assertions of such Truth as “totalizing,” as repressive of alternate ways of thinking and seeing

It may be useful here to draw postmodernism back to its originator, Jean-Francois Lyotard’s definition of it as “incredulity towards metanarratives”(Lyotard, 1998, p.509). Only in a world composed solely of narratives, do possibilities for continued debate exist. So, while “postmodernism” can be considered a pejorative term amongst those who adopt a realist ontology, critical or otherwise, it is important not to reduce this complex movement to one facet: its ontological beliefs.

Adopting a postmodern approach implies that the accounts qualitative research generates have no more epistemic authority than any other accounts (Hammersley,
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2013, p.45). To those sceptical about the possibility of truth, Williams asks: “If you do not really believe in the existence of truth, what is the passion for truthfulness for?” (Williams, 2002, p.5). Williams considers the denial of truth contradictory and based on “confused formulations in the philosophy of language, in part derived from a mangling of Saussure”(Williams, 2002, p.6). Here, Williams refers to Saussure’s theory of semiotics where the relationship between a concept (signified) and sound image (signifier) is arbitrary. However, according to Williams it does not follow that there is no non-linguistic world outside of the text (see Popora’s scepticism towards Derrida and Baudrillard above). For clarity, I will attempt to contextualise this within my own research project: an institution might announce that they are giving all academic staff a 5% pay rise, but if inflation and cost of living increase by more than that then the staff are effectively receiving a pay cut. This is not the case of there being “two realities” in existence, but rather reference to the same reality (a member of staff having less disposable income) using different terms. I argue that, in the context of my research project, the idea of multiple, theory determined realities is problematic. Postmodernism's scepticism of social reality therefore makes it less appropriate for the creation of educational policies because this process must grounded in some kind of non-sceptical account of social reality.

Even in less radical incarnations of relativist paradigms, types of social constructionism, for example, the idea of multiple realities is problematic and puzzling. If there is no single reality, then does it follow some truths cannot be more verifiable, valid and worthy of respect than others? Guba and Lincoln argue that Naturalistic Inquiry, a specific form of qualitative research, should be held to a different set of standards from positivist research in order to establish rigor and trustworthiness i.e. “credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability” (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p.246). While aspects of these criteria are useful and will be discussed later on in the section on quality assurance, it is unclear how a researcher could pursue these criteria without the acknowledgement of a single reality that creates boundaries around what can be deemed credible, dependable and confirmable. The fact that there is an infinite number of ways in which we could divide up and classify the world does not entail that any kind of distinction is possible (Pring, 2000, p.254). It is this single reality, existing despite our knowledge of it,
which allows researchers to justify their findings and defend their conclusions, because it limits the kinds of interpretations which can be drawn. Here, I agree with sociologist Kristen Luker (2008) who argues that the pursuit of truth and objectivity are worthwhile, even when there is no expectation to fully achieve either:

> even the most radical, postmodernist, social constructionist Act-Up AIDS activist still wants to know if AZT works. In other words, sometimes we just need to know. (Luker, 2008 p.6)

Therefore, the focus on the detachment of the researcher from the researched and the need for methodical control within the positivist paradigm is unsatisfactory for the aims of this qualitative research project. A critical realist approach, which will be considered next, maintains that an objective reality exists but that our access to it is always mediated by the researcher’s own biases, assumptions and experiences. However, flawed and error-ridden though attempts to get at truth may be, outright denial that it exits, seems like a step too far. Similarly, the rejection of a single reality within the deconstructivist/postmodern paradigms, are incongruent with the aims of this research project.

### 5.3 A qualitative approach.

The aim of this research project is to explore how individual, institutional and structural factors influence the perceptions and experiences of academic staff involved with CEL. The data that was collected comprised interviews with practitioners, University leaders and managers, and documentary evidence. The purpose of this project was to investigate the practice of facilitating CEL at the university by generating themes from the data collected. Themes, according to Braun and Clarke (2022, p.77): capture a wide range of data that are united by, and evidence, a *shared* idea. The themes in my research project were generated and analysed through a Neo-Aristotelian, virtue ethics lens to interpret and explain existing staff practice and attitudes towards CEL.

According to Silverman (2017, p.7), there is no universally accepted definition of qualitative research and the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research is not always clear. Hammersley (2013, p.9) argues that, although “the
label ‘qualitative research’ covers a heterogeneous field”, there are no sufficient conditions which can be used to define qualitative research. He defines qualitative research in terms of how it differs from quantitative research:

*a form of social inquiry that tends to adopt a flexible and data-driven research design, to use relatively unstructured data, to emphasize the essential role of subjectivity in the research process, to study a small number of naturally occurring cases in detail, and to use verbal rather than statistical forms of analysis.* (Hammersley 2013, p.12)

From Hammersley and Silverman’s definitions, we could tentatively argue that the quantitative paradigm aligns with a realist ontology and epistemology i.e., a belief that there is a single, independent reality and that a researcher can objectively investigate this reality and unearth truth and facts. According to Silverman (2017, p.7) research within a quantitative paradigm is most appropriate for investigating these perceived social facts, making standardised and systematic comparisons and accounting for variance whereas qualitative research may be used for studying a phenomenon in detail.

Research in this area of academic staff and CEL often has utilised quantitative methods both on its own and within a mixed-methods approach. For example, Antonio, Astin and Cress (2000) analysed quantitative data gathered from 33,986 full time undergraduate teaching staff whereas Borkoski and Prosser (2019) used a four point scale survey combined with an experimentally controlled intervention; Colbeck and Wharton-Michael (2006) carried out a review on quantitative and mixed-methods studies to determine the individual and organisational factors that shape college and university faculty members’ motivation to engage in public scholarship, and Doberneck and Schweitzer (2017) quantitatively analysed data from academic staff’s RPT (Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure) application forms to ascertain disciplinary variations within public scholarship. Although these studies have been discussed in my literature review and provide a context for my own research, I would argue that the nature of the research questions differ from my own. Although there is a desire to interpret staff responses to a questionnaire and within an RPT application form, the data is analysed quantitatively. For example, what percentage of staff who engage in public scholarship are female, people of colour etc. (Colbeck and
Wharton-Michael, 2006) or which faculty are engaged in service? (Antonio, Astin and Cress, 2000). The research questions posed by these studies focused on testing hypothesis, measuring, counting or ranking and the analysis of documentary evidence was done so in a quantitative way for example, how many staff were engaged in credit course delivery and how often a certain activity was mentioned in staff application forms.

The difference between existing quantitative studies and my own lies not only in the methods used to collect and analyse data, but also in the consideration of the role of researcher. Within qualitative research, the role of the researcher, subjectivity and the need for reflexivity is highly significant.

It means turning of the researcher lens back onto oneself to recognise and take responsibility for one’s own situatedness within the research and the effect that it may have on the setting and people being studied, questions being asked, data being collected and its interpretation (Berger, 2015, p.220). The notion that data and conclusions that can be drawn from them are always modified by the researcher's social and personal qualities is accepted, sometimes even embraced. It is acknowledged that the effects of these are impossible to eradicate, and that they may both facilitate understanding and lead to error (Hammersley, 2013). I acknowledge that every decision I make as a researcher, from my design of the research project, to whom I invite to interview, to my interpretation of the findings, and the themes I generate from the data is influenced by my social and personal context. I am not objective but reflexivity can allow me to account for my subjectivity and offers a unique lens by which to generate themes through the research data. Reflexivity and the acknowledgement of the researcher’s inherent bias contributes to quality and rigour in qualitative research.

To summarise, there were three main reasons why I chose a qualitative approach: first, a qualitative approach was the most appropriate one for this research project by nature of the kind of questions I wished to explore. I wanted to understand the perspectives of academic staff to gain insight into the phenomenon of CEL within a single institution. These perspectives would be analysed within individual, institutional and structural factors of influence. I wanted to gain insight into the lived
experience of staff who voluntarily chose to facilitate CEL. The mechanistic and
numerical nature of quantitative research was not appropriate for a research project
exploring human perspectives on a phenomenon. Second, the driving force behind
this research project was a will to illuminate the work of academic staff facilitating
CEL, with their students, for the common good. I wanted to find out what kind of CEL
was already being done, why academic staff wanted to do it, and what their
experiences were of it. Finally, I acknowledge my active role as a researcher in this
project and how my experiences, values and inherent biases will affect every aspect
of the research process. Accounting for this through a reflexive approach will allow
the justification for my decisions and methods to be as robust as possible. In
conclusion, a qualitative approach was the most appropriate given the multifaceted
nature of perspectives from practitioners, University leaders and managers and
university literature.

5.4 A Critical Realist Approach
Moving away from Paradigm A and B in this section, I will consider approaches
within which the issues I identified in the previous section, may be reconciled. The
main umbrella term for these approaches is critical realism. The title of this section
uses the indefinite article to acknowledge that there are many types of critical realism
(CR) however, I refer in this chapter to Roy Bhaskar’s CR and specifically his
Transformational Model of Social Activity (TMSA). Bhaskar was the originator of CR
and while I do not deny that there are different types of CR to compare, the extent of
the difference between them does not justify a lengthy account of the different
versions of CR. In the latter part of this section, I will focus on Margaret Archer’s
(2020; 2013b; 1995) subsequent development of TMSA: Morphogenesis, which I will
argue is most relevant for the purposes of my study.

CR is metatheory which marries a realist ontology with a relativist epistemology
however, it is distinct from the type of “naïve realism” adopted in Paradigm A and the
“naïve idealism” of Paradigm B. Danermark, Ekström and Karlsson (2019, p.220)
argue that CR offers a “third way” distinct from empiricism/objectivism at one end
and relativism/idealism at the other, whilst asserting that critical realism: “is not a
conflation of, or a compromise between, these perspectives; it represents a standpoint in its own right.” The “critical” in CR signifies the belief that any attempt to understand and analyse the world is inevitably flawed (Scott, 2005). In other words, conclusions drawn from research can be wrong at any given time about its object and the usefulness of this knowledge will change in different contexts. In the next section, I will expand on the rejection of one dimensional empiricism, using Bhaskar’s theory of stratified reality.

Roy Bhaskar (2011; 2008), argued that reality could be stratified into three domains: the real, the actual and the empirical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Real</th>
<th>Domain of Actual</th>
<th>Domain of Empirical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-2: Bhaskar's Domains of Reality (Bhaskar, 2008, p.47)

Mingers’ (2004) diagram below (Figure 1.) offers a summary of Bhaskar’s three domains and how they interact with each other: (Mingers, 2004, p.94)
The empirical domain relates to what is directly experienced and observed, the actual domain relates to events (invisible or observable), and the real domain refers to causal structures and mechanisms that generate the events in the actual domain (Bhaskar, 2008, p.46). To illustrate this with a simple example: stress, dissatisfaction and overwork might be experienced by a member of staff (the empirical domain) and precarious contracts and lack of promotion may be some of the events causing this (the actual domain). However, examining this on a deeper structural level, the researcher could abstract that these events were merely the symptoms of invisible mechanisms and structures such as social inequality, capitalism etc. (the real domain).

According to Bhaskar, each domain is analytically distinct:

> events must occur independently of the experiences in which they are apprehended. Structures and mechanisms then are real and distinct from the patterns of events that they generate; just as events are real and distinct from the experiences in which they are apprehended. (Bhaskar, 2008, p.46)

Bhaskar argued against empirical realism and naïve idealism by proposing that these doctrines meant collapsing three domains into one, thereby reducing ontology (independent reality) to epistemology (what we can know about it), or in other words, reducing reality to only what one can know about the world. This, according to Bhaskar constitutes an epistemic fallacy. The invisible domain of the real is a significant aspect of Bhaskar’s CR and indeed it is relevant for this research project. A descriptive account of the perspectives of university staff on the aims and values of CEL would not take into account the events (the actual domain) which have informed their experiences (the empirical domain). I propose that a deeper analysis of the events in order to abstract the causal mechanisms and structures (the real domain) that give rise to them is necessitated by a CR approach. I attend to approach this aim through Reflexive Thematic Analysis, which I will account for later in this chapter. Rather than merely describing different perspectives through data analysis, a CR approach seeks to analyse, propose and explore underlying causes. More importantly, as a researcher, for the knowledge produced to have emancipatory potential in the real world, it is crucial that empirical events are not
merely described, but also analysed in the context of the mechanisms that may produce them.

5.4.1 Transitive and intransitive objects

Bhaskar (2008, p.6) clarifies that theories must be regarded as a manufactured tool of science. These theories are the transitive objects of science which try to join science with reality in a way that is fallible; new theories can improve on older theories (Danermark, Ekström and Karlsson, 2019, p.27). This aligns with a belief that there is an important relationship between knowledge and the object of knowledge and that they are not the same: “reality has an objective existence but [...] our knowledge of it is conceptually mediated: facts are theory dependent but they are not theory determined” (Danermark, Ekström and Karlsson, 2019, p.19 original emphasis). The goal of science, Bhaskar (2008, p.6) argues, is to provide an understanding of the mechanisms that combine to produce events in the real world.

In natural science, these processes, which Bhaskar (2008) refers to as intransitive objects of scientific inquiry, exist and act independently of human intervention. Furthermore, when researchers make statements about these processes, laws of natural science, for example, these are statements about the way things are in the natural world (independent of researchers) and not researchers’ experiences of them. Of course, while this cannot apply directly to the social world because social phenomena do not exist without human actors, Bhaskar (2008) argues that the principle of intransitive objects still broadly applies because a theory is still about something which is independent of itself; social structures are borne out of individuals acting collectively and it also influences individuals. Collier (1994, p.51) rejects the notion that this entails the promotion of ontological relativism:

Rival scientific theories [in social science] necessarily have different transitive objects, or they would not be different; but they are not about different worlds – otherwise how could they be rivals?

Accepting Bhaskar’s theory of transitive and intransitive objects allows social researchers to build on existing research and construct knowledge by making meaningful statements about social reality. Bhaskar’s original “Transformational Model of Social Activity” (TMSA) p.215 describes a process by which agents engage in intentional action to transform social structures and institutions through the
process of reflecting on and analysing social structures and institutions and the process of negotiating and co-ordinating action with others. However, in this study, the purpose of identifying possible causal mechanisms which influence the experiences of academic staff is to challenge and change the status quo. This requires an examination of how the three domains might interact with each other; if they are distinct and influence only flows in one direction (real to actual to empirical), then there is no hope for transformation, only cyclical reproduction. Therefore, within the domain of the real, other critical realists have theorised how this might be further defined and developed to identify how agents can effect change within structure and culture in the real domain.

5.4.2 Morphogenesis – Structure and Agency

In this section, I have drawn on Archer’s development of Bhaskar’s TMSA model. This is highly relevant to my study in terms of the experiences and perspectives of academic staff within a university context. Archer’s (2020; 2013b; 1995) model of Morphogenesis was a response to Anthony Giddens’ (1986) theory of Structuration which proposes that agency (in the actual domain) and structure (in the real domain) are interdependent and as such one is unable to exist without the other. Giddens argues that these two entities mutually constitute each other with respective agents reproducing and/or shaping structures through their actions and practices simultaneously.

While aligning with Giddens’ (1979; 1986) argument that agency and structure exist interdependently, Archer’s (2013b; 1982) model of Morphogenesis/Morphostasis (M/M) makes three important distinctions. First, it challenges Giddens’ assertion that agents and structures exist as a duality (distinct but conceptually bound), instead arguing for analytical dualism (related but distinct). This distinction places much stronger emphasis on the analytical distinctiveness of each entity, with their own emergent properties and powers, and the capacity of agents to not only challenge, but transform social structures through their conscious actions.

Second, Archer agrees with Giddens that structures cannot exist without people in
the same way as, for example, gravity and other natural forces can exist entirely independently of human agents. However, this is not the same as saying that our current society can be entirely independent of and immediately transformed by human agents simultaneously (Archer, 1995). Therefore, transformation on every level, occurs sequentially and over time. For example, an agent may wish to change the structure, but this kind of change happens relatively slowly.

Finally, Archer’s (2013b; 1982) M/M model makes an important distinction between the concepts of culture and structure as generative mechanisms. Culture and structure can be presented as two related but distinct entities which have the potential to both influence and be influenced by human agency or agential powers. Importantly:

Morphogenesis is also a process, referring to the complex inter-changes that produce change in a system’s given form, structure or state (morphostasis being the reverse), but it has an end-product, structural elaboration, which is quite different from Giddens's social system as merely a ‘visible pattern’. This to him can best be analysed as recurrent social practices' (Archer, 1982, p.456)

The M/M model therefore focusses on the interplay between culture and structure within the real domain and human agency within the actual domain. By creating a distinction between culture and structure and emphasising that structure always pre-dates agency, the transformative potential of human agency is therefore given much more prominence, and structure and culture may be examined separately from agency.
Chapter 5: Methodology and theoretical assumptions

In Figure 5-2 above, I summarise useful elements of Bhaskar’s concept of stratified reality and Archer’s Morphogenesis. Within Bhaskar’s domain of the real, generative mechanisms influence the actions and events which occur (actual domain) and thereby the experiences and observations which results (empirical domain). Archer’s M/M model emphasises the possibility of change occurring in a bilateral direction. By making this emphasis, a better understanding of the relationship between culture and structure can be achieved. Archer (1995) argues that culture provides the resources and tools that agents use to navigate social structures and institutions; cultural norms and values can either reinforce or challenge existing structures depending on how they are enacted by agents.
no structural or cultural emergent property is constraining or enabling tout court. To become constraints or enablements involves a relationship with the use made of personal emergent properties. Whether or not their causal power is to constrain or to enable is realised, and for whom they constitute constraints or enablements, depends upon the nature of the relationship between them and agential projects. (Archer, 2003, p.8)

In her argument, I believe Archer (1995) makes the distinction between the interaction of agency and structure that results in a transformed end-product (Morphogenesis) and interplay that results in reproduction (Morphostasis).

Archer (2015) considers Bhaskar’s TMSA to be complementary to her concepts of Morphogenesis and Morphostasis. Archer’s diagram above elaborates on the idea that structure, culture and agency are analytically distinct. The diagram shows that the structure pre-dates but does not predetermine the action which changes it. I argue that Archer’s M/M model proves highly relevant to my study. Not only is there a need to identify and examine the causal mechanisms that influence the actions, experiences and observations of participants in this study, but also bilateral flow of influence that can lead to cultural, and eventually structural, transformation. In other words, my study examines both the cultural and structural factors that constrain and enable agents but also how agents receive and respond to these factors. Specifically, my investigation is concerned with the extent to which practitioners at Alba University reproduce or transform cultural and structural factors.

There is a great deal of literature around elaborations of Bhaskar’s original TMSA model. I have only summarised some of the ideas above so far as they are relevant to the specific methodology which has guided my own study. In the following, and final section on CR, I will argue why Archer’s M/M model can be usefully applied to
my study and how this complements the adopted Neo-Aristotelian, virtue-ethics approach.

5.4.2.1 Morphogenesis and Virtue Ethics

In my research project, I examine the complex ways in which academic staff’s individual ethical principles interact with structure and culture according to Archer’s model (2013b; 1982). In one direction, individuals’ ethical principles are, to some extent, shaped by the cultural norms of their institution and practices and beliefs provide a framework for individuals to understand the rightness and wrongness of actions. In the opposite direction, academic staff’s ethical principles can lead to action which challenges and transforms cultural norms and beliefs within the institution. Structural factors include laws and policies which can either support or constrain individuals’ ethical principles. As discussed in Section 3.2.2, MacIntyre (2007, p.52) argues that humans have the innate potential to cultivate virtues, but this is not automatically acquired, virtues are developed by the agent habitually, voluntarily and intentionally committing virtuous acts over time and in specific contexts. In my study, I examine the individual desire to cultivate virtues as a motivation for action, specifically being involved in CEL projects.

In one recent study on the agential powers of academic staff within a HE institution to respond to structures such as the market and capitalism, Bushra Sharar (2018) adopted a CR approach, specifically that of Morphogenesis, to examine how academic staff at one English HE institution resisted and reproduced structures such as performativity, resulting from privatisation and marketisation of HE. Using a framework that integrates Aristotelian virtue-ethics, MacIntyrean practices and critical realism, Sharar (2018) examines ways in which the academic staff in her study preserved their agency, by actualising their internal potential to develop their virtues. Drawing upon Archer’s (2003) concepts of personal properties and powers, Sharar concludes that:

acting in the physical world changes our bodies to give us emergent physical powers; acting in the social world further develops emergent powers for social interaction; while acting in the cultural and linguistic world further develops our
emergent powers in this area [...] In the process, not only do humans develop new powers, they learn how to use them judiciously in different contexts and to different extents as appropriate. Habitual activities play a part in this process and habits formed due to the pressures of performativity can interfere with our capacity to successfully carry out pedagogical work. (Sharar, 2018, p.263)

Sharar’s integration of Aristotelian virtue-ethics and morphogenesis is very relevant to my study, especially her consideration of habitual activities and how it affects agents’ response to the constraining or enabling powers of structures. In my context, academic staff involvement with CEL could be considered a response to the structure (the marketisation of HE) and the institutional culture of prioritising research and income-generating activity. The agents’ response is therefore not determined by culture and structure; another possible response would be to develop habitual activities which support the reproduction of the culture and structures. Therefore, a methodological framework that stratifies reality into experiences, actions and causal mechanisms and allows for the analysis of agency within the context of culture and structures, is highly appropriate for my study which investigates the factors that influence the experiences and perceptions of academic staff who are involved with CEL.

5.5 Ethical practice and quality in qualitative research

In this section I argue that the notions of ethical practice and quality in research are inexorably linked to the concepts of virtue ethics as discussed in the earlier “Critical Literature Review” chapter. The question of “what kind of person ought I to be?” embodies the core principle of virtue ethics in that, in order to live ethically, one ought to act as a virtuous person would. This is a commitment and consideration which reaches across a person’s life span rather than a deontological approach to ethics, which may consider each moral choice as an isolated event. With this in mind, I will first consider two broad approaches to quality assurance in qualitative research: criteria and output-orientated approaches and following Schwandt (1996) will argue why a criteria based approach could lead to a superficial consideration of research quality. Second, I will detail both the external and internal commitments to ethical practice that I considered necessary for this piece of qualitative research and again, why this is closely linked with the notion of virtue ethics.
5.5.1 Quality and rigour in qualitative research

The quality of quantitative research is judged by the extent to which it is valid, reliable and generalisable beyond the sample used in research to the general population (Braun and Clarke, 2013). In pursuit of quality, qualitative researchers in education, however, face a more complex dilemma. In its applied form, education research is desired by policy makers to determine evidence-based interventions for improving some aspect of learning and teaching in schools, colleges and universities. Therefore, to demonstrate the efficacy of intervention, results and evidence through evaluation are required. This is arguably more straightforward with a quantitative approach which favours hypothesis testing and an experimental approach. Proponents of the qualitative approach reject the assumption that meaningful results can only be achieved in this way:

One cannot add together or subtract what are essentially social or personal constructions, each intelligible within a unique and distinct life story. (Pring, 2000, p.248)

This difference in general research aims entails a different approach to justifying the quality of qualitative research. Nevertheless, in the context of carrying out education research for the purposes of informing policy change, researchers may feel the need to align their work to quantitative measures of quality in order to enhance its credibility in the eyes of policy makers who wish define their decisions as evidence-based (Pring, 2000).

In a meta-analysis by Reynolds et. al (2011) of quality as discussed in 93 qualitative research papers, no universal agreement about how to ensure quality in qualitative research could be reached (Reynolds et al., 2011, p.6), however two main approaches were discussed: 1) the output-oriented approach and 2) process-oriented approach.

5.5.2 The output and criteria-oriented approach

In the output-oriented approach, quality is conceptualised in terms of theoretical concepts like plausibility, credibility, comprehensiveness, confirmability, relevance (Reynolds et al., 2011, p.7) which are derived from the positivist paradigm, and is shown through the use of particular prescribed methodological procedures within methods for quality assurance including triangulation, member checking, negative
case analysis, theoretical sampling and peer review (Reynolds et al., 2011, p.7).
While there are benefits to adopting this approach, especially if working within an interdisciplinary team, Reynolds et al. (2011) also argue that this approach needs to be adopted with caution, especially by novice researchers, who may find the existence of prescriptive procedures to be falsely reassuring and limit their understanding and examination of the core principles and values of qualitative research. Thomas (2021) is similarly wary of a criteria-based approach to quality:

We have to be wary of assessing work on the basis of these crude, post hoc constructions. They are the tools of an audit society, not of good research. (Thomas, 2021, p.70).

In other words, the importance of rules as a tool for demonstrating quality can lead novice qualitative researchers astray when it comes to determining what constitutes good qualitative research. After all, following check-lists does not necessitate understanding and commitment to the theoretical underpinnings of qualitative paradigms or what defines quality within the paradigm, as Reynolds et al. (2011) suggest is the case with the process-orientated approach.

Schwandt (1996) goes even further by suggesting that a checklist approach or “criteriology” not only affects the quality of the research but also has ethical implications. In “Farewell to Criteriology” Schwandt (1996) argues that:

Reverence for procedure means that to be rational is not to engage in moral and political speculation, critique, interpretation dialogue, or judgement. In fact, the rules of method are intended precisely to exorcise this kind of activity from the pursuit of truth (Schwandt, 1996, p.61)

Similar to Aristotle’s argument that political and moral life requires *phronēsis* (practical wisdom gained through guided experience) Schwandt (1996) argues that social inquiry itself is a kind of practical wisdom. Therefore, it is not productive or useful to focus on the terms or criteria used to determine the quality of qualitative research; there are no sufficient conditions for ensuring the quality of this approach to research.

A more holistic approach that requires the researcher to actively engage in methodological awareness, rather than relying on checklists, is described by the
“process-orientated approach” (Reynolds et al., 2011, p.7). Some of the methods for quality assurance examined by Reynolds et al. include using a reflexive field diary, recording an audit trail of methodological decisions and, crucially “ensuring researchers’ comprehension of and engagement with their role in assuring quality”. With the process-orientated approach, quality is assured through concepts such as “Reflexivity, Transparency, Comprehensiveness, Responsibility, Ethical practice, Systematic approach” (Reynolds et al., 2011, p.7). Therefore, I agree with Reynolds et al. that we can use an approach centred on researcher-led good practice guidelines rather than externally-determined indicators such as validity and rigour. Adopting a more holistic approach to quality assurance is therefore desirable but in keeping with the critical realist approach, some semblance of structure is required.

One way of maintaining validity in quantitative research is the avoidance of bias. For example, in clinical trials, double blind randomised controlled trials are known as the gold standard and lends weight to the reliability of the results. Such experimental conditions are impossible to replicate in qualitative research. I agree with Reynolds et al. (2011) that the concept of “validity” cannot be neatly imported into qualitative research and packaged under a different name e.g., plausibility or credibility. At its core, quality in qualitative research is again arguably more complex. Griffiths (2009) claims that bias occurs when the researcher specifically presents results in a way that does not allow the reader to best judge how reliable the evidence is and only seeks results which align with one’s desired outcome. In other words, bias is not inherent in the researcher’s lack of objectivity, but in a lack of transparency. Griffiths examines the argument that a researcher can ever really remove themselves from the context they are researching and be truly objective. Griffiths argues, if one cannot really escape one’s social and political opinions then one must declare them in an attempt to avoid bias (Griffiths, 2009). This supports Merten’s (2014) argument, mentioned earlier about declaring assumptions and Lather’s argument that “[i]t is not a matter of looking harder or more closely, but of seeing what frames our seeing – spaces of constructed visibility and incitements to see which constitute power/knowledge.” (Lather, 2006 p.675). Therefore, reflexivity and disclosure are considered reasonable ways to mitigate bias.
In the early section on Positionality and Social Identity, I attempted to highlight and trace significant moments within my life experience that have influenced my beliefs around education. This reflexive account, alongside raw data such as field notes, and unprocessed audio files and transcriptions should be made available, according to Akkerman et al. (2008) and Halpern (1983), if claims around the quality of a qualitative research project can be made. As argued earlier, if I wish to eschew a criterion-focussed approach to quality assurance then other robust output-focussed approaches must be utilised. One of the alternatives uses the metaphor of the fiscal audit trail which I used to allow me to focus on a holistic approach to quality: an ongoing methodological awareness rather than reliance on checklists. For my audit trail I used Akkerman et al.’s (2008) outline of five components. I paid particular attention to keeping a reflective journal which included field notes taken during the process of data collection and analysis. Included in field notes was familiarisation notes which were initial impressions of the interviews carried out and the data collected. Braun and Clarke (2013; 2022) suggest that this is a crucial part of their six-phase approach to reflexive thematic analysis and it is the approach that I used as part of quality assurance in this research project. Using the reflective journal allowed me to analyse the biases and assumptions which informed my methodological approach and inevitably influenced my analysis of the data in the themes I generated. With a critical realist approach to ontology, I acknowledge that there is a single, independent reality but also that there may be multiple and contradicting accounts of this amongst research participants given their different biographical contexts. Similarly, my attempt to access this reality through my participants is similarly influenced by my biographical context. For example, my biographical account details my experience and education which encompasses theoretical concepts from sociology, education and critical theory. This influences all of my methodological decisions and the themes I generate from the data collected. Even given the data I collected, which was influenced by my methodological decisions (structure, topic choices, questions asked etc.) another researcher in psychology might generate a different set of themes relevant to their discipline area and their biographical context. I purposefully do not refer to themes “emerging” from the data but rather “generated” (by me). Braun and Clarke’s (2022) metaphor of the researcher as sculptor, forming a piece of art from raw materials rather than an
archaeologist searching for or discovering a hidden artefact, was especially useful for me.

### 5.5.3 Ethical practice in qualitative research

All research carried out within higher education needs to be carried out in an ethical way. In order to gain approval to commence data collection in the form of interviews for the research project, I was required to complete a progression board paper and present this to examiners from my academic school. Included in this process, was a consideration of the ethical implications of my piece of research by submitting an application to the academic school’s ethics committee. In the UK, researchers in the field of education routinely refer to the British Educational Research Association’s (BERA) Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research when submitting applications. The academic school ethics committee which considered my application and approved it as satisfying the School Ethics Level 2 criterion:

> applies to non-intervention research where you have the consent of the participants and data subjects. This may include, for example, analysis of archived data, classroom observation, or questionnaires on topics that are not generally considered ‘sensitive’. This research can involve children or young people, if the likelihood of risk to them is minimal.

It is also expected that research students completing research projects as part of an MSc, PhD or EdD will justify their ethical approach to research within their final dissertations. One approach is Mertens’ (2014) identification of three ethical principles and six norms of scientific research in her “Beneficence, Respect and Justice” (Mertens, 2014 p.14).

Merten’s approach derives from the Belmont Report, written by the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral Research 1979 which identified Respect for people, beneficence, and justice as three fundamental characteristics for doing ethical research. The first of these tenets stated that participants should be treated as autonomous agents by researchers (Macfarlane, 2008, p.11).
In “‘Fiction written under oath?’ ethics and epistemology in educational research” Bridges (2003) examines the paradox of the rejection of truth and difference between fact and fiction by some researchers who at the same time, assuredly claim the ethical soundness of their methods and research. He also considers a distinction in approach according to the power affiliation between the researcher and subject of research. Therefore concealment, deception and breaking an individual’s confidentiality may be justifiable if it maximised utility e.g. it was in the public interest to know (Bridges, 2003). Bridges further asks that if one rejects the position that there can be a knowable reality and dismisses the possibility of truth then how can ethical principles and honesty still be relevant? He suggests that care and kindness are still relevant and that principles which support the following are compatible with “the pursuit of knowledge and understanding (truth even).” (Bridges, 2003):

- the free expression of ideas, feelings and experience;
- in a regime characterised by a reasonably equitable distribution of power;
- careful, respectful and attentive listening to and recording of these ideas;
- the open communication of and interaction with these ideas, including critical interaction;
- reflective and interactive interpretation of these ideas.

In adopting a critical realist approach to this research project, I sympathise with Bridges’ argument that an acceptance of the possibility of truth and a knowable reality are necessary in the conduct of research ethics. Furthermore, Bridges’ focus on the qualities of “care and kindness” align with the virtue ethics conception of research ethics. That is, the focus is less on which individual, moral choices were made in the course of the research project in isolation and more on the researcher reflecting meaningfully on the question “what kind of person ought I to be?”. This is a commitment that reaches beyond the confines of one research project.

Another author who espouses the view of research ethics as lifelong, practised commitment of one’s virtues rather than decisions made with a focus on the consequences of one’s actions or a sense of duty is Bruce Macfarlane (2010; 2008; 2006). Macfarlane’s attitude to research ethics is very much grounded in a virtue ethics approach. Macfarlane (2008) argues that research ethics in every discipline leans heavily towards a bioethics approach to research ethics originating from the
legacy of war crimes committed in the form of involuntary medical experimentation carried out on human beings by Nazi doctors during the Second World War. Similar to a criteria-based approach to quality, I agree with Macfarlane (2010) that simply transferring set principles to research within all disciplines is problematic because it dilutes the researcher’s notion of personal responsibility and cannot account for different interpretations of the principles:

No code of ethics can operate without being interpreted by the individual through their own value system [and therefore must] depend on the integrity of the individual, which means that to really understand research ethics we need to engage with our own character and belief system. (Macfarlane, 2008, p.32)

Macfarlane’s position that research quality and ethics requires a commitment to moral and intellectual integrity is a convincing one. In some ways, the legacy of war crimes and atrocities distracts the researcher from more banal acts of poor research, which could compromise the integrity of the researcher and their project. This includes poor scholarship, exaggeration, and laziness (Macfarlane, 2008). This promotion of character and integrity above guidelines and a criteria-based approach, in part aligns with Bernard Williams’ (2002) consideration of the concept of "truthfulness", which he relates to the virtues of accuracy and sincerity:

You do the best you can to acquire true beliefs, and what you say reveals what you believe. The authority of academics must be rooted in their truthfulness in both these respects: they take care, and they do not lie. (Williams, 2002, p.11)

In section 5.6.1, I discuss the problem of presenting institutional documents which I analysed in a way that would reduce the risk of participants being identified as they worked in the same institution.

In conclusion, I assert that the concepts of research quality assurance and ethical practice in research are closely linked. While a criteria-based approach can serve as a systematic layer of quality and ethical assurance, I agree with Macfarlane (2010; 2008) and Bridges (2003) that it should complement a more holistic, virtues ethics driven approach.
5.6 Sampling and Data Collection

5.6.1 Documentary data

As well as interview data, I analysed institutional documents from Alba University through Reflexive Thematic Analysis. One question that arose was how best to reference these documents given that references would be inaccurate if they referred to a fictional institution and readers would not be able to access these documents to verify my data. After consulting with academic colleagues, I chose to include these documents in the appendix of my thesis with any institutional identifiers redacted. Doing this would allow readers to access the documents I refer to in their entirety without increasing the risk of participants being identified. The latter was a priority of mine given my ethical principles as a researcher on this project; I had promised participants that I would make every attempt to preserve their anonymity and their experiences and observations had been shared with me on this basis.

5.6.2 Interviews: how were participants chosen?

The predominant method of sampling used in this study was purposeful (also called purposive) sampling. Purposeful sampling is a form of non-probability sampling (Guest, Namey and Mitchell, 2013, p.8) (Patton, 2014, p.264) where participants are chosen from a target population based on criteria and characteristics prioritised by the researcher. Patton (2014, p.266) discusses over 40 purposeful sampling strategies within eight categories. Under the “Group Characteristics Sampling” category, “Complete target population” (Patton, 2014, p.268) where everyone within a unique group of interest is interviewed, was used to select participants in this study along with, to a much lesser degree, “Snowball or chain sampling” (Patton, 2014, p.270).

Early on in the consideration of this project’s research focus, it was clear that little research on this type of pedagogy has been carried out in the United Kingdom, let alone Scotland. I undertook an initial search of eligible participants and ascertained that the total number of academic staff involved in CEL would be relatively small
(<25). Therefore, in order to explore practice in one institution, in detail, across different disciplines, I invited every eligible member of staff to take part in the study.

Two subgroups of participants were recruited: University leaders and managers, those considered to be leading the institution’s move towards strategic goals towards community engagement as identified in Strategy 2030, and practitioners involved in projects or courses which I considered to fit the category of CEL.

Purposeful sampling was mainly used to identify participants by consulting known contacts through my membership of Alba University’s Community Engagement Forum, finding lead authors of strategic documents linked to community engagement and searching on the University website for senior university staff members with community engagement in their remit. For practitioners, I conducted a search of the University’s internal course and programme database for any course or programme with the terms “community” “service-learning” “placement” “outreach” and “experiential learning” in the title and course description. The courses and programmes found were then filtered down to only those which fit my definition of CEL. I also researched previous winners of the University’s Principal’s Medal in relevant community engagement categories and by contacting those involved in projects promoted by the Centre for Experiential Learning on their website.

I constructed a list of themes based on my research aims and decided that the semi-structured interview would be an appropriate form of data collection. The semi-structured interview while sufficiently structured to address specific questions in my research aims, was also flexible enough to allow participants the space to broach new topics or focus on a particular topic of relevance to them. Preparing for these interviews included drafting some open-ended questions and anticipating possible responses (Galletta and Cross, 2013) as well as practising this style of interviewing; it was very different from the type of highly structured interviews which I had been accustomed to conducting in the past.
After establishing a list of all possible participants, I contacted all of them by email with an invitation to interview on video call by default. This task was made much easier because of my insider status as an employee at Alba University: I had access to staff profiles and email addresses as well as a searchable database of all University courses. Being an insider made relevant contacts and information easier to find and made it more likely that potential participants would respond to my invitation to interview.

I had originally intended to conduct face to face interviews with members of staff, but had to pivot to online or virtual face to face interviews after lockdown was imposed following the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic March 2020. By this point it was October 2020 and strict physical distancing and lockdown measures had been imposed in Scotland. All participants who responded to my invitation agreed to the interview being carried out online. Overall, twenty-eight practitioners and six leaders and managers were contacted and invited to an interview over video call using a platform of their choice. Twenty-five practitioners responded, three excluded themselves as not relevant to the study after further explanation, and five were unable to attend the interview for personal/work reasons after initially agreeing to be part of the research project. All six leaders and managers accepted my invitation to interview. In total, seventeen practitioners and six leaders and managers participated in a semi-structured interview held over MS Teams (see Appendix A: Participants Interviewed). Interviews averaged 56 minutes each and were transcribed by me and coded using NVivo software.

By the end of the data collection period, all participants had been interviewed by video call. I was initially concerned about interviewing participants in this way in case this inhibited the ability to build rapport or necessary trust between the researcher (me) and the participants. However, at the beginning of my schedule of interviews, six months had passed since staff had begun working from home and so the technology was familiar to all participants and they were comfortable with the basic video calling functions. After the first two interviews, I recognised that there were practical advantages to interviewing participants online which helped to:
overcome many of the inherent limitations and challenges of face-to-face data collection, such as: difficulties of arranging a time and place to meet; participants not feeling comfortable sharing their experiences in person; and the challenges of noise and disruptions if interviewing in public spaces. (Hanna and Mwale, 2017, p.258)

Another advantage, not mentioned above, was that many participants were interviewed in their own homes; conducting the interview in a familiar environment may have helped participants feel more at ease and less intimidated (Hanna and Mwale, 2017, p.60) than if I had interviewed them in their place of work, my office, their home or a public place such as the campus cafe. By default, I switched my camera on at the beginning of the interview. I felt that this would help to establish trust and rapport with the participants.

As the interviews progressed over the course of six weeks, I noted themes and patterns within the interview data collected, however I was mindful not to let this determine the course of future interviews:

It is important not to overload an interview with excessive attention to your search for converging and diverging thematic trends in the data. This approach has the potential to dull your sensitivity to what is said and not said during the interview. It also may slant your questioning in pursuit of confirming evidence. (Galletta and Cross, 2013, p.77)

I found the reflective research journal especially useful at these points to question my selection of questions within my topic guide.

5.7 Method – Reflexive Thematic Analysis

The method of analysis adopted for this research project was thematic analysis, specifically Reflexive TA (Reflexive Thematic Analysis) as developed by Victoria Clarke and Virginia Braun (2006; 2016; 2017; 2018; 2019). This section will begin with a very brief description of other methods considered. However, there is no attempt to provide a full methodological survey of all available methods of analysis in order to compare and contrast with Reflexive TA and ultimately justify its use in this project. Neither is there any attempt to propose that Reflexive Thematic Analysis was the only method found to be suitable after a rigorous evaluation of all possible
methods of qualitative analysis. To do so would be disingenuous or at the very least potentially misrepresentative of methods which I am not fully familiar with. I will however, attempt to offer a justification of the Reflexive TA method as well as an account of how Reflexive TA was applied in the context of my particular analysis.

Braun and Clarke (2006) described reflexive TA as “searching across a data set - be that a number of interviews or focus groups, or a range of texts - to find repeated patterns of meaning” and prescribes a six phase process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarizing yourself with your data:</td>
<td>Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report:</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.87)

Following guidance for good practice within Reflexive TA, I have included a concise account of how I executed the generic six phases within the context of my own research project (see Appendix E section 12.5) Appendix E: Six Phases of Reflexive Thematic Analysis. I found “close reading” skills that I had gained as an undergraduate English literature student useful in the initial analysis of institutional documentary data but also guidance on the analysis of documentary data in the literature (Tight, 2019; Rapley, 2007).

Reflexive TA is intended for data analysis only and “does not prescribe methods of data collection, theoretical positions, epistemological or ontological frameworks” (Braun and Clarke, 2013, p.78) because of this, it is considered theoretically flexible and compatible with a critical realist approach (Braun and Clarke, 2013, p.27) is used to generate themes by identifying patterns, which are relevant to the research
question, across a dataset. The dataset in this research project includes the interviews described above but also supporting documents such as course descriptors, project descriptions and university policy documents which lay out the strategic intentions of the institution with regards to community engagement. Note that, with this method, themes do not emerge passively from the data, nor do they lie within the data waiting to be discovered by the researcher, rather they are actively created and interpreted by the researcher. For this reason, the researcher is required to be reflexive by reflecting transparently on inherent biases and assumptions they bring to the research process:

Reflexive TA needs to be implemented with theoretical knowingness and transparency; the researcher strives to be fully cognisant of the philosophical sensibility and theoretical assumptions informing their use of TA; and these are consistently, coherently and transparently enacted throughout the analytic process and reporting of the research. (Braun and Clarke, 2019, p.594)

Other forms of thematic analysis exist as do other forms of pattern-based analyses, such as grounded theory (GT), discourse analysis (DA) and interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA). All of these forms were considered initially but considered less methodologically appropriate. Grounded theory, whilst theoretically flexible and a popular pattern-based approach, is generally more suited to research about social structures and processes rather than the experience of the individual. IPA is less theoretically flexible than TA, does not allow the researcher to account for the socio-cultural context as well as TA and analysis can be restrictive to descriptive rather than interpretative analyses (Braun and Clarke, 2013, p.80). While TA can also lean towards more descriptive analyses, by using an existing theoretical framework, a more interpretative analysis can be produced.

Three main sources of data were engaged in this process:

i. Interview transcripts from 17 university practitioners involved in delivering, developing and/or coordinating CEL activity for undergraduate and postgraduate students.

ii. Interview transcripts from six university leaders/managers i.e., influential members of university staff whom I considered to be leading the institution
towards strategic goals involving community engagement (see section 12.1 Appendix A: Participants Interviewed)

iii. Alba University institutional policy documents relating to strategic plans, community engagement plans, outcome agreements with the Scottish Funding Council, and staff promotion guidance.

In Section 5.6, I discussed data collection and processing in detail. All of the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

5.7.1 A note on frequency and prevalence in presenting findings

I have presented the findings consistent with the qualitative, critical realist approach taken in this study. Three overarching themes were generated through the method of Reflexive Thematic Analysis. The following presentation of findings is intentionally free of any attempt to quantify the number of participants who discussed a theme or broached a topic. Reporting absolute frequencies (Braun and Clarke, 2022) was not methodologically congruent with my study which was intended to examine patterns within accounts of the perspectives and experiences of a group of academic staff; the important aspect of identifying a pattern is whether it aids understanding of the research topic. Moreover, the semi-structured interviews undertaken allowed for flexibility regarding the subjects discussed. Although as interviewer I used a topic guide, the questions asked of each participant were not the same, so responses are not directly comparable but subjective and situational. Importantly, however, the varied interview questions were all designed to address my overall research questions.

5.7.2 Clean Verbatim Transcription

In the process of integrating extracts and quotations in the following chapters, I used clean verbatim transcription rules to clarify the transcription whilst preserving the general framework of the interviews. I did this after coding and theme generation so as not to “prematurely reduce the text” (McLellan, MacQueen and Neidig, 2003, p.65) Therefore, elements such as stutters, filler words, unintentional repetition and false starts were eliminated before being used to illustrate findings. Where I have omitted parts of the interview which were not relevant to a quotation I have used
ellipsis in square brackets [...]. Additionally, where a participant has said something which might be used to identify them, I have also replaced this text with a description in square brackets in a continued effort to preserve their identity.

5.8 Limitations of the study

1. The study's focus on one university may introduce a potential bias towards that university's perspective and experiences of CEL Practitioners, and the researcher's ontology and approach may also influence the study's findings. I have tried to account for this by using a reflexive research method and reflecting on my subjectivity in the “Introduction and Positionality Statement” section of the thesis.

2. There are possible gaps in the data: the study's reliance on documentary analysis and interviews have not taken into account other sources of data, such as observations or surveys, which could provide additional insights into the experiences and perspectives of CEL Practitioners and University leaders and managers. Given the very limited practice of CEL within the institution, it is not clear that a quantitively evaluated survey would have enhanced the quality of these findings. In addition, this EdD project had resource limits and therefore the most appropriate method of data collection which would garner rich and in-depth data with limited resources was chosen.

3. Lack of comparison with other forms of university-community engagement: The study primarily focuses on CEL and does not compare it with other forms of university-community engagement including staff and student short-term volunteering and public engagement lectures. This may limit a comprehensive understanding of the university's approach to community engagement. However, CEL uniquely incorporates staff, students and community partners and therefore a good basis for comparison with future research.

4. The study only focusses on academic staff perspectives and experiences of CEL. Students were not invited to participate mainly for safety and ethical reasons during the Covid-19 pandemic lockdown. Future research on community partner and student perspectives and experiences would be valuable within and outwith this institutional context.
5.9 Conclusion

In this methodology chapter I have provided a comprehensive overview of the key components and considerations in conducting my qualitative research study using a specific critical realist approach and using reflexive thematic analysis as a method of analysing the documentary and interview data.

I chose a qualitative approach as it aligned with my aim of exploring complex phenomena through the subjective experiences of academic staff. I considered available research paradigms and justified adopting Bhaskar's critical realist approach and Archer's Morphogenesis approach to situate my study within a broader theoretical framework that acknowledged the dynamic and stratified nature of reality.

To ensure the quality and rigor of my analysis, I adopted a holistic approach based on researcher-led good practice guidelines rather than externally-determined indicators such as validity and rigour with emphasis on transparency, coherence, and relevance in identifying and defining themes. Furthermore, I prioritised virtue-ethical practice, striving to maintain ethical conduct throughout the research process by respecting the rights and well-being of participants.

In terms of sampling and data collection, I was mindful of selecting participants who could provide rich and diverse insights into my research topic across the University of Alba. I employed reflexive thematic analysis as my chosen method, acknowledging the iterative and reflective nature of the analysis process, allowing for ongoing engagement with the data and active involvement of my subjectivity as a researcher. This methodology chapter serves to lay a solid foundation for my data analysis and interpretation. By adhering to rigorous methodological principles, I aim to generate meaningful and reliable findings which will be explored in detail in the following chapters.
6 Findings and Analysis Part One

6.1 Introduction

As detailed in section 5.7, I utilised Reflexive TA as the primary method of analysis. Reflexive thematic Analysis is a simple and theoretically flexible interpretative approach to qualitative data analysis that helps identify and analyse patterns or themes in a given data set (Braun and Clarke, 2022). After an iterative process of coding and theme generation, three key themes were generated from the interview data:

Theme 1: Achieving the ultimate purpose: (Third) Mission Impossible?

Theme 2: “How to seem virtuous without actually being so”

Theme 3: Moral principles, culture and structure

In Chapters Six, Seven and Eight, I will explore each main theme in turn through its constituent sub-themes.

In this findings chapter, I present the first overarching theme: "Achieving the ultimate purpose: (Third) Mission Impossible?" This theme was generated through my use of Reflexive Thematic Analysis (TA). Through an iterative process of data analysis, I identified four distinct subthemes, each offering valuable insights. The first subtheme, "Research and the Third Mission," explores the relationship between Alba University’s research activities and the realisation of the third mission. The second subtheme, "University as a ‘partner’ and/or ‘neighbour,’" explores the dynamics of Alba University in its role as a partner or neighbour in its communities. The third subtheme, "CEL contributes to a university's missions," highlights how Community-Engaged Learning (CEL) contributes to the broader missions of universities. Lastly, the fourth subtheme, "Exposing and understanding privilege through CEL," delves into the critical aspect of privilege and its implications within the context of Community-Engaged Learning.
6.2 Theme 1: Achieving the ultimate purpose: (Third) Mission Impossible?

In section 3.2.5, I argued that the purpose of universities should be to support students to act for the common good and to enable individual flourishing (MacAllister, 2016) and one way of putting this into practice could involve academic staff cultivating their own identities as civic-minded professionals as well as, and through, cultivating civic-mindedness in their students. Kreber (2016a) argues that cultivating “emancipatory knowledge”, critical reflection on tradition, ideologies, power dynamics and structures that allow the status quo to remain, is a crucial dimension of civic-mindedness (see section 3.2.4). I also argued that an essential component of achieving a university’s ultimate purpose included third mission activity, which was defined as “the interactions between universities and the rest of society” (Molas-Gallart et al., 2002, p.4). Community-engaged Learning (CEL) principally belongs to the category of “third mission” activity i.e., activity undertaken by a university alongside the missions of research and teaching. In this over-arching theme, I explore the ways in which staff (practitioners and university leaders and managers) described CEL and third mission activity more broadly. Data examined in this section includes internal institutional literature (policy and strategy documents), public-facing institutional literature and participant interviews.

Through three main themes, which I generated from the data collected using Reflexive Thematic Analysis (TA), I explore the complex ways in which participants and institutional literature interpret and express the relationship between “the third mission” and what was perceived to be the ultimate purpose of a university. I also identify to what extent connotations of this image are congruent with participant perspectives on university-community relationships as well as how participants believed CEL contributed to the ultimate purpose of a university.

Throughout the interview data, participants construct the purpose and nature of third mission activity in particular ways. One main area of tension exists between how the internal institutional literature describes third mission activity and how University leaders and managers, practitioners and public-facing institutional literature interpret
or describe it. From the data I analysed, I have categorised interpretations of the third mission of the University in three main ways:

1) Knowledge Exchange
2) “A good and welcoming neighbour”
3) A partner with responsibilities to their communities

Within the University’s internal and public-facing literature, there is a tension between projecting the image of the University in a positive light, “A good and welcoming neighbour”, and one which is focussed on the role of the academic expert and the outputs of “knowledge exchange”. Between participants and the institutional literature, I will identify clear differences between interpretations of what kind of ultimate purpose a university should support and how this might be realised through the third mission.

Across participants’ accounts was the idea that research and teaching, and third mission activity were distinct entities. Practitioners described these missions as existing in a hierarchy with research being highly prioritised at the University before teaching. However, amongst University leaders and managers there was also acknowledgement that these three missions were, in reality, intertwined and interdependent. Compared to practitioners, University leaders and managers were also more disposed to finding the goals of wealth creation and community engagement to be compatible. Therefore, the idea that knowledge exchange might genuinely benefit communities outside of the University and be monetisable was accepted.

Participants agreed that third mission activity was and should be closely linked with teaching activity through CEL. While some asserted that this should and could be mandatory for all students, others considered it impractical given the huge volume of students at Alba University and the danger of oversaturating and overwhelming community partners with student placements for these learning activities. Nevertheless, University leaders and managers and practitioners spoke comprehensively about the benefits of CEL for students, community partners and
wider society. These benefits included the direct benefit of students as a human resource, although this cost organisations in terms of supervision and training new students, but also in other clearly defined ways.

The theme 6.2.3 “CEL contributes to a university’s missions”, focusses on CEL activity within Alba University and how practitioners and University leaders and managers have interpreted their understanding of CEL through their own experiences. Common across all interpretations of CEL is the element of student and practitioners interacting with communities outwith the University for what I argue to be the common good. “Creating close encounters” focuses on this element that, according to participants, sets CEL apart from traditional classroom-based teaching.

6.2.1 Research and the Third Mission

6.2.1.1 Advancing knowledge exchange

In section 2.3, I identified that some interpretations of third mission activity were constrained to a definition which only included “knowledge exchange”. Within Scottish Government policy, knowledge exchange is synonymous with the third mission of a university. This is then further narrowed down to knowledge exchange which directly benefits the national economy through monetised innovation and wealth creation. In Alba University’s public-facing institutional literature (see 12.2 Appendix B: Ten-year Strategy Plan and 12.3 Appendix C Community Plan) there is only one reference to the term “knowledge exchange”:

13. Facilitate knowledge exchange between the University and local communities, including community groups. (Appendix C Community Plan)

Within this strategy document, the third mission is conceived as “Social and Civic Responsibility”:

We are going to support volunteering, build public engagement, and be a good and welcoming neighbour. We can also make a difference to individuals and communities in a number of ways; from tackling climate change, global justice and water safety to sustainable food production, information security and the impacts of rare diseases. (Appendix B: Ten-year Strategy Plan)
The Community Engagement Plan (Appendix C Community Plan) focuses on co-creating “opportunities and projects which have measurable and sustainable impacts” and the need for the institution to work as a whole in order to bring about positive social change, as well as the need to share experiences and resources with local community groups to this end. The Community Engagement Plan addresses a broad notion of a third mission that is both interwoven within the missions of research and teaching and also completely separate. For example, it describes research as contributing towards tackling social issues such as “homelessness and rough sleeping” and “digital inclusion”, but also activity which is not connected to teaching or research: investing university funds into Social Enterprise and Social Investment Strategy and growing the University’s Community Grants Scheme which offers relatively small grants (up to £4,500 in 2022) to local non-profit organisations for the purpose of increasing engagement between the University and its communities for positive social change. Activity such as widening participation into the University is mentioned as the core remit of a new learning centre situated in a local neighbourhood which experiences social deprivation. Public-facing institutional literature therefore presents a broad interpretation of the third mission which incorporates social justice and social responsibility aims which are not directly linked to economistic goals. I argue that these aims align closely with the “common good” aspect of a university’s ultimate purpose. However, there is much less evidence of this within internal institutional literature.

Documents which are relevant to the third mission, include guidance for staff promotion at Alba University. The promotions process at Alba University is detailed in the internal document 12.7 “Appendix G: Academic Promotions Policy (Extract)”. The process is structured so that teaching and research staff have a defined track on which to progress their careers from Grade 06 Tutor/Demonstrator, Grade 07 Teaching fellow, 08 Lecturer, 09 Senior Lecturer to 10 Professor. Traditionally this did not apply to practitioners who were not involved in research but this policy was recently expanded to also include staff who taught but did not produce research for the Research Excellence Framework (REF). Staff apply for promotion by clearly stating how their experience and achievements meet key performance criteria. The
core goals of the University’s strategy are clearly set out in promotion guidance
document 12.8 Appendix H: Exemplars of Excellence in Knowledge Exchange:

Excellence in Teaching, Excellence in Research and Excellence in Innovation. The latter incorporates knowledge exchange with a variety of audiences and stakeholders. It is crucial that the University’s reward and recognition processes reflect achievements in all three of these goals.

This is echoed in the grade profile-specific guidance, where the academic work of the University is identified as being driven by three key strategic goals within its current Strategic Plan. These are:

(i) Excellence in learning and teaching;

(ii) Excellence in research;

(iii) Excellence in commercialisation and knowledge exchange.

which is eligible for inclusion in a promotion application, according to 12.8 Appendix H: Exemplars of Excellence in Knowledge Exchange is:

The kind of knowledge exchange activities engaging stakeholders beyond the academic community in order to increase impact of research; and includes commercialisation, technology transfer, public engagement and engagement with policy and professional practice […] effective engagement with stakeholders, audiences and users of research, aiming to increase the uptake and thus the impact of the academic expertise in the University […] we will only reward engagement activities where there is evidence of uptake from the target groups beyond academia.

The value to the University and effort required of the knowledge exchange (KE) activity must be proven to be equivalent to the other core missions of research and teaching:

KE may be derived from research and/or teaching. Rewards for excellence in KE must be equal in status, and most importantly in value to the University, to those for excellence in research and teaching […] To ensure that the achievements measured are of equivalent value and status, and are as challenging to attain, as those for research-focused and teaching-focused activity. (original emphasis)

The kinds of examples used for knowledge exchange include consulting on policy and practice in the public, private or third sector, receipt of external awards in recognition of KE, membership of boards and contribution to public media
broadcasts. Although there is reference to public debate, the vast majority of these examples point to a unilateral interpretation of knowledge exchange which positions University academics as the experts who are able to bestow knowledge on communities for the benefit of wider society.

CEL was very rarely linked to knowledge exchange by any of the participants interviewed. If anything, practitioners such as Erin (see section Research for the common good6.2.1.2) expressed scepticism towards the idea of “knowledge exchange” by highlighting a propensity towards exacerbating the existing unequal power dynamic between communities and universities.

Within the grade profile-specific guidance, several activities fall under the category of the “third mission; (see 12.8 Appendix H: Exemplars of Excellence in Knowledge Exchange). Across four grade profiles, expectations are set out on how staff can achieve and evidence criteria in third mission activity such as knowledge exchange; public engagement; involvement of external organisations in teaching; representation of the University in networks and public activity; and development of relationships with external organisations. Staff are expected to evidence achievements in these areas in order to apply for promotion. Here, third mission activity is closely linked with activity in the other two missions of research and teaching for example to develop relationships with external organisations with the goal of increasing the impact of research and to offer expertise in an advisory capacity.

Similar to how Scottish Government Policy documents emphasise the economistic aims of the third mission, Alba University’s promotion guidance prioritises third mission activity which benefits the institution by enhancing its public profile. Public-facing institutional literature focus on different aspects of third mission activity and project the image of a welcoming and socially responsible institution. Third mission activity is also interpreted in a much broader way than monetisable innovation or knowledge exchange. Importantly, no reference is made to the national economy or monetising innovation in
or anywhere in Appendix C Community Plan, instead the emphasis is on global social justice goals and promoting a more equitable society. This is held in contrast with internal policy documents, which offer a narrow interpretation of the third mission.

In contrast to how the University is portrayed in public-facing literature, internal institutional literature positions third mission activity as a means to enhance research and teaching. That is to say that the desired goal of interacting with the rest of society in the form of third mission activity is a means to better achieving the first two missions. It also positions the University’s third mission largely as an instrumental one: the University’s requirement for staff to demonstrate evidence of influencing target groups and of impact, could be interpreted as a means to exert more influence and therefore power as an institution.

Within internal guidance documents (see 12.8 Appendix H: Exemplars of Excellence in Knowledge Exchange) relating to knowledge exchange, staff are encouraged to pursue third mission activity which is “equal in status, and most importantly in value to the University, to those for excellence in research and teaching” (original emphasis) in other words, third mission activity is only relevant evidence for a promotion application if the outcomes present the prospect of direct benefit to the institution. Benefits to third party organisations and external partners are measured in terms of impact which can be measured and counted in a way which enhances the reputation of the University. This interpretation of the University’s third mission is heavily focussed on enhancing the reputation of the University and generating income rather than contributing to the ultimate purpose of a university, which I described earlier as being to support individual flourishing and foster skills of emancipatory critical thinking for the common good.

6.2.1.2 Research for the common good

In Section 3.2.2 I presented MacIntyre’s argument that there is no shared and universally agreed idea of what the common good should be but that there can be
meaningful deliberation about these matters in the public sphere (MacAllister, 2016b, p.11) and that this deliberation should promote and cultivate the virtues which are required to sustain practices. MacIntyre’s (2016) notion of the common good necessitates the cultivation of common goods over a sustained and indefinite period of time, for the good of individuals, and the good of those communities in which they live. I generated this theme “Research for the common good” from staff accounts of who and what they understood the work of the University, including research and teaching, to be for.

Participants described communities that were relevant to the University and its third mission in several ways. University leaders and managers spoke in broad and abstract terms about communities, incorporating concepts of communities of identity and practice as well as location. Through their CEL projects, practitioners most commonly worked with community partners in the immediate locality of the city (around two miles wide) and some slightly further out into the wider reaches of the City Council area (around an eight mile radius). Despite this, practitioners spoke about the wider-reaching potential that their CEL projects could have in three main ways: 1) through shaping the experiences of students who could be influential in their own communities in the future; 2) through contributing to climate change and sustainability; and 3) through students contributing to research with broad significance.

Practitioners, University leaders and managers did not position third mission activity as separate from teaching and learning. While the
Appendix B: Ten-year Strategy Plan describes providing services and resources to local communities and groups as separate from its “core” mission, participants, in contrast, described third mission activity as being closely linked to this. Linking third mission activity with research and teaching was frequently described as being a duty or a responsibility of Alba University by participants.

Unsurprisingly, given that all participants were involved with CEL activity or community engagement more generally, University leaders and managers and practitioners positioned third mission activity as something that was essential for Alba University to be involved in. It was not enough for the University only to be involved in knowledge exchange in the narrow sense, the University needed to be involved in meaningful interactions with community in order to maintain its legitimacy and fulfil its responsibility to society and its students. In other words, a university should act for the common good of communities and not just for the benefit of the university. Below, James places emphasis on the perceived debt the University owes the City as a result of its occupation of land, estates and use of resources. This seems contrary to public-facing institutional literature which emphasises how the University contributes to its communities rather than it being on the receiving end of any resources and benefits.

**James (Academic/applied/STEM):** I think it’s making stuff like our research available to the city in which we squat. Basically, helping them improve the way things work, livelihoods etc, etc. We do all this amazing research. But if we’re not applying it, then what’s the point? [...] I think we have a duty, we’re a civic institution. And I do get a bit pissed off when these things are seen as luxuries [...] I do feel it’s something we should be doing. We have to be doing. To be honest, I kind of think we get a lot from the community [...] I think we can learn a lot from just getting out there and talking to people rather than being in our tower.

James strongly asserts the duty of the university as a “civic institution” to make its research useful to wider society. He uses the metaphor of the University as a squatter in the city i.e., somebody who enters an area of land or a building that they do not own or have lawful permission to use. James positions residents of the local community as the “rightful” owners or residents and the University as potentially, an unwelcome occupant. In this analogy, the squatter needs to pay back the rightful owners of the land and property by producing applicable research that will have a
positive impact on society. For some staff this includes research that is done on communities (who are respondents/research subjects), as well as research that is done for communities (research to address a societal issue) and research that is done with communities (individuals design and carry out research with practitioners and students). In arguing that “we can learn a lot from just getting out there and talking to people” James emphasises that the “point” of a university’s existence is related to the idea of the common good and not just a top down model of applied research. This idea of the three missions being intertwined was clearly echoed by Emma, who occupies a leadership role at Alba University. Emma first articulates her understanding of the definition of community as a broad and inclusive category.

Emma: I say there are multiple communities. So, there are all sorts of cross cutting; there are communities of place, communities of identity. [...] if we’re thinking about the university in its city, we’re thinking about people who live in this area. But of course, there are international communities as well. [...] So, communities of interest, communities of practice, communities of, of location, different age groups [...] There isn’t a community that you can point to. It's not bounded. It’s multiple.

Emma’s definition of community arguably extends beyond the community of “locality” as described by Tett and Fyfe (2010) in section 1.5.1. Emma’s definition does not exclude or prioritise any particular kind of community even though university-community engagement was consistently discussed by other participants as involving groups in the neighbouring locality. Defining target communities in university-community engagement seems important for prioritising resources for different strategic aims. For example, university-community engagement with well-educated, privileged community groups seems less relevant than engaging with communities in areas of multiple deprivation for the purposes of widening participation, but this was not mentioned in Emma’s account.

With regard to the three missions, Emma believes that these cannot be separated and that it is wrong to prioritise one mission over the others. In her view, the University’s third mission activity contributes to its validity and authority as an institution within its communities.

Emma: What is a university for? It's an integration of, of useful knowledge. So, research, and education are, they're not either or, it's what university is
about, and working with the community and being involved […] I think it'd be very wrong for us to separate out the, you know, what the values of the university are, and what it stands for, and what it's doing, from its capacity to be working with its local community, it just simply wouldn't work couldn't be separated from it, we are integrally involved in it.

Emma frames third mission activity as an essential undertaking of a university that is deeply connected with research and teaching as well as the identity of an institution. She also echoes James’ sentiment that it is a responsibility of a university to contribute to communities, but without prioritising one type of community over another. Although Emma does not offer specific examples in her account, her interpretation of this interaction is broad, involving the need to be useful to our communities and to cultivate a reciprocal, “symbiotic” relationship.

Chloe, a University Manager, with a wealth of practical experience working in the interface between the University and community, echoed this belief that university-community engagement should be founded on a basis of reciprocal symbiosis. She noted that some academics were “so well meaning […] they’re oblivious to the power dynamic that might exist” when proposing community engagement activity. Chloe described her role as trying to plug gaps in the university where certain roles don’t exist.

**Chloe:** I kind of mop up the things to do with local communities that don't fit into public engagement with research and they're not widening participation? They kind of end up with me […] there were sort of lost souls as well […] academics doing some engagement isn’t really linked to their research and the head of school doesn’t like it and they want someone to advise them or give them some money, so often they come to me […] that doesn't mean that I am in any way qualified, in my opinion, other than by common sense.

Chloe stated that she sometimes felt uncomfortable in her role and not an expert on the matters that academic staff and researchers often consulted her about. Often Chloe felt that her job was to discourage someone from doing outreach activity out of concern for a community organisation or members. She referenced cases where she felt the staff member or researcher had not done enough research into community needs before approaching an organisation and was in danger of draining the time...
and resources of an organisation. In another more extreme case, she mentioned untrained undergraduates being placed in potentially dangerous situations in order to collect research. Chloe states that:

**Chloe:** there is a bit of a black hole when it comes to community engagement that is not obviously enough to linked to research that would go through a research ethics process. [...] people do a risk assessment, but that doesn't cover everything. I think it does mean that we get some really weird and random projects going on and sometimes they're just not right, basically, done with the best of intentions [...] But the will to do something good doesn't suddenly mean that you are qualified to do jobs that people train years to do.

Chloe’s account suggests that while there is a will amongst individual members of staff to engage with community, this is not always proposed or designed in a way that is of benefit to the community. In some cases, this type of intervention might prove harmful. Chloe’s account also highlights the fragmented nature of the University’s approach to fulfilling the third mission in a way that is not fully integrated with the other two missions of research and teaching.

The majority of staff framed research that is done *for* and *with* communities as a responsibility and duty of the University. Internal university documents also encourage the prioritisation of research, but the difference in the participant data is that the ends of the research carried out is for the benefits to communities in a broad sense as opposed to income generation or enhancing the reputation of the University.

**Rachel:** I absolutely think that we have responsibility, there is a responsibility, but there’s also the need, and that just that research needs to be applied, otherwise, it's not useful for anybody. [...] So, I think that's what really, research is all about. And teaching, I guess, is about as well, because we're trying to create, we respond to future leaders and decision makers who want to solve problems for the people and the organisations that they live with.

Rachel emphasises the future-focussed application of research and teaching in her account as part of the responsibilities that universities hold. As well as highlighting the importance of applied research which tackles societal problems, Rachel stresses the need to collaborate with people with lived experiences of these problems in the design of research. Rachel advocates for knowledge that can be applied and useful;
this, I argued, was central to the UK Government’s focus on “useful” degrees which had obvious instrumental value. However, Rachel also talks about cultivating future leaders who want to make decisions that improve the lives of others, in other words, to act for the common good. Thus, Rachel references knowledges which can be categorised as both the instrumental type of knowledge as well as the communicative and emancipatory, which Kreber (2016) argues is necessary for cultivating civic-mindedness in students.

Participants consistently expressed a broad interpretation of knowledge exchange which involves a reciprocal relationship rather than the traditional dynamic of the academic expert imparting knowledge to wider communities. Erin considers this unilateral interpretation of knowledge exchange to be “patronising” and harmful to efforts to build trust between university and its communities. As Erin explains:

\begin{quote}
Erin: I think community engagement is key to a university, I think, is to crack open the walls of the ivory tower and to say “what can the community do with us as well, as you know - I think that old model of developing research studies and employing this knowledge exchange, which is the slightly patronising way of saying “we'll now tell you the answers.” I think it's very outdated. [...] I think we have to move towards, and that that sort of co-constructing, really building research together.
\end{quote}

Similar to Rachel, Erin discusses types of knowledge which can be categorised as communicative and emancipatory knowledge, which required to carry out this kind of community engagement. This suggests that a broader definition of knowledge exchange presents a more democratic kind of community engagement for the benefit of the common good. Amy’s account also expresses caution in framing academics as the “experts” and refers to the knowledge, assets and resources which the University gains from its communities.

\begin{quote}
Amy: I think possibly the danger is more of the, you know, the ivory tower type danger, the type that the university expertise has the answers, you know, all of that rather than, you know, community partners knowledge and assets and resources. So that to me is possibly more of the risk.
\end{quote}

A narrow interpretation of knowledge exchange is expressed by Amy and Erin as being patronising and potentially damaging to community-university relationships. Implicit in this is the idea that a narrow interpretation of knowledge exchange exacerbates an already unequal power dynamic between the University and its
communities. Crucially, they highlight the need to cultivate types of knowledge which are communicative and emancipatory with communities, as well as offering instrumental knowledge to society.

References to a dimension of university research which I considered emancipatory, were repeatedly made by participants. Here, it is emphasised by Megan who frames access to knowledge as a “human rights” and “social injustice” issue.

Megan: it’s an absolute right of people to have that knowledge. They just saw it as a human rights issue. […] there was a social injustice of people not being able to access that information. And they should have ways to do that.

In the case of research, both Megan and Connor facilitate opportunities for individuals (patient groups and prisoners) within the wider community to become researchers. In this way, non-academics become actively involved in co-constructing research and generating new knowledge. Participants without direct roles in involving non-academics in research frequently expressed the opinion that the outputs of research ought to be “useful” and “applicable” in a way that would contribute to solutions to societal issues, both globally and locally. These attitudes reflect a commitment to the common good but also to individual flourishing both in the sense of expanding individual capabilities (Nussbaum, 2011) but also that deciding what is good for a community is context dependent (MacAllister, 2019) and should be deliberated within the context of communities and their traditions. In these examples of research, individuals in the wider community are not only participants but, active researchers involved in identifying issues and prioritising solutions.

Participants explicitly referred to useful and applicable research that benefits wider society as a “responsibility” or “duty” of universities. Also inferred from participant accounts was that there is similarly a duty and responsibility to imbue students, future graduates and professionals, with the kinds of knowledge that cultivate civic-minded professionalism. By doing so, this cultivated the kind of instrumental and interpretive knowledge that allows students as future professionals to carry out the functions of their profession, but also to challenge the status quo.
6.2.2 University as a “partner” and/or “neighbour”

I identified the theme of the University as a good and welcoming neighbour following thematic analysis of University documents as well as interview data. This theme was echoed by the University leaders and practitioners whom I interviewed within the context of the CEL activity they had instigated or were involved in. Both the community engagement plan (Appendix 12.3) and the 10-year strategy document (Appendix 0) position the University’s interactions with the rest of society as that of a “partner” to community and a “good and welcoming neighbour” which denotes a sense of warmth, mutual respect, reciprocity and, crucially, minimises the power differential between the University and the community. However, I would also argue that “partner” and “neighbour” have distinct connotations with “partner” implying collaboration and shared responsibility and “neighbour” as someone who lives in close proximity but without any real obligation or responsibility to their neighbours. In other words, besides not breaking the law, neighbours have no defined social responsibilities to each other in the same way that a partner might. The participant data I present below, strongly suggests that University leaders, managers and practitioners perceive the University’s role as much more than just a neighbour but a partner with defined duties and responsibilities.

Public-facing institutional literature presents what the University has already contributed to their communities as well as what they are committed to delivering in the future. So, while there is reference to partnership working and reciprocity, these documents focus only on unilateral benefits that the University bestow on their communities as opposed to the benefits the communities contribute to the University. While there is no explicit reference to research and teaching as the University’s primary missions, statements such as the one below, hint that the core purpose of the University’s resources is to exist for these primary missions:

Actively look for ways in which we can place more of our resources (buildings, equipment, vehicles) at the service of local communities and groups, whilst still using them to deliver on their core purpose (Appendix 12.3)
In contrast, participants were much more likely to describe their role within communities as part of the core purpose rather than being separate. In other words, participants were more likely to express the role of the University within its neighbouring communities as that of a partner rather than, more passively, as a neighbour. Among the kinds of responsibilities and commitments that participants felt were important included sharing its resources. In his interview, Ross couches this in terms of the University delivering on its commitment to outreach:

Ross: I think it's good for the university in the sense of universities, you know, one of his priorities is community outreach, right, and the university using its resources and capabilities to connect with the community.

Similarly, Caitlin sees the CEL work she does with local state schools as offering something of value to the community that it could not otherwise afford:

Caitlin: We have the work in special schools, which is very therapeutic, and using models of [discipline area] therapy. And so again, that's providing something, you know, no schools can afford to buy in that service.

The idea of sharing resources as a good neighbour was prevalent across participants' accounts of comprising third mission activity. Some participants described this as more than a mere adjunct to the University's core, primary missions but as a key part of the University's historical relationship with the host city and immediate communities. As Cameron states:

Cameron: 100% I think there's a duty upon us to share what we have as much as we have wider than just our student and staff community. We've done that in our long history of sharing parts of our riches with the city.

Cameron refers here to the Alba University Settlement which ran from 1905-2010 (Ragged University, 2020) where students lived amongst local people in deprived areas of Alba City for the benefit of both students and community members. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 and highlights the view of the University, even over 100 years ago, as being a partner to its neighbouring communities. This is echoed in more detail by Liam who expresses the third mission of the University in terms of enhancing the local infrastructure and contributing to social development aims.

Liam: the university has a responsibility to be putting back in resources into the community [...] it now dominates a large part of the city [...] in terms of the real estate, that it owns, the land that it owns. And so, it's benefiting from the
Liam explicitly highlights widening participation and arguably supports cultivating the kind of knowledge that goes beyond the instrumental and seeks to challenge the status quo.

The idea of doing CEL to fulfil a kind of professional, ethical commitment will be discussed in section 8.2. At this point it is relevant to note the way in which staff refer to third mission activity as a kind of “responsibility” or “duty”. This is expressed both as a personal duty and an institutional one. Ethically, this idea of fulfilling a duty can be ascribed to a deontological (see section 3.2.1.1) or rule-based commitment. This is relevant to my later discussion on the “values-led” institution (7.2.1) and how individual morals principles interact with ethics, culture and structure (8.2).

Ross’s CEL activity involves delivering courses within prisons in Scotland in collaboration with trained PhD volunteers. He positions the prisoners as fellow researchers who are producers of knowledge and highlights the need to challenge more traditional approaches to prison education.

Ross: it’s very much about treating the prisoners as researchers, they do original research. […] that turns into a book. And I think that’s a particular thrilling possibility, because it takes the educational paradigm, if you like, in prisons, to beyond just "Oh, these are some people who just need to be educated, we’re gonna feed them information, and hope to turn them into better people," […] into more of the idea of "how can we enrich these people’s lives and actually get them to see that doing original research is actually interesting?"

Across these accounts, the relationship between the University and the surrounding communities as described by participants goes beyond the “consumer-producer” relationship which is defined by the Conservative government’s Higher Education Research Act (HERA) (2017). Practitioners express the relationship as being less transactional and more of a relationship of symbiotic mutualism where both parties should benefit from each other’s actions and resources. Caution around this relationship becoming more one of parasitism (where one party benefits at the
expense of another) rather than mutualism, was highlighted by Amy who explained
that any third-mission activity must benefit the community as a priority.

Amy: do we ever risk being? I don't wanna say parasitic, but like, […] who truly, is that benefiting? And I think that's a question in our mind, and we were thinking about some of the community engagement projects that we do, and they must be about community benefit. [...] there could be a shared objective around learning around research, but it really must be about benefits as well, too.

There is a clear narrative within public-facing University literature which places the institution within the role of a friendly and welcoming neighbour as well as a partner. I have argued that these two roles are distinct and have different connotations related to the level of responsibility and obligation that the institution has towards its surrounding communities. Participants in both groups emphasised the role of the university as a “partner” with obligations and responsibilities much more emphatically than public-facing University literature. Participant data also focussed on the reciprocal relationship between the University and its community partners with many highlighting the benefits the University received from communities and stressed the need to preserve this balance to avoid the University being a drain on its communities. Public-facing literature placed much more emphasis on the resources and knowledge that the University shared with communities rather than what it received.

### 6.2.3 CEL contributes to a university’s missions

With this theme, I explore participants’ accounts of how CEL contributes to the missions of a University, with clear links to helping to sustain the ultimate purpose: to support individual flourishing and critical thinking for the common good. I asked all participants if they believed CEL experiences could offer students benefits that traditional classroom learning, experiential learning in general, or casual volunteering could not. In other words, if they believed there was anything unique about this type of learning. Common to all responses was the idea that, unlike traditional classroom learning, CEL could offer practical skills and knowledge that aligns with the concepts of communicative and emancipatory knowledge (Kreber, 2014). Colleagues in nursing, for example, discussed how essential it was for students to learn how to
speak to people and relate to people whose backgrounds were unlike their own. Community Education practitioners spoke about younger students or students with limited life experience before attending University, being able to gain this experience, to some degree on the course through CEL. Participants below set CEL apart from more general types of experiential learning and volunteering and relate its unique qualities to a student’s motivation for being involved in this type of learning.

Although not all participants agreed that CEL activity should be mandatory for students on all degree programmes, those who envisaged all students benefitting from CEL activity expressed a broad and holistic view of the benefits of CEL which transcended instrumental knowledge as categorised by Kreber (2016a). Andrew considers CEL to be a vital aspect of the ultimate purpose the University should support. He believes that a university education is not just a vocational education. In other words, it is not enough to cultivate instrumental knowledge in students.

Andrew: As a university, our point is not vocational education. [...] we are a critical part of civil society, right. It's about creating enlightened citizens, it's about, you know, a venue or forum for, to debate different perspectives. And so that's our moral mandate, I mean, that it fits in with our capabilities too, yeah, we can do other things, but that's not what we're good at. Okay, in a sense, we say what we're good at, or we're about educating citizens.

Andrew clearly highlights the concepts of enlightenment and creating “enlightened citizens” as part of “our moral mandate” as university educators. This view is shared by Matthew who ties it in with the concept of human flourishing within a community. Matthew aligns the benefits of CEL with the ultimate purpose of “flourishing” and adds that universities should aim to “broaden” the experiences and perspectives of their students.

Matthew: thinking about the sort of people you want, in a kind of like happy flourishing society, I think the biggest contribution that the humanities could make of encouraging people to kind of like, enlarge their perspectives and consider other perspectives. I think that's really important. And yeah, I think that's one reason why all these non-STEM university subjects should be doing community engagement stuff.

Andrew and Matthew views echo MacIntyre’s (1987) concept of an “Educated Public” which is held in contrast to the traditional “ivory tower” image of universities. MacIntyre (1987) argues that two main goals of contemporary educational systems
are to prepare students for specific social roles and occupations, and to provide them the skills necessary to think independently within an inclusive, educated community, which is open to different ways of knowing, being, and acting. Through discoveries and discussions, this community is inclusive, allowing for the introduction of fresh viewpoints and the creation of new possibilities (MacAllister, 2016, p.533).

The idea of supporting emancipatory critical thinking is evident in Abbie’s account. Abbie argues that one crucial difference between CEL and more casual forms of volunteering, was the development of student’s critical awareness of the social context of their activity.

**Abbie:** if you just go and do it, yeah, I'm going to help the garden, I'm going to paint the wall. And that's an engagement with an individual. And I think what the students get by doing it with a course is that they understand the social context, much better. Okay. So, I think that's, I think that's valuable, because we're all in our social contexts. And hopefully, it's producing more aware, more humane, perhaps, people. I mean, people are humane, I don't want to say that that's something that we have to try and encourage, but I think you can develop that.

Abbie argues that understanding the social context of other people helps develop empathy and compassion in her students. She phrases this as producing more “humane” people which aligns with Nussbaum’s (2017) concept of Cultivating Humanity but with a much greater emphasis on students having achieved this through encounters with people and their social contexts, rather than through theory and individual reflection. Findings suggest that nurturing empathy is linked to critical awareness and an impetus to challenge the status quo. In the example below, Kieran’s student’s placement experience engenders feelings of empathy but also anger about what she perceives as societal injustice:

**Kieran:** We ask them [students] to think critically about – “why does poverty exist?” What are the structures in place that do that? So, this student […] revisited and changed the way completely that she thought about the work she did, people she worked with, because of that kind of idea. And that idea, she began to think "well, why is it like that?", you can see her getting angry about, why do we let this happen, you know, so [...] that's just one example of how you that any theoretical idea has helped have given them a tool or framework to analyse the people they work with to kind of make sense of their condition.
In their accounts above, participants highlighted the importance of the emancipatory dimension of learning which are clearly linked to challenging the status quo and questioning tradition and ideology. Practitioners gave examples of how this idea of emancipatory knowledge could be cultivated in practice alongside instrumental and communicative knowledge. In section 6.2.4, there is further evidence of students gaining emancipatory knowledge through reflecting on their privilege during CEL placements.

6.2.4 Exposing and understanding privilege through CEL

Alba University is a Russell Group University with a disproportionately high number of students from independent schools compared with other universities in Scotland (Commissioner for Fair Access, 2021). While not a direct measure of comparative social advantage or privilege, this finding is consistent with participants’ perception of the social background of the majority of their students.

Andrew recounted an assessment he had set up for students in the initial iterations of his CEL course where students were asked to reflect on instances where they had experienced discrimination but soon found that most of his students, the majority of whom came from relatively privileged backgrounds, found it more meaningful and relevant to reflect on examples of their own privilege.

Andrew: one student from India told me how her first experience at the village school, how she was told to sit on a stool. And some of the kids that were from lower castes had to sit on the floor, or had one student who was up on charged with possession of cannabis. Right. But because his father was well to do, yeah, and because they could afford the best lawyers. [...] he got out of everything. But then he was just thinking, what if I were actually, what if I were black? What if I had this situation? [...] So, you see things on both sides, that's become a very powerful tool, I think, earlier on in the course just to get really get them thinking about its social problems.

Students on Andrew’s course gain emancipatory knowledge through explicit reflection on their social context alongside their CEL placements in the community. His students reflected on their past experiences with a view to questioning tradition and the status quo. Similar to Andrew, Emily stresses the importance of highlighting the social context of their work to students as future professionals.
**Emily**: people come from a really wide variety of walks of life, as well. They don't necessarily realise the circumstances that other people live in. [...] the majority of the students we attract, and it's not necessarily the same on all programmes, but they've come from relatively privileged background. Not all but many, but realising that some people are living day to day hand to mouth or, you know, on the streets can be quite eye opening. It's there on the telly. But when you actually start talking to people that is their everyday life, [...] it's alright to have this idealism about what you're going to do and how you're going to do it people but actually realising that you can't apply the technical in the way that perhaps you would like to or you're prepared to. So, you have to learn to adapt things to work with people.

Emily acknowledges that, some students may come from more privileged, sheltered backgrounds which would have included limited exposure to people from different walks of life. Exposure comes chiefly from the media “on the telly”, and not through extended real-life encounters. Emily’s comment highlights the need for action-orientated pedagogical practice as a way to incorporate, not only theory with instrumental/technical knowledge, but also stimulating a greater curiosity and understanding of how others experience their social context. Emily also clearly highlights the need for a kind of *phronēsis* where students learn to adapt their practice depending on their context and the individual they are working with.

Here I recall Butin's (2007) well-founded argument against the kind of CEL which exacerbates social stereotypes or through uncritical experiences or “poverty tourism” through ad hoc, short-term placements. None of the practitioners here espouse the kind of “antifoundationalist” approach that Butin discusses but rather the kind of structured, reflective approach which Deeley (2022) advocates as helpful for service-learning experiences.

This is similar to the way in which Erin talks about the importance of tying theory together with practice in an applied research context:

**Erin**: At Masters level, to really be able to critically analyse policy [...] but also to really understand that reality is very different, often from what's reflected in research, or certainly for what's in policy. So, to understand where the synergies are between them, but also where it just doesn't work. [...] students are sometimes really shocked to hear lived experience and how services don't connect up and how what happens at policy level
Erin’s account speaks to the importance of fostering emancipatory knowledge, where students are given the tools to critique and challenge the status quo, There is also the opportunity to question and reflect on assumptions. Emily highlights the way in which students’ experience challenge their assumptions based on their limited exposure to these issues. Abbie emphasises the need to expose students to a more diverse population. This broadening of experience again echoes MacIntyre’s concept of an Educated Public (1987), allowing for the introduction of fresh perspectives and the creation of new possibilities

**Abbie:** I wanted them to really appreciate that learning in a different way. Don't just be interested in it and enjoy their student years, which is important too, but, but also see that connection with the outside world, and feel themselves as actors with their knowledge. But also meeting a more diverse population, [...] depending what kind of school background or community background you've come from, you might only have met a really kind of middle class, educated kind of community by the time you come to university.

This emancipatory dimension is linked to the kind of transformation that Kreber (2016a, p.8) describes (discussed in section 3.2.4). It is transformation that involves a reflective reorientation that allows students to confront the evident injustices predominant in the world, compelling them to take action and amplify the voices of individuals and groups who are marginalised. At the same time, they cultivate greater acceptance and openness towards individuals whose lives are different to theirs.

Aside from placing students into the community on placement, another way to involve the wider community into university teaching and learning is through introducing “Experts by Experience” into the classroom. Erin involves people who have had lived experience of homelessness or working with people experiencing homelessness.

**Erin:** So, we have somebody who has been a refugee and comes and, and is part of the class [...] so you really have that lived experience. And that is next to the research evidence, obviously, you're presenting the research based evidence, but you've got that real life story. And so, we've had people with lived experience of harmful drug and alcohol use, and recovery of homelessness in terms of rough sleeping and hostel living, and refugee asylum seeker. And then we also have practitioners who are working, so a GP who's working, and in a GP practice with people experiencing homelessness.

**Rachel:** I think, a happy student who feels like they've learned something, is very rewarding. [...] being able to teach something to students that they
probably wouldn’t be able to learn in other settings and other courses? I think that’s just a really - it’s very rewarding.

Rachel emphasises the uniqueness of CEL in offering what cannot be learned or experienced on other courses or environments. Emily argues that these encounters are necessarily to inform better professional decision-making for individuals. This is echoed in Erin’s account below but with more emphasis on the civic responsibility dimension of students’ developing professionalism:

Erin: I think it can transform a life I think for people who, you know, our students are going to be the barristers, the human rights lawyers of the future and they’re going to be the doctors and nurses who are leading organisations in the future, you know, we do develop leaders in the world and, you know, people that, that opportunity to have that real lived experience can totally transform how you view homelessness or the refugee experience. And, and, and I think it can be transformative in terms of education, in a way that reading the research doesn't necessarily do.

Erin argues that real-life encounters do more than help students make better-informed decisions as future professionals for individuals in communities but for communities as a whole. She acknowledges that, as graduates of a research-intensive, Russell Group University, a relatively high proportion of students will progress to careers of significant influence in society in research and political leadership. An understanding of social issues which goes beyond research and theory is therefore necessary. This is very much mirrored in Abbie’s statement below which also highlights the way in which students can be sensitised to the impact of policies on the lived experiences of individuals in society.

Abbie: So that also is an element to, to get to grips with some of the world’s problems, in a way, furnished with our learning that’s ongoing, could be really beneficial for students and bring everything much more alive for them. It's not just in books, it's out there in the world. And you can see it in a different way. [...] they thought about that volunteering, in concert with their learning, and that gave them a whole new perspective. So, it had been really valuable. And they understood things like how the impact of society and the impact of policy is very real in people's lives in ways they hadn't appreciated before.

The practitioners above see CEL as more than a useful adjunct to traditional classroom learning, but rather an essential complement to teaching and research.

Ross’s account describes the feeling of exhilaration and satisfaction felt by him and his students by experiencing a wholly distinct learning environment, which is the lived experience of prisoners.
Ross: So it really makes you quite hyper when you come out [...] you feel really satisfied that you've gone into this environment, into this sort of difficult to access environment and deliver something and come out again, I think my PhD students always felt that they always came out invigorated, felt like they're done something really added a richness to their PhD experience, even if it was just over a few months, you know, once every couple of weeks, it's still for them is a quite prominent experience in their sort of day to day lives.

Echoing this sentiment from a community perspective, Ryan recalls a black American student's experience on a CEL placement at a local school in Alba City.

Ryan: some of the pupils in these schools have never met a black person before. [...] And one girl looked directly at her and said, "Oh, you're American and black. Are you a slave?" She didn't mean to be racist. [...] that's a way of, of sort of tapping into the pupil's own ideas about social justice and curiosity about the world in a way that at first may sound racist, like, "are you a slave?" With but in fact, it's not. It's curiosity. And it's an inability to articulate the question so they can later articulate once they've had that conversation.

Clearly, Ryan believes that the secondary school pupils benefit from their encounters with the student on placement for two reasons: it creates opportunities for meaningful interaction between school pupils and individuals from a broader range of cultural backgrounds and it inducts pupils into expressing their curiosity about potentially controversial topics in an appropriate way.

As well as bringing theoretical concepts to life, CEL was identified as providing students with opportunities to have meaningful encounters with organisations and individuals outside of the University. This was seen to be crucial in developing students’ graduate attributes by improving their relational and communication skills. Amongst participant accounts, students were frequently referred to as “privileged” or “sheltered” because of their age and social status. CEL was seen as an activity which could help compensate for those students' lack of life experience. More than this, however, those meaningful encounters gave students an insight into lived experience of individuals in society living lives unlike their own. It acted as a trigger to initiate empathy and, crucially, the will to challenge rather than reproduce the inequality they might witness. Structured, reflective practice was seen as one important tool to avoid the kinds of placements which would exacerbate unhelpful social stereotypes.
The findings in this chapter provide an insight into participants' perceptions of their institution, the analysis of CEL experiences sheds light on the institution's role in facilitating meaningful encounters and fostering graduate attributes. Participants recognised the inherent privilege and sheltered nature of students due to their age and social status. Therefore, CEL emerged as a pivotal activity that bridged this gap, compensating for their lack of life experience and offering encounters with individuals living lives different from their own. These encounters not only fostered empathy but also instilled a desire to challenge rather than perpetuate societal inequalities. Reflective practice, viewed as a vital tool, was highlighted as a means to avoid reinforcing unhelpful social stereotypes during placements. In this section, these insights into the transformative potential of CEL intertwine with the examination of participants' perceptions of their institution and its alignment with the Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics approach, as discussed in the next chapter. By drawing on theories of virtues, ethics, values, and morals, and by analysing public-facing and internal university policies, this analysis aims to uncover the prioritization of certain "goods" over others and its impact on staff-led activities such as CEL.
7 Findings and Analysis Part Two

7.1 Introduction

In Chapter 2, I explore an overarching theme entitled “How to seem virtuous without actually being so”. This overarching theme was derived from three distinctive subthemes, which I generated from my analysis of the data. The first subtheme, "A 'values-led' institution," examines the phenomenon of an institution projecting a values-driven image, even when their actions may not align with these declared principles. The second subtheme, “Corrupted practices and undermining the progress of CEL” draws specifically on Alasdair MacIntyre’s concepts of practices and institutions as discussed in Section 3.2.6 and investigates how practices can become tainted and potentially hinder the advancement of Community-Engaged Learning (CEL). The third subtheme, "Pockets of excellence in a community of practice," sheds light on the existence of isolated instances of exceptional practice within a broader community context.

7.2 Theme 2: “How to seem virtuous without actually being so”

In this section I explore how participants perceived their institution and described their experiences with their institution specifically within the context of doing Community Engaged Learning work. MacIntyre's (2007) definition of an institution is useful here:

Institutions are characteristically and necessarily concerned with external goods. They are involved in acquiring money and other material goods; they are structured in terms of power and status, and they distribute money, power and status as rewards. [...] no practices can survive for any length of time unsustained by institutions. (MacIntyre, 2007, 194)

I argued in Part 2 of the Critical Literature Review that the ultimate purpose of a university should be grounded in an emancipatory, Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics approach. In this section, I analyse the themes generated from the data to examine how staff perceived their institution in the context of doing CEL and university-community engagement more generally. I refer to concepts such as virtues, ethics, values and morals which I clarified in Part 2 of the Critical Literature Review. I also utilise public-facing and internal University policy documents to explore areas of
alignment and tension between what the University commits itself to publicly and how this is enacted in their internal policies. I use existing theories as a lens to understand how some “goods” come to be prioritised over others and the impact this might have on staff-led activity such as CEL.

7.2.1 A “values-led” institution

This theme captures how participants considered the institution as being “values-led”. I explained earlier that values express what an individual or group agrees to be important. Being values-led and being led by ethics or morals are distinct concepts; one’s values may be grounded within an ethical or moral framework but this is not a necessary condition. Alba University’s values stem from its vision and purpose:

Our vision: Our graduates, and the knowledge we discover with our partners, make the world a better place.

Our purpose: As a world-leading research-intensive University, we are here to address tomorrow’s greatest challenges. Between now and 2030 we will do that with a values-led approach to teaching, research and innovation, and through the strength of our relationships, both locally and globally. (Strategy 2030 see section 0)

The stated purpose is future-focussed but ambiguous and the object of the purpose is vague. For example, one might ask: “challenges for whom?”; “strengthen relationships with whom?” or “world-leading in which sense?”. In its ten-year strategy document “Strategy 2030” (see section 0), Alba University outlines its ambitions to be a future-facing institution with a “values-led” approach to all of its activities:

- **We aim to achieve excellence in all that we do, always being principled, considerate and respectful.**
- **Our teaching and research is relevant to society and we are diverse, inclusive and accessible to all.**
- **We are ambitious, bold and act with integrity, always being willing to listen.**
- **We celebrate and strengthen our deep-rooted and distinctive internationalism, attracting the world’s best minds and building innovative global partnerships for research, teaching and impact.**
- **We foster a welcoming community, where staff, students, alumni and friends feel proud to be part of our University.**
- **We sustain a deep allegiance and commitment to the interests of the city and region in which we are based, alongside our national and international efforts, ensuring relevance to all.**
• *We are a place of transformation and of self-improvement, driven to achieve benefit for individuals, communities, societies and our world* (Strategy 2030” see section 0)

It is possible to interpret many of these values as being consistent with an emancipatory, neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics approach: integrity, benevolence, cooperativeness and tolerance, for example. However, virtuous action needs to be motivated by the “right” reasons; being benevolent to the local community because doing so creates good publicity for an institution, is distinct from seeing benevolence as an end in itself.

Participants interpreted the idea of being “values-led” in particular ways. Emma identified it as a condition of the University being able to operate as it did, supporting both immediately-useful scholarship as well as scholarship for its own sake:

**Emma:** I would want to defend scholarship for scholarship’s sake in some respects as long as it is within that institution that is about being values-led.

Therefore, for Emma, being values-led implies that there is some underlying, defined structure which guides the scholarship of an institution. So, while, on the surface, research on entirely abstract and esoteric subjects may seem irrelevant to society, they may still contribute to the overall values of a university. Amy believed that the University should strive to be politically neutral but that this was not incompatible with being values-led and did not exclude CEL placements in organisations primarily associated with wealth creation:

**Amy:** our mission has to be, you know, politically neutral as well too […] why can’t you have interest in any part of the political spectrum and still think about experiential learning or service? [...] it would be interesting to look at that, with the hedge fund activity, you could say that every fund manager at the moment is looking at environmental and social risks and opportunities through investments. So as part of their education and a quality education, need to think not just about financial returns, but natural capital and social capital and all of those, so I would be keen to dispute that.

From Amy’s example, an institution could theoretically be politically neutral whilst claiming to be values-led. I would argue that an institution cannot be politically neutral any more than it can be value free. This would only be possible if the values were declared in sufficiently vague terms as to disguise any tension or
disagreement. This is relevant to MacIntyre’s (1999a, p.122) “façade of moral consensus” where moral disagreements and tensions can be obscured by rhetoric. This is similar to the idea of creating an illusion of neutrality which benefits the status quo and the existing power dynamic.

**Chloe:** [assumption of political neutrality is a] very naive, sheltered perspective on the world. Because everything you do from the moment you wake up, so when you go to bed, and actually who made the bed that you chose to sleep in, and where you bought it from, and when you bought it on credit cards, or which banks that credit card is [...] the way universities are run is determined by the government that's in power to an extent and the funding models. The university does not exist in a political vacuum at all [...] its objectivity has been misappropriated.

Practitioner Kieran expresses his own values explicitly and agrees that it is impossible for any institution to be neutral; this to him, is equivalent to maintaining the status quo which I argue is the opposite to promoting emancipatory knowledge.

**Kieran:** So, if I look at anything that I've produced, you could say “it's biased it's not valid”, because I'm a Marxist. And I'm obviously kind of seeing things in a skewed way. [...] we can’t be neutral. If we don't do what you suggested and, and get folk to think critically, then [...] all we'll do is sustaining the status quo, or reproducing the way things are.

While Jack agreed that the University should be a site of “transformation and self-improvement” (point 7), he also expressed that, as part of being a values-led institution meant having a shared understanding of what this meant, without conflating one’s personal value set with the institutional one.

**Jack:** I have a certain set of values that I bring into my attitudes about higher education and what it should be [...]even if a student had genuinely engaged in diversity of experiences, and hadn't developed an increased level of self-awareness that was truly informed, which always has to be our hope [...] Am I in the right position to judge that the person did come out at the end is not somebody that we want as part of our [University] community? I don't think that I am.

Jack’s views on institutional values echo MacIntyre’s (2016) argument about the common good in that it should be meaningfully deliberated in the public sphere, within the context of a community. Jack also describes the change in attitude, as an institution, towards being comfortable expressing values within the last decade.
notes that ten years ago, during the consultation period for graduate attributes one senior member of staff stated:

**Jack:** “it is not for us, the university to determine what is ethically correct.” [...] if somebody chooses to come through our experience, and develop these skills, and then how they deploy it, is up to them. [...] we couldn’t at that time, didn’t get ethical stuff into the framework. I don’t believe that was the right thing. [...]”

From this account, it appears as though the senior staff member Jack refers to felt little or no responsibility for the moral education of their students, only for imbuing students with certain skills, presumably instrumental skills for employment. Despite feeling that this was not right, Jack was not able to influence the outcome of the committee. Jack’s account suggests that he places importance not only on values but also on ethics. Jack later states that he feels this situation has now changed for the better:

**Jack:** the discourse around values and the values of the institution, and that has now become clear. And that would mean that hopefully, what we’re also doing in our educational experiences is trying to foster an explicit and stated set of values within our students. So, I think we move we’d start moving towards a scenario where we could, in theory, say, actually, as an institution, we’re disappointed in a particular outcome, as opposed to just me personally, being disappointed, if we feel that that is at odds with our set of values that are institutionally trying to be supported and encouraged.

So, while Jack uses the term “values”, I argue that he is also speaking here of ethics. He speaks of collectively disapproving of an outcome based on the rightness and wrongness of it as a group. Again, Jack emphasises the Common Good aspect of deliberating what is ethical but also the need for values to be explicit and clear. This aligns with MacIntyre’s (1999) and Kreber’s (2005) critiques of institutional rhetoric which can fudge over disagreement; explicitly stating values, ideals and goals is necessary. It is arguable whether the institutional values of the University of Alba are yet as explicit and clear as Jack believes it to be. While the interview data from University leaders such as Jack, Emma and Amy suggested thoughtful engagement with and awareness of the institution’s values. This was not the case with practitioners I interviewed.
Practitioners tended to be less clear about the University's commitment to being values-led. When asked what this idea meant to James in the context of his CEL work at the University he responded:

**James:** Not a lot to be honest. When it's phrased like that, it just feels like it's a tick. "We care about blah blah blah." Yeah. It's like, No, you don't really, but you just say that because you have to. Okay, sorry, that's really cynical.

James identifies “box ticking” as symptomatic of a superficial approach to being values-led. Caitlin similarly expresses doubt about the reasons the University agrees to engage with CEL and whether they express sincerely held virtues.

**Caitlin:** Whether or not it's coming from, at the top from not just about ticking boxes, that's the only thing, you know, certainly not with them [The Community Engagement Forum], they're doing a great job. The University, I think the university need this [...] awareness. And I hope it's for genuine reasons.

Casting further doubt on the University’s motivation for engaging with communities, Abbie suggests that it is done reluctantly and only for the purpose of positive public relations rather than an expression of virtue:

**Abbie:** [Alba University] seem to like this kind of initiative and to be very pleased to have it on their website and that kind of stuff. But they don't really want to do it. [...]

Referring to MacIntyre’s (1999) distinction between genuine virtues and counterfeit virtues and Hursthouse’s (1999) four conditions for virtuous action, I suggest that Abbie’s account does not support the notion that the University’s action reflect an institution that is genuinely virtuous. Moral motivation, I have already mentioned, requires that the actor acts for a reason/s and for the right reason/s. Both Caitlin and Abbie are, to some degree, doubtful that this is the case.
Maintaining a good public relations (PR) profile alone is arguably not the right kind of moral motivation for community-engagement. Cameron’s account however, positions the act of generating good PR as an essential part of being a values-led institution.

**Cameron:** Some of what I’ve said in today’s interview might sound quite cynical around the PR side of it, but it’s actually in an effort, most of the time, to demonstrate to a cynical public that there’s actually a lot of amazing work that the students, the staff and the University itself are doing within communities. If you don’t tell those stories they don’t get told ‘cause they’re often small acts of people doing great work.

Cameron’s account of university-community relations is founded on a strong awareness of the need for the university to *act* as a values-led institution, but also for this to be *seen and widely publicised* in order to maintain good relationships with community, acknowledge the work being carried out by staff and students, and enhance the overall reputation of the University. While maintaining good relations with community certainly could be motivated by virtue, I would argue that it would be need to be part of a sustained programme of effort. Drawing from MacIntyre (1999) and Hursthouse’s (1999) condition that an action is virtuous when it comes from a settled and consistent state of character, I would argue that, for example “small acts of people”, the Day to Make a Difference programme or short term volunteering does not, by itself, qualify as virtuous action because it is usually short term, sporadic and does not require consistent commitment.

This theme highlights the distinction between an institution that is led by values (things they agree are important) and one that is led by a virtue-ethical framework and guided by a compatible ultimate purpose. An institution which is values-led may include values which are compatible with a virtue-ethical approach, but this is not the same thing. A values-led institution does not need to adhere to an ethical framework and carry out actions which are genuinely virtuous i.e., for the right reasons and as from a settled state of character.

Some of the university leaders and managers interviewed espouse the notion of the University being values-led whilst participants expressed doubt that there was an
awareness or shared understanding of what these values were, beyond the Senior Leadership team. Furthermore, they expressed doubt that the University was genuinely values-led but rather than being led by goods such as status, wealth, and power - in other words, examples of what MacIntyre termed “external goods” (Section 3.2.6).

7.2.2 Corrupted practices and undermining the progress of CEL

In the previous chapter, a tension was identified between those aims with which the institution purportedly identified, and those aims participants believed were genuinely supported by the institution’s infrastructure. Similarly, this theme explores practices which were identified as corrupting and undermining CEL as it is currently practised and/or its existence as a sustainable teaching method.

The idea of practices being corrupted derives from MacIntyre’s scheme of institutions, practices and internal and external goods. Pursuit of power, status and short-term profit in institutions are factors that corrupt the power of practices to support the sort of individual flourishing and common good aims that MacIntyre describes. In the accounts from colleagues, agents of the institution were referred to as specific people or the roles they undertook i.e., the principal, heads of school, line managers however, they were also referred to as a local collective entity "senior management" or a more amorphous, universal entity referred to as "the university" or simply "they".

Some participants described the institution as recognising the importance of their work through non-monetary rewards and public recognition. Within their own schools and departments, participants identified different levels of encouragement and support from senior management and other colleagues. Participants such as Matthew and Morgan gave cautiously positive responses when asked about the level of support they identified for their participation in CEL activity. Matthew is a member of staff on the academic track. While he receives no formal workload allocation for his CEL work, he has worked around this by applying to small grants.
Matthew: I think the kind of head of department and Head of School, they've never been anything but supportive, and they've always kind of made nice approving noises about this stuff that I've been doing. [...] I'd like to kind of scale it up into something more sustainable. And, you know, I suppose they've not somehow magically made that happen, but that's not really something that I can blame them for

Morgan is a member of staff who has been employed solely to carry out CEL activity. She also identifies her head of department and fellow colleagues as being supportive and that this is demonstrated through their taking an interest in the outcomes of her work and helping her design and validate CEL courses.

Morgan: As for my head of department, the evidence shows that he's really keen, because he created the post. [...] he's always very keen to know about successful activities [...] so I feel, and I think he’s supportive. When I was designing the course, the people who were in the teaching programme committee [...] not many of them had actually helped with the with outreach tasks, but they were supportive in [...] giving advice on how to make it in a way that it would be approved by the Board of Studies.

At the highest level of the academic track, Ross expresses less dissatisfaction with his work allocation and how this limits his ability to take on CEL activity. Possibly as a result of being at the highest level, however, he is also less concerned with non-monetary recognition and gathering evidence to support career progression.

Ross: I do purely because I enjoy it. And that is the only motive really for it. I mean, it's ended up being, for example, got a Chancellor's Award two years ago, but that actually wasn't the - it was only because the School insisted I was put forward for it because I'd done this so ended up as the case for, that certainly wasn't the reason for doing it

For other staff on the academic career track, the University's workload allocation model acts as a barrier to managing a sustainable workload. As Abbie describes below, with no adjusted work allocation for teaching and organising courses including placements, her manager is forced to allocate time which was supposed to be reserved for citizenship.

Abbie: The work allocation model seems to favour the more traditional kind of modes of learning, which is like tutorials, lectures, [...] if you're doing a placement type course, then you would need extra time to organise those placements, liaise with placement, hosts, etc. [...] you get the same work
allocation as another colleague who might not do any of those activities [...] [My line manager] he’s found ways of accounting for giving me extra hours and some of it is citizenship. I mean, one could argue that it’s it this is about citizenship. So that’s a jolly good use for it. But of course, the citizenship is actually for being a good colleague. That’s what it was intended for.

Allocation for citizenship can be used by staff for activity which might support an application for promotion. However, Abbie later indicates that the extra workload attached to running a CEL course, is not considered the kind of citizenship activity that supports promotion applications. Therefore, compared to colleagues teaching “traditional kind of modes of learning” she is at a disadvantage.

Shannon echoes Abbie’s comment that coordinating and delivering CEL courses and projects is much more time consuming than is the case with traditional university-taught courses. She describes colleagues who, already struggling with time, are concerned about taking on more CEL (clinical) activity because there is no allowance for the extra time required.

Shannon: All of this brings more work. Yes, yes. And I do wonder if that’s why some of the more traditional academics resist the idea of bringing in more clinical work. Yeah, into the courses because there is a fear that it’s going to also bring more work.

The fact that there is no official variation in work allocation for more time-consuming delivery such as CEL can disadvantage the careers of practitioners, delaying or removing opportunities for promotion, and imply that this kind of sustained community-engagement is not prioritised.

Interviews were conducted during the first Covid-19 lockdown; some participants expressed a concern with the future of their CEL projects because of the unknown impact of the Pandemic. In their eyes, CEL would not be given the same level of support as before and less priority than income-generating activity such as research and teaching, as the school or department was understood by them to be in financial difficulty.
Ryan: To be honest, I won't even speak to my head of school about this right now. Because I don't think there's any point like I think if I went to my head of school and stuff, I want to set up a community engagement project and I have a few hours to go and do it. I don't think I think he would really want us to go off and do those things. I just don't think we have the resource to do it anymore. [...] I'm only an employee. So, I have to do what my line manager asks me to do.

Shannon echoes this sentiment and repeats some of the warnings about funding cuts she received from her school. In her account, Shannon was expected to increase or maintain her level of activity around CEL but did not expect to be compensated for this or support to increase her activity.

Shannon: And unfortunately, due to what has happened this year, I've already been told that you know what I mean, my budget's been cut dramatically this year. But I think that's been the same throughout a number of schools. And we've all been told "Don't be expecting extra staff." No, no, because that's not going to happen. I can only do what I can do with what I have.

While Ryan and Shannon are accepting of the extraordinary context of the Covid-19 Pandemic and therefore somewhat resigned to the uncertain future of their CEL projects, Caitlin sees the lack of support she has received historically as being a consistent before and after the Pandemic. However, with a change of head of department, she is more optimistic about the future of her CEL projects.

Caitlin: I would say that my previous head of department tolerated it. And it kept on being you know; people would hold it up as an example. And I got quite frustrated, because I felt, yeah, well you hold it up as an example, but actually, you really don't give a monkey's, ooh! But the new head of department is very much committed to it, and actually was speaking to me today about, he wants us to run a new postgraduate full programme in Community Arts, and I think that would be amazing.

In this example, Caitlin describes her former head of department as being ostensibly supportive but without the action to reinforce this. Caitlin sees this support as being performative in a way that capitalises on her CEL work with no exchange of resources or support. Work which Caitlin, and almost all participants, have characterised as having a higher workload than traditional teaching and research. Caitlin and just under half of the participants interviewed had previously won
University-wide recognition such as the Principal’s Medal for “Contribution to the Community”, for their efforts in CEL.

**Ryan:** On the other hand, I won a Principal's Medal for what I'm doing. So, I also feel the university has other ways of recognising this [CEL work]. And I know it's so tremendously important for my own students and for the pupils and teachers. That's very difficult to give it up. It's also tremendous fun.

Ryan considers non-monetary recognition and his intrinsic enjoyment of leading CEL activity as means to compensate for the CEL activity he carries out. As staff within a research intensive, Russell Group, University participants expressed no surprise that research was widely prioritised over other activity. Nevertheless, some expressed dismay that research and income generating activity (recruiting international students) always trumped activities such as teaching and community engaged learning.

**Ryan:** The university needs to support students. But as we as we both know, right now, it's all about international students. That's really where the money's coming in. And it's international students who cross subsidise parts of the university that need it. Yeah. And so, I do worry that engagement and WP will fall by the wayside.

Similarly, Abbie feels that, while the University publicly supports CEL activity, its importance in real terms is clearly downgraded below income generating activity and attracting international students who will pay high tuition fees. In her view, this creates unhelpful competition and harmful inequity between schools.

**Abbie:** I would change the kind of - setting schools against each other in terms of profit, so schools that don't bring in so much money are not penalised in the ways they can be. I mean, our school is just not resourced and funded in ways that the richer schools are. So, I think there is inequality between schools.

Within the group of academic staff interviewed the majority were on traditional research or teaching career tracks. Additionally, some staff were on “professional services” contracts even through their job involved course design, development and teaching. The latter category of staff were often employed on the basis that they would be carrying out public engagement work as their core remit. Staff on more traditional academic staff contracts either had CEL activity included as part of their teaching allocation or, did it as a voluntary or unofficial part of their general work allocation.
In the accounts above, staff identified institutional support in distinct ways from actively ring-fencing budget for public engagement activity and using this fund staff and projects, to more passive expressions of support, such a simply not obstructing CEL activity, nominating the staff member or activity for non-monetary recognition. Competition for finite resources and a lack of proactive support on a meso level exist as a common source of frustration amongst staff. A lack of financial support is a particular source of frustration and main reason that small projects cannot be developed or scaled up.

**James:** we do stuff [that] works, kind of local level, and [could] just scale it up. And yeah, if there was the will that a bit of support? I think we could, [...] start kind of building it up. [...] This is what I find frustrating. [...]there has been no buy-in or push from the top

**Matthew:** one struggle, one kind of frustration that I have with it, is that I've yet to think of a way that I can make it anything that's more larger scale or self-sustaining than that. Yeah. So, I'm kind of stuck in this cycle of like, applying for these little drips and drabs of money [...] we're running up against basically, a lack of ideas about how to kind of grow it beyond this little piecemeal project stage.

Some participants expressed frustration that more was not being done to promote CEL activity that was happening within the institution in the way that Cameron described earlier. Ross states that even though his project was recognised through the Principal’s Medals awards and deemed successful amongst prison education colleagues, the University did not actively approach him to promote this kind of activity.

**Ross:** I mean, no one has once come up to me in the last four years, and basically said, How can we use this to show what the university is doing in the local community [...] it does always strike me as a strange that I'm I don't have the university crawling all over this, trying to use it. Yeah, to advance the university's own benefit, you know, in a very selfish but justifiable, they're paying me a salary. [...] I think I think the university should get a lot more out for its own benefit.

For Ross, he believes that the University can justify capitalising on his work for good publicity because “they’re paying me a salary”. However, it was clear from his account that no part of his work allocation was specifically assigned to CEL activity, this was independently and unofficially integrated into his own research allocation.
Earlier, Caitlin and James referred to the University calling itself “values-led” as a “box-ticking” exercise. Similarly, with regards to pursuing positive publicity for CEL activity, Caitlin and Abbie consider this a hollow and unjustified exercise. According to Caitlin, the University will not invest the necessary funds into her CEL projects even though the projects are often used publicly as examples of the University engaging in meaningful third mission activity.

**Caitlin:** Often, when I've got some private funders who support music in the community they get very frustrated and say, “Well, why is the University not putting money into this? Because the University, you know, will then use this project that you've done [Name] and just to show everybody look at the good work they're doing!”

As well as the kind of passive support which neither Ross, Abbie nor Caitlin find to be useful to developing and sustaining CEL activity, in her context, Morgan describes an atmosphere of ambiguity around CEL activity.

**Morgan:** many people who don't value outreach as much as it should be valued. […] some people are helping out or doing outreach themselves. But that is a very small percentage. […] I would say there's still a majority of people who are silent. I don't know how to interpret that silence.

Further along the continuum of experience, Erin reported that some of her colleagues explicitly objected to CEL; it was not seen to be the kind of activity that Alba University should be involved in.

**Erin:** There's still loads of colleagues who don't think that there should be any community engagement. It's just to do with research, but I think there's a will from senior management, but there's no money that follows it, there's no workload allocation, and it's just done; it just adds to your own workload. […] But it's purely personal drive. And I look at other people who are doing community engagement, I think it's the same. The university isn't at a point that it puts its money where its mouth is at all.

For clarity, I asked Erin whether this disapproval was explicitly expressed or merely implied through inaction or “silence” as described by Morgan.

**Me:** do you think there are people in the university who think that we should just be about research and not community engagement? Are these people that you've met or is it just an impression that you get from some of the attitudes?

**Erin:** No! Loads of people […] If I talk about community engagement, they don't see that as the job of the university, they think the job of the university is
to evaluate to do research, and, and that all the expertise is held by the researchers.

Erin explicitly emphasises her frustration with what she sees as the institution’s lack of financial support for CEL activity and amongst some of her colleagues, a failure to see CEL, or community engagement more generally, as a being part of the ultimate purpose of the University. Abbie similarly portrays Alba University as a resource-rich university, but one which fails to invest in what she deems the “genuine purposes” of a university because of a preoccupation with economic goals.

**Abbie:** And then coming to a university like Alba, there’s got so much financial resources behind it, you know, the money, it’s got to fall back on that, it just thinks it’s got to be never used, I think. And that is the danger with just thinking about how best to deploy the money for genuine purposes of the institution. And that's so compromised now. Both research and teaching, I think, because of the profit motive.

In a similar vein, Amy suggests that, proportional to the income received by the University, its contribution to community in terms of funding was relatively low. This in itself was not so much an issue, according to Amy, but rather what individuals within the University implicitly expected in return for this funding:

**Amy:** There is this feeling of, well, let's give some funding, and that's going to make all the difference in the world. And absolutely not, you know, and we're an organisation approaching a billion pounds turnover. And, you know, each year, there might be £50,000 for a community grants project, and I worry that the university sometimes could even get more benefit from that than the actual benefits, […] our programme manager had to almost push back a little bit and say, well, actually, we've just, you know, had a lot of time invested from these organisations

These findings explain some of the ways in which an institution supports and undermines the success of CEL activity according to participants. The kind of support practitioners reported receiving is summarised in the table below:
Practitioners stated that CEL work was not directly eligible as evidence for promotion. This is discussed in detail in the third part of the analysis. The table shows that, of the mechanisms for recognition and reward that practitioners mentioned, none are required. So, while there are clear mechanisms for recognising excellent staff contributions, no one is required to engage with this. Similarly, while some staff do report that they are paid for their CEL work, this is usually through unofficial means, because there is no suitable workload allocation model tariff to reflect how time consuming this kind of delivery is.

Goddard’s model of the “un-civic” university (2016, p.6) is especially relevant here where there is a hard boundary between core activity (maximising, facilitating and incentivising success in teaching and research) and the periphery “where activities happen in spite of and not because of central support” (Goddard, 2016, p.7). Therefore, according to Goddard, infrastructure to support and reward for staff are shaped by priorities related to the first two missions: teaching and research. The data relevant to this theme reflects this model of community-engagement which happens despite of and not because of the institution and because there are no mechanisms in place to integrate learning or good practice back into the “core” missions; accomplishments that occur in this peripheral area are unsustainable.
Chapter 7: Findings and Analysis Part Two

Where participants did report supportive action from their school or department, this was usually in the form of vocal support, ring-fencing funds within departmental and school budgets for CEL activity. Proactive promotion of CEL activity internally and externally was seen as positive but only if this was undergirded by tangible support for the CEL projects being carried out in the form of realistic work allocation and funding. To some extent non-monetary rewards were also seen as contributing to proactive support but these sorts of rewards on their own meant little for the future sustainability of CEL projects. Few colleagues experienced outright disapproval from other University colleagues for CEL activity, but when this was the case, this was attributed to a different understanding of what the ultimate purposes of a university should be and whether third mission activity was optional and peripheral.

7.2.3 Pockets of excellence in a community of practice

The data presented and discussed in this section focuses on one of the salient points generated from participant accounts around institutional support for CEL work. Aside from active and passive support for CEL activity or more rarely, outright disapproval, participants’ accounts commonly cited the very infrastructure of the University as being inherently geared towards research and teaching but not supportive towards CEL as part of the third mission. By infrastructure I refer to internal, institutional organisation structures such as the rewards and promotions process and the institutionalisation of CEL activity. One way in which the institution has sought to support community engagement has been through establishing an informal, cross-University network involving staff and students who are interested in engaging with local communities: the Community Engagement Forum. Established in 2018, the University’s Community Engagement Forum is considered by Emma and other participants as a “community of practice” where individuals with a shared concern interact to enhance their knowledge and skills in a particular area (Wenger, 1998).

Emma: If we don't have some kind of community of practice, then we don't learn from best practice and the good things that are happening. And we also want to tell the world about what we're doing. We want to celebrate it. So, it is
important to flush out what's happening, but it's not quite there yet. Although it's better than it was.

Caitlin also comments positively about the Community Engagement Forum as being both a place to share positive energy around community engagement and exemplifies an institutional shift towards supporting this kind of activity.

**Caitlin:** You know, the Community Engagement Forum? I feel so bad that [...] I physically have not had the time to go. Yeah, but I can see a shift. And there's a lovely energy about what they're what they're doing. Whether or not it's coming from, at the top. Not just about ticking boxes. [The Community Engagement Forum] are doing a great job. I think the university need this awareness.

Caitlin separates the Community Engagement Forum and its members from the larger institution. For Caitlin, the University are more likely to have ulterior motives for supporting and promoting Community Engagement which prioritise benefits to the institution through, for example, positive public relations stories. Colleagues such as Ryan also spoke positively about the Community Engagement Forum describing it as “a really friendly place”

Colleagues who had participated in the Community Engagement Forum spoke positively about the atmosphere and its function as a community of practice. Many colleagues had not heard of the Forum at all (Ross, Rachel, Andrew and Matthew) and attributed this to a lack of time for networking as there was no formal work allocation for CEL work. Similarly, amongst colleagues who had participated in the Forum or who had heard of it, a desire was expressed towards becoming more involved and to participate more; a lack of time due to their work allocation was cited as the main reason why this was not possible.

**Ross:** I don't even know who's developing the university community engagement strategy, and whether they're even aware of [the CEL project] maybe that's something I should try and do such that didn't increase my workload, but they could use this in their strategy. And for any other presentations they want to give about what the university is doing in the community.

Ross suggested that the university community engagement could be coordinated in a more proactive way, so reaching out to individuals involved in CEL rather than waiting for them to approach the Community Engagement Forum. Ross advocates
for the kind of consultancy service which is available to support researchers at Alba
University but does not currently exist for CEL practitioners.

Ryan engages in CEL on what he calls a “voluntary” basis. That means he is not
allocated time for CEL activity. Ryan believes this to have a negative impact on the
sustainability of CEL activity both because of individual time pressure on staff and
the overriding, implicit message this projects about the University’s commitment to
CEL and community engaged activity in general.

Ryan: That's great, but it's all voluntary. Who's gonna take a couple days
away from grading papers if we don't get paid [...] because the university
doesn't pay us to do it, it leaves us believing it's not really something they
want us to do.

Academic staff make arguments for, not only increased resources, but also an
infrastructure that better supports CEL activity now and in the future. The
sustainability of CEL projects, beyond the passion and commitment of individual staff
members was rarely supported. When asked what would happen to their CEL project
if they left the University, Ross responded that the project would likely not be
continued.

Ross: there's not much strategy with these sorts of things, people leave, and
things die out. [...] I'd be very surprised if everyone suddenly gathered around
a table and said, we've got to keep this prison project going. How can we
carry it on?

Academic staff repeatedly broached the issue that community engagement activity
often happened disparately and often in siloes according to discipline area. This was
seen as a weakness in terms of efficiency, quality of teaching, and ensuring the long
term sustainability of CEL projects.

Megan: There were people who you've now met that were doing this practice
in the university, but in small pockets and but not connected in any big way.
[...] it was so disconnected. And those people were so focused into their
thing, and still are, that it isn't really a community that I feel personally is
pushing our work forward. [the Community Engagement Manager] is not a
deer of it, she's an enabler. And she's a great at that. She's great at
connecting us. But then it's our job. [...] that's a missing link for the Uni. I feel
that if I could work with some [pedagogical] expertise, I could really make [the
CEL Project] so much better.
Megan attributes a lack of cohesiveness in pedagogical CEL approaches to a lack of resource. While she acknowledges the existence of communities of practice such as the Community Engagement Forum and the Centre for Experiential Learning, the people leading these communities are seen as enablers rather than the “doers” and therefore they cannot compensate for a lack of institutional investment in CEL.

Connor refers to CEL links to University Widening Participation activity through its dedicated team. Connor expresses frustration that experience and

**Connor:** I don't feel there's like an overall approach. And it's not centralised at all which has good points but also some bad points [...] I have contacted the WP Team many times, and so sometimes it just feels like you're just getting a bit ignored and different people just do different things, and we just don't seem to want you to actually work together, which is a bit weird [...] there is no really big vision and it just depends on like, small individual or groups who push some things, because I guess they want some recognition or whatever, but in the end, it's just extremely patchy.

Academic staff noted that a lack of top-down, institutional support to help CEL projects flourish is a hindrance to their success. However, University leaders such as Emma rather consider this to be an intentional move by the University not to interfere with what Amy refers to as “pockets of excellence” i.e., small, independent projects driven by individual passion and commitment. This echoes the way in which some scholars consider Aristotelianism to be potentially revolutionary (MacAllister, 2016a, p.531).

**Emma:** You don't want to over-control, because that undermines innovation and enthusiasm. And actually, some of the stuff that's happening, like staff volunteering, we don't want to interfere with that at all. You know, that's what staff do and we don't want to control that. But we, although there is a thing now called "Day to make a Difference" that people weren't aware of that they could have one day off. It's good to be paid volunteering, [...]. So, there is that kind of delicate balance. But I do think the University is not, we still don't know and whether we'll ever capture that, I don't know, there are so many staff and students, it's really difficult.

Emma refers to an institutional-wide initiative to encourage staff to volunteer called “Day to make a Difference” where staff on certain contracts are granted one day per year to volunteer for an external organisation. For Emma, this kind of ad hoc volunteering should not be coordinated or controlled by the University. This differs significantly from the type of “volunteering” that most academic staff consider
themselves to be doing on CEL projects. This type of volunteering is longer term and involves having responsibility for student activity outside of the University. Emma also broaches the issue that for such a large university, actively tracking this type of project with the current infrastructure, is not a realistic objective.

Chloe, a University manager, favours a more structured and formal approach to community engagement. At the time of interview, there was no formal process for academic staff to approach community members and organisations. Activity related to research would be considered through School research ethics committees with defined processes and guidelines but community engagement activity which did not fall under research (including CEL), did not have an official body to consult or a process to follow. Unofficially, Chloe felt that colleagues often deferred to her:

Chloe: sometimes it's just a hunch that something feels off. So actually, when I was sent that kind of educational ethics, media, research ethics, I was like, this framework helps me to make sense of the things that I've been [...] pushing back on, purely on the basis that they didn't feel quite right.

Without a clear ethical framework of university-community engagement, Chloe has, in the past, discouraged activity she felt was wrong to do. To her, it was easier to refer to a set of ethical guidelines, which do exist for other missions the University carries out, to justify her intuitive decision about the right or wrong thing to do. This is a clear argument against a more organic, intuitive approach which characterised the University’s approach to community engagement.

The key findings of this section highlight participants' perceptions of their institution in relation to CEL and university-community engagement. The analysis explores how participants viewed their institution and their experiences within the context of CEL. The definition of an institution by MacIntyre emphasises its concern with external goods, including the acquisition and distribution of material goods, power, and status. The examination of themes generated from the data reveals staff perceptions of the alignment and tension between the institution's public commitments and internal policies. The use of existing theories provides insights into the prioritisation of certain "goods" and its impact on activities like CEL.
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8.1 Introduction

In this final findings chapter, I present a crucial overarching theme entitled "Moral principles, culture, and structure." This theme was derived from three subthemes which I generated from the data. The first subtheme, "It's career suicide, isn't it?" uncovers the sentiments expressed by academic staff, many of whom strongly believed that their engagement in CEL courses did not enhance their career progression and, in some cases, hindered it. The second subtheme, "Doing the right thing for the right reasons," resonates with one of the key principles of Aristotelian virtue ethics. It presents sentiments expressed by a majority of staff when discussing their overall approach to their careers and decision-making about their career paths, and provides valuable insights into why participants chose to engage in CEL activities and sustain their involvement to the present day. Finally, "Personal experiences as motivation," seeks to explore the origins of participants' motivations to be involved with their communities. Participants frequently cited experiencing inequality in their own lives as the primary catalyst for their desire to contribute to CEL.

8.2 Theme 3: Moral principles, culture and structure

In this third part, I explore the concept the virtuous professional by shifting the focus onto colleagues and how they might frame themselves as ethical professionals. Archer (2020; 2013a) argues that agents can either transform or reproduce culture, and eventually structure, through their actions. The findings presented indicate how colleagues frame their own moral choices and the ways these interact with the culture (as described by Archer see 5.4.2) of their institution.

Earlier in section 6.2.1.2, the data indicated that most participants agreed it was a duty of the university as an institution and collectively as educators to be impactful to the wider local and global community, directly through CEL or indirectly through students doing the CEL activity. Furthermore, I argued, following MacIntyre (2007),
that the university is an institution and as such, according to MacIntyre, is vulnerable to corruption by the desire for goods external to practices. The safeguarding of practices in order to cultivate internal goods, requires the virtues and in this specific context, individuals who carry out virtuous actions. This part of my analysis explores how the participants’ individual moral principles and ethical commitment are supported or constrained by institutional culture and social structures.

8.2.1 “It’s career suicide, isn't it?”

Academic staff strongly expressed the sentiment that teaching and organising CEL courses did not benefit their academic careers, and in some cases, held them back. In earlier parts of the findings and analysis section, the findings suggest that the institutional infrastructure of Alba University and the expectations of the Scottish and UK Governments, and wider society, heavily prioritised the teaching and research missions of universities. I argue that these institutional and structural factors constitute the cultural and structural factors that can constrain or support human agency as described by Archer (see 5.4.2). In other words, they prioritise the economistic aims of universities as opposed to its ultimate purpose. This theme explores the constraints experienced by academic staff in their careers as a result of their choice to engage in CEL activity. Findings in section 7.2.2 showed that, compared with traditional classroom-taught university courses, CEL was overwhelmingly considered to be more time consuming and unpredictable because of its involvement with external organisations and agencies through placements. However, with no distinct work allocation to compensate for this, academic staff are left to absorb this into their own free time or sacrifice time spent on activity more traditionally rewarded for promotion purposes.

Caitlin: This is the problem with the [CEL] courses, but you know, it's very, very time consuming. And other people from the university have approached me and asked how the placement scheme works. [...] it works really well. But it just takes up so much time. So, if you're going to do it, then we have a responsibility to the University to do it well, and to support our students and the organisations we're working with.
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An internal university document (see 12.4 Appendix D: Work Allocation Model (Extract)) verifies this lack of differentiation between different modes of delivery as described by Caitlin and Abbie; there is no formal way to acknowledge the extra time required to organise placements, liaise with placement organisers and troubleshoot issues that arise.

Colleagues at Alba University interviewed were either following an academic research promotion track or were technically categorised as “professional services” staff and not eligible for promotion based solely on their CEL activity. In response to my question “does doing CEL help you get promoted?” colleagues answered overwhelming in the negative.

Abbie: I've always been told I'm “un-promotable”, because I don't do enough research […] I've been told that I couldn't go through the teaching route, because College didn't favour it. And I don't think that was true. […] So even though I'd created a whole new degree programme, even though I'd started this new type, of course, and made a success of it. And it's not like I've got no research. But I haven't brought in any huge grants.

On the subject of professional sacrifice, colleagues repeatedly referred to CEL and its impact on their careers on a continuum. At best, it was considered to have an indirect and positive impact on prospects for future promotion, but with CEL teaching occupying a relatively inferior position of priority relative to research activity. To the question of whether doing CEL contributes to a promotion case, Caitlin answered:

Caitlin: No, sadly not. I, it took me 16 years to become a senior lecturer. And I was told many a time "[…] all your teaching is undergraduate level" this was before I started my Master's Course. […] 16 years, is a very, very long, long amount of time to lecture.

Caitlin implies that being focussed on CEL work in her career has significantly slowed down her journey to promotion. Similarly, Erin agrees that doing CEL work is not helpful in achieving promotion:

Erin: It's not recognised in at all in promotions. So, if you want promoted, you devote all your time to big research grants, and that's what you do. And that's what gets you promotion, community engagement doesn't get you a promotion. […] community engagement is the complete wrong way to go for personal career development. […] it is very, very exhausting, and time
intensive. And it's all relational, you know, getting people and from the community and preparing them that, you know, it's massive.

Similar to Abbie, Erin argues that it is specifically grant-generating research which is desirable for promotion. In contrast, devoting time to CEL activity may be detrimental to career growth. Colleagues expressed that there is no professional obligation to engage in CEL activity. Officially, in terms of promotion, it can be regarded as an optional extra. As the colleagues discuss above, research that generates income and publishing research is the key to cultivating a successful portfolio for one's promotion application. In addition, the important factor is the academic level of the students taught and not necessarily what or how you teach your discipline. Although qualitative feedback and College Teaching Award nominations can act as supportive evidence, it cannot be used in place of experience of developing and teaching courses at postgraduate level. Ryan below acknowledges the lack of balance within his academic department.

**Ryan:** [CEL] does not count towards promotion. And that's very unfortunate. But that's just the way it is [...] our subject area has 45, full time members of staff, we are the only two who are engaged in a community impact project that has sustained itself over one year. Other people do really great things like for example, colleagues, or going to museums to give speeches and talks [...] But this [CEL project] is the only one that involves students in this way. [...] It's the only project that works with the employability service. So, yeah, if you're if you're really ambitious, you write books and teach classes, you don't go into deprived schools and teach teachers.

Ryan acknowledges the lack of impact CEL has on potential for promotion. However, he expresses acceptance of this situation “that's the way it is”. This sentiment of acceptance is echoed by other participants throughout the dataset.

**Sophie:** I won't have enough research to keep me here. [...] I would like to stay [...] I just won't make the grade from that point of view. [...] I mean it's career suicide, isn't it? Yeah, no, it's not a good job from that point of view. And I'm not ambitious.

Sophie accepts that her contract, though open-ended, may become precarious because her research output is not high enough. She attributes this to the way that universities in general, and not just the one in which she works, operate. In the same account, however, Sophie expresses an extreme sentiment about the detrimental impact of not focussing all her available time on research by calling CEL “career
suicide”. Like Ryan, Sophie acknowledges that she is not ambitious in her career, if she were, doing CEL would not be an efficient way to make progress.

Academic staff reported many reasons why doing CEL activity is not helpful and in some cases, is damaging towards their career progression. Despite this, staff continued to work on these CEL projects and did not express an intention to refocus their attention to other areas of their work such as research. These findings strongly reflect existing research, for example Zlotkowski (1996) (see section 2.4.3) who reports a distinct institutional undervaluing of CEL-type activity undertaken by academic staff. Moreover, consistent with the existing literature, findings confirm that, rather than being encouraged, academic staff continue to carry out CEL work despite a lack of support from their institution.

The findings clearly indicate examples of practitioners acting in conformity with their moral principles and ethical commitments, but being constrained by the overriding culture of an institution which is set up to prioritise research and income generation over third mission activity. This culture is supported by structural factors such as government policies which encourage an economistic model of higher education. Practitioners’ motivations for persevering with CEL activity will be explored in the next section.

8.2.2 Doing the right thing for the right reasons

The subheading for this section refer to one of the conditions of acting virtuously according to Aristotelian virtue ethics. It encapsulates the sentiment expressed by the majority of staff when asked about their overall approach to their career and decision making about their career path. A core principle of Aristotelian virtue ethics is that in order to live virtuously, one ought to act as a virtuous person would (see section 3.2). This is a commitment and consideration which reaches across a person’s life span rather than deliberating each moral choice as an isolated event, adhering to a set of rules (deontological ethics), or justifying an action based achieving the greatest good for the greatest number of people (utilitarian ethics). The
data presented here showcases staff accounts of their motivations for maintaining a commitment both to CEL and the actors involved (students and community partners – organisations and individuals). This theme accounts for some of the reasons participants chose to take on CEL activity and sustain it to the present day.

When asked why Academic Staff chose to participate in CEL activity, the majority of participants described how rewarding they found CEL. In part 1 of the analysis section, I focused on what staff perceived the benefits to be for their students, which featured in many accounts of what staff found rewarding. On a more personal level, practitioners spoke about the work giving them a sense of fulfilment, making a tangible, positive difference, and the transformative potential of CEL. In other words, CEL’s potential for cultivating the individual flourishing of others for the common good (see 3.2).

In his account, Ross highlights the satisfaction of seeing knowledge from his discipline area shared outside of the university in a way that has a positive impact on the lives of others.

    **Ross:** On a personal point of view, it’s fulfilling, just because you feel like you’re actually doing something with your knowledge and, and expertise[...] that’s just more widely useful than this internal use of knowledge in a university environment and it is genuinely fulfilling.

Similarly, Caitlin enjoys bringing unique opportunities and experiences to children who might not otherwise have been able to access them. With her example of the Botanic Gardens, it is also bringing a broader audience to spaces that are ostensibly free and open to the public (e.g., galleries and museums) but which are apt to be most visited by more affluent strata of society.

    **Caitlin:** I know from my experience of doing projects that when I’ve been able to, for example, bring children who’ve never ever set foot in the Botanic Gardens, to the Botanic Gardens to be involved in a performance. And we’ve been there at night, and it’s all lit up and looking absolutely beautiful that is a life changing experience.

Erin talks about contributing to a community of practice within her applied discipline area of healthcare. She uses examples of students on her course who are also
working in public healthcare or third sector organisations. Erin believes her course acts as a kind of retreat for these practitioner students and allows them to network and bolsters their resolve to persevere with their difficult professions.

Erin: *(Academic/applied/health)* It makes a difference to people who work in, you know, people are working in third sector organisations, local authority in the NHS, they’re blooming’ tough jobs, [...] it can really help people to keep going, to be reinvigorated about their jobs and their work [...] it can transform a life.

Ryan expresses this sentiment even more powerfully by describing CEL work as part of his identity and ultimate purpose as an educator over and above his commitment to research and teaching in his discipline area.

Ryan: So, I should be very frank with you, I prioritise my community engagement work, I think it's really important part of who I am and what I do. [...] I went into [education to] make a difference. And this has really allowed me to do that.

Caitlin describes a similar personal commitment to CEL but also a clear conflict between doing what might be helpful to her own career and fulfilling a commitment to her students and the community.

Caitlin: This is the subject that I love teaching. But no, it's been an absolute disaster, that part [organising CEL] of it and I think it puts a massive strain, but then I could teach the course in a different way. [...] then that would cut my workload. But I just don't believe that's right or ethical.

Rachel similarly acknowledges this conflict but prioritises what she regards as her moral principles over external goods: tangible benefits to her career. Her account closely reflects the core belief of virtue ethics: in order to live ethically, one ought to act as a virtuous person would. Rachel stresses the importance of leading a professional life that is consistent with her moral principles:

Rachel: Doing applied teaching is not going to get anybody a professorship. [...] I think it's about who do I want to be as a person? And what do I want people to think about me? And, you know, I think a lot of actions don't get us promotions. I think a lot of actions - they might get a promotion? I don't know. But I think it's not what every step is about, I think it's much more, can I sleep well at night?
8.2.3 Personal experiences as motivation

Wishing to explore the origin of participants’ motivations to be involved with their communities, I asked participants if they could identify any experiences from their past which had contributed to their desire to work in this area. The majority of participants cited experiencing inequality in their own lives as the main catalyst for wishing to contribute to CEL. For some, these experiences were significant childhood memories. Emily describes early experiences of prejudice:

Emily: I'm the lightest [skinned] person in my family. So, I think I've always been very aware through my childhood, because we had travelled, and because we looked a little different, and I had family members that looked a little bit different. So, I knew things were not an equal playing field that we didn't really understand it.

Megan attributes her early experience of social inequality as the main catalyst for her sustained commitment with her work with community groups.

Megan: I'm from [city in England], and I'm from a very, you know, very poor family, and really, in a very socially disadvantaged area of [city in England]. [...] my dad was a trade unionist as well. And we had the miners’ strike in the 80s during the Thatcher era, and that was definitely pivotal that in terms of social injustice as communities rising up to have power to take power. [...] that's where my sense of I'm wanting to do something, as a group, as an individual power for the group, to address things that just aren't fair.

Participants’ accounts of the factors that motivated them to start and continue CEL projects were often deeply personal and emerged from personal experiences of oppression and their desire to act on their moral principles. Megan’s account of power dynamics in the macrocosm of UK society in 1980s above resonates with Chloe’s own powerful personal account of inequality and a struggle for power within the microcosm of her own family unit as a child,

Chloe: I could never go back to being the person who keeps quiet. [...] Life is much more enjoyable if you are trying to make things better. Even if you don’t manage or it doesn’t happen in your lifetime. Why would you want to get out of bed in the morning? I feel better helping. I can imagine a whole life story of people living in the street. It must be so much less stressful if you don’t notice. It keeps me well. The times I have shut up I have become mentally unwell.

Individuals’ motivations for starting and continuing CEL were not always clear from the outset. Two participants each described themselves as taking on CEL projects
largely for the sake of personal interest rather than to address social inequality. Ross instigated his CEL project principally because of a professional research interest:

Ross: I Googled, "head of education". So, this idea that prisons are a bit like Moon and Mars stations, because they've got an isolated population that's disconnected from the rest of the world had occurred to me some time ago.

However, following further engagement with the project, he described moments of critical reflection where his experiences influenced his outlook in a way which caused him to question societal attitudes towards prisoners:

Ross: I've also sort of been [...] slightly shocked at the way some parts of our population have viewed, I mean, I wrote a proposal to, to the UK [funder] [...] and it was wasn't funded. On the basis, this was not a high priority population. And, and that sort of shocked me, you know, you've got these incarcerated people, and you're using [discipline] exploration, [...], to try and encourage them and inspire them to make their lives better [...] it's quite strange to meet people in their 40s and 50s, who share with you the fact that [...] is the first time anyone has ever treated them seriously, and asked their opinion on something.

Similarly, Andrew described critical moments in the course of doing CEL which caused him to reflect on his purpose as an educator.

Andrew: being a parent, and all these other things. [...] one of the things that's alarming is that how I used to think democracy was something I could take for granted. I used to think that I mean, I still - you know, I grew up in a reasonably middle class background [...]. I used to think that racism was something that I - didn't really affect me that much. [...] Well, in the last six-seven years. Like for instance Brexit was quite shocking to me. In that you saw this latent racism that was just a little bit beneath the surface. [...] I think that's also one of the drivers. I started thinking "Geez, this shit is serious."

Both Ross and Andrew describe these experiences as “shocking”, revealing dimensions of inequality and prejudice which they had not previously been conscious of. Despite initiating CEL projects without the principal aim of addressing inequality in society, Ross and Andrew express increased awareness of these issues, partly as a result of their engagement with CEL. I argue that both are examples of practitioners becoming aware of their cultural and structural factors that constrain their work.

However, while these factors constrain their work (Ross did not receive the funding he applied for), their enhanced understanding of these constraints through reflection can been seen to further motivate their work.
Other examples of critical reflection involved a practitioner (Matthew) expressing a sense of satisfaction through his work “really seeing the kids like, get something out of it and hearing from the teachers that they find it valuable. That's what keeps me coming back” but at the same time acknowledging that structural constraints within state education can make CEL placements impractical and difficult for his secondary school colleagues:

Matthew: working with all these kind-of like beleaguered and overstretched teachers has made me realise is that like [...] they've constantly got so many people beating down their door, saying like, "Oh, you got to organise this extra thing for your classes, because it's the, it's the most important thing that you can do to help your kids." And so, kind of realising that fact, made me a bit warier of, you know, giving them this really strong sales pitch.

8.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings presented shed light on the concepts of emancipatory knowledge and the virtuous professional, particularly in relation to colleagues and their framing of themselves as ethical professionals. Others have that agents have the power to either transform or reproduce culture and structure through their actions (Archer, 2020; Archer, 2013a). The data from my study illustrates how colleagues navigate their moral choices and their interaction with the institutional culture they are a part of. The analysis has emphasised the participants' shared belief in the university's duty to serve the wider community, either directly through community-engaged learning (CEL) or indirectly through students engaging in CEL activities. These beliefs are framed as both deontological (expressions of duty and responsibility) and virtue-ethical commitments.

Overall, this exploration has provided valuable insights into the complex interplay between moral principles, culture, and structure, as well as the role of individual agency in shaping ethical professionalism within educational institutions. It emphasizes the importance of considering these factors in understanding and supporting colleagues' engagement with CEL and their commitment to addressing societal challenges through their pedagogical practices.
9 Discussion

9.1 Summary and significance of key findings

In this section, I provide a summary of key findings from Chapters 0 to 8. I will highlight salient themes and patterns which I generated from the data with analysis of their significance in relation to existing literature. Throughout this thesis, I have offered a rich and detailed analysis of the subjective perspectives and experiences reported by participants. As I discussed in Section 5.4.2, this follows a critical realist approach, specifically Morphogenesis (Archer, 1982; Archer, 1995), which seeks to examine the underlying structures that influence and are influenced by the actions and behaviours as well as the experiences of agents. Within the three sections below, I discuss the individual, institutional and structural factors that influence and can be influenced by the experiences and perceptions of academic staff.

My findings are derived from a small-scale study and so I do not make any claims for broad generalisability; any findings should be considered with this in mind. However, I have framed my analysis within the participants’ personal, institutional and political contexts in order that broader extrapolations may be possible. My presentation and analysis of data promotes the transferability of the findings. Transferability is a way to connect the issues identified and make inferences beyond the borders of this dataset and the experiences of this particular participant group (Braun and Clarke, 2022, p.143). Three salient overarching themes were generated from the interview and documentary data; I now discuss each of these in turn.

9.2 Theme 1: Achieving the ultimate purpose: (Third) Mission Impossible?

There was a clear tension between how Alba University presented its attitude to community engagement within its internal and public-facing documents. The latter portrayed an institution which was committed to being considerate to and contributing to the local community. This was echoed by university leaders and managers who emphasised the integrated nature of the university’s missions: research, teaching and the third mission. This closely mirrors Goddard’s model
(Figure 1-4) of the “Civic University” where the three missions interact cohesively. The majority of practitioners expressed opinions about the university’s priorities which aligned closely with the “Civic University” model. However, their experiences were that the University’s priorities, manifested in its internal policies on promotion and work allocation, were more closely aligned with the model (Figure 1-3) of the “Un-civic University” (Goddard, 2016). Internal literature, including promotion and work allocation guidance supported this view and in some examples, this message was implicit even in public-facing literature. The civic and un-civic models (Goddard, 2016) were relevant to understanding what academic staff and the University believed the ultimate purpose of a university to be. In Goddard’s (2016) model (Figure 1-3), society, sits outside of the institution and could be interpreted as representing a very local concern (e.g., local communities) through to the idea of global communities. Therefore, aims such as widening participation and societal challenges such as socio-economic deprivation require very different approaches depending on the scope of its intended impact i.e. whether it is local or global,

The way in which the Scottish Government and the UK Government, described the purpose of a university mainly in economistic terms and the third mission as knowledge exchange, impacted the internal policies of the Alba University which in turn affected the sustainability of CEL projects. An economistic interpretation of the University’s ultimate purpose is also apparent in the University’s international university rankings and creates an attractive destination for prospective international fee-paying students to study at. Such opportunities are presented by UK and Scottish Governments as being desirable for society and as such implies that the ultimate purpose of universities should be strongly connected to facilitating national economic growth.

Academic staff at Alba University conveyed a broader interpretation of the ultimate purpose of the university. For example, staff cited status, omnipresence in the city, prestige and wealth as reasons why it should “give back” to society and in particular, the local community. Both practitioners and university leaders and managers, described this as the university’s responsibility and duty to its local community in the form of research that was directly beneficial to society, CEL and directly funding
community engagement projects. I frame these expressions of duty and responsibility as deontological ethical commitments. However, participants would often fail to clearly distinguish between what was their personal responsibility and what was an institutional responsibility. I discuss in section 9.4, how this may have a negative impact on the individual practitioner.

In practitioner accounts of their CEL projects, a consistent understanding of CEL was expressed, even if they talked about it more specifically (as service-learning) or more generally (experiential learning or outreach). Accounts were consistent in how practitioners drew a clear line of distinction between CEL activity (recurrent, reflective, staff-facilitated and supported, and of use to community) and more irregular or ad hoc community engagement (one-off volunteering). While university leaders and managers were more likely to consider many forms of university-community engagement to be valuable to both parties, CEL Practitioners considered their practice to be more valuable in terms of promoting different types of student knowledge and individual flourishing.

The idea of promoting individual flourishing was expressed through notions of capability expansion (Nussbaum, 2011), where practitioners talked about giving access to services that individuals and groups would not otherwise be able to afford. For example, Caitlin’s community school project, free legal services, exposure to the arts for children and involving patient groups and prison inmates as co-researchers with undergraduate and postgraduate students. I argue that this is a clear example of what MacIntyre describes as collective deliberation within the context of community and its traditions, for the common good (MacAllister, 2019).

Closely related to the idea of individual flourishing is that of emancipatory critical thinking which I discussed in section 3.2.4. Practitioner accounts of the benefits of CEL (in section 6.2.3) for their students were examples that aligned closely with Kreber’s account of cultivating the civic-minded graduate in which students are encouraged to pursue different types of knowledge:“(1) instrumental, (2) interpretive..."
(or communicative) and (3) emancipatory knowledge” (Kreber, 2016, p.80). Finally, there were several accounts of students’ experiences causing them to question their previous assumptions about tradition, ideology and power structures within their future professional context which Kreber calls emancipatory knowledge. Often, these experiences were a result of formal reflection which emerged as the most widely used form of student assessment on CEL courses.

When asked what they thought the ultimate purpose of a university was, participants commonly spoke of the University’s unique function i.e., its missions. Participants’ accounts of their CEL activity support the idea of the ultimate purpose of a university being for the common good. In chapter 0, for example James believes that “we [Alba University] get a lot from the community […] I think we can learn a lot from just getting out there and talking to people” while Matthew and Andrew both broach the idea of creating enlightened citizens who will contribute to a flourishing society. This is clear in the description of local communities and the expressed idea that CEL helps to cultivate civic-minded graduates. Students are given the opportunity to interrogate theory through their practice and by doing so generate, not only instrumental knowledge but also communicative knowledge and *phronēsis* (see section 0). Throughout the data, staff highlighted the key benefits of CEL for students, which I argued could be categorised under “gaining emancipatory knowledge”.

Alba University students tended to be from the more privileged backgrounds. Some practitioners agreed that exposure to wider sections of society helped students to foster meaningful encounters with people facing challenging life circumstances such as those related to poverty, substance use, and ill health. CEL placements or related activity commonly took place over the period of one or two semesters. This, compared to one-off volunteering, was considered by practitioners to be much more meaningful. Existing literature (Butin, 2006; Butin, 2010b) highlights the danger of Service-learning resulting in a kind of “poverty tourism” which reinforces unhelpful stereotypes (Deeley, 2022). Practitioners believed that this would be more likely in the case of short-term volunteering without structured critical reflection and
practitioner support. Practitioners considered students to be future civic-minded professionals who might go on to hold powerful positions in society. Therefore, they argued that it was important for students to be exposed to the reality of societal ills and its impact on individuals to enable them to empathise with individuals from very different backgrounds.

The data confirmed that CEL experiences could disrupt students’ assumptions about concepts such as social justice and fairness (expressed through student critical reflection), and create spaces where irresolution and ambiguity about ethical decision-making could be observed and experienced (Himley, 2004). This idea of cultivating *phronēsis* or practical wisdom was commonly emphasised by practitioners as an important aspect of CEL that could not be simulated in a traditional classroom setting. This finding supports the need for educator-facilitated critical reflection to complement theoretical study (MacAllister, 2018), Nussbaum’s (1997) narrative imagination, for example. Furthermore, especially in projects where students work with community members as co-researchers, this creates fertile ground for cultivating the kind of “Educated Public” espoused by MacIntyre (1987). In other words, citizens engage in reasoned and meaningful dialogue together to make informed decisions about public policy.

Recent polarising political events, including the referendum concerning the UK’s membership of the EU, highlighted the detrimental effects of not consistently engaging in dialogue as an Educated Public. In discussions about the third mission and the ultimate purpose of a university, Brexit was only mentioned by one participant, specifically someone from a BAME category. This limited mention of Brexit in the broader discussion on Alba University’s ultimate purpose suggests that, within the scope of this conversation, participants did not extensively consider or perceive Brexit as a prominent factor influencing the University’s internal dynamics or its approach to community engagement. Another explanation for this could be that the aftermath of Brexit had been overshadowed by the global Covid-19 Pandemic; participants were interviewed during initial lockdown periods. Nevertheless, the emphasis remained on the institution’s missions, internal policies, and the perceived
responsibilities of academic staff and leaders toward local communities. Through their accounts of teaching and research activity, practitioners express an interpretation of the third mission which accords closely with what I argue to the ultimate purpose of a university. University leaders and managers express this through their accounts of what they view as the essential duties and responsibilities of a university: producing applicable, useful research that contributes solutions to society’s problems and designing teaching activity that develops students’ civic-mindedness. For leaders especially, the idea that the three missions were intertwined prevailed. Common good aims are somewhat reflected in public-facing institutional literature, in its aspiration towards the University becoming a “good and welcoming neighbour”. However, it, is significantly undermined by a preoccupation with profile-raising and economistic aims which are evidenced in the internal institutional literature and associated policies.

9.3 Theme 2: “How to seem virtuous without actually being so”

A key focus from my investigation is a need to interrogate our current understanding of what universities are for. Following MacIntyre (2007), I argued that institutions will be vulnerable to being excessively influenced by the dominant political imperatives of the state. In particular, the acquisition of “external goods” i.e., goods that have extrinsic or instrumental value: fame, wealth, power, status which MacIntyre (2007) considers to be the concerns of institutions, including universities. Therefore, the idea of a university having a clear set of agreed values and to have them permeate and influence the actions and decision-making of individual academic staff and students is crucial.

Findings confirm that a lack of institutional support can corrupt practices of community engagement. The University of Alba, in its public facing literature, presents itself as a “values-led” institution; a concept which was echoed by leaders and managers engaged in my study. University leaders making normative claims about the Alba University being values-led had only recently been adopted (see Jack’s comment in 7.2.1). This was described by one leader as an important shift within the last decade, from a reluctance to refer to institutional values, to explicitly
describing values and including them in strategic documents and the literature on graduate attributes. The stated values are an expression of what the institution's leaders believe to be important, rather than a reflection of the range of values that will be identifiable across a large university or the manifestation of any stated or implied set of ethical principles. In some cases, the values may even conflict with ethical practice, for example, pursuing excellence or ambition. Repeatedly in the interview data, Practitioners questioned how committed the institution was to the community-engagement activity it actively promoted in its public-facing literature.

University leaders and managers' views on the idea of the University being “values-led” generally aligned with the external institutional literature. University leaders and managers clearly distinguished individual values from institutional values with some even using the term “politically neutral” to describe what they considered to be appropriate. While many university leaders and managers identified themselves as holding politically “left-wing” views, most identified the concept of community engagement as being attributable across the political spectrum. Other participants disagreed that political neutrality was possible and stated that their personal political beliefs had a significant impact on the choices they made in their professional roles. Similar to writers such as Kagan and Diamond (2019), University leaders and managers noted that while there was, theoretically, a distinction between experiential learning for social rather than economic interests, in reality this was often blurred.

As a group, Practitioners were less confident in recognising the University as “values-led” compared to University Leaders and Managers. Most had no awareness that the University had a stated set of values and those who did expressed scepticism about the intentions of the institution when the University's literature promoted itself as having a de facto CEL commitment. Which, rather than helping to cultivate internal goods, was seen as an exercise in the pursuit of status, to justify their relationship with local communities, and maintain good public relations in general. This illustrates MacIntyre’s (1999a, p.122) concept of the “façade of moral consensus” where moral disagreements and tensions can be obscured by rhetoric. Following MacIntyre's (1999) distinction between genuine virtues and counterfeit virtue and Hursthouse’s (1999) four conditions for virtuous action, the evidence from
my study confirms that being values-led is not synonymous with acting virtuously. In other words, advocating certain values in public-facing literature is not the same as actually being led by, and acting upon, those values.

Practitioners reported receiving differing levels of institutional support through their departments and colleagues. Levels of support ranged from ring-fencing department budget for CEL projects, colleagues offering advice and moral support to managers fudging existing work allocation hours. Practitioners also reported other experiences ranging from receiving more passive or ambiguous support (“silence” or publicly praising the CEL activity without supporting it with resources) to withdrawing resources from CEL projects, de-prioritising CEL in favour of income-generating to expressions of disapproval. There are clear examples within my study of staff expressing frustration towards the institution because of a perceived lack of support for their CEL projects, especially when this was coupled with a willingness of University leaders and managers to use their projects as examples to generate good publicity. The example of CEL consultancy service for staff, students and community partners at the University College of London demonstrates institutional commitment to CEL which will be visible both internally and externally. This example would seem to align more closely with Goddard’s (2016) model of the “civic university” in that CEL is centrally financially resourced and therefore good practice can be proactively shared and disseminated amongst the community of practice (Wenger, 1998).

Participants in my study generated numerous examples of individual action taken for the pursuit of what MacIntyre (2007) terms “internal goods” i.e. goods that have intrinsic value and are characterised as being good for the whole community who participate in the practice (MacIntyre (2016, p.50) uses the example of participating in an orchestra). Caitlin’s community music project, Ross’s participatory research in prisons, and Erin’s inclusion of “Experts by Experience” as teachers on her course are some the examples of this. However, the lack of institutional support was seen as undermining or corrupting these practices. As well as the more explicit examples of academic staff being discouraged from pursuing CEL activity, more commonly, corrupting a practice in this context manifested as a lack of supportive institutional
infrastructure (e.g., precarious contracts, lack of central promotion or coordination; lack of work allocation, lack of staff recognition through promotion processes).

Academic staff elevated the effort required to deliver and coordinate CEL activity above traditional research and classroom teaching and assessment practices. However, the work allocation model (see 12.4) did not account for these differences and although managers could compensate for this in other ways, this often resulted in having less time for activity which could contribute towards promotion. Against a backdrop of industrial action, rising living costs and pension cuts this issue emerged as particularly salient amongst staff. Also, unlike traditional research and teaching practices, participants were either ambivalent about the positive impact of CEL work on their career progression or outright scathing of its detrimental effect on their careers due to the opportunity cost of not having used the time to conduct and publish research. Academic staff supported the idea that staff undertaking CEL activity did not have the same currency as traditional research or teaching as it was not equally valued. This was particularly evident, in the way in which third mission activities were explicitly deprioritised during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Practitioners cited receiving peer support from staff involved with the University Community Engagement Forum. However, not all participants reported that they engaged as much as they wanted to because a lack of capacity; some participants reported that they had not heard about the forum at all. Those who were aware of the University’s Community Engagement Forum generally praised its communication and organisation while also acknowledging that the institution would need to invest much more into coordinating and mapping CEL activity if this kind of activity were to be embedded within institutional missions. However, without more formal processes in place to have community-engagement projects approved and scrutinised, similar to how research proposals go through an ethics committee, as Chloe suggest in section 7.2.3, there was a threat of harm to the University’s reputation and the lives of people involved in and outside of the University.
University leaders and managers spoke of “pockets of excellence”, and of their wish to avoid “over-control” or undermining the enthusiasm of individuals and groups taking part in small projects. In one way, this would seem to support MacIntyre’s idea that small-scale community projects are much better equipped to challenge unfair social and economic structures (such as capitalism) and lead to common goods for particular communities being realised, than are formal social movements because communities can be involved in decision making.(MacAllister, 2016a, p.531). On the other hand, there are risks involved with too little institutional involvement in CEL projects.

Research is integrating community engagement as a core component of the institutional missions and indeed, recognises that this is necessary for it to be taken seriously (Chmelka et al., 2020; Robinson and Hudson, 2013; Goddard, 2016). In addition, to properly recognise and convey the importance of this type of work, it should be recognised by the employee appraisals, awards and promotions process (Robinson and Hudson, 2013). Goddard’s (2016) model of the civic and un-civic university is useful here: without meaningfully embedding CEL as a core activity with formal processes for scrutiny and dissemination of good practice, its sustainability, quality and effectiveness is limited. Clearly there is boundary to be determined between desirable institutional support and unnecessary institutional interference. A university which is serious about engagement will need to invest in relevant staff development and outreach. If that commitment is to be sustained, it must also be mainstreamed, integrated into how the university operates, and reflected in its strategy and budget.

As well as lack of accessible funding for projects, work allocation and formal recognition of their work, the lack of institutional support was also expressed by practitioners resulting in a lack of central coordination. Participants viewed this lack of cohesiveness as undermining and stunting the growth of their CEL projects and ambitions. There was a desire amongst practitioners to know more about what was happening in other CEL projects within the institution. This was understood as a way to operationalise the effectiveness of CE because there was currently no way to
evaluate activity. Ultimately, while there were many participants who expressed frustration at the lack of institutional support and the siloed nature of CEL activity, there was widespread recognition that the situation within the institution was “better than it was” and likely to continue along a more positive trajectory. With the establishment of the institution-wide Community Engagement Plan (see 12.3) and increased acceptance of the notion that an institution should express values, there was cautious optimism that a more cohesive approach might be possible in the future.

For most University leaders and managers, CEL was distinguished by the intent of the learning and the service rather than by the type of organisation in which a student was placed. MacIntyre’s (2007) scheme of institutions, practices and internal and external goods is particularly useful here. In this institutional context, one can acknowledge the need for external goods to sustain practices: a university obviously needs financial means to pay its staff and fulfil its function. However, as the accounts of participants demonstrate, the existence of external goods is no guarantee for the cultivation of internal goods and of practices if there is no conscious effort to maintain an effective balance. The internal goods of teaching and research for academic staff and learning for students are characterised as being good for the whole community who participate in the practice. The key to maintaining this balance, according to MacIntyre (2007) are the virtues, or in this context, the virtuous actions of individuals.

9.4 Theme 3: Moral principles, culture and structure

The final theme “Moral principles, culture and structure” captures the complex ways academic staff framed themselves as practitioners guided by their own moral principles. Practitioners expressed this commitment through their accounts of self-sacrifice and fighting against the prevalent institutional culture, often to the detriment of their own careers and in the knowledge that their projects would not be sustainable without their personal efforts. In this section, I also build on arguments introduced in Theme 1 around practitioners taking on the burden of responsibility towards fulfilling their own moral commitments as well as the institutions.
In Goddard’s (2016, p.6) words, practitioners often described the success of CEL projects being achieved “despite of, not because of” their institution. The very time consuming nature of running CEL activity was not accounted for in the current work allocation model. As a result, for research and teaching staff, this necessitated taking time out of other activity which was recognised as valuable for promotion (research, publishing, citizenship roles, securing an open-ended contract) and using this to run their CEL projects and/or apply for funding.

For practitioners on professional service contracts in defined project roles, there was less pressure to juggle their work allocation. However, they also felt that the work allocation they were given significantly underestimated how time consuming CEL projects were. Regardless, they were reluctant to complain openly. These roles were also commonly fixed term and therefore a lack of job security may have been a reason for this.

Practitioners felt that the time-consuming nature of CEL, compared to more traditional modes of delivery e.g., giving lectures and classroom teaching, was not recognised within the University’s existing work allocation framework. Combined with the perception that the opportunity cost of doing CEL included timely career progression and promotion, it was important to explore why practitioners chose to instigate a CEL project and why they chose to continue it even when it was associated with significant disadvantages. Examples of practitioners continuing to run CEL projects despite a lack of institutional resources, align with existing theories of “vocation hegemony” and professional self-sacrifice which I discussed in section 3.4. There is strong evidence from my investigation that practitioner experiences of CEL are influenced by personal factors such as character and moral principles.

Practitioners cited sources of personal influence that included early life experiences of witnessing oppression or discrimination. Others described their own CEL experiences as students or early career academics which inspired them to create similar opportunities for students. Less common, but significant nonetheless, two
practitioners recalled starting their CEL projects principally out of personal interest. However, in both those and other cases, practitioner experiences unexpectedly led to significant periods of reflection around challenging the status quo. In effect, this developed their own emancipatory knowledge as well as that of their students.

Another significant finding related to personal and cultural factors was the interplay between attitudes towards ethical commitment and sacrifice. Participants such as Abbie, Erin, Caitlin, Sophie and Ryan describe their actions as contributing to institutional civic duty. However, I argue that framing it as a deontological rather than a virtue-ethical commitment is ultimately detrimental. A Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethical approach to fulfilling ethical commitment would require practitioners to not only act to encourage the flourishing of others but also themselves. Therefore, the idea of self-sacrifice for the benefit of others is rather not to be encouraged.

There is also evidence of influence at an institutional and structural level. On the subject of personal sacrifice, Kreber (2016a; 2016b) describes the institutional environment as contributing to a culture of professional inauthenticity i.e. disproportionately prioritising either the self or other (see section 3.4). I have given examples of institutional policies which do not offer adequate resources or support to CEL projects but also government education discourse which exacerbates the consumer-producer dynamic between universities and society with universities measured by outputs which present value for money, monetisable innovation and employability outcomes. So, while university leaders and managers, including those interviewed for this study, wish to promote the idea of values-led university, I argue from the data gathered that this is problematic in several ways.

From an analysis of my findings, I interpret institutional values as a declaration of what its leaders believe to be important. This is neither a commitment to making moral decisions nor to cultivating the ethical character of those who belong to or who interact with that institution. Furthermore, there can be cases where achieving what is deemed important may involve immoral means as well as immoral ends. In my study, the institutional literature clearly expounds values but even within this
literature, there are internal conflicts with no sense of which values might be prioritised when conflicts arise. Finally, there is little evidence that the University’s existing value framework represents a shared understanding of what the institution emphasises as being important; most practitioners were either unaware of its existence or of what the values included. I argued in section 1.3 that a university’s missions originate from its ultimate purpose. Alba University’s purpose is open to a broad range of interpretation. While the evidence from findings suggests that the University uses “values” and “ethical commitments” interchangeably, findings confirm that this is not an altogether sincere commitment.

Despite all this, even if Alba University had an explicitly stated ethical purpose and values, and accordant frameworks to express this, it is of little consequence to practitioners if the purpose and values are not congruent with the working policies and practices of that institution. The majority of practitioners within the sample interviewed were not aware of the University being values-led, let alone what the values were. However, all of them were clear on how much they were being paid, how supportive their department and institutional leaders were of their work, and where and how their projects were being funded. These were fundamental to the success of their projects and the quality of their experiences as CEL Practitioners.

In contrast to their employer, individual practitioners described their motivation for running CEL projects in ways that I define as a professional, ethical commitment to students, local communities and society in general. This was expressed through a range of political (Marxism, Centre Left), religious (Christianity) and secular beliefs but also explicitly personal, ethical reasons (“can I sleep well at night?”). Throughout the findings, there were powerful accounts of staff working in a way that was consistent with their moral principles but counter to what they perceived as institutional priorities (income generation, status promotion etc.) in other words, constraints of institutional culture. Participants felt that doing CEL in an institution that did not wholly support it negatively impacted their career progression and hindered any effort at establishing meaningful, long-term relationships with local community. The fact that they continued to practice CEL exemplified vocation hegemony (Brookfield, 2005b) and self-sacrifice (Farnham, 2006) which is essentially inconsistent with Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics. This kind of excessive
professional self-sacrifice does not cultivate individual flourishing, emancipatory critical thinking or represent benefits for the common good in any sustainable sense.

9.5 Conclusion

The findings set out in this chapter highlight the structural, institutional, and individual factors that impact on the experiences of academic staff who work on CEL projects. UK and Scottish Government policy present a narrow interpretation of the third mission of universities which equates to monetisable innovation, employability and research which can enhance the national economy. My findings strongly suggest that academic staff perceptions of the ultimate purpose of universities accord with a broader framework which takes into account community needs, individual flourishing, emancipatory critical thinking and common good aims.

Findings from an analysis of internal university literature suggest that the favoured approach for university-community engagement reinforces government narratives which may exacerbate the consumer-producer dynamic between universities and society. Within a critical realist framework, I have categorised these factors as structures which have ultimately contributed to negatively impacting the experiences of academic staff involved with CEL. Specifically, Government policies directly affect institutional policies and priorities which I have categorised as cultural factors; Alba University’s policies regarding staff work allocation, promotion, recognition and financial support for CEL enables a culture of professional inauthenticity (Kreber, 2016b) where practitioners feel they have no choice but to engage in vocation hegemony (see section 3.4.1) or professional self-sacrifice to maintain their commitment to their ethical principles.

I have also argued that individual factors including personal experiences and individual moral frameworks and perception of their professional, ethical framework, interacts with cultural and structural factors. For example, individuals can be deeply constrained by cultural practices of their institution (for example, doing CEL work without expecting pay or formal recognition) but this can also be exacerbated by a
conflation of institutional civic duty with their own individual duty. In particular, the kind of deontological commitment that permits self-sacrifice and short-term gain instead of a virtue-ethical commitment which encourages long-term habitual action for the common good and the commitment to one’s own flourishing as well as that of others.

The evidence also portrays a university which has adapted to the changing social context over the last century, from enacting longitudinal and meaningful community-university engagement through the Alba University Settlement project from the early 20th Century to an institution which claims to be led by a stated set of values. Participant accounts suggest that there has been renewed interest and acceptance of the university’s third mission in the last decade, indeed the vast majority of projects run by participants in this study started during this time frame. If this renewed interest is to result in meaningful and sustainable benefits for the institution, its people and society, then findings strongly suggest that change at a structural, institutional and individual level is required. I discuss my recommendations for changes to practice in the following chapter.
10 Overall Conclusion

10.1 Introduction
This chapter provides an overall response to the Central Research question and outlines recommendations for practice to address some of the key issues that were highlighted in the findings of this study. My reflections are expanded in section 10.6 below which showcases implications for future practice. I argue for the transferability of this research to other institutional contexts beyond the field of Higher Education. The chapter concludes with the limitations of my study and I speculate on possible areas for future research projects. Section 10.8 covers topics that, in light of the findings of this study, warrant additional investigation as well as issues that I have considered beyond the scope of this research.

10.2 Contribution of the research
The investigation focuses on CEL practice, which is a rarely-studied form of university-community engagement in a UK and Scottish higher education context. The original contribution of this research lies in its comprehensive exploration of the factors impacting the experiences of academic staff involved in Community-Engaged Learning (CEL) projects within the aforementioned context. By adopting a critical realist, morphogenetic approach (see 5.4) to examine the structural, institutional, and individual factors which interact with each other, the study sheds light on the complex dynamics at play.

The research contributes new knowledge to the field by challenging the narrow interpretation of the third mission of universities as presented by UK and Scottish Government policies, which prioritise monetisable innovation, employability, and research for economic gain. In contrast, the findings indicate that academic staff perceive the ultimate purpose of universities to encompass broader goals, including addressing community needs, fostering individual flourishing, promoting emancipatory critical thinking, and pursuing common good aims.
Chapter 10: Overall Conclusion

Another significant contribution is the identification of the consumer-producer dynamic perpetuated by UK and Scottish education policy, which appears to negatively affect the experiences of academic staff engaged in CEL. Through this study, I classify these influences as structural factors within a critical realist, morphogenetic framework. Specifically, I have highlighted the direct impact of government policies on institutional priorities and policies, categorised as cultural factors. This examination reveals how Alba University's policies regarding staff work allocation, promotion, recognition, and financial support for CEL contribute to a culture of professional inauthenticity, wherein practitioners feel compelled to engage in vocation hegemony or professional self-sacrifice to uphold their moral principles.

Furthermore, my findings underscore the interaction between individual factors, such as personal experiences and individual moral frameworks, and cultural and structural factors. They reveal how cultural practices within institutions can constrain individuals, and the conflation of institutional civic duty with personal duty exacerbates these constraints. The study uses a Neo-Aristotelian, virtue-ethical lens to compare perspective and experiences of participants: from maintaining a deontological ethical commitment that permits self-sacrifice and short-term university-community engagement to a commitment that fosters emancipatory critical thinking, long-term habitual action for the common good, and the flourishing of oneself and others.

Finally, my research provides insights into the historical evolution of Alba University, highlighting its transition from meaningful community-university engagement from its history as a settlement university, to an institution purportedly guided by stated values. The findings indicate a recent resurgence in interest and acceptance of the university's third mission, as evidenced by the majority of CEL projects initiated during the last decade. To translate this renewed interest into meaningful and sustainable benefits for the institution, its people, and communities, my research strongly advocates for structural, institutional, and individual-level changes.

Overall, this research makes an original contribution by deepening current understanding of the multifaceted factors influencing academic staff's experiences on
CEL projects. It challenges prevailing government policies, explores the interplay between individual agency and institutional culture, and underscores the need for transformative changes at various levels to realise the full potential of universities’ third mission.

10.3 Research Q1: What are academic staff (practitioners’, university leaders’ and managers’) perceptions and experiences of community-engaged learning?

Academic staff interviewed in this project did not use terminology such as CEL or SL to describe the projects they were involved in. This was unsurprising, given that the sample had been purposively selected by me and that CEL (including SL) is not a clearly defined or a widespread pedagogical practice in the UK. Practitioners described CEL activity as a form of outreach, experiential learning, placement or community engagement more generally. While I have justified my use of the term “Community-engaged Learning” in this study, this finding highlights the need for communities of CEL practice within the University to recognise and promote the use of consistent terms to describe non-traditional pedagogical approaches. Accounts were consistent in how they drew a clear line of distinction between CEL activity (recurrent, reflective, staff-facilitated and supported, and of use to community) and more irregular or ad hoc community engagement (one-off volunteering). While University leaders and managers were more likely to consider all forms of engagement to be valuable to the University and the community, practitioners considered CEL to be more valuable in terms of fostering different types of student knowledge which I have aligned with knowledge categories that Kreber (2016a) describes as instrumental, communicative and emancipatory (see Section 3.4.2).

Academic staff perceived CEL to be central to the University’s third mission alongside teaching and research and considered this to be essential to the University’s function. Their interpretation of the third mission was much broader than the way it was portrayed in government and the institutional literature of Alba University: knowledge exchange or monetisable innovation. Academic staff perceptions of CEL and the third mission more closely aligned with public-facing
university literature and maintaining the University’s historical roots as a civic university.

University leaders and managers involved with community engagement were positive towards CEL. Their concerns around CEL were based on risk to institutional reputational damage, student safety, imposing on local community, and not being in a position to accurately map the activity that was taking place. Leaders and managers did not want to act as gatekeeper to academic staff engaging directly with community organisations.

Practitioners expressed a dilemma between finding the practice of CEL pedagogy to be immensely rewarding but difficult to maintain because of workload in the context of their institution. Their perception of CEL as being central to the University’s function and responsibility was not matched by their experience of institutional support. For them, CEL within the institution was not equally valued nor a core part of the University’s missions. Goddard’s model of the un-civic university would seem to be an accurate summary of these accounts (Figure 1-3).

10.4 Research Q2: What do academic staff perceive to be the purpose and benefits of higher education institutions and community-engaged pedagogy for their students and their communities?

I interpreted academic staff perceptions of the ultimate purpose of their institution as being firmly associated with ethical principles and deeply connected with the local community and wider society. The ultimate purpose of a university was commonly expressed in terms of the University’s unique function i.e., its missions. Participants’ accounts support the idea of a university being for “the common good” as described by MacIntyre (2016): a notion of human freedom that is concerned with an ultimate purpose which comprises both the good of individuals and the good of the communities in which they live. Therefore, CEL was considered to be a vital part of connecting teaching, learning and, in some cases, research with community-engagement and therefore necessary for fulfilling the University’s missions.
CEL was singled out for key benefits considered unique to this kind of pedagogical activity, and inextricably linked to the ultimate purpose of a university. I associate these benefits with Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics theories of promoting individual flourishing, including the flourishing of academic staff, students and community members; this was expressed through accounts which I associated with capabilities expansion (Sen, 1974; Nussbaum, 2011) and collective deliberation for the common good, within the context of a community (MacAllister, 2019).

Practitioners spoke enthusiastically and passionately about the benefits of offering opportunities to students outwith traditional classroom (lecture-tutorial) learning. However, this was expressed as more complex than simply putting learned theory into practice. First, the importance of highlighting the ethical and social dimensions of their practice was emphasised by practitioners. Second, the concept of developing phronēsis (Hughes, 2013b) or practical wisdom in situations where, for example, a moral conflict arose. Finally, clear links could be made to how Himley (2004) described embodied encounters which could be in contrast and disruptive to a person’s worldview. This kind of benefit was associated with longer term placement activity like CEL, which was scaffolded with structured opportunities for reflection as opposed to short-term volunteering.

Closely related to enabling these kinds of encounters was the idea of gaining emancipatory knowledge. While experiential learning very broadly might be thought to be beneficial in terms of instrumental and communicative knowledge, CEL also focussed on expanding emancipatory knowledge as a significant outcome. Importantly, these were benefits described by practitioners not just for their students and community members but also for themselves. Again, MacIntyre’s (1987) concept of collective deliberation is very relevant here, as what is considered to be worthy for the common good, needs to be decided and acknowledged within a community.
10.5 Research Q3: What are the individual, institutional and structural factors which shape the perspectives and experiences of academic staff and in what ways do they influence them?

Following Bhaskar’s (2008, p.47) critical realist domains of reality which inform Archer’s model of Morphogenesis discussed in section 5.4.2, I considered the interplay between agency, culture and structure. As discussed in relation to the previous two questions, practitioners’ experiences and observations of undertaking CEL spanned a range of both positive and negative perspectives.

Practitioners experienced feelings of reward, satisfaction, enthusiasm and genuine passion for their work. This was cemented by the impact of their CEL work being observed in their students, community members and themselves. However, these positive experiences were often undermined by experiences of employment insecurity or delay to career progression for several reasons: CEL activity was not considered eligible for promotion; CEL activity was not considered equal in value to the university as research; the practitioners who felt that their contracts were precarious did not feel that doing CEL activity would help them secure an open-ended contract. In addition, while staff observed positive rhetoric around university-community engagement in public-facing literature and in the way that they were nominated for university community awards, this belied very limited institutional support for their CEL work in terms of funding, co-ordination and formal work allocation.

Following Archer’s model of Morphogenesis (2013a; 1982), I argue that the experiences and observations collected in participant accounts are influenced by generative mechanisms (culture and structure). According to Archer’s theory, agents (in this case academic staff) are able to transform or reproduce the culture and therefore the structure which influences their actions and experiences.
In the context of my study, many actions (and non-actions) on an institutional level (including the actions of, for example, practitioners) could be said to reproduce and reinforce culture (beliefs and practices). This could include acting to maintain the status quo regarding work allocation, pay and funding for CEL and promotion culture. On an individual level within an institution, this could also include continuing to accept existing pay and reward conditions which make one’s CEL practice unsustainable in the longer term.

Through a Neo-Aristotelian virtue-ethics lens, I have also made the distinction between actions and events carried out for the sake of maintaining virtue-ethical, character-driven principles in contrast to those which exhibit counterfeit virtues (MacIntyre, 1999a). An example of this is offering institutional recognition for CEL activity (in the form of a Principal’s Award) without financial recognition i.e., staff were awarded recognition for but not paid for the work or valuing research grant money over non-income generating community-engagement work. Actions driven by counterfeit virtue such as these strengthen the cultural and structural forces which negatively impact the experiences of staff, thus undermining the morale, livelihood, and the sustainability and quality of their CEL projects.

Finally, cultural and structural forces enable or constrain individual action and impact on individual experiences. Structural-level powers that influence actions and events include the mechanisms and structures generated and maintained by the political and social context. Linked to the idea of practitioners, moral principles, culture and structure, phenomena such as vocation hegemony and professional inauthenticity (see section 3.4.1) account for some of the acts of self-sacrifice and self-abnegation which academic staff openly or implicitly commit in an attempt to maintain the success of their CEL projects. I postulate that practitioners maintain this way of working in order to act in accordance with their moral principles, even if they go against the purported or practised values of their institution.
From the data collected, I argue that institutional and governmental actions maintain generative forces such as societal attitudes towards higher education generally. A conspicuous example of this is the consideration of higher education as a private good, a commodity, and an economic investment for which value for money is expected. Also relevant was the Scottish and UK governments’ reframing of the third mission of universities as, principally, knowledge exchange or monetisable innovation. This conflates the ideas of national economic health with the well-being of its citizens even though national economic growth may correlate poorly with variables such as zero carbon initiatives, political liberty, stable democracies, health and education (Drèze and Sen, 2010; Diener and Seligman, 2004).

Structural forces within the real domain are intangible and invisible; however, a critical realist informed research approach attempts to identify the events and actions with a view to challenging them and ultimately, change the experiences of those negatively impacted. This will be the focus of the following section 10.7 “Recommendations”, where I will explicitly recommend changes to practice based on my research.

10.6 Novel claims of this study and further implications

Aside from addressing the research questions above, further implications of this study are evidenced in this section. First, section 1.5.3 explores the limitations of previous studies in this field. Earlier work has primarily focused on service-learning practice in the United States. Although the body of CEL literature is growing in the UK, I contend that my project has uncovered evidence of the tendency of existing research to treat CEL data in the UK as if it co-existed in one homogenous context. As previously noted, education is a devolved power within the respective governments of the four nations of the UK with related but distinct systems. More comparative research is needed to compare national education contexts and examine the influence these contexts may have on practice.
As CEL activity becomes a more established pedagogical practice in UK, common accounts of practice and related quantitative research, will undoubtedly contribute to developing a sustainable and ethically sound practice. However, with my study, I have concluded that evaluating the ethical basis for institutional decisions around community-engagement should stem from a clear idea about the ultimate purpose of the institution, which in turn informs the unique function of that institution.

There has been a distinct paucity of literature on the ethical theories that undergird motivation to engage with CEL (see section 3.2.1.3). Current research in CEL lends a theoretical focus towards social justice driven aims; critical pedagogy seems to inform dominant conceptualisation of CEL. Adopting a Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics lens allowed me to examine other ways into understanding the generative forces and actions and events that influence and are influenced by the experiences and observations of academic staff. This approach reflects and invites a wider range of philosophical and conceptual ideas than social justice theory alone. A virtue ethics approach could be a useful approach for suggesting changes to CEL that will promote a more sustainable practice which promotes the flourishing of all individuals involved. A morphogenetic approach to analysis suggests that some of the negative experiences recounted by practitioners are influenced by the institutional actions which result from cultural and structural generative mechanisms. In turn, this approach also suggests the possibility of cultural transformation through individual agency and action. Therefore, future research in this field could consider using these approaches to explore the effectiveness and challenges of CEL practice.

Finally, by identifying inconsistencies in public-facing institutional literature and internal literature, policies and practice. This study frames, as an ethical commitment, the need for institutions to ensure that their public-facing literature with regard to university-community engagement, accurately reflects the level of support they are prepared to invest in related projects and staff time. It is hoped that the findings of this study contribute to the development of more effective policies and strategies to support CEL practitioners and promote the ethical dimensions of their work, particularly in the context of research-intensive universities.
10.7 Recommendations for changes to practice

This study highlights the importance of CEL practice in contributing to Alba University’s missions and therefore its ultimate purpose: promoting individual flourishing and critical thinking for the common good. Based on my findings, my recommendations for changes to practice are based on enhancing the institutional commitment of Alba University to CEL. As the presentation and analysis of data are richly contextualised, this promotes the transferability of the findings allowing the reader to connect the issues identified and make inferences beyond the borders of this study and of this particular participant group (Braun and Clarke, 2022, p.143).

Following analysis of the data from my investigation, I propose the following recommendations.

1. Making and maintaining a strategic, institutionally supported commitment to CEL by:
   i. Cultivating a supported community of practice through a centrally supported hub which offers support, funding, training, mentoring and promotion. The hub would track existing and proposed activity and oversee commitment by the institution to an ethical framework for community engagement.
   ii. Revising existing workload allocation models for delivery and development of courses to include a realistic multiplier for colleagues who teach, develop and/or coordinate CEL courses.
   iii. Consulting with staff, students and community partners on a formal ethical process that potential non-research CEL projects would need to complete before engaging with communities. A committee, similar to a research ethics committee, would consider applications and its membership would include community partners and students who are paid to attend.

2. Establish a model to map all university-community engagement within the institution, including CEL and produce the interactive model in an editable and accessible online format. Consultation of this live map by practitioners before
planning future CEL and other community engagement projects will prevent duplication of work and over-saturation of areas within the local community.

3. Further research (detailed below) to ascertain student demand for CEL opportunities and the kind of financial support they may need to realise this.

4. Revision of existing academic staff promotion criteria to include a broader interpretation of third mission objectives and outcomes. “Value” should be operationalised and revised so that value pertaining to external goods (status, money, power) are not the only kind of value that is recognised by the institution.

5. Consultation on the institutional statement on values and whether a normative ethical framework would be more appropriate. Ethical commitments must cohere with working practice, policies and the infrastructure of the institution.

10.8 Suggestions for future research:

The study highlights the importance of CEL practice in contributing to the university’s missions and therefore its ultimate purpose, which I have argued is to promote individual flourishing and emancipatory critical thinking for the common good. Future studies could therefore concentrate on the potential and challenges of CEL practices in advancing these outcomes in various institutional contexts and for various stakeholders. On reflection, I make the following suggestions:

1. Comparative studies: Future research could compare the experiences and perspectives of CEL practitioners in other universities or higher education contexts to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness and challenges of CEL under different levels of institutional support. This would include, for example, non-Russell Group universities in Scotland and the rest of the UK.

2. Enhanced Mixed-methods research: Future studies could use a mixed-methods approach that combines documentary analysis, interviews, surveys, and observations to triangulate data and provide a more comprehensive understanding of CEL practice within the institution and in other institutions.
3. Intersectional analysis: Future research could use an intersectional approach to explore how factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, or socioeconomic status may influence the experiences and perspectives of CEL Practitioners, and how these factors may affect community engagement outcomes.

4. Comparative analysis with other forms of university-community engagement: future research could compare CEL with other forms of university-community engagement, such as volunteerism, community-based research and public engagement, to explore the similarities and differences between these approaches and provide a more comprehensive understanding of university-community engagement practices.

5. Comparative analysis with other stakeholders: future research which compares academic staff experiences with those of students and community partners.

6. Other theoretical perspectives: Other theoretical lenses could be used to further explore some of the claims that practitioners make for the benefits of CEL for example, the Capability Approach: this lens could explore how CEL practice could promote the development of individual capabilities within communities, particularly for marginalised individuals. Theories of moral education could also be a useful lens to examine the goals and outcomes of CEL in a higher education context.
11 References


Berger, R. (2015) 'Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research', *Qualitative research* : QR, 15(2), pp. 219-234.


Butin, D. W. (2010a) 'Service-learning as an intellectual movement: The need for an "academic home" and critique for the community engagement movement', in


Civic University Commission (2019) Truly civic: Strengthening the connection between universities and their places: UPP Foundation


Deeley, S. J. (2022) *Assessment and service-learning in higher education : critical reflective journals as praxis / Susan J. Deeley*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.


Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R. and Schweitzer, J. H. 'Scholarly Outreach and Engagement Reported by Successfully Tenured Faculty at Michigan State University, 2002-2006'.


Harrell, E. (2022) 'Combating White Saviorism in Community-Engaged Learning'.


Kaufmann, E. (2017) 'Why values, not economics, hold the key to the populist right - and to crafting new migration narratives', in *Migration Research Leaders' Syndicate Ideas to inform international cooperation on safe, orderly and regular migration*. pp. 183-188 [Online]. Version.


MacAllister, J. (2016b) 'What should educational institutions be for?', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 64, pp. 375-391.


MacAllister, J. 'Educating virtues in a plural world: In defence of revolutionary Aristotelianism', *7th Annual Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues Conference*, Oriel College, Oxford University: The University of Birmingham.


Scottish Funding Council (2019) Background information on the development of the University Innovation Fund.

Scottish Funding Council (2022a) Our funding. Available at: https://www.sfc.ac.uk/funding/funding.aspx (Accessed: 27/07/2022 2022).


UCL (2023) *Community Engaged Learning (CEL)*. Available at: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teaching-learning/teaching-resources/community-engaged-learningCEL (Accessed: 9th April 2023).


# 12 Appendices

## 12.1 Appendix A: Participants Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Discipline Area</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Assigned participant role</th>
<th>CEL Activity undertaken by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbie</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>First and Second Year students Volunteering befriending placement with local charity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students’ placement - collaborate with local social enterprises and voluntary groups to analyse their operations, create promotional videos, and enhance their comprehension of their activities' impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students develop and deliver 5 music workshops for community placement provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Outreach Engagement Officer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>STEM undergraduate outreach students lead a science club for primary 4 and 5 pupils with weekly school visits for over 2 months. Student organise a science festival for the local community where school pupils present activities. Part of widening participation programme, focus on early engagement, and parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students complete community placements with NHS, independent and voluntary sectors. Students work and learn alongside experienced practitioners who act as mentors, passing on their established skills and assessing the students' progress and levels of achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students engage with local “Experts by Experience” on a specific urban health challenge. Learning from these first-hand experiences, students are expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Discipline Area</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Assigned participant role</td>
<td>CEL Activity undertaken by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Impact Coordinator</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students undertake an outreach or public engagement placement in the community. Working alone, or in small teams, students must negotiate with their host organisation to deliver a resource than can be used to help communicate science to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Student complete significant practice-based placements with local community learning and development organisations. Student mentored and supervised by professionally qualified and experienced practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Student complete significant practice-based placements with local community learning and development organisations. Student mentored and supervised by professionally qualified and experienced practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students are trained as subject assistants to help local secondary school teachers develop materials and delivery classes to pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary students and patient groups collaborate in participatory research into relevant health issue. Design and research by student/patient groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students work with local city partner to define an urban challenge. Group project to analyse issues and affect climate change mitigation planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Discipline Area</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Assigned participant role</td>
<td>CEL Activity undertaken by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>PG student involvement in prison education – led by academic staff member. Engaging prisoners in research related to space exploration resulting in art and published work by the prisoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students are trained as subject assistants to help local secondary school teachers develop materials and delivery classes to pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students take on client cases in legal advice centre supervised by trained practitioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Students complete community placements with NHS, independent and voluntary sectors. Students work and learn alongside experienced practitioners who act as mentors, passing on their established skills and assessing the students’ progress and levels of achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Outreach Engagement Officer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>STEM undergraduate students lead fun and engaging, subject-specific activities for local primary school children as part of widening participation programme, focus on early engagement, and parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>University Manager</td>
<td>Leader/Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>University Manager</td>
<td>Leader/Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Senior Leader</td>
<td>Leader/Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Discipline Area</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Assigned participant role</td>
<td>CEL Activity undertaken by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>Senior Leader</td>
<td>Leader/Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Senior Leader</td>
<td>Leader/Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>University Manager</td>
<td>Leader/Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practitioners $n= 17$

University Leaders and Managers $n= 6$

Total Participants: 23
12.2 Appendix B: Ten-year Strategy Plan

Strategy 2030

I am delighted to share our strategy for the next decade. On the following pages we have outlined our plans for the future, and you will see that our direction is led by a distinctive, honest and realistic set of guiding principles and goals.

Our vision to continue delivering excellence to 2030 and beyond is rooted in our values, with a focus on four key areas: people, research, teaching and learning, and social and civic responsibility.

In learning about our bold strategy for the future, I hope you will be inspired to join our efforts and help us to bring these plans to fruition.

Professor XXXX
Principal and Vice-Chancellor

Our vision

Our graduates, and the knowledge we discover with our partners, make the world a better place.

Our purpose

As a world-leading research-intensive University, we are here to address tomorrow’s greatest challenges. Between now and 2030 we will do that with a values-led approach to teaching, research and innovation, and through the strength of our relationships, both locally and globally.

19: The number of Nobel Prize winners among our staff, students and alumni
29% The proportion of our staff who are from outside the UK

Our values

- We aim to achieve excellence in all that we do, always being principled, considerate and respectful.
- Our teaching and research is relevant to society and we are diverse, inclusive and accessible to all.
- We are ambitious, bold and act with integrity, always being willing to listen.
- We celebrate and strengthen our deep-rooted and distinctive internationalism, attracting the world’s best minds and building innovative global partnerships for research, teaching and impact.
- We foster a welcoming community, where staff, students, alumni and friends feel proud to be part of our University.
- We sustain a deep allegiance and commitment to the interests of the city and region in which we are based, alongside our national and international efforts, ensuring relevance to all.
• We are a place of transformation and of self-improvement, driven to achieve benefit for individuals, communities, societies and our world

Our University, then and now

Founded by the city of [place] in [year], we were the first true civic university in the UK and one of the four ancient universities of Scotland. Our predecessors played a central role in establishing [place] as the chief intellectual centre of the Age of Enlightenment.

Our collegial and collaborative approach established entirely new subject areas from geology to epigenetics. Since that time, we have made significant and sustained contributions to a huge range of societal challenges. We have worked to tackle malaria and diabetes and helped improve youth justice. We have contributed to work on global sustainable development and the use of solar power to give displaced communities in camps access to mobile communication.

Members of our community go on to benefit society as engineers, teachers, social entrepreneurs, artists, medics and agents of change. We are the home of Britain’s oldest literary awards, the James Tait Black Prizes, and of Dolly the sheep. Chrystal Macmillan, suffragist and founder of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, was our first female science graduate in 1896.

In 2013, our Emeritus Professor, theoretical physicist Peter Higgs, was jointly awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics for his 1964 prediction of the Higgs Boson.

Our world is faced with a variety of significant and complex challenges, from rising inequality and the mass displacement of people, to climate change and the emergence of artificial intelligence. Established ways of thinking must be challenged, and as a university we are reflecting on what needs to change (and what does not) as we move forward.

To respond to these challenges and do justice to future generations, we need to adapt and work in new ways. We will work through new partnerships with local authorities, third sector, and business, both nationally and internationally.

This is a strategy for the next decade. In a fast-changing world it is difficult to plan much further ahead than that. By focusing on our values, on the civic purpose for which we were founded, and the changes we want to deliver, we can provide a rationale for the University’s future, and financial sustainability.

We have more than 400 years of excellence behind us. Working together, we can lay the foundations to make the next 400 years even better
Our focus

To make the greatest impact we will focus on four key areas, each shaped by our values.

- People
- Research
- Teaching and Learning
- Social and Civic Responsibility

Our People

Our students, staff, alumni and friends are our lifeblood.

We will continue to welcome and bring together people from a wide range of backgrounds and experience, both close to home and across the globe.

We will encourage and take care of one another. We will provide support in times of difficulty and celebrate every success. We will build relationships that are mutually beneficial, long-lasting and constructive.

We will value the contribution of every individual, regardless of whether they are students, staff, alumni or other contributors. We will support each other’s development and career progress.

We will set an example for others by conducting ourselves with integrity, transparency, honesty and clarity at all times. We will always value and protect freedom of expression, while respecting the boundaries dictated by law, decency, ethics and respect for others. We will be open to change to best support our academic mission and ensure we have policies and procedures that are people-focused, efficient and effective.

Our Service Excellence Programme will make the University an even better place to study and work. It will make it easier for students to join and study with us, make life easier for staff, and help reduce costs so we can focus investment in other important areas.

“The key tenets of the project are making things simple and efficient, making all of our lives easier.”

Assistant Human Resources Adviser

Research

Our ethos of working without boundaries will deliver a step change in innovation and research.
We will strengthen our ability to generate new knowledge through primary research and provide ever better education and training for exceptional early career researchers. We will be the catalyst for new industry programmes and businesses that deliver benefit to societies around the world.

We will do all of this while being critically aware of the ethical, legal and regulatory responsibilities of research. We will openly communicate our research findings to the public, governments and funding agencies.

The University’s student HYPED society includes more than 200 students from various academic disciplines. Together they share a vision to accelerate the development of Sir Richard Branson and Elon Musk’s Hyperloop and implement the technology in the UK.

We will strive to make our research even more interdisciplinary and international, to address social and global challenges including the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

We will create initiatives in a variety of areas including justice, data science, environmental sustainability, mental health and wellbeing, ageing and dementia, human rights, and global governance, driven by new collaborative research communities. Working in open facilities, researchers, students, the public sector and companies will ‘breathe the same air’ and solve major challenges side by side.

“There are a lot of really ambitious students at XXXXXX, and at HYPED we are working together to try to do something interesting for our careers and the wellbeing of the world.”

HYPED President 2018

Social and Civic Responsibility

Our vision is to make the world a better place, so we will ensure that our actions and activities deliver positive change locally, regionally and globally.

Working with partners, attracting investment, fuelling entrepreneurship and delivering inclusive growth are our City Region Deal aims.

“We are finding innovative ways to use machine learning and artificial intelligence to solve global problems, with a focus on ethics in order to progress our excellence in this field and, ‘do data right’. It is about helping people and businesses to build skills and jobs.”

Director, Data-Driven Innovation Programme
Our University in 2030

By 2030 we will be able to demonstrate the success of our strategy in the following ways:

We will see our research having a greater impact as a result of partnership, international reach and investment in emergent disciplines.

The undergraduate curriculum will support breadth and choice, preparing students, graduates and alumni to make a difference in whatever they do, wherever they do it. We will be a global leader in artificial intelligence and the use of data with integrity.

Improved digital outreach will see us enabling global participation in education.

We will be leading Scotland’s commitment to widening participation.

We will be a destination of choice, based on our clear “XXXXXX Offer”. All of our staff and students will develop here, whether they are from Leith, Lisbon, Lahore or Lilongwe.

XXXXXX will become the Data Capital of Europe. We will deliver inclusive growth, provide data skills to at least 100,000 individuals, and create new companies and solutions for global challenges.

We will have created opportunities We will see integrated reporting. Our estate will be fit for purpose, for partners, friends, neighbours and whole organisational impact against sustainable and accessible. We will supporters to co-create, engage with the United Nations Sustainable support learning, research and the world and amplify our impacts. Development Goals. collaboration with our neighbours, businesses and partners.

We will have more user-friendly processes and efficient systems to support our work. Multidisciplinary postgraduate education pathways will support flexible whole-life learning. We will be on track to be a Carbon-Zero University by 2040.

Play your part

www.XXXXX.uk/strategy-2030

This publication is available online at the URL above. Published by: All photographs and images used in this publication are protected It can also be made available in alternative formats on request. Communications and Marketing, The University XXXXXX by copyright and may not be reproduced without permission.
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12.3 Appendix C Community Plan

Community Plan 2020–25
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Foreword

The University has always been closely intertwined with the City of and its local communities. Founded by Town Council in we are the oldest university in the English-speaking world to be established on a civic foundation and, as such, place a special importance on how we engage with our city, our region and its various communities. In the early 20th Century, this relationship was exemplified by the University Settlement movement, which sought to alleviate poverty across the city and empower communities. Fast forward 80 years, and the University is now a key partner in the South East Scotland City Region Deal, where we are putting our excellence in research and education at the service of communities, government and industry, to realise the benefits of data driven innovation and promote inclusive economic growth.

In 2016, the University became the first university in Scotland to have a formal community engagement strategy. Our new University strategy (Strategy 2030) reinforces the significance of our relationship with our communities even more, by placing social and civic responsibility at the forefront of our ambitions. This new strategy commits us to deliver positive change locally and regionally, as well as globally, and that has been the ambition behind this new Community Plan.

In the spirit of co-creation, we have tried to develop the actions in this Plan in consultation with a wide range of communities external to the University, as well as with our own staff and student partners. We are conscious, however, that the University has not always got its relationship with communities right in the past and so we have approached our task in the spirit of humility and realism, and have welcomed and acted on the feedback we have received.

At the time of writing, we are living through extraordinary times. The Covid-19 pandemic has cruelly highlighted the fragility of our social, political, cultural and economic institutions. Indeed, the differential impact of the virus on our communities reflects and reinforces a global social order riven with inequalities. Likewise, the Black Lives Matter movement has exemplified how important it is for us to really listen to, and act on, the concerns of our BAME communities.

I believe that higher education, in general, and the University specifically, has a critical role to play in supporting the city and region’s post Covid-
19 recovery and regeneration in positive, measurable and sustainable ways. We can also help communities interrogate the history of slavery and colonialism and the ongoing impact it has in today’s world.

The commitments outlined in this Community Plan will, therefore, find their first test in how we contribute to these very current challenges but, in the longer term, we hope it will help to embed our desire to partner with all local communities to help deliver positive change, and show our willingness to be a good and welcoming neighbour to those around us. In implementing our Plan the safety and well-being of the community, our students and staff are of the highest priority. We are mindful of the need to adapt in times of social distancing and lockdown. In implementing our commitments, we will always follow public health guidance.

We want to be a university of, with, and for [insert place name] and the wider region and I look forward to working with you to help us achieve a better future for all of our communities.

Professor [insert name]
Assistant Principal, Community Relations

The story so far
We have made great progress in the few years since our initial Community Engagement Strategy was approved in 2016, but we know we need to go further and redouble our efforts to ensure the University is integrated into the city and its communities. Highlights since 2016 include the following: In 2019–20, the Centre for Open Learning’s Short Courses and Languages for All programmes attracted 8,000 registrations, from learners aged between 18 and 92. Since 2017, we have given out over £300,000 to 79 local organisations through our Community Grants scheme.

[Insert place name] was one of the first universities to sign up to the Scottish Government’s Social Impact Pledge.

[Insert place name] Hall hosted 62 concerts and events ranging from community groups to the Scottish Chamber Orchestra. In 2019, over 42,000 visitors enjoyed exhibitions and events at University [insert name] museums such as the [insert name] Gallery and [insert name] Hall. Our Digital Ambassadors programme has helped over 130 people through 300 one-to-one digital befriending meetings, eight courses and at least 100 University student and staff volunteers. We have increased our engagement with community councils, development trusts and neighbourhood groups. In 2019 alone, the University was represented at over 50 meetings with community groups.

In response to the pandemic, an estimated 500kg of clothing was donated by staff to local charities in need. An additional £25,000 of rapid-response grant funding provided to local community organisations involved with the Covid-19 emergency response. Support to local homelessness services, including the donation of PPE for frontline workers and delivering food, toiletries and clothing to people living in temporary hotel accommodation during the lockdown. Staff and students piloted the remote teaching of basic digital skills to adults with disabilities and minority ethnic women in partnership with the charities LEAD Scotland and Amina Muslim Women’s Resource Centre.
Over 1,400 people receive our monthly [redacted] Local e-newsletter and over 3,000 people follow us on social media. Community sports groups, governing bodies and members of our local communities have access to our sports and exercise facilities. Fifty per cent of bookings at [redacted] are from the community.

In order to deliver positive change, we know we need to develop a ‘whole institution’ approach to working with our local communities. Delivering positive change with communities This means that we will draw on our research, education, staff and students, to co-create opportunities and projects which have measurable and sustainable impacts.

We want to embed community engagement into our learning and teaching, develop a culture of working together with communities in shaping our research, and provide opportunities to recognise, reward and celebrate community contributions.

In order to achieve these aims, we will: Support social impact
1. Sustain and grow activities related to our social impact pledges including:
   • Tackling homelessness and rough sleeping;
   • Promoting digital inclusion;
   • Supporting vulnerable groups and areas of multiple deprivation.
2. Develop training and support for student social enterprises, and invest up to £8 million by 2023 in social investments that help tackle social and environmental challenges, as part of our Social Enterprise and Social Investment Strategy.
3. Grow our Community Grants scheme and develop links with a more diverse group of organisations.
4. Conduct an Equality Impact Assessment of our Community Grants scheme and act on its findings.
5. Create more opportunities to bring our community grantees together to share their experiences.
6. Work with local schools and IntoUniversity to establish a new learning centre in Craigmillar in 2021. The centre will respond to educational disadvantage and poverty, and will foster aspiration and improve access to higher education and training.
7. Work with local communities to find new ways in which local residents can take part in community planning.

CASE STUDY
Centre for Regenerative Medicine and [redacted] community
Dr [redacted], Community Science Engagement Manager at [redacted] has worked with the [redacted] community since 2016. The partnership project has included work with [redacted] Primary Schools and [redacted] Community High School, all close to the Centre for Regenerative Medicine at the [redacted]. Partnership activities have included a community science festival, a holiday science club, continuing professional development for teachers and free boxes of STEM activities for families during lockdown. The work that Dr [redacted] has done with [redacted] Primary School won the Rolls Royce Science Prize in 2019.
Share knowledge and experience
8. Actively look for ways in which we can place more of our resources (buildings, equipment, vehicles) at the service of local communities and groups, whilst still using them to deliver on their core purpose.
9. Encourage staff to take part in the University’s new ‘Day to Make a Difference’ scheme (staff can take one day of paid leave each year to volunteer on a community project of their choice), and highlight ways members of the local community can take part in University activities.
10. Continue to support the University Students’ Association in their work running the Student Volunteering Service and recognise students for their voluntary efforts, including through the Award.
11. Work more closely with our alumni in and the wider region as a source of expertise, volunteers and a vital link to our local communities.
12. In partnership with local communities, create a programme of exhibitions linked to University collections.
13. Facilitate knowledge exchange between the University and local communities, including community groups.
14. Provide learning opportunities for local communities through the Centre for Open Learning, Short Courses and Open Lectures, making sure that voices of the local communities are taken into account in the development of the Centre’s new Outreach Plan.
15. Support and scale-up opportunities for all students to undertake community engagement projects as part of their degree programmes.
16. Support community groups to develop stronger links with the University, and celebrate and showcase the work of staff, students and community partners.
17. Build a network of Scottish universities, and seek best practice examples from our international networks, in order to share and improve our own work with local communities.

CASE STUDY

The Students as Change Agents project

The Students as Change Agents project brings together students, staff, and external partners to tackle real-life challenges and generate fresh thinking. It involves students from multiple disciplines who want to make a social impact during their time at University. The culmination of the programme in June 2020 saw 150 students taking part from across the world, working together with partner organisations to address challenges like youth homelessness in Scotland and exploring what an environmentally sustainable future might look like for in the revival of its tourism industry and festivals post-Covid-19.

Since 2017, our Community Grants scheme has supported great projects across and the wider region, some of which are shown here. We have already distributed over £300,000 through this scheme. We commit to providing £250,000 more over the next five years.

A good and welcoming neighbour
We recognise that our presence brings responsibilities, and that community partnership and goodwill is fundamental to our legitimacy as an institution. In order to
be a good and welcoming neighbour, we will continue to build and maintain strong relations with our community partners. We will do this by making sure the University is embedded in our local communities. We will listen to feedback and suggestions from the community, and will act upon these where we can.

In order to achieve these aims, we will:

**Build close connections**
18. Sign up to the city’s 2050 City Vision which is underpinned by the following principles: Fair; Pioneering; Welcoming and Thriving.

19. Maintain our membership of the Partnership Board, and relevant Locality Community Planning Partnerships, so we can contribute positively to the future of the city.

20. Continue to regularly engage with elected representatives, community councils and neighbourhood groups as part of our ‘business as usual’, in order to build and maintain long-lasting relationships.

21. Continue to participate in, and support, local events in the communities in which we are based, from Doors Open Days to community-led events.

22. Alongside other community partners, we will take part in a review of our city’s and University’s historical links to slavery and colonialism and take measures to address these.

23. Continue to build on our role as a University of Sanctuary when working with members of the local community who have had to flee conflict and persecution in their countries of origin.

**Provide services to our communities**
24. Expand our sports and exercise services and facilities offer to community sports groups, governing bodies and members of our local communities.

25. Better promote our University museums and collections to the local community and make performance space available for local charities at XXXX Hall.

26. Provide frameworks to support apprenticeships and career mentoring opportunities as part of the University’s Youth Employment Strategy.

27. Continue to support and grow student social enterprise in partnership with the Students’ Association, Innovations and local networks.

The University has a major presence across the city and region, with more than 550 buildings, 40,000 students, 12,000 staff and many alumni living locally.

**CASE STUDY**

Futures Institute (FI)

FI is a major strategic initiative of the University. It is being developed in recognition that almost all of the biggest challenges facing society are complex and multi-layered, and that insight and innovation can come from bringing together expertise...
from across different disciplines. The Institute is working with local communities, governments and industry to create a portfolio of research, education and wider engagement which is data-rich and aims to have demonstrable ethical, social, cultural, economic and environmental impacts. Once open, the Institute will offer a warm welcome into the newly redeveloped former Royal Infirmary building on XXXXX Place

– fulfilling the Latin pledge above the main entrance: ‘patet omnibus’, open to all.

Open up our estate
When possible, following any easing of restrictions related to Covid-19:
28. Designate a physical front door on each of our campuses all year round, so that members of our community know how to reach us in person.
29. Trial opening up some of our buildings to allow community bookings on a cost-free basis.
30. Aim to operate on a ‘no surprises’ basis with community partners on developments of our estate which could impact local communities, and be as open and transparent as possible about our future plans.
31. Create positive community benefit through our procurement processes.
32. Work with community partners to protect our shared cultural heritage and enhance access to green spaces.

CASE STUDY
Museums Dementia Socials
Museums Dementia Socials is a partnership that offers people affected by dementia a regular, informal Friday morning guided visit of a museum, gallery or zoo. St XXXXX Hall, the University’s Concert Room and Music Museum, hosts once a month and the programme includes a cup of tea and cake, a discussion around some of the rare instruments on display, and a short concert.

CASE STUDY
Slurp
Slurp is a student-run social enterprise aiming to support individuals affected by homelessness in XXXXX. Slurp runs bi-weekly cooking sessions at Streetwork’s XXXXX hub where they make up to 50 hot meals alongside Streetwork’s service users. Slurp also aims to build a forum for educating the student community on the causes of homelessness and misconceptions surrounding it. They create campaigns, organise events and try to develop innovative ways to convey messages to the student population and wider community in XXXXX. All the work they do is funded by selling cooking vouchers and sustainably-sourced shopper bags.

CASE STUDY
University of Sanctuary
In July 2020, the University XXXXX became the first institution in the UK to renew its status as a University of Sanctuary, reaffirming a commitment to creating a culture of inclusivity and awareness for those seeking sanctuary on campus, and within the city. We will continue to enhance our leading role in the Universities of Sanctuary stream at a national and local level, working with other Universities of Sanctuary and City of Sanctuary colleagues in XXXXX, to achieve collective aims. This work will include using research to shape national policy, improving access to
information and support for sanctuary scholars, and building up Refugee Week activities.

**Delivering on what we promise**

We will be open and transparent with our local communities about who is responsible for delivering aspects of this Plan, how we are measuring and evaluating ourselves, and how members of the community can contact us if any issues arise. In order to achieve our aims, we will:

**Be accountable to our communities**

- Highlight our Community Plan and its activities to residents and the wider region using our dedicated community-focused communications channels.
- Reform our Community Board to increase representation from colleagues across the whole institution, as well as community partners.
- Publish information and contact details of the members of the Community Board and Community Team who are responsible for the implementation of this Plan.
- Undertake a social impact survey to measure our impact and make sure we are meeting our social and civic responsibilities.
- Publish an annual report detailing the progress made against the commitments in this plan, and a final report after five years.

The University is committed to carrying out the actions of this plan between 2020 and 2025 and, as a University plan, it will require the whole institution to live up to these commitments.

**Further information**

Published by: Communications and Marketing, The University of XXXXXX

Photography by: [photographer names]

All photographs and images used in this publication are protected by copyright and may not be reproduced without permission. No part of this publication may be reproduced without the written permission of the University of XXXXXX.

© The University of XXXXXX 2020

The University of XXXXXX is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SC005336.

www.xx.ac.uk/local/our-community-plan

This publication is available online at the URL above. It can also be made available in alternative formats on request.
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12.4 Appendix D: Work Allocation Model (Extract)

University of [redacted]
College of [redacted]

Workload Allocation Models: Common Principles and Guidance for [redacted]

1. Introduction

We have made considerable progress in developing a set of guidance to inform the use and development of Workload Allocation Models (WAMs) across the College since the Staffing Management Committee first discussed the issue in January 2013. Following discussions at our Committee meetings over the past 2 years, we now have revised the model taking account of local experiences of using it while still promoting the achievement of standardisation and consistency across the College, where this is possible and desirable, and understanding where local variation is required to take account of disciplinary differences in academic practice.

This document provides guidance for each School in constructing a School-specific WAM which is consistent with College norms and expectations.

2. Limitations of WAMs

WAMs are one tool among several available to School managers to help them to determine the appropriate contribution which each academic colleague makes to fulfilling a School’s objectives. WAMs cannot, of themselves, resolve tensions or conflict between colleagues and they cannot address capability issues. However, if combined with School planning and resourcing discussions at the macro level, and with annual review at the micro level, then the information collected when updating WAMs, and the issues thrown up by those data, can assist School managers in balancing variable contributions to multiple School responsibilities in ways which are demonstrably fair.

In utilising WAMs, School managers have to realise that the goal of fairness and equitable treatment of staff in the distribution of workloads and contributions to School activities are likely to be only achievable over a period of 3 to 5 years, since it is not necessarily possible to re-assign duties or to increase or re-deploy academic capacity quickly or to make in-year adjustments. Furthermore, the proportions of time devoted to particular activities (teaching, research/KE, management and administration) which are set out in this guidance are not intended to apply to every week and month of the academic year; but are intended to be achieved across a whole year or the longer time period indicated. For example, it should be recognised that across a 52 week year, excluding annual leave, someone contributing 40% of their time to teaching and student support is likely to have some weeks of 100% teaching and some weeks of 0% teaching. Similarly, a 40% allocation of time for research might be understood to be achieved across a 3-5 year period, if a semester or year of sabbatical leave is included in the calculations. Given the different cycles
of work in the teaching and research domains, and the likely differences of expectation for individual academics to be involved in teaching and research (see sections 4.4 and 6 below), it might make sense to try to achieve a balanced contribution to teaching on an annual basis, with the balance in research being achieved across a longer timescale.

3. Professional Development and Engagement in Scholarship

It is important for our WAMs to allocate time for colleagues to engage in professional development and scholarly activities. We will need to be clear that when we describe typical or possible ranges of time allocated to a set of duties (teaching, research/KE, management/administration) that the time allocation includes within it an expectation of engagement in professional development related to that set of duties. Colleagues carrying out teaching, research and management/administrative duties should expect to have between 5% and 10% of their deployable time devoted to professional development inclusive of time devoted to training and development in each of the three main work domains.

4. General Principles

4.1 Coverage

Schools should use a single, whole-School WAM, with a degree of subject-specific flexibility applying where factors unique to that subject pertain.

4.2 Hours-based Calculation

Schools should approach workload allocation in terms of a notional numbers of hours per year relative to the total available number of hours. This should be (for one FTE) 1,540 hours per year (a total of 1,820 hours, less 280 hours of annual leave (inclusive of public holidays)).

Calculations of hours should be adjusted proportionately for part-time staff, or as necessary to take account of legacy contractual terms and conditions.

4.3 New Colleagues

For WAM purposes a new colleague is defined as: a person in the first year of their first academic appointment at lecturer level. New colleagues should receive an additional 15% time allocation for engagement in professional training and development. For a full-time member of staff this would equate to 230 hours per year. This would be in addition to the time which should be allocated to all staff in support of their professional development and scholarly engagement in teaching, research and management/administration.

4.4 Minimum Contributions

We recognised that it was undesirable to create mechanisms within our WAMs by which academic colleagues could become separated from engagement in teaching and student support. In light of this, we agreed that all academic staff with a contractual expectation of involvement in teaching should have a minimum teaching-related allocation of 40% of their deployable time (inclusive of the time allocated to
them for engagement in professional development related to teaching and student support). For a full-time member of staff this would equate to a minimum contribution to teaching and student support of 615 hours per year.

In much the same way, we agreed that each academic colleague should make some contribution to management and administration within their School; to the idea of good citizenship in the running of the School. Against other WAM values for management and administrative activities, it was agreed that the minimum level for ‘active citizenship’ might be set at 10% of deployable time, or 150 hours per year for a full-time member of staff (inclusive of the time allocated to them for engagement in training or development related to management and administration).

These minima would not apply to colleagues during periods of sabbatical leave, funded full-time research or other leave.

**4.5 Sabbatical Leave and Bought-out Time**

The allocations of time outlined in this paper would not apply during periods of sabbatical leave, or where someone was bought-out 100% from their contractual duties. However, in a situation where a colleague was partially bought-out of their contractual duties, the partial buy-out would effectively reduce the FTE of deployable time, and then the principles outlined in this paper would apply to the remaining FTE. For example, if a colleague has a 50% buy-out of their time, then 40% of the remaining 50% (20% of the total) would be allocated to teaching and student support, etc. The most frequent reason for a partial buy-out of a colleague’s time is to undertake an externally-funded research project, but the same approach would apply in internal situations, such as when the College Office compensates a School for the time an individual devotes to roles such as Dean of Students or Dean of Research. In such circumstances, the 40% of time devoted to the Dean role would reduce a colleague’s deployable time in the School to 60%, of which a minimum of 40% (24% of the total) would be devoted to teaching and student support, etc.

**4.6 Consultancy and Additional Salary Payments**

Where colleagues engage in consultancy activities or deliver CPD for other organisations as part of their contribution to the range of the School’s academic activities, and receive no additional payment, it is important for managers to take account of that contribution within the workload allocation. However, if colleagues engaging in such activities receive additional salary payments, or a share of the income generated from the activity, then the additional salary/income should be regarded as sufficient recognition of the contribution to the School, and the time spent on such activities should not be included within the workload allocation. All consultancy activity should be conducted in accordance with the University’s consultancy policy. Further information is available at [XXXXX].

**5. Teaching-related Responsibilities**

**5.1 Personal Tutors**

The time allocation within the WAM for Personal Tutor duties should be 2 hours per tutee per year, and 210 hours per year should be allocated to the School’s Senior
Personal Tutor. If a Senior Personal Tutor is also a Personal Tutor, they should be allocated 2 hours per tutee per year in addition to the Senior Personal Tutor allowance of 210 hours per year. All of this time allocation should be regarded as teaching/student support time.

5.2 Multipliers/Weightings for Teaching

We agreed that the most practical means of determining overall teaching-related workloads was to use contact time as a basis of multiplication, and to apply consistent multipliers (or weightings) for a range of activities and circumstances. The following set of multipliers/weightings was accepted as reasonable, subject to local adjustments (with justifications noted for the amendments), to be applied to actual class contact time to arrive at a notional number of hours of teaching-related work:

- Delivery of routine lecture/seminar x 2
- First time creation of new content x 6
- Tutorials x 1.5
- Studio teaching/lab demonstration/ supervision x 1

In addition to these weightings, School managers need to factor into their workload allocations time devoted to assessment. The following multipliers were agreed for assessment and supervision of students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Assessment and Supervision</th>
<th>Number marked</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 hour exam script</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two hour exam script</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three hour exam script</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Essay (up to 3000 words)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Essay (3001-4500 words)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Essay (4501 words or more)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative assignment other than an essay</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Hons/Masters Essay moderation</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours/Masters Dissertations/MSc Research Methods Marked</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters by Research Dissertation examination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal PhD Examination</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*LLC has additional common weightings for the different requirements of marking language assignments.

5.4 Grade UE06 Tutors

The teaching-related weightings outlined in section 5.2 should apply equally to all staff with a contractual expectation of involvement in teaching and student support from grade UE07 to grade UE10. We should, however, recognise in our WAMs that for colleagues employed as tutors on grade UE06 contracts, many of whom are PhD students just beginning their academic careers, it will be necessary to allocate more time to preparation and assessment. Accordingly, for UE06 tutors who have yet to complete their PhD the following weightings should apply to contact time and to assessment, again subject to local requirements (with justifications for the amendments clearly noted):

- Tutorial: x 2
- Assessment: values above x 1.25

5.4 PhD Supervision

The following time allocations should be used for the teaching-related work involved in supervising PhD students:

- First supervisor: 45 hours per full-time student per year
- 2nd supervisor: 15 hours per full-time student per year
- Joint supervisors: 30 hours each per full-time student per year

These rates would be halved for part-time students. These values for PhD supervision should apply for four years of full-time PhD study only. Similar allocations, or a variation of them (with justifications supplied) should be used for supervising Honours or Masters dissertations.

6. Research/Knowledge Exchange-related Responsibilities

The allocation by managers of time to be deployed on research and knowledge exchange activities should take account of the ability of individual colleagues to contribute to their School’s research activities. Against that background, a typical academic performing to a satisfactory standard across the full range of academic activities would normally have an allocation of 40% of their time for research (inclusive of the allocation of time for engagement in research-related professional development). But that would be an allocation made by their manager(s), and could not be regarded as a contractual entitlement.

For those colleagues less able to contribute to their School’s research activities a lower allocation than 40% of their deployable time would be more suitable, and for research-inactive colleagues an allocation of deployable time for scholarly engagement would be appropriate. Accordingly, the guiding principle for our College-wide WAM is that the time allocated to research and knowledge exchange activities should be considered on an individual basis, and could reasonably vary
within a range from 5% to 45/50% of an individual academic’s deployable time (unless they are bought-out for all or part of their contracted time, when a larger overall allocation of research time would be possible).

[...]  

8. Variations from Standard WAM Principles  
In our discussions we recognised that there would be occasions or circumstances particular to a School where it would be sensible to introduce variations to these standard WAM principles. For example, in some Schools with particularly onerous professional body accreditation requirements it may make sense to use a larger time allocation than outlined here for their Quality Assurance Director.

We should not feel unduly constrained by these general principles and guidelines, and should have the managerial confidence to vary our practice to take account of local conditions. However, if we are to move forward together as a group of managers with some sense of consistency across our College, it is necessary to accept the discipline of (i) keeping a record of the reasons for variations from the application of our general WAM principles, and (ii) reviewing the operation of our WAM, and the extent of variation from our norms, with some regularity, and no less frequently than once every three years.

9. Typical Workload Allocation  
As the table below illustrates, these standard WAM principles should not necessarily result in much change from the typical split of academic responsibilities of 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% administration for the majority of our colleagues who are performing the various duties of their academic roles satisfactorily, and who are not bought-out for all or part of their contractual duties. However, these guidelines would allow managers to vary the actual deployment of time for individual colleagues around that average split, whilst still being able to demonstrate that such variation was fair and reasonable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Typical Value</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Student Support</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40% - 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/KE</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5% - 45/50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Administration</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10% – 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclusive of CPD time.

Inclusive of CPD time.

10. Implementation and Review of the College-wide WAM  
It is the intention of that all Schools will implement the College WAM with local variations as necessary but within the stipulated guidelines noted in this document. Regular review will ensure that this document is updated to continually to meet the needs of our Schools and academic colleagues.
College Management
for and on behalf of the Staffing Management Committee
May 2016
### 12.5 Appendix E: Six Phases of Reflexive Thematic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>My account of process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Familiarizing yourself with your data:</td>
<td>I took notes after each interview and transcribed each audio file using Otter AI transcription software. The accuracy of the software varied according to the accent of the speakers and the sound quality of the recording. It ranged between 75% for native speakers of English speaking Standard English to around 30% for non-native speakers of English or speakers speaking different dialects of English. I listened to each recording and corrected the automatic transcription. This allowed me to become increasingly familiar with the content of each interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>In the second phase, I exported the transcribed text to MS Word and imported it into NVivo software. I decided to use this software over the traditional paper and highlighter method for practical reasons (I was using three different office locations and did not want to risk misplacing physical copies of transcribed material). I also preferred the flexibility to create draft codes and experiment with different ways of organising codes and themes. Paper based highlighting did not offer this flexibility. I followed Braun and Clarke’s guidance on avoiding bucket themes and trying to generate a coherent story across the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Searching for themes:</td>
<td>For this part of the process, I exported the codes I generated into an MS Excel spreadsheet to give myself an overview of the frequency and salience of codes used. I noted that frequency and salience of codes needed to be considered. In other words, just because a subject is mentioned frequently, does not mean it is automatically relevant to the research question. I found it helpful to print out all of the codes I had generated into separate lines. I cut these out and then organised and amalgamated closely related codes together where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Braun and Clarke (2022) describe a theme in Reflexive TA as a unit which “captures shared meaning, united by a central organising concept”. The authors also present the option of using additional structuring if doing so adds “interpretative depth or clarity” (Braun and Clarke, 2022, p.87). I drew a visual thematic map of my “candidate” or potential themes as suggested by Braun and Clarke (2022, p.85) In this way, I was able to see relationships between core themes and was able to experiment with different groupings and hierarchies. In a bid to avoid inadvertently oversimplifying my findings, I chose not to use additional structuring such as overarching themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>My account of process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>I wrote definitions for each theme that captured its essence and considered the content and context of the data to ensure accurate representation. I used descriptive names that encapsulated the core idea of each theme. Following this, I validated the identified themes by checking them against the dataset as a whole ensuring that each theme accurately reflected the data and added meaningful insights to the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Producing the report:</td>
<td>In my three Findings and Analysis sections (chapters 0-8) I used illustrative quotes or examples as supporting evidence with context from the data and explored the nuances and variations within the theme and patterns that were identified. After presenting the individual themes, I analysed and discussed the connections, relationships and contrasts between the themes. I discussed overarching patterns or broader implications that were generated from the analysis in chapter 9: Discussion. Finally, I concluded by discussing how the themes contributed to addressing the research questions research objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.6 Appendix F: Raw Codes and Themes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Achieving the ultimate purpose: (Third) Mission Impossible?</th>
<th>Theme 2: &quot;How to seem virtuous without actually being so&quot;</th>
<th>Theme 3: Moral principles, culture and structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE done well needs investment- effort, time and patience</td>
<td>Safeguarding against institutional reputational damage</td>
<td>Maintaining partnerships that are respectful and reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal sequential sustainable activity desirable</td>
<td>Positive Public Relations based on authentic engagement</td>
<td>Responsible CE requires sensitivity and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and long term commitment desired from collaborators</td>
<td>Strategy and public relations can affect authenticity</td>
<td>Preparing students responsibly for community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating reciprocal learning and influence with students</td>
<td>Nurturing organic authentic relationships unstructured</td>
<td>Showing concern for community partners and or service users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE Learning Arising from networks and contacts from other third sector activity</td>
<td>University leaders limited in their support for Community Engagement</td>
<td>Risk of harm to communities and institutional reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-production with community partners</td>
<td>Staff too time poor to do Community Engagement as well as they would want</td>
<td>Partnerships with community aren't equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working primarily with organised community</td>
<td>Ambiguity of how staff time is allocated for community engaged learning</td>
<td>Universities should be useful to their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to scale up or expand project</td>
<td>Frustration and dismay at lack of financial support</td>
<td>We should not burden impose on community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipatory and Interpretive (communicative) knowledge also required.</td>
<td>Lack of funding restricts progress in Community Engaged Learning</td>
<td>Avoiding student exploitation on placement as cheap labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating desirable graduate attributes</td>
<td>Funding - precariousness of</td>
<td>Feel guilty asking people to do more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental knowledge is not enough</td>
<td>Teaching and community engagement not always good for career and promotion</td>
<td>Motivated by own experiences of injustice or prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students’ reflexivity, critical thinking and rational argument</td>
<td>University prioritises income-generating activity over Community Engagement</td>
<td>Influenced by interaction with external communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement is rewarding</td>
<td>Financial interests outweigh community relations</td>
<td>Influenced by the transformative power of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack open the ivory tower</td>
<td>Difficult to measure-operationalise impact of community engagement</td>
<td>Feeling of utility drives community engaged learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockdown has allowed activity to extend beyond</td>
<td>Community Engagement is part of the Uni political agenda</td>
<td>Students should have authentic real world experiences &amp; responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International communities count too</td>
<td>Institution supports diversity in thought and opinion</td>
<td>Social Injustice is motivation for community engagement activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement for social good not exclusively left learning</td>
<td>The university respects alternative politics</td>
<td>University is a values based institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International community relations are important</td>
<td>Politically neutral institution not necessary or desirable</td>
<td>Identifying and living values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of community complex, multiple not limited to geography</td>
<td>Staff feel standard University curriculum is not very progressive</td>
<td>Infusing teaching &amp; learning with institutional values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement alone can be superficial</td>
<td>University needs systematic way of promoting outreach work</td>
<td>Deontological ethical drivers for community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting students from a range of disciplines across Uni</td>
<td>University doesn’t capitalise on positive engagement stories</td>
<td>Teaching staff need to be genuinely committed to community engagement for programmes to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX Award and Credits aren’t main attraction for students</td>
<td>Staff contracts restrict meaningful long term involvement</td>
<td>Good intentions alone are not enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students often commit to CE Learning for longer than they need to</td>
<td>Important CE resources not being utilised-CE staff not consulted</td>
<td>Feeling underqualified to do CE: ‘Relying on instinct rather than qualifications for CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity of CE courses amongst students</td>
<td>Try not to supress enthusiasm and innovation</td>
<td>Community Engagement is rewarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students feel a greater sense of belonging in local community</td>
<td>We need to know more about existing CE across institution</td>
<td>Enjoys finding real world relevance for own research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CEL activity credit impractical</td>
<td>Effectiveness and evaluation of CE</td>
<td>‘Random shit I find interesting’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE as a strategic means to demonstrate impact</td>
<td>Internal tensions and debates around CE</td>
<td>Some colleagues disagree Uni should do CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engaged Learning needs clear pedagogical principles</td>
<td>Attempting to map existing CE relationships at University</td>
<td>Internalising vocation hegemony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening participation is an important goal</td>
<td>Awareness of University CE strategy is uneven</td>
<td>Maintaining networks across disciplinary sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach out to hard to reach groups not just organised</td>
<td>Trying to make CE more visible across University</td>
<td>Some academics are out of touch with real world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engaged Learning takes situated and unsituated forms</td>
<td>Uni Community Engagement primarily for political reasons not sustainable</td>
<td>Kinds of support available within department and school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling real world issues with T&amp;L</td>
<td>How power and influence is increased</td>
<td>Other Uni colleagues inspire, motivate, enables indiv CE activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not appropriate for all students or subjects to engage with community</td>
<td>Community Engagement in hierarchy of University activity</td>
<td>Being non-core staff can be alienating but has advantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative modes of community engaged learning</td>
<td>Uneven distribution of teaching and research within schools</td>
<td>University approach to CE is diverse and disparate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engaged learning depends on curriculum reform</td>
<td>Research Excellent comes at expense of quality teaching</td>
<td>Coordination &amp; Community of Practice helps us improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality of opportunity for widening participation students</td>
<td>University recognition of staff &amp; student contribution to community engagement</td>
<td>Co-ordination is hard in large institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Community Engaged learning is inequitable</td>
<td>Research at university is rightly prioritised</td>
<td>Staff community engagement enabled by mentoring or volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False dichotomies wealth creation vs social development</td>
<td>CE integrated with education and research is desirable</td>
<td>Enthusiasm, goodwill and good intentions in institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuance distinction in activity CE literature doesn't translate on the ground</td>
<td>Integration of T, L , Research and CE</td>
<td>Acting as interface between Uni and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves of compulsory CE Learning for students</td>
<td>Rejection of Research as most important mission</td>
<td>Being the exception - doing something different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University does not exist in a political vacuum</td>
<td>Creative ways to overcome institutional university restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive partnerships reaching out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Making community members feel they are worthy of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from communities through CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Academic Promotions Policy

1. Policy Statement

The University is committed to an academic promotions process that values excellence in all that we do and is fair, consistent and equitable. We recognise outstanding contributions to research, education, knowledge exchange and management, leadership and citizenship that support the University’s strategic purpose and objectives. This policy explains the annual academic promotions process.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all academic staff covered by the University’s academic grade profiles who are seeking promotion to a higher grade and to academic and clinical academic staff applying for the title of Reader or Personal Chair.

3. Definitions

**DORA** is the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment which recommends
how research outputs should be evaluated. Research should be assessed on the
value and impact of a range of measures and not solely on publication metrics. refers
to activities related to teaching, learning, student outcomes and the
student experience. It may also involve research led learning and
teaching and the provision of continuing professional development.

Hybrid role means a role that includes significant elements of both academic and
professional services responsibilities.

Knowledge exchange refers to activities that you are involved in beyond the academic
community which contribute to increasing the visibility and impact of
research. This includes commercialisation, technology transfer, public
engagement and engagement with policy and professional practice.

Management, Leadership & Citizenship refers to contributions to the management of your School, College
and/or the University, for example through membership of committees,
participating in collegial projects or by leading an academic area of
activity. It may also include professional activities outside the University. It is
expected that your contribution will support the University’s commitment to equality,
diversity and inclusion.

Research Outputs include datasets and software, influence on policy and practice,
research income, research publications, conference presentations,
exhibitions and discipline specific content.

Team and interdisciplinary contribution includes undertaking interdisciplinary research, making an individual
collection of research and/or working as a member of a
research team or undertaking interdisciplinary educational programme
development.

[...]

2. Making an Application

If you decide to apply for promotion you must:
complete the required forms and documentation for the appropriate grade or title as outlined in Appendix III

provide evidence of your achievements, normally in at least two areas of activity which include: research, education, knowledge exchange and management/leadership/ citizenship.

send your completed forms and documentation to your Head of School by the required date.

Appendix I Guidance and Criteria for the Award of the Title of Reader

1.0 Introduction

A Readership is awarded as a mark of personal distinction. It recognises an individual's contributions to the advancement and exchange of knowledge, by important contributions to:

Education
Research
Knowledge Exchange
Management
Leadership and Citizenship

The title of Reader may be awarded to academic grade 9 or equivalent staff e.g., Clinical Academics at grade 9 level on the relevant Clinical scale.

If you are considering applying for promotion to grade 9 and/ or the title of Reader you should read this guidance in conjunction with the Academic Promotions Policy, the Academic grade 9 profile, the Exemplars of Excellence and the FAQs for Academic Promotion Process.
## 2.0 Essential Criteria

Your application must provide evidence of ALL of the following:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Growing, recognised achievement at a high level, in the advancement of knowledge and understanding or its creative and professional application, evidenced by peer-reviewable output.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Ability in and demonstrable commitment to academic leadership and citizenship in any combination of education, research and knowledge exchange to influence, stimulate, inspire and mentor others to develop careers and further the University’s vision, purpose and values, including through promoting:  
  - equality, diversity and inclusion  
  - social responsibility and sustainability |
| 3 | Growing recognition in an international context, which may include, but is not limited to: |
|   | - invitations to present at prestigious conferences |
|   | - invitations to review teaching at prestigious Universities |
|   | - editorships or membership of editorial boards of learned journals |
|   | - receipt of prestigious prizes and awards |

## 3.0 Expanded Criteria

Depending on the balance of your application, you will demonstrate some of the criteria in this section.

### 3.1 Expanded Criteria for all Reader Appointments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contribution to management, leadership and citizenship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Professional standing commensurate with growing international recognition, as demonstrated by:
- advisory work
- recognition by and contribution to learned societies, professional bodies etc.
- other forms of external recognition and awards.

3. Notable contribution to public understanding of academic research and/or scholarship.

3.2 Expanded Criteria for Reader Appointments with a Strong Focus on Education

Education can be summarised as activities related to teaching, learning, student outcomes and the student experience.

- High-quality and developing contribution, including practice in the field, may include, but is not limited to:
  - advancement of disciplinary teaching (for example curriculum development)
  - excellence as a teacher (including the ability to stimulate, inspire and support students at all levels)
  - other forms of educational development (for example, assessment practice, digital learning, continued professional development)
  - development of teaching materials, including influential textbooks.

3.3 Expanded Criteria for Reader Appointments with a Strong Focus on Research

Research often occurs within an academic discipline, however we acknowledge that it also takes place across interdisciplinary boundaries. You may wish to refer to the guidance on [Interdisciplinary work](#), in addition to the [Exemplars of Excellence](#) in research.
Appendix II Guidance and Criteria for the Award of the Title of Personal Chair

1. Introduction

A Personal Chair is the highest mark of distinction. It recognises an individual’s contributions to the advancement and exchange of knowledge, by outstanding contributions to:

Education
Research
Knowledge Exchange
Management
Leadership and Citizenship
The title of Personal Chair may be awarded to academic grade 10 or equivalent staff e.g. Clinical Academics at grade 10 level on the relevant Clinical scale.

If you are considering applying for promotion to grade 10 you should read this guidance in conjunction with the Academic Promotions Policy, the Academic grade 10 profile, the Exemplars of Excellence and the FAQs for Academic Promotion Process.

2. Essential Criteria

Your application must provide evidence of ALL of the following:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sustained, recognised achievement of the highest distinction, in the advancement of knowledge and understanding or its creative and professional application, evidenced by peer-reviewable output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expectation of continuing contribution at international level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | Ability in and demonstrable commitment to academic leadership and citizenship in any combination of education, research and knowledge exchange to influence, stimulate, inspire and mentor others to develop careers and further the University’s vision, purpose and values, including through promoting:  
  o [equality, diversity and inclusion](#)  
  o [social responsibility and sustainability](#) |

3. Expanded Criteria

Depending on the balance of your application, you will demonstrate some of the criteria in this section.

3.1 Expanded Criteria for all Chair Appointments
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Significant contribution to management, leadership and citizenship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional standing commensurate with significant international recognition, as demonstrated by: advisory work, recognition by learned societies, professional bodies etc. other forms of external recognition and awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significant contribution to public understanding of and engagement with academic research and/or scholarship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2 Expanded Criteria for Chair Appointments with a Strong Focus on Education

Education can be summarised as activities related to teaching, learning, student outcomes and the student experience.

Outstanding contribution, including practice in the field, may include, but is not limited to:
- advancement of disciplinary teaching (for example curriculum development)
- excellence as a teacher (including the ability to stimulate, inspire and support students at all levels)
- other forms of educational development (for example, assessment practice, digital learning, continued professional development)
- development of teaching materials, including influential textbooks.

#### 3.3 Expanded Criteria for Chair Appointments with a Strong Focus on Research

Research often occurs within an academic discipline, however we acknowledge that it also takes place across interdisciplinary boundaries. You may wish to refer to the guidance on Interdisciplinary work, in addition to the Exemplars of Excellence in research.
Outstanding, sustained contribution through methods other than publication, may include, but are not limited to:

- applied research
- consultancy
- advanced professional practice
- creative work.

[...]
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Exemplars of Excellence in Knowledge Exchange (KE)

Note: Knowledge Exchange (KE) is in this document used as shorthand for activities engaging stakeholders beyond the academic community in order to increase impact of research; and includes commercialisation, technology transfer, public engagement and engagement with policy and professional practice.
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Introduction

The University strategic plan highlights the importance of global impact and contribution to society. The three goals that underpin this are: Excellence in Teaching, Excellence in Research and Excellence in Innovation. The latter incorporates knowledge exchange with a variety of audiences and stakeholders. It is crucial that the University’s reward and recognition processes reflect achievements in all three of these goals.

The University has clear, balanced Grade Profiles for academic staff that match individuals’ activities and achievements to UoE grades 6-10, with respect to teaching, research and leadership/management. Reward processes have, historically, recognised contributions in these three areas. Exemplars of productive activity and excellent performance in research and leadership are well established and understood within their discipline-specific contexts and cultures. Exemplars of excellence in teaching have now been defined in a document (Exemplars of Excellence in Student Education) that is an adjunct to the grade profiles - effectively fleshing out their rather skeletal nature. While some outstanding promotions have been made with KE as a component of the case, we have to date lacked an accepted set of flexible and dynamic exemplars to put flesh on the bones of the Grade Profiles with respect to KE.

The purpose of the exemplars is to encourage and reward effective engagement with stakeholders, audiences and users of research, aiming to increase the uptake and thus the impact of the academic expertise in the University. This is entirely consistent with external imperatives to demonstrate impact from research, including those expressed in the Research Excellence Framework (REF). The impact component of REF 2014 focused on the difference that the underpinning research made, not on who actually generated the impact. For the University promotion process however, it is appropriate that it is the successful effort made by the academic applying for reward/promotion that is rewarded. This should acknowledge the time invested in engagement with stakeholders to increase impact, which otherwise could be used on research, teaching or leadership activities. For that reason, it is essential that the applicant has taken a proactive and effective role in the KE activity individually or as part of a group. Similarly, we will only reward engagement activities where there is evidence of uptake from the target groups beyond academia.

A set of exemplars should not, by definition, be exhaustive. It will thus develop continuously as (a) experience of its use in our own reward processes improves its clarity and usefulness; (b) the nature of KE per se evolves and (c) new exemplars emerge. This 2015 document should not therefore be regarded as either a fully-formed,
complete document or a one-off experiment. It is, rather, the next step in a process that aims to improve the robustness and effectiveness of our reward processes in all areas of activity - matching individual efforts and achievements to the goals of the University. This will, in the KE area, stimulate the growth of a more diverse set of exemplars of excellence in KE drawn from future promotion/reward cases that have been inspired and informed by this initial list.

This document therefore provides additional guidance to users of the existing grade profiles, supplementing both the Research and Teaching sections of the Representative Work Activities in all academic profiles. It also aims to assist both colleagues preparing a case for promotion/reward and those evaluating such cases as members of promotion panels. It provides concrete, illustrative examples of excellent performance in and contribution to KE that match the better-understood measures of research and, now, teaching excellence. It does not set numeric targets for what is required, as in line with the amount of research funding and number of research outputs expected, this will vary greatly between disciplines and the context in which the activity and impact takes place. The challenge for the candidate is to demonstrate sustainable activity that has filled a demand or need and has had impact beyond academia.

The exemplars must not be regarded as a set of boxes to be ticked. Rather they offer an insight into the nature, level and breadth of impact of the achievements and contributions, and the form of the evidence needed to support them, that can give substance to the generic activities that are in the grade profiles. Furthermore, it is not expected that all cases for reward will necessarily have an explicit KE component.

KE may be derived from research and/or teaching. Rewards for excellence in KE must be equal in status, and most importantly in value to the University, to those for excellence in research and teaching. This document therefore proposes exemplary achievements in KE that are as challenging as those used in determining promotions and rewards for research and teaching. It thus provides a principled framework, clear exemplars and maximal evidence to inform the value judgements that are made by promotions and reward committees. These exemplars should help to set clear,
challenging and valuable goals for colleagues whose primary focus, as agreed during Annual Review, includes KE.

This will have a gradual and sustainable effect on the quality of KE and the esteem that is given to it.

Most nominations for promotion/reward are, however, based on at least two, if not more of Teaching, Research, and Leadership/Management. This document therefore has the potential to inform all nominations and thus raise quality with respect to the KE dime.

1. Background and Assumptions

Existing Grade Profiles provide clear, balanced, but necessarily generic, descriptions of the nature of the activities in teaching, research and leadership (with references to knowledge exchange) that define an individual’s level of contribution to the work of the University. They also provide generic measures of performance.

Detailed criteria of excellence for research are well-understood and largely quantitative (e.g. publications, research income). The exemplars are quite different across diverse subject areas, but are well understood within the context of each subject and research discipline. Used holistically and flexibly, they reward a wide range of research excellence, in different subjects and contexts.

Similar Exemplars of Excellence in Student Education are now defined, in use and are “bedding down” well as a useful component of the reward and recognition process, informing the value judgements that are made by reward committees.

Criteria for excellence for KE-focused activities are currently far less well understood and are relatively ill-defined.
2 Guiding Principles

- To reward excellence in KE that is evidenced by individual achievements that are of direct and measurable benefit to the process of KE.
- To maximise the level of external evidence in assessing excellence.
- To present robust sources of internal evidence where external evidence is not feasible.
- To ensure that the achievements measured are of equivalent value and status, and are as challenging to attain, as those for research-focused and teaching-focused activity.
- To encourage candidates using this set of exemplars of achievement to present multiple, but not necessarily all of these exemplars of excellence, as do candidates for reward/promotion based upon teaching, research and leadership1. Multiple, sustained achievements are, quite correctly, sought for all promotions.
- To encourage the presentation of new examples of excellence that is of the same standard and integrity as those in this document.
- These exemplars are grouped for clarity. The groupings are not, however, mutually exclusive. For example, a valuable external activity that bestows esteem on the individual will reflect well on the University and is also likely to make a substantial direct or indirect contribution to the quality of KE.
- Internal evidence should be sought from the Head of School, Head of College or a relevant Vice Principal appropriate to a particular exemplar of excellence. The evidence will therefore carry that authority. However, it is accepted that details of the evidence are likely to be sourced from, for example, Research and Innovation, the Public Engagement Network, Communications and Marketing and other colleagues with direct involvement of the exemplar in question.
- These exemplars do not distinguish between grades. However, for grade 10 examples of achievement in Leadership in Knowledge Exchange would be required.

3 Exemplars of Excellence in Knowledge Exchange

3.1 Direct Contribution (“Hands-on” involvement and achievement in KE activities).

With Internal Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major contribution to impact achieved as documented in one of the impact case studies submitted to REF2014.</td>
<td>Evidence provided confirms the contribution of the individual in the process generating impact.</td>
<td>Head of School (based on REF submission).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This principle is already embedded in the Grade Profiles as “No job is expected to include all the activities listed; most will only include a subset.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secured external funding for KE activity.</td>
<td>Translational awards from RCUK Charities and other sources (incl. Impact Acceleration Account funds), Public Engagement, Proof of concept funding, Industry, CASE and Collaborative Studentships etc.</td>
<td>Head of School (based on ERI data).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective commercialisation/technology transfer</td>
<td>Licenced IP to third party and/or spin out company based on University owned IP.</td>
<td>Head of School (based on ERI data.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of consultancy for external organisation</td>
<td>Significant consultancy income administered through ERI (private consultancy not included). For additional impact see below.</td>
<td>Head of School (based on ERI data.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Continuing Professional Development/Executive Education.</td>
<td>Significant income through consultancy, fees or other income coming to School. For additional impact see below.</td>
<td>Head of School, based on ERI, Registry and School income data (for consultancy). IAD and OLL (for CPD provision).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained proactive media engagement.</td>
<td>Used as expert by broadcast, print and significant social media outlets, contributing significantly to public debate and enlightenment. This includes news, current affairs, documentaries etc.</td>
<td>Head of School (based on press/broadcast clips and data from CAM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s Medal, Tam Dalyell Prize and other internal prizes.</td>
<td>Achievement in KE recognised by the award.</td>
<td>Head of School/award documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With External evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustained engagement with organisations in public, private or third sector using research to inform policy and practice.</td>
<td>Successfully exchanged knowledge/research to the benefit of the organisation.</td>
<td>External organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided talks, exhibitions, performances and other activities designed to communicate research to a range of external organisations and audiences.</td>
<td>Several invitations over time from a range of organisations demonstrating demand and active engagement with the content provided.</td>
<td>Invitations/documentation of events taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake of research based content, including creative outputs, among external organisations/audiences.</td>
<td>This includes a broad set of achievements from developing good practice guidelines that is taken up by psychotherapy agencies, science engagement tools being used by other institutions, to music scores used by choirs and orchestras.</td>
<td>External organisation(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments to boards, working groups, and committees in public, private and third sector organisations.</td>
<td>Using academic expertise to inform and make an impact upon policy making, development of practice and the effective running of organisations.</td>
<td>External organisation incl. documenting that the appointment is based on candidates' academic expertise/University role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Leadership in KE

**With Internal Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Held internal KE management positions and served on College and University committees with KE remit.</td>
<td>Effective and sustained service in management positions and on committees.</td>
<td>Head College /relevant VP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major contribution to development of policies for KE within the institution.</td>
<td>Effective and sustained service on temporary working panels or in other ways making significant contributions to policies and guidelines promoting KE.</td>
<td>Head of School/College/ relevant VP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an ambassador for KE, mentoring colleagues and extending networks to other colleagues.</td>
<td>Contribution to culture change by involving colleagues and students in KE, including encouraging and mentoring them to develop their own strands of activity.</td>
<td>Head of School/College/ relevant VP (could be based on info from Beltane and other KE support).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### With External Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to KE policies and guidelines beyond the institution, incl. RCUK, SFC, charities etc.</td>
<td>Effective and sustained service on a major external committee or in other ways called upon as expert to significantly inform KE policy and guidance.</td>
<td>External organisation/ body.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contribution to review of grants and judging competitions with strong KE components. | Member of assessment panels for external KE grant and prizes incl. EPSRC Public Engagement Fund, BBSRC Innovator of the Year, ESRC Impact Awards etc. | Documentation of invitation/acceptance. |

### 3.3 Dissemination of Good Practice in KE (i.e. Publication and Conferences)

### With Internal Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving talks at awareness raising and good practice events at the University.</td>
<td>At least two invitations to share experience from KE activity at School, College or University level.</td>
<td>Head of School/College/ relevant VP, based on info from KE support staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Major contribution to material developed within the University to share good practice in KE. | Significant input in the writing, and/or provision of expertise and case studies to material delivered online or print. | Head of School/College/ relevant VP, based on info from KE support staff. |

### With External Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication in academic and/or practitioner oriented journals.</td>
<td>Publication accepted subject to peer review and/or rigorous editorial selection/review.</td>
<td>Confirmation of the publication and the review process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Presentation of experiences and case studies of KE at conferences. | Invitations from external conference and/or panel organisations. | External organisation/ individual extending the invitation. |
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| Significant contribution to good practice guides including online resources for KE activity. | Material used beyond the institution (e.g. RCUK, National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement etc.). | External institution hosting the material reporting on use and quality. |

3.4 External Esteem and Recognition

With External Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, achievement</th>
<th>Evidence of Excellent Performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awarded external prizes in recognition of excellence in KE.</td>
<td>Includes RCUK Impact awards, RSE Prize for Public Engagement, Praxis Unico awards, Scottish Enterprise, subject/area specific prizes etc. Generic prizes can be included when the individual award was made in explicit recognition of KE and impact achievements.</td>
<td>Prize award statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External promotion of individual and their work through case studies, feature interviews etc.</td>
<td>Case studies featuring individual and/or KE excellence on web and print publications in order to promote KE.</td>
<td>Print of publication/online material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 History and Review

This document was produced by a working group comprising:-

It was subject to consultation with a range of senior academic colleagues across the three Colleges and published in July 2015.
It is intended that the document will evolve and grow in light of experience and further examples.

Feedback is welcome to
12.9 Appendix I: Exemplars of Excellence in Student Education (Extract)

Exemplars of Excellence in Student Education [...]

Ongoing review of the Exemplars

Introduction

The University has clear, balanced grade profiles for academic staff that match individuals’ activities and skills to UoE grades 6-10, with respect to teaching, research, knowledge exchange, management and leadership. Measures of productive activity and excellent performance in research, management and leadership are seen to be well understood within their disciplines and cultures. Concrete and unequivocally evidenced exemplars of excellence in teaching have proved to be more elusive. We have made outstanding promotions for teaching-focused activity. However, we have to date lacked an accepted set of flexible and dynamic exemplars of achievement with respect to student education.

By definition, a set of exemplars should not be exhaustive. It will develop continuously as:

- experience improves clarity and usefulness;
- teaching methods evolve; new exemplars are defined and assimilated (see section 5).

This document therefore provides additional guidance for the Teaching sections of the existing grade profiles, 8.2/8.3 9.2/9.3 and 10.2/10.3 for grades 8, 9 and 10 respectively. It also aims to assist colleagues in:

- preparing a case for promotion/reward; acting as members of promotion panels. It provides concrete, illustrative examples of excellent contribution to student education that match what are generally perceived to be robust measures of research excellence.

However - the Exemplars are not a set of boxes to be ticked.

Most nominations for promotion/reward include at least two, if not all three of:

- student education;
- research, knowledge transfer, outreach etc;
- leadership and administration. This document will therefore inform all reward/promotion nominations, raising quality with respect to the student education dimension.

The Exemplars offer an insight into the nature, depth and breadth of impact of the skills and contributions that can give substance to the generic activities in the grade profiles and the nature of the evidence needed to support them.

Rewards for excellence in student education must be equal in status, and most importantly in value to the University and our students, to those for excellence in research, innovation and leadership. This document therefore proposes examples of achievements in student education to maximise the evidence that informs the value judgements made by promotions and reward committees.

---

2 These measures are, however, individually imperfect. For example, monographs are key measures of excellence in some subjects, while substantial research grants are in others. Proper
assessment of research quality combines several such measures.

### 1.1 Aims of the Exemplars

- To reward individual achievements in student education that are of measurable benefit to student education, particularly in the University;
- To maximise consistency of quality in the achievements cited across Schools and disciplines;
- To ensure that they are of equivalent value and status, and are as challenging to attain, as those for research-focussed activity;
- To maximise the use of external evidence in assessing performance;
- To present examples of sources of robust internal evidence where external evidence is not feasible;

---

3 This principle is already embedded in the Grade

---

- To encourage candidates to present multiple, but not necessarily all of, these exemplars of excellence, as do candidates for research-focussed reward/promotion;
- To encourage the presentation of new examples of excellence that are of the same quality as those in this document.

A portfolio of multiple, sustained contributions are sought for research-related promotions and this principle must apply to all reward processes.

We have grouped these exemplars for clarity. The groupings are not, however, mutually exclusive. For example, a valuable external activity that brings esteem to the individual will reflect well on the University and is likely to make a substantial contribution to student education.

Internal evidence may come from the Head of School, Head of College or Vice Principal, as appropriate to particular exemplar of excellence. The evidence will therefore carry that authority. However, it is accepted that details of the evidence are likely to be sourced from, for example, the School's Director of Teaching, Senior Tutor, a Dean or a member of senior management.

Where documentary evidence can be included in the reward paperwork, it should be. Panels will, however, work on the assumption that a candidate is telling the truth and will only follow up sources of evidence if necessary. This is consistent with the attitude and procedures for presenting evidence of research excellence.

Promotion is designed to recognise sustained past performance. However, it comes with the clear expectation that promoted staff will continue to develop excellence and perform at, and, it is to be hoped, beyond that level. The ethos of the Exemplars is that they demonstrate a contribution at a particular grade. For example, the Grade 10 (Professor) exemplars indicate what is expected of a Professor and therefore the level of achievement that candidates for promotion to that level should be exhibiting.

It is therefore axiomatic that the exemplars present achievements that are above the individual’s current grade and therefore, taken together, may justify promotion and regrading.

### 1.2 Exemplars, reward and annual review

Profiles as “No job is expected to include all the
Annual review and reward/promotion are separate processes. However, annual review should:

- Match individuals’ skills and efforts to the School’s needs (to include the individual’s current and future balance of teaching, research, leadership etc);
- Discuss individuals’ aspirations in all dimensions of academic work and optimise their likely achievement;
- Reduce or remove barriers to individuals’ success if possible;
- Discuss progress toward promotion, including
timescales and activities to maximise its success. The Exemplars should inform this with respect to the student education dimension.

activities listed; most will only include a subset.”
GRADE 8 - Exemplars

Promotion applications need high-quality evidence. Within each of these sections, we provide examples of evidence that an applicant can use to support an application, and that a panel can use to inform its value judgement. Applications are not expected to cite all of these evidence sources and the examples listed are not intended to be exhaustive.

Most pieces of evidence will be more or less biased. For example, student questionnaire data may exhibit unconscious bias with respect to gender, first language, age, and course content. It is difficult to attain good feedback in, say *Statistics for Biologists*, or *Electromagnetics for Engineers* but these are vital subjects. All data should therefore be looked at holistically and in context.

This is not a “tick-box” exercise and a sensible number of strong exemplars is more persuasive than a long list that includes prosaic exemplars. In particular, simply holding a leadership post or delivering a set of lectures is not useful evidence. Impact and effectiveness must be highlighted.

2.1 Direct teaching and support for University [[xxx]] students.

With internal evidence

---

### Awards and nominations

**For Example**
- Chancellor’s Award
- multiple nominations for, or receipt of a Students’ Association award
- investigator on a Principal’s Teaching Award grant
- clearly, external awards are also valuable

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Students’ Association
- Director of Teaching
- Head of School
- Awarding body

### Course delivery

Successful and varied portfolio of excellent teaching (including, but not restricted to, lectures) over a sustained period, with excellent student feedback. This activity is particularly welcome in sensitive and challenging classes

**For Example**
- large classes of early-years students
  - these are especially sensitive to the quality of teaching
  - and affect large numbers of students at a crucial stage
- courses that are crucial to the subject and to graduates’ wider attributes, but may be unpopular,
  - For example, *Statistics for Biologists, Electromagnetics for Engineers*
- Subject area-related engagement with practice for enhancement of learning and employability

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Director of Teaching or Programme Director
- Course Enhancement Questionnaire

### Course development

Successful and varied portfolio of excellent teaching (including, but not restricted to, lectures) over a sustained period, with excellent student feedback. This activity is particularly welcome in sensitive and challenging classes

**For Example**

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
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- significant contribution to the design and development of a successful new course
- successful major re-design of an existing course
  - for example syllabus change or the introduction of new and improved teaching methods
  - potentially including significant input to the School and College approval processes
  - creating links between courses thereby enhancing students’ understanding and confidence
  - Course development that conveys the importance of equality and diversity in our curricula

**Innovative learning - delivery and development of improvements**

Clearly identifiable contribution to a valuable new development in innovative learning

**For Example**
- identify innovative teaching strategies that improve student engagement
  - such as inquiry-based teaching, collaborative learning
- enhancements to the use of digital learning technology
- promoting useful synergies between two programmes
- innovative improvements to methods of assessment

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Director of Teaching
- Programme Director

**Improvement in teaching practice**

Clearly identifiable contribution to a “step-change” improvement in learning. This need not be pedagogically innovative as it may simply involve teaching existing content substantially and sustainably more effectively.

**For Example**
- identify areas in need of revision or improvement
- contribute to the planning, design and development of objectives and materials
- clearly identifiable contribution to a ‘step-change’ in the development of learning

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Director of Teaching
- Programme Director
- Course Enhancement Questionnaire

**Personal tutoring**

Successful Personal Tutor with excellent student feedback for multiple years

**For Example**
- support personal tutees’ academic progress and development
- provide effective and timely signposting to appropriate student support functions.
- help tutees to navigate University regulations and policies
- introduce innovative improvements to the provision of support
- where relevant, evidence of adaptation to meet the needs of students with disabilities or special needs

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Senior Tutor
- Head of School

**Improvements to the student experience**

- Director of Teaching or Programme Director
Clear contributions to, for example, teaching, assessment and student support that improves the experience of multiple students

**For Example**
- enhancements to student engagement
- enhancements to student transitions between school, university and years of study
- clear improvement in student achievement and retention
- clear improvement in support for WP (widening participation) students
- successful work with Alumni
- where relevant, evidence of contribution to meeting the needs of students with disabilities or special needs
- Active involvement with student extra-curricular activities

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Director of Teaching
- Course Evaluation Questionnaires

### 2.2 Leadership in student education

With internal evidence

---

**Course Organiser**

Substantial, positive contribution to the organisation of a major course, perhaps within a course team for more than one year. This may include identifying and optimising resources for the course

**For Example**
- demonstrate academic ownership of courses
- design teaching materials and delivery
- set, mark and assess work
- provide timely and appropriate feedback to students
- contribute to future-proofing courses for potential changes that might arise in their external context
  - and between reviews/reaccreditations
- creating links between courses

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Director of Teaching
- Programme Director

**Course/Programme support and organisation**

**For Example**
- leading tutor and demonstrator training
- devising new processes for improvements to provide effective and efficient student engagement and feedback
- development of new and successful assessments that have enhanced student learning and student experience

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Director of Teaching
- Programme Director

**Community-Building**

**For Example**

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
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- clear and demonstrable improvement to the formation of student or student/staff learning communities
  - i.e. co-design of provision that embeds the experience of community, partners and/or learners
  - while it is not necessary to have been the lead on this, proactive involvement is essential
- demonstrable contribution to building wider communities ("outreach") that enhance the student experience
- contribution and leadership in open days and recruitment
- organisation of international exchanges, and support of international students

*School, College or University committee work*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference presentation (talk or poster) to national/international conferences on Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Example</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ paper presented at research or teaching conference, colloquium, workshop, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Source of Confirmation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Host/organiser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substantial, positive contribution to an influential committee or working party in the area of student education

*For Example*

- contribution to or drafting of reviews, proposals, procedures, etc.
- regular attendance at meetings and involvement in the work of the committee
- taking forward university wide initiatives
  - e.g. SLICCS

#### 2.3 Dissemination of excellence in student education

With internal evidence

*Contributor or presenter - internal education event*

**For Example**

- A teaching session at a School away day
- the University’s Learning and Teaching Conference
- Institute for Academic Development teaching event on student education

**Potential Source of Confirmation**

- Director of Teaching
- Programme Director

**With external evidence**
### Publications on pedagogy

Authorship of publications on subject specific or general pedagogy

**For Example**
- includes contributions to books
- contributions to subject-specific community or blogs
- contributions to practitioners’ newsletters, blogs, etc.

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Journal
- Conference

### Education conference presentation.

### Presentation on student education

Presentation at external Higher Education institution

**For Example**
- School staff teaching “away day” at another institution
- paper presented as part of research series

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Invitation from HE institution

### 2.4 Esteem and recognition

**With internal evidence**

### Commendation by external examiners

Commendation at least once either by name or course in a Board of Examiners’ report

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Head of School
- Director of Teaching
- Board Chair.

### Commendation in formal teaching review

Commendation at least once either by name or course in formal teaching review

**For Example**
- Professional body
- Internal Periodic Review

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Head of School
- School QA Officer

### Contribution to professional accreditation

Clear and significant contribution as to the process of external accreditation by a professional body

**For Example**
- leading a focus group with the accreditation panel
- responsibility for elements of the accreditation documentation or process

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Head of School
- Director of Teaching

**With external evidence**
**Advance HE (HEA) recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Example</th>
<th>Potential Source of Confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Receipt of positive feedback on submissions to date | - Advance HE  
- Institute for Academic Development |

**3  GRADE 9 - Senior Lecturer/Reader: Exemplars**

Promotion applications need high-quality evidence. Within each of these sections we provide examples of evidence that an applicant can use to support an application and that a panel can use to inform its value judgement. Applications are not expected to cite all of these evidence sources and the examples listed are not intended to be exhaustive.

Most pieces of evidence will be more or less biased. For example, student questionnaire data may exhibit unconscious bias with respect to gender, first language, age and course content. It is difficult to attain good feedback in, say *Statistics for Biologists*, or *Electromagnetics for Engineers* but these are vital subjects. All data should therefore be looked at holistically and in context.

This is not a “tick-box” exercise and a sensible number of strong exemplars is more persuasive than a long list that includes prosaic exemplars. In particular, simply holding a leadership post or delivering a set of lectures is not useful evidence. Impact and effectiveness must be highlighted.

### 3.1 Direct teaching and support for University Students.

**With internal evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards and nominations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award nominations in multiple years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Example</td>
<td>Potential Source of Confirmation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Chancellor’s award | - Students’ Association  
- Head of School |
| - Students’ association |  |
| - clearly, external awards are also valuable |  |

**Excellence in student support**

Effective, sustained contribution as a Personal Tutor or in a more general context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Source of Confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Head of School  
- Senior Tutor |

**Favourable student feedback**

Demonstrated, extended, excellence “in class” teaching, recognised by students and peers and evidenced in student feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Source of Confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Collated student feedback  
- Head of School |

**Innovative Learning**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantive, sustained contribution to the development and delivery of innovative methods that enhance learning. This may include contribution to improved assessment and feedback

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Vice Principal Students
- Course Enhancement Questionnaires

### Leadership of new practice in student support

Implementation of a significant and effective new practice

**For Example**
- Improving the Personal Tutor system for School, College or across the University
- Improving the support for WP (Widening Participation) students

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Head of School
- Head of College
- Dean

### Step-change” development in learning and teaching - substantial contribution

**For Example**
- Membership of implementation group at School, College, University level
- Successful secondment to Institute of Academic Development/Principal’s Teaching Award Scheme award holder

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Vice Principal Students

### Significant improvements to the student experience

Major contributions to, for example, teaching, assessment and student support that improves the experience of multiple students

**For Example**
- Enhancements to student engagement
- Enhancements to student transitions between school, university and years of study
- Clear improvement in student achievement and retention
- Clear improvement in support for WP (widening participation) students
- Successful work with Alumni
- Where relevant, evidence of contribution to meeting the needs of students with disabilities or special needs
- Active involvement with student extra-curricular activities

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Director of Teaching
- Course Evaluation Questionnaires

### 3.2 Leadership in student education

With internal evidence

---

**Leadership in teaching at School level**

Effective, sustained performance, causing positive, sustainable change

**For Example**

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
Excellence in developing student education at the University

As with all exemplars, merely holding the post is not useful evidence. Impact and effectiveness must be highlighted.

For Example

- Programme Director
- Head of Subject Area
- Depute Director of Teaching
- Exchange Co-Ordinator
- Dean
- Mentor for colleagues in developing teaching

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Head of School

Internal Periodic Review and Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR)

Effective membership

For Example

- Internal Periodic Review panels
- Leadership of an Internal Periodic Review
- Substantial contribution to the University’s ELIR process

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Assistant Principal QA

With external evidence

Policy development for University education - major contribution

Effective and sustained service on a major external educational Committee

For Example

- Government
- Scottish Funding Council
- Office for Students
- Advance HE
- Quality Assurance Agency
- Learned Society

Potential Source of Confirmation

- External Committee Chair

With internal evidence

3.3 Dissemination of excellence in student education

With internal evidence

Authorship of textbook

Adoption beyond the author’s own teaching
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Potential Source of Confirmation

- Head of School

With external evidence

Publications on subject-specific or general pedagogy

Multiple publications

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Journal
- Conference

Major invitations to speak on pedagogy

Multiple invitations

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Conference
- Inviting institution

Online materials for student education - creation and maintenance

Peer-reviewable learning materials that are used beyond the University

For Example

- including Open Educational Resources

Potential Source of Confirmation

- External users of online learning materials.

3.4 External esteem and recognition

With internal evidence

Commendation from External Examiners

Commended at least once at an Examination Board (identifiable by name or by course taught)

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Head of School

Commendation in formal teaching review

Commended at least once (identifiable by name or by course taught)

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Vice Principal Students

With external evidence
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Appointment as External Examiner

Appointment in another University (Taught degrees) – with evidence of impact

Potential Source of Confirmation

☐ External appointer

Excellence in knowledge transfer

Sustained excellence in delivering Continuous Professional Development (CPD) course material

Potential Source of Confirmation

☐ Recipient/sponsor of CPD

Review of teaching in another University - contribution

Member of review panel external to University

Potential Source of Confirmation

☐ External appointer

Development of Quality Assurance in another University - contribution

Participation in Enhancement Led Institutional Review process at another institution

Potential Source of Confirmation

☐ Quality Assurance Agency

Substantive lecturing at another University

Sustained and distinctive commitment – above and beyond a pooling relationship

Potential Source of Confirmation

☐ External Appointer

Excellence in internationalisation of teaching

Sustained contribution to international student education

Potential Source of Confirmation

☐ Vice Principal Students

Advance HE (HEA) recognition

Senior Fellow

Potential Source of Confirmation

• Advance HE
• Institute for Academic Development

External award for teaching

Significant award
Promotion applications need high-quality evidence. Within each of these sections we provide examples of evidence that an applicant can use to support an application and that a panel can use to inform its value judgement. Applications are not expected to cite all of these evidence sources and the examples listed are not intended to be exhaustive.

Most pieces of evidence will be more or less biased. For example, student questionnaire data may exhibit unconscious bias with respect to gender, first language, age and course content. It is difficult to attain good feedback in, say Statistics for Biologists, or Electromagnetics for Engineers but these are vital subjects. All data should therefore be looked at holistically and in context.

This is not a “tick-box” exercise and a sensible number of strong exemplars is more persuasive than a long list that includes prosaic exemplars. In particular, simply holding a leadership post or delivering a set of lectures is not useful evidence. Impact and effectiveness must be highlighted.

### 4.1 Direct teaching and support for University professors students.

**With internal evidence**

**Awards - and “runner-up”**

Winner or "multiple runner-up" of major awards

For Example

- Chancellor’s award
- Students’ association
  - clearly, external awards are also valuable

**Potential Source of Confirmation**

- Students’ Association
- Head of School

**With external evidence**

**Named commendation from Internal Periodic Review or professional accreditation**

Specific commendation, identifiable to the individual, for strategic contributions, leading to sustainable improvements in student education

**Potential Source of Confirmation**

- Vice Principal Students
- Head of School

**Leadership of professional accreditation process**

**Potential Source of Confirmation**

- Head of School

**External awards for teaching**

- Externally awarding agency
Multiple awards

For Example

- Exxon Mobil award in Engineering
- Learned Society Awards
- Times Higher Education Supplement teaching awards

Potential Source of Confirmation

• External awarding agency

Leadership of improvements to the student experience

Instigating and leading the development of, for example, teaching, assessment and student support that improves the experience of multiple students

For Example

- enhancements to student engagement
- enhancements to student transitions between school, university and years of study
- clear improvement in student achievement and retention
- clear improvement in support for WP (widening participation) students
- successful work with Alumni
- where relevant, evidence of contribution to meeting the needs of students with disabilities or special needs
- Active involvement with student extra-curricular activities

Potential Source of Confirmation

• Director of Teaching
• Course Evaluation Questionnaires

4.2 Leadership in student education

With internal evidence

Excellence in developing student education and/or support

Influential activity as Dean, Vice/Assistant Principal (in a student education context)

Potential Source of Confirmation

• Head of College
• Vice Principal Students

Strategic leadership of Internal Periodic Review

Convener of panels that lead to a significant improvement to the Internal Periodic Review process and/or to the programmes reviewed

Potential Source of Confirmation

• Assistant Principal QA

’S’ development in learning and teaching - leadership

Leadership of implementation group at University and/or College level. Successful and significant innovation in learning and teaching adopted widely across the University

Potential Source of Confirmation
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- Vice Principal Students

**Innovative learning**

Leader and instigator of a high-impact, successful innovative course

**Potential Source of Confirmation**

- Vice Principal Students

**With external evidence**

**Policy development for University education - major contribution**

Sustained and effective leadership of a major external educational committee or substantive working group

**For Example**

- Government
- Scottish Funding Council
- Office for Students
- Advance HE
- Quality Assurance Agency
- Learned Society

**Potential Source of Confirmation**

- External committee organiser or organisation

Multiple publications with demonstrable impact in the field (high citation count with respect to the journal’s average)
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**Excellence in internationalisation of teaching**

Sustained leadership of new and significant international educational links and/or improvements to international student education

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Vice Principal Students

**Excellence in knowledge transfer**

Leadership in development and sustained delivery of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) course

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Recipient/sponsor of CPD

**Effective mentoring and support for colleagues**

Professors should provide both formal leadership and informal encouragement, guidance and mentoring to both junior colleagues and peers.

**For Example**

- Critiquing colleagues’ teaching
- including peer observation

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Head of School
- Colleagues who have been mentored/guided

**4.3 Dissemination of excellence in student education**

**With external evidence**

**Authorship of influential textbook**

Adoption in a course external to the University

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- External adopter(s) of textbook
- Publisher
- Sales figure

**Author of publications on pedagogy**

**Major invitations to speak on pedagogy**

Multiple invitations at international conferences and/or internationally leading institutions

**Potential Source of Confirmation**
- Conference
Creation and maintenance of online materials for student education.

Influential peer-reviewable learning materials that are used widely beyond the University

Potential Source of Confirmation

- External users of online learning materials

4.4 External esteem and recognition

With external evidence

Leading contribution to review of teaching in another University

Major influence in a review panel external to University

Potential Source of Confirmation

- External appointer

Contribution to development of Quality Assurance in another University

Leader of Enhancement Led Institutional Review panel or equivalent at another institution

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Quality Assurance Agency

Advance HE (HEA) recognition

Principal Fellow

Potential Source of Confirmation

- Advance HE

5 Ongoing review of the Exemplars

This document was first published in 2013 and revised by the Teaching and Academic Careers task group in 2019. It is intended that the document will evolve and grow in light of experience and further examples. It is likely that distinctively different areas of the University (e.g. University College of Art, Medicine) will define new and different exemplars of teaching and leadership excellence that are not in the mainstream University mind-set. We encourage this form of creative thought. This is therefore neither a fully formed, complete document nor a one-off experiment. It is a step in a process that will stimulate the development of a more diverse and inclusive set of exemplars of educational excellence. Future promotion/reward cases that have been inspired and informed by this initial list will prove especially valuable.

Feedback is welcome to: humanresources@XXXXX 27 June 2019

inviting institution
12.10 Appendix J: Interview Topic Guide and Sample Questions

Biographical Info

- Describe your role. How long have you worked at the University? • Why did you initiate/get involved in this course/programme?

Recruiting students

- You’re in the School of X, can any student within your College can apply to do your course? Discipline-wise, how diverse is your student body?
- Do you have to do any filtering out to make sure students really understand what the course is about or do they usually come on board completely ready to engage?

Community-Engaged Learning/Service Learning/Experiential Learning

- What do terms like service learning/community engaged learning mean anything to you?
- Thinking about terms like CEL, Service Learning and Community Engagement. For you as a practitioner and a teacher, do they mean significantly different things? How do you distinguish them?
- Do you/have you taught more traditional courses at the University?
- What for you are the important differences between CE courses and more traditional ones.
- What can students gain from this type of course that they wouldn’t get on a more traditional course or volunteering?
- You’ve taught more traditional courses before as you’ve mentioned (Lecture, seminar and tutorials) Is there anything you think students get out of this kind of CEL course that they maybe don’t get from more traditional types of courses that you’ve taught before?
- What’s the value of CE? What for you is a genuine partnership with communities?
- How do you prepare students to interact with community responsibly, meaningfully and respectfully?
- Apart from you, is there anybody else within your department who would be teaching as well?
- Thinking about you as a researcher, an academic, a teacher and practitioner, since you started teaching this course have you had to challenge your assumptions or realign any of your thinking?

Curriculum/Course Design History of Course/Programme

- SCQF Level and credits – check
- Course Detail (Initiation, student CE, set up, consultation)
• Course Learning Outcomes – Higher order learning?
  • Curriculum and knowledge (what kinds of knowledge do you want the students to have at the end of the course? Types of knowledge social change or employability.)
  • Do your learning outcomes reflect the kinds of knowledge you expect or want your students to gain by the end of the course? Kinds of things students should be able to do or know?
  • Are the two courses treated completely separately the level 10 and 11?
  • How does this CEL activity interact with your research?

Macro, meso and micro influences – National Policy, Local institution/department and personal

• Are you in communication with other colleagues doing CEL courses similar to yours? Do you network with them?
• As an institution, to what extent do we have a responsibility to engage with communities?
• What prompted ** career decision*?
• How does the Institution support the kind of CE you do? E.g. Thinking of resources, staff that you have to run the course
• Does the university (departmental or institutional) do you feel supported to do the work you want to do?
• What’s driving you you’ve talked about the experiences that you’ve had before. It’s very difficult what you’re doing and incredibly challenge there’s very little resource.]
• How supportive are other colleagues within your school?
• towards community engagement activity?
• Is CE a helpful way to achieve Career Progression?
• What are the rewards for you?
• What are the main challenges?
• Personal influences – critical incident or collection of incidents that moved you to take action?