THE VALUE OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION:

AN IRISH CASE STUDY

DCU in the Community Papers No. 1
March 2015

The DCU in the Community Papers series addresses issues of concern to the community where a research perspective can be translated into practical action.

It seeks to engage with critical thinking- from wherever it might emerge- and promote empowerment through research.

The views expressed here are purely those of the authors.

DCU in the Community Papers No. 1:
The Value of Civic Engagement in Higher Education: An Irish Case Study
Authors: Ronnie Munck, Ursula Kelly, Joanna Ozarowska

DCU in the Community Papers No. 2:
Community Safety in Ballymun-Shangan, Coultry and Whiteacre Crescent
Authors: Laura Martins de Carvalho and Ailbhe Garvey

DCU in the Community Papers No. 3:
Student Volunteering in the Community: Results and Prospects
Authors: Orla Egan, Ailbhe Garvey, Joanna Ozarowska

ISBN: 978-1-873769-35-5

CONTENTS

Abstract....4

Introduction....5

Social value of the university....7

The engaged university....12

Civic Engagement at DCU (Dublin City University)....18

Measuring engagement....20

- The Bridge to Higher Education Programme....23
- FETAC Level 5 programmes....23
- The Community Maths Programme....23
- Project FUTSAL and the Ballymun Football Foundation Programme....24
- Summer Schools....24

What next?....29

References....30

ABSTRACT

In the current economic climate we are seeing a renewal of the debate over *What are Universities for?* (Collini 2012) with much focus around 'value for money' and the contribution they may make to economic regeneration. We argue here for a widening of this debate beyond an implicit economism to consider higher education as a public good and to recognise the social value it adds. In particular, we explore the emerging notion of the 'engaged university' which is promoting social, public and civic engagement as a core function for higher education institutions.

The **Introduction** advances some of the current arguments around the role of the university and the need to consider the 'public good' or 'social value' component. We argue that universities need to become more vocal around the public value they deliver. We then consider the **Social Value of the University** in some detail, where we focus particularly on the measuring of value in higher education, a contested terrain as many have noted. This provides us with a much broader perspective than simple 'value for money' approaches. Next we consider **The Engaged University** as a possible vehicle for advancing a more social, public or civic orientation for higher education. Today the traditional view of the university is increasingly being questioned by both governments and the public. This debate is then concretised through a review of **Civic engagement at Dublin City University (DCU)** as an example of Irish Higher Education Institution (HEI) activity in this area, followed by **Measuring Engagement** which reports on a recent survey seeking to measure or put a value on civic engagement activities by staff at DCU.

INTRODUCTION

For Stefan Collini: "Universities across the world in the early twenty-first century find themselves in a paradoxical position. Never before in human history have they been so numerous or so important yet never before have they suffered from such a disabling lack of confidence and loss of identity" (Collini 2012: 3). Buffeted by the pressures of global competitiveness and the need to prove their 'usefulness' universities have sometimes reverted to economistic arguments about their direct and, more often, indirect contribution to economic development. The limitation of this line of argument is that it tends to be individualistic and thus ignores the nature of the university as a public good. Being 'useful' cannot be reduced to the production of employable graduates if we are not to completely devalue what the purpose of the university is.

Over the last thirty years the processes of globalization have undoubtedly generated considerable economic dynamism. The downside of this is 'commodification', that is the belief that everything can be bought and sold, including knowledge. Citizens become consumers and students become customers. The whole notion of pursuing new knowledge, forging a community of scholars and the basic freedom of intellectual enquiry has tended to take a back seat. There are undoubtedly huge pressures on universities to become 'competitive' in terms or research income, attracting 'star' researchers, and preferably fee-paying students. This pressure is condensed in the ubiquitous 'ranking' systems now driving much of strategic thinking. However, even today, the university is a national cultural institution which is more akin to a national broadcasting organisation or a museum than it is to a retail store or multinational company.

In a bid to rethink and re-energise the contemporary university there is now increasing attention being paid to its potential public mission. Historically, as Craig Calhoun puts it, "Universities flourished on the basis of a sometimes explicit and more often tacit expectation that they would serve public purposes" (Calhoun 2010:46). Creating knowledge through research, transmitting it through teaching and learning, and applying it to social need is the business of universities. Producing technically competent graduates and generating technological innovations for private profit might be necessary activities but they do not define what the university is basically about. While the market has encroached on socially driven priorities there is now – especially after the 2008-2009 Great Recession- a backlash which seeks to re-embed the market within social relation and the university within its community.

Sometimes neglected in current debates around the changing role of the university in the era of globalisation is the regional dimension. On the whole, universities have been characterised by low territorial embeddedness, but recently European policy-makers have focused on the regional regeneration dimension. John Goddard, for example, has called for a re-invention of the traditional 'civic university' to make it fit for purpose today, to "realise that its location helps form its identity and provides opportunities for it to grow and help others…." (Goddard 2010: 5). Globalisation has, paradoxically, strengthened the role of the region (compared to the nation-state) and we now see higher education institutions engaging in novel ways with stakeholders in what are becoming known as 'learning regions'. Learning and teaching is becoming more interactive and experiential as well as location specific.

It is at the local level that we are finding a renewed interest in engagement with society. Universities may call it civic engagement, community engagement, social engagement or public engagement but the overall drift is clear. Whereas traditionally

universities have been seen (and have seen themselves) as autonomous institutions, they are now striving for some form of local embeddedness. They want to be ‘relevant’ to their local communities, promote widening participation and access, and maybe engage, in forms of community knowledge exchange. There is sometimes a degree of self-interest here, in terms of garnering political support and some advantages can be achieved in terms of ‘brand differentiation’. But we also see the emergence of a new society - state - higher education paradigm which sets the context for the discussion below on the social value of the university.

SOCIAL VALUE OF THE UNIVERSITY

For many academics it probably seems inherently wrong to conceive of the work of a university in terms of its ‘value’. Civic engagement, for example, seeks to build partnerships and shared objectives with communities, based on values such as reciprocity or social responsibility. Putting a monetary value on such work might be seen to devalue its ethical component, “not everyone within the higher education sector itself is convinced that valuation of higher education activity is a worthwhile task” (Kelly and McNicoll 2011: 4). We might end up just measuring what is easily quantifiable (number of students, number of publications, etc.) and thus miss out on the more subtle ways in which higher education contributes to society. This is a challenge certainly, but not one we can avoid.

Once we get beyond the notion of value as simply financial value, we can see how complex the issue really is. Even economic value is a much broader concept than financial

value (which simply measures actual money flows), because it embraces resources used and generated, including time, and seemingly intangible elements such as 'quality of life'. The financial return to the individual student of a degree is only a very small part of what universities contribute to society. A holistic approach to the 'worth' of the university to society would have to take into account the social value generated by teaching, research and civic engagement and also identifiable 'externalities' in terms of the broader social effects, for example in relation to health, social mobility and intercultural dialogue.

If we accept that universities can, and do, benefit society, the next question is how we might measure or at least estimate that value. Given that higher education runs largely on public money, it is only right that some form of social accountability exists. The fear might be that 'valuation' exercises might impact on funding allocations but it would be doing civic engagement a disservice to leave it as just an intangible, 'feel good' or optional extra. When we turn to consideration of the 'social rate of return' that universities provide, we are helping to move the debate beyond the 'individual rate of return' problematic which only considers the individual graduate. Furthermore, once we introduce the language of 'social value', we open the door to consideration of how the 'worth' of higher education can be linked to the 'values' of the society within which it operates.

In the first instance it is necessary to evaluate a number of successful attempts to generate 'hard' data in the value of university-community engagement to assess the method. One of the best documented is the Higher Education Community Engagement Model created in 2003 by several Russell Group universities in the UK in collaboration with the Corporate Citizenship Company. The aim of this benchmarking model was to capture community activities which were conducted over and above the university's core purposes of teaching and research. It presents data on a number of key categories:

1. **Why contributions are made** e.g. charitable gifts (responding to community needs and requests with minimal expectation of a return for the university); community investment (investing in particular issues because they are in the university's interests long-term, so looking for a 'win-win'); core initiatives in the community (meeting the core needs of the university as the primary motivation, but structured in such a way as to deliver additional benefits to the community). Motives matter because they help assess what types of benefit need to be measured. Being clear about motives also helps build trust with wide audiences, and a basis for communication about future partnerships.

2. Who is contributing? - A university is itself a broad community, composed of many different groups. To ensure transparency, whilst capturing the full range of contributions made by the university community as a whole, inputs are categorised by the particular group responsible for making the contribution.

3. Types of contribution - How the university contributes to a project can take three forms - cash, time and in-kind, with an additional category of management costs (i.e. the costs of managing the entire community engagement programme). Defining these categories helps to identify more clearly how the university contributes to the community.

4. What is supported? – To get a picture of the types of projects supported in the community the subject focus (education, health, environment etc.) of each project is identified.

5. Where it is supported? – the geographic scope of each project is identified.

6. Type of beneficiary organisation – details of the type of organisation (school etc.) that receives support from the university.

Based on an assessment of each community oriented activity along these lines, the university is able to establish consolidated information about both the costs and benefits of a community engagement programme.

In the 2010-2011 Business and Community Interaction Survey, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) found that in real terms the contribution to society by higher education had risen by 41 percent since the 20032004 survey and now had a monetary value of £3.302 million. In terms of cultural community events the UK HEIs in 2010/2011 attracted 1.3million people to free lectures and 1.7 million paid to attend performance events such as music, film, dance and drama. The universities were also found to have a major role in terms of local regeneration and leverage of EU funding. Many UK universities are engaged with regional and local partners around social regeneration projects, to which they contribute skills and creativity. Some 375.000 people were employed directly by universities and colleges and the student body accounted for £2.5 million personal expenditure off-campus.

Another study which carried out an appraisal of how universities benefit society was Degrees of Value by the New Economics Foundation (NEF 2011). It sought to go beyond the benefits to the individual graduate (25% greater economic potential than the non-graduate) and the benefits which 'human capital' provides in terms of economic growth. The NEF Report presents information on areas such as the value of university cultural facilities. . For example, the Warwick Arts Centre, based on the University of Warwick campus, offers a high calibre cultural programme, attracting over a quarter of a million visitors per annum. NEF estimated that in terms of increased local reputation for the university, and in terms of the cultural enrichment of the local community it was 'worth' £27 million. Much harder to evaluate is the 'worth' of the university in terms of its facilitation of greater social mobility.

In the case of Manchester, they estimate that Manchester Metropolitan University's access and wider participation programmes in a low-income area contributes £147 million to society per annum, mainly in terms of the increased earning and spending power of graduates.

In Ireland, Campus Engage, a network for the promotion of civic engagement in Irish higher education carried out a survey in 2010 which provided valuable quantitative data on the level of community engagement by higher education institutions. Half of the responding institutions (12 out of 24) reported that community engaged research was part of their research strategy, with a similar proportion saying the same for community-based learning, or service learning (as it is sometimes called). Volunteering, by both students and staff, was a major feature of community engagement Overall, the survey found that "compared with international civic engagement activities within higher education, Ireland is at an early stage, despite signal advances in some institutions" (Campus Engage 2010: p.13). With the support of the Higher Education Authority (HEA) that uneven development is now being addressed, and sees the mainstreaming of civic engagement in strategic planning.

THE ENGAGED UNIVERSITY

Public engagement' became a common way of describing the broad relationship of a university with its external environment, as in the Beacons of Public Engagement. 'Social engagement' is a variation on public engagement but with an implicit charge of equity underlying the partnership. This has become explicit in some U. S. colleges which refer to schools or programmes of 'social justice'. 'Community engagement' usually refers to involvement with a local neighbourhood which is defined geographically. 'Civic engagement', is a further variant , and one with a stronger mutual consultation or citizenship orientation.

Today it is possible to articulate a fairly widely accepted definition of the 'engaged university'. For example, the international Talloires Declaration on the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education states that: "We are dedicated to strengthening the civic role and social responsibility of our institutions. We pledge to promote shared and universal human value, and the engagement by or institutions within our communities and with our global neighbours" (Watson et al 2011: xxiii). This presents higher education as having a responsibility to serve the needs of society, over and above its own missions in regards to teaching and research. The engaged university is committed to a broad agenda, which some would see in terms of 'corporate social responsibility- in which staff and students assume a commitment to a social good and play a positive role in local, national and global communities.

However, the engaged university is a project in the making and not an actual type of university. In the introduction to its Manifesto for Public Engagement (2012:3), the UK's Beacons for Public Engagement states:

> *We believe that universities and research institutes have a major responsibility to contribute to society through their public engagement, and that they have much to gain in return. We are committed to sharing our knowledge, resources and skills with the public, and to listening to and learning from the expertise and insight of the different communities with which we engage. We are committed to developing our approach to managing, supporting and delivering public engagement for the benefit of staff, students and the public, and to sharing what we learn about effective practice*

This is based on an underlying philosophy that, while higher education institutions already play an important social role, this is not always recognised either by the institutions themselves or by society at large. Furthermore, it is through public engagement that universities can (re)discover their own distinctive missions, in terms of social transformation as well as gain hugely in practical terms, not least through experiential learning.

Many higher education institutions, such as the 'land grant' universities in the US and the 'civic universities' in the UK, have a long history of engagement with the local communities from which, in a sense, they sprung. One such institution (the University of Brighton) recalls how it "…has emerged from its local communities. Established through the development of local trades' colleges, and with a strong concentration on vocationally based learning, the university has a powerful natural bound with locality and communities" (Watson 2005: p.34). This pattern, with local variations of course, is more common than

usually acknowledged in an era when all universities strive for placement in, sometimes dubious, global rankings. If we consider how higher education institutions were originally socially embedded, then we might better understand the need for social (re) embedding today after some thirty years when market predominance has led to considerable dis-embedding.

It is clear is that there are many national variations of the ‘engaged university’. The dominant conceptual model is that of the US ‘service mission’ which has its roots in the 1950’s (see Bawa and Munck 2011). The newly emerging dominant world power launched its overseas development model and its local community development model at the same time. Both were marked by a confident US position in the new world order as the former colonial powers faded in importance. Both had democracy at their core albeit a rather ethnocentric model of democracy, which assumed the US as global model. Today it is very hard to see how this approach can be universalised, given the gap between it and the world views of Islamic and other states, societies and higher education institutions. In the Third World, the engaged university has always had a more directly political role. In general, particularly in South Africa and across Latin America, civic engagement has been quite explicitly identified with the problems and aspirations of poor and marginalized communities. Universities - or, more often, individuals and departments within them- have made a strong ethical commitment to redressing power imbalances and using their resources for democratic development. The UK model – which Ireland is arguably closest to – was based on an implicit understanding of the social democratic state and the civic role of the university. It was neither a business nor ‘service’ model à la US, nor explicitly political as in the Third World; rather it was a model based on a tacit understanding that universities were a public good and had an inescapable and natural social role to play. That philosophy is now becoming more explicit once again.

Chatterton and Goddard (2000: 476) have noted that while "all higher education embraces some notion of territoriality within their mission statements" in practice most universities are "characterised by low levels of local territorial embeddedness. But one of the main features of the engaged university – especially following the onset of the economic crisis in 2008 – is its commitment to local and regional socio-economic development. Universities are now being urged by policy-makers to engage in a more meaningful dialogue with local and regional stakeholders who are not just consumers of their products. Teaching and research programmes are now expected to contribute to local and regional needs, and universities are actively seeking to adapt their traditional models, sometimes opportunistically, but at other times through mutually respectful dialogue which does not sacrifice the still relevant role of the university as custodian of knowledge.

Many higher education institutions today seek to be, or to become, relevant to the city or locality in which they are based. Gone are the days when local relevance was seen as the second prize while the first prize went to those who achieved 'global excellence'. Thus in 2010, the Creative Dublin Alliance was formed, led by Dublin City Council but with the enthusiastic participation of all the Dublin city-region universities alongside both the business and the not-for-profit sectors. Its objective was the fostering of a knowledge-based economy, specifically supportive of development of the Dublin City Region in what was clearly a win-win alliance for higher education and the private sector.

The engaged university is more, though, than an economic driver through technology transfer. Its staff and students are also citizens, so the engaged university overlaps with the active citizenship agenda. As John Goddard puts it: "Future graduates will need more awareness of the major issues facing the world and their part in it if they are to be effective engaged citizens" (Goddard 2011: 23). Thus, for example, student volunteering, often seen

as the main plank of student engagement, is really not sufficient. The engaged university, in the global era, will need to rethink the syllabus to see if the existing disciplinary boundaries are conducive to an understanding of the world around us in all its complexity. We may be providing the technical skills that society requires, but are we developing the critical understanding of major contemporary problems and their possible solution?

Today's university exists in a complex multi-scalar world where local, regional, national and transnational scales of activity interact in novel ways. Knowledge has always been transnational but universities have tended to be national in outlook. Today universities seek to be locally embedded and relevant to their local communities, while at the same time being conscious of the global dimension. In the past the 'regional university' was perceived as less prestigious than the 'national university'. Such rankings are irrelevant today as the regional dimension assumes increasing importance with the 'hollowing out' of the nation-state due to the pressures of globalisation. The engaged university thus has many stakeholders, engages with diverse communities and has to deal with competing visions of how it might succeed.

Civic engagement can be defined as a mutually beneficial relationship between the university and the community, understood in its broadest sense to encompass local, national and global groups committed to social, economic, political and cultural development. It encompasses a range of activities through which staff and students engage with the needs of communities and also seek a development of their own social understanding through active and global citizenship. Civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of communities through the development of appropriate knowledge, skills and values. It should not be seen as an optional extra or even as a 'third stream' activity as it is sometimes called. It should, instead, lie at the very core of the university's strategic outlook.

Engagement with society, with enterprise, with communities, and public engagement more broadly, is an integral element of what the contemporary university should be about.

The engaged university recognizes that it is part of the community around it. The success of a university is very often completely intertwined with the prospects of the civic community of which it is a part. A thriving university boosts the town or city in which it is situated. Likewise, a dynamic city is good news for any university trying to make its mark in a global knowledge system. The productive interaction and mutual engagement between the university and the wider community are beneficial to both in many ways. It is now increasingly acknowledged that universities can play an important role in community development, in support of civil society, in a knowledge-based global economy, and in a socially challenged world. This can lead to enhanced human and social capital development; improved professional infrastructure and capacity building; and, more broadly, to benefits for the socioeconomic, environmental, and cultural dimensions of the wider community. The contribution toward the development of active citizenship is an intangible but significant addition. To generate debates on issues of significance to communities is also an area where universities can contribute directly to the quality of life.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AT DCU (DUBLIN CITY UNIVERSITY)

DCU is a relatively young university with a strong science and technology orientation, sited in an area in Dublin's north side that has the highest indices of social deprivation. In 2006 there was a strategic move by DCU to place community or citizenship as the third leg of university core business alongside teaching and research. The main action taken in the implementation of this new strategy was the opening of a teaching centre in neighbouring Ballymun, in partnership with the local regeneration company, Ballymun Regeneration Limited. North Dublin in general, and Ballymun in particular, had exceptionally low levels of access to higher education. In June 2008, the university's community-based learning centre was opened in an approximately 130-square-meter educational facility in the heart of Ballymun. The university was joined by the City of Dublin Vocational Educational Council (VEC) in an innovative partnership to develop and deliver programmes to help bridge the gap between the formal educational qualifications of local residents and university-entry requirements.

From the beginning, the Shangan Road centre acted as a bridge between a severely disadvantaged neighbourhood and the world of higher education. But, within DCU, this social and educational experiment raised many questions. How to "mainstream" it? How to resource it? Should we expand our activities? Do we mediate all our community engagement activities through the centre? If the university is not an ivory tower, nor an extension of the business world, then it needs to be seen as a socially embedded institution. There are dense social networks (collectively termed call social capital) tying in the university with its local community. These can include social, economic, cultural, political, and sporting links. One

of DCUs international partners, Arizona State University (ASU) describing their design aspiration to be socially embedded: “Every university is geographically situated. Every university *has* a place, and every university *is* a place. We must leverage our place;, leverage our unique locale and its culture. We must leverage the cultural diversity of our locale, its economic and cultural heritage, its social dynamics, and its aspirations” (Arizona State University 2011). The university is, or should be, firmly committed to social transformation and the pursuit of knowledge for the benefit of the community. A socially embedded university becomes anchored in a community, with its positive democratic and communal values.

The university, for its part, can put its considerable intellectual resources to imaginative uses. Some universities do not seem conscious of the place they inhabit, but some others make use of their surroundings and create mutually beneficial linkages with local communities and neighbourhoods. DCU is a Dublin city university in a very real sense. It does not exist only in an anonymous international academic market. Local issues impinge on it in a direct manner; for example, in relation to the Metro North project, designed to create a rail link between Dublin city centre and Dublin airport, passing through DCU, or the siting of IKEA (a major Swedish furniture outlet) in Ballymun. For its part, DCU, as a sizable public institution, has the ability to bring community issues to light with a certain degree of independence and moral legitimacy. As a player with considerable weight in the local community, the university needs to act in a socially responsible manner.

Universities are well placed to link the requirements of the economy with the demands of citizenship. The production of knowledge was once engaged in for its own sake. Now we see the instrumentalization of knowledge by market requirements, undermining the traditional role of the university. The contemporary university can regain a positive role by prioritizing social goals, by researching in socially relevant ways, and by placing social inclusion at the

heart of its mission. It is well placed to bridge the gap between science, technology, and citizenship. Science needs to be relevant to people lives, and technology, not least, information and communication technology, permeates the world around us, but needs to be humanized.

DCU is also well placed to bridge the gap between the global and the local (as are other universities in their own settings). We are constantly reminded that we live in a global knowledge economy, but we also live in particular geographical locations. In DCU's case, it is firmly embedded in Dublin's Northside, a hinterland characterized by acute deprivation but also a great creative dynamism. For DCU, its civic engagement strategy is not an add-on, rather, the university is firmly committed to building its civic engagement role by promoting DCU in the community in all its aspects, and working alongside others to promote social, economic, and cultural development in its part of the city.

MEASURING ENGAGEMENT

There are many challenges to assessing the overall impact or value of the work of a university to the economy and to society. As a complex organisation producing many different outputs, there are several dimensions to university impact, dimensions that are financial and socio-cultural as well as educational. In considering the broader impact of any university there is also the challenge of finding ways to reflect the value of non-monetary or non-market benefits generated. Dublin City University is a case in point. Like all Irish universities, it is a not-for-profit organisation though some areas of its work do provide a financial return. . Others, which do not provide any such return (e.g. providing free legal advice clinics for local

residents) are an important part of the university's ethos of civic engagement. However, it can be difficult to capture or assess the value of these activities alongside others that have clearer financial flows associated with them or which give a financial return.

Given that a university is not a market - or even quasi- market - actor, financial value measurement is probably inappropriate to capture the value of its non-market impacts. The same could be said, of course, for libraries and museums, and for the 'third sector' in general. Kelly and McNicoll (2011) considered the use of 'socially weighted' economic valuation, encapsulated in the 'social return on investment' (SROI) model. It is an outcomes-based measurement tool, with stakeholder involvement and consultation. However, given the difficulty in applying an outcomes-based approach to higher education and the further difficulty of using it to measure social outcomes, Kelly and McNicoll proposed the use of what they termed a Socially Modified Economic Valuation (SMEV) approach. At its simplest this model focuses on what higher education institutions do and what they deliver.

In terms of 'community outreach' the SMEV model seeks to weight socially the contribution of its activities. Thus activities in socially disadvantaged areas would be 'worth' more in terms of social value generated. By using the same type of social weighting which aids planning in the health sector for example (in terms of health outcomes), universities would be able to better assess their portfolio of activities in terms of the overall desired societal outcomes. It also allows for greater integration between strategic planning and the university's strategic goals and objectives. Furthermore, the model allows a university to customise its approach, for example, by making civic engagement a priority mission, or by devising its own 'social weighting' to reflect the importance it places on local community activities.

In a pilot study in 2014 we applied a new and holistic approach to valuation, taking examples of DCU 'non-market' engagement activities and applying economic 'shadow-pricing' techniques to impute the economic value to society of the outputs delivered. Shadow-pricing is a tool used in cost-benefit analysis and is a recognised way to estimate the value of an output where an actual financial flow does not exist or where it is clearly a 'non-market price' (for example it is a 'nominal' or and 'administered' price.) Shadow-pricing is about finding ways to impute the underlying economic value of an output which cannot be observed by looking at financial value alone.

Another important aspect to using cost-benefit analysis techniques in a holistic framework to assess economic value generation is that it is also legitimate to apply sets of 'social weights' to the outcome economic evaluation. Application of a 'social weight' means that a higher value can be imputed to an activity that affects the target group, compared to one which affects other groups. This is in the interests of 'equity' and is appropriate when the project, programme or activity being assessed affects higher policy priority social groups. This is particularly relevant in the case study of DCU in the Community presented below given that it is explicitly targeted at priority groups.

DCU in the Community, as described above, acts as a bridge between the local community and the university. It does this by promoting access and participation in educational programs that benefit the residents of the university's host community of North Dublin. It has five core programmes of engagement, all of which seek to promote access to education

- Bridge to Higher Education;
- FETAC Level 5 Modules;
- Community Maths Programme;
- Project FUTSAL and the Ballymun Football Foundation Programme;
- Summer School

The Bridge to Higher Education Programme

This consists of three tiers of classes that prepare students to apply for admission to degree programs through Dublin City University. Classes comprise 10 – 12 week modules that address basic academic skills and strengthen students' research and study skills in preparation for certain professional areas of interest. In addition DCU also offers courses to DCU in the Community students that help to integrate them into third level classes at DCU and programs that encourage their participation in campus life. The completion rate of students enrolled in college preparatory modules during 2011 was 70%.

FETAC Level 5 programmes

These are delivered in partnership with local education and training providers in conjunction with Whitehall College of Further Education, Community and Family Training Agency (CAFTA) and Ballymun Men's Centre. All five FETAC Level 5 component awards which can include courses in nursing, marketing, human growth and development, social studies and working with groups can apply toward selected DCU modules and degrees.

The Community Maths Programme

This programme (piloted in 2012) is aimed at addressing a range of community needs – from parents who would like to better support their children in learning maths to those adults seeking to enhance their finance and budgeting skills. There are also courses for secondary school students and specific supports available for students preparing for the Leaving Certificate. Tutoring is also provided for students on DCU undergraduate courses. Some of the maths classes are run within the Bridge to Higher Education programme.

Project FUTSAL and the Ballymun Football Foundation Programme

DCU in the Community is partnered with the Football Association of Ireland, Ballymun Regeneration Ltd. and Whitehall College of Further Education to run one of three pilot FUTSAL (Football Used Towards Social Advancement and Learning) hubs. PROJECT FUTSAL is a joint initiative between the Football Association of Ireland, the Welsh Football Trust and the EU Interreg programme. The goal of FUTSAL is to provide education and work opportunities for people in disadvantaged areas and to support community regeneration via employment and volunteerism in the field of sport.

The FUTSAL programme consists of an academic year of adult education, football coaching education, volunteering opportunities and work placements. Participants study for a range of FETAC accredited modules in the areas of General Education, Health, Fitness and Sport in the Community, as well as selected FAI modules, such as Coaching, Referee Education, and Strength and Conditioning. Additionally, the programme has a strong disability coaching and disability studies component. Students from DCU's School of Health and Human Performance designed a series of Masterclasses for the programme for 2012. In this way, the Ballymun programme draws on DCU's expertise in Sport, Health and Human Performance to introduce participants to state of the art sports education.

Summer Schools

DCU in the Community offers summer courses which included topics related to recreation and health as well as those that will prepare students for college including "Building Self Confidence," "the Mature Student Experience" , "Needs of the Elderly" and Photographing People and Portraits.

DCU in the Community also regularly offers study support and course application preparation, facilitates volunteering in the community with an annual 'Volunteer Fair' and responds to community need (such as offering English Conversation classes for non-native speakers.)

Three different approaches were applied to shadow-price the DCU in the Community activities as outlined above. These were:

(1) A Market-equivalent fee (a 'parallel price') was used to impute a value for the full time FUTSAL programme. (Table 1.) To determine the 'market-equivalent fee' for the FUTSAL programme we reviewed a range of courses (including those of FE Colleges) offering similar types of coaching and training activity. The official 'full economic cost' of this level of course has been stated by the Department of Education and Skills to be €3653.[1] While this is still an 'administered price'[2] rather than a 'market price', it is likely to reflect the minimum economic value being delivered.

(2) For volunteering work we applied the 'opportunity cost' of an hour of volunteer delivery time at minimum wage rates (Table 2).

(3) The remainder of the activities delivered were priced using participant time-cost (with a rate derived from official sources.) (Table 3). The time-cost approach is frequently used for evaluation of transport initiatives and we drew on the recommended time cost figures used by the Irish Government for evaluation of transport and related projects. [3]

1 http://oireachtasdebates.oireachtas.ie/debates%20authoring/debateswebpack.nsf/takes/dail2013092500071 (Statement from Minister of State at the Department of Education and Skills (Deputy Ciarán Cannon)

2 i.e. set by government rather than freely in the market

3 Parameter Values for Use in Cost-Benefit Analysis of Transport projects Goodbody Economic Consultants in Association with Atkins 2004. The rates given were 2002 prices. We uprated these to 2012 according to the method recommended, in line with changes in GDP per person employed.

Table 1: Value of One Year's Delivery of FUTSAL[4]

FUTSAL **Programme**	**Numbers Enrolled and completing course in 2012 (Year 1 Part 2 and Year 2 Part 1)**	**Equivalent 'market-rate' for annual fee**	**Imputed Economic Value**	**Application of social weights (as a targeted programme it is assumed that all participants are from the lowest income quintile)**	**Socially Modified Economic Value** **Estimated as being between**
	41	€3653	€149,773	1.9 – 2.0	€284,569-£299,546

This used a market equivalent fee to impute the economic value. Income distributional weights derived from the UK Treasury Green Book were applied to give the 'socially modified economic value.'

Table 2: Valuation of DCU in the Community-Facilitated Volunteering.

Opportunity cost of Volunteer time across a range of DCU in the Community activities	**Volunteer numbers**	**Average hours per volunteer delivered across DCU programmes in 2012**	**Total Hours delivered**	**Rate (assumed as minimum wage rate for adult with 2 years' work experience)**	**Economic Value**
	42	13	630	€8.65	€5450

The social weighting of volunteer time in this case is neutral because it is assumed that the engagement in volunteering is in itself reflective of the volunteers' own social weight preferences.

4 If the 'all enrolment' figure was used, 55 people were enrolled, this would imply a higher value

Table 3: Valuation of other DCU in the Community Outputs.

Calendar Year 2012	Hours Delivered	Participant numbers	Total Participant Person Hours	Hourly Rate 5	Economic Value €
Bridge into Education	128	16	1088	7.8	8486.4
FETLAC 5	75	37	660	28.1	18546
Digital Media iMac	20	9	180	7.8	1404
Boxing Clever	24	20	248	7.8	1934.4
Maths for parents	4	4	16	7.8	124.8
Physics Workshop for older learners	1	12	12	7.8	93.6
Mentoring (individuals)	112	1	112	7.8	873.6
Mentoring (Groups)	18	126	2268	7.8	17690.4
English Conversation classes	20	12	240	7.8	1872
Drop in pre-prep sessions for mature students	5	2	10	7.8	78
Summer School	26	57	1482	7.8	11559.6
TOTAL	**433**	**296**	**6316**		**62662.8**

This uses the time-cost approach to each hour of participant time spent. We found that around 90% of all general DCU in the Community participants are from low income 'priority

5 Time values are based on official sources: Parameter Values for Use in Cost-Benefit Analysis of Transport projects Goodbody Economic Consultants in Association with Atkins 2004. The values were compiled for use by the Department for Transport. The rates given were 2002 prices. We uprated these to 2012 according to the method recommended, in line with changes in GDP per person employed. The outcome 2012 rates used were €7.8 for 1 hour of Leisure Time and €28.1 for one hour of 'work' time. We applied the lower leisure time rate for all non-accredited activities and the work hour rate for the accredited activities, to reflect the higher value of accreditation to individuals.

groups.'[6] Assuming that the 90% are from the lowest quintile income group, with the remaining 10% of participants from the 'mid' quintile (i.e. 'neutral' group), the appropriate weighting (1.9) can be applied to the economic value result (reflecting the greater social value being delivered). This would have the effect of giving a Socially Modified Economic Value of €113,418 for the activities measured in Table 3.

Taking all of the elements together, the overall value generated by a single year's outputs, 2012, from DCU in the Community was considerable as we see in Table 4 below

Table 4: Summary of value generated by DCU in the Community

	Economic Value	**Socially Modified Economic Value**
FUTSAL	€149,773	€284,569
VOLUNTEERING	€5450	€5450
OTHER ACTIVITIES	€62663	€113,418
TOTAL	**€217,886**	**€403,437**

6 DCU in the community students range in age from 18 to 75 years of age. Approximately 60% of students come from Ballymun. There are significantly more women attending with the male to female ratio being 3 : 7 Over 90% are unemployed and receiving welfare benefits while the remaining 10% work part time. In addition to their lack of financial assistance, many are returning adults who are balancing the demands of family while enrolled in college courses.

WHAT NEXT?

The findings reported above highlight the importance of taking the broader economic and social value of programmes into account when considering their worth to society and whether expenditure on the programmes is justified. It should be remembered that the purpose of this type of exercise is not to generate 'big numbers' but to provide evidence for the benefits of programmes that can be used within a cost-benefit analysis. The results can inform policy and decision-making on whether the economic and social value of the benefits delivered exceed the financial costs of producing them. While undertaking a full cost-benefit analysis was beyond the scope of this study, nonetheless the valuation of a subset of DCU civic engagement outputs clearly shows how holistic economic valuation can reveal the underlying value of 'non-market' university outputs, which might otherwise be overlooked. In a broader sense, and reflecting back on our earlier arguments, this new approach to 'measuring' civic engagement provides us with greater opportunities within higher education to provide robust metrics to an area of work once regarded as 'fluffy' by many because it does not seem to immediately lend itself to the Key Performance Indicator (KPI's) beloved of all strategic plans. We now have the tools to credibly measure the broad economic and social value of civic engagement. While admittedly just a case study of one particular experience it will be possible to scale up the methodology. The new engaged university needs this approach to move forward conscious that this area of activity can be measured, albeit indirectly, as much as teaching and research is.

REFERENCES

Arizona State University (2011) "Leverage our Place" http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu/blog/category/leverage-our-place

Bawa, A and Munck, R (2011) "Globalizing Public Engagement" in L. McIlrath, A. Lyons and R. Munck (eds) Higher Education and Civic Engagement. New York: Palgrave

Beacons for Public Engagement (2012) The Engaged University: a manifesto for public engagement, Bristol: NCCPE

Calhoun, C (2006) "The university and the public good", Thesis Eleven, No 84 (1) 7-43

Campus Engage (2010) Survey of Civic Engagement Activities in Higher Education in Ireland. Galway: Campus Engage

Chatterton P and Goddard J (2000) "The Response of Higher Education Institutions to Regional Needs", European Journal of Education, Vol 35 No 4

Collini, S (2012) What Are Universities For? London, Penguin

Goddard, J (2011) Connecting Universities to Regional Growth: A Practical Guide. Brussels, EU

HEFCE (2011) Business and Community Interaction Survey. London: HEFCE

Kelly, U and McNicoll (2011) Through a glass darkly: Measuring the social value of universities. Bristol: National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

New Economics Foundation (2011) Degrees of Value. How Universities Benefit Society. London: New Economics Foundation.

Watson, D (2005) Managing Civic and Community Engagement. New York: Mc Graw Hill

Watson, D, R. Hollister, S. Stroud and F. Babcock (2011) The Engaged University: International Perspectives in Civic Engagement. New York: Routledge