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Workshop Summary

The 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop held at the premises of the University of Innsbruck (UI), Austria, was officially opened on the 6th of June with the welcome addresses delivered by:

- Prof. Margret Friedrich (Vice-Rector for Teaching and Students, University of Innsbruck, Austria);
- Amb. Nguyen Quoc Khanh (Deputy Executive Director, Asia- Europe Foundation, ASEF); and
- Prof. Erich Thöni (Workshop Convenor and University Representative - International Relations, UI, Austria).

All speakers emphasised the relevance of the workshop for the ASEM region and commended the initiative as a valuable platform for exchange between the two continents which are growing closely together and have much to learn from each other.

Mag. Elmar Pichl, Chief of Cabinet to the Minister for Science and Research and Deputy Director General at the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research, delivered an opening keynote, which illustrated the timeliness and significance of the workshop topic, both in the host country and at the international level. One of his key messages was that the agenda of higher education policy should not be detached from social policy, if we want to secure a promising, just and environmentally sustainable future for our societies.

The workshop group was composed of twenty-six experts from the fields of higher education, business, media, etc. from 20 ASEM countries. They were chosen by means of an open call for participation launched in early 2011, according to their expertise in the field and in order to attain a geographic balance among ASEM countries.

Structure of event and summary

The event was organised in four topical sessions, structured as plenary panels of two presenters and two to four panellists. Each session was introduced by a chair and followed by two case examples. These presentations were followed by input statements or comments by the panellists. The core elements of the sessions were the ensuing discussions among all workshop participants. The topics discussed in the four topical sessions were:

1) Universitas today and the mission of universities
2) The many faces of University Social Responsibility (USR) in ASEM countries - our common features
3) Facing new challenges: How does the concept of USR help to address widening access to universities?
4) The internationalisation of knowledge (production, transfer and distribution) and the role of USR

As the first two sessions tried to explore, in general terms, the role of today’s universities and societal missions of higher education in ASEM countries, the last two narrowed down to focus more specifically on the social perspective in a stricter sense, i.e. touching on aspects relating to equity (in access, etc.). It was clear that the discussions of the sessions would overlap and recur to the encompassing role of universities and the interpretation of USR. In order to keep the summary concise, the subsequent synthesis does not follow the above points in a chronological order and session by session, but is presented summa summarum, picking up the fundamental aspects of the two workshop days. These were:

1) The role of universities in ASEM societies
2) The various faces of University Social Responsibilities (USR) in ASEM countries
3) The strategic development of USR
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The limitations of this approach are the following:

- The Final Report does not give a detailed account of each presentation (the presentations are, however, annexed to this publication as a CD attachment).
- Not all points have been discussed to the same depth; for the sake of readability, some have been omitted, whereas some are emphasised.
- As the expert group was composed of twenty-six participants, not all ASEM countries could be represented. The case examples given are therefore limited to the geographic origins/expertise of the workshop participants.

The Recommendations following the Workshop Summary should be read keeping these in mind.

(1) The role of universities in ASEM societies

The first panel of the 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop addressed the question of what the concept of Universitas stands for today, in terms of mission, aims and values. The discussion on the role universities play in the societies of today and tomorrow, however, was not limited to this session. On the contrary, it was brought up and reflected upon throughout the entire meeting, as a point of reference for all aspects of the social dimension of higher education. Clearly, universities find themselves in a changing environment. They are, more than ever before, expected to contribute to social progress, as Magister Elmar Pichl pointed out in his opening keynote. Their mission not only encompasses teaching and research, but increasingly the services to the community and to society at large. Some of the aspects of the role of universities in our societies and the highlights of the discussions are described in this section.

University mission statements

Several participants explained how their university’s mission statement reflected their understanding of the university at the service of society. Prof. Sanchez Ruiz (Director of the USA/Canada & Asia/Pacific Programs Office at the Universidad Politecnica de Valencia, Spain), for example, described one of his institutions’ main duties to be “to contribute to the economic, social and cultural development of the Spanish society in general, and to the Valencian society in particular”. An important aspect of which is to ensure the quality of campus life of students and staff, next to teaching, research, governance, and community service. Dr. Nantana Gajaseni of the ASEAN University Network (AUN) pointed out that the mission of a university strongly depends on its context and is influenced by its culture and history. Therefore, the social responsibility of universities, often reflected implicitly in universities’ mission statements, should also be seen based on this context. However, importance was also given to the fact that university social responsibility (USR) should not only encompass teaching and research, but increasingly the services to the community and to society at large. Some of the aspects of the role of universities in our societies and the highlights of the discussions are described in this section.

Tan Sri Dzulkifli Razak (Vice-Chancellor of the Universiti Sains Malaysia, USM, Malaysia) made a reference to an ASEF’s Conference on “Universities of Tomorrow” (16-19 February 2005), held at the University of Luxembourg, which also looked at the mission of universities in ASEM countries. At the said scenario-planning conference, the sustainability of actions was emphasised. Prof. Razak explained that it is crucial to understand the role of universities even beyond the immediate environment, and rather as a question of humanity. He advised education planners to think afresh. The university of tomorrow is not the one of today, which, in his view, is strongly linked to industry. A new paradigm for the mission of universities would therefore be to think of a humaniversity. This forward-looking concept of higher education was taken up by many participants, e.g. by Prof. Pavlos Michaelides (Assistant Professor, School of Humanities and Social Science, University of Nicosia, Cyprus), who called for “Education for all, and for the heart”.

Dr. Teay Shawayn, President of the Southeast Asian Association for Institutional Research, (SEAAIR) and the chair of the first panel, said in his summary during the final discussion that the
mission of universities needs further reflection: “We need to look at the long-term future of universities: Who/what are we? Who do we serve?”. Universities need to meet the needs of stakeholders, contribute to the changes in society, and look at the capacities for critical reflection. In serving society, they need to critically question themselves whether their processes, e.g. in teaching, research and services, are really of value to students and will help students to contribute to the betterment of the society.

To reflect the mission/role of universities in today’s societies, Dr. Shawyun proposed a concept of “7 Cs”:

1) **Context** and
2) **Content**: using the picture of liquid in a bottle, he described that the content needs to be considered in its immediate context.
3) **Capabilities** and
4) **Capacities**: this refers to critical self-reflection and to the identification of newly needed capacities and capabilities.
5) **Communities**: this refers to prioritisation of which community/-ies to serve.
6) **Change**: how can we change as an educator? Before, educators tried to change students. The current plea is for the professors, to change themselves first.
7) **Culture**: this ponders on the reflections of heart and brain coming together in education.

To this, Prof. Hubert Dürrstein (President, Austrian Exchange Service, OeAD, Austria), added three more “Cs”: **Competence, Competitiveness** and **Collaboration**, to which Prof. Vasilios Tourasis (Vice-Rector, Democritus University Thrace, Greece) and Prof. Razak contributed **Costs** and **Conscience**, respectively.

*Universities and society*

In the view of Mr. Zainal Muttaqin (Expert Staff to Member of Parliament assigned to the Commission of Education, House of Representatives, Indonesia) the social responsibility of universities is not only to provide employment (i.e. to link labour and education), but also to enable students to be involved in society. He maintained that an overall increase in educational levels as well as increased access to education would bring about societal benefits. Prof. Lynne Chisholm (Chair in Education and Generation; Head of the Research Centre, Institute of Educational Sciences, University of Innsbruck, Austria) argued that education contributed to structure societies, as it is a means to develop the capacity for critical thinking and self-expression. Dr. Shawyun questioned whether we are producing the kind of graduates that can contribute to the development of a balanced society, and a society of the future. Ms. Isabelle Turmaine (International Association of Universities - IAU) proposed to start systematic information exchange and strategic advocacy beyond the education sector. Prof. Tourasis, in this context, emphasised an issue that was discussed in more detail during a specific session on Workshop Day 2: He maintained that broadening access to higher education was important for the development of a democratic society.

*Universities and businesses*

The relationship between universities and businesses was discussed from several angles, the two main ones being:

1) What are the lessons learnt from Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for University Social Responsibility (USR). Please refer to Dr. Shawyun’s contribution to the *Introductory Paper*.

2) What are the respective roles of the university and the industry in training and educating citizens for the future?
On the second aspect, Dr. Laurent Frideres (Lecturer, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) noted that “businesses are turning into educators, universities are turning into businesses”. Prof. Ruben Cabral (Rector of the University of Saint Joseph, Macau SAR, China), gave anecdotal evidence from the US: their businesses, in the 1980s, spent the same amount of money invested in the re-training students. In his experience, it is therefore necessary to reflect on the relationship between universities and business, not to copy what is being done now but to ponder on the skills needed in 30 years. Prof. Agastin Baulraj (Associate Professor of Economics at Saint John’s College, India), deliberating on the situation in India, questioned whether there will be demand for higher education if jobs are de-linked from education. On a critical note and in line with what had been said about the future mission of universities, Prof. Tourasis, among others, pleaded that universities should maintain an inertia towards the demands of businesses and governments, and to think in longer terms.

Knowledge and Learning

Related to the overall theme “Knowledge Societies” there were several considerations by the participants throughout the workshop that were not limited to a specific session and are worth a mention in this section. Please also refer to the respective sections in the Introductory Paper.

Ms. Sin Man Ada Leung (Student Advisor, Centre of Development and Resources for Students, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China), coined a key question: “Does knowledge have any boundaries?” In her view, knowledge should promote the development of societies, to which Prof. Michaelides added that knowledge does not have boundaries – it is the environment that changes, the society. Boundaries are created if we only stick to old values of universities. What is needed is a kind of transformation that is guided by the questions: What is university, what is knowledge? Prof. Chisholm critically observed that universities are in a paradox. The expectation is that new knowledge and ideas are formed in universities but they have become repositories of knowledge. “They say they are producing knowledge, but they are re-producing it”. She maintained that universities should be turned into places that generate knowledge. In this respect, Prof. Chisholm commented that higher education in Asia may seize the opportunity to innovate and reflect on new models of universities as it does not have the restrictions posed by previous education paradigms and traditions. A key concept was introduced by Dr. Shawyun according to which “universities do not only produce knowledge: they shape people – knowledge, in fact, resides within people”.

These considerations were also reflected in the comments on what learning encompasses. Prof. Chisholm noted that an emphasis on learning is important, as teaching and learning are linked. Prof. Cabral described learning as a matter of “questioning what is happening” while Prof. Razak observed that “learning is not about having but about being”. Consensus was built among the participants as regards the skills of today not corresponding exactly to those of tomorrow. Therefore, the concept of lifelong learning becomes ever more important. As Prof. Tourasis pointed out, universities have to provide flexible learning environments. Ms Marcella Orrù (International Research Office at University of Trento, Italy) observed that there is no (and hardly can be any) clear match between teaching and what is required by the market. The role of universities in teaching soft skills is therefore crucial. Chripa Schneller (Special Advisor of the ASEM Education Hub, ASEF) added that, while we cannot safely know what is required in the future, among the important skills universities should convey is the ability to learn, to unlearn and to relearn.
(2) The various faces of University Social Responsibilities (USR) in ASEM countries

When the title “University Social Responsibility” was picked for the event, the organisers already had a feeling that the workshop participants would bring along with them many different understandings of this term. Thus, to come close to a description of USR, a two-pronged approach is used: first to look into the alternative/complementary terms used, and then observe some of the practices and central points of “USR”. This will, hence, serve as the structure of the present section.

What is in a name? USR and similar terms in ASEM countries

“University social responsibility” (USR) does not seem to be a commonly used term throughout ASEM. Although there was an initial perception that everyone is aware of what USR encompasses, the understandings differ in focus, extent and action. This is reflected in the diversity of terms used alternatively or complementarily throughout the Workshop discussions.

An expression rather widely used, especially in Asia, might be community engagement or community service. Mr. Muttaqin of Indonesia explained how his country was a pioneer worldwide as it has legislated community engagement of universities. Dr. Saran Kaur Gill (Deputy Vice Chancellor, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, UKM), made a strong case to institutionalise USR practices – not just community engagement, but industry and community engagement, as it is denominated in her university. She explained that it is necessary to, as far as possible, work closely with government agencies, industry, and NGOs, to develop and enrich the eco-system for industry and community engagement within universities as this framework reinforces education, research and services. Another example from Asia, as detailed in the Introductory Paper to this workshop, came from the University Sains Malaysia, where the concept of USR is embedded in a so-called Community Consciousness Circle.

The case example from The Netherlands, given by Dr. Galema of the University of Groningen, took into consideration the immediate vicinity of the university, i.e. the city and the region. The approach of knowledge valorisation should not be seen only in terms of economic purposes, as Dr. Galema explained. Driven by the external need to develop the “knowledge economy”, the rationale of this research-centred concept is to create awareness, and in practice, regional research clusters, which have also integrated public-private partnerships in its implementation strategy. Prof. Sanchez Ruiz, in his presentation, looked at the responsibility of universities towards society and pointed out the differences between short-term and long-term impact. In the context Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain, the social responsibility of universities puts emphasis on the well-being of students, as explained further below.

The term University Social Responsibility (USR) is “etymologically borrowed” from Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). In how far it can and should borrow from CSR theory has been explored by Dr. Shawyun in the Introductory Paper. The participants agreed, above all, that whatever the name, USR should not be reduced to a mission statement. Also, it should not be limited to an interpretation as derived from CSR, but open up new lines of thinking (cf. Prof. Dzul’s thoughts of a humaniversity in the previous section). For the sake of readability, the term USR is continued to be used in this publication.

How is USR understood and operated?

As mentioned previously, Prof. Sanchez Ruiz gave an example of value creation for the society via looking after the well-being of students. By this, the transfer of knowledge to the cultural and productive sectors of the society could be secured.
Magister Elmar Pichl, in his opening keynote, gave a practical example of what USR might entail. He argued that it is the responsibility of universities to eliminate barriers to higher education and integrate non-traditional students, thus also to ensure alternative pathways of access. In Austria, the debate about how the student body can reflect the composition of the society is in full swing. One effort to achieve this aim is to pursue affirmative action measures in higher education.

As regards the question of access, and in how far it falls within the social responsibility of universities, Mr. Florian Kaiser (European Students' Union, ESU) critically explored how the best are selected and what hard skills would be needed in the future. While the growing demand for higher education may, quantitatively speaking, be more of an Asian phenomenon, it seemed to be rather the Western societies that pose questions of equity in access in the context of USR. Prof. Chisholm referred back to her introduction to the panel on access to higher education – that inequalities are complex and contain cumulative effects, despite social policies, as we are encouraged to think we are in a meritocratic society. “If students fail, they think the failure is due to factors within themselves”. Related to this observation, Ms. Turmaine of IAU pointed out that the question of access should indeed not be detached from the question of success, as drop-out rates continue to rise. Her plea was therefore to link access to success. Prof. Razak pointed out that one aspect of USR, if it is to be understood beyond national barriers, must be related to the “Bottom Billions” group. This term refers to the four billion people, roughly two-thirds of the world’s population, who are neglected in terms of education, health, social-economic parameters, and quality of life, since they survive on about three US dollars per day. These are the groups that we feel must be given attention as part of our global agenda, and this is especially true if we wish to promote long-term peace and a harmonious world. Accordingly - if a university wants to be a global player – it should have a global agenda for USR and remain committed to it. USM’s global agenda, as Prof. Razak explained, is also to reach out to the four billion people at the bottom of the socio-economic pyramid, in tandem with the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA). Dr. Gajaseni, who chaired the panel on the internationalisation of research and education for development, summarised this specific dimension of USR by formulating five action points to be implemented:

1) Universities should reform their curricula by integrating USR and linking with MDGs/EFA in order to serve society;
2) Universities should gear towards informal learning and social entrepreneurship to eradicate poverty, hunger, and other MDGs;
3) Universities should enhance research directions not only to serve global markets, but also to serve local demands of a particular society to respond to MDGs/EFA;
4) Universities should promote the role of USR and ensure effective communication and information exchange among all stakeholders;
5) Universities should consider not only cooperation within their countries, but should extend further with other countries and regions.

Dr. Gajaseni emphasised that there could not be a “one-size fits all” model. The diversity of models must be explored to meet different purposes of nations. Ms. Turmaine, who contributed to the Introductory Paper on IAU’s project on Education for All (EFA) and higher education, stressed that EFA, more than the MDGs, is a world-wide issue. Moreover, if EFA is reached, the chances of meeting the MDGs are increasing. However, the contribution of higher education to EFA is not sufficiently nor clearly communicated.

Prof. Razak solicited the view of Dr. Frideres on excellence vis-a-vis social responsibility coming from an elite university (such as University of Cambridge). Dr. Frideres explained that this was done via (1) programmes that help widen access, (2) dissemination of high quality research outcomes, (3) community outreach (e.g. the university is the biggest employer of the area), and (4) research output on sustainability of the environment. Prof. Chisholm acknowledged these efforts, however, commented that Cambridge was an exception, as it is financially independent
and representative of excellence. What she missed was the information on how Cambridge evolved over the past decades.

Dr. Galema, as explained above, explained how USR is practised at her university (also see her contribution to the Introductory Paper). “Knowledge valorisation” is a research-centred approach which is made possible in Groningen through the close collaboration between the university and the city, a concept not so different from the one given by Prof. Gill of UKM. The latter, however, distinguished even more strongly between the social, economic, technological dimension of community and industry engagement. In her experience, USR needs a (1) clear model and engagement principles, (2) a governance system, (3) strategies, and (4) the “scholarship of engagement”, i.e. training people to become engaged.

Mr. Artur Wieczorek (Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman of the Student Government of the Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland), said that USR should encompass community outreach and involving students in such activities. Taking Poland as a case example, he described the high degree of intra-Polish mobility and proposed to invest in scholarship for students from developing countries as well as in study programmes in English, as part of the social dimension of higher education.

Prof. Cabral, added another dimension to USR. Taking up the point of quality in education, albeit stating that quality in education cannot be assessed like cars, he questioned the idea of a good student is defined according to classical exams. He underlined this point by relating that 93% of Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) in the United States never graduated from university. In the future, universities must go back to their original understanding of a community of scholars in the initial sense, to educate and create knowledge at the use of society. Along these thoughts, a critical reflection was brought up by Prof. Erich Thöni (Workshop Convenor and University Representative for International Relations at the University of Innsbruck, Austria), who questioned whether serving the society should be interpreted as serving the economy as well as business – as it is nowadays often done (cf. e.g. Australian universities). He personally rejected this interpretation, as this would inevitably lead to a cutting of subjects like philosophy, as graduates might be classified as non-employable in terms of hard skills.

Mr. Pim van Loon (Research Advisor at the Department of Research for Public Policy and Security at the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, Netherlands), gave the perspective from the government sector on the issue of USR. He stated that the role of universities could be described as providing guidance and applied research. He called upon universities to communicate what – according to research – is most needed for the society. “Having a brilliant idea is one, but sharing it is a second one”. His plea was for universities to better ventilate research results. Furthermore, Mr. Van Loon advocated networking, accountability and ethics to continue to be the guiding principles for universities’ role in the society.

Dr. Shawyun generally observed a difference between Europe and Asia. His impression was that European universities actively seek links with the industry, whereas Asian ministries seek to engage students in society.

**Underlying principles**

Prof. Chisholm, who chaired the session on access to higher education, provided a summary of the social responsibilities and the context of social inequalities, as well as the opportunities for access in the education and its outcomes. She proposed five “working agenda” we have to work at or towards. They are not specifically or strictly for implementation, rather principles to bear in mind:

1) Working Agenda of Integration (towards an integrative pedagogy in HE – the coming together of “Hearts, minds and hands”). The principle of all progressive pedagogy which is about the
integration of the emotional, the effective, the cognitive, and the practical. This is just as true for universities as it is true for schools, for kindergardens, etc.

2) Working Agenda of Empowerment. The principle of capacity-building for self-transformation and social transformation at one and the same time. This is just as important for universities, as it is for the societies and the politics in which they exist.

3) Working Agenda of Balance. The principle of the complementarity of personal development and economic survival as goals of higher education. This is just as important for universities as it is for the rest of the education and training system.

4) Working Agenda of making people feel Welcome in higher education and having a purpose in being there. The fourth working agenda is about an imperative of relevance and meaning. This is just as important for universities, as it is in everyday life.

5) Working Agenda of Diversity of provision, process and performance. This is about the tension between excellence, on the one hand, and equity, on the other. And this is just as important for universities as it is in democratic polities and policy-making.

(3) The strategic development of USR

What would the strategic development of USR entail? Would this be rather a bottom-up or top-down approach? This paragraph looks at the suggestions of participants, voiced directly or indirectly, of how USR can be strategically developed and pursued.

The social dimension on the political agenda

Mr. Kaiser, voiced concern that, while the “Social Dimension” was part of the Bologna Process¹, it was mainly being addressed by student organisations. Furthermore, it is often interpreted in terms of services to international students. Mr. Kaiser clearly stated in his presentation that the National Action Plans on the social dimension needed to be improved. This could be done by the:

- Introduction of social criteria in education targets;
- Set-up of anti-discrimination legislation covering education at all levels;
- Expansion of student services;
- Reflecting the social dimension in the teaching and learning process; and
- Quality Assurance (QA) standards that reflect the social dimension.

In the context of education targets and top-down initiatives, the increase of the higher education enrolment rates and the reduction of drop-outs were recurring lines of discussion, also with reference to the education targets in the “Europe 2020 Strategy”.² Prof. Thöni, looking at the graduation rates in Austria and the exemplary role of vocational training there, questioned whether a target of 40% university graduates was the right one to set. He challenged this quota and asked, whether everyone should go to university. Mr. Wieczorek, reflecting on the Polish situation, argued that there is a trade-off between quality and accessibility. In Poland, the enrolment rate in tertiary education is as high as 70%. He questioned its economic utility versus creating socially responsible citizens and even further challenged the idea that everybody should go to university. A better way, he suggested, would be to have a smaller number of students in higher education, but to understand universities as servants to a larger community of society.


² In May 2010, the European Commission had proposed the “Europe 2020 Strategy” as the successor of the “Lisbon Strategy for growth and jobs” of 2000, aiming at making Europe more dynamic and competitive and securing a prosperous, fair and environmentally sustainable future for all citizens. Among the five targets of the new strategy for 2020 is to reduce the share of early school leavers to under 10% and to increase the percentage of the younger generation with a tertiary degree or diploma to at least 40%.
On the issue of affirmative action, Prof. Baulraj explained that, in India, education is predominantly considered a private good, blocked to certain groups of the population. The government had therefore introduced affirmative action schemes (for earners of less than 100,000 Rupees per year at his institution). The implementation of affirmative action was discussed with controversy. Mr. Kaiser expressed the participants’ common ideal that the restriction for participation in education should be the ability, nothing else. Governments and universities need to find ways to work towards this ideal together.

Higher education provision: for whom and by whom?

Prof. Chisholm added that only mixed models of provision, i.e. public and private, would be adequate for addressing the challenge of widening access to quality education and integrating non-traditional learners. She observed the interdependency in the levels and sectors of the learning continuum – formal, non-formal and informal learning.

Prof. Tourasis critically noted that it is often too late at the university level to make up for losses in secondary education. Prof. Cabral maintained, however, that it is still the responsibility of universities to do so as they train all the teachers, i.e. they should try to secure equity at all levels of education. Prof. Michaelides gave a practical example of how to integrate non-traditional learners: his university offers a one-year programme to familiarise them with academia. He also added that there is a critical dichotomy between teaching and research. While there may be many good researchers, there are very few good teachers. Marcella Orrù, who considered the main challenge for higher education (and thus USR) is to broaden awareness. She also commented that among the factors hampering access is the quantitative and qualitative deficit in the number and training of teachers.

Data needs

In further practical terms, data on the social life of a student should be collected, to make informed decision. Mr. Kaiser made some concrete examples of data sets to be collected. Prof. Chisholm described this principle as evidence-based policy in her summary and stressed the data needs. As said by many participants, a university title is not everything: what counts are skills, competences and reflected knowledge, i.e. education in its fundamental meaning.

Stakeholders

Ms. Turmaine of IAU called for the increased ownership of USR among all stakeholders (university people, students and staff as well, and beyond). The classic models of higher education division should be re-evaluated and the opportunities should be explored. The question of the heart in education, as mentioned by various participants, should be at the forefront of concern and should be put into policy and practice. Prof. Gill added that policy was important, but implementation, even more. As regards learning, she called for assistance at the policy level for the integration of objectives in the curriculum. This holds true also for the exchange of knowledge. Knowledge exchange has manifold aspects, extending from community development right up to knowledge exchange for scientific and technological innovation. Universities need to be aware that they are not the sole custodians of knowledge. Even though we focus a lot on the term knowledge transfer, it might be adequate to start using knowledge exchange, which breaks the universities away from the idea that they are the sole custodians and developers of knowledge, and exemplifies that they have just as much to learn from the communities and the larger society.
Global higher education agenda

As regards the role of higher education in “Education for All” and the “Millennium Development Goals”, it was agreed that higher education and research can contribute to meeting the UN global imperatives, and that the global higher education agenda should reflect this. One important instrument is communication.

Communication

Several participants commented that the Workshop provided a venue to exchange and communicate ideas on universities’ social commitment. Others noted that academics sometimes lack the capacity to communicate with people who come from different areas or sectors. If knowledge is truly to be at the use of society, communication skills needs to be systematically developed. Furthermore, it is necessary to convene the right dialogue partners, e.g. policymakers, to ensure that discussions can be useful and lead to concrete, efficient and effective decisions. ASEF was considered to be in a key position to help in making this happen.

Support for strategic development of USR

In general, participants noted that the concept of USR (or community engagement, etc.) is not entirely new, but takes place largely on an ad-hoc, individual basis, with different emphasis and in different contexts. What is new, and indeed innovative, is the critical reflection and exchange on USR practices – and certainly the steps taken in some Asian countries to legislate or institutionalise them. Some participants even forecasted that history would show that these are the areas that will create the transformation in our universities.

Some aspects of the strategic development of USR to be supported by universities were summarised by Prof. Dürrstein during the final plenary discussion.

1) Capacity and capacity building within and via higher education. Universities need to be aware of their potential and responsibility, which is marked by the interdependency between levels and sectors in a learning continuum of formal, non-formal and informal learning.

2) The social understanding of knowledge as multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral, within and beyond the universities.

3) International aspects: how can universities contribute to answer local at the same time international challenges?

4) Triple bottom line (TBL) for universities to measure organisational (and societal) success: the three pillars are the economic, ecological and social aspects in university operation\(^3\).

As universities produce and transfer knowledge at the use of society, the social responsibility of universities and the stakeholder concept must be anchored on a much broader understanding than in Corporate Social Responsibility.

---

\(^3\) The triple bottom line is a concept created and used in Corporate Social Responsibility. With the ratification of the United Nations and International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) TBL standard for urban and community accounting in early 2007, this became the dominant approach to public sector full cost accounting. Similar UN standards apply to natural capital and human capital measurement to assist in measurements required by TBL, e.g. the ecoBudget standard for reporting ecological footprint. In the private sector, a commitment to corporate social responsibility implies a commitment to some form of TBL reporting. This is distinct from the more limited changes required to deal only with ecological issues.
Recommendations

In today's global, fast changing, but also critical world, universities need to be aware that they serve the society at large more than ever before. Therefore, they need to revisit their role, assume social responsibility as an evidence-based concept and foster sustainable development. Their mission cannot be built only on an academic base anymore. Higher education policy should consequently not be detached from social policy in order to secure a promising, just and environmentally sustainable future for our societies. As this kind of University Social Responsibility (USR) does involve 'investments' and therefore 'costs', governments need to secure funding for the further development of USR, which encompasses wider aspects than Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), such as international links in teaching, research and services.

Based on the expert discussions at the 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop on "Knowledge Societies: Universities and their Social Responsibilities", the ASEM Education Hub (AEH), herewith presents three main recommendations, for the consideration of policy-makers and higher education stakeholders in ASEM countries.

(1) Promote and support the topic of universities social responsibility

USR is not an entirely new phenomenon, but as the 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop has shown, the use of the term and its practices differ throughout ASEM countries. This is, above all, due to varying contexts. What all practitioners and interested stakeholders have in common is an awareness of a changing context. The University of Today is not the University of Tomorrow, both in Europe and in Asia. A new general (minimum) paradigm should thus be developed, devoid of the chains of the past and present contexts, including geographic ones. The international links in research, teaching and services need to be strengthened to meet the changes and challenges of a changing world. Clearly, there is great interest and need to further explore concepts of USR, benchmark them and exchange good practices.

The topic of universities’ social responsibilities (USR) should therefore be promoted and supported through the continuous dialogue of stakeholders – universities, communities, industries and governments alike – in ASEM countries. Universities should particularly be supported in communicating and exchanging good and innovative ‘ideas’ with the general public.

(2) Identify elements of a new (minimum) paradigm for USR

As mentioned above, a new (minimum) paradigm for University Social Responsibility (USR) could include the following elements:

- ethically grounded research;
- teaching based on educational aims founded on critical reflection, values and knowledge including traditional wisdom and indigenous knowledge (not only skills and competences);
- a social dimension towards students (access in accordance with the ability to achieve equity) and staff (e.g. gender issues); and the
- inclusion of national and international dimensions, in particular Education for All4.

In developing this paradigm, universities in ASEM countries should reflect on the entire ‘education process’, from early childhood education to lifelong learning. Furthermore, in the practice of USR, the needs for the following arise:

4 On Education for All, see UNESCO: [http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/ed_for_all/](http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/ed_for_all/).
- a clear model and engagement principles (esp. on the trade-off between ‘excellence’ and ‘social responsibility’ or ‘ability’ and ‘social support’);
- a governance system;
- sustainable strategies grounded on evidence-based research (today, they are on an ad-hoc basis); and
- a rewards systems, for both students and staff (to initiate and promote volunteerism as part of learning and help).

Some of these elements were identified at the 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop and they should be further promoted.

(3) Pursue evidence-based USR policies: data needs, target-setting and monitoring

National systems are highly diverse and there is a lack of comparable data. To support evidence-based policy, it is recommended that an ASEM-wide data collection or pilot studies on the social dimension of higher education be undertaken. The data collected should serve, in particular, to identify whether and what kind of support can be further provided at supranational (ASEM) level and national level.

- The education targets should include social criteria, and stipulate the social dimension to be reflected in the teaching and learning processes, in research frameworks, as well as in the quality assurance standards. A non-exclusive and non-exhaustive list of indicators on the social and economic situation of students in ASEM countries could include: ethnic and cultural background of students, social status of parents including their contribution to student finances, capacities of higher education systems, etc.

- Each country should further develop a strategy, including an action plan, for the social dimension of higher education, determining the “musts” (elements that the state must provide to everyone) and the “wants” (elements that are desirable but not essential or even possible for everyone). This might in some case involve (soft and hard) affirmative action programmes.

To monitor the progress made by the countries on their national strategies for the social dimension of higher education, an ASEM observatory should be established to collect and share data among stakeholders.
Introductory Paper

I. Framework

With the series of Asia-Europe Education Workshops, launched in 2010, the ASEM Education Hub (AEH), the higher education initiative under the auspices of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), provides a tool to identify and explore issues that are at the heart of Asian and European higher education in a dedicated forum. Furthermore, it makes sure that ideas and findings are shared with all stakeholders, civil society and political decision-makers alike.

The proposal to discuss the ‘social responsibilities’ of universities in creating knowledge societies at ASEM level was first raised in the discussions of the AEH Advisory Committee in 2009, and was further elaborated at the 2nd ASEM Rectors’ Conference in 2010. The concept of universities’ social responsibility was then interpreted in a two-folded manner: On the one hand, it was understood as the multifaceted role of today’s universities, such as research and higher education for societies’ political, economic, ecological, technical, cultural, social, and other advancements. On the other hand, “social” was interpreted in its stricter sense, touching on aspects relating to equity (in access, etc.).

This workshop tries to combine both aspects. In its first, general parts, it tries to expound on the role of today’s universities and their societal missions; in its second, more specific parts, it narrows down to focus more specifically on the social perspective in the above restricted dimension, as we hope that this common denominator will help us to connect to the original idea of universitas and to understand the implications for higher education and research cooperation in Asia and in Europe and between them today.

The present Introductory Paper adheres to this line of thought. It first serves some food for thought for the workshop discussion on the following four key terms or concepts:

- Universitas and Knowledge societies;
- From Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) to University’ Social Responsibility (USR);
- Access to higher education;
- Education for Development (Education For All – EFA and Millennium Development Goals – MDGs).

This choice of terms is certainly not exhaustive - and does not claim to be. The workshop does not strive to provide an exhaustive answer either to the question of what the social responsibilities of universities in creating knowledge societies in ASEM countries are. The aim, however, is to try to find ASEM examples of universities’ good practices with regards to USR which can serve as a basis for further cooperation. The above-mentioned terms and concepts wish to set the tone and give some references for the discussions at the meeting. Also, they serve to illustrate some of the sub-themes and to visualise the links between them.

These reflections are complemented by two case examples of University Social Responsibility: the first is the “Knowledge Valorisation Centre” at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands (and the second is the “Community Consciousness Circle” (3Cs) at the University Sains Malaysia (USM). Three case studies were added after the Innsbruck Workshop. They were contributions from the European Students’ Union (ESU), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) and the Southeast Asian Association for Institutional Research (SEAAIR).

---

5 Please see Annex 1 for the full description of the ASEM Education Hub.
6 The ASEM Education Hub (AEH) Advisory Committee, created in 2006, is an observatory and guiding body for the initiatives of the AEH. It is composed of major higher education organisations and networks as well as individuals with proven interest, expertise and experience from ASEM countries (see www.asef.org).
The Introductory Paper was prepared and consolidated through the joint efforts of the Workshop Preparatory Group composed of:

- Prof. Erich Thöni, Workshop Convenor and University Representative – International Relations at the University of Innsbruck;
- Tan Sri Dzulfiki Razak, Vice-Chancellor of the Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM);
- Dr. Teay Shawyun, President of Southeast Asian Association for Institutional Research (SEAAIR); and
- Dr. Annemieke Galema, Director of Knowledge Valorisation Centre, University of Groningen.

Their respective contributions are outlined in the succeeding pages. Ms. Chripa Schneller, Special Advisor of the ASEM Education Hub (AEH), facilitated the discussions and deliberations of the Group in addition to her contributions to the paper.

II. Introduction: some reflections on terms and concepts used in the context of “universities’ social responsibilities”

Encyclopedic wisdom of the term university usually refers to the Latin origins of the word universitas, more specifically to the concept of universitas magistrorum et scholarium, which could be translated as a "community of teachers and scholars." Today, it is felt that universities are involved more closely, more concretely and more centrally than ever before in the development of society at large. Higher education institutions play a crucial role in creating “knowledge societies”. This aim, as stated in various policy documents and university mission statements over the world, results from the need to transform societies for reasons of global and/or regional change and, at the same time, raises challenges that come along with such changes: growing demand for higher education and research, with it a trade-off discussion on access versus quality, transfer of knowledge, and the internationalisation of knowledge/research are some of the most obvious examples.

**Universitas and Knowledge societies** (by Erich Thöni and Chripa Schneller)

As stated above, the term university goes back to the classical understanding of learning and teaching community. As knowledge has become an ever stronger driving force for the development of society at large, today’s understanding of “universitas” is indeed more encompassing than ever before. Universities can not survive today as autarkic systems with no direct links to all other societal fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By way of reflecting the many purposes of universities in the 21st century, we realise that they encompass the critical examination of:</th>
<th>It is thus felt that universities should contribute to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- politics: political power (sway)/ democratic advancement/ conflict resolution/ critical public/civic leadership</td>
<td>- politics: power restrictions/ democratic advancement (esp. in developing countries)/ conflict resolution/ critical public/civic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- economics: regulation/ ‘deregulation – liberalization (WTO)’/ ‘globalization’;</td>
<td>- economics: economic (incl. social market) development/ fair sharing of wealth and income;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- technology: technological progress/manageable and sustainable development/ technical limitations;</td>
<td>- technology: unavoidable necessity (manageable not doable)/ sustainability/ social responsibility;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- society: ‘Zeitgeist’/ discussion of values/ cultural progress/ social advancement/ development of the commons;
- human well-being and development (health etc.): disease prevention/ medical limits/ ethical medicine/ ethical biology;
- social dimensions: poverty/ starvation/ wealth gap;
- education & research: curricula/ internationalization/ networks/ vocational background vs. training/ handicapped/ minorities/ promotion of scientific progress/ advancement of knowledge;
- ecology: global warming/ climate change/ disasters/ scarcity of water/ pollution (water, air,...)/ noise/ environmental sustainability.

- society: progressive community of values and civilization/ cultural progress/ individuality (individual personal achievement) in solidarity/ caretaking of the commons/ common good of society;
- human development: human existence in health and dignity/ social responsibility
- social dimension: eradication of poverty/ starvation/ closing of wealth gap.
- education & research: curricula reform (critical, responsive citizens)/ internationalization of research and teaching and learning/ networking/ capacity building in developing countries/ vocational background and/or training/ integration of handicapped/ integration of minorities/ scientific progress/ advancement of knowledge
- ecology: prevention and diminution of global warming, etc. /mitigation of risks, etc. / environmental sustainability.

The debate about whether these are appropriate purposes/aims for the 21st century, and whether universities can indeed fulfill them is still in full swing. Many universities, as multifaceted stakeholders, may perceive these developments as threats and take a defensive stance. Another question that arises along with this debate is whether universities are/will be actively responsive or whether they have to be “seduced” or even “forced” to necessary changes? What are the implications of policies that stress the move towards “knowledge societies” for the university sector? In fact, the terms “knowledge societies” or “knowledge economies” “investment in innovation” (rather than costs), etc. are used so commonly today that it might be worth re-thinking what knowledge is and what knowledge societies are. There are a number of interpretations of the term “knowledge”, “knowledge transfer” and “knowledge societies”. Finding a common understanding in ASEM (and beyond) is probably more difficult than identifying the most common misunderstandings. For example, the term “knowledge transfer” is often wrongly used as a synonym for “training”, “knowledge” is likewise mistakenly confused with “information”. It is, strictly speaking however, not possible to "transfer" experiential knowledge to other people. Information might be thought of as facts or understood data; however, knowledge has to do with flexible and adaptable skills - a person’s unique ability to process and apply information. This fluency of application is in part what differentiates information from knowledge. Knowledge tends to be both tacit and personal; the knowledge of one person is difficult to quantify, store, and retrieve for another one to use.

The underlying principles of a common understanding of “knowledge societies” are the move of advanced societies from a resource-based to a knowledge-based development. “Knowledge” and "innovation" are recognised as significant driving forces of economic growth, social development, and job creation. The European Unions’ “Lisbon Agenda” (also known as the Lisbon Strategy or Lisbon Process) is the most outspoken example of this. In this context the promotion of ‘knowledge transfer’ has increasingly become a subject of public and economic policy, which is not only limited to the education sector.

We need to keep in mind, however, that there are also different cultural understandings of knowledge, and their mode of “transfer”, especially of traditional wisdom and indigenous knowledge which has largely been marginalised. This can lead (and sadly has lead) to a loss of knowledge that is critical for the survival of the traditional community and practices. A case example from Malaysia, to be detailed at the end of this paper, will show how the orientation towards community engagement with members of the community as the co-creator of knowledge is gaining support with funds allocated for this purpose in a systematic way.
Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has been widely discussed, argued (Friedman, 1962 and 1970; Caroll, 1974 and 1991; Davis, 1973; Epstein and Roy, 2001) and researched (Dahlsrud, 2006; Heslin and Ochoa, 2008) over the last decades, but it has eluded a definitive and standardized concept as accepted by all (COM 2001, 6; Ethos Institute, 2007). It has also been discussed from the Corporate Social Performance perspectives (Hocevar & Bhambri, 1989; Sethi, 1979; Preston, 1978; Ullmann, 1985; Wartick and Cochran, 1985; Wood, 1991) and its impact on the financial bottom line (Margolis and Walsh, 2003; Orlitzky, Schmidt and Rynes, 2003) and the firm’s competitiveness (Kong et.al., 2002; Burke and Logsdon, 1996; Porter and Kramer, 2002 and 2006; and Weber, 2008). Though there are multifarious and diverse perspectives, approaches and frameworks, most of these literatures on CSR are converging into some widely accepted aspects that underpin the CSR directions for the future of CSR.

This key convergence is the general acknowledgement and acceptance of CSR with respect to:

1. the basic triple bottom line of “people, planet and profit” or the economic, social and environmental aspects that most firms should aim to achieve;
2. there is an “ethical” and a “moral” dimension of the firm towards its stakeholders, both internal and external; and
3. that a successful organisation strives and succeeds in a healthy society, that is sustainable.

Cases and arguments for CSR (Caroll, 1974; Davis, 1973; Epstein and Roy, 2001) centre around:

1. long range self-interest of firm through increased market share (Epstein and Roy, 2001 and long-term survival (Kong et.al., 2002);
2. public image through improved image and reputation (Epstein and Roy, 2001);
3. viability of business through employees motivations, risk management, cost reductions, differentiations, efficiency gains (Turban and Greening, 1997, Schaltegger and Burritt, 2005), resource preservations (Rondinelli and London, 2002) as CSR can improve competitiveness of company (Burke and Logsdon, 1996 and Weber, 2008) through process and product benefits (Porter and van der Linde, 1998) and positively related to financial performance (Margolis and Walsh, 2003; Orlitzky, Schmidt and Rynes, 2003) like tax advantage, financial advantages and better capital access (Schaltegger and Frigge, 1998);
4. avoidance of government interventions and regulations;
5. responsibility towards social and cultural norms; and
6. stockholders’ interest.

A key question is that with the very diverse and multifarious approaches and understanding of CSR, the issue of what and how the firm or organisation can strategically manage CSR is still elusive. While the CSR fundamentals and principles of CSR are still widely debated in the business communities, some of the same issues can also be questioned of the operations of a university as an organisation. With public funding becoming scarce, university being more corporatised, commercialised and competitive through student mobility and wider access, and the education for all principle, greater and ease of information access and availability to diverse information in the knowledge society, a university is in the public limelight of its social responsibility and is under the microscopic lense in the newer social order and knowledge society.

**University Social responsibility**

Much has been written on the CSR from the business organisation perspectives. Though universities have been in existence for centuries as the foundations of education for all and the development of human sustainability, a key question is the relevance of social responsibility of
the university which can be termed as “USR – University social responsibility”. What is the context of USR within the university and what are the mechanisms that are put up to manage USR responsibly toward the society at large. Changes and challenges facing universities’ operating scenario are discussed by Vukasovic (2008) and Felt, (2003) in terms of mass expansion of higher education, internationalisation, student access and student mobility, decrease in public expenditure, diversification of higher education, commercialisation of higher education, and impact of ICT. All these have impacted on the quality of the education value delivery in the notions of autonomy, and academic freedom, its changing focus and responsibilities towards society (Vasilescu, et. al., 2010). Nagy and Robb (2008), highlighted the fact of the corporatisation of the universities and the increased call as a good corporate citizen. As CSR, as applied to university as USR which are rather new, universities have tried to envision them through their visions and missions statements and a cross sections of the ranked Asian universities found these stated directly and indirectly as:

**a. Envisioned outcomes desired of university**

- community of learners and scholars who value the pursuit of new knowledge in a society of learning and are valued members and leaders of society, and global citizens effective in diverse settings
- graduates who have well-balanced knowledge and wisdom and good character, intelligent, think rationally, behave morally and ethically, possess life and leadership skills, conscious of public and common good, practice good governance and socially responsible, world view competency and competent to compete in international job market, socially responsible global leaders

**b. Envisioned contribution of university**

- betterment and benefit of locality, society and mankind through raising, strengthening and transforming community and national potential, services to community through social, community engagement and outreach, economic and national development, preservation and enhancement of national heritage in arts, religious, cultural and socio-cultural, socio-economic building that increase and achieve sustainable development and negotiating power competitiveness of country in the world community and ensuring the well being, welfare, justice, security and sovereignty of the country and the world by upholding social and humanity values and in realising peace
- develop local human resources, nurture creative and entrepreneurial leaders with quality and virtue for society in a society of learning and wisdom through accessibility for acquisition of knowledge, in a variety of dimensions, formats and platforms through wealth creation, nation building and universal human advancement
- development of a dynamic, learned and morally strong society through contributions for the greater good of society while generating science, technologies and arts beneficial to and advances society with quality, beneficial and sustainable research, creativity and innovation and accountability for national and international society
- advancement of the world civilisation by producing graduates who have global insight, tolerance, sense of love for peace and high academic achievement with commitment to National Development and Social Responsibility and pursue universal principles that relate activities to the needs of the people and their aspirations for social progress and transformation
- generate, advance and disseminate knowledge and learning, expand human knowledge through quality research and education for the nation and for humanity with deep sense of social responsibility in improving the quality of life in society and harmonious development of moral and intellectual virtues in the implementation of university social responsibility
It is noted that these dimensions are discussed and included in the Ethos Institute definition of strategy and CSR (2007)

“CSR is a form of management that is defined by the ethical relationship and transparency of the company with all the stakeholders with whom it has a relationship as well as with the establishment of corporate goals that are compatible with the sustainable development of society, preserving environmental and cultural resources for future generations, respecting diversity and promoting reduction of social problems”.

In reality a key question is what and how these envisioned outcomes and contributions have been affected.

**Status of USR practices**

What is actually being believed and practiced by universities in their USR is still open to debate and these are practiced within their own interpretations and understanding of what USR is and what constitutes USR to be achieved. Since it is still an open field and open for discussions and debates, most of what the universities practice as USR are within the requirements of quality management and accreditation requirements. Directly or indirectly, the accreditation standards and quality management standards in most countries have a “community” or “social engagement” criteria. These can range from small community services or academic services that are rendered free of charge to the larger community, to hosting a community or involvement of the community in its university life. A review of the main accreditation systems that includes a “community relation” or “social engagement” or “academic services” criteria shows that most of the universities will work within the confines of these standards and criteria to fulfil or meet the minimum criteria.

These community and academic practices which the universities consider as social responsibility or responses to the community loosely define and cover the practices of USR, as it is understood. Academic service to society is a key mission of higher education institutes. Academic servicing refers to the fact that the educational institution is in a position, in which the communities could rely on, or is an academic reference point, or performs any function which impact the development of learning and knowledge of the communities, as well as improving the strength of the community, the nation, and other countries. Academic service projects which impact the development and strengthening of the community refer to those being organised or operated by the institution and result in the improvement of the community in various aspects and make it self-reliant according to its potential. These could include recognised service which are nationally or internationally recognised, are under the responsibility of the institution. Being an academic service centre means the institution or a program has a centre, or regularly organises academic activities or the institution functions as an academic reference point, on which the communities could rely for academic services, or it functions in any ways that impact the academic and knowledge development of the communities, and is nationally or internationally recognised. Areas of community support appropriate for inclusion might include their efforts to strengthen local community services; community education; the environment, including collaborative activities to conserve the environment or natural resources; and practices of professional associations.

Based on these quality criteria, there are processes and mechanisms in the delivery of academic service that are tangible in forms and formats. The objectives of academic services are determined by the operations plans and frameworks to provide academic service by the faculty and department. There are follow-ups, evaluation and control mechanisms and support systems in its performance based on the mission of academic service provided to society by the school human resources which is consistent with the school and institute objectives. School's support of key communities, include the contributions of their senior leaders, workforce, and students.

In retrospect, leaders of these schools and institutes stress its responsibilities to the public, ethical behaviour, and the need to practice good citizenship. Leaders should be role models for
the school and institute in focusing on ethics and protection of public health, safety, and the environment. Protection of health, safety, and the environment includes the school and institute's operations. Practicing good citizenship refers to leadership and support—within the limits of a school and institute's resources—of publicly important purposes. Such purposes might include improving education in the community, pursuing environmental excellence, practicing resource conservation, performing community service, and sharing quality-related information. Leadership also entails influencing other school and institutes, private and public, to partner for these purposes. Planning for these social responsibilities entails anticipating adverse impacts that might arise in facilities management, laboratory operations, and transportation. Effective planning should prevent problems, provide for a forthright response if problems occur, and make available information and support needed to maintain public awareness, safety, and confidence.

**Issues pertaining to USR**

In a wider sense of social responsibility, school and institutes should not only meet all local, state, and federal laws and regulatory requirements, but they should treat these and related requirements as opportunities for improvement "beyond mere compliance." School and institutes should stress ethical behaviour in all stakeholder transactions and interactions. Highly ethical conduct should be a requirement of and should be monitored by the school and institute's governance body.

Managing social responsibility requires the use of appropriate measures and leadership responsibility for those measures. The school or universities need to addresses their current and future impacts on society in a proactive manner and how they accomplishes ethical practices in all student and stakeholder interactions. University administrators, faculty and staff, students and itself identify, support, and strengthen their key communities as part of good citizenship practices. They will need to define define performance or outcome indicators to ensure that the social consciousness and responsibility meet the basic requirements and expectations to service the stakeholders.

As such, some of the issues pertaining to CSR in the business can be relevant to the universities in terms of:

- What is the role of social responsibility within the context of the university and what would it mean to the organization as a definitive part of the university mission?
- What is the generic social responsibility or moral duty of the university to the society at large in order to define the “university social responsibility” (USR) of an education institution?
- What existing CSR fundamentals, principles, models or frameworks can be adapted for the USR of the education institution?
- What strategic models can be developed for the USR of the education institution?

Based on these academic issues that will need to be addressed, issues on USR that need to be addressed should aim to achieve the following:

- Review the role of the universities in a knowledge society within the context of the existing CSR literature and determine the relevance and applicability of the CSR to the universities.
- Determine what would constitutive the USR (University Social Responsibility) of the university.
- Determine the operational variables that the university should envisage and manage as a fully socially responsible university.
- Develop a strategic USR management model that can be used to manage the context of a socially responsible university in a knowledge society.
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Access to higher education
(by Chripa Schneller)

Higher education today is regarded as a constituent element of economic, social, political and cultural development. The education sector is further developing into the new big “market” of the 21st century. With a continuously upward trend of 2.000 billion USD invested world-wide in training, lifelong learning has become a universal must (see Löw 2006). In higher education, the challenge for our societies is therefore to ensure continuity, quality, access, equity, diversity and sustainability (see CCS4 – Working Group 1 Report). This challenge is often a predicament: how can access to higher education be widened and social inequalities reduced while quality is maintained and funding secured? Specific challenges may vary across the globe, with many Western countries striving to universalise tertiary education while others are focussing their efforts on making primary education commonly available. The questions of funding and access to education, however, are at the heart of the debate ubiquitously.

According to UNESCO’s Global Education Digest, the capacity of the world’s education systems has more than doubled in almost 43 years. Comparing absolute numbers from 1970 to those in 2008, we see that the number of students enrolled in primary education rose from 415 million to 696 million. In secondary education, the increase was from 195 million to 526 million in the same period. Meanwhile, the number of tertiary students increased by six times over the same period, from 32 million to 159 million students in 2008. Tertiary education is thus indeed the sector with the most significant change. Among regions, East Asia and the Pacific led the way. North America and Western Europe recorded the lowest rates of change in the past decade due to already high participation rates and minimal growth of the tertiary-age population. In every region, tertiary growth has exceeded population growth for the corresponding age group and was higher among women than among men. It should also be noted that the growth in the tertiary sector began at a much lower starting point compared to secondary and especially primary education. In Asia, according to a recent regional study carried out by the Asian Development Bank (ADB), demand for higher education is expected to double in 5 years and to triple in 10 years in many of ADB’s developing member countries.

The German case

By way of illustrating the effects of widening access in higher education, I will briefly introduce the German situation as a practical example. A significant expansion of the entire - and in particular the tertiary - education sector took place in the decades after World War II. Reforms to increase participation, level and duration in education were enacted in the 1960s and 1970s (Hadjar und Becker 2006). They were triggered by economic and political scenarios, in which a non-investment in education would cause the country to significantly fall behind other nations. The shock caused by the launch of the Sputnik by the USSR in November 1957, aspirations for democratisation, as well as economic worst-case scenarios of “education calamities” are some notable examples (further reading on arguments for education expansion: economic human capital theory (Becker 1975, Picht 1964), democratisation of the individual and equal opportunities (Dahrendorf 1965), talent theory (Roth, 1968), curriculum theory (Blossfeld und Shavit 1993).

In a first step, the capacities of the secondary education sector were expanded. A structural particularity of German secondary education, which has given (and is still giving) cause for debate, needs to be noted here. Germany has a three-tier secondary system, which divides secondary schools into three types: the lower-level Hauptschule and Realschule (up to years 9/10) and the Gymnasium (up to years 12/13). Only the completion of the latter grants access to higher education and this was the type of school that was most widely expanded in the wake of the secondary education reforms. The assumption was that there were significant talent pools, e.g. in rural areas, that had remained untouched. Statistical evidence suggests that this effort has been rather successful, as secondary (and primary) education has been made universally
accessible. The numbers, however, have to be taken with a grain of salt. Drop-out rates from secondary schools and unsuccessful transition to the labour market remain unsolved problems. Studies show that a basic level of education does not guarantee successful participation in the labour market (Allmendinger 1999). Furthermore, the expansion of the secondary education system may have led to a quantitative increase of student numbers, but not necessarily to equal opportunities. While educational opportunities for boys and girls have been levelled out and differences between cities and rural areas have largely been overcome, new paradigms have developed. The social exclusiveness of the highest secondary school, the Gymnasium, has decreased considerably, but at the same time the socio-structural homogeneity of the lower school, the Hauptschule, has increased (Leschinsky/Mayer 2003). The social gap between the best and the least educated strata of society has thus been increased at the transition from primary to secondary education. This selection is further resumed at the transition from secondary to tertiary education. Studies show that the lower and new middle classes are among those that benefitted most from widened access to education (Rodax 1995).

The student movements of 1968 brought about a change of perspective from secondary to tertiary education. Higher education became the focal point of political debate. In the following decade, capacities were expanded, not least to meet the increased demand for trained teachers and to cater for the rising numbers of secondary school graduates. Higher education institutions, once elite organisations, became mass universities. The increase of graduate with higher/tertiary qualifications was a Europe-wide phenomenon at that time (Shavit und Blossfeld 1993, Müller und Shavit 1998). Statistics show that the opening up of all education sectors – in terms of participation rates – has indeed led to an expansion of secondary and tertiary education. Institutional, economic and geographic barriers have widely been torn down. In 2009, 2,025,307 students were enrolled in German higher education institutions (see Wissenschaft Weltoffen 2010, note that 8.9 % were international students). From this perspective, the policy of widening access has been successful. At a closer look, however, the expansion has not been able to promote equal opportunities at large (Meulemann 1992, p. 123). As regards access to tertiary education, inequalities have merely changed face. While gender and local origin no longer play a role, the odd ratios for students from working class backgrounds and migrant backgrounds, for example, have become and remain unfavourable.

The question arises of whether it falls within the social responsibilities of higher education institutions themselves to achieve equity in access and to guarantee quality at the same time. Clearly, this is embedded in the larger picture of the role of universities today. As mentioned above, the concept of lifelong learning plays a crucial role in the mission of universities. As societies are opening up, so are universities, with internalisation and cooperation in higher education at the core of the debate (On universal access and on open societies, see: Trow 2006, Chisholm 2010).

Lessons learned?

Universalising education and providing education for all is a multifaceted endeavour. As the case example from Germany showed, overcoming unequal opportunities are among the challenges that arise from widening access to higher education. Why is this so? There are several studies describing inequalities in education (Carnap, Edding 1962, Coleman 1966, Grimm 1966, Becker 2010), but there is no common understanding of the mechanisms that cause these inequalities. There are, however, a few attempts of an explanation, such as the rational choice theory (Boudon 1974), the human capital theory (Becker 1975), and the status group and conflict theory (Weber 1980. Collins 1979, Parkin 1983), the theory of cultural reproduction (Bourdieu und Passeron 1971; Bourdieu 1983) and the curriculum theory (Blossfeld und Shavit 1993).

As the topic of this workshop is university social responsibility, some of the unintended consequence of the expansion of higher education should be noted, not least to further discuss what the role of universities should be:
If the education sector and the labour market do not expand at the same pace and in the same way, the returns on the investment in education will be subject to change. Increased access to higher education can lead to the deflation of degrees, i.e. the value of a single degree will diminish.

An increase of capacities may lead to an increase of opportunities for all social groups, but it may not necessarily lead to a decrease of social inequalities of these opportunities. (Several studies show this for Germany: Müller 1998, Meulemann 1995, Blossfeld 1993, Solga/Wagner 2001).

When we look at access and participation rates to higher education, we need to bear in mind various factors:

- What is the relationship between population growth and participation rates?
- What are the transition rates between the different levels of education, in particular from secondary to tertiary education?
- What are the quantitative and qualitative objectives of widening access?

Critically speaking, we need to question whether human intellectual capabilities are all the same: Should therefore every person be able to enter university? What is, in fact, the understanding of “universalising education” in each context?

If universities and governments agree that equitable access to quality learning contributes significantly to the development of national human resources, promotes social justice and cohesion, enhances personal development, employability and, in general, facilitates sustainable development (see the policy statement by member universities of the International Association of Universities, IAU, 2008), it will be crucial to discuss how broadening access can be effectively compatible with academic excellence and equity and how all stakeholders can practically go about this.

References


**Key Weblinks**

ASEF – 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference, 2010


International Association of Universities

[http://www.unesco.org/iau/access_he/access_statement.html](http://www.unesco.org/iau/access_he/access_statement.html)

Wissenschaft weltoffen

[http://www.wissenschaft-weltoffen.de/daten/1/1/3](http://www.wissenschaft-weltoffen.de/daten/1/1/3)
When we speak about the social responsibilities of universities, we need to acknowledge higher education and research as a structural element of development. This has been proven by several countries such as Finland or South Korea which have quite successfully linked higher education with economic development. But no country can build an effective higher education sector without human resources and quality basic and secondary education. And it seems inevitable that higher education and research should also be involved – as part of its social responsibilities – in the promotion of other education levels.

With the launch of the United Nations’ EFA Movement in 1990 (Jomtien Declaration), education has been a major issue at both the national and international levels, with international organisations, governments, civil society and the private sector centrally positioning education development in their policies and strategies. Yet, the momentum generated by the movement has slowed down recently partly because of the relatively good results obtained in the field and because of an increasing number of global issues of importance to be tackled. UNESCO, the UN agency in charge of the EFA Movement, resolved to find ways to make the case for education, revitalised the whole process beginning with the recent approval of the second Jomtien Declaration (March 2011) which, among others, acknowledges for the first time the role of higher education at least as far as quality education is concerned. Looking at another recent development, the World Bank’s new education strategy for the period to 2020, Learning for All: Investing in People’s Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development approved in April 2011, sets out the Bank’s agenda in support of the effort to achieve EFA and the MDGs in the developing world over the next decade. While Learning for All does not highlight tertiary education as a specific priority area for the Bank, the shift from education to learning could be a higher education/research topic as well as the need to support and attend to a lifelong continuum of education and learning, which is an overarching theme of the document.

But what exactly is, can, and should be the role of universities in achieving EFA and the MDGs, in particular those that encompass education7? In 2005, the International Association of Universities (IAU) first embarked in this field with a 3-year pilot project to investigate the contribution of higher education to achieve EFA, with a particular focus on the inter-university partnerships between South and North higher education institutions and to determine whether there was potential interest and need for a larger project regarding this question. The pilot project culminated with an Experts’ Seminar, held in January 2007, from which the following conclusions were drawn:

- indeed higher education was engaged in EFA,
- but more light still needed to be shed on this topic.

It highlighted poor articulation between education sectors and lack of information on and misunderstanding of what was covered by EFA within the higher education community. Based on these first findings, a new 3-year project was developed in 2008 entitled Strengthening Linkages for Improved Education: Higher Education and Research Working for EFA and education-related MDGs. The project was driven by a shared understanding that the higher education sector is involved in both EFA and MDGs -

- directly, through teacher training and research at faculties of education and because of the interdependency between educational levels;
- indirectly, through other faculties (cognitive studies, for example, consists of multiple research disciplines, including psychology, philosophy, neuroscience, etc. and education), the teaching of the values covered by the EFA movement; students’ participation and community services, etc.;

7 MDG 2: To achieve universal primary education; MDG 3: To promote gender parity and empower women
Furthermore, it was argued that the impact of achieving EFA and MDGs on higher education and on society in general remains relatively under-estimated. At the same time, actions undertaken by higher education institutions and research in EFA/education-related MDGs fields have been practically invisible.

Last, but not least, the importance of higher education for development and for the reduction of inequalities in all countries has made it necessary to take a holistic approach and not just to pursue policies that make higher education and research compete with other levels of education for funding and attention. To overcome the identified challenges and address specified needs/gaps, the project was designed around a two-pronged approach to:

- provide information to the higher education/research sector on its potential role in the EFA initiative;
- build capacities to enhance the participation of the HE sector in EFA related activities.

It has led to the achievement of several outcomes:

- the creation of the IAU Reference Group on HE & EFA;
- an information Brochure;
- the HEEFA Portal;
- Capacity building sessions.

The IAU project outcomes are briefly described below. More can be found at http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/efamdgs

IAU Brochure: Why and How Can Higher Education Contribute to All Levels and Types of Education?

The 40-page Brochure was developed, by its design and content, to clearly and concretely answer the questions of:

- What (What are the MDGs and EFA initiatives?);
- Why (Why should higher education be involved in EFA?);
- How (How can higher education get involved in EFA?);
- Where (Where can higher education activities be developed for EFA?), and
- Who (Who is already engaged in EFA).

The aim pursued was to increase the readers’ understanding of how higher education contributes to EFA/related MDGs and how it can do so more systematically. The Brochure incorporated a language familiar to both the higher education sector and that of the EFA Movement to facilitate making the connection and to overcome the identified obstacle of misunderstanding between the two communities.

IAU Portal on Higher Education/Research and EFA/MDGs (HEEFA Portal) http://www.heefa.net/

HEEFA (for higher education and EFA) is an online collaborative Portal to disseminate information on the work being undertaken by higher education in EFA-related fields and to build up a like-minded community. The Portal attempts to raise awareness among those working in higher education and all other interested stakeholders (International Organizations, NGOs, Ministries of Education, school administrators and teachers) on the important role that higher education is achieving and can play in EFA and related MDGs.

8 The realization of this project received support from the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) for its financial endorsement in this IAU initiative; the Working Group for Higher Education of the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA-WGHE) and UNESCO Participation Fund
The Portal contains two searchable databases:
- A Project database on HE initiatives in EFA/related MDGs;
- An Expert database which contains CVs of experts in one/several areas in EFA/related MDGs from the higher education sector.

It allows for the production of a Newsletter and online Fora. The Newsletter features news on the HEEFA project, latest entries, selected news on EFA, calls for participation, and upcoming conferences.

**IAU Capacity Building Sessions**

IAU has designed capacity building sessions that directly target a country’s higher education and research entities and key EFA stakeholders to involve them collectively in an intensive exercise of developing concrete tools to strengthen higher education participation for EFA at the local level. The capacity building sessions concern all components of EFA, with an additional focus on ‘problematic’ areas identified by participants. The sessions are based on the results of a questionnaire sent or given on the spot to all participants.

It becomes clear that - if we speak of University Social Responsibility also in terms of EFA and in the attainment of the educational aspects of the MDGs - it is vital to the overall success and sustainability of these efforts that the higher education sector becomes more involved in areas where it has unique expertise, such as in teacher training and pedagogical research of course but also in learning assessment, programme evaluation, educational planning and makes greater use of its human resources (in particular, students).

It is also essential that researchers and higher education leaders become involved in these efforts because, as the base of the educational system of any country, EFA success has an impact on the entire education system, i.e. increasing demand for secondary, vocational and higher education in due course. Too little attention to this domino effect still seems to prevail, yet developing capacity to effectively monitor, evaluate and manage this growing demand takes time, careful planning and an early investment. Policy makers and educational planners require support to develop more evidence-based policies through research conducted by the HE community.
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Knowledge Valorisation at the University of Groningen (the Netherlands), the City of Groningen, and some reflections on the Dutch situation (by Annemieke Galema)

Mission of the University of Groningen

“The University of Groningen provides high quality teaching and research, is internationally oriented, respects differences in ambition and talent, works actively with business, the government and the public, and ranks among the best universities in Europe. The University of Groningen has an international research orientation, with strong roots in the region”.

The University was founded in 1614, has a number of 28,000 students, 5,500 staff, 9 faculties covering all academic disciplines, and an annual turnover of €564 million. Strategic partners and international networks comprise of: Uppsala University (Sweden), University of Göttingen (Germany), Gadjah University, University of Indonesia, Bandung Institute of Technology (Indonesia), University of Beijing, Tsinghua University, Fudan University (China), Osaka University (Japan), UCLA, University of Pennsylvania (USA), National Autonomous University of Mexico-UNAM (Mexico), University of Sao Paulo-USP (Brazil), Coimbra Group, EUA, Asea Uninet, APAIE.

The University of Groningen also feels a social responsibility to cooperate with universities in developing countries, thereby contributing to the further development of academic teaching and research worldwide.

In valorizing research, the University of Groningen chooses a position that is directly concerned with issues relevant in the northern region and society at large. Together with businesses, regional governments and educational institutions, and in conjunction with its own research themes, the University of Groningen is investing heavily in research into current issues in society related to sustainability (energy and water), healthy ageing, medicine, food, carbohydrates, sensor technology, nanotechnology, new materials, social efficacy, law and administration, and cultural heritage. The University considers that its engagement in this research is an important social responsibility, which follows from its primary concern with teaching and research, and its financial participation in such activities is subordinate to those interests.

Two main focus-areas (research themes) have been declared as an umbrella, to fulfill particular social responsibility for Groningen and the northern Netherlands: energy and healthy ageing.

The University of Groningen has a Technology Transfer Office called the Transfer & Liaison Groep. This Office is the unit for valorisation in research and offers university-wide support services. Its main ambition is to create value from knowledge and a strong believe that knowledge valorisation is a social responsibility is in its genes.

The strategic goals of the Transfer & Liaison Groep are:
(1) Generate research funding in regional, national and international perspective
(2) Develop patents and conduct management/registration of intellectual property
(3) Business development and industrial contacts.

Valorisation can take the following forms: contract research and public-private partnerships, the creation of new companies based on university knowledge (entrepreneurship), and trading of intellectual property in any form, usually patents.

For the purpose of the ASIA-EUROPE workshop, a few examples of the different forms of valorisation in Groningen, will be given below.

Public-Private Partnerships

a. Groningen Agreement: local, with national ambition

The University of Groningen cooperates with the City of Groningen, the Hanze University of Applied Sciences, and the University Medical Centre Groningen (UMCG) under the banner of the ‘Groningen Agreement’, which sets out certain mutual arrangements as to facilities and the positioning of Groningen as the City of Talent. Specific topics that have been addressed include knowledge transfer, creating and attracting new knowledge institutions and knowledge initiatives, traffic measures required to keep various city locations accessible, student housing for both Dutch and foreign students, and IT facilities at the city level.

In the heart of the Groningen Agreement is the focus on increasing the appeal and image of the city and region. Exchange of knowledge between knowledge institutions, government agencies and businesses is a key success factor in the city and region’s degree of competitiveness. These organizations are important sources of employment and prosperity in the city of Groningen and the surrounding region. A sustainable international position can be supported by creating the very best conditions for creativity, open exchange of ideas and in general a sparkling and stimulating environment.

In this respect City of Talent Groningen also has a strong basis. This should lead to the following concrete results:

- making better use of the strong distinguishing knowledge sectors – energy and healthy ageing
- promoting excellence: attracting more students and top-class researchers to Groningen and keeping them there – holding and captivating talent
- being an internationally strongly competitive region based on the urban network.

The close collaboration between the University of Groningen, the Hanze University of Applied Sciences, the UMCG and the City of Groningen is often taken for granted – but it should not be. Big autonomous organizations have to learn to work together. After five years of collaboration the partners have now renewed their strategic alliance in the new Groningen Agreement 2.0. They defined their social and economic responsibility in a new programme.

Considerable progress has been made across a broad spectrum of collaboration. In the coming years student housing will be given a significant boost. The partners will strengthen each other in regard to international contacts. Together they will work on creating a welcoming atmosphere for foreign students.

After the knowledge institutions’ heavy investments in the Zernike Campus and Science Park, a new joint effort is required to organise more spin-offs in work and industry. Collaboration between the University of Groningen and Hanze University of Applied Sciences is growing, resulting in a
single system of higher education for students: in Groningen you can keep all your options open – in this city your university programme can be tailor-made.

The Groningen Agreement 2.0 will be more specifically focused: energy and healthy ageing are the themes around which a broad spectrum of academic, scientific and socially relevant activities revolve. The city and the knowledge institutions are presented together – that is how they strengthen each other. The City of Talent campaign focuses on the city’s knowledge intensity, and this campaign will certainly have an impact on the North as a whole.

b. Healthy Ageing Network Northern Netherlands (HANNN): regional and international

The Healthy Ageing Network Northern Netherlands was set up in 2009. All the activities of companies, government agencies and knowledge institutions dealing with the focus area of healthy ageing, come together in this network agency and cross-connections can be made.

This is expected to lead to the following results:

- in collaboration with the business world, government agencies and other institutes of higher education in the North, the knowledge of the University of Groningen, the University Medical Centre Groningen and Hanze University of Applied Sciences will be clustered in the Groningen Institute for Healthy Ageing Research (GIHAr). Researchers will strengthen each other through joint research projects. Lecturers and students will set up projects and exchange knowledge with the northern business world
- the European Research Institute on the Biology of Ageing (ERIBA) will grow to become an international Centre of Excellence in the field of fundamental knowledge about ageing issues
- the biobank and cohort study LifeLines, a longitudinal population study of healthy ageing, will evolve into an international Centre of Excellence in the field of knowledge about health-determining factors in order to optimise prevention, diagnosis and treatment of chronic, multi-factor diseases which are often related to ageing
- the northern region will become a testing ground in relation to healthy living and healthy ageing, with a well-developed aged care network
- HANNN clearly has a European dimension. The network relies on ongoing funding for collaboration in clusters and for the issue of healthy ageing, which will be high on the European agenda as one of the major social challenges

The driving force behind HANNN is LifeLines, which has initiated a large-scale collaborative arrangement with biobanks throughout Europe. In the context of this collaboration efforts will be made to set up a pan-European research infrastructure in which research will be conducted into multi-morbidity. This research will take place on the basis of the large quantities of data collected in the various biobanks.

In the context of HANNN work is also being done on an application to Regions of Knowledge (RoK). Several European partners were asked if they were interested in participating in a project involving the formation of networks between eHealth clusters focused on healthy ageing. Partners who cooperated positively were Hamburg, Tartu, Uppsala, Copenhagen and Helsinki.

The UMCG is a member of the Scanbalt network, which consists of regional networks in the Baltic states and constitutes one large bio network.

c. Carbohydrate Competence Centre (CCC): national

The Carbohydrate Competence Centre related to 5 of the 9 Top sectors that are defined by the national government and industry, in the national Dutch research agenda: Agro/Food – Life Sciences – Chemistry – Energy – Tuinbouw (Agriculture, f.e. vegetables/flowers).
CCC is a demand-driven Public-Private Partnership in the field of carbohydrate research in which 19 private companies and 6 knowledge institutes (Universities of Groningen, Wageningen and Utrecht, UMCG, Hanze University of Applied Sciences, TNO) collaborate (2009-2014: total budget 27 M€ (25% companies, 25% knowledge institutes, 50% grants Northern Netherlands and European Union). CCC research focuses on production, modification and application of carbohydrates, aiming to stimulate innovations in nutrition and health and in the biobased economy, and thus to contribute to a healthier and more sustainable society. At the core of all projects are both industry-driven research questions and expert research technologies. As such, CCC is an attractive partner for innovation in areas where carbohydrate knowledge and applications play significant roles.

All living matter is for a large part made up of carbohydrates. From microbe to human, carbohydrate materials are essential for proper functioning of living cells. Carbohydrates are isolated from these renewable sources and used for many nutritional, pharmaceutical, cosmetic and industrial applications.

CCC is a unique partnership to tackle the challenges mentioned above:

- CCC has a demand driven approach with a balanced steering role of industrial partners.
- CCC combines the important strategic science disciplines and top carbohydrate expertise in the Netherlands working as interdisciplinary teams.
- CCC is embedded in the international carbohydrate community and has good antennas for new knowledge and developments which can be quickly adopted and explored for strengthening innovation power.
- CCC has good interactions with other prominent Dutch research institutes where carbohydrate expertise is desired (TIFN, FND, Kluyver Centre, DPI, TI Pharma, Healthy Ageing Initiatives, Energy Valley, Dutch Biorefinery Cluster, Biobased Performance Materials, WETSUS and TTI-Groene Genetica.

For the University of Groningen, research collaboration with the business world, usually through contracts, will take on a new form in Technology Transfer. In the coming years, this development will increasingly become a joint activity of the University and the University Medical Centre. In addition, the University will continue to collaborate with governments and regional business representatives in the Northern Netherlands Assembly (SNN – Samenwerkingsverband Noord-
Nederland), contributing to the development of knowledge-intensive industry in the region. Much of this kind of activity originates at the University of Groningen, which fosters the initiatives of entrepreneurial students and provides support on the road ‘from patent to company’, keeping in mind that success requires the active participation of all parties. The University has also set up a patent fund with an allocation model to evenly distribute any revenues generated. The University set research priorities based on national (topteams) and international (EU) agendas, and especially on its own excellence in research.

Community Consciousness Circle and University social responsibility at the Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) (by Tan Sri Dzulkifli Razak)

In Malaysia, the percentage of students enrolled in tertiary education is about 20-25, with the objective to attain 35-40% by 2020. Mostly, students are funded through governmental loan schemes covering both the private and public sectors. The opening up of the higher education sector is in part to meet the challenges of the past, namely, the lack of places in higher education institutions, the lack of qualified academic talents, and also the widening disparities between the rural-urban (also rich-poor). Currently, the major challenges appear to be related quality assurance issues, sustainable funding, and the impact of internationalisation and globalisation on societal well-being. Social responsibilities is therefore increasingly a “core” element for the universities.

At the University Sains Malaysia (USM), a predominantly science-based university of 26,000 students, 8,000 graduate students, a third of which are international students from more than 50 nationalities, social responsibilities are spelt out in the university’s vision and mission as well as values. The USM vision is: “Transforming Higher Education for a Sustainable Tomorrow”, while its mission reads:

“USM is a pioneering, transdisciplinary research-intensive university that empowers future talents and enables the bottom billions to transform their economic well-being”.

It is craved with the ambit of “sustainability” or more specifically the “Community Consciousness Circle” (see below).

Glancing at the mission statements of various Malaysian universities, it generally seems that they are academic-oriented, in the usual jargons of ‘excellence’ and ‘world-class’. They usually do not explicitly express the need to assess their HEI’s impact beyond education output, though some do to the extent of educating/being good (global) citizens. As regards Universitly social responsibility (USR), many practise what is called “community services”, more as an option (except for medical courses), rather than specified as a core value. At USM, the term used “Community Consciousness Circle” with a long-term engagement to produce an impact for both communities – the university and the public. This is to circumvent the impression of university social responsibilities like corporate social responsibility (CSR) is very limiting and even one-sided. It generally covers five themes of: education, economic enhancement, health, environment and, heritage and culture.

Community Consciousness Circle (3Cs)

At USM, USR is indeed articulated as the Community Consciousness Circle (3Cs) with the appeal that it is a voluntary part of learning that is carried out with full consciousness to engage with the community. It is not a “pay back” concept where the universities is obliged to carry out, but a conceptualised as one of its core academic activities. In USM’s mission statements the words “bottom billions” is use to focus on the issue of disparities at all levels, and also the phrase “empowers future talents” as a focused activity of the university to contribute to solving/reducing
the existing/future disparities. This goes beyond the shore of Malaysian societal well-being but others in a project like Cleft Lip and Palatable Reconstructive Surgery for Underprivileged Children of Bangladesh and Indonesia for example. Of late USM has also engaged Haiti in the attempt to “reconstruct” the higher education sector after the earthquake disaster, like it did for Aceh post-tsunami in 2004.

To this effect an office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Vice-President) for the Division of Industry and Community Network (ICN) was created in 2007 with regular budget to operationalise its activities, i.e. to plan, implement, and monitor the 3Cs throughout the university. Similar set up are also established at the various Schools and Centres under specific portfolios of Deputy Deans (ICN) who report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (ICN). The number of community project by the various Schools/Centres that is funded by ICN almost tripled from 24 in 2008 to 65 in 2010.

Currently, as special track for career promotion is being designed to mainstream the involvement with community (other than industry) as part the core academic mission.

Recurring to the first part of the Introductory Paper, the different cultural understandings of “knowledge” and their mode of “transfer” especially of traditional wisdom and indigenous knowledge, which has largely been marginalised, need to be considered. Otherwise, this leads to a loss of knowledge that is critical for the survival of traditional community and practices. In Malaysia, the orientation towards community engagement with members of the community as the co-creator of knowledge is gaining support with funds allocated for this purpose in a systematic way. To this end, communities have been adopted to ensure continuity and impact that could uplift the social well-being and quality of life.

As for research, USM is implementing a special track for recognition and promotion based on “knowledge production” with community as the co-creator and owner. A knowledge transfer module and mechanisms are now being implemented at the Ministerial level as a pilot. The intended objectives are varying based on the notion of educational in transdisciplinary (rather than silo-ed) activities and to be relevant for the future. It also depart from the narrow notion of grading and rewards but more on voluntarism and sacrifices as part of learning.

In this regard, USM is very involved in addressing the “Millennium Development Goals” and “Education for All” as short-term goals given that these will end in 2015. USM’s bias and forte is on “Education for Sustainable Development” (2005-2014), it being one of the 7 pioneering United Nations University (UNU) Regional Centres of Expertise on Education for Sustainable Development” (since 2005). The objective is to mainstream education for sustainable development to develop more concretely the social dimension of the university in ensuring the well-being of the future generation.

Nevertheless, the relationship between internationalisation of higher education and research, and USR at the USM, however, is still very superficial, because the orientation seems to be still very academic-oriented (e.g. credit transfer, limited mobility, lack of field activities) with very little “immersion” in the process as an international activity. Also, internationalisation too seems to driven by Euro-centric actors, leading to unequal sharing and partnering.

In the attempt to correct this apparent shortcoming, USM initiated the establishment of a network of university-community engagement in the Asia-Pacific region as an outcome of the First University-Community Engagement Conference (UCEC) in Penang in 2009. The next meeting is schedule in 2011 in July. The network is called Asia-Pacific University-Community Engagement Network (APUCEN) as described below:

a. Rationale

Though progress in science and technology has brought considerable benefits for many in terms
of comfort and a longer life expectancy, it has also brought about much consumerism, exclusion and miseries to many others. Rapid growth and improvements in standards of living have simultaneously generated environmental unsustainabilities and social instabilities. As such, we are confronted with a perpetuation of disparities between and within nations, a worsening of poverty, hunger, ill health, and illiteracies in many parts of the world as well as a continuing deterioration of the ecosystems on which we depend for our well-being. In varying ways, and to varying extent, most people are living in ways that are ecologically, economically, socially, culturally and personally unsustainable. How can understandings of the unsustainable state of our world be taken on board as a core function of universities? How can universities nurture awareness and commitment of the young to be personally, collectively and institutionally engaged for a sustainable now and the future?

Market driven priorities increasingly dominate the thrust of universities throughout much of the world, resulting in the generation of knowledge and labour for the capitalist enterprise instead of developing capacities of and for people most in need – especially the poor, and the disadvantaged.

With a projected student population of 200 million by 2030, universities in the 21st century have the critical mass for potentially making the difference to local and global concerns. While universities have to produce graduates who have skills to function effectively in a globally competitive environment, it is also widely recognised that it is a challenge to provide them with an ethics-based knowledge and to mould them to be responsive to societal needs, so as to contribute to the well-being to its entire people. Indeed the complexities of our unsustainable societies can present new opportunities and challenges for universities to maintain their relevance to society.

Revisiting the roles of universities, vis-a-vis the ways and kinds of knowledge being produced, is vital to building the kind of world we desire. If universities are to achieve their mission to develop and apply knowledge with society in mind, then their core functions have to build not only on an academic base but also upon an intellectual civil base that can offer solutions to societal problems.

Various attempts in different parts of the world have started to address these concerns. An effective and high impact approach is the engagement of universities with communities. Engagement goes beyond outreach and extension or service as universities seek mutually beneficial relationships and partnerships with communities to address communities’ issues and needs; with a commitment to sharing and reciprocity that is guided by mutual respect among the partners. Engagement brings mutual learning and discovery in the co-creation of knowledge with partners. Engaging in and with communities will help faculty, students and administrators develop as discerning citizens who can reflect on and interact in their world with integrity, understanding and committed action. Engagement in its various forms, be it through collaborative research, health-care provisions, low-cost innovations, micro-credit, heritage/cultural preservations, service learning, participatory research or community-based research, should be aimed at serving the marginalised two-thirds of the world’s population.

Outstanding examples of such attempts have also build networks and alliances to share good practices like the Commonwealth Universities Extension & Engagement Network, the Living Knowledge Network, the Global Universities Network for Innovation (GUNI), the Talloires Network and the Global Alliance on Community-Engaged Research (GACER).

Since most, if not all of the above networks originate from the developed West, it is proposed that a regional network of universities in the Asia-Pacific region that subscribe to the concept of an engaged institution be set up. It is envisaged that this regional network will better address local/regional issues and problems with approaches/solutions that better suit local/regional cultures and values. In this, the adoption of local wisdom is greatly encouraged. (Adapted from the Concept Paper for UCEC 2009)
Name of Network: Asia-Pacific University-Community Engagement Network (APUCEN)

Objectives: The objectives of the regional network are as follows:

- To promote and instill community engagement concepts and values to staff and students of institutions of higher learning;
- To create capacity building for university-community partnerships;
- To disseminate and share information, knowledge, resources and good practices in community engagement;
- To implement joint flagship projects; and
- To collaboratively develop resources to support regional flagship projects.

b. Membership

Membership is open to all universities in the Asia-Pacific Region. As a start, no membership fee would be imposed. To date the following are the founder members:

Malaysia
1. Universiti Sains Malaysia
2. Universiti Putra Malaysia
3. Universiti Malaysia Pahang
4. Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin
5. Universiti Malaysia Kelantan
6. Universiti Pendidian Sultan Idris
7. Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
8. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
9. Universiti Malaysia Perlis
10. Universiti Utara Malaysia
11. Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia
12. Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia
13. Universiti Malaysia Sabah
14. Universiti Malaysia Sawarak
15. Universiti Teknologi MARA
16. Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka
17. Universiti Tenaga Nasional

Others
18. Australian College of Applied Psychology, Australia
19. Royal University of Law and Economics, Cambodia
20. Hongkong Institute of Education, Hong Kong
21. Ateneo De manila University, Philippines
22. San Pedro College, Philippines
23. Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia
24. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
25. State University of Malang, Indonesia
26. Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia
27. Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia
28. Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia (UNESA)
29. Thammasat University, Thailand
30. Suratthani Rajabhat University, Thailand
31. Wailalak University, Thailand
32. Mae Fah Luang University, Thailand
33. Chiang Mai University, Thailand
34. Mahidol University, Thailand
Besides universities, other institutions such as polytechnics and community colleges as well as relevant organisations like NGOs and corporations can be invited to join as associate members.

c. Secretariat

A permanent secretariat has been set up at Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) using the University’s own resources.

Address : Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Industry & Community Network)
Chancellery
Universiti Sains Malaysia
11800 USM Penang, Malaysia
Telephone : 604-653 2902
Fax : 604-653 2903 / 2918
Website : www.usm.my/icn

The APUCEN Summit and General Assembly is scheduled to be held concurrently with the formal launching of APUCEN by the Minister of Higher Education, Malaysia on 13–14 July 2011. All APUCEN members, including potential associate members, will be invited.

d. Operation and Structure

The day to day activities of APUCEN shall be operated from USM, and administratively shall be headed by an Executive Director appointed by Universiti Sains Malaysia. The task of formulating policies, evaluation of projects, budget preparation, coordination and implementation of projects are to be done/ overseen by the Executive Director and the Secretariat under the administration of the Division of Industry and Community Network, USM. The founder President is from USM. Five council members for the APUCEN Council shall be elected from Malaysian universities and other 5 council members shall be elected from foreign universities. One Vice-President shall be elected during the APUCEN Summit. The Executive Director (also a member of the council) shall act as the secretary of the council. After the first 3 years period, the Vice-President and 10 council members shall be elected at the APUCEN General Assembly.

e. Funding via a Foundation

Funds required to implement activities to achieve the objectives of the Network shall be via the ‘University-Community Engagement Foundation (UCEF)’, which is to be set up at a later stage. All members shall collectively solicit resources from ministries, government agencies and philanthropic organisations as well as from the private sectors. UCEF shall be managed by an 8-member board of trustees, 6 of which shall be selected from APUCEN members, associate members, NGOs, philanthropic organisations and the private sectors. The Board shall be chaired by the APUCEN’s President and the Executive Director of APUCEN shall act as the secretary of the foundation. The task of the Board is to formulate funding policies and approve the funding for project proposals channeled to them by APUCEN council.
A Social Dimension to Higher Education (by Florian Kaiser, European Students’ Union - ESU)

During the 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop (Innsbruck, 5-7 June 2011), the European Students’ Union (ESU) had the chance to give an input from a student’s perspective about the social responsibility of higher education in all its dimensions. The following article is a detailed version of ESU’s presentation and discussions throughout the workshop including background information. The European Students' Union is strongly supporting the strengthening of the social dimension and therefore also for emphasizing the social responsibility of higher education institutions.

The recent political developments in Europe and the countries of the Bologna process show that there is no clear and common understanding of a social dimension or a social responsibility of Higher Education. As an example, one could use the way tuition fees are handled by the different governments. In large parts of Europe, tuition fees increased massively like in the Netherlands or in England. But there are also developments to completely abolish tuition fees with the argumentation that tuition fees are one important factor for social selection. This small example shows that the diversity that could be understood as social dimension (SD) is unclear. Another basic problem for the social dimension referring to students is how the role of students is defined. In Europe, students are seen in four different ways: as investors (like in the United Kingdom), as children of a family (like in Italy), as adolescent trainees (like in France) or as citizens with own responsibilities (like in Norway).

The Bologna process and the social dimension

For the participants of the Bologna process it is not a question whether there is social responsibility, as the social dimension is an integral part of the process. In the Berlin Communiqué 2003, the social dimension was mentioned for the first time. In this Communiqué, it is proclaimed that adequate conditions, tackling barriers and comparable data are a necessity. In the 2005 Bergen Communiqué, the social dimension was labeled as a fundamental part of the European Higher Education Area and also that the SD is a public responsibility. With the London Communiqué 2007, there was a definition of the social dimension introduced. The last engagement with the SD was the Leuven Communiqué in which the participation of students was fixed and the creating of measurable targets was announced. But, as mentioned before, the reality of social dimension is not that clear and structured as it could be understood.

There is a variety of problems hindering the development of a social dimension. One of the biggest problems is that the definition of the London Communiqué is written in a spongy way while concrete working steps are not mentioned. Another problem is that the social dimension is not a mandatory target. This is partly caused by the fact that social policies are made by the national states. Also the cognizance is not clearly defined in the Communiqués and statements. Another barrier for the social dimension is the fact that social dimension cannot become true without financial investigations. For a lot of European countries it is impossible to invest money in the future of students in times of crises. One huge challenge is the diversity of existing groups with different needs and problems, making it nigh impossible to create a general solution to satisfy all their specific needs. To list up all the different groups is nearly impossible, some of them are obvious and well-known, others not. The European Students’ Union evaluated its members who are underrepresented or discriminated groups in the area of Higher Education. The result was that nearly all answering National Unions’ of Students named the group of students from low socio-economic background. Other samples would be students with disabilities, with a migrant background, with jobs, with children or groups like Refugees, LGBT Students or ethnic-cultural minorities. A last example for the barriers of SD is the still existing lack of data; even though this lack was mentioned and recognised in 2001, it is not eliminated completely.

9 LGBT students = Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Students
Five steps to reach a social dimension to higher education

The European Students’ Union sees the social dimension as a fundamental cornerstone of the Bologna Process, which exists in order to guarantee that the student body entering, participating in and complementing higher education at all levels reflects the diversity of our population. ESU recognised that the goal of a social dimension in the higher education area is still not reached. Therefore, ESU developed five steps to a social dimension to higher education. The final goal of these steps is to create an inclusive higher education community that is based on both fairness and equality:

1. Filling the data gap
2. Widening access policy
3. Tackling barriers
4. Support the student as a learner
5. Providing high quality education

Step 1 – Filling the data gap

The lack of data on the socio economic conditions of students is often used as a rationale for not starting to improve the social dimension of studying. Research on the issue is essential, but action could be taken also without extensive surveys. Studies in various countries, like Austria or Germany, and also the Eurostudent survey suggest that there is a strong correlation between the socio-economic background of students and the paths they will choose in their educational career. This background also includes the educational background of the respective parents. At the European level, comparable data for all the Bologna countries rarely exists and this makes policy making extremely difficult. A major effort to collect comparable data, not only on the social living conditions of students but also on their background and actual needs, is required. This data collection should be coordinated at a European level to ensure that the data is comparable. A non-exclusive list of indicators is to be included: parental educational, ethnic and cultural background, language spoken at home, marital status of parents or guardians including their contribution to student finances, available budget for students, the effect of the financial situation on stress levels and mental health, estimated expenses, time spent working, amount of persons dependent of the student (children) and available social services. A clear pictured is needed if the educational structures in Europe are to be changed. For those countries that have data already available, it becomes clear that more efforts need to be undertaken to include and support under-represented groups in higher education.

Step 2 – Widening access policy

From a social justice perspective, it is clear that no group in society should be left outside of higher education. A well-educated workforce keeps productivity high and unemployment figures low and enhances society as a whole, therefore equity of access is not only reasoned from a social perspective, it is also qualified from an economic perspective. A diversified student body provides a more stimulating environment to the single student. With different backgrounds as well as perspectives on a topic, a better academic standard is obtained. Often the argument is raised that diversity is threatening quality, but this is not essentially true. If investments are made in curriculum reform or study tutoring, widening participation will provide better quality for all. Widening and diversification of the higher education area is not only accomplished by changing the structure of the students body, also the people who are teaching or working as administrative or technical staff need to be included in this process. The higher education community should be in total, a mirror of society. Higher education provides a chance to make social mobility feasible. Through education, people get the chance to build a better life for them and their future families. There should be no waste of potential talent. When other means have not proven to be efficient, affirmative action should be taken into consideration. Affirmative action can have a soft and a hard side – while, for instance, outreach programs belong to the soft side, quotas or positive
discrimination belong to the hard side. To sum it up: the policy makers are responsible for the development of binding widening access policies including all necessary tools to implement them to provide equal chances and to ensure that individual capabilities could be flowered.

Step 3 – Tackling barriers

Everyone regardless of his or her socio-economic background should have the opportunity to follow the education he or she prefers. This right is often deterred by institutional access policies that only focus on the “best” students. It is rather difficult to define in general what the “best” student is and often the “best” is reduced to marks, even if it is well-known that school marks have a high correlation with status and income of the parents. Access limitations in general are discriminatory according to socio-economic backgrounds. Also tuition fees are referring to the socio-economic background and therefore tuition fees should be abolished. If access limitations are existing – like tests – they should be as neutral as possible with regard to the socio-economic background of the applicant. Assessment based on previous academic results alone has the potential to embed the inequalities of pre-university education so deeply into the higher education systems that equity of access is virtually impossible. Underrepresentation does not start at the higher education level; in fact, the underrepresentation starts in kindergartens and schools. Valuing extra curricula activities is also not an adequate way, because it does not take into account that some applicants might not have had the chance to do such kinds of activities. But not only the socio-economic background provides barriers, there are also physical barriers and (hidden) disabilities. Furthermore, pre-conditioned perceptions and expectations keep students from entering higher education, hence it is necessary not only to inform future students about their possibilities; also the parents should be informed, because a lack of mental support could be a barrier to enter higher education. As mentioned in the paragraph above, diversity of staff and teachers is important and this concerns also barriers, because often there is a lack of role models for students of different disadvantage groups. The academic subject matter should reflect the diversity of a society, e.g. in case-studies, photos and so on. Barriers do not start to exist with the beginning of a student’s life, but they also do not end with the end of study. Barriers as a dimension have to be tackled as well before the study as also after the study in the work-life.

Step 4 – Support the student as a learner

In order for all students to have a real chance to enter and complete a higher education program or course, economic barriers must diminish. Economic barriers affect not only the demographics of the student population, but are also interlinked with student health issues, the quality of the studies and student mobility. All countries should have a generous, accessible and parent-independent system of grants that allows the student to survive and support the student as a learner in order to ensure and promote equal access to higher education. Combining work, studying and having a family should be possible in higher education. The higher education institutions and the authorities share a responsibility to offer flexible learning paths. Social services should make studying more accessible; to facilitate this, it is necessary that they are widely available and that these services take into consideration students with additional needs - such as students with disabilities or people with parental responsibilities. The same is valid for academic services like computer facilities and libraries. The educational system is to ensure that there are no drop outs and that it provides chances all over the life span to get back into the system. Systems of recognition of prior learning, a national qualification framework should provide the learner with the possibilities to be socially mobile. Learning outcomes play a central role here. Not only do they provide the learner with transparency on the kind of knowledge she/he needs to know to pass a module, they also make mobility achievable.

Step 5 – Providing high quality education

The social dimension is strongly linked to the quality of education. Through appropriate teaching methods, dropout rates can be reduced. It is not enough to widen access and participation to
higher education if no measures are in place to guarantee that the focus is also on “throughput” and “output”. Dropout should be minimised and the groups graduating should be in the same proportion as those who started with higher education. A way to reduce dropout is improving the quality of education. Using average workload as a benchmark and designing models in accordance to this benchmark is a good start. Furthermore, eliminating certain cultural barriers, such as unnecessary academic language and discriminating reference points, play an important role. New teaching methods should be implemented, with increased contact between students and teachers. Smaller classes and in general a student-centred approach will also increase the quality of higher education. Finally, obligatory counseling services for students ensure that students are following the right track in their educational career.

Conclusion and future targets

The social dimension or the social responsibility is still a valuable and important target. Even though many things have to be changed or developed, all stakeholders of the higher education area should take it into account and work as equal partners together to reach social justice and equity. The aforementioned five steps from the European Students' Union (ESU) are listed but this is not all that could be done. It would be relevant that the National Action Plans of the Bologna countries will be improved, to clearly defined and binding targets. Social Criteria should be introduced in education targets; in a globalised world, these skills become more and more important in the every day life. Social dimension should be reflected actively in the teaching and in the learning process. An interesting way to implement social dimension is through the quality assurance standards – examples for such standards are the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance from the E4-Group (adopted from the ministerial conference in Bergen 2005)10. At the moment, quality assurance does not take social criteria into account, while this would help to make undesirable developments obvious and would motivate the activists to monitor progress on social developments. Setting up anti-discrimination legislation covering education at all levels would be another important development. This development has been started with the Treaty of Amsterdam in which the anti-discrimination legislation of employees is written, but it has to be improved. Also mentioned before were the student services which should be expanded in all countries as one column of the social dimension with a main focus on the social needs. A lot of work has to be done, to ensure a real implementation of a social dimension, but this is an important investigation in the future of societies.

University Social Responsibility (USR) in ASEM countries - lessons learned (by Saran Kaur Gill, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia “The National University of Malaysia”)

This paper addresses the insights gained at the 2nd Asia-Europe Education Workshop, held in June 2011 at the University of Innsbruck. In particular, it deals with the various “faces” of University Social Responsibility (USR) in ASEM countries, aiming to provide an understanding of the basic principles and approaches of USR or engagement with industry and community, how it ties in with the core business of universities (research, education and service) and what is needed to develop synergies and meaningful exchange of knowledge and experiences of universities in Asia and Europe in the area of USR. While the European insights are gained from the above-mentioned workshop, the ASEAN perspectives were largely based on the outcomes of the 2nd AUN Regional Forum on University Social Responsibility and Sustainability co-organised in May 2011 by Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) and the ASEAN University Network (AUN)11.

11 The ASEAN University Network (AUN) is an autonomous organisation, established under an umbrella of ASEAN and the mandate of Ministers responsible for higher education in ASEAN countries, dealing with the promotion of human
**What does USR mean to stakeholders? Do we have a common understanding?**

This aligns with one of the main recommendations of the delegates at the AUN forum which was the need to define the various references to terms used in this area, such as civic / community engagement, community services social responsibility, outreach, service learning, needs analysis/asset-based analysis (for details, cf. the workshop summary report).

In the key addresses presented at the aforementioned Innsbruck workshop, it was highlighted that, traditionally, universities focus on teaching and research. A third mission is emerging – service – which encompasses all the other portfolios. This results in applicable research, appreciation of arts, gender equality and advancement of women, the need to explain to the public what the functions and values of universities are.

There is a need at this stage to clarify between “service” as the third mission of the university, as referred to above, and that of engagement with industry and community as integrated into research and education. “Service” as the third mission of the university is entrenched in volunteerism. As universities work on meaningful and relevant applications of their research, they engage with industry and community. It is this engagement with industry and community that constitutes university social responsibility and that needs to be integrated across the three core activities of a university – research, education and service.

The AUN-UKM forum raised a need for clear models and engagement principles to drive responsible community engagement. It shared with stakeholders what had been worked out at UKM – a Strategic Plan for University-Industry-Community Engagement that sets out strategies, operational systems and processes for effective engagement across Research, Education & Service.

In the UKM Strategic Plan, “Engagement is defined as meaningful, considerate, sustainable and productive interaction with both internal (university staff and students) and external stakeholders (industry, community, NGOs and government agencies), to enrich the areas of research, education and service, for the establishment of mutually beneficial partnerships. These partnerships are to address the social, economic, environmental, technological and health issues of the nation and the region.”

The main point to emphasise here is that it is necessary for universities to integrate community engagement in the core business of the university – research, education and service. There is a need to work out clearly how this can be done for each of the key components with clear examples so that it promotes greater understanding, acceptance and application in the academic environment which shows academics how they can achieve their research and publications KPIs and yet work at ensuring their knowledge is applicable and benefits communities.

**A second question is: Can we identify universities with a specific USR strategic model?**

A specific USR or university-industry and community engaged strategic model needs to have clear governance systems and processes. In the European context, as the focus seems to be on knowledge transfer and knowledge innovation (wealth generation), most universities have centres that focus on this.

UKM has a strategic model for USR which is underpinned by some of the following set of systems and some of them are recommendations that have come out of the AUN-UKM forum.

resource development in the field of higher education within ASEAN and with its dialogue partners, namely Japan, Korea, China, India, Russia and the EU. For more information see www.aun-sec.org.
1. **Governance Systems:** There is a need to establish institutional strategies, policies and processes that support and facilitate strategic engagement with all stakeholders.

All research universities in Malaysia have recognition at senior management position to drive forward university social responsibility. This is the position of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Industry and Community Partnerships). The role of this portfolio is to reduce the gap between universities and external stakeholders. To ensure that these initiatives permeate through the university, each faculty has a designated head of industry and community partnerships.

2. **Quality Systems:** There is a need to develop standard operating procedures for quality engagement processes within the university and with external stakeholders. In addition, clear indicators for successful multi-sectoral engagement need to be developed. These will feed into review audits that will be carried out to assess the quality of engagement at institutional levels, and just as importantly the social impact assessment of community engaged projects.

**Strategic knowledge production (research) and knowledge transfer (education/teaching) models**

UKM works towards ensuring that knowledge production (research), education & service are strongly supported by industry and community engagement. One initiative that has worked for the university is the development of two research driven mechanisms: These are the University-industry research grants and University-community research grants. Successful proposals have to provide evidence for the following criteria. These are:

i. develop partnership with industry/ NGOs/ government agencies or with communities;
ii. show clear knowledge transfer/exchange in the research and development process
iii. obtain external funding to support the seed funding provided by the university to move these projects forward;
iv. secure evidence of economic and social impact assessment of the research and development projects;
v. enhance teaching and learning by integrating the outcomes of research and development projects with either industry or community.

Another powerful model that is used to leapfrog the knowledge transfer initiatives is the concept of the endowed chair. This provides strong public-private collaboration in terms of knowledge generation and funding.

All of these require academics to convert the specialised knowledge that they have into a form with which they are able to persuade industry and communities of the value of the specialised areas. UKM was successful recently when it achieved an endowed chair for sustainable development: zero waste technology for the palm oil industry. The industry partner for this is the Sime Darby Foundation. This is because of Sime Darby’s mission that is committed to making sustainable futures real for everyone. In line with this mission, the Foundation dedicates itself to the protection and preservation of the environment from degradation and the conservation of ecosystems.

**Creating multiplier effect and synergies in USR for both Europe and Asia through international platforms**

The AUN-UKM forum showed the need for replicating the Community Engagement strategic model and sharing the experiences through creating a multiplier effect across the region. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia has gained the confidence and trust of many international organisations and is suitably positioned to lead in this area. UKM is the secretariat of the Asia-Talloires Network.
of Industry and Community Engaged Universities (ATNEU). The Talloires Network is a network of over 200 universities in 59 countries around the globe that has a passion for university social responsibility and civic engagement. In addition, UKM's bid and proposal to be secretariat of the Asean University Network’s thematic network on USR&S was recently endorsed by the AUN Board of Trustees. The Malaysian Minister of Higher Education, Dato’ Seri Mohamed Khaled Nordin, being a strong advocate of the benefits of university-industry-community collaborations, has presented the ATNEU proposal to the Malaysian Ministerial Cabinet where it has been endorsed by the Prime Minister and cabinet Ministers.

ATNEU has the following plans:

i. An international conference on “Higher Education-Industry-Community Engagement in Asia: Forging Meaningful Partnerships” when the Asia-Talloires Network of Engaged Universities (ATNEU) will also be officially launched. This will be on the 7-9th May 2012. The organisers are working towards ensuring that in addition to academia, participation from industry and NGOs is secured. As an example, the first thematic session will focus on the alignment of USR and CSR.

ii. A Summit on Youth and Volunteerism in Asia will be held on the 5th and 6th May 2012. For this, UKM intends and will be sending invitations soon to AUN, and ASEF to work with us on this exciting enterprise.

To synergise and create a multiplier effect between two very important regions of the globe – Asia and Europe - it would be important to share experiences and best practices in these areas, it would be beneficial to collaborate with international platforms in Europe to create greater impact and partnerships. To strengthen existing collaborations and forge new ones, ATNEU members look forward to working more closely with the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF). European based platforms that focus on industry and community engagement are warmly invited to be strategic partners in ensuring that communities benefit from initiatives driven by ATNEU and the various member universities across Asia.

Strategic USR Management Framework (by Dr. Teay Shawyun: SEAAIR)

I. Introduction

As discussed earlier in the introductory paper in this report, CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) while widely defined and researched has evaded a holistic agreement on what CSR is. But CSR has slowly been argued and accepted over the last decades as "legitimately what organisations should do towards a successful organisation in a healthy society that adheres to the triple bottom-line of profit, people and planet for sustainability”. While widely applied to the business, it can also be argued that universities as organisations should also be socially responsible to society. Universities as pillars for human development and that produce graduates for society should be “socially responsible” towards their human product and their potential stakeholders who affect the future of business and society. University as derived from its Latin “universitas magistrorum et scholarium” means "community of teachers and scholars” designate a key university role as the hub of human development through teaching and learning. A key research issue is what and how CSR can be applied to universities and how the universities can strategically manage its social responsibilities. This paper will propose a strategic management framework of USR that is anticipated to balance the management of its internal and external stakeholders’ social responsibilities through its value creation processes. This builds on the discussions held at the 2nd Asia – Europe Education Workshop in June 2011 in Innsbruck, Austria. The workshop explored what “Universitas” stand for today (aims, values); the links
between educational and environmental, societal, economical (labour-market) outputs of universities; how the universities define their mission (in creating knowledge societies); the many faces of USR in ASEM countries and internationalisation and the role of USR which is the basis of the development of this Strategic USR Management Framework.

II. Strategic USR Management Framework

Within this framework of managing USR strategically, this paper aims at developing a comprehensive strategic USR management framework to ensure that the management of USR is prioritised as part of the university management based on its vision and mission. It also introduces the processes that lead to the development and incorporation of USR in its annual planning processes and as part of the university strategic plan. The basic premise is that the university’s final output is a set of “socially and ethically conscious group of knowledgeable and competent graduates in a community of scholars” of which knowledge is interpreted and exercised by the human scholars that affects society. As such, the production of a socially and ethically knowledgeable graduate passes through both an internal process component within the institution, and through one that conforms to the external societal requirements of a morally and ethically responsible member of society that cares for the overall wellbeing of society as opposed to one who is self-centered and self-destructive.

Fig. 1 Strategic USR Management Framework
Since the graduate undergoes two main components of the internal institutional and external societal requirements, it is deemed necessary to fully understand the SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat) of the institution from the perspective of societal responsibilities. Fig. 1 explains the process of the strategic analysis of identifying its internal societal capabilities and capacities and the development of the strategy in achieving its envisioned societal responsibility. As illustrated, the institution will first need to identify its internal strengths and weaknesses of its organisational systems, human, information and values systems capacities and capabilities that constitutes its “capacities and capabilities that is inherent in the institution towards societal responsibilities” (Internal environmental and social responsibilities analysis). On the external environmental and social responsibilities elements, it would also need to determine its competitive, stakeholders’ and societal requirements that constitute its opportunities and threats that represents a “position that it seek to achieve in its societal responsibilities”. This will result in the strategic SWOT analysis of the institution’s societal responsibilities that leads to a better understanding of the strategic issue facing the institution’s societal responsibility. In reading Figure 1, a single directional arrow should be interpreted as a uni-directional link or flow of actions from one action to another whereas a bi-directional arrow is representative of an inter-relational that can flow both way in both direction and vice-versa. Based on the strategic SWOT analysis and the strategic issue pertaining to the institution’s societal responsibility, an appropriate set of institution’s societal responsibility strategies will be developed. The development of the strategies for societal responsibilities lies in matching its “internal societal responsibilities capacities and capabilities” and the “positional societal responsibilities that it seeks to achieve”. The capabilities comprehensively refer to the sets of knowledge and skills of the human factors in the utilisation of the institution resources to create and deliver of actions that creates and deliver of societal responsibilities value. The capacity is analogical to the “volume” of a vase to hold a specific amount of water, which in this case represents the resources availability and accessibility to support the human factors to create and deliver on these societal responsibilities.

In the implementation of the institution societal responsibility strategy that has been selected based on its internal institutional societal responsibilities analysis and its external environmental societal responsibilities, this calls for the “creation or building” of the institutional societal responsibilities capabilities and capacities and to achieve its external societal responsibilities. As shown in the Figure 2, the 4 main internal societal capacities and capabilities dimensions that the institution needs to create are proposed to be:

i. **People responsibilities** – the basic premise is that it is people who are responsible in using the knowledge and skills or its competencies sets that interpret and utilise knowledge within their ethical and moral domain to bring about actions and they should be developed with a conscience. As such, these 3 main groups of students, faculty and staff should be conscientious of the moral well-being of their actions that contributes to the furthering of society’s well-being and these are developed through the education that builds and develops.

ii. **Governance processes responsibilities** – this broadly covers the governance processes, the management and administration of its societal responsibilities, its appending systems and mechanisms developed to ensure societal responsibilities are in place, executed and monitored and that is assured through quality systems and mechanisms of managing societal responsibilities. It is what we do and not just what we talk. Actions of societal responsibilities are ethical pragmatisms.

iii. **Primary educational processes** – this comprehensively enshrines the societal responsibilities within the teaching and learning, the research and the external engagement educational processes, systems and mechanisms. These educational components are the ultimate mechanisms that should instill and imbues societal responsibilities of a “morally and ethically sound mind in a healthy body” in the students’ development process (education value creation and addition activities).
iv. **Support educational processes** – this covers the supporting processes, systems and mechanisms that aims at valuing people whereby the institution values its people and building a strong conducive societal responsible environment in support of the primary education and people’s accomplishment and achievements processes. These systems cover the student support services, learning resources, human engagement and valuing human resources, facilities and equipment, and information resources management as an integrated whole to add not basic but ethical and moral value and social conscience to the primary education processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People Responsibilities</th>
<th>Governance Processes Responsibilities</th>
<th>Primary Educational Processes Responsibilities</th>
<th>Support Educational Processes Responsibilities</th>
<th>Secondary External Processes Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Responsibilities</td>
<td>Governance Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Staff Responsibilities</td>
<td>Staff Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Responsibilities</td>
<td>Planning Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management Responsibilities</td>
<td>Management and Administration Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Responsibilities</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Responsibilities</td>
<td>Primary Educational Processes Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Engagement Responsibilities</td>
<td>Student Support Services Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources Responsibilities</td>
<td>Learning Resources Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Responsibilities</td>
<td>Human Resources Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment Responsibilities</td>
<td>Facilities and Equipment Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Responsibilities</td>
<td>Information Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The external societal responsibilities dimensions (Fig. 2) can be classified as:

i. **Primary external people responsibilities** – this will basically cover the main institutional output of its graduates and alumni who had undergone the internal institutional societal focused processes to be “ethically and morally sound graduates and alumni” who can contribute positively and proactively to the societal development and its well-being.

ii. **Secondary external people responsibilities** – as the graduates and alumni are employed, their basic societal responsibilities and conscience should contribute to the employment market and the total society and all its stakeholders that work within the framework of regulatory requirements. This in essence provides them with a societal conscience that their actions can either enhance or destruct the society at large, of which there are ample evidence in the downfalls of companies, destruction of natural resources and bettering others through "greed" and one’s self well-being rather than the well-being of the society as a whole.
iii. **Primary external processes responsibilities** – this comprehensively covers the systems and mechanisms of the “what and how” that the institution set up to relate and to engage their immediate communities and society at large. Traditionally it means academic services but the enlarged societal responsibilities goes beyond this covering the commitment and positive engagement with the community and society to bring about a better and healthier and more prosperous society built on a more moralistic and ethical foundation.

iv. **Secondary external processes responsibilities** – this covers the moral well-being of the individual’s contributions of what and how s/he do for the benefit of society through its environmental and societal conscience that had been instilled and imbued in the “responsible citizen of society”. This emphasizes that every small contribution of an individual towards environmental and societal protection and conservation will add up to a better and more liveable society.

### III. Discussion and Conclusion

Though USR is still in a very infant stage, with academics still debating the role and scope of the constituents of USR, one should basically be forward-looking and proactively incorporate USR as part of the institution’s management. This paper argues for the institution’s societal responsibility to be embedded in its internal systems and mechanisms capacities and capabilities that should incorporate the “societal responsibilities” mind set in its operating realms that underlies its internal processes capacities and capabilities. It also argues that the internal processes capacities and capabilities ultimately will result in a societally conscious and responsible graduate who carries on and champion the cause of societal responsibility for the well-being and health of a productive society.

Based on this premise, the paper recommended a strategic USR management framework with two main components of:

- Analysing the internal and external societal environmental (Fig. 1) which is its “internal societal responsibilities capacities and capabilities” and the “positional societal responsibilities” it intends to stake out and in the formulating of its societal responsibilities strategies.
- Implementing its societal responsibilities strategies by creating or building the internal societal responsibilities capacities and capabilities in order to achieve its positional societal responsibilities based on the key internal and external factors as discussed above (Fig.2).

In conclusion, this paper attempts to develop a strategic USR management framework by strategically managing its societal responsibilities focused components. This paper borrows heavily from the CSR researches and the strategic management literature and practices to develop this strategic USR management framework. It is believed that this paper can provide a framework to concretize the approach in developing and managing the societal responsibilities of the universities based on its basic premise that the universities’ main output is a socially responsible graduate who is ethically and morally sound and can contribute to a better society. This call for the managing of its internal capacities and capabilities conscientiously to achieve its strategic intent of the external positional societal responsibilities that it intends to stake out.

*Disclaimer: The views expressed herein are in no way taken to reflect the official opinion or position of the Asia-Europe Foundation or ASEF’s partner organisations.*
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