



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.
This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

UNIBILITY

university
meets
social responsibility

UNIBILITY – University Meets Social Responsibility 2015-2017
Grant Agreement No.: 2015-1-AT01_K203-005033

From Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) to
University's Social Responsibility (USR)

A READER.

Gabriel Dima & Katharina Resch

Editors

Gabriel Dima, University Politehnica of Bucharest (RO)
Katharina Resch, Postgraduate Center, University of Vienna (AT)

Contributors

Alina Borcos, University Politehnica of Bucharest (RO)
Tanja Božič, Public University of Ptuj (SI)
Petja Janžekovič, Public University of Ptuj (SI)
Joaquim Luís Coimbra, University of Porto (PT)
Fernanda Rodrigues, University of Porto (PT)
Isabel Gomes, University of Porto (PT)
Isabel Menezes, University of Porto (PT)
José Pedro Amorim, University of Porto (PT)
Tiago Neves, University of Porto (PT)
Jordi Miret Marti, University of Barcelona (ES)
Esther Murphy, Dublin City University (IE)
Yurgos Politis, Dublin City University (IE)
Maria Slowey, Dublin City University (IE)
Francesca Uras, eucen (BE)
Isabel Vidal, University of Barcelona (ES)
Mojca Volk, Public University of Ptuj (SI)

Volume 1, January 2016

This READER is a product / Intellectual Output produced in the framework of the Erasmus+ Project UNIBILITY, coordinated by the University of Vienna (Austria), Postgraduate Center.

More information about the project is available at
www.postgraduatecenter.at/unibility

Contact the editors:

gabriel.dima@reu.pub.ro or katharina.resch@univie.ac.at

Cite this reader as follows:

Dima, G. & Resch, K. (2016): From CSR to USR – a reader. Intellectual Output 1 in the framework of the Erasmus+ UNIBILITY-Project, available at
www.postgraduatecenter.at/unibility.

Photo credits

University of Vienna, Barbara Mair

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Starting out with the CSR state-of-the art	3
	2.1 Which policy documents for CSR matter?	4
	2.2 International Standards for CSR within ISO 26000:2010	7
	2.3 The politics of CSR – a theoretical perspective	9
	2.4 A CSR cooperation project between a university and a company	11
3	From CSR to USR – a shift for university policy	14
	3.1 The shift from CSR to USR	15
	3.2 CSR applied by the 10 top world universities	17
	3.3 The perception of employees at universities towards CSR	19
	3.4 The necessity for multi-stakeholder governance in USR	21
	3.5 A European Framework for USR	23
4	USR – universities' engagement in the community	27
	4.1 The third pillar of engagement in universities in Ireland	28
	4.2 Managing the university community	31
	4.3 What we can learn from Australian USR strategies?	33
5	Conclusions for universities	37
6	References	39
7	Key terms	40
8	Critical thinking questions	40

1. Introduction

Social responsibility can be considered a puzzle with many pieces. It is difficult to grasp its full range as it can be understood as a concept with various dimensions: a management task, a theoretical concept, an action plan – just to name a few. Historically the concept of social responsibility derives from Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), which is well known in the business world. Without the corporate context, the term Social Responsibility is used, applying to all types of organisations – public, private, profit, non-for-profit. We refer to Social Responsibility in the context of higher education institutions and universities.

University's Social Responsibility (USR) emerged as a central issue of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in the Ministerial Declarations of London (2007) and Leuven (2009) with an emphasis on equality of opportunity in terms of students' access and progression.

The social dimension of higher education is not a new issue in itself, since in all countries, to differing degrees, the contribution of higher education institutions to social development is recognized as evidenced since the 1998 UNESCO World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st century.

In 2003, UNESCO already underlined the important role higher education institutions (HEIs) exert on developing European societies and defining and transmitting the values

on which this is built: "At no time in human history was the welfare of nations so closely linked to the quality and outreach of their higher education systems and institutions" (World Conference on Higher Education Partners, June 2003).

The social dimension of higher education was reiterated in the UNESCO 2009 "Communique from the World Conference on Higher Education: The New Dynamics of Higher Education and Research for Societal Change and Development" and the Council of Europe's 2006 "Declaration on the Responsibility of Higher Education for a Democratic Culture - Citizenship, Human Rights and Sustainability".

The European Council's Conclusions on the Social Dimension of Higher Education (June, 2013: 2013/C 168/02) draws attention to the pivotal role the Bologna Process has in terms of this social dimension. In doing so, it underlines the importance of the promotion of equity, social cohesion and active citizenship and high-level skills as key to improving employability, inclusion and personal fulfillment. In turn, it also highlights the importance of widening access to higher education, improving the quality, relevance, flexibility and attractiveness of courses through student-centered learning and high quality student support in achieving these objectives. In addition, it identifies a need to deepen understanding and engagement with the social dimension of higher education.

In short, there are their different ways in which the relevant supra-national bodies all emphasize the social responsibilities of higher education institutions. However, even if the subject is on the top agenda of most of the relevant bodies, there are few effective processes yet that can support the development of practice within higher education institutions.

At practice level, most European universities seem sensitive to and aware of the importance of their social dimension to some degree and many are developing actions to make this a priority, not only in policy terms, but also in daily practice. University's Social Responsibility can be found across Europe under different headings such as social responsibility, social dimension, third mission, university-business cooperation, civic engagement, liaison with socio-economic environment, and many more.

The mission of the »**University Meets Social Responsibility**« (**UNIBILITY**) partnership is the promotion of university's social responsibility (USR) among European universities and other higher education institutions that seek to integrate social responsibility into their 1) internal policies and government structures as well as their 2) external activities with local stakeholders and target groups.

The UNIBILITY-project (2015-2017), coordinated by the University of Vienna (Austria), is one of the pioneer projects in

Europe for active social responsibility. It is co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme (Strategic Partnerships, Key Action 2).

Within the UNIBILITY-project a focus was put on the relationship of universities and the local community, regional stakeholders, civic engagement and other activities relating to external university contexts. The main aim is to strengthen the social impact of universities on their external stakeholders. Therefore, these texts have been prioritized in this Reader.

We hope to have collected relevant and interesting texts and publications for your research, teaching and training activities.

This **UNIBILITY-Reader** was meant to be used as training material – both for staff trainings and student trainings – concerning social responsibility of higher education institutions in Europe.



2. Starting out with the CSR state-of-the art

In this chapter, quite different texts have been collocated together to start thinking about the “puzzle” of USR: The first text (2.1) is an analysis of policy documents relevant to CSR, the second text ISO-26:000 (2.2) is a corporate document to provide international standards for social responsibility, and the third text (2.3) conveys a theoretical position on the politics of CSR. The fourth text of this chapter adds a practical example of a CSR cooperation project between a university and a private company (2.4) to the puzzle.

2.1 Which policy documents for CSR matter?

TEXT REFERENCE:

Schimanski, Caroline (2013): An Analysis of Policy References made by large EU Companies to Internationally Recognized CSR Guidelines and Principles, European Commission.

OPEN ACCES:

<http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/10372/attachments/1/translations/en/renditions/native>

Only recently, in October 2011, the European Commission adopted a new strategy on corporate social responsibility (CSR). The strategy places a strong emphasis on a core set of internationally recognized CSR guidelines and principles. It highlights in particular the ten principles of the UN Global Compact; the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises;

the ISO 26000 guidance standard on social responsibility; the ILO Tri-partite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy; and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. The European Commission refers to these instruments as “an evolving and recently strengthened global framework for CSR.”

As part of its CSR strategy, the European Commission invites large enterprises to make a commitment to take account of the UN Global Compact, OECD Guidelines, ISO 26000, ILO tripartite declaration, UN Guiding Principles on Business & Human Rights when developing their own policies on CSR, and announces an intention to monitor such commitments for enterprises with more than 1.000 employees.

The paper is part of that monitoring exercise aiming to present statistics on the extent to which 200 randomly selected large companies from ten different EU Member States make policy references publicly available to certain internationally recognized CSR guidelines and principles. The ten Member States are the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

The sample of 200 EU companies is based on a random selection of 20 companies from ten EU Member States. For all countries except Poland and the Czech Republic, companies were randomly selected from the Database on European Works Council Agreements, which lists all companies, public and private, with more than 1.000 employees, of which at least 150 employees work in another country.

As the European Works Councils database appeared to not fully cover Polish and Czech companies, the random samples for these two countries have been drawn from the Amadeus/Bureau van Dijk database. The same selection criteria were applied, with the exception of the requirement for at least 150 employees to be working abroad. Fully state-owned companies and companies fully owned by a foreign parent company were excluded from the sample for all countries.

This random selection methodology led to a sample with the following characteristics:

- About half of the companies have between 1.000 and 10.000 employees, and the other half have more than 10.000 employees. About one quarter of the companies have over 20.000 employees, with the largest company having 534.500 employees.
- The distribution of company sizes is roughly the same for all countries, except for the Spanish sample which contains slightly more companies with over 20.000 employees.
- 53.5% of the companies in the sample are privately owned, and 46.5% are publicly listed.
- The sample does not carry any bias regarding industry sector or whether or not the company has a CSR/Sustainability policy.

As mentioned before, this study analyzed the public references companies make to the following **policy instruments**:

- United Nations Global Compact
- Universal Declaration on Human Rights
- United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights
- OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD Guidelines)
- ISO 26000 Guidance Standard of Social Responsibility (ISO 26000)
- ILO Core Conventions and the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (Instruments of the ILO)
- ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises on Social Policy (ILO MNE Declaration)
- Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)

The analysis leads to the **following main findings**:

- 68% of the sample companies make reference to “corporate social responsibility” or an equivalent term, and 40% refer to at least one internationally recognized CSR instrument;
- 33% of the sample companies meet the European Commission’s call to refer to at least one of the following: UN Global Compact, OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, or ISO 26000;
- only 2% of the sample companies meet the European Commission’s call to refer to the ILO MNE Declaration;
- only 3% of the sample companies refer to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which the European Commission expects all enterprises to implement with regard to the corporate responsibility to respect human rights;
- The UN Global Compact and the Global Reporting Initiative, with 32% and 31% respectively, are the most commonly referenced instruments, followed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Instruments of the International Labour Organisation;
- Very large companies in the sample (those with over 10.000 employees) are about three times more likely to refer to

internationally recognized CSR instruments than companies with between 1.000 and 10.000 employees.

- Danish, Spanish and Swedish sample companies refer to internationally recognized CSR instruments more often than the average EU sample company. Dutch, French and Italian companies were about average for the sample, and Czech, German, Polish and UK companies in the sample refer to CSR instruments less frequently than the average.

2.2 International Standards for CSR within ISO 26000:2010

TEXT REFERENCE:

International Standards' Organization. Guidance on Social Responsibility, ISO26000, 2010.

OPEN ACCESS:

<http://www.cnis.gov.cn/wzgg/201405/P020140512224950899020.pdf>

The ISO 26000:2010 document was written as an implementation guideline for social responsibility and was selected for this Reader as a main resource document about CSR since it provides guidance to all possible types of organizations, regardless of their size or location, on:

- concepts, terms and definitions related to social responsibility;
- the background, trends and characteristics of social responsibility;
- principles and practices relating to social responsibility;

- the core subjects and issues of social responsibility;
- integrating, implementing and promoting socially responsible behavior throughout the organization and, through its policies and practices, within its sphere of influence;
- identifying and engaging with stakeholders; and
- communicating commitments, performance and other information related to social responsibility.

ISO 26000:2010 is intended to assist organizations in contributing to sustainable development. It is intended to encourage them to go beyond legal compliance, recognizing that compliance with law is a fundamental responsibility of any organization and an essential part of their social responsibility. It is intended to promote common understanding in the field of social responsibility, and to complement other instruments and initiatives for social responsibility, not to replace them.

In applying ISO 26000:2010, it is advisable that an organization take into consideration **societal, environmental, legal, cultural, political and organizational diversity**, as well as differences in economic conditions, while being consistent with international norms of behavior.

ISO 26000:2010 is not a management system standard. It is not intended or appropriate for certification purposes, regulatory or contractual use. Any offer to certify, or claims to be certified, to ISO 26000 would be a misrepresentation of the intent and purpose, and a misuse of ISO 26000:2010. As ISO 26000:2010 does not contain requirements, any such certification would not be a demonstration of conformity with ISO 26000:2010.

ISO 26000:2010 is intended to provide organizations with guidance concerning social responsibility and can be used as part of public policy activities. However, for the purposes of the Marrakech Agreement establishing the World Trade

Organization (WTO), it is not intended to be interpreted as an “international standard”, “guideline” or “recommendation”, nor is it intended to provide a basis for any presumption or finding that a measure is consistent with WTO obligations. Further, it is not intended to provide a basis for legal actions, complaints, defenses or other claims in any international, domestic or other proceeding, nor is it intended to be cited as evidence of the evolution of customary international law.

ISO 26000:2010 is not intended to prevent the development of national standards that are more specific, more demanding, or of a different type.

2.3 The politics of CSR – a theoretical perspective

TEXT REFERENCE:

Porter, Michael E.; Kramer, Mark R. (2011): Creating shared value – how to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. In: Harvard Business Review, January-February 2011.

OPEN ACCESS:

The article „Creating shared value – how to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth“, by Michael E. Porter and Mark R. Kramer, expands the business concept of creating shared value (CSV), firstly introduced by the same authors in two previous articles (Strategy & Society: The Link between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility and “Creating Shared Value: Redefining Capitalism and the Role of the Corporation in Society”). The authors define the concept of shared value as “policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it operates”. The article provides insights and relevant examples of companies that have developed deep links between their

business strategies and shared value. The central premise behind creating shared value is that the competitiveness of a company and the health of the communities around it are mutually dependent. Recognizing and capitalizing on these connections between societal and economic progress has the power to unleash the next wave of global growth and to redefine HYPERLINK “<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitalism>” \o “**Capitalism**” capitalism.

In recent years, business has been criticized as a major cause of social, environmental, and economic problems. Companies are widely thought to be prospering at the expense of their communities. Trust in business has fallen to new lows, leading government officials to set policies that undermine competitiveness and sap economic growth. Business is caught in a vicious circle. A big part of the problem lies with companies themselves, which remain trapped in an outdated, narrow approach to value creation. Focused on optimizing short-term financial performance, they overlook the greatest unmet needs in the market as well as broader influences on their long-term success. The authors state that companies could bring business and society back together if they redefined their purpose as creating “shared value”—

generating economic value in a way that also produces value for society by addressing its challenges. A shared value approach reconnects company success with social progress. Firms can do this in three distinct ways: by reconceiving products and markets, redefining productivity in the value chain, and building supportive industry clusters at the company's locations. A number of companies known for their hard-nosed approach to business—including GE, Wal-Mart, Nestlé, Johnson & Johnson, and Unilever—have already embarked on important initiatives in these areas. Nestlé, for example, redesigned its coffee procurement processes, working intensively with small farmers in impoverished areas who were trapped in a cycle of low productivity, poor quality, and environmental degradation. Nestlé provided advice on farming practices; helped growers secure plant stock, fertilizers, and pesticides; and began directly paying them a premium for better beans. Higher yields and quality increased the growers' incomes, the environmental impact of farms shrank, and Nestlé's reliable supply of good coffee grew significantly. Shared value was created.

The authors make clear that shared value is not redistribution (i.e., not "sharing value"), but "about expanding the total

pool of economic and social value." If many more companies focused on creating shared value we'd see important changes: even stronger political support for sustainable policies, companies tackling a wider set of environmental threats with less prodding, and more creativity avoiding environmental problems before they are created.

Shared value could reshape capitalism and its relationship to society. It could also drive the next wave of innovation and productivity growth in the global economy as it opens managers' eyes to immense human needs that must be met, large new markets to be served, and the internal costs of social deficits—as well as the competitive advantages available from addressing them. The current general understanding of shared value is still in its genesis, say the authors of the article. Attaining it will require managers to develop new skills and knowledge and governments to learn how to regulate in ways that enable shared value, rather than work against it.

2.4 A CSR cooperation project between a university and a company

TEXT REFERENCE:

Peterlin, Judita; Dimovski, Vlado; Uhan, Miha; Penger, Sandra (2011): Re.Thinking the Corporate Social Responsibility in Slovenia: Empirical Evidence, In: Ekonomska Istraživanja, 24:4, DOI: 10.1080/1331677X.2011.1151748 Journal Article; pp.126 -142.

OPEN ACCES:

<http://hrcak.srce.hr/file/115223>

This paper deals with a more applied approach to CSR within a cooperation project at university level, more specifically with a project named “Re.think”, which is a joint corporate social responsibility project between the Faculty of Economics of the University of Ljubljana (FELU) and the second largest Slovenian mobile operator – Si.mobil. FELU is the largest Faculty of the University of Ljubljana and has previously concentrated on the social component of CSR, but has recently also started its path to social responsibility in the environmental sense.

The research seeks to define factors of CSR in Slovenia and evaluate the change in brand perception and consuming behavior of students at FELU. The aim is to fill this research gap by developing the conceptual model of CSR and testing the factors that govern the foundation of CSR in Slovenia.

The main research goal was to identify the effects and underlying factors that contribute to the fostering of CSR reputation. The main research question posed were whether or not students perceive FELU and Si.mobil as socially responsible organizations, which was measured through the perceptions of students at FELU.

The main hypotheses of the project are: 1) the project “Re. think” strengthens the social responsibility awareness of the students at FELU; 2) the employees of Si.mobil find it empowering to be able to cooperate within CSR projects, conceptualized by the Si.mobil’s Eco team; and 3) the project “Re.think” influences the behavior of students as consumers of Si.mobil products and services.

The “Re.think” project brings together environmental values of FELU and the Si.mobil company which are: recycling, reusing, reducing and above all rethinking what you use and where you use it. It is based on the “Re.think” concept (Reduce, Reuse and Recycle), which has been widely accepted and epitomizes environmental awareness and responsibility of individuals and organizations.

Si.mobil is the second largest Slovenian mobile operator and they are aware of the significance of responsible and environmentally friendly operation, so they have included environmental care into their long-term business strategy and processes. The initiative for project “Re.think” came from employees themselves. The management founded an in-company Eco team, in which 15 % of their employees are active on a voluntary basis. The FELU is the first outside organization to have started the “Re.think” philosophy, initiated by Si.mobil.

The Eco team is trying to implement small but important changes at the Faculty. Specifically, Eco team activities at FELU are: 1) placement of stickers with ecological contents in the lavatories with the intention to reduce the usage of water, paper and electricity; 2) yearly inventory of water, paper and electricity consumption; 3) promotion of an environmentally friendly and separated waste collection system; 4) promotion of usage of bicycles, which are an ideal environmental transportation for short distance, like the drive to the University of Ljubljana; 5) CO2 footprint calculation for the Faculty; and 6) organization of movie nights, where ecological topics are presented and discussed.

CSR was measured by interviewing 120 students at FELU in 2009/2010. Convenience sampling was used for this purpose; this being the first research on CSR in collaboration with the profit company Si.mobil and Slovenian higher educational institution.

The **main findings** of the analysis of the Slovene consumers’ attitude and behavior regarding CSR support the thesis that the brand perception and consumer behavior of the Slovene consumers correlate positively with the CSR activities of the organizations and that Si.mobil is on the right track with its CSR orientation which we have also confirmed for

FELU’s social responsibility activities. Research has shown that **students respond positively to socially responsible activities**. Their research has demonstrated that students at FELU **prefer services and products from socially responsible suppliers**, such as between buying intention (dependent metric variable) and attitude towards social responsibility (independent metric variables). Practical significance of the results was in the stated influence between attitude towards social responsibility and buying intentions from ecologically responsible suppliers. Therefore, it is stated that ecologically responsible suppliers can in their marketing efforts target people who are inclined toward socially responsible campaigns. They also concluded that advertising at ecological institutions (such as FELU is perceived by the students) and events are beneficial for ecological suppliers. The company Si.mobil is – by taking care of the wider environment in collaboration with employees and students at FELU – also taking care for future business since socially responsible students prefer buying from ecologically responsible suppliers.

The collaborative CSR partnership has two main strategic benefits:

1) Incorporation of CSR into education at FELU and everyday practice of staff and students is valuable for strengthening their multiple intelligence: logical-mathematical; musical; bodily-kinesthetic; linguistic; spatial; interpersonal; intrapersonal; naturalist; and existential intelligence as the members of the Eco team are free to demonstrate their social responsibility in any way appropriate.

The analysis confirmed that FELU and Si.mobil are perceived as socially responsible organizations through clear extraction of factors in four perspectives, as follows:

- 1) conceptual perspective** of social responsibility (concept of ecology and corporate social responsibility is worth investing in as it has impact on work satisfaction and customer loyalty)
- 2) individual perspective** of social responsibility (students were shown to be capable of proactive actions and producing actions that encourage social responsibility)

- 3) **institutional perspective** of social responsibility (both Si.mobil and FELU are perceived by students as socially responsible institutions)
- 4) **state perspective** of social responsibility (elements of ecology and social responsibility are widely appreciated and should therefore be incorporated in the state's politics agenda).

Eco-directed projects in student-employee teams, such as “Re.think”, offer educational experiences and possibilities to learn from the business community, promote mutual understanding and transfer of knowledge through service learning by designing the educational environment according to the theory of multiple intelligence and by promoting their different students’ interests and potentials, therefore, incorporating social responsibility in the everyday educational activities of the university.

All of the three hypotheses have proven to be positively correlated with the activities of the “Re.think” project. The “Re.think” project does not only strengthen CSR reputation of both organizations and fosters social responsibility awareness of the students at FELU, but also influences students’ behavior as potential consumers of Si.mobil products and services. Si.mobil’s business success of the past few years is in great parts based on these recently started CSR activities, including the “Re.think” project. Research results in this paper show that investments in CSR do pay off in the long run and are, therefore, a reasonable investment into the long-term existence of organizations in general.





3. From CSR to USR – a shift for university policy

In this chapter, we would like to show the shift from CSR to USR, the changing roles of universities towards society and thus reasons and arguments for engaging in USR for higher education institutions (3.1, 3.4 and 3.5). Also, we would like to apply social responsibility to the university context (3.2) and show the perceptions of employees towards USR (3.3). A key pioneer project about USR is summarized in 3.5 leading to a categorization system for USR practices.

3.1 The shift from CSR to USR

TEXT REFERENCE:

Shawyun, Teay; Al-Kaarni, Awad; Al-Shehri, Mansour; Al-Hamali, Rashid (2012). From CSR to USR: A strategic USR management framework. In: Anderson, Neil (ed.). Proceedings of the 7th QS-APPLE Conference Manila, 16th – 18th November, 2011, pp. 115-127.

OPEN ACCESS:

http://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/23111/1/qsapple_2011_proceedings_manila.pdf

The paper starts with CSR research and strategic management literature to make a case for USR. It answers the question how CSR can be applied to universities and how these can strategically manage USR.

There is a vast amount of research on CSR, about its benefits like increased market shares, public image increase, employee motivation, tax advantage and others, and it is generally acknowledged that CSR has different dimensions,

like an economic one, a moral dimension, and it involves stakeholders. Companies have various responsibilities, classified as:

- **Economic responsibility:** making an acceptable profit
- **Legal responsibility:** fulfilling the law and the social contract
- **Ethical responsibility:** having a concern for stakeholders and their rights, complying with ethical standards
- **Philanthropic responsibility:** contributing to civil society and the community

Still, however, there are unsolved issues in CSR management and research, and of course there are cross-cultural differences to CSR practices. Also, measuring CSR is a complex issue.

However, if universities are understood as organizations within society, CSR can be applied to them (USR). Universities' roles in society have shifted, as public funding has been decreasing in recent years, universities have

been more corporatized and must learn to deal with competitiveness through student mobility and a more dense offer of courses following the principle “education for all”. Therefore, the pressure for universities to apply USR has increased.

Reasons for universities to engage in USR are:

- Mass expansion of higher education
- Internationalization
- Student access and student mobility
- Decrease in public funding
- Commercialization of higher education
- Need for graduates to match the labor market

All these reasons contribute to universities’ having to shift their focus also towards society. What can be outputs of USR activities? Universities can be understood as communities of learners and scholars who pursue knowledge and lifelong learning, and are valued members of society.

Also, graduates should be socially responsible members of society. Universities can contribute to transforming communities and services to the community through their research. They are responsible for developing local human resources and nurture leaders with quality knowledge. Their responsibility also entails disseminating knowledge and learning within society. In a wider perspective they generate science, technology and arts which benefit society and strengthen social progress.

The state-of-the-art of USR practice in universities varies from university to university, but needs thorough planning and strategy management. Leaders need to take over responsibility for USR. The article suggests **three key actions:**

- Identify internal strengths and weaknesses in the university (human resources in staff, faculty and students, governance processes, educational processes, etc.)
- Determine societal requirements with stakeholders from outside the university
- Build capacities within the university for USR

3.2 CSR applied by the 10 top world universities

TEXT REFERENCE:

Nejati, Mehran; Shafaei, Azadeh; Salamzadeh, Yashar; Daraei, Mohammadreza (2011): Corporate social responsibility and universities: A study of top 10 world universities' websites. In: African Journal of Business Management Vol. 5(2), pp. 440-447.

OPEN ACCESS:

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1868688

There is a growing interest in social responsibility of the corporations among academicians and practitioners. Companies now are not only expected to be responsible to their shareholders but to society in general. Universities, as the centers of knowledge generation and sharing, play a very important role in solving world's problems by ensuring a sustainable tomorrow.

However, it is questionable whether world leading universities are concerned about CSR and if they do, to what extent they are committed to their social responsibilities. This paper elaborates on this issue by exploring the website content and annual reports of the world top 10 universities. This was done by using content analysis to analyze the websites of the top 10 world universities ranked by Times Higher Education in 2009. The study sample includes Harvard University (US), University of Cambridge (UK), Yale University (US), University College London (UK), Imperial College London (UK), University of Oxford (UK), University of Chicago (US), Princeton University (US), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (US), and California Institute of Technology (US).

The **findings of this research** show that world leading universities have all announced CSR/USR on their websites and are – to different extent – committed to their social responsibility. Their websites cover issues like “organizational governance”, “human rights”, “labor practices”, “environment” or “fair operating practices”.

2 of the 10 studied universities do not directly report involvement in the community as part of USR on their website. The rest, however, report this involvement through various activities such as providing grants for community projects, providing funding or support to affordable housing to low and middle-income residents, etc.

Also, the mission statements of the universities were studied and interestingly, most of the studied universities indicate their strategic mission and goal for sustainability and solving societal problems in their mission statements and other contents reported on their websites.

3.3 The perception of employees at universities towards CSR

TEXT REFERENCE:

McDonald, Fiona; Liebenberg Jacques (2006): The perceptions of employees in a private higher education institution towards corporate social responsibility, In: SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 2006, 4 (1), 27-35.

OPEN ACCESS:

www.sajhrm.co.za/index.php/sajhrm/article/download/83/83+&cd=4&hl=de&ct=clnk&gl=at

This article explores the perceptions employees of a private Higher Education Institution have of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Results were gathered from a selection of 19 employees at the organization, through in depth face-to-face interviews and one focus group. Results were substantiated across both groups. A brief analysis of secondary unsolicited data was conducted to further explore the organization's role in CSR.

In brief, the **objectives of the study** were:

- To determine the perceptions of the organization's employees in terms of what they believe CSR to be;
- To determine whether these are positive or negative perceptions;
- To determine whether perceptions differ across levels of employees in the organization.

For purposes of this research, the researcher provided the following definition of CSR to all participants: "For purposes of conceptualizing CSR, it can be seen as an **organization's pursuit of profit and economic progress by serving all its stakeholders** – government, employees, investors, customers and society, by maximizing the use of its profits for the advancement of all these stakeholders".

The **results of the study** show that the perceptions of CSR amongst the organization's employees differ significantly. There was a discrepancy as to how the participants

understood the concept of CSR. Very few participants had actually given some thought to the concept prior to the interview/focus group.

Furthermore, it has been observed that the organization does not have a dedicated CSR strategy guiding its CSR activities. CSR is also not mentioned in its overall strategic planning documentation. However, the organization embarked on a Values Charter planning project in 2003, out of which emerged a set of core values guiding all organizational behavior, planning and strategies. A list of values were identified by Executive staff, after which this list was presented to staff for the final decision. Staff voted on the values and Social Responsibility was identified as a core value for the organization.

Several themes were addressed around the organization's CSR activities and how staff perceived these. This was done to determine the culture of acceptance of CSR at the organization. All participants felt that the organization was engaged in good practices, but they agreed that there were

employees who feel that the investment should go to staff first, before the community is assisted.

From the results, the following three themes emerged as significant to the results:

- Definitions of CSR
- Perceptions of CSR in the country
- Participant's perception of the organization's role in CSR

The authors' final perceptions reveal that CSR is a concept that is not well understood, and thus the negative perceptions surrounding is asking for an explanation. The lack of awareness around this concept has highlighted the shortcomings of both government and the corporate sector, and the role they play in the CSR arena.

3.4 The necessity for multi-stakeholder governance in USR

TEXT REFERENCE:

Vidal, Isabel (2013): Reflexión sobre la Responsabilidad Social Universitaria, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4422.6009.

OPEN ACCESS:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Isabel_Martinez12/publications

The “University social responsibility” (USR) is a systemic concept that encompasses all the daily decisions made in faculties and research centers of a university. Regarding the higher education and research, social responsibility means taking into account the impact produced to society when making decisions. This book focuses on cooperation, the dialogue between academia and society, as a mechanism that can facilitate the transfer of knowledge from the university to companies and society.

The first section of this book relates the sustainable development strategy with the promotion of social responsibility by governments. In 1999 the EU formulated a strategy for sustainable development based on **four pillars (economy, society, environment and governance)** that should be mutually reinforcing.

To facilitate the implementation of a growth model based on sustainable development, the European Commission proposes a set of measures, some of them specific to a particular sector. For the European Commission, **universities must place special emphasis on providing training to the largest possible number of citizens** in order to encourage behavioral change and provide them the skills required to achieve the objectives set in the strategy for sustainable development. Moreover, **scientific and technical innovation** should also be promoted, in particular through framework programs for research and development, with the collaboration of the universities, research institutes, businesses and public authorities.

According to the definition made by the European Commission, “University’s social responsibility” is based on their impact on society. Following the approach of the EC (2011), CSR is the vector that guides university performance in the achievement of positive and growing impact on sustainable development. To obtain good performance and knowing what society expects of the university system, are necessary preconditions. Besides, in each area there are different needs and, therefore, specific expectations. Responding to society’s demands in each area reveals a

clear desire to share, cooperate and, ultimately, enter into a strategic alliance with stakeholders. Stakeholders are any group influencing or influenced by the organization's activity. The term "multi-stakeholder" makes reference to different stakeholders, each one of them with different aspirations and expectations regarding what they expect from the activity of the university.

As an example: Who are the **stakeholders** of a Science and Technology Park? The stakeholders of a Science and Technology Park can be public administrations, companies which use and rent their spaces and services, managers, employees, suppliers, new generations etc. The identification of stakeholders done by the managers of a Science and Technology Park is called map of stakeholders. Identifying stakeholders involves putting in place mechanisms that will enable those responsible for the Science and Technology Park to know who is influenced by its activities and to what extent. Some stakeholders are obvious, but others less so. In order to have a joint photograph of potential stakeholders, some companies produce regular **maps of their stakeholders**. This map is an **excellent management tool** to facilitate the dialogue with all relevant stakeholders and with the multi-stakeholder governance. What is the difference between dialogue with stakeholders and **multi-stakeholder governance**? The difference lies in the type of formalization and the involvement required in each case. When stakeholders have no right to vote would be preferable consider this relationship as dialogue with stakeholders, even when relationships are structured. However, when relationships are formalized by contract or agreement, and when stakeholders have a voice and vote in the governing bodies of the organization we will consider that the organization applies multi-stakeholder governance.

According to the European Commission the dialogue with stakeholders is an important tool to help the university system to achieve better social outcomes in the management of their resources and, as a result, they promote this dialogue. Dialogue means informing stakeholders about your decisions. Therefore, any strategic decision should be based on a scrutiny of the foreseeable consequences for different stakeholders. In order to help stakeholders in the

assessment of such consequences, the organization must prepare a report based on the triple bottom line: economic-financial, social and environmental results. The techniques for accountability are very diverse. The AA1000 standard (Institute of Social and Ethical Account Ability, ISEA, 1999) bases the rhythms of implementation of social responsibility based on dialogue with stakeholders. The main assumption is that the incorporation and advancement of the RS in management in, for example, a technology transfer center, must be the result of dialogue and networking with various stakeholders. It means that each technology transfer center begins its process and decides the rate of incorporation of social responsibility on the basis of reciprocal agreements between technology transfer center and its stakeholders. From this perspective and to measure the results of this networking, the AA1000 standard proposes to identify how the process of collaboration works and assess the benefits of such participation. To do this, the mentioned rule proposes that each technology transfer center that belongs to the system of creation and transfer of knowledge should develop a process of accountability about the process of informing its stakeholders. Besides the AA1000 standard notes that this **process of accountability** can be useful for the organization in support of its strategic and operational management.

Spanish universities have made a major effort to assess the performance of its resources using the Guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), which raises the need to inform about the relations and queries that the organization has had with its stakeholders. "Materiality" is one of the key concepts of the GRI Guidelines. Materiality means that the organization on the basis of its characteristics decides which issues are most relevant for the organization and reports about progress in their achievement.

Concluding, it should be noted that this book understands CSR as a strategy based on cooperation between universities and society. In order to reinforce this cooperation, society should have a greater and more effective participation in the governing bodies of universities and centers of creation and transmission of knowledge.

3.5 A European Framework for USR

TEXT REFERENCE:

Amorim, José Pedro; Arenas, Begoña; Burgos, Daniel; Borcos, Alina F.; Carrasco, Aurora; Carvalho, Lourenço X.; Coimbra, Joaquim Luís; Dima, Gabriel (Coord.); Don, R. Marjolein; Freires, Thiago; Loja, Ema; Martin, Brian; Menezes, Isabel; Negaiades, Aurora; Osuna López, María Del Carmen; Robles, José Manuel; Rodrigues, Fernanda (2015): University Social Responsibility: A Common European Reference Framework. Final Public Report of the EU-USR Project, 52709-LLP-2012-1-RO-ERASMUS-ESIN, February 2015.

OPEN ACCESS:

<http://www.eu-usr.eu/?p=607>

The EU-USR project, entitled “Comparative Research on the Social Responsibility of Universities in Europe and Development of a Community Reference Framework”, was carried out from 2012 to 2015 by the following partners: University Politehnica of Bucharest (Romania), Scierter CID (Granada/Spain), Universidad Internacional de La Rioja, S.A. (Logroño/Spain), Foundation University of Granada Enterprise (Granada/Spain), University of Porto (Portugal), MENON Network EEIG (Brussels/Belgium) and University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom).

Notwithstanding the emphasis given by all “the relevant supra-national bodies” to the social responsibilities of higher education, there was no “effective framework” in the context of the European Higher Education Area. So, the EU-USR project “was developed to fill this gap and to create a Community Reference Framework for University Social Responsibility across the EHEA” (Executive Summary). There have been, nonetheless, in the last two decades,

“(…) relevant efforts on the part of various international bodies, to clarify possible definitions, policies and practices that could be integrated under the umbrella term of USR. These include ISO 26000 (The International Standards Organisation’s ‘Guidelines on Social Responsibility’); the UNESCO 1998 ‘World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century’ reinforced in the UNESCO 2009 ‘Communique from the World Conference on Higher Education: The New Dynamics of Higher Education and Research for Societal Change and Development’; the Council of Europe’s 2006 ‘Declaration on the Responsibility of Higher Education for a Democratic Culture - Citizenship, Human Rights and Sustainability’; and the European Commission’s 2011 ‘Renewed EU Strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social

Responsibility.” (Amorim, Freires, Loja, Rodrigues, Coimbra & Menezes, 2015, p. 4).

Besides that, other proposals have emerged, namely in Latin America, such as the one from François Vallayes (see, for example, Vallayes, 2006, and Vallayes, Cruz & Sasia, 2009), and that from the Chilean project “Universidad Construye País” (see, for instance, Jiménez De La Jara, Fontecilla & Delpiano Troncoso, 2006).

With respect to the methodologies, the project encompassed desk-research identification and analysis of “interesting policy and practice in fifteen selected European countries”, interviews, focus groups and five benchmarking visits. This research-based process led to “an operational definition of university social responsibility (...), a directory of examples of interesting current practice and a set of Benchmark Standards” (Executive Summary).

Relying on “various sources”, USR was defined by the project team “as the responsibilities of universities for the impacts of their decisions and activities on society and the environment through transparent and ethical strategies” (Amorim, Freires, Loja, Rodrigues, Coimbra & Menezes, 2015, p. 4).

The thematic analysis of forty interesting practices, from fifteen European countries, revealed that

“(...) ‘community involvement and development’ is the most frequent focus of ten cases, including universities of northern, central, eastern and southern Europe. The second most frequent thematic focus is ‘the environment’, addressed by nine universities especially from central and southern Europe. ‘Human rights’ follows with eight projects mainly in southern universities, followed by seven projects on ‘organizational governance’. Practices in relation to ‘labour practices’, ‘fair operating practices’, ‘consumer issues’ and ‘policies related to gender equality’ were less frequent. Three universities from central Europe had USR curricula incorporating courses on Corporate Social Responsibility in their regular programmes.” (Freires, Amorim, Loja, Coimbra, Rodrigues & Menezes, 2015, p. 5)

With the basis provided by the research, the team proposed a “Common Reference Framework for University Social Responsibility across the European Higher Education Area”:

1. Research, Teaching, Support for Learning and Public Engagement

The institution’s core academic activities are underpinned by the values and principles of social responsibility. In order to ensure this, the institution:

- 1.1 Guarantees academic freedom for its staff and students.
- 1.2 Widens and diversifies access to education within a commitment to lifelong learning.
- 1.3 Manages student admissions in a transparent and equitable way, using explicit criteria to inform selection decisions, providing formative feedback to unsuccessful candidates.
- 1.4 Ensures that public funds provided to support teaching and student fees are used for the purpose for which they are provided.
- 1.5 Requires that its curricula are informed by socially responsible, ethical research and that its graduate attributes incorporate evidence-based thinking and decision-making, active citizenship and employability.
- 1.6 Adopts a learner-centered approach to teaching and student support, ensuring assessment and feedback is used to promote learning.
- 1.7 Facilitates collaborative and independent learning that goes beyond the classroom and into the community.
- 1.8 Enables international collaboration and supports student and staff cross-national mobility.
- 1.9 Enforces ethical protocols for research, teaching and related activities.
- 1.10 Facilitates dialogue between the research community, the public and policymakers to link research to ‘real world’ issues.
- 1.11 Improves its contribution to society through open access to research outcomes and its public engagement activities.

2. Governance

The principles of social responsibility are respected throughout institutional policy, strategy, procedures and processes. They permeate all levels, as an integral element of management accountability and stakeholder engagement.

The institution:

- 1.1 Encourages a culture of social responsibility with high ethical and professional standards and clear protocols to avoid conflict of interest.
- 1.2 Formally recognizes staff and student unions and involves them as partners in governance and decision-making, providing for their representation on the Board (or equivalent) and on its advisory committees.
- 1.3 Ensures that social responsibility is treated as a core commitment by the Board and senior management and that the institution's social responsibility performance is the focus for annual evaluative reporting.
- 1.4 Exercises due diligence by assessing the risk and impact of all activities, ensuring compliance with the law, relevant standards and norms.
- 1.5 Conducts ethical and socially responsible investment and procurement, with comprehensive public reporting of criteria and decisions.
- 1.6 Is a responsible neighbour, facilitating dialogue and working in partnership with and investing in the local community.
- 1.7 Recognizes its staff and student social responsibility initiatives through an internal reward scheme.
- 1.8 Actively participates in relevant social responsibility networks.
- 1.9 Reports on its progress towards clear and independently verified social responsibility and sustainability goals.
- 1.10 Publishes the outcomes of internal and external reviews, complaints, academic appeals and the source and use of all funding.

3. Environmental and Societal Sustainability

The institution is committed to environmental sustainability and biodiversity in all aspects of its operations, including in its use of goods, services and works and in its evaluation of decisions. It takes appropriate action to ensure that its commitments are realised and

- 2.1 Ensures its policies and practices minimise any negative impact on the environment caused by its activities or supply chain.
- 2.2 Promotes sustainable development.
- 2.3 Delivers a continuous improvement programme that works towards cleaner, sustainable, eco-efficient, resource efficient, zero waste and ethical operations including procurement.
- 2.4 Publishes regular environmental sustainability reports, incorporating risk and action assessments covering environmental, societal and supply chain risks.
- 2.5 Encourages the use of environmentally friendly technologies, and of energy efficient, reusable and biodegradable materials.
- 2.6 Practices socially responsible and sustainable procurement, publishes a code of ethical behaviour for procurement decision-making that includes workers' rights and fair trade principles and promotes social responsibility and sustainability wherever it has influence over the supply chain.
- 2.7 Ensures respect for and compliance with internationally proclaimed human rights, the rule of law and national and International anti-corruption requirements.
- 2.8 Ensures that all its International activities promote human and societal development and, where possible, help address the issues of poverty, quality of life, advance peace and promote conflict resolution.

4. Fair Practices

The institution ensures equality and fairness for its staff, students, and others as appropriate and its policies and procedures are intended to avoid discrimination or inequity.

The institution:

- 3.1 Promotes and celebrates pluralism and diversity, and ensures equality regardless of age, culture, ethnicity, gender or sexuality.
- 3.2 Practices open, transparent, fair and equitable recruitment and promotion of staff, using affirmative action where appropriate, providing comprehensive staff development that incorporates social responsibility.
- 3.3 Establishes through negotiation with staff unions comprehensive employee communication, consultation and negotiation protocols and implements these.
- 3.4 Promotes the health, safety, physical social and mental wellbeing of staff and students beyond minimum legal requirements.
- 3.5 Promotes equality of opportunity, guarantees equal, fair and just pay and equitable conditions, and proactively works to avoid inequality through flexible working and career development and progression opportunities.
- 3.6 Ensures that working conditions at least comply with relevant national laws, collective agreements and applicable International Labour Organisation standards and makes every effort to avoid casualisation of the workforce.
- 3.7 Guarantees freedom of association and respects collective bargaining.
- 3.8 Has transparent, fair and equitable complaints and disciplinary procedures and ensures that complaints and disciplinary matters are addressed swiftly and fairly.
- 3.9 Publishes the possible sanctions for a proven breach of ethical or related requirements and protects whistleblowers.

3.10 Provides professional support services to meet specific additional needs of students and staff as arising from a disability, for example.

3.11 Communicates with suppliers about its procurement policy and uses research to inform its procurement decisions" (Martin, 2015, pp. 12-14).

In sum, the project concludes that this (or other) framework must respect the contextual specificities of each institution, and that it should be used as a tool to improve the life of people (and not only inside the university), and never as fuel to rank universities across Europe, in particular to stress how "irresponsible" they might be:

"The findings from the desk and field research carried out in this project show clearly that professors, researchers, board members, staff, students and others all value and recognize the significance of USR, considering it as a central feature of the work of European Higher Education Institutions. Yet they also recognize that a further step has to be taken with regard to the development of policy and practice and that should take into account the specifics of each HEI, its context, history and mission. It is in this sense that we hope that our definition can inform and support HEIs in taking this step and positively impacting on the lives of students, teachers, staff and communities" (Amorim, Freires, Loja, Rodrigues, Coimbra & Menezes, 2015, p. 4).



4. USR – universities' engagement in the community

In this chapter, we would like to underline one aspect of USR: the engagement of universities and higher education institutions in the local community. The texts in this chapter give insight into this specific aspect of USR (4.1, 4.2, and 4.3) and adds on to the last two texts of the previous chapter about multi-stakeholder governance for universities (3.4) and USR practices (3.5). In the end of this chapter, we would like to look beyond the obvious – European development – and read into experiences from Australia with USR as well (4.3).

4.1 The third pillar of engagement in universities in Ireland

TEXT REFERENCE:

Munck, Ronaldo; McQuillan, Helen; Ozarowska, Joanna (2012): Civic Engagement in a Cold Climate: A Glocal Perspective, pp. 15-30.

OPEN ACCESS:

<https://www4.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/community/docs/Chapter1.pdf>

This chapter presents both the challenges and the opportunities facing civic engagement in an age of austerity when universities are coming under increasing pressure to become more business oriented. The authors assert that civic engagement becomes even more important for higher education in a period of austerity.

Therefore, there is a greater need for clarity in conceptualizing and embedding civic engagement in not only our institutions but also in the wider community. “Glocal” for the authors is a key concept to understand civic engagement for the university in our current environment. Glocal refers to a locally embedded while at the same time globalized university; “where the global meets the local”.

In essence, this chapter is comprised of two core sections. Firstly, the importance of **global contexts within which universities operate is examined** and a call to carefully consider the politics of scale is recommended. The second focus is on national meditations and in the section “Local Settings” **a case study of civic engagement within North Dublin is depicted.**

To fully grasp the complexity of the global domain and how we can respond innovatively to it, it is necessary to develop a better understanding of the scales of human activity. The authors believe that the overriding trend within the civic engagement literature operates within a rather restrictive, and arguably ethnocentric, paradigm rooted in 1950s post war United States understanding of the university. Instead, the authors argue there is a need to develop an integrated framework that describes not only the expansion of market forces over the last 25 years but also the social reaction toward it. The optic of Karl Polanyi (2000) writing toward the end of World War II is suggested as a helpful starting point, an example being his explanation of globalization as “one big self-regulating market”.

In current university management and strategy marketization it is also a prominent feature. Marketization which has driven the World Trade Organization’s TRIPS (trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights) agenda and the World Bank’s “reform” agenda focused largely around the self-financing of higher education.

The section ends with the thought provoking question: If civic engagement is part of a Polanyian social counter-movement, how can it reconcile that role with the new academic capitalism, which is the dominant ethos of the contemporary university?

The second section of this chapter addresses the more in-depth of the two investigates Ireland as an example of a small nation-state that shifted in the 1950s from a national development model toward ‘enthusiastic accommodation within the new world order’. Ireland has experienced extreme social and economic highs and lows especially over the last 10–15 years, fluctuating from postcolonial stupor to dynamic European Union (EU) success story and back again to a very fragile and dependent state. During this time Ireland for most of the 2000s ranked as the most “globalized” country in the world. A key factor in this economic boom and bust was the housing prices which, between 2008 and 2010, lost 40% of their value.

The **impact for universities** the authors argue was loss of their reputation for well-paid public sector employment, as became subjected to a quite draconian Employment Control Framework that was meant to achieve “more for less” from the higher education sector.

Despite being in the midst of recession in 2011 the Irish government opted to progress with the establishment the **National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030**. A concern for the authors is that this strategy replaced the concept that the university is a place where creative knowledge is generated, to a state-led coordination. This shift leads they believe to an overwhelming **focus on marketization through internationalization** (attracting fee-paying overseas students) and **knowledge transfer** through the **commercialization of research**.

The authors are critical of the reports shortage of references to ‘equality’; 3 mentions versus 40 references to ‘enterprise’. However they do welcome the Strategy’s recommendation that a **new third ‘pillar of engagement’** should join the traditional university activities of research and teaching.

To understand fully the concept of engagement the authors assert that visualizing engagement as interactions is helpful. For example, they suggest interactions be considered with distinct sectors of society such as with the university itself, with enterprise and with the wider community. In their view, each should be closely examined as interrelated sets of activities not separated out.

Engagement works best, in Irish universities when guided by clear social and economic priorities be they national/and or regional. Results from **Campus Engage survey** where 75 % of respondents found a moderate or strong acknowledgment of community engagement in their institutions, but far fewer found that it was embedded in terms of management structures (Lyons and McIlrath, 2011) is given as evidence of the unrealized potential for establishing academic – community partnerships. Ultimately, the authors believe that community engagement has the potential to be at the very least complementary to the marketization strategy.

In their final subsection “Local settings” the authors state that “global” and the “local” should be complementary to each other, and create linkages and dialogical relationships with other universities and their localities. Dublin City University (DCU), is given as an example of this in action as it is represented on the board of a large number of local agencies and organizations including a regional think-and-do tank (NoDubCo), and an environmental nongovernmental organization (NGO) in its immediate area. DCU has achieved its success in its commitments to civic engagement they believe because it is socially embedded, a “grounded global university”. However the authors warns against loss of its social relevance and neglecting a commitment to academic citizenship.



4.2 Managing the university community

TEXT REFERENCE:

Conraths, Bernadette; Trusso, Annamaria (2007): Managing the university community: exploring good practice. European University Association

OPEN ACCESS:

http://www.eua.be/typo3conf/ext/bzb_securelink/pushFile.php?cuid=400&file=fileadmin/user_upload/files/Publications/Managing_the_University_Community.pdf.

Comprised of a selection of institutional case-studies and plenary contributions the text aims to provide leadership teams of higher education institutions with a set of inspiring and concrete suggestions for developing autonomous, effective and innovative institutions.

This publication contains the condensed results of a EUA project, partly supported by the European Commission, which started in 2003. It is designed to contribute to this process by enhancing and strengthening the professional leadership

and management competence in European higher education institutions, with particular regard to their European and international context and strategic goals.

In order to broaden the expert pool and to develop European learning platforms complementary to national provision, EUA collaborated with two partners: the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, LFHE, UK and the Centre for Science and Research Management, ZWM, Germany.

The learning gathered during this project through a series of eight workshops and seminars addressing different leadership levels in the higher education institutions is collated in this publication. These activities were guided by four principles:

- 1)** good practice and innovation exchange (**'how to'**)
- 2)** case based learning transfer (**'hands-on'**)
- 3)** international network platform (**'peers learning'**)
- 4)** mix of academic and administrative decision-makers (**'bridging the gap'**)

Chapter 1 addresses the topic of change management and gives a new meaning to leadership in autonomous universities. The strategic and systemic change management is explored and in particular the role of university presidents is examined with a case study of the University of Hamburg in Germany. Approaches to implementing change of roles is discussed and the University of Trento offers an example. From a UK perspective, the University of Manchester is presented as an example of managing a merger and Allan Schofield broadly examines developments in UK governance in higher education institutions.

Further examples from Catholic University of Leuven/Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School, Belgium; University of Aix-Marseille, France; University College Dublin, Ireland are presented.

The second half of Chapter 1 is dedicated to exploring the perspective and impact of internationalization for managing the university community and whether individual universities have a voice within the EU governance debates and policy implementation or not. Developing and Implementing European and International Strategies to ensure individual universities are represented in Brussels is debated and the University of Newcastle, UK, is presented as a case study.

Chapter 2 turns its attention to **Research Management**, the concept of science management and the challenge of developing an interdisciplinary research strategy, funding approaches are discussed and Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona is presented as a case study. Some innovative initiatives that promote interdisciplinary research are explored with example from ETH Zurich in Switzerland.

In the second half this chapter the role of Graduate Schools in Europe is assessed in terms of how they can enhance university research, firstly a case study of The University of Helsinki, Finland, is illustrated. Next the experience of doctoral schools at the University Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France over a period of four years is evaluated.

Finally, Imperial College London is presented as an example of effective management of Graduate School development.

Further examples include, Ruhr University Bochum, Germany, and European University Institute, Florence Italy.

The third and final Chapter of this publication, is entitled “General Management: New Territories and Tools” and debates the **necessity for management processes** in higher education and the value of working with and adhering to key performance indicators at all institutional levels. A US perspective is shared highlighting the critical need for performance indicators to measure what individual institutions value and for this to be clearly and openly communicated to its community.

The final contribution to the publication is a case study from the University of Edinburgh outlining and justifying its choice in the **performance indicator Balanced Score Card** method. Since 2002, the University of Edinburgh has been using a Balanced Scorecard to measure institutional performance. This case study explains why the University adopted this approach, and how the Scorecard is used within the University. It outlines the measures initially used, and how these have been revised over time both in response to performance on individual measures and to represent a more strategic approach currently undertaken to set institutional targets.

4.3 What we can learn from Australian USR strategies?

TEXT REFERENCE:

Sunderland, Naomi; Muirhead, Bruce; Pasrons, Richard; Holtom, Duncan (2004): The Australian Consortium on Higher Education, Community Engagement and Social Responsibility, Prepared by the Australian Consortium Project Centre at the University of Queensland's "Boilerhouse" Community Service and Research Centre, Foundation paper: February 2004.

OPEN ACCESS:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37616950_Foundation_Paper_The_Australian_Consortium_on_Higher_Education_Community_Engagement_and_Social_Responsibility

Community engagement

The purpose of this paper was to begin a discussion regarding core conceptual and theoretical tools which informs the research agenda of the Australian Consortium on Higher

Education, Community Engagement, and Social Responsibility (henceforth 'The Australian Consortium').

With the community engagement movement Australia has seen a renewed interest in the **role of the university as an agent of community and regional [re]development**. The prescription that a university should network not only with industry partners but also with communities at local, state, national, and international level has gained primacy in higher education policy over traditional conceptions of academic freedom and the university as a province in and of itself.

The push for universities to engage with, and be directly responsive to, communities at local, state, national and international level has had varying responses from universities and the academia to date. Community engagement has the potential to be controversial precisely because it appears to be more specific, prescriptive, and immediate than traditional calls for universities to practice a generic 'civic responsibility'.

University community engagement

Initial literature and policy reviews have thrown up claims on what community engagement is and involves – some old and some new. The first point to note in defining community engagement is that different practitioners and advocates of community engagement advance different definitions and interpretations of their contexts, processes, frameworks and strategies - many of them permissible, but none completely definitive.

- The first vision of community engagement frames community engagement as an **irreducible and unavoidable element of existing university activities**. This conceptualization of community engagement assumes that all research and teaching ultimately involves engagement with the community, whether it is direct or indirect and whether the impact is social, economic or cultural.
- The second vision of community engagement sees community engagement **as a separate and predominantly voluntary activity** for academics, in much the same way that “service” is currently viewed in Australian universities.
- A third vision of community engagement is referred to as the **“engaged university”**. This approach regards **community engagement and service as a central overriding goal of higher education**, arguing that it should be embedded within all teaching, learning and research functions.
- They suggested a fourth vision of **community engagement as friendship** that will potentially overcome a “university-centric” view. They see this kind of friendship being realized in a range of university – community engagement activities which are explicitly geared toward local community (re)development and social justice outcomes.

Universities serve a particular role in society to actively and deliberately guide and shape the learnings of their students as future professionals and citizens. When a university actively engages with its community, its responsibilities in this area become simultaneously more complex and widespread.

The authors of this paper proceed from the assumption that community engagement has the distinct potential to open university structures and processes to provide incentives and rewards for researchers and community members alike to practice non-traditional ways of doing research, teaching, and service. But while they do acknowledge and foreground this potential, they emphasize that community engagement, like any practice, has the potential to cause harm, to breed cynicism, to silence voices, to privilege certain actors, and to marginalize others. They argue that **university community engagement** practices must be informed and rigorously critiqued not only by members of the academy, but also by practitioners in areas such as community development, social policy, social responsibility, ethics, and social justice. They invite their collaborating researchers and partners to think, write, and speak about how this level of critical responsiveness in engagement might be achieved over the next three years and beyond.

The point to note in terms of engagement is that, to be successful, the philosophies and methods of community engagement and social responsibility must be ensconced not only in the strategic mission of universities, but also in their partnerships with external others.

Engaging for sustainability and social responsibility:
Evaluating universities’ engagement within society and the environment

They posit that the concepts and practices of sustainability and social responsibility provide one way to explore the ‘ethicality’ of universities’ and other large organizations’ engagements with their surrounding communities and environments. The concepts of sustainability and social responsibility have only recently permeated mainstream organizational thinking. Today the concepts of social responsibility and sustainability involve taking a ‘stakeholder view’ of an organization, and understanding the organization’s responsibilities to those stakeholders.

Many organizations find the concept and practice of engagement to be the most challenging aspect of implementing sustainability preferring to focus on the

more 'tangible' processes, such as identifying indicators and 'measuring' performance. In a social responsibility and sustainability context, 'engagement' implies building relationships with stakeholders. An organization's stakeholders are those who affect, and/or are affected by, the organization's activities. This includes communities at both local and international levels. Organizations increasingly recognize that, at least potentially, stakeholders have influence over them.

Recent research found that barriers to practicing sustainability in Australian universities include a lack of unified or coordinated effort, insufficient cross-institutional synergy, and a lack of committed leadership. Too often, sustainability initiatives are driven by lone individuals, meaning that the initiative leaves when that individual leaves.

Key findings

- **Engagement is a fundamentally dynamic and relational process** (Engagement, like community itself, is a dynamic and ongoing process. Engagement happens between people – not in individuals alone – and hence is inherently relational.)
- **Engagement “happens” at multiple levels of human organization and in multiple settings in and over time** (Community engagement can happen between two individual people; between an individual and a social groups such as a community group or an institution; between two or more social groups; between communities, nations, or continents; or any other combination of the preceding categories.)
- **Community engagement can be both formal and purposeful and informal and unrecognized.** (Both formal and informal engagements need to be identified, evaluated, and practiced with equally high levels of critical social responsibility and ethical responsiveness, particularly where universities and other social institutions such as governments are in an obvious position of power.)
- **The contexts of community engagement shape the nature of engagement which is possible and**





acceptable within those contexts (=contextual “codes of engagement”)

(Universities and government departments have a range of traditional and emerging genres for the ways they engage with communities and external others.)

- **All human relationships and engagements involve a political and an ethical dimension** (Social responsibility and sustainability are two particular ways of framing the link between power and responsibility in university-community engagement.)
- **Engagement is a fundamentally educative practice** (Engagement is a fundamentally educative practice, one that is central to our understanding of ourselves and of others.)
- **Humans and human social systems are embedded within, and hence are engaged inevitably with, ecological systems** (In pursuing a research agenda on higher education, community engagement, and social responsibility, social responsibility also entails a dimension of environmental responsibility because the two spheres (social and environmental) are necessarily entwined.)
- **Community engagement can be a means to an end, an end in itself, or both** (Community engagement is not always inherently good in and of itself, particularly if the outcomes of the processes are not seen to be beneficial, equitable, authentic, or relevant to community participants. Community engagement can be beneficial in and of itself if it enhances community wellbeing and/or social capital, purely through the process of it happening, regardless of any subsequent effect or outcome. Community engagement can also be a means to an end, in the sense that it can be a process, a framework, or an underlying principle, for achieving a desired social outcome, which preferably is defined collectively by various participants in the engagement experience.)

5. Conclusions for universities

The mission of the **»University Meets Social Responsibility« (UNIBILITY)** partnership is the promotion of university's social responsibility (USR) among European universities and other higher education institutions that seek to promote social responsibility. The UNIBILITY-project focuses on the relationship of universities and the local community, regional stakeholders, civic engagement and other activities relating to external university contexts. Therefore, these texts were prioritized in this Reader.

Any university, whether private or public, wants to explore its full range of purposes in higher education and its impact on society. Universities want to consider societal, environmental, legal, cultural, political and organizational diversity as well as differences in economic conditions in the framework of their teaching and research. If universities are understood as organizations within society, Corporate Social Responsibility (→ CSR) can be applied to them (→ USR). However, universities' roles in society have shifted, as public funding has been decreasing in recent years, universities have been more corporatized and must learn to deal with competitiveness and show how their research impacts their

stakeholders. Universities are more and more understood as agents of change, and of community and regional [re] development. Therefore, the pressure for universities to apply and measure USR has increased. It is generally recommended to follow these four action points:

- Identify internal strengths and weaknesses within the university (research, human resources in staff, faculty and students, governance processes, educational processes, etc.)
- Determine societal requirements with stakeholders from outside the university
- Build capacities for USR within the university
- Actively work on reducing barriers for USR within the university

Without stakeholders Universities' social responsibility (USR) cannot take place. Identifying stakeholders involves putting in place mechanisms that will enable those responsible for teaching and research to know who is influenced by these activities and to what extent.

Some stakeholders are obvious, but others less so. In order to have a joint strategy of potential stakeholders, universities or faculties/institutes should develop maps of their stakeholders as management tools to facilitate the dialogue with all relevant stakeholders and as the basis for multi-stakeholder governance.

Summary of statements

- Both CSR and USR can be applied in different degrees of depth and detail.
- Universities' social responsibility (USR) cannot happen without teaching and research at university; social responsibility is not a separate ("third") task of universities but is interlinked with the former two.
- Universities' social responsibility is a fundamentally educative and inclusive practice when it involves citizens, learners or stakeholders in cooperation with staff, researchers and teachers.
- Universities must avoid falling into the trap of turning social responsibility into another standardized policy they have to follow, and which is measured, audited and controlled according to specific requirements. The key aspect of USR is the awareness of the impact that research and teaching have and the desire to have as much of a positive impact on stakeholders as possible.
- USR is a central component of institutional practice and should be documented strategically and systematically.
- Universities' social responsibility can be both formal and purposeful or informal and unrecognized. The main need is to find a documentation practice which corresponds to defined criteria.
- Each university has to define their areas and focus of USR practice and its (yearly) focus, as USR is a broad topic ("puzzle"). Many activities contribute to reaching the overarching objective of socially responsibly governance within the higher education institution and socially responsible action towards stakeholders.
- USR practices are fundamentally dynamic and relational processes.

6. References

- Amorim, José Pedro; Arenas, Begoña; Burgos, Daniel; Borcos, Alina F.; Carrasco, Aurora; Carvalho, Lourenço X.; Coimbra, Joaquim Luís; Dima, Gabriel; Don, R. Marjolein; Freires, Thiago; Loja, Ema; Martín, Brian; Menezes, Isabel; Negaides, Aurora; Osuna López, María Del Carmen; Robles, José Manuel; Rodrigues, Fernanda (2015): University Social Responsibility: A Common European Reference Framework. Final Public Report of the EU-USR Project, 52709-LLP-2012-1-RO-ERASMUS-ESIN, February 2015 [available versions also in Portuguese, Spanish, French and Romanian, HYPERLINK "<http://www.eu-usr.eu/?p=607>" <http://www.eu-usr.eu/?p=607>].
- Conraths, Bernadette; Trusso, Annamaria (2007): Managing the university community: exploring good practice. European University Association. International Standards' Organisation Guidance on Social Responsibility, ISO26000, 2010.
- McDonald, Fiona; Liebenberg, Jacques (2006): The perceptions of employees in a private higher education institution towards corporate social responsibility, In: SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 2006, 4 (1), 27-35.
- McQuillan, Helen; Ozarowska, Joanna (2012): Civic Engagement in a Cold Climate: A Glocal Perspective Ronaldo Munck, pp. 15-30.
- Nejati, Mehran; Shafaei, Azadeh; Salamzadeh, Yashar; Daraei, Mohammadreza (2011): Corporate social responsibility and universities: A study of top 10 world universities' websites. In: African Journal of Business Management Vol. 5(2), pp. 440-447.
- Peterlin, Judita; Dimovski, Vlado; Uhan, Miha; Penger, Sandra (2011): Re.Thinking the Corporate Social Responsibility in Slovenia: Empirical Evidence, In: Ekonomska Istraživanja, 24:4, DOI: 10.1080/1331677X.2011.1151748 Journal Article; pp.126 -142.
- Porter, Michael E.; Kramer, Mark R. (2011): Creating shared value – how to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. In: Harvard Business Review, January-February 2011.
- Schimanski, Caroline (2013): An Analysis of Policy References made by large EU Companies to Internationally Recognised CSR Guidelines and Principles, European Commission.
- Shawyun, Teay; Al-Kaarni, Awad; Al-Shehri, Mansour; Al-Hamali, Rashid (2012): From CSR to USR: A strategic USR management framework. In: Anderson, Neil (ed.). Proceedings of the 7th QS-APPLE Conference Manila, 16th – 18th November, 2011, pp. 115-127.
- Sunderland, Naomi; Muirhead, Bruce; Pasrons, Richard; Holtom, Duncan (2004): The Australian Consortium on Higher Education, Community Engagement and Social Responsibility, Prepared by the Australian Consortium Project Centre at the University of Queensland's "Boilerhouse" Community Service and Research Centre, Foundation paper: February 2004.
- Vidal, Isabel (2013): Reflexión sobre la Responsabilidad Social Universitaria, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4422.6009.

7. Key terms

- University social responsibility (USR)
- Corporate social responsibility (CSR)
- Universities
- Higher education institutions
- Social impact
- University-business cooperation
- Social dimension
- Civic engagement
- Third mission
- Social action
- Corporate citizenship
- Stakeholder engagement / dialogue
- Sustainable development
- Multi-stakeholder governance
- Internal and external impact

8. Critical thinking questions

1. Which definitions of social responsibility can be found in the different texts? What do they convey about the topic?
2. Which policy documents were important for the emergence of USR in Europe? Why?
3. What are the main reasons for universities to engage in USR?
4. Why is it important to identify and involve stakeholders in USR practice? Argue why and how you would involve stakeholders and name first steps.
5. Which four forms of community engagement of universities do you know? Argue the pros and cons of each of the four forms.



This project has been funded with support
from the European Commission.
This publication reflects the views only of
the authors, and the Commission cannot
be held responsible for any use which may
be made of the information
contained therein.