CHALLENGING THE "APARTHEIDS" OF KNOWLEDGE

in Higher Education through Social Innovation

Joana Bezerra, Craig Paterson & Sharli Paphitis (Eds)

Chapter 14

Facilitating Local Social Innovation by Appreciating Glocal Community–Higher Education Partnerships

Deidré van Rooyen and Karen Venter

CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT;
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT,
UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE

griesd@ufs.ac.za

1. Introduction

Across the globe, the reality of unmet human needs (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2015) in greater society remains a challenge. Often, it is a lack of quality education that hinders sustainable development in society. However, scholars such as Cooperrider, Whitney and Stavros (2008), who work from an appreciative perspective, would rather reframe the previous statement, namely that quality education can facilitate (Fredrickson, 2006; Seligman, 2010) the wellbeing of people and the planet and profit-making (Whitney, Trosten-Bloom & Rader, 2010). By making use of PERMA (positive emotion, engagement, relationship, meaning-making and accomplishment), people can contribute to a positive society (Seligman, 2010).

To enable the delivery of quality education, Boyer (1990, 1996) advised scholars in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to become responsive towards societal challenges by revisiting their scholarship. By making use of four interlocking scholarly functions, namely discovery, integration, knowledge sharing and application, scholars and practitioners can deliver an integrated and engaged

scholarship (Sandmann, Saltmarsh & O'Meara, 2016). Zuber-Skerritt, Wood and Louw (2015:3) also advised scholars to follow a participatory paradigm of engaged scholarship towards rendering a "holistic and actively engaged scholarship that integrates the three core functions of higher education – teaching-learning, research and community engagement."

In the same manner as Boyer, the South African government called upon scholars in HEIs to become responsive to pressing social challenges and engage in their surrounding communities (Republic of South Africa (RSA), Education White Paper 3, 1997). However, it seems that the ideal practice of engaged scholarship remains at the margins of some HEIs (Albertyn & Daniels, 2009; Council of Higher Education (CHE), 2016; Erasmus, 2014; Petersen & Osman, 2013).

One of the reasons for the marginalisation of engaged scholarship is a lack of available funding for enabling inquiry with the community (Kearney, Wood & Zuber-Skerritt, 2013; Wood, Louw & Zuber-Skerritt, 2017; Zuber-Skerritt *et al.*, 2015). This challenge has opened the agenda for scholars to establish a partnership project, named Common Good First, funded by the European Union and the Erasmus+ Programme. The aim of the project is to support and grow the emerging South African social innovation sector by creating a digital network through Common Good First for connecting social change champions and HEIs around the world.¹ This funding opened doors for capturing and showcasing innovative social impact in existing community–higher education partnerships (CHEPs).

As a result, not only local, but also global partnerships have been established to enable scholars and practitioners to augment their responsibility for engaged scholarship. On the basis of their experience of more than ten years in community engagement, three engaged scholars who serve as key role players in the project at the University of the Free State (UFS), South Africa, formed a core CHEP to conduct an Appreciative Inquiry (AI). The question that defined the inquiry was: *How can we facilitate local social innovation by appreciating glocal community–higher education partnerships?* By making use of a semi-structured triad appreciative conversation, the scholars co-discovered their best practices, character strengths and positive values. The discovery of this positive core served as a foundation for collectively designing a strategy to facilitate the establishment and development of two digital storytelling labs.

The scholars applied PALAR (Zuber-Skerritt *et al.*, 2015) to advance social change. It is argued that PALAR can facilitate the co-construction and generation of knowledge (Bushe, 2007; Gergen & Gergen, 2008) to provide a preferred future for the common good of the greater society. It is suggested that collaborative

1 www.commongoodfirst.com

inquiry for learning in a CHEP should start with the identification of a relevant societal challenge and end with the dissemination of the knowledge generated (Tandon, Singh, Clover & Hall, 2016). Furthermore, the outcomes of the research should generate user-centred knowledge to influence policy and to develop the capacity of scholars and practitioners. The aim of such collaborative inquiry is to sustain the ability of all the participants in a CHEP for improving their current practice.

Here, the theme of social innovation for advancing transdisciplinary inter-institutional and glocal networking can be fostered to inform future inquiry. Such learning can also stimulate and sustain diversity, social inclusion and citizenship (Elliot, 2013). Moreover, when the positive design and methodology of AI (Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008; Stavros, Godwin & Cooperrider, 2016) is applied to guide the scholarship of engagement, PALAR is placed in a positive context. The application of PALAR calls participants to continuously and critically reflect on the quality of their practice for enabling holistic (affective, social and cognitive) and emergent professional learning and development (Zuber-Skerritt *et al.*, 2015) in a CHEP.

Therefore, in this chapter we will illustrate how a positive scholarship of engagement can be enhanced through the establishment of local and global CHEPs for networking. Firstly, the reader will be informed as to what is meant by the concepts 'facilitate', 'PERMA' and 'scholarship of engagement'. The essence of funding for community engagement projects will be discussed, with a focus on glocal partnership building to advance social innovation. Local social innovation projects are highlighted within the global Common Good First project. Lastly, the findings of the above-mentioned inquiry will be shared as a strategy to guide holistic learning in a CHEP, with the intent to stimulate the growth of a project beyond sustainability. Here, the concept of emergent learning will be discussed (Taylor, 2011).

2. Imagining a positive future in which societal wellbeing flourishes

Leaders from across the globe united with the hope to inquire on how to create a better future for a human and non-human society (UNDP, 2015). However, it seems that scholarly inquiry mostly focuses on minimising the challenges in society, rather than focusing on imagining and generating a "positive human future" (Seligman, 2010:231).

When engaged scholars work from a positive framework, the intent is to facilitate the growth of society beyond sustainability. Such a positive intent can

contribute towards creating a common good for all. In fact, if the focus falls on enabling conditions for people, the planet and the economy, the positive side of life can be built through application of the acronym 'PERMA' (Seligman, 2010). When PERMA is applied, the aim is to create conditions in which humans can flourish by finding sources for (1) more positive emotion, (2) more engagement with people we care for, (3) building better relationships with people, (4) finding more meaning in life, and (5) creating more positive accomplishments. In summary, a flourishing human system portrays positive social change as a result of collective action, which in turn brings goodness, generativity, growth, and resilience (Fredrickson, 2006) into society.

Thus, when scholars and practitioners (hereafter referred to as scholar-practitioners) engage for collective inquiry on a topic from an appreciative stance (Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008), positive learning and development occur at the 'heart' of an organisation or a partnership. Here, the positive core of the whole system is discovered to create an awareness of the collective thoughts, habits and actions of participants. Such inquiry can allow for appreciation of human connectivity and collaboration in a CHEP to become "universes of strengths" (Stavros *et al.*, 2016:97) for enabling scholar-practitioners to develop a positive scholarship of engagement.

3. A positive scholarship of engagement

When scholar-practitioners engage for inquiry in the community, resources should be shared, and knowledge exchanged in order to address the most pressing social, public and ethical challenges in society (Boyer, 2016; RSA, 1997).

From a positive PALAR perspective, it can be argued that personal and practical wisdom (Taylor, 2011) emerges from participants' knowledge sharing and experiential learning in a CHEP. Hence, it can be anticipated that positive practical learning "gives life" (Stavros *et al.*, 2016:97) to pure scientific theoretical assumptions. In the whole system of a CHEP, engagement in collaborative learning (community and scholarly) occurs when participants connect to co-generate socially innovative ideas. Then, positive theory becomes grounded in best practices for humans (Grieten, Lambrechts, Bouwen, Huybrechts, Fry & Cooperrider, 2017) by discovering the positive core of participants, which leads to the development of caring human capitalism.

Therefore, as a global movement in support of engaged universities, the Talloires Network (2018) envisions HEIs around the world becoming "a vibrant and dynamic force in their societies, incorporating civic engagement and community service into their research and teaching mission". Inspired by the global

vision, engagement embraces an integrated reciprocal, two-way exchange (Sandman, 2008) of resources between communities and HEIs, within the context of CHEPs.

After more than 20 years since the birth of democracy in South Africa, scholars now need to critically analyse the public educational service rendered by HEIs. With a focus on the history and current practice as it is, scholars can re-imagine and plan for decisive actions to improve educational practices for the future. Such appreciative reflection can lead to a better understanding of the whole system.

In their pursuit of strengthening sources of income, HEIs mostly focus on pure scientific research to address the important gaps needed for the advancement of future economic wellness in society. However, such research often only offers ideal theoretical frameworks as solutions and fails to discover the potential of existing social innovations created amongst and by communities themselves (the heart of human capital).

On the other hand, by assessing the positive core of people at the heart of society and creating common awareness of challenges, policy can be informed to make the necessary choices needed to ensure the creation of an ideal future. Here, the South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum played a pivotal role over the past nine years in facilitating debate, informing policy, networking and expanding the existing knowledge base of engaged scholarship.

Therefore, engaged scholarship has been recognised in South Africa. Since 1997, HE scholar-practitioners aimed to establish community engagement and service-learning initiatives at their different institutions. Engaged scholarship foregrounds the knowledge developed for a public purpose. It involves (1) discovery that mimics pure research but pushes back the "frontiers of human knowledge" (Boyer, 2016:21); (2) application of knowledge to address societal issues; and (3) knowledge sharing and exchange to facilitate collective learning. The scholarship of engagement requires scholars who continuously reflect critically on their practice and act as members of society who commit themselves to develop knowledge for the wellbeing of society, rather than for their own sake (Checkoway, 2013).

This is why, in 2010, Prof Mabel Erasmus from the service-learning division at the office of Community Engagement at the UFS applied for funding from the NRF to support the initiative called *Knowledge as enablement: NPO focus (2011 – 2013)* (Erasmus, 2014). This initiative aimed to establish a long-term collaborative research platform for the reciprocal building, sharing and utilisation of knowledge, used for mutual enablement and capacity building between a limited number of HEIs, a selection of participants from the NPO sector and

relevant public sector role players. By publishing *Knowledge as enablement: Engagement between higher education and the third sector in South Africa* (an edited scholarly book by Erasmus and Albertyn (2014)), this project laid the foundation for community engagement research in the Free State Province.

In the same way, Prof Annemarie Joubert from the Faculty of Health Sciences, School of Nursing, UFS (Mulder, 2016) applied for funding in the NRF Community Engagement Programme (2015 – 2017) for the *Knowledge sharing through rural-based health dialogue in action project* (NRF, 2015/2016). Venter, Holtzhausen and Erasmus (2018) established that long community–higher education partnerships are fundamental to growing community engagement. Taking these two examples of case studies into consideration, the assumption seems clear that funding plays a prominent role in developing flourishing partnerships.

4. Funding through partnerships

The question is what sources of funding are available in South Africa and abroad to assist and develop engaged scholarship. In 2016, the Glasgow Caledonian University in Scotland partnered with six South African and six European universities in a three-year (2016 – 2019) programme, the Erasmus+ Funding Programme of the United Union (European Commission, n.d.). The partnership manifested the Common Good First project that created a digital network to identify, showcase and connect social innovation projects in South Africa to one another and to universities around the world for research, community engagement and teaching-learning. Apart from building a digital platform, the team collected 100 social innovation profiles from CHEPs across South Africa. To make the Common Good First funded storytelling lab at the UFS worthwhile and sustainable, the office of Community Engagement partnered with the team members from the Centre for Development Support to form part of the Common Good First project.

Thirty social innovation profiles of partnerships were compiled in the Free State Province. Furthermore, Venter *et al.*, (2018) shared that there is a need for reciprocal and inclusive capacity building for all stakeholders (internal and external) involved in CHEPs. Thus, to continue with the excellent foundation that was laid for CHEPs since 2011 at the UFS, in line with the opportunity that Common Good First (middle-2016 – 2019) has created, a positive engaged scholarship through social innovation within glocal community–higher education partnerships was spawned.

A partnership is an alliance between two or more organisations that commit themselves to work together towards a common goal, share risks and benefits and review the partnership when necessary (UFS, 2006). At the heart of a good

partnership are relationships characterised by values such as closeness, equity and integrity (Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2009). Scholar-practitioners engaged in long-term partnerships need to establish strategies for extending and developing social networks that would facilitate learning and development. Such networking will depend on the "context, goals and needs" of all partners in the partnership (Bringle *et al.*, 2009:15).

Therefore, building on the previous principles to guide knowledge sharing in CHEPs, the four Cs of "connection, collaboration, continuous communication and change" (Venter, Erasmus & Seale, 2015:157) have already created meaningful conversations and relationships. The glocal partnership between international role players, national community engagement forums and local cooperation through digital storytelling to showcase social innovation and entrepreneurship has opened doors for continuous collaborative action through a multi-interdisciplinary approach (Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008). "Universities need to use the opportunities presented by the National Development Plan (2030), and the recognition of major challenges facing the globe, to position engaged scholarship as a key strategy for strengthening the contribution of universities towards addressing national and global challenges" (CHE, 2016:269). Therefore, partnerships are key in establishing an effective engaged-generative scholarship.

Furthermore, Nikula, Kopoteva, Niska, Butkeviciene and Granberg (2011) have distinguished three perspectives on partnerships that can be viewed as a way of action or as a process or structure. Also, partnerships have been viewed as a site of action (Seddon, Lewis, Freeman & Shanks, 2004). When a partnership is viewed as a structure, the focus is (1) on the diversity, skills, local knowledge and leadership of the partners; (2) on the complexity, delegation, management or staff competence of the organisations; and (3) on the organisational and institutional arrangements of the state and the non-state actors.

When partnerships are viewed as a process, the focus is on the formation of partnerships and their development, strategic planning, networking and local decision-making. Here, James (2002:19) defined a partnership "as a process involving an inter-organisational arrangement that mobilises a coalition of interests around shared objectives and a common agenda as a means to respond to a shared issue or to realize specific outcomes". This is then a process of integration of actors across different sectors: their joint working, pooling of resources, integrating 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' interests, experimentation and innovation.

Partnerships can further be viewed as a space or a site of action in which people and organisations from some combination of public, business and civil constituencies come together to engage in voluntary, mutually beneficial, inno-

vative action (Seddon *et al.*, 2004). Social innovation in current societies is an "essential factor for fostering sustainable growth, securing jobs and increasing competitive abilities" (Howaldt & Schwarz, 2010:6-7). It is clear that social innovation aims at enhancing the common good of greater society and tends to be grounded in moral values, more than on exclusively economic criteria.

Wenger and Wenger (2015) described such a collaborative environment as a community of practice, of "groups of people who share a passion for something that they know how to do and who regularly interact in order to learn how to do it better." In South African community engagement, the triad partnership model mimics such a community of practice and serves as a vehicle to connect HEIs and the community. Knowledge sharing can occur within such communion (Venter *et al.*, 2015). Langergaard (2008) distinguished two kinds of knowledge: 'know-what' (explicit knowledge) and 'know-how' (tacit knowledge). Both explicit and tacit knowledge facilitate the creation of social innovations. When local knowledge is shared in a CHEP, it can create a pool of knowledge which, again, creates an opportunity for synergistic effects. Such a pool of shared knowledge in a CHEP can foster discovery, design and development of social innovations.

5. Social innovation

The term 'social innovation' has overlapping meanings, such as open-source methods of innovation, innovations with a social purpose and social entrepreneurship or innovation in public policies and governance (Chesbrough, 2006; Von Hippel, 2005). Social innovation results from the construction and integration of new knowledge. According to Dees, Anderson, and Wei-Skillern (2004), this could be programmes, organisation models of a set of principles and other means to utilise a local response to positive and negative results.

According to Howaldt and Schwarz (2010:16), "A social innovation is new combination and/or new configuration of social practices in certain areas of action or social contexts prompted by certain actors or constellations of actors in an intentional targeted manner with the goal of better satisfying or answering needs and problems than is possible on the basis of established practices."

Social change can then be accentuated and provides improved solutions, compared to already established solutions, to meet one or more common goals to help create a future for a society (Adams & Hess, 2010; Gillwald, 2000; Ogburn, 1964; Pol & Ville, 2009).

Furthermore, social innovation can be seen as the generation and implementation of new ideas about how people should organise their interpersonal activities or social interactions. This is not necessarily societal improvement, but

improvements in such things as the actions, organising and know-how of a group of people are the goal, measured at the group's horizon of experiences and thus based on the existing know-how and experiences of the group involved (Moulaert, Martinelli & Swyngedouw, 2005; Mumford, 2002). This field has evolved from the classical sociology of social change (*Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Schumpeter*) to the practically inclined orientation more likely to be directly linked to the interest of "caring capitalism" (Jessop, Moulaert, Hulgård & Hamdouch, 2013:111). Here, change champions interact with their social context, transforming from being transformed by it, as they promote social change through this innovation (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014) and appears as an interactive bottom-up collective learning process (Rao-Nicholson, Vorley, & Khan, 2017).

A connected 'difference theory' can be emphasised because these social innovations usually combine new or existing elements, practice cross-cutting disciplinary boundaries and leave behind compelling new social relationships. The critical aspect is the 'connectors' in these networks that bring together the people, ideas and money (Mulgan, 2007).

According to Hart, Ramoroka, Jacobs and Letty (2015), social innovations are new products, services models and practices that meet social requirements and involve new social collaborations. They furthermore state that there are three lenses through which social innovation is adopted. Firstly, individuals usually have excellent communication skills to transfer good ideas with practical abilities. These individuals have inspiring, energising and impressive stories to prove that persistence and dedication against all odds can change society radically. Secondly, movements for change, such as environmentalism, feminism and disability rights, root their ideas in discontent. The third lens is the organisation. New and existing organisations can be renewed through radical possibilities for future planning.

According to Mulgan (2007), online networks are becoming essential innovation drivers. Global links therefore also make it easier to share the lessons learned. The Common Good First digital platform will allow the social innovation profiles, established within an HEI, to promote their positive impact through digital stories. The connectivity and enhancement of these projects should not stop there. Therefore, the aim of the positive engaged scholarship through social innovation within glocal community-higher education partnerships project is to enable positive engaged scholarships through supporting the thirty partnership projects to an advanced stage of creating flourishing livelihoods and, ultimately, social change.

Despite the legislation and introduction of social innovation (RSA, 2017), the concept has not been actively implemented outside of the policy realm in South Africa. According to Hart *et al.*, (2015), the emphasis has shifted to inclusive develop-

ment, which also supports the underserved people in society as innovators and allows for social and economic development. The trends of social innovation in South Africa were highlighted by Junge (2015) from the Social Innovation Exchange (SIX) initiative. These trends showcase that social innovation is driven by determination, improves access to information, is human-centred and community-based, and listens to the hidden voices – all of which facilitate a movement towards inclusive, integrated, collaborative and holistic learning.

6. Holistic learning

From a PALAR perspective, grounded in neuroscience, it is of essence to respect and address the service and learning needs of the individual, social group, cultural backgrounds, economic state and even the environment. To ensure the effective collective generation of knowledge when creating a social innovation design that ensures wellness in a CHEP, such a complex, whole system learning platform calls for a holistic learning strategy. Fletcher (2015) described such a holistic and inclusive learning framework as the affective-socio-cognitive model for learning where the brain is seen as an emotional, social and cognitive organ for enablement of learning (Fletcher, 2015).

Learning is rooted in the affective domain of the brain (Zull, 2002). Through a continuous interplay between the physical perception through senses of the body and mental experience, perceptions are processed in the brain. Neural learning pathways become engrained in the brain through repetitive exposure to experiences, leading towards the development of patterns for combining thought, action and habits. These patterns are influenced by an integration of primary (innate emotions), secondary (emotions influenced by the limbic system) and tertiary processes (neo-cortical cognition, reflection and decision-making). Throughout the developmental stages, from birth to adulthood, these processes first start from a bottom-up response to emotion (underpinned by reliance on positive or negative affect), to a top-down response, underpinned by complex cognitive and reflexive control. Emotions include systems of seeking, rage, fear, lust, care, grief and play (Panksepp, Asma, Curran, Rami, and Greif, 2012). Stemming from the emotion of seeking, curiosity and motivation to seek out new experiences, aligned with networking, understanding and learning follow.

To create social innovation, it is of essence that expectations are met. Therefore, ethical and moral principles for collaborative inquiry – such as gaining informed consent, doing good, applying justice, valuing freedom, building trust, practicing the Golden Rule², respecting human rights and diversity, serving

2 *"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you"* (Māhrik, 2018)

others with integrity, being honest and acting with care (love for others) – should be followed (Venter *et al.*, 2018). In brief, these principles could be summarised as the philosophy of life in African societies – Ubuntu: “*I am because we are*” (Nzimakwe, 2014: 31). If these principles are not met, it can hinder the development of equity, closeness and integrity.

With regard to the social domain of learning, Lieberman and Eisenberg (2009) state that the human brain is wired to connect and interact with others in order to learn. By making use of thinking, we as humans can choose how we respond to and reflect on emotions and we can learn new ways of thinking, doing and being (Rock, 2008). Therefore, in a partnership, it is essential to appreciate and value the positive core of scholar-practitioners and to allow for inclusive discovery and creative imagination and design of innovative solutions for a preferred future (Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008).

The cognitive domain of learning involves awareness of knowing ourselves and enables our understanding of others (Damasio, 2010). Because our cognitive brain decides on how we will act, it is essential to develop a sense of self-awareness and social awareness when learning with others in a CHEP. Here the new sensory sources which enter our environment, such as listening to the diverse perspectives of other participants or observing behaviour different to ours, might seem a threat to our existing frame of knowledge and worldview. Relational learning should allow for the development of empathetic understanding to guide our actions. If we know ourselves well, we can become willing to develop the ability to manage our feelings and reflect before, during and after we act (Gregory & Parry, 2006). By knowing ourselves and focusing on information received during social interaction, we can learn from how we differ from others and evaluate if such new information should be added to our existing frame of knowledge. Therefore, cognitive and emotional intelligence should guide our actions when generating social innovative solutions for advancement of a well-functioning society (Fletcher, 2015).

Such integration of theory and practice, research and development, thought and action, is described in the literature as praxis (Zuber-Skerritt, 2001). When scholar-practitioners have developed praxis, they progress to a level of learning beyond knowledge acquisition called wisdom. Wisdom can stem from emergent learning in a CHEP. Therefore, a CHEP can help scholar-practitioners to learn and develop in a holistic way when making use of PALAR for development of positive engaged scholarship.

7. Methodology

Working from a synthesis of a positive, social constructionist and generative paradigm, the design and methodology of AI was applied in the PALAR. Here, the research process followed the steps of discovery, dream, design and destiny.

Drawing from their experience of more than ten years in community engagement, three engaged scholars who serve as key role players in the project at the UFS, South Africa, formed a core CHEP with which to conduct an AI. The main question that guided the inquiry, was: *How can we facilitate local social innovation by appreciating glocal community-higher education partnerships?*

As mentioned earlier, the PALAR was framed in a positive paradigm, because the participants wanted to generate a socially innovative solution (by the community for the community) and did not try to solve a problem. By making use of a semi-structured triad appreciative conversation, facilitated by one of the scholars, the participants inquired into their best practices, character strengths and positive values. The discovery of this positive core served as a foundation to collectively dream forward and design a strategy to facilitate the establishment and development of the Common Good First initiative in two digital storytelling labs. The dialogue in these conversations called for active, respectful and compassionate listening.

During the data generation, an empathetic understanding of the participants' stories about their careers emerged. Their appreciative dialogue created a feeling of interconnectedness and a profound understanding of their commitment to the development of a positive, engaged scholarship.

The appreciative conversation enabled the participants to 'enter' into each other's worlds. During the conversations, a sense of inspiration resulted from a spontaneous surge of excitement, characterised by positive thinking, feelings of joy, hope and resilience (Cooperrider, 2013; Fredrickson, 2003). It was a challenge to remain objective amidst their subjectivity, especially when they became excited and energised by the learning experience, but they guided each other to stay focused on their factual generation of data during the appreciative conversation.

The data was transcribed, coded and analysed by two of the participants. Thematic inductive analysis was applied by making use of the holistic learning model of Fletcher (2015). Furthermore, it was possible to generate an innovative strategy for facilitating the establishment of the two digital storytelling labs.

8. Findings

The findings will be reported on under the phases of the process.

8.1 Discovery

Table 1 displays a summary of the positive core portrayed by the participants in the CHEP. As mentioned, the characteristics and values that were described by the participants when they reflected on the high points of their careers – when they experienced successful partnership project outcomes – were framed according to the affective-socio-cognitive model for holistic learning.

Table 1: Summary of the positive core of the CHEP

AFFECTIVE	SOCIAL	COGNITIVE
Citizenship Care/love Trust Honesty Democracy Safety Appreciation Asset-based Commitment Making a difference Willingness Humble Equality Acceptance Authenticity Common good Empathy Compassion	Relationship Partnership Friendship Adaptable & flexible Connect Collaborate (purpose-driven) Coordinate (glocal networking) Continuous dialogue Change Socio-economic environmental challenges Enough time Mindful listening Engagement Enablement Transformation Mentorship Access Inclusivity Dynamic	Innovation Unlock potential Sustainable development Lifelong learning Funding Framework & structure Employability Flourish Academic grounding Knowledge dissemination Academic networking Implementation Applicability Practical example (pilot) Interdisciplinary Research Capacity building Marketing Inform policy
Knowledge sharing	Reciprocity & mutuality	Holistic approach
Engaged scholarship (theory & practice = PRAXIS) Critical thinking PALAR Trialogue		

(Source: Authors’ own (2018))

As portrayed in the last column of **Table 1**, it seems that knowledge sharing, reciprocity and mutuality and the use of a holistic approach can contribute to the success of a partnership project. Positive engaged scholarship thus calls for an integration of theory and practice (praxis). It can be assumed that praxis, or

practical wisdom, stems from collaborative learning that emerges at the heart of human interaction in a partnership.

In the practice of PALAR, the participants portrayed that an innovative initiative to conduct collaborative inquiry can be applied. The concept of triadogue explains the idea that emerged when the participants engaged to generate data. One of the participants advised that rather than doing two paired conversations, one triad conversation can be conducted. This method not only saved time but provided the opportunity for all the participants to be in the room at the same time. As a whole system change strategy (Stavros *et al.*, 2016), AI is about the discovery of the positive core in people, their organisations and the strengths-filled, innovative, opportunity-rich world around them. AI "is not so much a shift in the methods and models of organisational change, but a fundamental shift in the overall perspective taken throughout the entire change process to see the wholeness of the human system and to inquire into that system's strengths, possibilities, and successes." (Stavros *et al.*, 2016, p. 97).

It further appeared that an array of affective, social and cognitive characteristics in a CHEP can serve as a holistic framework for facilitating inquiry and advancing the project.

8.2 *Dream, design and delivery*

Collaborative inquiry and knowledge sharing in a CHEP needs principles and a caring mentorship by a change champion to enable relationship and character building and to facilitate learning. As portrayed in **Table 1**, and confirmed by Zuber-Skerritt *et al.*, (2015), PALAR portrays seven Cs, namely communication, collaboration, commitment, coaching and learning from another, critical and self-critical attitude, competence in facilitating PALAR and character building. Such character building should be portrayed by role modelling trust and being trusted, honesty, reciprocal respect, diversity and cultural difference, resilience, integrity and openness to new perspectives for enabling the creation of innovative solutions to deliver a preferred society. Furthermore, three Rs – relationship, reflection and recognition – can serve as guiding principles for relationship and partnership building.

It also seems that the skills of adaptability and flexibility are needed for collaborative inquiry.

Of interest is that the values of partnerships, inclusion, democracy, engaged citizenship, social responsibility, respect, reciprocity and lifelong learning are embedded in the framework.

The characteristics mentioned in **Table 1** portray various elements of emergent learning, which Taylor (2011: 3) defines as follows:

Emergent learning arises from our direct experience of the practical world; it is triggered by an unpredicted event. The process that follows has the possibility to create not only knowledge but also wisdom we need to engage productively and effectively in a world of uncertainty. Learning that leads to wisdom involves the whole person and new dimensions that have been banished from public life in the modern era. It requires attention to our right-brain processes – sensing, feeling, imagination, metaphor, and context – as well as left-brain processes – analysis, logic, strategy, and application.

Therefore, it is suggested that the holistic strategy of emergent learning (Taylor, 2011) can be followed to facilitate collaborative learning in a CHEP, no matter what the goal of the project is.

9. Conclusion

We argued that, in order to facilitate the growth of a project, glocal partnerships and collaboration should be established. Without the contribution of committed change champions (community and HE stakeholders), society as a whole will not grow beyond viability. Furthermore, the Common Good First project funded by the European Union supports social innovation by creating a digital network to showcase the social impact of community projects in South Africa. In this way, partnership building can take place in South Africa, as well as with international collaborators. Because of the globally funded network initiative, the building of appreciative local CHEPs have evolved into an ideal practice where scholar-practitioners could engage for PALAR in CHEPs.

Partnerships are therefore key in developing positive engaged scholarship. This is also true in converse, because engaged scholars create relationships that spawn community development. Reciprocal and collective knowledge sharing, exchange, generation and dissemination would then always be ideal; to improve relationship and partnership building and allow community and HEIs to function as a collective whole system.

The ultimate goal for investments such as the Common Good First and the partnership building of the CHEP, is to engage practitioners from vulnerable and marginalised groups as participants in participatory research. This can be made possible through PALAR and community engagement initiatives. It is suggested that the focus should be shifted from only developing an individual scholar, to rather creating the wellbeing of the greater society. Each and every

scholar should take up the responsibility to not only develop their own scholarly achievement, but also to contribute to the common public good. Glocal citizenship can be coined by integrating academic champions' critical reflective questioning with their role as citizens and members of society at large. In this way, engaged researchers can acknowledge their role in social accountability and civic responsibility.

References

Adams, D. & Hess, M. 2010. Social innovation and why it has policy significance. *Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 21(2):139-155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/103530461002100209>

Albertyn, R. & Daniels, P. 2009. Research within the context of community engagement. In: E. Bitzer (ed). *Higher education in South Africa: A scholarly look behind the scenes* (409-428). Stellenbosch: SUN Media.

Boyer, E.L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of professoriate*. A special report. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. <http://www.hadinur.com/paper/BoyerScholarshipReconsidered.pdf>. [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Boyer, E.L. 1996. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 1(1):10-20. <https://www.files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1097206.pdf>

Boyer, E.L. 2016. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 20(1):15-28.

Bringle, R.G., Clayton, P.H. & Price, M.F. 2009. Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning & Civic Engagement*, 1(1):1-20.

Bushe, G.R. 2007. Appreciative inquiry is not (just) about the positive. *Organization Development Practitioner*, 39(4):30-35.

Cajaiba-Santana, G. 2014. Social innovation: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 82, 42-51. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.008

Checkoway, B. 2013. Strengthening the scholarship of engagement in Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17(4):7-22.

Chesbrough, H. 2006. *Open business models: How to thrive in the new innovation landscape*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Cooperrider, D.L. 2013 (October 2). *The power of resilience: David Cooperrider at TEDxUNPlaza*. TEDx Talks [Video file] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-SoAKaTKAYA> [Accessed 16 April 2018].

Cooperrider, D., Whitney, D. & Stavros, J. 2008. *Appreciative inquiry handbook. For Leaders of change* (2nd edition). London: Berrett-Koehler.

CHE (Council of Higher Education). 2016. *South African higher education reviewed – Two decades of democracy*. Pretoria: Author.

- Damasio, A. 2010. *Self comes to mind: Constructing the conscious brain*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Dees, J.G., Anderson, B.B. & Wei-Skillern, J. 2004. Scaling social impact strategies for spreading social innovations. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 1(4): 24-32.
- Elliott, G. 2013. Character and impact of social innovation in higher education. *International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning*, 5(2):71-84. ISSN: 1997-7034; Online: 2071-1158.
- Erasmus, M. 2014. The political unconscious of higher education community engagement in South Africa. In: M. Erasmus & R. Albertyn (eds). *Knowledge as enablement: Engagement between higher education and the third sector in South Africa* (100-114). Bloemfontein: SUN MeDIA.
- Erasmus, M. & Albertyn, R. (eds) 2014. *Knowledge as enablement: Engagement between higher education and the third sector in South Africa*. Bloemfontein: Sun Media.
- European Commission. n.d. *About the Erasmus+ funding programme*. https://ec.europa.eu/info/education/set-projects-education-and-training/erasmus-funding-programme_en. [Accessed 16 April 2018].
- Fletcher, M. 2015. Professional learning. In: O. Zuber-Skerritt, M. Fletcher & J. Kearney (eds). *Professional learning in higher education and communities: Towards a new vision for action research* (41-75). London: Palgrave.
- Fredrickson, B.L. 2003. Positive emotions and upwards spirals in organizations. In: K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (eds). *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (163-193). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Fredrickson, B.L. 2006. Unpacking positive emotions: Investigating the seeds of human flourishing. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(2):57-59.
- Gergen, K.J., & Gergen, M.M. 2008. Social construction and research as action. In: P. Reason & H. Bradbury (eds). *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (150-170). London: Sage Publications.
- Gillwald, K., 2000. Konzepte sozialer innovation, Working paper. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.
- Gregory, G. & Parry, T. 2006. *Designing brain-compatible learning*. (third edition). Cornwin Press: California.
- Grieten, S., Lambrechts, F., Bouwen, R., Huybrechts, J., Fry, R. & Cooperrider, D.L. 2017. Inquiring into appreciative inquiry: A conversation with David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 27(1):101-114. doi: 10.1177/1056492616688087

- Hart, J., Ramoroka, K., Jacobs P. & Letty, B. 2015. Revealing the social face of innovation. *South African Journal of Science*, 111(9/10):1-6.
- Howaldt, J. & Schwarz, M. 2010. *Social innovation: Concepts, research fields and international trends*. Aachen IMA/ZLW. http://www.asprea.org/imageses/IMO%20Trendstudie_Howaldt_englisch_Final%20ds.pdf. [Accessed 15 April 2018].
- James, J.E. 2002. Third-party threats to research integrity in public-private partnerships. *Addiction*, 97(10):1237-1360.
- Jessop, B., Moulaert, F., Hulgård, L. & Hamdouch, A. 2013. Social innovation research: A new stage in innovation analysis. In F. Moulaert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch. *The International Handbook on Social Innovation*. Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK.
- Junge, J. 2015. 10 trends of social innovation in South Africa. *Social Innovation Exchange*, 20 April 2015. <https://www.socialinnovationexchange.org/insights/10-trends-social-innovation-south-africa> [Accessed 26 July 2018].
- Kearney, J., Wood, L. & Zuber-Skerritt, O. 2013. Community-university partnerships using Participatory Action Learning and Action Research (PALAR). *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 6:113-130. doi:10.5130/ijcre.v6i1.3105
- Langergaard, L.L. 2008. Social entrepreneurship and capitalist crisis. *Nordicum-Mediterraneum*, 9(3) (Online). Icelandic E-Journal of Nordic and Mediterranean Studies. <http://nome.unak.is/nm-marzo-2012/vol-9-no-3-2014/73-conference-paper/493-social-entrepreneurship-and-capitalist-crisis>
- Lieberman, M.D. & Eisenberger, N.I. 2009. Pains and pleasures of social life. *Science Mag*, 323:890-891.
- Mährlik, T. 2018. The golden rule of morality – an ethical paradox. *Ethics & Bioethics*, 8(1-2): 5-13.
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F. & Swyngedouw, E. 2005. Towards alternative model(s) of local innovation, *Urban Studies*, 42(11):1969-1990.
- Mulder, M. 2016. *School of nursing: Annual progress report*. https://www.ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider25/school-of-nursing-documents/all-documents/2016-annual-report.pdf?sfvrsn=4edd721_0 [Accessed 29 July 29].
- Mulgan, G. 2007. *Social innovation. What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated*. Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Oxford Saaid Business School, Working Paper. The Young Foundation. London: Basingstoke.
- Mumford, M.D. 2002. Social innovation: Ten cases from Benjamin Franklin. *Creativity Research Journal*, 14(2):253-266.

Nikula, J., Kopoteva, I., Niska, M., Butkeviciene, E. & Granberg, L. 2011. Theoretical and methodological context. In: J. Nikula, I. Kopoteva, M. Niska, E. Butkeviciene & L. Granberg (eds). *Social innovations and social partnerships in Finland, Russia and Lithuania*. (11-54). Finnish Centre for Russian and Eastern European Studies, University of Helsinki, Finland. http://www.helsinki.fi/aleksanteri/english/publications/files/Nikula_Social_innovations.pdf . [Accessed 16 April 2018].

Nzimakwe, T.I. 2014. Practising Ubuntu and leadership for good governance: The South African and continental dialogue. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 7(4):30-41.

Ogburn, W.F. 1964. *On culture and social change*: Selected papers. Duncan, O.D. (ed). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Panksepp, J., Asma, S., Curran, G., Rami, G. & Greif, T. 2012. The philosophical implications of affective neuroscience. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 19(3):6-48.

Petersen, N. & Osman, N. 2013. An introduction to service learning in South Africa. In: R. Osman, & N. Petersen (eds). *Service learning in South Africa*. (2-32). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Pol, E. & Ville, S. 2009. Social innovation: buzz word or enduring term? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38(6):878-885.

Rao-Nicholson, R., Vorley, T. & Khan, Z. 2017. Social innovation in emerging economies: A national system of innovation based approach. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121:228-237. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.03.013

Rock, D. 2008. SCARF: A brain-based model for collaborating with and influencing others. *NeuroLeadershipJournal*. https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/thurs_georgia_9_10_915_covello.pdf. [Accessed 18 April 2018].

RSA (Republic of South Africa), Department of Science and Technology. 2017. *White paper on science, technology and innovation*. Pretoria. <https://tbcsa.travel/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/NEW-White-Paper-Draft-1.5-V2-as-at-24-November-2017.pdf>. [Accessed 16 April 2018].

RSA DoE (Republic of South Africa, Department of Education). 1997. *A program for the transformation of higher education. Education White Paper 3, Notice 1196 of 1997*. Pretoria: DoE.

Sandmann, L.R. 2008. Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996–2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1):91-104.

Sandmann, L.R., Saltmarsh, J. & O'Meara, K. 2016. An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 20(1):157-174.

- Seddon, P.B., Lewis, G.P., Freeman, P. & Shanks, G. 2004. The case for viewing business models as abstractions of strategy. *Communications of the Association of Information Systems*, 13:427-442. <http://aisel.aisnet.org/cais/vol13/iss1/25> . [Accessed 18 April 2018].
- Seligman, M. 2010. *Flourish: Positive psychology and positive interventions*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. The University of Michigan. https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/s/Seligman_10.pdf [Accessed 29 July 2018].
- Stavros, J.M., Godwin, L.N. & Cooperrider, D.L. 2016. Appreciative Inquiry: Organization development and the strengths revolution. In: W.J. Rothwell, J.M. Stavros & R.L. Sullivan (eds). *Practicing organization development: Leading transformation and change* (fourth edition) (96-116). New Jersey: Wiley.
- Tandon, R., Singh, W., Clover, D. & Hall, B. 2016. Knowledge democracy and excellence in engagement. In: M. Leach, J. Gaventa & K. Oswald (eds). *Engaged excellence. IDS Bulletin*, 47(6):19-36. doi:10.19088/1968-2016.197
- Taylor, M.M. 2011. *Emergent learning for wisdom*. New York: Palgrave-McMillan.
- The Talloires Network. 2018. *Who we are – Our vision*. Tufts University, Medford, MA. <http://talloiresnetwork.tufts.edu/who-we-are/>. [Accessed 15 April 2018].
- UNDP. 2015. *Sustainable development goals*. http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/brochure/SDGs_Booklet_Web_En.pdf [Accessed 16 April 2018].
- UFS (University of the Free State) 2006. *Community Service Policy*. (Policy 06.1). <https://www.ufs.ac.za/supportservices/departments/community-engagement-home/community-engagement/policy-definition>. [Accessed 16 April 2018].
- Venter, K. Erasmus, M. & Seale, I. 2015. Knowledge sharing for the development of service learning champions. *Journal for New Generation Sciences*, 13(2):147-163. DSpace Repository, Central University of Technology, Free State. <http://hdl.handle.net/11462/772>. [Accessed 18 April 2018].
- Venter, K., Holtzhausen, S. & Erasmus, M. 2018. Appreciating integrated service-learning praxis for flourishing of engaged scholarship in community-higher education partnerships (Submitted for publication).
- Von Hippel, E. 2005: *Democratizing innovation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wenger, E. & Wenger, B. 2015. *Communities of practice: A brief introduction*. EB Wenger-Trayner: <http://wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice> [Accessed 15 July 2018].
- Whitney, D., Trosten-Bloom, A. & Rader, K. 2010. *Appreciative leadership*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Wood, L., Louw, I. & Zuber-Skerritt, O. 2017. Enhancing postgraduate learning and development: A participatory action learning and action research approach through conferences. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, 14(2):120-135. doi:10.1080/14767333.2017.1295361

Zuber-Skerritt, O. 2001. Action learning and action research: Paradigm, praxis and programs. In: S. Sankara, B. Dick & R. Passfield (eds). *Effective change management through action research and action learning: Concepts, perspectives, processes and applications* (1-20). Lismore: Southern Cross University Press.

Zuber-Skerritt, O., Wood, L. & Louw, I. 2015. *A participatory paradigm for an engaged scholarship in higher education. Action leadership from a South African perspective*. Netherlands: Sense.

Zull, J. 2002. *The art of changing the brain: Enriching teaching by exploring the biology of learning*. Sterling VA: Stylus Publishing.