

Final Report on Evaluation and Impact Assessment Frameworks

This paper is prepared to present research on evaluation and impact assessment (EIA henceforth) frameworks of Science Shops and community engagement projects in universities. While providing introductory information on what an EIA is and the basic methods that can be used for the framework, it aims to highlight the crucial points to creating an EIA framework in OSUN Science Shop. The paper starts with a discussion on what an impact assessment is and when it is necessary; continues with the preparation for evaluation and impact assessment processes for science shops. The second section, after presenting a literature and practice review on the relevant evaluation and impact assessment methodologies related to the educational/research approaches; provides potential methods, especially for the OSUN Science Shop (OSS henceforth) project. Explanation of each method includes a brief description of the technique, advantages, and disadvantages of that technique for the OSS. The third section moves beyond the literature review and presents the notes on interviews that have been conducted with three Science Shops/the implementors of community engagement learning projects in order to listen to their experiences in the process of creating and implementing their EIA framework. In the conclusion and discussion section, the author presents her evaluation of the importance of evaluation and impact assessment; and potential methods that can be used for the OSUN Science Shop.

1. What is Impact and When Should we Assess it?

Impact, according to the definition of OECD, is “positive and negative primary and secondary long-term effects produced by an intervention, whether directly or indirectly, intended or unintended”.¹

The impact assessment and project evaluation could be parts of different projects from environmental issues to education-related ones. However, impact assessment is not a standard practice among institutions. Rather, each institution needs to consider some key points to decide whether creating an evaluation and impact assessment framework is necessary for a specific project. Therefore, there is not one way to conduct an impact assessment. A combination of designs and methods is needed for different scenarios.

In this section, I will start explaining when it is *not* necessary to assess impact by drawing on the discussions in the literature, and then discuss whether the OSS projects are a good fit for impact assessment. Later, I will zoom in on the necessary steps for the preparation of evaluation and impact assessment, mostly for Science Shops.

1.1. Impact Assessment and Evaluation (EIA) – When and why is it not a good idea?

Creating an EIA framework needs time and dedication since researching potential EIA methods and their implications for the project are vital for receiving useful data in the assessment. However,

¹ Presentation Of The Inspires Open Platform, Impact Evaluation Methodology And Online Tool, 1

as mentioned in the previous section, not every project needs an EIA process due to several reasons. This section briefly explains the cases where EIA can be unnecessary by drawing on the discussions in the literature.

- **Do not have the right tool:** While some projects need to be precisely analyzed in terms of their process and outcomes to understand how useful they were, it does not mean that all of them need an EIA approach. In such cases, it is important to reconsider the question and rethink if this question requires an evaluation process. There might be another approach needed, but this might not necessarily be an EIA framework.
- **Not the best time:** The timing of the application of EIA methods depends on the case and the methods that are used. However, in some cases, it is not worth using these methods if it is almost certain that they are not going to give you tangible results. When the program/project is not ready (not possible to integrate the intended impact in it), when the project implementation is not ready (not possible to monitor the project and start measuring impact), and when it is too late (not possible to measure the impact fully many years after the end of the project), using EIA is might not be sufficient to achieve the expected results.
- **Not feasible:** There are cases in which using an EIA framework is not feasible at all. One of these cases is projects with limited resources. If there is a small-scale project going on with limited resources, then researching the evaluations of similar projects and learning from them might be more useful than spending the resources on a small-scale evaluation. Another case is when the implementation happens at too high a level, like a national or international scale project. Implementing the EIA methods on such a big scale can be infeasible. The third case is the projects where indirect effects are difficult to identify. Especially in a program where the theory of change is implemented, indirect effects are significant to be studied, and ignoring them might lead to a flawed study. If indirect effects are impossible to measure, then implementing an EIA framework might not be needed. Finally, some programs setting might be too chaotic to assess the impact, such as ad hoc projects or disaster relief situations. In these cases, evaluation might not be possible since the implementation of the projects keeps changing to adapt to current circumstances.
- **Not worth it:** In some cases, whether a project works well or not is already known from another study implemented for a similar project. Therefore, conducting another study on EIA might be unnecessary.

For more info, please visit:
[https://ssir.org/articles/entry/ten reasons not to measure impact and what to do instead](https://ssir.org/articles/entry/ten_reasons_not_to_measure_impact_and_what_to_do_instead)

1.2. Preparation Process for Science Shops

After considering the points in the previous chapter and thinking that impact assessment is potentially a good idea for a specific project, the next step should be preparing to create a framework for this practice. It is important to consider creating an EIA framework during the planning of a project because the impact is more readily achieved when it is factored into the planning of a research project. Below, there are some points to be considered before moving on to choosing the techniques of impact assessment.

- Identifying the Science Shop/project team that will be responsible for the evaluation,
- Identifying stakeholders and partners to be included in the evaluation (such as faculty, university, students, and CSOs)
- Discussing the purpose and procedures of the evaluation with the project partners and Science Shop stakeholders and setting out the scope and aims of the evaluation
- Preparing partners/stakeholders for the possibility that evaluation results may not be as expected
- Preparing or selecting tools for evaluation.

More info: https://livingknowledge.org/fileadmin/Dateien-Living-Knowledge/Library/Project_reports/PERARES_Evaluation_toolkit_with_checklist_and_evaluation_form_2012.pdf

2. Tools for the Impact Assessment: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods

Following the preparation of the basis for the impact assessment and evaluation process by setting up the team and informing stakeholders, it is time to decide which methods to use for the project. As mentioned earlier, each project is unique, therefore the method that will be used to assess the impact must be specific to the project and the type of information one needs. This section provides the potential impact assessment techniques that can be helpful for educational projects, such as the ones OSS is implementing. In the final part of the section, there is a summary of the theory of change technique, as a widely used path in the framework of impact assessments that helps to map the identified changes and provides a flow between long-term outcomes along the path to the desired impact.

2.1. Potential Methods with Their Advantages and Disadvantages

- Storytelling

Storytelling is an impact assessment technique that can be used mostly for projects that have life-changing effects on individuals or communities. Since stories give a more personal/human dimension compared to quantitative data, it ensures that the meaning is coming from the participant.

However, when it comes to the OSUN Science Shop project, using the storytelling technique might consume a lot of time due to the substantial number of participants. Nevertheless, it might be still possible to use this technique as a complementary method and with a few adjustments, such as asking stakeholders (students/faculty/CSOs) for journaling for this project (anonymously and voluntarily) after each interaction.

For more info about the storytelling method for EIA:
<https://www.digitalstorytellers.com.au/using-story-to-measure-and-communicate-your-impact-and-how-to-tell-if-its-working/>

- **Participant observation**

Participant observation is a technique in which the EIA researcher regularly visits the field of research (for instance, to understand the impact on students in the OSS course-based projects case, the researcher visits the classrooms) and collects information from that given field. This technique provides an opportunity for more detailed findings and might help the researcher to follow the development that is going on in the classroom throughout the semester.

The biggest challenge of this technique is that it requires additional human resources. Due to the need for a regular visit in this method, one researcher who will be specifically in charge of this research should be hired. Moreover, the conclusions drawn by the researcher depend on the capacity and abilities of the researcher since the findings will be mostly his/her observations. Therefore, this technique itself might not always provide the best results for the OSUN Science Shop project

For more info about the participant observation method:
<https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/participantobservation>

- **Social Network Analysis (SNA)**

Social Network Analysis is an approach that covers different techniques to study social relationships within a given network. It focuses on identifying and comparing the relationships within and between individuals, groups, and systems to model real-world interactions. This method is useful to identify who plays a significant role in the project and raise awareness of the importance of informal networks.

In the literature, it is suggested to follow five main stages for conducting SNA.

- 1) Identify the target network and purpose of the exercise
- 2) Design the methodology for collection and analysis
- 3) Collect, store, and process the data
- 4) Present the data in diverse ways
- 5) Analyze the data and recommend appropriate action

This method is one of the few methods that look beyond the characteristics of individuals and focuses on the relationships between them, and it can be useful for the OSUN Science project to identify the key actors and the roles of different stakeholders in the process. However, using only this method for impact assessment will lead to overlooking other important aspects of the project, therefore SNA can be used as a supplementary technique for the OSS. Moreover, there is a need to learn specific techniques that are necessary for the analysis, therefore working with an expert for this analysis is necessary.

For more info about the analysis:

<https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Social-network-analysis.pdf>

<https://www.betterevaluation->

[org.translate.google/en/blog/Using_SNA? x tr sl=en& x tr tl=tr& x tr hl=tr& x tr pto=op,sc](https://www.betterevaluation.org.translate.google/en/blog/Using_SNA? x tr sl=en& x tr tl=tr& x tr hl=tr& x tr pto=op,sc)

- **Most Significant Change**

Most significant change is an approach that can be used for impact assessment and evaluation, and it involves generating and analyzing personal accounts of change, mostly the most significant ones, and their reasons. It is based on a storytelling technique where the participants of a project are asked to share their experiences with the researcher. The selection of the participants is based on extreme cases to understand the most meaningful change the project has created.

Three basic steps can be used in this technique: First, deciding on the types of stories to be collected and their focus; second, collecting the stories and deciding on which one is more significant; finally, sharing these stories with stakeholders and contributors.

By itself, it is not sufficient for impact evaluation as it does not provide information about the usual experience but about the extremes. Most Significant Change works best in combination with other options for gathering, analyzing, and reporting data.

For more info: https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/most_significant_change

- **Questionnaires/Surveys**

Questionnaires and surveys are one of the most common techniques that are used for impact assessment and their results might provide meaningful data for the impact assessment of the project. In educational/course-based projects that have been applied by OSUN, asking the stakeholders (students, faculty, and CSOs) about their experiences in the project at different stages is a potential method.

However, three points need more careful usage of this method. First, although asking the same questions at various stages is a common method to assess the impact, the change in the answers of the stakeholder might not be only caused by this project (i.e., an increase in the research skills of students). Secondly, it is important not to overburden stakeholders with multiple

evaluation forms, especially the students. Receiving different evaluation forms for the same course by different authorities (university, faculty, Science Shop) might decrease the motivation of students to provide honest answers. In this case, a collaboration between the Science Shop and faculty might be useful, and two evaluation forms can be merged into one to help students save time and keep their focus. Finally, since the interpretation of these quantitative results is significant for the project, asking for support from a professional researcher/specialist might be crucial.

For more info: <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/questionnaire>
<https://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/375621526315039384/English-SurveyDataCollection-for-IE-Hughes-Cairo.pdf>

- **Focus Groups**

Focus groups are important to receive qualitative data and learn more about the individual experiences of the stakeholder. One of the most important opportunities this method provides is to create a discussion environment where people can be inspired by each other's responses and rethink their experiences. It can turn into a discussion where the unintended impact of the project is revealed and create a safe space for the storytelling of the participants.

The biggest challenge of this method could be finding volunteers to take part in the focus groups, especially for the faculty and student groups due to their workload and the timing of the group discussions (potentially early summer). Many people might not be around the universities at that time, but in this case, an online focus group might be proposed depending on the preferences of the researcher /expert who will be leading the discussion.

For more info:

<https://methods.sagepub.com/book/the-sage-handbook-of-applied-social-research-methods-2e/n18.xml>
<https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/FocusGroups>

- **Interviews**

An interview is a technique that can be used to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. While this technique is mostly used to ask qualitative questions, adding close-ended questions to the interview can help collect quantitative results in research. Interviews are commonly designed and conducted in three different ways: Unstructured interviews (the least structured, a conversation-like), semi-structured interviews (half constructed, there is an outline of the topics to be covered but leaves room for free flow in the conversation), and standardized/fully structured interviews (includes the most structured set of questions and doesn't leave space for the flexibility).

Interview techniques can be useful when the target of the assessment process is to get more in-depth information about the personal experiences of participants. Therefore, using them to assess

the impact of the class-based projects in OSS can provide significant results to understand the individual experiences of stakeholders. However, the investigator should be responsible for developing ethical interview standards and consider the potential challenges and harm the interview can cause to the participants. Additionally, this technique, when it is done individually instead of in a focus group, is more time-consuming in addition to being susceptible to interview bias. Therefore, using focus groups instead of individual interviews might be more time friendly and helps conduct a fruitful discussion among the participants that can help decrease the bias.

For more info:

<https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/evaluation/pdf/brief17.pdf>

<https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/interviews>

- **Anecdotal Evidence-Based Research**

Anecdotal evidence is collected casually or informally and relies heavily or entirely on personal testimony. When compared to other types of evidence, anecdotal evidence is generally regarded as of limited value to several potential weaknesses unless documentation and/or statistical evidence is maintained.

Despite this technique being also an important one to reveal the participants' firsthand experiences in the project, it can bring personal biases into play. Therefore, the ideal number of samples/participants to share their testimonies should be decided very carefully to get results that can be generalizable. However, even in the most ideal scenario, this technique can work better as a complementary method in the EIA design.

For an example of the implementation: [https://www.annalsofoncology.org/article/S0923-7534\(19\)48171-4/pdf](https://www.annalsofoncology.org/article/S0923-7534(19)48171-4/pdf)

2.2. Theory of Change

The theory of change is a method and illustration of how and why the desired change is expected to happen in a particular context and it is mostly developed during the planning of a project which can be useful for the evaluation and impact assessment processes. It explains how the activities undertaken by an intervention contribute to a chain of results that lead to the intended or observed impacts. It presents what the intervention intends to achieve and how in addition to explaining how change is understood to come about, rather than simply linking activities to expected results with an arrow.

Using this framework in the impact evaluation might help identify the data that needs to be collected and the way they need to be analyzed and reported. It can help identify the specific

evaluation questions and the aspects of implementation that should be examined. The theory of change;

- Begins with a good situation analysis: Identifying the problem that the intervention seeks to address; the causes and consequences of this problem; and the opportunities,
- Continues with clarifying which aspects of the problem the intervention will address and making explicit the outcomes and impacts that it seeks to produce,
- When the current situation and the targeted situation have been decided, then there needs to be a theory developed regarding how to get from the current situation to the desired one.

Creating this framework might be time-consuming in the beginning. However, it can save time in the evaluation process with the key points it provides for the analysis. While this framework mostly helps with identifying the intended outcomes, the unintended outcomes that appear at the end of the project must be also considered for evaluation.

For more info: (<https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/747-theory-of-change-methodological-briefs-impact-evaluation-no-2.html>)

https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/managers_guide/step_2/describe_theory_of_change

<https://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/>

<https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/UNDG-UNDAF-Companion-Pieces-7-Theory-of-Change.pdf>

3.1. Interviews with Science Shops and Individuals on Community Engagement

The final stage of the research included interviews with several science shops and individuals around the world who implement community engagement projects. Below, you can see the common points that came out of the interviews and the author's interpretation of them. The detailed meeting notes are available in the Appendix while the video recordings of each interview can be found in the One Drive folder. Please note that the interviews in the folder are for internal use purposes only.

Common points that were raised during the interviews

1. The first point that was commonly mentioned by the interviewees was that the whole EIA process is conducted by the Science Shop team in the institution, without any further full-time professional support. Despite the highlight on taking additional support for specific methods in the literature review, the interviewees stated that from the preparation of the surveys to their analysis and reporting, they are fully in charge of the process. However, it is important to note that their EIA process mostly includes questionnaires and interview

techniques, therefore, for more complicated techniques, outsourcing support might be necessary.

2. The theory of change is important and used for each community engagement project that we investigated. Starting a project by setting the intended outcomes helps the design and the EIA process of the project. There is an example of how to create this framework in the second interview (UTS Shopfront) in the 6th minute of the recording.
3. Assessing the impact and evaluation of the community (CSOs) is considered to be the hardest part of the EIA process. After the completion of the project, many CSOs unlikely to stay connected and respond to questionnaires/surveys of the Science Shops. One of the interviewees suggested conducting interviews with the community right after the project, before losing contact. Nevertheless, assessing the long-term impact might require a different solution depending on the relationship established between the community and the Science Shop.
4. Evaluation of course-based projects, especially the impact assessment for students, is embedded in the course's evaluation and faculty is recommended to collect the feedback. There are not several authorities who send different questionnaires for different purposes to students (impact of the course, impact of the project, university support, etc.) but rather, there is cooperation with the faculty at this stage. There is mostly one questionnaire that assesses the impact of the course and the Science Shop project at the end of the term. In case of a need for further assessment, interviews and focus groups with the students are organized by the Science Shops.
5. Cultural and societal structures are important for the design of projects and the EIA framework. In an international setting such as OSUN Science Shop, I believe that a couple of years for the experiment would help what works the best for a multicultural community (students, CSOs, and faculty). Setting an international standard might be harder. In addition to the societal structure, human resources and budget are important determinants to create a framework.
6. Questionnaires are mostly the primary method used for evaluation and impact assessment. However, there are complimentary methods used as well depending on each case.

Conclusion and Discussion

As mentioned earlier, each project requires a different strategy regarding the evaluation and impact assessment (EIA). After a careful review of the literature on the basics of the EIA framework, and familiarizing myself with the OSS project, I recommend creating an evaluation and impact assessment framework specific to the characteristics of this program. The pilot year of the project is completed, and there are a significant number of participants whose lives/career developments might be changing due to the project and whose ideas are significant for the evaluation and development of this program.

Based on the literature review and interviews, starting from next year on, the theory of change might be taken into consideration and an EIA framework could be developed accordingly in the OSUN Science Shop. In the basics of this theory there lies an idea of setting the intended impact at the beginning of the project and monitoring it accordingly. While this framework helps with monitoring the intended income, it helps indicate the unintended outcomes at the end of the project too. Depending on the intended outcomes, the methods that will be used for the EIA could be decided by the team. Also as mentioned both in the literature and interviews, regarding the monitoring, a closer connection with the faculty might be more helpful in the evaluation process, especially to follow the academic progress of the students and the achievements of the faculty.

This document has presented eight different impact evaluation methods which seemed to apply to the OSS project. While all of them have different characteristics and help bring out different results via different focuses, depending on the intended impacts, a combination of some of these methods can be used. If the main aim is to evaluate group dynamics, social network analysis, and focus groups might be the most convenient options, while for an evaluation of individual experiences, story-telling and individual interviews might work better. A chart on the short evaluations of each technique can be found attached to this document.

Despite the main motivation for conducting the interviews with other Science Shop projects was to discover some novel methods for EIA, the interviews revealed that the dominating methods for EIA are still questionnaires and interviews. However, their design and implementation, such as the timing of the questionnaire and the stakeholders to conduct interviews, make a change in getting useful data. Every interviewee mentioned that it took them many years to set their final EIA framework. Therefore, I believe that OSUN Science Shop has the capacity to try more novel methods for a pilot course-based, such as storytelling by asking students to journal throughout the course. In any case, the timing of the methods and the communication with the faculty are the key to EIA frameworks.

Resources for further information

Australian Government, Department of Industry, Innovation and Science. 2015. *Choosing Appropriate Designs and Methods for Impact Evaluation*. https://www.industry.gov.au/sites/default/files/May%202018/document/pdf/choosing_appropriate_designs_and_methods_for_impact_evaluation_2015.pdf?acsf_files_redirect

International Labor Organization. 2018. *Guide on Measuring Decent Jobs for Youth: Monitoring, evaluation and learning in labour market programs*. Available at https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_627314.pdf

APPENDIX (Interview Notes)

Barbara Schmid - Knowledge Co-op

- University of Cape Town
- Two part-time staff working in Knowledge Co-op and in charge of everything, including the EIA. Barbara will be retired in the new term.
- The name Science Shop does not work in the community, they had to rename it Knowledge Co-op.
- The main resource for the EIA structure and other projects they benefit from is The Living Knowledge website.
- **Motivations for EIA framework:** “Should we or should not we were never a question” (for setting up a framework). The framework works both for internal use, to learn what to do better the next time; and for reporting purposes (university administration and funders).
- EIA framework was established as they developed the program, and it took 3 years (the funding period between 2011-2014). In the beginning, there were interviews: They chose 10 pilot projects and interviewed students, faculty, and SCO.
- **Methods:** At the end of each project, a questionnaire is shared with stakeholders for impact assessment in the short term. At least a year after the project, there is a follow-up with community partners and academics (regarding publications and organizations) about the long-term impacts.
- **Pros and cons of the methods:** Questionnaires are the main method to receive feedback. They are flexible. If they send out the questionnaire right after the project, they receive a significant response. So, the timing of the questionnaire is important. They also e-mail the academics one by one to ask whether they published something regarding the project implemented after a certain period.
- **Cooperation with the faculty:** The value of the Science Shop approach regarding community engagement is communicated clearly and acknowledged by the faculty. However, some of the faculty have their connections with the CSO and use their means instead of including Knowledge Co-op in the process.
- Initially, separate assessment techniques were applied by the Knowledge co-op and by faculty, but now there is a joint questionnaire.

UTS Shopfront – Mitra Gusheh (Manager), Dianne Moy (comm. Engagement -learning), Maddy (operations)

- The EIA framework begins with the theory of change. What are some of the outcome areas and indicators of success? In the recording, there is an example of their theory of change scheme (06:02)
- **Motivation for an EIA framework:** Demonstrating the impact, reporting to funders, and celebrating the achievement.

- Multiple people are involved in the evaluation process; it is embedded into the existing system and happens at various levels depending on what they want to achieve (linked to the theory of change). Embedding the evaluation questions into the already existing surveys, some of the data gets captured in that way. But they still run out their surveys as part of the program. The primary responsibility of the Shopfront staff is to collect the data, analyze it and share/report it.
- **Methods:** Primarily, Pre-semester + post-semester surveys for three stakeholders (CSO, students, academics). The aim is to evaluate the process (communication, overall experience, etc.) and the outcomes (are the skills/outcomes still used?) of the offering. There is also a follow-up survey with the community six months after the end of the project.
- Different methods for different stages:

Short term: Population-level questions embedded in the university-level evaluation

Final stage: significant research that looks at the last five or ten years, in this context there might be focus groups not there is no strict rule about that. +

Stories of change: Interview with CSOs after three months.

- **Difficulties:** Timing is important, getting an adequate number of responses is not easy. Contacting the students and sending surveys right after the project is significant. A combination of numbers and stories works the best way.
- **Collaboration with the faculty:** Creating a win-win situation and starting with community needs. Identify the key areas where the outcome of the subjects exactly matches the community's needs. Demonstrate what the value of the Science Shop is: “If they work on a real project, they will develop their skills”
- **Tip:** Having a touchpoint with the faculty is important to demonstrate the Science Shop values and make them more visible to the faculty. (One in each department?)

Martina Joordan – University of Pretoria

- In charge of one of the 7 campuses
- EIA framework depends on each project that is implemented on the campus: Sometimes the community is not strong enough to get proper results. There is no impact assessment but an evaluation of the sustainability of the project. (According to her, in Africa, assessing impact is always hard, but evaluation of a project is easier)
- There is no Science Shop at the Uni of Pretoria, but in different faculties and departments, there are different projects implemented. Ms. Joordan can work with any faculty.
- Process: Usually, first, finding the needs of the community and the stories. Sometimes there is a project/need of the students that start the cooperation with the community.
- The theory of change is significant. Setting the specific outcomes and trying to reach them.
- **Methods:** Written feedback + interviews in general.

Faculty: Questionnaire

Community Partners: Always harder to get a response to surveys (the community's computer literacy might be low). In the South Africa case, talking to stakeholders might work better.

Long-term impact: sustainability depends on the community. As they work longer on the project, the more sustainable it is.

- The societal structures are incredibly important in creating a project and its EIA framework - Community structure, working with black and disadvantaged communities requires different management than other projects. It is more manageable to work only with one community instead of working with different communities (in the South African context)

- **Advantages and disadvantages:** Faculty do not have time for interviews, so it is easier to reach them with surveys. However, some strong individuals work with Martina and have regular meetings with her to discuss the future of the projects.

For the community, interviews and focus groups are a better option. Their community is open to sharing and talking.

For students, recommend lecturers have a reflection session to receive some feedback + surveys.

The faculty is free to get the student feedback; this could be blogs, journals, or reports.

- **Cooperation with the Faculty:** It is easy to work with the community. How? There is a community engagement forum every three months where Martina meets with the faculty and talks about the needs of students and the community. It is a tradition. In addition to the forum, there are hubs and clinics in every faculty that work on community engagement projects. According to the national education regulations, every student must take part in community engagement projects, and this helps with mobilizing the faculty and the students.