Looking good or doing good? U.S. universities' response as it relates to their community engagement actions translated to 3 P's for a "better society" during a crisis

Antigoni Papadimitriou, PhD
Farmer School of Business, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA
antigoni.papadimitriou1@gmail.com
Sarah Schiffecker
College of Education, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, USA
Sarah.Schiffecker@ttu.edu

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to explore the ways in which the 'third mission' of the university is founded in university mission statements in the United States, especially in 15 universities that have participated in both the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification and in the THE Impact Rankings; and secondly, to identify actions related to community engagement in their strategic planning as it translates into the 3 P's as well as mentioned measures and impact initiatives.

Keywords: Community engagement, SDGs, strategic planning, third mission, universities, USA.

1. Introduction

University mission statements inform the public about the purpose of the university, which consists of the creation and dissemination of knowledge as well as their distinct public responsibility, while strategic planning outline the specific actions universities plan on taking in order to follow its various duties. The so-called 'third mission' of universities can be found in both institutional documents and is related to civic and community engagement. The wide range of activities incorporated in universities' community engagement suggests that a precise definition of the public mission is difficult and that organizing and coordinating such external collaborative activities, university policies, and practices is a complex task (Papadimitriou, 2020). The COVID- 19 crisis had and still has terrible effects on most universities around the world. Pre-covid, university community engagement received special attention at many universities as an activity related to universities' public mission. Community engagement activities and measurements vary, however, there are two major markers that should be considered: supporting the Sustainable Development Goals and participation in Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.

In September 2015, world leaders at the United Nations unanimously adopted a new global development agenda, Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, one of the most ambitious and important global agreements in recent history. The agenda, which came into effect on 1 January 2016 with the 17 Sustainable Development

Goals (SDGs) at its core, represents a guide to tackle the world's most pressing challenges including ending poverty and bringing economic prosperity, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and peace to all countries and all people by 2030. These goals can be summed up in the so-called 3 P's: People, Prosperity, and Planet. There is already a strong interest in, and response to, the SDGs by governments, businesses, and organizations in most countries. The SDGs set out a vision for a better world that relies on cooperation and interdependence (Owen, 2017).

Additionally, The *Times Higher Education* (THE) Impact Rankings use a range of performance metrics and developed the global performance tables that assess universities against the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Impact Rankings use carefully calibrated indicators to provide comprehensive and balanced comparison across four broad areas: research, stewardship, outreach and teaching. There are several critiques about the Goals and how universities might support them for the public good (Hickel, 2015; Neubauer et al. 2017). Despite this criticism, universities around the globe support, within their capacity, the 17 SDGs. In the 2021 Impact Rankings edition and the overall ranking includes 1,117 universities from 94 countries/regions.

Another initiative related to community engagement is the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. It has been the leading framework for institutional assessment and recognition of community engagement in U.S. higher education for the past 16 years with multiple classification cycles in 2006, 2008, 2010, 2015, and 2020. The classification review process takes place every five years. As of the 2015 cycle, 361 campuses are currently recognized, of which 31 are SDGs supporters. 15 out of those 31 universities in the THE Impact Ranking are active holders of the Carnegie Classification. Those 15 institutions make up the sample for this study.

With the COVID-19 pandemic having severely interrupted most human interactions as well as having changed how we think about connecting with communities, it is crucial to understand the ways in which universities voice their 'third mission' and contribute to the public good. Under those particularly challenging circumstances, the universities' adherence to the 'third mission' warrants closer attention. Throughout the COVID-19 crisis, universities need strategic planning and actions not only to survive and succeed, but also to support their 'third mission' and community engagement. While there are studies looking at the ways in which universities value and incorporate some of the 17 SDGs (Crespo et al., 2017), there is a dearth of studies looking at the university's 'third mission' as it relates to all SDGs. Grund, (2020, para. 1) is asking the inevitable question: "How Can Universities Meaningfully and Effectively Use the SDGs?" In these uncharted waters, and to add to the body of literature on pressures of pandemic, the aim of this paper is twofold. Firstly, to explore the ways in which the 'third mission' of the university is founded in university mission statements in the United States, especially in those universities that have participated in both the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification and in the THE Impact Rankings; and secondly, to identify actions related to community engagement in their strategic planning as it translates into the 3 P's as well as mentioned measures and impact initiatives.

2. Literature Review and Context

2.1 Community Engagement in the U.S. Higher Education

Studies (Boyer; 1996; Furco, 2010) highlight that since 1995 there has been a growing

demand for public and land-grant institutions in the United States to return to their roots and address society's most pressing issues through a new commitment to the study of engagement. In 1995, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) questioned colleges and universities to become "engaged campuses" and requested universities to promote engagement and community participation through teaching and learning (Hodge et al., 2001). Boyer (1996) underscores that the traditional connection between higher education and American society had partially declined, because universities turned away from the public role of a more intellectual, guarded, and exclusionary view of research. Universities were urged to become more responsive to the needs of their communities/societies and develop commonly relationships with them (Kellogg Commission, 1999). The Kellogg Commission advised public universities and land-grant presidents in 1999 to move universities beyond the traditional "outreach and service" to a responsibility to "sharing and reciprocity" in their respective communities/societies. Maurrasse (2010, p. 223) states that university-community engagement is the "process that brings together groups of stakeholders from neighborhoods, city, or region (including individuals, organizations, business, and institutions to build relationships and practical collaboration to improve the collective well-being of the area and its stakeholders." Reed, Swanson, and Schlutt (2015) emphasize the importance of introducing extension and engagement throughout the entire university. Despite these demands for actions, the institutionalization of community-engaged research and scholarship has encountered challenges in many land-grant and public research universities (Jameson et al., 2012).

Researchers (i.e. Doberneck et al., 2010; Ellison and Eatman, 2008), also highlight the interaction of campus and community in numerous ways while the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement in the United States has helped focus universities' attention on a common definition of engagement as "a collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Classification, n.d.). Moreover, others (Brukhardt et al., 2004; Pollack, 2015) echoed that university-community engagement has been more rhetoric (window dressing) rather than actions in the last 25 years. Petter (2008) directly links quality to the nature of partnerships with communities and he explains that universities, "by encouraging faculty and students to work in partnership with communities, can enhance the scope and quality of research, provide better learning opportunities, and increase their social relevance and efficacy" (p. 1). Hall and Tandon (2012) also share the view that "community engagement may sometimes actually contribute to improvements in higher education institutions especially to their teaching and research functions" (pp. 4-5). Additionally, communities, funding agencies, and universities are increasingly involving community stakeholders as partners in research, to provide direct knowledge and insight. Drahota et al. (2016) highlight that effective community and stakeholder engagement supplements the accomplishment and importance of research by using the experience of those most connected to the community of interest and results in the development of more sustainable and adaptable interventions and research. "The institutions that we are recognizing today are doing extraordinary work in addressing their societal responsibilities in and through community engagement and service. In doing so, they bring scholarship, knowledge, and expertise to bear in the address of real challenges in our communal lives," said Paul LeMahieu, senior vice president at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "They inspire us, even as they instruct us how to be our best selves in service to our communities. These are the very purposes for which the Carnegie Endorsement was established. Its execution, under the stewardship of the Howard Swearer Center and Brown University, has helped us fulfill that purpose for the greater public good" (The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU, 2020).

2.2 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is one of the most ambitious and important global agreements in recent history. At the 70th Session of the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015, member states adopted a new global development agenda Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Sustainable development is an organizing principle for global development that supports the wellbeing of both people and the planet (United Nations, n.d.). There are 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Figure 1 shows those 17 SDGs and their grouping into three P's categories (People, Planet, and Prosperity).

Figure 1. SDGs and their grouping into three P's (People, Planet, and Prosperity).

The Sustainable Development Goals (graphics below) address the "social" side of sustainability or the "social" problems at the root of the different sustainable development goals. Click each icon below to learn more about them.

1 NO POVERTY 2 ZERO HUNGER 3 GOOD HEALTH AND WELL-BEING 4 QUALITY EDUCATION 5 GENDER EQUALITY 6 CLEAN WATER AND SANITATION 10 REDUCED INEQUALITIES

7 AFFORDABLE AND CLEAN ENERGY 13 CLIMATE ACTION 14 LIFE BELOW WATER 15 LIFE ON LAND 3 Ps

The Sustainable Development Goals (graphics below) address economic viability of and for businesses within the communities they reside in and the global marketplace…Click on each icon below to learn more about them.

8 DECENT WORK AND ECONOMIC GROWTH 9 INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE 11 SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES 12 RESPONSIBLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION 16 PEACE, JUSTICE AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS 17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE GOALS

The agenda containing the 17 SDGs as a core element came into effect on 1 January 2016. Universities as institutions with a long-standing history of education, knowledge creation and more recently the so-called 'third mission' of community and civic engagement have become actively involved in aiming to achieve the SDGs through "a larger potential for contributing to societal development" (Chankseliani & McCowan, 2021, p. 2).

2.3 Time Higher Education (THE) Rankings

The 2020 THE Impact Rankings (April 22, 2020) made available the list with the participant universities and 31 out of 766 located in the United States. Advocates of engagement (Bloomfield, 2005; Furco, 2010; Holland, 1999, 2006; Kellogg Commission, 1999) argue that it is one approach institutions can use to fulfill their public-oriented missions, increase financial support, and improve their public relations and reputation/prestige. Engagement cuts across and connects different university functions and

embraces the processes and values of a civil democracy (Alter, 2005; Boyer, 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2012; Holland, 2006). Furthermore, engagement has been shown to enrich student learning and citizenship (Bringle and Steinberg, 2010; Furco, 2010; Holland, 2005; Howe et al., 2014), improve faculty members' teaching ability (Blakey et al., 2015), increase trust, openness, and investment (Bruning et al., 2006), build relationships and the capacity of individuals and organizations to achieve desired goals (El Ansari and Phillips, 2004) and promote greater understanding of diversity and societal problems among all involved (Stukas and Dunlap, 2002).

2.4 The Triple Bottom Approach and the 3 P's

When talking about Sustainable Development as an aspect of Corporate Social Responsibility, a definition that "encompasses economic, social, and environmental dimensions" (Montiel & Delgado-Ceballos, 2014, p. 123) is needed. The Triple Bottom Line approach (Dainienė & Dagilienė, 2015) and the 3 P's (people, prosperity, planet) are two available tools to tools "to examine, appraise or measure the effects of business activities on the economy, social equity, and environment" (Arowoshegbe et al., 2016, p. 91) and ultimately an organization's sustainability. Figure 2 displays the three P's as an intertwined whole within community and civic engagement efforts or in other words social responsibility. It places the three foci within the context of corporate social responsibility and sustainable development while assigning each P to an area. 'People' here refers to goals targeting community engagement, 'Prosperity' focusses mainly on economic growth, and 'Planet' stands for environmental action.

Figure 2. Three P's as an intertwined whole within community and civic engagement efforts.

Generally, higher education is mostly associated with a concern for SDG 4, which focusses on providing quality education and falls into the category of the first P (people) (Allais et al., 2020; Ferguson & Roofe, 2020; Franco & Derbyshire, 2020; Martin & Godonoga, 2020). While achieving SDG 4 is undoubtedly a major concern for universities, it

should not be the only element of higher education's 'third mission' (Chankseliani & McCowan, 2021; Chaleta et al., 2021; Hansen et al., 2021).

2.5 University Mission Statements

Mission statements are considered the "institutional North Star" (McNaughtan et.al, 2019) and hence reflect the general positioning of organizations in their immediate and more global environment. Guiding the organization into the right direction, the mission statement hovers over all organizational operations. Strategic goals, actions and solutions, especially during a crisis, as important organizational routines and therefore should be guided by the values expressed in the mission statements. Studies have underscored the ubiquitous character of mission statements (Lang & Lopers-Sweet man, 1991; Morphew & Hartley, 2006) and critically examined their role for organizations like universities, in relation to both insiders and outsiders. Lang and Lopers-Sweetman (1991) emphasized the plethora of different forms mission statements can take and point out strengths and weaknesses of university mission statements as an encapsulation of the organization's "peculiar raison d'être, what it seeks to accomplish in the larger environment" (p. 600). Ultimately, mission statements express an organization's plan, hopes and expectations of the future.

In addition to this focus on the mission behind the mission statement, other studies have driven the further investigation of the impact mission statements have on both strategic and operational decision making (Allison, 2019; Haberkamp et.al., 2018; Zenk & Seashore Louis, 2018). Not just for universities but in a broader organizational context it can be assumed that an organization's alignment of its mission and vision leads to an enhanced performance (Allison, 2019). The mission statement as "a socially constructed phenomenon with a variety of different functions revealed through metaphor that engage different audiences and are closely tied to institutional context and purpose" (Zenk & Seashore Louis, 2018, p. 1) represents a key element of the organizational identity.

While mission statements convey a general direction or guideline for universities, it is practices like the ones outlined in the institutions' strategic planning that reflect a university's actual values and priorities. Even though U.S. universities like to write ideas and values like supporting the community on their banners or "socially responsible universities", the practices enforcing those values don't always align with the promoted mission. During exceptional times like the covid crisis, organizational routines and potential weaknesses become even more visible.

2.6 Strategic Planning

Routines such as strategic planning reflect strategic views held by universities and provide a window into how universities position themselves in a globalized economy (Papadimitriou, 2014). Strategic planning is a way of thinking, acting, and learning. Hence, strategic planning has received considerable attention by several universities in several different countries. Strategic planning is "a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what organizations or other entities do and why they do it" (Bryson and Alston, 2004, p. 3). Beyond the criticism of strategic planning in the 1980s "planning remains a pervasive practice in today's organizations" (Whittington & Cailluet, 2008, p. 241). Researchers stressed that strategic planning has a powerful impact on the competitive success of universities (Dooris et al., 2002; Taylor & Miroiu, 2002). Additionally, other researchers have argued that in recent years, where information is now directly available, strategic planning becomes even more important for higher education institutions (Rowley & Sherman, 2001). Papadimitriou (2014) noted that "in general,

planning activities involves thinking about the future. The central idea of strategic planning within higher education institutions is not to envisage their future, but rather, to make better decisions here and now in order to reach a desired future. Universities' strategic planning does not exist in a vacuum. Rather their planning exists in relation to the external and internal environment in which the university operates" (pp. 262-3). Thus, in this study we expect to find information about universities' actions related to community engagement, specifically in those 15 institutions that have participated in both THE ranking and Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.

3. Methodology

4.1 Data Collection and Analysis

To understand if universities are merely looking good or actually doing good, this study uses document analysis to examine the 3 P's (People, Planet, Prosperity) framework reflecting the 17 SDGs in universities' mission statements in a sample of 15 universities in the United States that have both the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification and THE Impact Rankings. Additionally, it examines their strategic planning with an effort to understand community engagement actions related to the 3 P's (if any) as well as measures or/and impact mentioned in those documents. For the purpose of this study, we collected publicly available data related to mission statements and strategic planning. Additionally, we collected data from the THE website. Specifically, we gathered data that has been collected from the THE rankings released in April of 2020. A search on the 15 institutional websites produced the 15 mission statements, which were copy-pasted into a word document in order to facilitate coding. The strategic planning were also obtained through a search of the institutional websites and consecutively saved as pdf files. The process of deductive coding employing a priori codes and themes allows for a close analysis of the data according to a theory or hypothesis (Bingham & Witkowsky, 2021). In this study, the three P's (people, prosperity, planet) were used as a priori codes, which were then searched within the content of the university mission statements and strategic planning. The 3 P's were hence used to describe and interpret the phenomenon of community engagement as the third mission of the university, following Boyatzis' (1998) definition of a theme as, "a pattern in the information that at minimum describes and organizes the possible observations and at maximum interprets aspects of the phenomenon" (p. 161). Thematic analysis was employed as "a method for systematically identifying, organizing, and offering insight into patterns of meaning (themes) across a data set" (Braun & Clarke, 2012) and was perfectly suited for identifying patterns communicating community engagement. The process of identifying the themes consists of the "careful reading and re-reading of the data" (Rice & Ezzy, 1999, p. 258); while Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006) considered it "a form of pattern recognition within the data, where emerging themes become the categories for analysis" (p. 82). The official university websites were dissected for themes, following Boyatzis' (1998) claims that "thematic analysis enables scholars, observers, or practitioners to use a wide variety of types of information in a systematic manner that increases their accuracy or sensitivity in understanding and interpreting observations about people, events, situations, and organizations" (p. 5).

5. Findings and Discussion

5.1. Universities and SDG's

The 3 P's are each comprised of a specific number of SDG standards. The category People subsumes 7 SDGs, Planet subsumes 4 SDGs, and finally Prosperity makes up the remaining 6 SDGs (see Figure 1). Table 1 shows the distribution of the 17 SDG's in the THE rankings of the 15 sampled universities, as they relate to the 3 P's people, planet and prosperity. The analysis of the data obtained from the THE rankings revealed that within the category People, a total of 7 universities put emphasis on SDG 3 (Good Health and Wellbeing). SDG 5 (Gender Equality) was emphasized by 5 of the 15 universities, SDG 4 (Quality Education) was a priority for 3 institutions, as was SDG 1 (No Poverty). The least attention appears to be paid to SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) only found in two institutions, SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) in one institution and finally SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) was not found in any of the 15 universities according to the THE.

Within the category Planet, SDGs 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) and 13 (Climate Action) did not show up in the THE evaluation of any of the 15 universities, SDG 14 (Life Below Water) and 15 (Life on Land) were only mentioned by 2 respective institutions.

Lastly, the category Prosperity sums up a total of 6 SDGs. By design all universities need to participate in SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals). Institutional collaboration in achieving the goal of sustainable development builds the base for success and basically sets the tone for other collaborative efforts (Tandon & Chakrabarti, 2017). SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) were identified in 6 of the universities, SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production) and 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) could be found in 2, and finally SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure was located in only one of the 15 universities.

Table 1. SDGs related to 3 P's and universities' involvement

University	People (SDG 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10)							Planet (SDG 7, 13, 14, 15)				Prosperity (SDG 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17)					
1. Arizona State	1									14	15						17
2. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill						6						8		11			17
3. Florida International University	1									14						16	17
4. University of Georgia			3									8		11			17
5. University of Maryland					5						15				12		17
6. University of Massachusetts			3	4								8					17
7. Ohio State University			3									8		11			17
8. University of South Florida			3		5							8					17
9. Stony Brook University					5		10					8					17
10. Loyola University New Orleans	1				5											16	17
11. Old Dominion University				4			10							11			17
12. Oregon State University					5									11	12		17

Universities																	Total
13. University of Texas at Arlington			3	4										11			17
14. University of Texas at El Paso			3	4	5												17
15. University of North Carolina at Greensboro			3	4									9				17
Total	3	0	7	5	6	1	2	0	0	2	2	6	1	6	2	2	15

As visible through the color coding, out of the 3 P's, People and Prosperity are most prevalent. Only three institutions mention environmental and ecological concerns, which alludes to a focus of universities on issues that pertain to society and community rather than the planet as an ecosystem. The analysis of the data confirms literature stating SDG 4 (Quality Education) is a concern for universities (Allais et al., 2020; Ferguson & Roofe, 2020; Franco & Derbyshire, 2020; Martin & Godonoga, 2020), however the THE rankings only place it as a specific focus for 5 of the 15 sample institutions. This supports the notion that SDG 4 is not the only 'holy grail' for universities to consider (Chankseliani & McCowan, 2021; Chaleta et al., 2021; Hansen et al., 2021). Rather than merely relying on the THE rankings, this study analyzed documents like the institutional mission statements and strategic planning in order to get better insights into the ways in which the universities incorporate civic and community engagement.

5.2 Mission Statements

Table 2 illustrates the analysis of the 15 mission statements made publicly available by the sample universities.

Table 2 Missions statements translated to 3 P's

Universities	People	Planet	Prosperity
1. Arizona State	X		X
2. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	X		X
3. Florida International University	X		X
4. University of Georgia	X		X
5. University of Maryland	X		X
6. University of Massachusetts	X		X
7. Ohio State University			X
8. University of South Florida			X
9. Stony Brook University	X		X
10. Loyola University New Orleans			X
11. Old Dominion University			X
12. Oregon State University	X	X	X
13. University of Texas at Arlington	X		X
14. University of Texas at El Paso	X		X
15. University of North Carolina at Greensboro	X	X	X

The overall distribution of the 2 P's People and Prosperity coincides for the most part with the evaluation in the THE rankings. However, whereas the THE rankings note that all 15 institutions cover both People and Prosperity, the content analysis of the publicly available

mission statements shows that four of the 15 universities do not explicitly mention a focus on the people in the communities. Examples of the ways in which universities talk about the category People within sustainable development are often related to SDG 4 (Quality Education) "as an essential component given its role in education policy and practice at all levels through teaching and research" (Chaleta, 2021, p. 1828). Providing "affordable and accessible education of high quality" (Mission Statement, University of Massachusetts) is part of most universities' responsibilities as providers of higher education. However, universities extend their missions to include the "formation of good citizenship through its community service learning programs" (Mission Statement, University of Texas at Arlington) as well as the desire "to provide state-of-the-art innovative health care, while serving as a resource to a regional health care network and to the traditionally underserved" (Mission Statement, Stony Brook University). Community service learning as well as community health care are just two examples of the many ways in which universities become active participants in their local communities.

Another interesting finding is that all 15 analyzed mission statements mention a focus on Prosperity, yet only two of them bring up environmental issues. This "commitment to excellence in public service, economic development, and technical assistance activities designed to address the strategic needs of the state" (Mission Statement, University of Georgia) ensures that the communities prosper and thrive. Collaboration and partnerships play an essential role in maintaining this prosperity of the communities, which is why the university as an institution needs to be "mindful of its role as a resource to the community, locally, nationally, and internationally, the University continually seeks partnerships with public and private concerns in order to advance the economic, social, and cultural welfare of our constituencies" (Mission Statement, University of Texas at Arlington). As mentioned above, the category Planet was found to be underrepresented in the analyzed mission statements compared to the other two categories People and Prosperity. However, institutions like Oregon State University make it clear that they put emphasis on "Maintaining a rigorous focus on academic excellence, particularly in three signature areas: the science of sustainable earth ecosystems, health and wellness, and economic prosperity and social progress" (Mission Statement, Oregon State University).

A close look at Tables 1 and 2 shows that the THE evaluation of the 15 U.S. universities does not completely correspond with the information provided in their mission statements. Mission statements as the "institutional North Star" (McNaughtan et.al, 2019) of universities are supposed to provide general values and institutional priorities. Papadimitriou (2020) states that the universities' mission, besides the creation, reflection, and spread of knowledge, is also one of social and community engagement, or in other words the university's third mission. It is the "ongoing engagement of higher education institutions across world regions with market forces, the state and civil society (for instance, NGOs)" (Calderon, 2021, para. 18) that needs to be a main focus of higher education. In a globalized world, the range of a university's responsibilities in those forms of engagement has to be extended to their stakeholders and their communities.

5.3 Strategic Planning

The mission statements and their integration of the SDGs present valuable data to determine what universities emphasize in their institutional 'third mission'. It is in the strategic planning of universities that concrete actions become apparent in the form of the desired or anticipated impact of their community engagement. Table 3 provides an overview of which of the 15 universities mention a desired or anticipated impact of their community engagement in their most current, publicly available strategic planning.

Table 3 Strategic planning, measures, and impact

University	Year	Mention Impact	Mention Measures
1. Arizona State	2019-2021	X	X
2. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	2017-2022	X	-
3. Florida International University	2016-2025	-	-
4. University of Georgia	2020-2025	X	X
5. University of Maryland	2016	X	-
6. University of Massachusetts	2018-2023	X	-
7. Ohio State University	2016-2020	X	-
8. University of South Florida	2019-2023	X	-
9. Stony Brook University	2019	-	-
10. Loyola University New Orleans	2020-2023	X	-
11. Old Dominion University	2014-2019	X	-
12. Oregon State University	2019-2023	X	X
13. University of Texas at Arlington	2020-2025	X	-
14. University of Texas at El Paso	2020-2023	X	-
15. University of North Carolina at Greensboro	2017-2022	X	-

The vast majority (13 out of 15) of the universities mentioned impact in terms of the 'third mission'. In their 2018-2023 strategic planning for example the University of Massachusetts states "We aim to create far-reaching impact on society by welcoming students and faculty from around the world and assisting them to contribute to the welfare of people both locally and globally". Another example is the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill's definition of impact as the desire to "Grow partnerships with businesses, non-profits, and government to translate and implement research-based ideas and discoveries into practical applications and public use" (strategic plan 2017-2022). Old Dominion University's strategic planning mentions the university's desire "to focus community engagement efforts and raise awareness of the University's work on community-relevant issues that impact our region and beyond" (Strategic planning 2014-2019).

	Universities	People (THE)	Planet (THE)	Prosperity (THE)	People (Mission)	Planet (Mission)	Prosperity (Mission)	Mention Impact	ention Measures
1.	Arizona State	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
2.	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	X		X	X		X	X	-
3.	Florida International University	X	X	X	X		X	-	-
4.	University of Georgia	X		X	X		X	X	X
5.	University of Maryland	X	X	X	X		X	X	-
6.	University of Massachusetts	X		X	X		X	X	-

# / University								
7. Ohio State University	X		X			X	X	-
8. University of South Florida	X		X			X	X	-
9. Stony Brook University	X		X	`X		X	-	-
10. Loyola University New Orleans	X		X			X	X	-
11. Old Dominion University	X		X			X	X	-
12. Oregon State University	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
13. University of Texas at Arlington	X		X	X		X	X	-
14. University of Texas at El Paso			X	X		X	X	-
15. University of North Carolina at Greensboro		X	X	X	X	X	X	-

However, only three universities elaborate further on how they intend to measure their impact. An example for well-structured and publicly shared impact measurements comes from the University of Georgia. The Strategic planning offers specific Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that serve as a control point for the institution's strategic goals in order to "illustrate how the impact of these activities is changing lives in Georgia, across our nation, and around the world" (2025 Strategic Planning, University of Georgia). In the Appendixes Figure 4 illustrates one set of KPIs provided by the University of Georgia for their community engagement goals. Another example for a possible measure of community engagement impact is provided by Arizona State University (ASU). Rather than KPIs, Arizona State includes specific strategies to address the issues mentioned in their strategic planning. As an example, in order to address Issue 5 ("Enhance Our Local Impact and Social Embeddedness"), ASU provides four strategies (see appendixes Figure 5). Additionally Oregon State University provides a similar impact report in form of a checklist (Appendixes Figure 6).

Finally, Table 4 summarizes the findings from the THE rankings, the mission statements as well as the Strategic Planning.

Table 4 Overall view

6. Conclusion, Limitations, and Future Research

While the results from the THE rankings and the analysis of the mission statements vary slightly, there are still major trends that can be observed. U.S. universities seem to focus mainly on the 2 P's People and Prosperity, while issues pertaining to the Planet tend to not be focused on as much. For the categories of People and Prosperity, the universities mention a desired impact in their strategic planning, however, often fail to specify how that impact will be measured or achieved. A possible limitation of this study is that we focusses exclusively on publicly available data and maybe the universities mentioned the desired impact and its measures in other documents.

Overall, U.S. universities certainly look good by incorporating community engagement into their missions, but also do good, by including this 'third mission' into the strategic planning. That way, the basis is laid with a lot of room for improvement for U.S.

universities to be engaged and get involved in their communities while following their social and community responsibilities (Maurrasse, 2010).

First and foremost, this study uses only a preliminary examination of the data and presents a steppingstone for a plethora of potential future explorations. The insights gained on the focus of U.S. universities on the 2 P's People and Prosperity raises the question of why universities don't invest more in ecological and environmental issues. More research needs to be done in order to understand if this is potentially rooted in a lack of capacities or is seen by the universities as more of a state level issue. Another direction for future research is to investigate how the desired impact of strategic planning translates into real-life actions that can be measured and observed.

References

Allais, S., Unterhalter, E., Molebatsi, P., Posholi, L., & Howell, C. (2020). Universities, the public good, and the SDG 4 vision. In *Grading Goal Four* (pp. 135-155). Brill Sense.

Allison, J. (2019). "Mission statements and vision statements: examining the relationship t oward performance outcomes", *Global Journal of Management and Marketing Volume*, *3*(1): 25-36.

Alter T. (2005). "Achieving the promise of public scholarship", in Peters S., Jordan N., Adamek M., Alter T. (Eds.), *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system* (pp. 461-488), Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) 2020, February 4. 2020 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Recipients Announced. https://www.aplu.org/news-and-media/blog/2020-carnegie-community-engagement-classification-recipients-announced

Arowoshegbe, A. O., Emmanuel, U., & Gina, A. (2016). "Sustainability and triple bottom l ine: An overview of two interrelated concepts", *Igbinedion University Journal of Accounting*, *2*(16): 88-126.

Bingham, A. J., & Witkowsky, P. (2021). "Deductive and inductive approaches to qualitative data analysis", in Charles Vanover et al. (Eds.) *Analyzing and Interpreting Qualitative Research: After the Intervie* (pp. 133-148*). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Blakey J.M., Theriot S., Cazzell M., Sattler M. (2015). "Is service-learning worth it? A mixed- methods study of faculty's service-learning experiences", *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, *3*(1).

Bloomfield V. (2005). "Public scholarship: An administrator's view", in Peters S.J., Jordan N.R., Adamek M., Alter T.R. (Eds.), *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system.* (pp. 363-392), Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Boyatzis R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development,* Michigan: Sage.

Boyer E.L. (1996). "The scholarship of engagement", *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, 1(1): 11-20.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in*

psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological (pp. 57–71). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004

Bringle R.G., Steinberg K. (2010). "Educating for informed community involvement", *American Journal of Community Psychology, 46*: 428-441.

Brukardt M.J., Holland B., Percy S.L. Zimpher N. (2004). *Calling the Question: Is Higher Education Ready to Commit to Community Engagement. A Wingspread Statement*; Milwaukee Idea Office, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee: Milwaukee, WI, USA

Bruning S.D., Mcgrew S., Cooper M. (2006). "Town-gown relationships: Exploring university- community engagement from the perspective of community members", *Public Relations review*, *3:* 125-130.

Bryson, J. and Alston, F. (2004). *Creating and Implementing Your Strategic Plan: AWorkbook for Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Calderon, A. (2021, April 22). "How can universities ensure progress towards the UN SDGs?", *University World News*. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20210422155552481

Carnegie Classification (n.d.). *Definition of Community Engagement*. https://www.csusm.edu/community/carnegie.html

Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement Of Teaching (2013, May). Elective CommunityEngagement Classification: First-Time Classification Documentation Framework. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/downloads/community_eng/first-time_framework.pdf.

Chaleta, E., Saraiva, M., Leal, F., Fialho, I., & Borralho, A. (2021). "Higher Education and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)—Potential Contribution of the Undergraduate Courses of the School of Social Sciences of the University of Évora", *Sustainability*, *13*(4): 1828.

Chankseliani, M., & McCowan, T. (2021). "Higher education and the sustainable development goals", *Higher Education*, *81*(1): 1-8.

Crespo, B., Míguez-Álvarez, C., Arce, M. E., Cuevas, M., & Míguez, J. L. (2017). "The sustainable development goals: An experience on higher education". *Sustainability*, *9*(8), 1353.

Dainienė, R., & Dagilienė, L. (2015). "A TBL approach based theoretical framework for measuring social innovations", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *213*: 275-280.

Doberneck D.M., Glass C.R., Schweitzer J.H. (2010). "From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publicly engaged scholarship", *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement,* 14, (4): 5-35.

Dooris, M.J., Kelley, J. and Trainer, J. (2002). "Strategic planning in higher education", *New Directions for Higher Education*, *116*: 5-11.

Drahota A., Meza R. D., Brikho B., Naaf M., Estabillo J.A., Gomez E.D., et al. (2016). Community-academic partnerships: a systematic review of the state of the literature and recommendations for future research. *Milbank Q., 94*: 163-214.

El Ansari, W., Phillips C.J. (2004). "The costs and benefits to participants in community partnership: A paradox?", *Health Promotion Practice*, *5*(1): 35- 48.

Ellison J., & Eatman T.K., (2008). "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University", *Imagining Americ,* 16. https://surface.syr.edu/ia/16

Fereday J., Muir-Cochrane E. (2006). "Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development", *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1): 80-92.

Ferguson, T., & Roofe, C. G. (2020). "SDG 4 in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities", *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *21*(5): 959-975.

Fitzgerald H.E., Bruns K., Sonka S.T., Furco A., Swanson L. (2012). "The centrality of engagement in higher education", *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement,* 16(3): 7-27.

Franco, I. B., & Derbyshire, E. (2020). SDG 4 quality education. In *Actioning the Global Goals for Local Impact* (pp. 57-68). Singapore, Springer.

Furco A. (2010). "The engaged campus: Toward a comprehensive approach to public engagement", *British Journal of Educational Studies, 58*(4): 375-390.

Grund, L. (2020, July 6). "How Can Universities Meaningfully and Effectively Use the SDGs?", *IISD SDG Knowledge Hub*. https://sdg.iisd.org/commentary/generation-2030/how-can-universities-meaningfully-and-effectively-use-the-sdgs/

Haberkamp, A. M., Hoppen, N., & Diehl, C. A. (2018). "The Mission As A Driver For Strategy Formulation In Higher Education Institutions", *Revista Alcance*, *25*(2): 126-141.

Hall B.L., Tandon R. (2014). *Guest Editors World Report on Higher Education. Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education Contributing to Social Change*. London: Palgrave.

Hansen, B., Stiling, P. and Uy, W.F. (2021). "Innovations and challenges in SDG integration and reporting in higher education: a case study from the University of South Florida", *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-08-2020-0310

Hodge G., Lewis T., Kramer K., Hughes R. (2001). "Collaboration for excellence: Engaged scholarship at Collin County Community College", *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 25: 675-690.

Holland B.A. (2006). "Reflections on community-campus partnerships: What has been learned? What are the next challenges?", in Pasque P.A., Smerek R.E., Dwyer B., Bowman N., Mallory B.L. (Eds.), *Higher education collaboratives for community engagement and improvement* (pp. 10-17), Ann Arbor, MI: National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good.

Holland B.A. (1997). "Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors", *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4(1): 30-41.

Howe C.W., Coleman K., Hamshaw K., Westdijk K. (2014). "Student development and service- learning: A three-phased model for course design", *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement,* 2(1): 44-62.

Jameson J.K., Clayton P.H., Jaeger A.J., Bringle R.G. (2012). "Investigating faculty learning in the context of community-engaged scholarship", *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(1): 40-55.

Kellogg Commission On The Future Of State And Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Lang, D. W., & Lopers-Sweetman, R. (1991). "The role of statements of institutional purpose", *Research in Higher Education*, *32*(6): 599-624.

Martin, M., & Godonoga, A. (2020). *SDG 4-policies for flexible learning pathways in higher education: Taking stock of good practices internationally*. IIEPUNESCO Working Papers, International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris, France.

Maurrasse D.J. (2010). "Standards of practice in community engagement", in Fitzgerald H.E., Burack C., Seifer S.D. (Eds.), H*andbook of engaged landscapes, future directions*: Vol. 2. *Community Campus-Partnerships*, (pp. 223-233), East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

McNaughtan, Jon, Louis, Sarah, Hugo, Gacía, & Elisabeth D. McNaughtan (2019). "An institutional North Star: the role of values in presidential communication and decision-making, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *41*(2): 153-171.

Montiel, I., & Delgado-Ceballos, J. (2014). "Defining and measuring corporate sustainability: Are we there yet?" *Organization & Environment*, *27*(2): 113-139.

Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). "Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type", *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(3): 456-471.

Neubauer C., Calame M. (2017). "Global Pressing Problems and the Sustainable Development Goals", *Higher Education in the World 6 - Towards a Socially Responsible University: Balancing the Global with the Local*. Global University Network for Innovation.

Papadimitriou, A. (2014). "Strategic planning and benchmarking organizational routines of universities in the Western Balkans", *The TQM Journal*, *26*(3): 261-274.

Papadimitriou A. (2020). "Beyond Rhetoric: Reinventing the public mission of higher education", *Tertiary Education and Management*, 26(1): 1-4.

Petter, A. (2008). "Civic Engagement: Challenges and Opportunities" University of Victoria (To the closing session of CU Expo08).

Pollack S.S. (2015). "Critical civic literacy as an essential component of the undergraduate curriculum", in Jacobs W.J., Sutin S.E., Weidman J.C., Yeager J.L. (Eds.), *Community engagement in higher education: Policy reforms and practice* (pp. 161-184), Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.

Reed A.S., Swanson L., Schlutt F. (2015). "Timberline Manifesto: Seven concepts linking Extension and engagement", *Journal of Extension*, vol. 53, n. 4, Article 4COM1.

Rice P.L., Ezzy D. (1999). *Qualitative research methods: A health focus (Vol. 720),* Victoria, Australia: Oxford.

Rowley, D.J. & Sherman, H. (2001). *From Strategy to Change: Implementing the Plan in Higher Education,* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Stukas A., Dunlap M. (2002). "Community involvement: theoretical approaches and educational initiatives", *Journal of Social Issues*, 58: 411-427.

Tandon, R., & Chakrabarti, K. (2017). Partnering with higher education institutions for SDG 17: the role of higher education institutions in multistakeholder partnerships.

Taylor, J. & Miroiu, A. (2002). "Policy Making, Strategic Planning and Management of Higher Education", *Papers on Higher Education*, UNESCO-CEPES, Bucharest.

United Nations (n.d.). Sustainable Development Goals. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/

Whittington, R. and Cailluet, L. (2008). "The crafts of strategy", Long Range Planning, 41(3): 241-247.

Zenk, L. R., & Seashore Louis, K. (2018). "Mission as Metaphor: Reconceptualizing How Leaders Utilize Institutional Mission", *Teachers College Record*, *120*(9): 1-34.

Appendixes

Figure 4. Example of KPIs

STRATEGIC GOAL 3.2: Strengthen UGA's role in economic development across the state, with a particular emphasis on underserved communities.
KPI 3.5: Annual economic impact on the state of Georgia and on the counties of Georgia
KPI 3.6: Sponsored expenditures for community partnerships by county
KPI 3.7: Sponsored award funding for community partnerships by county
KPI 3.8: Sponsored proposals submitted for community partnerships by county
KPI 3.9: New businesses started with support of UGA
KPI 3.10: New jobs created with support of UGA

Figure 5. Strategies

Strategy 1: Strengthen Arizona's interactive network of teaching, learning and discovery resources that reflects the scope of ASU's comprehensive knowledge enterprise.
Strategy 2: Co-develop solutions to the critical social, technical, cultural and environmental issues facing 21st century Arizona.
Strategy 3: Meet the needs of 21st century learners by empowering families in the education of their children, increasing student success through personalized learning pathways, and promoting a college-going culture in Arizona's K-12 schools.
Strategy 4: Establish, with Mayo Clinic, innovative health solutions pathways capable of educating 200 million people about health care, engaging 20 million people in online health care delivery, and enhancing treatment for 2 million patients (2019 5 Year Strategic Plan, Arizona State University).

Figure 6 Example of the checklist for the goal of local as well as global impact

Figure 5 Checklist

SP4.0 Goal III: Significant and Visible Impact in Oregon and Beyond										
	Degrees Awarded—Total	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
	Undergraduate Degrees Awarded	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
	Undergraduate Degrees Awarded per Lagged Enrollment	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
	Graduate Degrees Awarded	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
	Dollars Leveraged per Appropriated Dollars for Statewides (SWPS) Research				✓					
	Number of Companies with Active Contracts				✓					2
	Number of Active International Partnerships				✓					2
	Percent Oregon Resident Undergraduates from Rural Counties						✓	✓	✓	2
	Number of Professional and Continuing Education Courses Delivered				✓					2
	Student Credit Hours Delivered				✓		✓	✓	✓	
	Student Credit Hours Delivered at Portland Center				✓					
	Student Credit Hours Delivered at OSH Hatfield Marine Science Center				✓					