Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Community Development

ISSN: 1557-5330 (Print) 1944-7485 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rcod20

Discussions of challenges in implementing UCE for community development: Case from a top-down context

Andi Sri Wahyuni, György Málovics & Judit Gébert

To cite this article: Andi Sri Wahyuni, György Málovics & Judit Gébert (10 Mar 2025): Discussions of challenges in implementing UCE for community development: Case from a top-down context, Community Development, DOI: 10.1080/15575330.2025.2473078

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2025.2473078

Published online: 10 Mar 2025.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2025.2473078

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Discussions of challenges in implementing UCE for community development: Case from a top-down context

Andi Sri Wahyuni, György Málovics, and Judit Gébert

Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the motivations and challenges faced by faculty members in implementing university–community engagement (UCE) in a top-down context. Using a qualitative approach, we conducted 23 interviews with Indonesian faculty members and analyzed images of their UCE activities. Findings show that UCE is primarily driven by institutional mandates, such as the Tri Dharma and faculty workload (BKD). However, some faculty members are intrinsically motivated, seeing UCE as an opportunity to contribute to the local community. While communities recognize mutual benefits, institutional shortcomings limit sustainable impact. A key finding is that current UCE evaluation lacks qualitative community feedback, weakening its effectiveness. To improve UCE, the government should integrate deeper community perspectives in assessments. Moreover, rather than mandating participation, institutions should support faculty members who are genuinely motivated to engage based on their interests and capacities.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 22 July 2024
Accepted 20 February 2025

KEYWORDS
University–community engagement; community development; faculty challenges; faculty opportunities; top-down mechanism

Introduction

The relationship between higher education institutions (HEIs) and their local communities has long been debated, with an increasing emphasis on how universities can effectively contribute to community development (Bhattacharyya, 1995; Hurd & Stanton, 2023). Recent studies suggest that HEI-related programs should concentrate on meaningful capacity-building outcomes rather than just quantifying service hours or academic achievements (Grant & Hains, 2024; Hurd & Stanton, 2023; Wood, 2016). This aligns with the concept of university–community engagement (UCE), which stresses mutual benefits in partnerships and the empowerment of communities/community partners (Benneworth et al., 2018).

To ensure the stability and sustainability of UCE, it must be integrated into the university or institution to support wide implementation and continuity (sustainability) of community engagement (Farner, 2019). However, incorporating UCE into academic tasks poses risks, as academic actors might focus on quickly fulfilling their obligations rather than carrying out meaningful UCE (Wahyuni & Málovics, 2023). In situations where

CONTACT Andi Sri Wahyuni andisriwahyuni@poliupg.ac.id Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

UCE is seen as an obligatory task, it may initially yield success but gradually lose momentum over time (Groark & McCall, 2018), especially since the academic environment is often characterized by irrational demands for teaching hours, high expectations for publishing in reputable journals, and insufficient remuneration and resources (Mahmud, 2022).

In addition, a significant proportion of faculty members in the Indonesian context (the context of the present study) earn below the minimum wage, thereby requiring them to seek additional employment beyond their academic responsibilities (Pertiwi et al., 2023). Such contextual factors suggest that Indonesian faculty members encounter challenges in allocating adequate time to UCE activities. Nevertheless, there is no prior research that thoroughly investigates and empirically demonstrates how the Indonesian academic context influences the implementation of UCE programs. The present paper aims to investigate the situation of UCE within Indonesia – in a context where UCE is an obligation to be fulfilled within the academy. Our research question is: What are faculty members' perceptions of UCE programs in an Indonesian setting, i.e. what are the opportunities and challenges faculty members face in implementing UCE programs that contribute to community development within a top-down context? To address the research question, we collected data through in-depth interviews with 23 Indonesian faculty members from various universities with diverse backgrounds and experiences.

The article begins with a review of the existing literature on the challenges faculty members encounter in implementing UCE programs in general and continues with an explanation of the Indonesian context. Subsequently, the research methodology is outlined, followed by a presentation and discussion of the study's findings.

Literature review and context

HEIs, UCE, and contributing to community development

The relationship between HEIs and surrounding communities has been a long-standing issue (Bhattacharyya, 1995; Wood, 2016), with increasing focus on how universities can better contribute to community development (Hurd & Stanton, 2023). Community development encompasses a wide range of practices, theories, and interpretations (Grant & Hains, 2024). For the purpose of this study, the authors will adopt the definition which has been extensively referenced in community development studies (Matarrita-Cascante & Brennan, 2012):

> Community development is a process that entails organization, facilitation, and action, which allows people to establish ways to create the community they want to live in. It is a process that provides vision, planning, direction, and coordinated action towards desired goals associated with the promotion of efforts aimed at improving the conditions in which local resources operate. As a result, community developers harness local economic, human, and physical resources to secure daily requirements and respond to changing needs and conditions. (p. 297)

Various models have been developed as frameworks for universities to collaborate with communities, ranging from older development models that emphasize solidarity and agency, such as Bhattacharyya's (1995), to newer models that focus on community capacity building (Grant & Hains, 2024). These models critically highlight that universities should rigorously design community development-oriented programs that concentrate

on capacity-building outcomes, rather than merely stressing HEI – community relations, "counting service hours," and "measuring student outcomes" (Hurd & Stanton, 2023, p. 876). This aligns with Wood's (2016, p. 685) assertion that university programs should genuinely focus on whether their initiatives "make a difference" in the surrounding communities.

The concept of UCE plays a critical role in the effort to bridge the needs of the community and the university (Koekkoek et al., 2021). Benneworth et al. (2018) define UCE as "a process whereby universities engage with community stakeholders to undertake joint activities that can be mutually beneficial even if each side benefits differently" (p. 17). Achieving a balance between community needs and university objectives can present challenges, particularly when juxtaposed with models that prioritize community capacity building over institutional outputs (Grant & Hains, 2024; Hurd & Stanton, 2023; Wood, 2016). Thus, for the present study, successful UCE means that both the community and the university are able to achieve their goals through sustainable collaboration, with the community benefiting from enhanced capacity to solve their problems, while the university gains valuable insights and experiences that contribute to its conventional missions (education and research). Success is thus not measured by institutional metrics but by tangible, long-term improvements in community well-being and the sustainability of collaborative efforts.

Benneworth et al. (2018) definition complements the ideas of HEI scholars focusing "solely" on HEI's role in community development by emphasizing the reciprocal nature of the university – community relationship. This alignment suggests that, while distinct in their focal points, the two frameworks can inform one another in fostering more effective and impactful university – community collaborations. This, in essence, fosters the collaboration desired by HEI scholars advocating for community development (Hurd & Stanton, 2023). In a similar vein, UCE models (Clayton et al., 2010; Davis et al., 2017; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Himmelman, 2001) distinguish between more and less meaningful forms of UCE. According to the original typology developed by Himmelman (2001), (coalitions of) collaborative betterment as a "shallow" form of UCE refers to goal-oriented cooperation which is controlled by powerful (in this case, academic) participants and does not aim to transform power relations within the cooperative project and the wider society but leaves them untouched. Meanwhile, collaborative empowerment as a deep and more valuable form of UCE aims to transform power relations by placing power in the hands of communities.

Challenges for community development within academia

These ideal concepts of community development and UCE face significant challenges when it comes to their practical realization. This is particularly true in an era where university faculty members are facing escalating demands as universities are increasingly compelled to adhere to market logic (Kang & Mok, 2024). Campus rankings based on Western standards are practices of cultural imperialism and represent the neo-liberalization of higher education worldwide, entrapping universities in a futile competition (Olssen, 2021). As a consequence of fulfilling various targets stipulated by rankings, university stakeholders are coerced into meeting diverse requirements, ranging from publications to international projects (McIntire et al., 2024). Within *transnational academic*

capitalism (Hazelkorn, 2018), UCE is more supported at the level of rhetoric than in material terms at the governmental level (Goddard et al., 2016). In addition, certain elements of the dominant values and norms that characterize academia also pose barriers to the implementation of UCE, including:

- the perception of the university as an "enlightened meeting place" for the elite and the resultant lack of academic presence of marginalized groups (Benneworth & Osborne, 2014);
- the unstructured, real-life, political situations that arise when working with communities compared to "safe," predictable university environments (Hazelkorn, 2016);
- UCE (e.g. research alongside and for the benefit of non-academic actors) may conflict with the concept of academic freedom (Benneworth & Osborne, 2014);
- UCE is *"too much work"* compared to conventional approaches to teaching and research (Goddard et al., 2016), being beyond university duties (Hazelkorn, 2016);
- UCE processes often conflict with dominant academic dogmas (e.g. frontal classroom teaching or "objective" research) (Benneworth et al., 2018; Levin, 2012); and
- as a consequence of a *lack of quantifiable measurement*, UCE is typically not reflected in university performance evaluation systems (Hazelkorn, 2016).

UCE in a case study context

In Indonesia, community service, which embodies the concept of UCE, was initially formalized in the 1970s, with a primary focus on reaching out to rural communities (Wahyuni, 2023), involving university students directly engaging with local communities, fostering collaboration at the grassroots level. During this period, when only four universities existed in Indonesia, the arrival of students in rural areas brought tangible improvements (Hardjasoemantri, 2007; Mandag et al., 2017). They worked alongside local communities, addressing substantial issues, such as pest control, teaching children, tackling public health challenges, and assisting village officials in building infrastructure (Fussell & Quarmby, 1975). This contributed to capacity building in remote areas of Indonesia. This community service program gained international recognition as a pioneering initiative, exemplifying how university-led programs could significantly contribute to community development (Fussell & Quarmby, 1975; Regional Office for Education in Asia, UNESCO, n.d.).

As the program evolved, community service was institutionalized as part of the Tri Dharma of Indonesian higher education, encompassing three core responsibilities: education and teaching, research and development, and community service (Suwignyo, 2023). Since 1961, every faculty member affiliated with an Indonesian HEI, whether public and private, has been required to engage in community service at least once a year. This obligation is reinforced by government mechanisms of reward and punishment, one of which is the certification of faculty members. The "educator certificate" is awarded through a certification process (competency test) and serves as a formal recognition of faculty members as higher education professionals. Certified faculty members are required to conduct at least one UCE program a year if they wish to receive the professional faculty incentive, equivalent to one month's basic salary from the government.

Thus, faculty members are both obligated and incentivized to engage in community service.

However, top-down directives coupled with the provision of incentives pose the risk of reducing UCE programs to mere obligations to be fulfilled (Wahyuni & Málovics, 202), especially since diverse responsibilities, including teaching and research loads and administrative tasks integral to the Tri Dharma obligations, reduce faculty members' ability to develop UCE programs (Bayu, 2023).

Furthermore, there might be an imbalance between the number of active students and faculty members at certain Indonesian universities (Mahmud, 2022). Faculty members may have teaching schedules that span an entire day without breaks, resulting in excessive workloads and high time demands, considering that the workload encompasses teaching responsibilities, research duties, community engagement, academic student services routines, and administrative duties. Meanwhile, the welfare level of faculty members remains an unresolved and neglected issue, as faculty members tend to be paid below the minimum wage (Pertiwi et al., 2023). All this means that Indonesian faculty members face a heavy workload, while successful UCE programs demand significant time and energy.

In addition, proposals for grant funding for community service activities, submitted by faculty members or students, must align with the "area of expertise" of the proposing faculty member (Director of Research, Technology, Service, Community, 2023, pp. 43, 46). The proposer's track record must also demonstrate continuity with the proposed program. This means that alignment between the proposer's field of expertise and the UCE program is crucial. If this alignment is lacking, the proposing team risks losing the opportunity to access UCE grant funding. Moreover, when applying for academic promotions or annual performance recognition, faculty members must ensure that their community service programs are consistent with their area of expertise for UCE activities to be considered part of their community service contributions (Directorate General of Science and DIKTI Resources, Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education, 2019). This top-down regulation may limit the range of program choices available to faculty members and restrict the target communities that can serve as collaborators for their initiatives.

There are three possible consequences resulting from these conditions. First, UCE programs become one-sided and trapped in formalities (Wahyuni & Málovics, 2023). Academics only become involved to fulfill their duties since the incentive is top-down, while a supportive context is lacking. Second, there is a risk of missing the target as community service activities implemented by academics in environments governed by top-down regulations not only risk becoming mere formalities but can even harm communities (Chen & Vanclay, 2021; Klein et al., 2011) if they fail to correspond to the actual needs of the partner community, for example, or academics only select a few individuals as representatives of the entire community to work with (Wahyuni & Málovics, 2023). Finally, faculty members might perceive themselves as superior and more knowledgeable than the communities they serve (Chen & Vanclay, 2021; Wahyuni & Málovics, 2023).

Method

Data collection

The study was conducted from January 2023 to May 2024 using semi-structured interviews and images of 23 Indonesian faculty members (Table A1). Interviews were conducted either *in person or online (via Zoom)*. In specific cases, in-person interviews were not tape-recorded due to conditions that rendered this impractical (e.g. interviews with informants 10 and 11 took place at their workplace, where many of their colleagues were present, making the atmosphere uncomfortable for recording equipment). *Online* Zoom sessions were adopted due to geographical constraints. Finally, two informants *answered interview questions via text* due to cultural barriers (informants 20 and 23), as conversing with the opposite gender can sometimes feel awkward in the Indonesian context (Smith-Hefner, 2009).

In addition to interviews, images also served to highlight the forms and diversity of UCE programs. Image as a visual medium can generate verbal discussion to create meaning and contribute to the trustworthiness and rigor of research findings (Glaw et al., 2017). In this study, images are used to visualize key data obtained from direct interviews, serving to make the textual data more vibrant and engaging. Images function as supplementary to the text rather than as primary reference sources. The photos used are credited to the informants and were taken by them during the implementation of the UCE programs. In qualitative research, this approach is referred to as photo elicitation (Gill, 2024), wherein photos are used with the consent of their owners.

Informants

Indonesia has five main islands, and at least two faculty members from each island were interviewed. The interview structure and questions (Appendix 2) were collaboratively designed by the researchers (the authors of the present paper) to empirically examine key themes related to the research question: What are faculty members' perceptions of UCE programs in an Indonesian setting, i.e. what are the opportunities and challenges do they face in implementing UCE programs in contributing to community development within a context of top-down motivation? The interviews were conducted in Indonesian. Prior research suggested that a minimum of 16 to 24 interviews would be needed to reach saturation in a context such as Indonesia, allowing for a "richly textured understanding of issues" (Hennink et al., 2017). Thus, we interviewed a total of 23 Indonesian faculty members, representing diverse regions across Indonesia (Figure 1).

The diversity of faculty members also extends to host universities, with nine faculty members originating from Java (the most populous island in Indonesia and the location of the capital city), while 14 faculty members are dispersed across four other islands. This distribution also encompassed variation in the levels and statuses of universities, with six faculty members from prestigious public institutions (three of whom are affiliated with universities ranked globally); four faculty members from public institutions situated in peripheral regions; five interviewees from applied science universities; and eight from private universities.

Figure 1. Geographical distribution of informants. Source: Authors, 2024 from https://www.canva.com/.

Informants were identified using purposive sampling to ensure relevance and alignment with research objectives (Wan, 2019). To enrich the data, we selected informants with a range of experiences, ranging from those who have only participated in UCE programs once to those who have been implementing such programs for decades. The frequency of participation and institutional affiliation were also considered. As for professional background, the faculty members have varied positions (junior and senior), diverse tasks related to UCE (head of UCE unit, grant reviewer, and UCE group coordinator), and a wide spectrum of disciplinary backgrounds (Appendix Table A2).

The variation in the number of interview sessions reflects the diverse contexts and availability of the participants, as well as the complexity of the data being collected. On average, interviews lasted approximately 60 minutes, with some sessions extending to 90 minutes when in-depth discussions were necessary. For participants with a higher number of sessions (e.g. four times), this was due to iterative engagement, often to clarify points or obtain additional insights. This iterative process aligns with qualitative research practices, particularly in this study where ongoing collaboration and trust-building with participants are required (Rutledge et al., 2023).

Also, as can be seen from Appendix 3, there are a few very short interviews (indicated by the very small number of words). These interviews primarily came from faculty members with a tenure of 1–3 years, typically categorized as junior faculty, with limited involvement in UCE activities. Consequently, there was little to explore here (e.g. informants 22 and 23). However, the information they provided is still relevant. For example, they must continuously participate in UCE programs early in their careers, despite not even fully understanding the objectives of UCE. On the other hand, informant 1, also a junior faculty member, provided more substantial input, as she holds the position of the director of community service at a small and newly established private campus. This leadership role allowed her to share richer insights and produce a more extensive narrative about the regulation and practice of UCE from the perspective of leader and faculty member at the same time.

The same applies to senior faculty. Due to their extensive experience with UCE, they have more "stories" to share. Moreover, informants who are both senior and hold important positions within UCE units (e.g. grant proposal reviewer and UCE unit director)

tended to provide more substantial information, which required longer interview times and often necessitated multiple sessions.

Furthermore, for some informants interviewed in person, recording devices were not used because the interview context did not allow for it, as the presence of such a device might have disrupted the natural flow of the conversation. Instead, notes were taken immediately after the interview. The drawback of this approach is that the interview results are not verbatim transcripts but rather summaries of the interview process with highlights of key statements. As a result, the word count produced is significantly lower in these cases compared to interviews conducted with a recording device (see Appendix Table A2).

Data analysis and validity

Recordings and notes were used to document the interview data. Transcripts were conducted using the naturalized transcription technique (NTT) (McMullin, 2023; Parameswaran et al., 2020). To capture every utterance verbatim as required by the NTT method, the researcher re-listened to the recordings and supplemented the results accordingly. This process enabled the researcher to simultaneously analyze informant responses while critically reflecting on the interview process.

Meanwhile, relevant images are presented in the results section. They were used to complement the findings from the analysis of the interview transcripts, ensuring they showcase the narratives that emerged from the participants' responses. For example, the image in Figure 2 depicted an informant teaching orphaned children affected by the tsunami natural disaster on a beach in the late afternoon. This image vividly illustrated how the UCE program (teaching activities) was conducted in an open space, without a formal classroom environment. Also, the images used in this study effectively captured the diverse conditions of community engagement activities carried out across Indonesia, as described by informants.

Figure 2. Teaching English to orphaned children affected by disaster. Source: Informant 18.

The collected data was analyzed by the researchers, following the guidelines for "manual data analysis" (Forinash, 2019), using an open and exploratory approach. Thus, data was analyzed without predetermined categories, allowing codes and themes to emerge from interview data. However, this study was necessarily influenced by the frameworks introduced in the early sections of the manuscript, which informed the interpretation of the findings and their alignment with the research questions.

Results

Faculty members' perspective in implementing UCE

Two interrelated terms were most frequently mentioned during the interviews: faculty workload (*Beban Kinerja Dosen* or BKD in Indonesian) and Tri Dharma. Tri Dharma is the general term for the three obligations of Indonesian HEIs, while BKD is a system designed to track faculty members' performance in fulfilling the responsibilities outlined in Tri Dharma, constituting a portfolio of a faculty member's work to be updated and reported on every semester.

Most faculty members agreed that their motivation is mainly to fulfill the obligation from the top-down Tri Dharma requirements and BKD every semester.

> That kind of community service has to be there every semester, so we help to create a program so that the faculty members don't get confused about the community service program. (Informant 2);

> From the perspective of being a faculty member generally, okay? First of all, for ourselves, what is called Tri Dharma, which is clear if there should be at least one community service program per semester, means that completing the Tri Dharma requirement for the individual purpose. (Informant 4);

> Yes, first, because this is a demand. We are faculty members, we have to fulfill the faculty workload, every time we have to do this, ... (Informant 7);

> The motivation is 100% not because of demands from society, no, hehe. It's back, ma'am, back to our performance. The faculty workload and Tri Dharma requirements. (Informant 12); and Yes, [we did community service] every year, it's mandatory. (Informant 21)

> Yes, the first thing is that the faculty member's obligations are clear because they are for BKD. (Informant 3)

As a result, numerous UCE programs did not align with the needs of the local community:

> There are indeed many faculty members who undertake community service activities just for the sake of it. Yes, just for the sake of it. Whatever the activities may be, as long as they can be recognized as community service, merely to fulfill their BKD, without really considering its urgency. For example, how significant is its impact on the problems faced by the community? (Informant 6)

While the vast majority of informants acknowledged the dominance of Tri Dharma and BKD in UCE, some also perceive UCE programs positively.

> Because I enjoy it . . . I've been teaching orphans who were victims of disasters since I was in high school, and it had nothing to do with my responsibilities as a faculty member. When

> I saw that they had been affected by a tragedy and had also lost their parents, I felt compelled to help. (Informant 18, smiling)

Informant 18 stated that the children in the local community found joy in the learning process in an open and informal setting (Figure 2), which motivated them to learn English and thereby facilitated their formal schooling.

Informant 14 felt a call to contribute to the local community when he encountered a group of village mothers, primarily housewives and wives of fishermen, who asked him to help them cultivate medicinal plants (Figure 3). Specialized in natural medicine, informant 14 found this request aligned with his field. Informant 14 still maintains contact with these mothers, albeit not as intensely as in the initial three years.

> . . . the impact felt most by this community of mothers is that those without education, only completing elementary school, can now be exposed to various types of medicinal plants scientifically . . . . (Informant 14)

The local community also enjoys the material benefits from the herbal products they grow and sell in front of their homes and even nationally in Indonesia. This community of mothers has also received various awards from the local government for their efforts in making use of local plants and has attracted visits from the presidential team to famous Indonesian artists. On the other hand, informant 14 and his institution have also gained numerous benefits: he no longer competes at the campus level for community service grants but instead competes at the national level, where the grant amounts are significantly larger. Additionally, informant 14 has obtained various patents for the herbal products produced and has received recognition as an outstanding faculty member.

Likewise, reciprocal benefits are also felt by other faculty members in the fields of health and medicine, such as informants 2, 5, 6, and 8. Here, UCE programs can enhance the value and benefits of other academic activities, such as research and teaching for faculty members. They can implement the results of their research and use the programs as teaching inputs.

Figure 3. A community of fishermen's wives. Source: https://kalimantan.bisnis.com/.

Figure 4. Local mothers trained by informants 10 and 11. Source: Syamsinar et al. (2021).

Such reciprocal benefits are also found in a different discipline, economics (e.g. informants 7, 10, and 11). Informant 7 acknowledged that UCE programs can contribute to his other academic duties. By interacting with the communities, faculty members obtain teaching material and ideas for research.

> When I also teach on campus, I feel that the teaching process becomes more lively. When I convey to students regarding the financial materials used by the local village government, for example, in the planning economics course, I relate it to the training I conducted with the local government, that's what happens, I think it becomes more lively and seems more satisfying once I convey it to students. (Informant 7)

Informants 10 and 11 are economists engaged in a community service project targeting women in a remote village, which, despite its isolation from urban areas, has become a favored tourist destination. Informant 11, the leader of the community service team, recognized the economic potential in the abundant nipa palm leaves growing around residents' homes. She then enlisted informant 10 and two other faculty members to implement a community service project with local mothers who live around the village. Historically, the women in this village have woven these leaves for generations, but they had not perceived this activity as an economic opportunity. Thus, informant 11 and his team, with their economic expertise, organized weaving workshops led by professional artisans to ensure the products were of marketable quality. Through the two-year mentorship provided by informants 10 and 11 and their team, which encompassed product development, sales, and marketing, village women successfully began marketing their woven products to visiting tourists (Figure 4).

In addition to contributing to the community, some faculty members view community service activities as forms of relaxation or entertainment, especially compared to the monotony of formal campus activities.

> The benefits are yes, the benefits are refreshing. I actually feel like I'm refreshing. Because community service makes us escape from our daily lives, such as teaching in class and beyond. Oh yes, this is useful for that community too, and it's like satisfaction for myself too. Yes, what I mean is when the community feels like they got something new and they apply it, well, that's what we're so happy about. (Informant 5)

Opportunities and challenge of implementing UCE from the top-down

To illustrate the diversity of potential and challenges faced by faculty members, Appendix A3 provides a detailed summary based on the clustering of higher education institutions in Indonesia for the year 2024 (Director of Research, Technology, Service, Community, 2023).

There are five clusters of higher education institutions: independent, primary, intermediate, basic, and built. To simplify the grouping in Appendix 4, we categorize the last three groups into "the developmental" group for higher education, as all of them are in the early stages of institutional development. The clustering below is not a ranking but a grouping of HEIs that serves as a basis for developing roadmaps and strategic plans, as well as for determining the authority to manage the "Tri Dharma" activities (Director of Research, Technology, Service, Community, 2023).

Appendix 4 illustrates how the challenges and potential in the implementation of UCE at Indonesian HEIs vary. In general, at larger universities, improvements in UCE that focus on sustainable UCE activities have begun to be observed at several campuses. In contrast, at developing universities, the programs remain periodic and short-term (see Appendix 4 for details).

Discussion and concluding remarks

Our findings indicate that when UCE is driven by top-down motivations, it is implemented and sustained by faculty members primarily due to pressure from regulations imposed by higher authorities. The Tri Dharma and BKD obligations are explicitly recognized by most faculty members as the primary motivating force behind UCE activities. This supports previous research highlighting the risks associated with top-down motivations in UCE implementation (Chen & Vanclay, 2021; Wahyuni & Málovics, 2023). UCE programs, when implemented solely in response to regulatory pressure without a deeper understanding of its underlying purpose, tends to deviate further from the core objectives of community development itself. We found that "shallow" cases like these result in the community not benefiting from the UCE program. Instead, the program is merely carried out to fulfill the UCE requirement as part of the Tri Dharma obligations, and, as such, it does not align with the parameters of successful UCE as defined by Benneworth et al. (2018).

In addition, the situations of the informants described in this study are strongly determined by their disciplinary interests as a consequence of top-down regulation: UCE programs that are not aligned with informants' field of knowledge will not be recognized for funding, performance evaluation points, or applications for promotion. As a result, UCE programs are limited to the academic expertise of faculty members, also restricting the range of local communities that can be targeted.

Nonetheless, there are certain groups of faculty members who, while not being entirely exempt from the need to fulfill top-down obligations, still find enjoyment in UCE. In these cases, UCE activities have made significant contributions to local communities by enhancing basic knowledge of surrounding natural resources, improving skills to use local assets, and even boosting the community's economy through training programs conducted in collaboration with faculty members. These success stories address the challenges posed by previous critical studies regarding how HEIs should contribute to community development (Grant & Hains, 2024; Hurd & Stanton, 2023; Wood, 2016).

For example, even when faculty members implement long-term and impactful UCE programs, the performance points for promotion and rewards they earn via UCE are not as substantial as those earned for teaching and research. This means that the success (quality) of UCE programs has no impact on the points awarded for UCE implementation within the centralized university evaluation system regulated by the Ministry of Education. Additionally, rigid regulations pose further challenges by making it difficult for faculty members to carry out long-term UCE initiatives, as they would often require shifting between different locations and community targets, which contradicts the existing requirements.

However, these challenges do not negate the alignment of these UCE cases with the concept of community development as defined by Matarrita-Cascante and Brennan (2012). Successful UCE programs facilitate and organize local communities in targeted areas, empowering them to shape the communities they envision and desire to live in. Additionally, they exemplify the concept of UCE as fostering a mutually beneficial relationship between university academics and the local community, as outlined by Benneworth et al. (2018). Despite systemic challenges, these programs create positive impacts by building stronger connections and empowering local communities.

In these success cases, faculty members genuinely engage with the community's needs and feel a sense of duty when encountering a community in need. This also aligns with previous research suggesting that UCE programs driven by intrinsic motivation tend to produce positive impacts for all stakeholders involved (Bakar et al., 2019; Petersen & Kruss, 2021), thus directly contributing to local development (Grant & Hains, 2024; Hurd & Stanton, 2023; Wood, 2016). Referring to the UCE models outlined in prior studies (Clayton et al., 2010; Davis et al., 2017; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Himmelman, 2001), we can conclude that university faculty members who implement UCE programs driven by intrinsic motivation and a deep understanding of UCE objectives conduct UCE in a "deep" manner. In contrast, faculty members who engage in UCE programs merely to fulfill obligations perceive them as "shallow" activities, thus failing to address the core issues of the target community.

Even though most faculty members interviewed in this study are exclusively motivated to carry out UCE just for the sake of completion, those who carry out successful programs do so out of personal motivation rather than because of institutional support. This shows that institutional functions/procedures (evaluation, programs, and program implementation systems) are inadequate in ensuring successful, impactful, and sustainable UCE programs. An example of this is informant 18: even though she enjoys teaching children affected by natural disasters and feels a sense of duty to carry out such activities, her institution has failed to support sustainable UCE activities because of the requirement to carry out different community service activities each year, forcing her to move from one community to another.

Because of the top-down character of the UCE system (including the evaluation system, the type of program activities, and institutional workload), several consequences arise that ultimately lead to a situation in which UCE often becomes inadequate in creating impactful and long-term programs (Appendix A3). The first consequence is that programs tend to be incidental: most activities are short-term and unplanned. Second, there is no continuity as activities are often conducted hastily when the semester is nearing its end and the UCE program has not yet been implemented. Third, the

evaluation system for UCE activities is not equivalent to assessment of teaching and research. While teaching and research quantity and quality criteria are transparent, community service points remain within a "gray area" – e.g. those worth a given quantity of "credit points," regardless of the number of participants involved in the activity. This leads to a situation where faculty members are structurally motivated (1) to maximize the quality and quantity of their teaching and research (as evaluation here is performance-based and transparent) and (2) to choose UCE activities that are as simple as possible.

This is especially the case since UCE evaluations tend to be formal. After activities are carried out, faculty members are only required to submit a report without a thorough evaluation procedure. There is no evaluation of whether the activity has truly impacted the community, how the community benefits from the activities or whether the program is sustainable or not, even though a prior study shows that sustainable and impactful UCE requires honest, qualitative feedback from the community (Wanjiru & Xiaoguang, 2021).

Considering that not all faculty members are passionate about UCE and not all academic disciplines are relevant to it, this study suggests that implementing UCE at the university level is a more effective approach to supporting community development than requiring individual faculty members to fulfill UCE obligations. University-level UCE implementation means that (1) UCE should not be treated as an individual obligation for all faculty members but rather as a collective responsibility of the university (institution). Therefore, (2) only faculty members who have a genuine interest in UCE should be involved and supported in UCE programs, and (3) faculty from various disciplines can collaboratively address the complex problems faced by communities through such an approach, enabling the emergence of comprehensive and interdisciplinary cooperation and solutions instead of the current disciplinary-based focus in UCE.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Andi Sri Wahyuni http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3628-299X

References

Bakar, F. A., Sharif, Z., & Abdullah, Z. (2019). Managing university-community engagement (UCE): The case of UUM. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, *8*(8), 199–205. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Fathiyyah-Abu-Bakar/publication/335174517_Managing_University-Community_Engagement_UCE_The_Case_of_UUM/links/5d54d271458515304075700b/Managing-University-Community-Engagement-UCE-The-Case-of-UUM.pdf

Bayu, D. (2023). *Data Rata-rata Upah Minimum Provinsi di Indonesia (2000–2024) [Data on average provincial minimum wages in Indonesia (2000–2024)]* (data Indonesia). https://dataindonesia.id/tenaga-kerja/detail/data-ratarata-ump-di-indonesia-20002024

Benneworth, P., Ćulum, B., Farnell, T., Kaiser, F., Seeber, M., Šćukanec, N., Vossensteyn, H., & Westerheijden, D. (2018). *Mapping and critical synthesis of current state-of-the-art on community engagement in higher education*. Institute for the Development of Education.

Benneworth, P., & Osborne, M. (2014). Knowledge, engagement and higher education in Europe. *Higher Education in the World*, *5*, 219–231. https://core.ac.uk/reader/41792090

Bhattacharyya, J. (1995). Solidarity and agency: Rethinking community development. *Human Organization*, *54*(1), 60–69. https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.54.1.m459ln688536005w

Chen, C., & Vanclay, F. (2021). Transnational universities, host communities and local residents: Social impacts, university social responsibility and campus sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *22*(8), 88–107. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-10-2020-0397

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., Senor, B., Huq, J., & Morrison, M. (2010). Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *16*(2), 5–21. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ904630

Davis, K. L., Kliewer, B. W., & Nicolaides, A. (2017). Power and reciprocity in partnerships: Deliberative civic engagement and transformative learning in community-engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *21*(1), 30–54. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1316/1313

Directorate General of Science and DIKTI Resources Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education. (2019). the Operational Guidelines for Assessing Credit Numbers for Academic Position/Lecturer Rank 2019 Updated Number 4, 2021 (Pedoman Operasional Penilaian Angka Kredit Kenaikan Jabatan Akademik/Pangkat Dosen 2019 Update No. 4, 2021). https://pak.kemdikbud.go.id/portalv2/panduan-pak/

Director of Research, Technology, Service, Community. (2023, December 30). *Announcement of higher education clustering for the Year 2024*. Directorate General of Higher Education, Research, and Technology of Indonesia. https://lldikti6.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Pengumuman-Klasterisasi-Perguruan-Tinggi-Akademik-Tahun-2024.pdf

Dorado, S., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (2004). Service-learning partnerships: Paths of engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *11*(1), 25–37.

Farner, K. (2019). Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: A case study of processes toward engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *23*(2), 147–152. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1457

Forinash, M. (2019). Interpretivist/qualitative research methods, data collection and analysis: Interviews, observations, and content analysis Cruz. In R. F. Berrol & F. Cynthia (Eds.), *Dance/movement Therapists in Action: A Working Guide to Research Options Third* (pp. 145–170). Springfield, Illinois: Charles C Thomas. https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=SMpyDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA145&dq=Forinash+manual+data+analysis&ots=zjdxcp-9b_&sig=JWqBYAoJDac_1Q0eCWkwFWQzxol&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Fussell, D., & Quarmby, A. (1975). Go to the villages! *Synergist*, *4*(2), 2–5. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Synergist/r2l-2IDN0HkC?hl=id&gbpv=1&dq=%22kuliah+kerja+nyata%22&pg=PA2&printsec=frontcover

Gill, S. L. (2024). About research - qualitative data collection: Photo elicitation. *Journal of Human Lactation*, *40*(4), 503–505. https://doi.org/10.1177/08903344241273863

Glaw, X., Inder, K., Kable, A., & Hazelton, M. (2017). Visual methodologies in qualitative research: Autophotography and photo elicitation applied to mental health research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 160940691774821. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917748215

Goddard, J., Hazelkorn, E., & Kempton, L. (2016). *The civic university: The policy and leadership challenges*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Grant, G. A., & Hains, B. J. (2024). Foundational phases for community development: An expanded conceptual model for community development practice and higher education. *Community Development*, *55*(2), 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2023.2225085

Groark, C. J., & McCall, R. B. (2018). Lessons learned from 30 years of a university-community engagement center. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *22*(2), 7–29.

Hardjasoemantri, K. (2007). The role of Indonesian youth students in the national struggle: A reflection and hope [*peran pemuda pelajar Indonesia dalm Perjuangan Bangsa: Sebuah refleksi dan harapan*]. *Jurnal Sejarah: Pemikiran, Rekosntruksi, Persepsi*, *13*(13), 1–12, 1858–2117.

http://118.98.228.242/Media/Dokumen/5cff5f5fb646044330d686d0/635aea0e55294b95f16a3958313f3686.pdf

Hazelkorn, E. (2016). Contemporary debates part 1: Theorising civic engagement. In J. Goddard, E. Hazelkorn, L. Kempton, & P. Vallance (Eds.), *The civic university* (pp. 34–64). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784717728.00010

Hazelkorn, E. (2018). Reshaping the world order of higher education: The role and impact of rankings on national and global systems. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, *2*(1), 4–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2018.1424562

Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N., & Marconi, V. C. (2017). Code saturation versus meaning saturation: How many interviews are enough? *The Qualitative Health Research*, *27*(4), 591–608. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316665344

Himmelman, A. T. (2001). On coalitions and the transformation of power relations: Collaborative betterment and collaborative empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *29*(2), 277–284. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010334831330

Hurd, C., & Stanton, T. K. (2023). Community engagement as community development: Making the case for multilateral, collaborative, equity-focused campus-community partnerships. *Community Development*, *54*(6), 875–898. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2022.2121297

Kang, Y., & Mok, K. H. (2024). China's policy responses to university ranking: Changes and new challenges. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *68*(1), 67–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2211987

Klein, P., Fatima, M., McEwen, L., Moser, S. C., Schmidt, D., & Zupan, S. (2011). Dismantling the ivory tower: Engaging geographers in university-community partnerships. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *35*(3), 425–444. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2011.576337

Koekkoek, A., Ham, M. V., & Kleinhans, R. (2021). Unraveling university-community engagement: A literature review. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *25*(1), 3–24.

Levin, M. (2012). Academic integrity in action research. *Action Research*, *10*(2), 133–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750312445034

Mahmud, A. (2022). Analysis of mental workload on faculty members using the NASA TLX method. [*Analisis beban kerja mental pada dosen menggunakan metode NASA TLX*]. *Integrasi : Jurnal Ilmiah Teknik Industri*, *7*(2), 62. https://doi.org/10.32502/js.v7i2.4558

Mandag, R. C., Lumenta, A. S. M., & Rindengan, Y. D. Y. (2017). Development of an integrated work lecture (KKT) information system at Sam Ratulangi University. [*Pengembangan sistem informasi kuliah kerja terpadu (KKT) di Universitas Sam Ratulangi*]. *Jurnal Teknik Informatika*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.35793/jti.10.1.2017.15375

Matarrita-Cascante, D., & Brennan, M. A. (2012). Conceptualizing community development in the twenty-first century. *Community Development*, *43*(3), 293–305. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2011.593267

McIntire, A., Calvert, I., & Ashcraft, J. (2024). Pressure to plagiarize and the choice to cheat: Toward a pragmatic reframing of the ethics of academic integrity. *Education Science*, *14*(3), 244. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030244

McMullin, C. (2023). Transcription and qualitative methods: Implications for third sector research. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *34*(1), 140–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-021-00400-3

Olssen, M. (2021). *A normative foucauldian: Selected papers of Mark Olssen*. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004464452

Parameswaran, U. D., Ozawa-Kirk, J. L., & Latendresse, G. (2020). To live (code) or to not: A new method for coding in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, *19*(4), 630–644. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325019840394

Pertiwi, K., Ferdiana, A., & Choiruzzad, S. A. B. (2023). *Berapa Gaji Dosen? Berikut Hasil Survei Nasional Pertama Yang Memetakan Kesejahteraan Akademisi di Indonesia (how much do faculty members get paid? The following are the results of the first National survey to map the welfare of academics in Indonesia)*. https://theconversation.com/berapa-gaji-dosen-berikut-hasil-survei-nasional-pertama-yang-memetakan-kesejahteraan-akademisi-di-indonesia-203854

Petersen, I., & Kruss, G. (2021). Universities as change agents in resource-poor local settings: An empirically grounded typology of engagement models. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *167*, 120693. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120693

Regional Office for Education in Asia, UNESCO. (n.d.). *Education in Asia reviews, reports and notes* (12th ed. Vol. 9). UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia.

Rutledge, S. A., Gilliam, E., & Closson-Pitts, B. (2023). 'I'm being heard right now': Amplifying individual voice through scaffolded focus groups. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *26*(1), 67–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2021.1973272

Smith-Hefner, N. J. (2009). Language shift, gender, and ideologies of modernity in central java, Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *19*(1), 57–77. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1395.2009.01019.x

Suwignyo, A. (2023). Higher education as an instrument of decolonisation: The community service programme in Indonesia, 1950–1969. *Asian Studies Review*, *48*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2023.2222225

Syamsinar, S., Ishak, A. A. A., Triana, D., & Ridwan, M. (2021). Empowering local economic potential through nipah leaf weaving craft business in Salenrang Village, Maros Regency (pemberdayaan potensi ekonomi lokal melalui usaha kerajinan anyaman daun nipah di Desa Salenrang, Kabupaten Maros). *Jurnal Dinamika Pengabdian*, *7*(1), 123–134. https://doi.org/10.20956/jdp.v7i1.18427

Wahyuni, A. S. (2023). Review of Student service-learning program in the early period of the higher education system in Indonesia. *ASEAN Journal of Community Engagement*, *7*(2), 196–210. https://doi.org/10.7454/ajce.v7i2.1228

Wahyuni, A. S., & Málovics, G. (2023). Top-down motivation in university-community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *27*(4), 43–64. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/2954/3134

Wan, Z. (2019). Participant selection and access in case study research. In K. K. Tsang, D. Liu, & Y. Hong (Eds.), *Challenges and opportunities in qualitative research* (pp. 47–61). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-5811-1_5

Wanjiru, I. R., & Xiaoguang, L. (2021). Evaluating university-community engagement through a community-based lens: What indicators are suitable? *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 25*(4), 133–152. https://ojs01.galib.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1495/2710

Wood, L. (2016). Community development in higher education: How do academics ensure their community-based research makes a difference? *Community Development Journal*, bsv068. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsv068

Appendices

Appendix 1

Table A1. Data collection.

No.		Mode	Data Source	Quantity	Time
1	Interview	In person	Recording and Notes	6 informants	August 2023–March 2024
2		Online; Zoom meeting	Recording	15 informants	January 2023–March 2024
3		Text: WhatsApp Messenger & Microsoft Word	Text	3 informants	March 2024
4	Informant archive	Sending photos with credits and anonymous photos	Image	3 photos	May 2024

Source: Authors, 2024.

Appendix 2

Background and experience with UCE

(1) Since when have you been working as a faculty member?
(2) Approximately how many times have you conducted community service activities since becoming a faculty member, and what has your role in those activities been (leader, member, volunteer, etc.)?
(3) How do you view and define community service activities?

Motivation for UCE

(1) What motivates you to engage in community service activities? Why?
(2) What benefits have you experienced from participating in such activities?

Challenges and barriers

(1) Have you encountered any challenges in implementing these activities? If so, what are they?
(2) How do these challenges influence your willingness or ability to continue participating in community engagement programs?

Impact of UCE

(1) What has been the impact of these activities on the local community? What has been their response?
(2) How have these activities affected the institution where you work?

Successes and failures in UCE

10. Based on your experience, can you share one example each of a successful and a failed community service activity?
Why was it considered successful?
Why was it considered a failure?

Views on the community service system at Indonesian universities

(1) How would you evaluate the community service system at Indonesian universities in general?
(2) What do you think an ideal community service system should look like?

Appendix 3

Table A2. Informants' background and data collection method.

Informant No. & gender	Interview mode	Interview word count	Position	Task	Activity and community target
Informant 1 Female	Online	4,096	Junior faculty member	Head of research and community service unit on university level	Empowering housewives and training small business owners in the city.
Informant 2 Male	Online	4,283	Junior faculty member	Head of community service unit on division level	Provide free vaccination for community around the university; safe drug use workshop.
Informant 3 Male	Online	3,463	Junior faculty member	Community service unit staff at the university	Distributing questionnaires to assess risk for communities vulnerable to natural disasters.
Informant 4 Female	Online	2,968	Senior faculty member	Reviewer of community service grant on division level	N/A
Informant 5 Female	Online	3,639	Senior faculty member	Head and department coordinator at the applied sciences? university	Training housewives to make healthy food for malnourished ?children, training in making home-made medicines, training in water purification from natural ingredients, and producing free hand sanitizer for society during pandemic.
Informant 6 Female	Online	3,668	Junior faculty member	Department coordinator at the university and head of community service	Socialization of the usage of safe cosmetics, training local farmers to produce and market herbal plants, and teaching children how to obtain, use, store, and dispose of medications.
Informant 7 Male	Online	3,313	Senior faculty member	Head of community service group	Training government employees in rural areas who lack adequate education in finance and regional reporting.
Informant 8 Male	Online, In person, and text	3,039	Senior faculty member	Head and member of community service group	Educating the general public on the proper use of medications and conducting training for housewives in preparing herbal medicine.
Informant 9 Female	In person	2,647	Junior faculty member	Head and member of community service group	Providing healthcare services to communities affected by earthquakes.
Informant 10 Female	In person	470	Senior faculty member	Head and member of community service group	Supporting small business owners in marketing their products and assisting housewives in producing useful, salable goods.
Informant 11 Female	In person	526	Senior faculty member	Head and member of community service group	Same as informant 10.

(*Continued*)

Table A2. (Continued).

Informant No. & gender	Interview mode	Interview word count	Position	Task	Activity and community target
Informant 12 Female	Online	2,772	Senior faculty member	Head and member of community service group	Supporting small business owners in enhancing the value of their products, offering financial training to business owners, and assisting them with online marketing strategies.
Informant 13 Female	Online	5,018	Senior faculty member	Head and member of community service group	Teaching simple and easy-to-understand financial reporting methods to small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) owners.
Informant 14 Male	Online	6,266	Senior faculty member	Head and member of community service group	Assisting fishermen's wives with limited education (elementary school graduates) in cultivating herbal medicines and selling them.
Informant 15 Female	Online	292	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	Teaching high school students in the city and rural villages.
Informant 16 Male	Online	3,106	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	Assisting communities in managing agroforestry; empowering communities living near swamps to convert non-value plants that grow wild in swamps into profitable and marketable plants.
Informant 17 Male	In person	3,486	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	Supporting local business owners in enhancing their manufacturing processes (for example, product packaging) to boost their competitiveness.
Informant 18 Female	In person	3,098	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	Teaching English to orphaned children affected by the tsunami natural disaster and to pedicab drivers who often meet tourists so they can transport them using basic English.
Informant 19 Female	Online	877	Senior faculty member	Member of community service group	Designing an extension course on philosophy for the public, including housewives and high school students who are interested in philosophy, which presents the material in an accessible manner.
Informant 20 Male	Text	739	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	N/A
Informant 21 Female	In person	1,858	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	Providing collaborative reading classes for local children and distributing books to them.
Informant 22 Female	In person	214	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	N/A
Informant 23 Male	Text	631	Junior faculty member	Member of community service group	Providing Microsoft Excel and predictive science training for airlines; teaching mathematics to instructors and students in schools.
			Total: 23 informants		

Source: Authors, 2024.

Appendix 4

Table A3. Opportunities through challenges of UCE.

		Independent	Primary	Developmental	Vocational
Potential	Sustainability of program	Improvements have been made where the orientation is toward sustainable mentoring. "(In the past) if the program was short-term, it would be like the activities were jumping from one community to another community. For example, this year [they're in] in village A, the next year they move to village B, and the next year they move again. So this case is not finished. For example, I've moved again. Finally, a rule was made: choose one village and work on it for three years." (Informant 16)		Campus regulations require that programs must be changed annually and cannot remain the same every year. "Even if it's from campus, it shouldn't be done repeatedly in the same place. It's not recognized if it's the same." (Informant 18)	
	Types of programs	Various types, starting from assisting communities at risk of natural disasters to assisting in processing local plants into finished products. Sources of funding for activities are varied, ranging from national grants to corporate social responsibility (CSR) funds from abroad. Because the funds are large, activities are not only carried out around campus but also reach communities outside the area where the university is located. "During my period, there happened to be a collaborative research project with a private company from Korea . . . so in the Cilacap area, it often floods, but the flooding is due to rising sea levels, which is why it's often called Kampung Laut (Sea Village). Coincidentally, the company from Korea was surveying for a disaster mitigation program named 'Local Community Disaster Awareness,' or something like that. The collaboration was with my university because it's a large institution, and it also has a geology department. Additionally, the location is close to Cilacap, specifically Kampung Laut." (Informant 3)		Tends to be in the form of seminars or workshops. The source of funding for activities generally comes from internal campuses, so the funds are not large and only reach communities near the university area.	The activities carried out are usually more product-oriented and entail training on how to use the product.

(*Continued*)

Table A3. (Continued).

		Independent	Primary	Developmental	Vocational
	Impact	Most (especially long-term) programs have had a major impact. For example, informant 14's activities have had a great effect, potentially resulting in products being marketed on a national scale.	Because the programs carried out are those that are "just implemented," they tend not to be consistent with the needs of the community. They? The participants? realize that the impact is not significant, but there is still a small positive effect. New knowledge has been provided for the community, for example, even though it is not used or needed. "There will definitely be an impact, even if it's small." (Informant 21)		Some programs have had a great impact, for example, the weaving assistance program carried out by informants 10 and 11 and the clean water filtration training conducted by informant 5. However, several other programs were only routine to meet obligations, so they did not have sufficient impact on communities.
Challenge	Evaluation	All types of universities have the same type of evaluation from the Directorate General of Higher Education, Research and Technology, Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology. However, it seems to be an inadequate evaluation of the sustainability development program. a. The point is not equal compared to other tasks (teaching and research) "For promotions to functional positions, for example, expert junior faculty members, the most emphasis is on research. Community service, no matter how many people are doing the work, the points are still the same, that's 5 points. So the important thing is that the activities are carried out." (Informant 1) "In that semester report, what is mandatory is teaching and research. Well, there must be a minimum of research. But when it comes to devotion, that's the problem with us, that's what's important. So, we conducted one or two studies, [but] the points are the same. Because devotion is what it is, it's a gray area, right? Some faculty members who use outside seminar activities as service activities, yes, you can, because the system has permitted and acknowledged that activity. So it's possible." (Informant 2) b. The evaluation is only in the form of a seminar and report submission. "As for the community service here, once the activities are done, the results are simply presented in a seminar, and that's it. There's nothing more to it, no follow-up, nothing further." "The next shortcoming: evaluation of this activity. So we only collect reports, but there is no evaluation after that program." (Informant 8)			
	Faculty members' expertise versus community needs	Community service programs involving faculty members with disciplines applicable to society tend to easily find target communities (health, economics, or education). This is different for faculty members from purely theoretical disciplines, such as informant 19 (philosophy) and informant 23 (mathematics). For such purely theoretical fields, activities are typically conducted in the form of workshops or teaching seminars for the community, which do not produce tangible products. "Yes, maybe I'll explain first because the program we are doing is a bit different in terms of community service. In general, community service requires going to a village, right? For the majority of us (in philosophy), we provide a kind of thematic extension course, so, for example, right now, we're discussing politics because this year is a political year (presidential election). So we open the classes to anyone from the general public, it can be any profession, it doesn't have to be philosophy, you can come from any background, so you can take those classes, so we fill in those materials. So it's more like a seminar, maybe actually in a more popular language." (Informant 19)			The team of faculty members who carry out activities tend to come from the same discipline so that complex community problems cannot be resolved.

(*Continued*)

Table A3. (Continued).

	Independent	Primary	Developmental	Vocational
Administrative tasks and pressure	More administrative tasks are required to achieve higher recognition, such as being listed among the top universities globally and obtaining good international accreditation. "We ourselves usually find it difficult to manage time. This means we are not only entrusted with that unit. We still have to participate in various committees, etc. So thinking about it [the UCE program] is difficult." (Informant 2).		a. Because the campus is still small, limited resource burdens faculty members with more administrative tasks "One of the challenges is definitely time because we usually do community service during working hours, so it usually starts from morning until afternoon. Doing community service in the evening is rare or never. And the time is also during working hours, usually between Monday and Friday. There is only an additional week, and that's just it, firstly the time. Automatically, we don't teach. Because if there are teaching hours, it will be replaced at other times or days. That's how it is. Secondly, energy." (Informant 3) b. Many MoU documents are required from the local community for accreditation. Thus, faculty members have focused on collaboration in terms of quantity. "In what way can we, who are not accredited, become accredited by fulfilling standard 8, criterion 8, community service (from the accreditation requirements) . . . . Well, something like that happened, where the village officials only needed an MoU and we also needed an MoU. So, after implementation, we made an official report . . . ." (Informant 1)	

Source: Authors, 2024.