

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

CAMPUS-COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: THE CASE OF AN
URBAN AGRICULTURE INITIATIVE AT AUB

by
SHALIMAR TOUFIC SINNO

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
to the Rural Community Development Program
of the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences
at the American University of Beirut

Beirut, Lebanon
May 2020


AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

CAMPUS-COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: THE CASE OF AN
URBAN AGRICULTURE INITIATIVE AT AUB

by
SHALIMAR TOUFIC SINNO

Approved by:

Dr. Yaser Abunnasr, Associate Professor
Department of Landscape Design
and Ecosystem Management




Advisor

Dr. Giuliano Martiniello, Assistant Professor
Rural Community Development Program

Giuliano Martiniello
Member of Committee

Dr. Shady Hamadeh, Professor
Department of Agriculture



Member of Committee

Date of thesis defense: May 12, 2020

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Yaser Abunnasr, for his support, guidance, and supervision throughout my thesis. Thanks are also due to my thesis committee, Dr. Shady Hamadeh and Dr. Giuliano Martiniello, for their efficient feedback and assistance in completing my thesis.

I am fortunate and deeply grateful to be surrounded by an amazing family who were the reason behind it all. First, I thank my parents, Dalal and Toufic Sinno, for their great role in my life and numerous sacrifices, their trust in my potentials, and for the backup and strength they gave me to continue my journey. I would also like to thank my in-laws, for their continuous and compassionate support all the way. Most of all, I thank my beloved husband, Aiman Suleiman, for his enduring love and for being an amazing and caring partner. I thank him for tolerating my ups and downs, for being present all the time, for his endless support and motivation, for believing in me, and for taking care of our daughters when my research took most of my time. My wholehearted thanks to my little daughter, Chanelle, and my newborn daughter, Galyna, for their smiles and unconditional love that I needed the most during the hard times of my study. Without them all, it would have been so much harder.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to my dear friend, Maher Khaled, and my wonderful cousin, Julia Jammal, who volunteered to participate and help in my project whenever needed.

I would also like to thank all those who were part of this. I cannot list all names here, but you are always on my mind.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Shalimar Toufic Sinno for Master of Science
Major: Rural Community Development

Title: Campus- Community Engagement: The Case of an Urban Agriculture Initiative at AUB

Urban Universities' missions and actions are reflecting on their role in contributing to potential solutions to local and regional socio-economic problems through their civic engagement missions. However, urban universities are often seen as if they are “in” the community and not “of” the community. It has been proven that Urban Agriculture (UA) is a tool and a community engagement approach that urban universities have adopted in the aim of enhancing sustainability in the city and supporting educational missions across university campuses as a mutually beneficial initiative that contribute to campus-community engagement. AUB through its historic civic missions, has long been contributing to local communities, especially its neighborhood, the neighborhood of Ras Beirut. Yet, AUB still falls in the dilemma of bridging the gap between the service activities it provides and the reality on the ground. This study aims at investigating the different elements and stakeholders that are challenging the principles for enhancing and sustaining campus-community relationships of AUB and Ras Beirut and explore the concept of UA as a platform to support sustainability, and ensure reciprocity of campus-community relationship through civic engagement and service learning. The results expected will propose ideas and a set of recommendations to maintain relationship between campus and neighboring community through putting hands on and promoting a sustainable food system.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
ABSTRACT.....	5
LIST OF TABLES	12
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	14

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION.....	15
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	23

A. The Key Role of Universities as Anchor Institutions and Engines for Sustainability	23
1. Universities as Global Actors	23
2. Universities as “Anchor Institutions”	24
3. Campus Community Engagement.....	26
4. University Food Systems: Engines for Sustainability.....	28
B. Universities and Community Engagement Approaches	30
1. Participatory Development.....	30
2. Participatory Approaches in Universities.....	32
3. Framework of Campus-Community Participation at Universities.....	33
C. Urban Agriculture: A Tool to Change the Current Situation	34
1. Definition and Types.....	34
2. UA Contribution to Food Security, Local Economy, Social Environmental Impact.....	36
3. UA in the MENA Region.....	38

4. UA in Lebanon.....	39
5. Campus UA: A Community Based Transformation for Sustainable Development.....	41
D. The Case of AUB: Serving Campus and Neighborhood Communities.....	43
1. CCE and Sustainability: Case Studies.....	43
2. History of AUB’s Civic Missions.....	50
3. Neighborhood Initiative	52
4. The Center for Civic Engagement System (CCECS).....	53
5. Agricultural Research and Education Center (AREC).....	54
6. Environmental and Sustainable Development Unit (ESDU).....	55
a. CLIMAT Project and REEF Initiative.....	56
b. KariaNet.....	56
c. Food Security and Economic Resilience.....	56
7. Factors that Influence Social Responsibility Programs in Universities.....	57
8. Factors that Influence the Social Responsibility Programs: The Case of AUB.....	59
9. Principles for building and sustaining campus- community relationships and AUB.....	60
a. Develop a Relationship Based on Trust and Mutual Respect.....	61
b. Maximize, Use, and Exchange Resources.....	61
c. Build a Two-way Learning Relationship.....	62
d. Establish Open Lines of Communication.....	62
e. Respect and Celebrate Diversity	62
f. Learn about the Culture of the Organization.....	62
g. The Research Collaboration is Based on the Needs of the Community.....	63
h. Understand the Multidisciplinary Nature of Partnerships.....	63

i. Use Both Qualitative and Quantitative Research Strategies.....	63
j. Share Accountability of Partnership Success and Opportunities.....	63
10. Urban Agriculture: A Tool for Civic Engagement, Service Learning, and sustainability at AUB.....	65

III. THE CURRENT STATUS AND PERSPECTIVES OF AUB CCE: THE PROBLEMATIC.....68

A. Sustainability Initiatives.....	69
B. Production Potential: The Landscape of AUB.....	70
C. Community Engagement.....	70
D. Liberal Arts Curriculum and Service Learning: Facts and Theories.....	70
E. Established on-campus Food Service.....	71

IV. MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGIES.....72

A. Literature Review	75
B. Questionnaire Survey.....	76
1. Questionnaire Design Instrument.....	78
2. Sampling and Selection Method	79
3. Data Collection	81
4. Methods of Analysis.....	82
a. Open-Ended Questions.....	82
b. Closed- Ended Questions	83

V. DATA ANALYSIS	84
A. Ras Beirut Community Sample	84
1. Sample Descriptive	84
2. General Understanding of CCE.....	86
a. Definition of CCE.....	86
b. Adjectives Describing CCE.....	87
c. Strengths and Challenges of CCE.....	91
d. Dimension of Campus-Community Partnership as Perceived by Ras Beirut Community.....	92
3. Participation.....	97
a. Participation of Community Members in Civic Engagement Initiatives in Ras Beirut by AUB.....	97
b. Reasons that Motivate Participants to Participate in Community Service Activities.....	97
c. Contribution to AUB Civic Activities in Ras Beirut.....	101
4. Urban Agriculture.....	103
a. Definition of Urban Agriculture.....	103
b. Adjectives Describing Urban Agriculture.....	104
c. Urban Agriculture Initiatives.....	106
B. AUB Community Sample.....	112
1. Sample Descriptive	112
2. General Understanding of CCE.....	113
a. Definition of CCE.....	113
b. Adjectives Describing CCE.....	115
c. Strengths and Challenges of CCE.....	119
d. Dimension of Campus-Community Partnership as Perceived by Ras Beirut Community.....	120
3. Participation.....	125
4. Urban Agriculture.....	128
a. Definition of Urban Agriculture.....	128
b. Adjectives Describing Urban Agriculture.....	129
c. Urban Agriculture Initiatives.....	133

5. Ideas to Improve and Develop the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut.....	141
--	-----

VI. DISCUSSION.....145

A. Findings and Interpretation.....	146
1. General Understanding of CCE.....	146
2. Dimension of Campus-Community Partnership as Perceived by Ras Beirut Community and AUB Community.....	150
3. Participation.....	156
4. Urban Agriculture	159
5. Best Model	162
6. Ideas to Improve and Develop the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut through UA.....	164
B. Implications and Recommendations.....	166
1. Mis-perceptions and Understandings of CCE.....	166
2. AUB’s Charity Role	166
3. Knowledge Sharing and Skills Development	167
4. Communication and Public Documentation of the Civic Activities.....	167
5. Livelihood Enhancement and Sustainability	168
6. Accessibility.....	168
7. Participation and Engagement.....	168
8. Mutually Beneficial UA Initiative.....	169
C. Significant considerations to achieve a Mutually beneficial Initiative.....	170

D. Best Model of a Mutually Beneficial UA Initiative that can Enhance and Sustain CCE at AUB.....	174
1. Communication Strategy.....	178
a. Develop an AUB and Ras Beirut Community Task Force.....	180
b. Provide Mutual Information.....	182
2. Urban Agriculture initiatives as the Common Ground.....	183
a. Building on Existing Initiatives.....	184
b. Building an UA Policy Strategy.....	185
c. Short Term UA Projects.....	186
d. Long Term UA Projects.....	186
3. Garden Service-learning Partnerships.....	187
a. Community-Engaged Research.....	189
b. Community- Engaged Teaching.....	190
c. Community-Engaged Service and Outreach.....	191
E. Limitations.....	192
VII. CONCLUSION.....	193
VIII. FUTURE RESEARCH.....	198
Appendix	
I. RAS BEIRUT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	202
II. AUB SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	208
III. IRB APPROVAL.....	214
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	216

TABLES

Table	Page
1: Descriptive of the Sample Characteristics of Ras Beirut Community	84
2: Sample Descriptive of Ras Beirut Community	85
3: Adjectives responses of Ras Beirut Community on CCE	90
4: Strengths and Barriers to the implementation of CCE as perceived by Ras Beirut Community	91
5: Positive and Negative impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by Ras Beirut Community	94
5: Cont. Positive and Negative impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by Ras Beirut Community	95
6: Ras Beirut Community Responses on how they perceive they may influence AUB’s civic missions	96
7: Participation Perception of Ras Beirut Community	97
8: Barriers and Motivators of Participation as perceived by Ras Beirut Community	99
8: Cont. Barriers and Motivators of Participation as perceived by Ras Beirut Community	100
9: Contribution to AUB Civic Activities in Ras Beirut	102
10: Adjectives defining UA by the Ras Beirut participants	105
11: Ras Beirut Perception of their Participation in Urban Agriculture	106
12: Ras Beirut Perception on the contribution of UA initiative to CCE	108
12: Cont. Ras Beirut Perception on the contribution of UA initiative to CCE	109
13: Best Model Urban Agriculture as per Ras Beirut Community	110
13: Cont. Best Model Urban Agriculture as per Ras Beirut Community	111
14: Participation in Workshop by Ras Beirut	111
15: Descriptive of the Sample Characteristics of AUB Stakeholders	112
16: Sample Descriptive of AUB Stakeholders	112
17: Adjectives responses of AUB Stakeholders on CCE	118
18: Strengths and Barriers to the implementation of CCE as perceived by AUB Stakeholders	120
19: Positive and Negative Impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by AUB Stakeholders	123

19: Cont. Positive and Negative Impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by AUB Stakeholders.....	124
20: Challenges/Barriers affecting AUB’s Civic Missions as perceived by AUB Stakeholders.....	125
21: Participation as Perceived by AUB Stakeholders.....	126
22: Perception of AUB stakeholders on measures to enhance relationship with Ras Beirut community.....	127
23: Adjectives defining UA by AUB Stakeholders.....	131
23: Cont. Adjectives defining UA by AUB Stakeholders.....	132
24: Possibility of Common UA Initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut Community as Perceived by AUB Stakeholders and its contribution to CCE.....	135
25: AUB Stakeholders Perception of how UA initiative can best contribute to CCE.....	137
25: Cont. AUB Stakeholders Perception of how UA initiative can best contribute to CCE.....	138
26: Best Model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative as per AUB Stakeholders.....	140
26: Cont. Best Model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative as per AUB Stakeholders.....	141
27: Participation in a workshop by AUB Stakeholders.....	141
28: Findings of a Best model of UA (mutually beneficial initiative for CCE.....	163

ABBREVIATIONS

ACTED	Agency for Technical and Development
AREC	Agricultural Research and Education Center
ANERA	American Near East Refugee Aid
AUB	American University of Beirut
AUBMC	American University of Beirut Medical Center
BUG	Bronco Urban Gardens
CCE	Campus- Community Engagement
CCECS	Center for Civic Engagement and Community Service
CE	Civic Engagement
CBL	Community Based Learning
CBR	Community Based Research
CSL	Community Service- Learning
ESDU	Environmental and Sustainable Development Unit
IFI	Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs
LDEM	Landscape Design and Ecosystem Management
NEF	Near East Foundation
NI	Neighborhood Initiative
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
SCU	Santa Clara University
SL	Service- learning
UA	Urban Agriculture

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Universities are places where the major “busyness” of the city is found. Students are seen in and out of campus to reach up to their classes and hangout in the city during their break. This youthful feel has allowed university neighborhoods to expand and evolve to meet their requirements in all goods and services. Universities’ missions are no longer only education, but have been translated to generate knowledge and put hands on real-world applications. Universities’ strategic plans are often built to meet the diversity of the student body, allow affordability and accessibility, demonstrate leadership and innovation, ensure community engagement, and local impact, starting with their surrounding neighborhood communities (Ehlenz, 2016). Nowadays, universities are committed to maintain their partnership with their neighborhoods to ensure their students are getting high education, at the same time, gaining the service-learning (SL) experience they need, thus, engaging with the civil society and gain experiential learning through their surrounding neighborhoods.

“Service-learning is a course-based, credit-bearing, educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility” - (Bringle and Hatcher 1995)

However, this partnership between university and their surrounding neighborhood communities is quite complex. Given the city density, globalization, technology, climate change,

economic crisis, population increase, and the struggle for survival is a burden most urban universities are seeking to solve on campus and outside campus walls, thus their surrounding neighborhoods. Lakshman Yapa argues that the reason universities are investing and engaging in their neighborhoods is because they see their neighborhood community “as the domain of the problem” and them as “the domain of the solution” (quoted in Enos & Morton 2003, p. 20). There are three questions also authors have raised in literature review on this issue **1) “Is the university in the city or part of the city?”** (Goodall, 1970) **2) “Are universities truly institutions that seek the development of communities and are the environments for communities?”** (Mauro, 2002) **3) “What works?”** (Thomas, 1998).

In response to critics of urban universities and their relationship to their surrounding neighborhoods, urban universities have worked to become part of the community through their partnerships and collaboration with business, public, and the private sector, all in the aim of enhancing education, ensuring connectivity to the world outside campus, and promoting an education that is not based on books and research, but SL and outreach. The key role of universities is not only teaching and research anymore, however, it is to inspire and develop local social, economic, cultural and recreational activities. Academic institutions through finding their way to students, who are part of the wider community when these students leave the university, are contributing to the development of societies and economies of the world (Abercrombie et al. 1998). Service- learning (SL) projects in universities are seen as triggers to social justice, genuine relationships, redistribution of power among communities, engagement, and social and institutional change (Levkoe et al., 2016; Marullo & Edwards, 2000; Mitchell, 2008; Swords & Kiely, 2010). Levkoe et al. (2016) see the best approaches to SL are those that include reciprocity,

building trust, connecting to personal experiences, and finding common strategies between universities and their surrounding communities or organizations (Levkoe et al., 2016).

Given that by the year 2050, about 70% of the world's population will be living in urban areas (Walsh, 2009). This will lead to an increase in the demand for housing, health services, employment, and transportation. The urban population increase will also lead to an increase in the need for stable, accessible, and nutritious food sources (Besthorn, 2013). Under the present agricultural practices, with all the current efforts for sustainable land use dealing with climate change; thus, high temperatures, water scarcity, and drought, there will be not enough land available to meet the world's growing food needs. Researches have shown that urban neighborhoods have less access to healthy food, especially those that consist of diverse cultural groups (Alkon & Norgaard, 2009; Mojtahedi et al., 2008; Valera et al., 2009). Encouraging and promoting home-grown food production is believed to ensure long term access to healthy foods and maintaining the viability of the food production system (Besthorn, 2013). Thus, the issue of food insecurity has also become another survival burden to many communities in the cities. However, these communities are not only urban dwellers but large number of students who come to the city to continue their higher education studies. In response to population increase in the cities, the socio-economic crisis, and food insecurity, many university campuses have begun initiatives towards becoming more sustainable, through being tools for local area development; and sustainable development stages for large ecological footprints as well as a capacity for innovative creations. Having said this, urban universities are playing key roles in influencing the landscape of their neighborhoods. They represent critical stakeholders with the capacity to contribute to regional economic development (Goddard and Vallance, 2013) since they are increasingly aware of the physical and socioeconomic challenges at their doorstep. In response,

university missions and actions are reflecting a new paradigm of active engagement (Perry, 2008). Universities are playing an important role in shaping society, with significant social, economic and environmental impacts at regional, national and global levels (Brennan et al. 2004). Focusing research on sustainable food systems, providing centers for engagement and collaborative action between campus and neighborhood community is a means for ensuring sustainability in the city with all the socio-economic and environmental pressures the cities are facing today as a result of over-population and climate change.

Urban university campuses offer potential possibilities for implementing sustainability that addresses every member of the campus and off campus communities. For example, universities supporting sustainable food systems (SFS) provide and purchase products or services from small-scale and minority producers, work on projects for sourcing local foods produced and transported with minimal ecological impacts, and sponsor research and engagement on related topics, thus, developing real estate, employing people, and engaging in workforce development (Pothukuchi & Mulnar, 2015). Having said this, SFS activities will, nevertheless, offer rich connections between campus and community partners, and between the university's everyday operations and its strategic mission. They certainly provide opportunities for hands-on and community-engaged learning experiences in the aim of dealing with real-world problems, mainly targeting and valuing local agriculture, access to fresh and healthy food, eliminating social insecurities, and fostering ecological responsibility. Thus, providing many benefits for both, the campus and its surrounding communities and meeting urban universities' mission statement in supporting to SL.

According to Niewolny et al. (2012), social wellness, capacity building (when a university and the community come together in ways that can lead to community development through joint capacities and knowledge) (Homan, 2011), and community engagement between universities and

communities is greatly achieved through a civically engaged basis of agriculture. For Hinrichs (2007), this civic agriculture model acts as a new platform for knowledge sharing, network building, and a basis for two-way interaction that aims for civic revitalization and food system transformation. A civically engaged agriculture model is built through the foundations of social embeddedness, reciprocity, and trust (Tolbert et al., 2002), thus, also a translation of the aim of SL programs at universities.

Agriculture has taken its first steps into the city decades ago, through Urban Agriculture (UA) projects. According to UNDP, Urban Agriculture (UA) is “*the practice of growing productive plants and raising animals within and around city boundaries*” (Mougeot, 2000). Estimates have revealed that about 15% of food production worldwide is grown in cities through UA practices (Armar-Klemesu, 2000; Smit et al., 1996). Thus, the practice of UA has been a major tool towards improving food security for some major cities (Chaminuka & Dube, 2017). Orsini et al. (2013) have observed that UA contribution to food security is reflected in the 100 to 200 million urban farmers globally through providing urban markets with fresh horticultural products (Orsini et al., 2017). It has also been proven that UA is a tool and a community engagement approach that urban universities have adopted in the aim of enhancing sustainability in the city and supporting educational missions across university campuses as a mutually beneficial initiative that contribute to Campus- Community Engagement (CCE). For example, Yale University in the United States of America, has adopted UA under the Yale Sustainable Food Project. As seen at Yale, students can use the university agricultural projects as a tool for learning, in addition, the projects are seen as a tool for people to reconnect as well as to discover the rich benefits of local foods (Wadkins, 2012). Therefore, located in the cities, through UA, urban universities have the potential to perform

SL projects, engage with their neighborhood, while accomplish sustainability at social, economic, and ecological level.

The MENA region relies heavily on the agriculture sector as a main source of food, despite the fact that it is mainly covered by dry lands and deserts (Waha et al. 2017). Approximately, 70 % of the MENA region's agriculture production is rain-fed (Selvaraju, 2013), given that the region receives less than 300 mm of annual rainfall (Waha et al. 2017). The region has coped with its water scarcity through the abstraction of groundwater, water harvesting and storage, wastewater reuse, desalinization plants and food imports. Early 21st century, the MENA region recorded 6 % of its population to practice UA, whereas only 2 % in other regions practices UA (Dixon, 2001). In Lebanon, some UA initiatives were established to enhance livelihoods in densely populated and vulnerable areas in the city Beirut where there is socio-economic instability, lack of international assistance, and pressure over natural resources. Most of these initiatives were established to alleviate urban poverty, address the food crisis, adapt to climate change, and create social cohesion.

Given that the world is facing food insecurity issues due to over-population and climate change, especially in urban areas, universities, through their civic engagement (CE) and service-learning (SL) missions, are adopting sustainable food systems, using UA, as a mutually beneficial tool to support sustainability and ensure reciprocity of campus-community relationships. In literature review, UA is a subject of interest, research, studies, and projects in many universities in the West, and today in the Arab world; however, there were not enough findings that report how UA initiatives can contribute to sustainability, CE and SL in Arab Universities, knowing that the region is challenging due to the ongoing social, economic, ecological and political instability.

The American University of Beirut (AUB) is one of the largest universities in the Arab World. AUB through its historic civic missions, has long been contributing to local communities, especially its neighborhood, the neighborhood of Ras Beirut. Approaches to community service at AUB has changed overtime, being affected by the economic and political changes as a result of war and conflict. Today, two civic engagement initiatives at AUB have been established to embody social responsibility and devote all its professionalism to the public good: The Center for Civil Engagement and Community Service (CCECS) founded in spring 2008; and The Neighborhood Initiative, launched in 2007. In addition, the Faculty of Agriculture and Food Sciences (FAFS) has established in 2001 a multidisciplinary center, the Environment and Sustainable Development Unit (ESDU), which aims at promoting collaboration for sustainable development through research specialized in community development and sustainable agriculture (“AUB”, 2001).

AUB has been established 150 years ago, covering about 25 hectares of land, in one of the most populated areas in the City Beirut, Ras Beirut Neighborhood. AUB has observed and lived with the many social, economic, and ecological changes in the area throughout history, affected by and affecting these changes through its multidisciplinary approaches and initiatives. However, literature has revealed that AUB still falls in the dilemma of bridging the gap between the service activities it provides and the reality on the ground. Highlighting on AUB’s history and multidisciplinary centers contributing to local communities and ones acting as sustainability development platforms, it was important to question **What is the nature of the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut community today? And How can AUB best develop a mutually beneficial UA approach that can enhance and sustain campus-community relationships?**

This paper aims at understanding the relationship between AUB and its surrounding neighborhood, and exploring whether UA can be used as a tool for enhancing sustainability in the over-populated neighborhood of Ras Beirut, at the same time, whether it can support AUB's educational mission and play the role of a mutually beneficial initiative that contribute to Campus-Community Engagement (CCE). Through literature review and questionnaire surveys conducted with Ras Beirut and AUB community, this study aims at investigating the different elements and stakeholders that are challenging the principles for enhancing and sustaining CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut community, while exploring the concept of an UA platform to support sustainability, and ensure reciprocity of campus-community relationships through CE and SL. Results have shown that UA can be a fertile ground for potential synergies and convergences between AUB and Ras Beirut. However, the issue is not in the possibility of developing a best model of an UA initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut, it is in dealing with the challenges facing CCE in the first place. It was found that there is a set of initial steps that need to be implemented first, playing the role of a stable base for a successful UA project to support CCE **1) Communication Strategy 2) Urban Agriculture initiatives as the Common Ground 3) Garden-Based- Service Learning Partnership.**

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. The Key role of Universities as Anchor Institutions for Sustainability

1. Universities as Global Actors

Between the 1980's and 1990's, with the increase of the world population, urban neighborhoods started facing poverty, safety concerns, and disinvestment. During that period, some urban universities, being aware of the physical and socioeconomic challenges present behind their gates, responded with diverse interventions in the aim of stabilizing the neighborhood's conditions and encouraging improvement (Ehlenz, 2016). These universities acted as critical stakeholders that have the capability of contributing to regional economic stability and to developing the civil society through SL and CE programs for the development of their surrounding neighborhoods (Goddard and Kempton, 2013).

Boyer (1996) argues that it is time for urban universities to become the helping institutions in the search of answers for the most persistent social, economic, civic, and moral problems (Boyer, 1996). In the 1990s, university presidents from across the globe agreed that "Universities educate most of the people who develop and manage society's institutions." For this reason, universities started bearing profound responsibilities to increase the awareness, knowledge, technologies, and tools to create an environmentally sustainable future" (University Leaders for a Sustainable Future [ULSF], 1990).

2. Universities as “Anchor Institutions”

Universities, in addition to training young people for future employment and helping them develop their potential, they have a big role towards transforming the society and creating more arrangements (Bowen, 1997; Boyer, 1996; Orr, 1991; White, 2000), especially within their own neighborhoods (Reardon, 2000). Many urban universities’ institutional goals, today, are to improve their surrounding neighborhoods and regions through extending their civic roles and ensuring sustainability. In this regard, urban universities are seen to have “anchoring” roles, economic development, human and social capital enhancement, and physical improvement of their neighborhoods (CEOs for Cities 2007; Sungu-Eryilmaz 2009). In this sense, urban universities play a big role in renewing their neighborhoods and creating value to their institutions.

Most of the urban universities’ missions was to become “anchor institutions” in cities as a result of their awareness of the challenges facing urban neighborhoods. Not only because of their economic and social contributions, but also urban universities own assets that include significant amounts of fixed capital, mainly real estate holdings and infrastructure, which makes universities less mobile (CEOs for Cities 2007; Sungu-Eryilmaz 2009). This has created strong connection of urban universities to their place and surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, it has created strong ties not only with the city and its communities, but also the need for an active engagement with their surrounding neighborhoods in response to the physical, economic, and social challenges in the city (Ehlenz, 2016). As per the Association’s Council on Engagement and Outreach, publicly engaged institutions should ensure and be committed to a two-way interaction with communities through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information and expertise for mutual benefit (Ehlenz, 2016). This two-way interaction has been known as the ‘Stepping Forward: as the Stewards of Place’. The dimensions of this ‘stewardship’ are defined by Place

Related, Interactive, Mutually Beneficial, and Integrated Place. “Related” through pursuing development that would benefit the institution’s neighbors, who can be its most consistent and reliable advocates. “Interactive” through engaging with the neighboring communities and becoming their resource of solving the problem. “Mutually Beneficial” through ensuring an engagement that has benefit to both parties; thus, enhancing community capacity yet support the role of the campus as knowledge asset and resource. “Integrated” through ensuring that this relationship with the hosting neighborhood is present in the institution’s policies, structures, priorities, and campus community (Goddard and Kempton, 2013). This interaction between universities and their host neighborhoods is referred to as “town and gown” (Goddard and Vallance, 2013). This town-gown interaction is seen as urban universities’ mission for civic engagement, thus, fostering partnerships among community stakeholders and building strong, healthy communities through engagement of teaching, research, and outreach resources.

However, Goodall (1970) in “The urban university: Is there such a thing?” argues that the understanding of ‘an urban university rather than just a university built in a city’ is vague. Sandra Enos and Keith Morton in “Developing Theory and Practice of Campus Community Partnership” explain that in the past seventy years, the concept of “education for community improvement” has become “community service” which then became “service learning” (Sigmon and Ramzay, 1967; Morton and Saltmarsh, 1997). This concept has often been understood as a tool towards having the youth and community participants learn from their joint and separate interests and actions to connect and affect one another respectively, and at the end to learn how to use this knowledge for the development of their shared physical and social space. Enos and Morton also explained that community leaders in cities residing around universities often see universities as if they are “*in*” the community and not “*of*” the community. To the authors, the campus and neighboring

community are one domain and share the same identity that influences their goods and resources that directly affect their quality of life.

In response to previously stated arguments, today universities' anchoring role is building a framework that would serve as regeneration activities for campus and neighborhood communities. This would include developing initiatives that target neighborhood quality of life issues at different levels such as physical conditions (e.g., safety, public infrastructure, housing), socioeconomic conditions (e.g., poverty, unemployment), and services (e.g., commercial and retail, neighborhood schools). These initiatives are different from other forms of university anchoring plans because they extend beyond campus boundaries to engage with the neighborhood community (Ehlenz, 2017). This engagement is important because it addresses basic needs and services, and ensures population socio-economic growth.

3. Campus-Community Engagement (CCE)

Campus Community Engagement, as per Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006) is:

“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, 2006).

According to Boyer (1996), universities see their “civic mission,” as a mission that connects “The rich resources of the university to their most pressing social, civic and ethical problems” (Boyer, 1996). This mission contributes much to building sustainable communities, which is achieved through the “engagement” with diverse stakeholders (Association of Commonwealth Universities 2001; Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance 2006; Business/Higher Education Round Table 2006). Universities' responsibilities to their

campus and wider community is through the sustainability of civic engagement policies, practices, and partnerships. This sustainability depends highly on a number of conditions that include commitment at policy and institutional levels; empowered agents within the institution; and a culture that enables, encourages, and rewards the engagement with community and civic partners (Boland, 2012).

Universities, as per Thomas (1998), have demonstrated community involvement in many ways, such as “(a) cooperative extension and continuing education programs, (b) clinical and pre-professional programs, (c) top-down administrative initiatives, (d) centralized administrative-academic units with outreach missions, (e) faculty professional service, (f) student volunteer initiatives, (g) economic and political outreach, (h) community access to facilities and cultural events, and most recently, (i) service-learning classes” (Thomas, 1998).

Bringle et al. (1999) argued that universities have often treated communities as “pockets of needs, laboratories for experimentation, or passive recipients of expertise” (Bringle et al. 1999). Boyer (1996) challenged universities to bring back dignity to what is called “community engagement” through connecting its rich resources (Boyer, 1996), thus, promoting institutional citizenship, building new campus-community initiatives, and promoting a broad sense of civic responsibility in higher education (Boyer & Hollander, 1999; Bringle et al. 1999; Zlotkowski, 1996). Yet, till today, there is little that has been researched on the nature of campus community partnerships (Giles and Eyer, 1998). Partnerships are built on overlapping interests that converge on the aim of improving community conditions (Howell, 2000). However, are universities truly institutions that seek the development of communities behind their gates?

Given the universities’ strong institutional leadership and campus-wide commitments that have been cited as revitalization practices, yet the most transformative efforts are the ones that

move beyond one-time investments. These transformative efforts include intersections between universities and their neighborhoods community's business practices and policies such as purchasing policies and hiring policies, neighborhood businesses, local workforce etc... Yet, one of the best practices include focused targeting of physical, economic, and social resources, establishment of partnerships with neighborhood stakeholders, finding a balance between university and community needs and goals, and organizing strategies that address the entire community resources (Ehlenz, 2015).

These universities are working on ensuring better approaches towards campus and neighboring community outreach through rewriting their mission statements; implementing new and creative strategic plans; reforming curriculum to incorporate themes of civic, social, economic, and moral issues; and most importantly seeking projects to work with community groups; thus, creating partnerships (Thomas, 1998). Thus, urban universities are reconsidering their public service and outreach activities through asking the question of "**What works?**" (Thomas, 1998).

4. University Food Systems: Engines for Sustainability

One of the major elements urban universities are adopting to address communities and generate sustainability is through promoting healthy food systems (Inman, 2015). These healthy food systems can best be stimulated through the promotion of sustainable food production, from the food on campus, to education, to the community behind the campus gates (Abercrombie et al. 1998).

In developing countries, urban populations are growing as a result of the rural-urban migration (FAO, 2007; "City Farmer", 2011). It is estimated that, between 1800 and 1900, 2 to 14 % of the world population, at global level, have moved to live in the cities. It is expected that by 2022, 55 % of the world population will be living in the cities (Orsini et al. 2013). This issue has

increased urban food insecurity due to the increase in demand and the high costs of supplying and distributing food from rural areas to the urban areas. In addition, climate change is one of the factors that has doubled the challenge of meeting food demands (Cassman et al., 2003). According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), human activities have led to warming of the Earth's atmosphere (Pachauri et al., 2014), such as burning of fossil fuels, cutting of the vegetation cover, in addition to, increases in the concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs). These are all seen as contributors to climatic change during the twentieth century and are expected to contribute to further changes in climate in the twenty-first century and beyond (Sivakumar et al., 2013). As a result of climate change, vegetation covers and natural resources are being affected by water scarcity, temperature rise, and drought, thus, affecting the agriculture sector which highly depends on water for more produce. The deficiency in agriculture production, high population rate, and increase on food demand has led to higher food prices; thus, food insecurity.

Urban communities are challenged by the conventional food system in diverse ways. To mitigate these challenges, a growing sustainable food system (SFS) movement was established to mobilize existing resources—including public institutions—to resolve disparities in access to healthy food, increase economic opportunities, conserve natural resources, and build a stronger, more local food system (Pothukuchi, 2015). According to SAREP, A SFS movement is “A collaborative effort to build more locally based, self-reliant food economies – one in which sustainable food production, processing, distribution and consumption is integrated to enhance the economic, environmental and social health of a particular place” (Feenstra, 2002). SFS aims to build stronger regional linkages to sectors within the food system and between the food system and their communities in order to promote public health outcomes, revitalize local economies, repair ecological systems, and foster social justice and equity. Within this movement, a growing

“food justice”—with increasing student participation—seeks to eliminate disparities within the food system through healthy food access in underserved communities, with emphasis on supporting small-scale food and farm enterprises locally and globally; and demand living wages and better working conditions for food workers (Pothukuchi,2015).

According to Feenstra (2002), given their presence and roles as “anchor institutions” between campus and neighborhood communities, urban universities should support SFS (Feenstra, 2002). When speaking of Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) towards solving the worldwide food insecurity issue, urban universities can be leaders in resolving disparities in access to healthy food, increase economic opportunities, conserve natural resources, and build a stronger, more local food systems. Urban universities’ SFS strategy may include sourcing local foods produced and transported with minimal ecological impacts, purchasing from small-scale and minority producers, supporting better living wages and working conditions for food workers, and sponsoring research and engagement on food related topics (Feenstra, 2002).

Therefore, urban universities offer possibilities for ensuring social equity principles and enhancing the relationships between campus and neighboring communities, while implementing sustainable food systems. This is done through the urban universities’ campus dining halls, food retail such as farmers’ markets, CE approaches and SL activities such as local/campus food production (Pothukuchi and Molnar, 2015).

B- Universities and Community Engagement Approaches

1. Participatory Development

Participatory development emerged in the 1970’s and became the dominant paradigm of development communication by Latin American scholars who refused methods of modernization

especially in terms of communication approaches. Modernization was brought by experts of the developed world to guide and direct people of the villages, who were treated like objects in a top-down approach to “development” (Yoon, 1996). This has intrigued critics of modernization to look up the literature for participatory communication approaches for development because these experts realized that development was not building roads and infrastructure nor increasing farm yields per hectare, but a Green Revolution. This strict top-down development measures was highly criticized for breaking down developing communities through underestimating indigenous knowledge, beliefs and social systems. In the 1980s and 1990s, participatory development paradigms have evolved to become more successful and more trust-worthy than the early development methods (Huesca, 2007).

“Participatory development is a process through which stakeholders can influence and share control over development initiatives, and over the decisions and resources that affect themselves” as per the Framework for Mainstreaming Participatory Development Processes into Bank Operations, ADB, 1996 (Huesca, 2007). The participatory development approach has been evolving worldwide as an answer to enhance the lives of the vulnerable rural communities. Their skills, knowledge, and experiences have been seen as important factors to development and their engagement and decision making is highly important for better and more efficient rural development. These participatory development approaches are seen as “bottom-up” approaches, which have been revived at the market of rural development for almost 30 years now.

Participatory approach in community development is a model that has been used for the past 30 years, where the needs of the communities were well documented and their participation in development was necessary for more efficient results. In the 1970s, when the ‘western’ methods were not as successful as developers hoped and peasants/locals started doubting these methods,

participatory methods emerged as an alternative strategy, where local methods and needs began to be integrated in the methods suggested as a development method (Yoon, 1996).

In 1990s, Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) came in to be “a family of approaches and methods to enable rural people to share, enhance, and analyze their knowledge of life and conditions to plan and to act” (Chambers, 1994). PRA came as a reaction to previous quantitative methods that often-ignored people and concentrated on issues of ‘production’ rather than on ‘producers’; thus, not taking into consideration the critical role played by indigenous knowledge system (Binns et al., 1997). A key feature of PRA is its importance in creating an interaction between different elements in complex people-environment relationships. PRA methodologies ensure that indigenous people identify and express their needs in their own way, where the researcher becomes more of a listener, learner, catalyst and facilitator (Chambers et al., 1989; Chambers, 1993).

Chambers believes that Professionals, whether in NGOs, governments, institutions, and donor agencies (whom he calls “outsiders”) need to understand that participation is neither strong nor sustainable if they are not participatory (Chambers, 1995). Scoones and Thompson (1994) have also observed that ‘in national and international agricultural research centers, universities, government agencies and NGOs, there is a growing acceptance of the need to involve local people as active partners in all aspects of the research and development process’ (Scoones and Thompson, 1994).

2. Participatory Approaches in Universities

There are three types through which community outreach, engagement, and partnership is adopted by universities. First, the transfer of knowledge and the encouragement of innovative actions and ideas. Second, the university engagement with the community through the education

and addressing the social aspects in all its curricula. Third, through emphasizing “community-based research” (CBR) and “service-learning” (SL) (Schuetze, 2012). All three types fall under “Participatory Development”.

Community Based Research (CBR) is “a form of research with community involvement and collaboration that uses scientifically accepted research methods” (Schuetze, 2012). Thus, community members in a research or development initiative should be actively involved in and understand the research process, and the research must carry data and information that are directly useful to the community. Service-learning (SL) is, “education that is grounded in experience as a basis for learning” (Ellis, Bianchi, and Shoop 2008)); i.e when education is tied to social action (Schuetze, 2012).

The characteristics of both CBR and SL allow researchers to use the community as their research laboratory, but in partnership and engagement with the community. These methods are defined as research *with* the community and not *on* the community. Both methods allow diverse knowledge and resources to meet and generate solutions for complex problems with the aim of increasing community capacity and social capital (Ward and Wolf-Wendel, 2000; Bringle and Hatcher 2002).

3. Framework of Campus-Community Participation at Universities

In university context, participatory research can contribute to the university civic missions through community based participatory research (CBPR), which is the “Action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities” (Reason and Bradbury, 2001). Through CBPR, universities are able to shift from theory to action through the process of reflective learning involving diverse stakeholders. In

universities, civic engagement, however, not only indicates where community–campus interaction occurs but also specifies qualities of process, thus, how it occurs through CBPR. Bringle Hatcher and Clayton (2006) see a difference between community involvement and civic engagement. They believe that civic engagement is when the community is involved and part of the research, whereas community involvement is when civic engagement allows the community to be part of the design, implementation, and assessment of a research (Bringle et al. 2006).

Universities are adopting the approaches Community service-learning (CSL), community-based research (CBR), and participatory action research (PAR) to reestablish their acceptability among the wider public (Russell & Flynn 2001; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). Despite what the form was, these engagement measures have a common ground and that is to rehabilitate the relationship between campus and community. However, critics have argued that no matter how much these engagement measures are to ensure CCE, they are often used to for the benefit of campuses and very rarely consider community needs fully (Bortolin, 2011; Cronley, Madden, & Davis, 2015; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000). Myntii et al. (2012) also argue that most of the service engagement in universities alleviated suffering but rarely changed the current problems and situations of the society and addresses the question of **to what extent should a university seek to change the current situation** (Myntii et al. 2012)?

C. Urban Agriculture as a Tool to Change the Current Situation

1. Definition and Types

Urban Agriculture (UA) is the practice of growing productive plants and raising animals within and around city boundaries (UNDP, 1996). Despite the criteria for its definition and understanding, UA is highly recognized today for its benefits by international organizations such

as UN-Habitat and FAO (World Food and Agriculture Organization) (RUAF Foundation, 1999). UA is one of the approaches that urban universities have adopted in the aim of enhancing sustainability in the city and support educational missions across university campuses by introducing local food systems, sustainable agriculture, and community services.

There are different types of UA that have one thing in common which is growing edible plants in the city (Mancebo, 2016) and develop the potential for people to exercise significant influence over the place where they live (Hou et al. 2009, Mougeot 2005). UA is usually established in large scale urban peripheries; however, introducing UA in dense urban contexts with less available land is challenging. UA projects are mainly food-producing projects and their activities are found on sites of all scales. Projects of UA fall under four general categories (“Five Borough Farm”, 2018):

- 1) Institutional Farms and Gardens:** Affiliated with an institution (such as hospitals, schools, public housing etc..)
- 2) Commercial farming:** When commercial farmers try to maximize their crop performance in order to achieve profitability, taking into account the health and ecological goals of the surrounding UA community
- 3) Community Gardens:** Located on publicly-owned lands and are mostly managed by local resident volunteers mainly to grow food
- 4) Community farms:** Spaces operated by a nonprofit organization that engages the surrounding community in food production but also acts as a social and educational program.

2. UA Contribution to Food Security, Local Economy, Social Inclusions, and Environmental Impact

In terms of food security, UA has been adopted in many cities to improve both food intake and the quality of food. Probably, the main strength of UA is its contribution to food security (Maxwell et al. 1998) that is through allowing the poor of the cities to have access to food and fulfilling their nutritional needs (Gockowski et al. 2003; Kahane et al. 2005; Smith and Eyzaguirre 2007). It is estimated that the urban poor spend about 60 to 85 % of their income to feed themselves (Mougeot, 2005; Redwood, 2012). UA is a source of urban food supply and an opportunity towards food security at different levels, especially household level. UA provides fresh produce, rapid delivery upon harvest, easy access to healthy food, and cheaper costs in the city, whereas rural agriculture usually supplies products with higher cost and fewer urban social benefits.

Moreover, UA has been growing for the past three decades. Smit et al. (1996b) claim that about 800 million people will be engaged in UA worldwide; where 200 million of these will be market producers, hence employing about 150 million people at full-time jobs (Smit et al., 1996b). The approach enhances the livelihoods of urban communities and develops the local economy through creating links between producers and consumers, and most importantly enhancing urban food security by ensuring nutritionally rich foods and stable food consumption against seasonality (RUAF, 1999). Thus, UA is an opportunity for using urban open spaces efficiently and enhancing livelihoods through generating income and ensuring employment (Mougeot, 2000).

At the social level, UA has been a means of engagement with disadvantaged social groups such as immigrants, refugees etc... The approach creates social networking and provides a better living conditions for these disadvantaged groups (Novo and Murphy, 2000). It has been shown that individual wellbeing and sustainable outcomes of activities are found when the cultivation in UA is operated by groups or associations. The negative impacts of, both the entrepreneurial risk

and the costs are reduced, such as the costs of renting the lands, transports, and technical assistance. Moreover, within the groups or associations, the interpersonal relations, support, and self-empowerment among producers are strengthened (Smit and Bailkey, 2006; Orsini et al. 2009). UA plays an important role in recreational and educational activities especially for youth. The approach provides the youth with knowledge on agricultural practices, which are believed to be lost within generations, especially that the rural-urban migration is expected to increase in the future (Orsini et al. 2013). Evidence from cities around the world highlights the positive impact of UA on women, youth, and children (Mawois et al. 2011).

Furthermore, UA plays a role in keeping the urban environment clean and ensuring the production of fresh food (Smit et al., 1996) through the production of compost from organic wastes, as in UA in Accra (Ghana) (Cofie et al. 2006; Buechler et al. 2006; Orsini et al. 2009). The spread of green areas within the cities helps in maintaining the cities' microclimate and the biodiversity (Smit et al. 1996), specifically green corridors to connect wildlife populations that have been separated by human activities or structures, nevertheless, connecting the city to the countryside. UA helps in reducing of the ecological impact of the cities through, reducing emission of transport, packaging, storage, etc., since the production areas are close to the final consumers (Ghosh, 2004; deZeeuw, 2010). In addition, compost extracts derived from urban household waste can be used to control of plant diseases, as in the case of Lomé and Tsévié (Togo), and Dakar (Senegal) (Kessler and Helbig, 2001), and the use of human decay as an alternative source for plant fertilization (Cofie et al. 2004; WHO, 2006). Thus, UA is an opportunity for using urban open spaces efficiently, reusing solid and liquid wastes, enhancing livelihoods through generating income and ensuring employment, and managing freshwater resources (Mougeot, 2000).

3. UA in the MENA Region

The MENA region's population was 341 million in 2015 and is expected to reach up to 571 million in 2050 as per the United Nation's medium-fertility scenario (United Nations, 2013). The population in the MENA region is expected to be 1.7 % of 1.1 % globally, which reached up to 3 % between 1990 and 2006 while the global increase was only 2.2 %. ("FAO", 2008), whereas income growth is at 3–3.4%, faster than the global average ("World Bank", 2008). This rapid increase in population will, nevertheless, be affected by climate change and the struggle for survival will surely impact water and land resources in the region (Waha et al. 2017), nevertheless, demand on food will increase.

In addition, migration in the MENA region is mostly internal, rural – urban migration. Since climate change is highly affecting the agriculture sector, rural-urban migration has become a casual aspect for most rural populations who are employed in the agriculture sector. For example, Algeria is facing environment degradation, water scarcity, and desertification threatening rural livelihood, the problem causing most rural communities to move to mid-sized towns (Gubert and Nordman 2010; Wodon et al. 2014). These issues may intensify with population growth (Fader et al. 2013).

The MENA region relies heavily on the agriculture sector as a main source of food, despite the fact that it is mainly covered by dry lands and deserts (Waha et al. 2017). Approximately, 70 % of the MENA region's agriculture production is rain-fed (Selvaraju, 2013), given that the region receives less than 300 mm of annual rainfall and that the lower limit for rain-fed agriculture is between 200- and 300-mm annual rainfall (Waha et al. 2017). These factors make the region vulnerable and changes in temperature impacts the agriculture sector, hence food security and rural livelihoods (Waha et al. 2017). Despite the dry climates of Arab countries, yet most countries

depend on rain-fed agriculture which is practiced on more than half of all arable lands, such as in Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, and Yemen (AOAD, 2007). However, rain-fed agriculture in Arab countries is in danger due to climate change (Lampietti et al. 2011). On the other hand, the MENA regions depends highly on food imports and is considered one the most regions suffering from food insecurity around the world (“World Bank”, 2009). Strong population growth, income growth, and rural-urban migration is increasing demand on food in the region. The Arab spring wave and political unrest in 2011 were triggered by socio-economic factors mainly decrease in salaries, increase in unemployment rates, and rise in food prices (Harrigan, 2011).

Early 21st century, the MENA region recorded 6 % of its population to practice UA, whereas only 2 % in other regions practices UA (Dixon, 2001). This percentage in the MENA region was mainly in areas of conflict and extreme poverty such as Palestine and Refugee camps (Bradford et al. 2009). Thus, the need for survival in this region has led people to use UA as a tool to ensure food insecurity.

4. UA in Lebanon

In Lebanon, some UA initiatives were established to enhance livelihoods in densely populated and vulnerable areas in the city Beirut where there is socio-economic instability, lack of international assistance, and pressure over natural resources. Some of the main organizations who have been leading UA initiatives in Lebanon include: The Environment and Sustainable Development Unit (ESDU) at AUB, Near East Foundation (NEF), and American Near East Refugee Aid (ANERA), Agency for Technical and Development (ACTED) and Amel Association. Most of these initiatives aimed at alleviating urban poverty, addressing the food crisis, adapting to

climate change, and creating social cohesion, especially in areas where Lebanese Communities are hosting Syrian and/or Palestinian refugees.

The NEF, in collaboration with Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) and the ESDU at AUB has established a project called “Building the Food Security and Economic Resilience of Syrian Refugees and Vulnerable Members of their Host Communities in Beirut/Lebanon” aimed at building the food security and economic resilience of Syrian refugees and vulnerable members of their host communities – enabling them to survive and prosper in the face of decreasing international assistance.

ANERA, on another note, implemented a project called “Rooftop Gardening” in Nahr El Bared Refugee Camp, Lebanon. This project was among the first to prove that UA is an efficient approach for improving food security and generating income for vulnerable communities (ANERA, 2017). The project aimed at investigating whether rooftop gardens are feasible and can help in producing food for poor families at the camp. The outcomes of the project were positive for ensuring food security for the families at the camp and increasing their income (the average 50 square meter space available on a rooftop has the ability to generate an income of \$378 a year) (ESDU, 2015).

ACTED and Amel Association are two Lebanese organizations who have worked on similar projects whose aim was to build Food Security and Economic Resilience through the implementation of Community Gardens in poor areas hosting both Refugees and Lebanese Communities, targeting women in specific and building capacities on agriculture.

5. Campus UA: A Community Based Transformation for Sustainable Development

University campuses can provide the same benefits of UA but, in addition, provide healthy diet, student social and cultural life, and educational objectives. Building a relationship between the youth and the traditional agriculture and food production systems is an approach many universities around the world are adopting to raise awareness on the need for a healthy environment where they live. University campuses in urban locations that include a good percentage of open space may provide the opportunity to become productive landscapes through the implementation of urban agricultural principles. The production of locally grown food within campuses can contribute to the sustainability of food systems on campuses by providing fresh and organic produce to cafeterias and snack bars across campus locations; serve to meet student SL objectives through their engagement in growing and managing UA plots; and potentially impact proximate civic engagement and social responsibility activities.

Sustainable and local agriculture efforts in universities aim to secure healthy, fast, and low cost food (“RootAbility”, 2018). Many university campuses have begun initiatives towards becoming more sustainable. One of the considerations of sustainability is local food production and food sourcing. Campus UA represents the support to local food systems and have become an educational model for understanding food issues. Campus UA is a platform for practicing and researching topics on agriculture, environmental science, resource management, sustainability, landscape design, and nutrition. In addition, this approach enhances learning, develops interpersonal and gardening skills, and gains access to fresh produce by the students.

Several universities have integrated campus grown food into their university systems. For example, University of Northern British Columbia in Canada has taken its support of local food producers to a new level by hosting a weekly farmers’ market on campus (“University of Northern

British Columbia”, 2018). Others, such as the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, have on-site community gardens where students can grow their own organic produce (“The University of Canterbury”, 2018), while Marist College (USA) has campus community garden that played a significant role in the educational experience of students by highlighting ethical food production and consumption, and allowing students to transfer their knowledge across to their own communities (Marist Minute, 2018). In addition, the Marist example shows that on-campus gardens can be a sustainable food source for the College as well as its surrounding neighborhood. Campus UA serves as a place where students work together, share ideas and knowledge, increase social cohesion, and improve relationships among students of diverse cultural and social backgrounds. University student participation in an on-campus UA may not only help students but also with faculty, department, university staff and neighborhood communities. The Middlebury College Farm and Food Project, is another example of sustainable campus UA project that aims to “promote awareness of food production through hands-on learning and special events” (Bellows, 2003). The farm is managed and operated mainly by students, staff, and faculty. Nevertheless, it provides community members the opportunity to participate in and learn about agriculture, in addition the large quantities of fruits and vegetables are then sold to campus dining services and the public. As such, campus food production can play a significant role in student education.

The literature review tackled UA and its socio-economic and ecological importance. Specifically targeting the issue of food security in the world, in general, and in the MENA region and Lebanon, in specific. Campus UA is seen as a small-scale UA initiative which also has socio-economic and ecological importance to campus life and its neighborhood communities. Nevertheless, the it is considered as a service-learning experience that will allow the sharing of knowledge for better quality and productivity of food in the future. However, no case study has

been found about campus UA in the MENA region. This indicated that such an initiative hasn't been explored yet and there is a need to study whether campus UA is as compatible, feasible and will create change, as it is in universities outside the Arab world, specifically in being a platform and an initiative for ensuring CCE.

D. The Case of AUB: Serving Campus and Neighborhood Communities

1. CCE and Sustainability: Case Studies

The concepts of civic engagement (CE) and service-learning (SL) has risen in North America by the 1980's and South America by the 1990's. The concept has flown to the Sub-Saharan African countries by the 2000s. Both concepts are present today but with minimal widespread in Asian pacific states, Europe, and the Arab Region. Many universities in the West have adopted the concepts of CE and SL and are known worldwide for their famous initiatives in this matter.

The University of South Carolina is known for its famous project "Innovista". "Innovista" is a community initiative project that aims at identifying and building on the architectural character of both the university and its neighborhood. Thus, making their neighborhoods more pedestrian-friendly and sustainable, though providing green recreational spaces, through the integration of public and private sectors. In addition, it provided plans for plans to develop a world-class waterfront park and a new baseball stadium, which will in return offer higher paying jobs within the city, thus positively affecting and thriving the economy sector (Hill, 2012).

Another example would be the University of Pennsylvania with its famous initiatives, West Philadelphia Initiative, Penn Connects and the Netter Center. These initiatives aimed at engaging with the community of West Philadelphia neighborhood. The Penn's West Philadelphia

Initiative was developed to improve the neighborhood's services and capacities; provide diverse and high-quality housing choices; revive commercial activities; accelerate economic development; and enhance local public schools (Rodin, 2007). Penn Connects was launched to redefine the campus borders and revive the surrounding community through expanding pedestrian pathways throughout the campus and creating civic and open space for public gatherings linking the campus and the community. On the other hand, the Netter Center for Community Partnership was established to improve the internal coordination and collaboration of the university community service programs and initiatives; create new and effective partnerships between the campus and its surrounding community; create and strengthen local, national and international networks of institutions of higher education committed to engagement with their local communities (Hill , 2012).

Universities' anchoring roles in the city, as some researchers argue, came in for three main reasons. Some aim to strengthen their teaching and research missions while putting hands on real-world problem and trying to solve these problems through applied interdisciplinary work (Vidal et al., 2002; Wiewel and Lieber, 1998). Others, aim at making the urban environment a better place for living, working, and studying, especially in poor areas that are crime-ridden (Maurrasse, 2001; Rodin, 2007; Trostle and Hersch, 2003). While others engage with their neighborhoods for reasons that serve the university in the first place, such as to head off political opposition to campus expansion through property acquisition (Myntii, 2013).

Derek Bok, president of Harvard University, in a seminal work on the subject of universities' social responsibility, argues that, despite their noble mission to develop society through knowledge production, universities have a duty to use their resources to respond to the society's public needs (Bok, 1982). Community-based research at universities is now directed

towards solving pressing societal problems (Harkavy et al., 2009; Howard and Alperovitz, 2010), while, SL is there to help ensure that ‘the work of the academy (relates) to the world beyond the campus’ (Boyer, 1990; Silka, 1999).

The United Nations Climate Change Conference in Mexico (2012) and South Africa (2011) have emphasized on the need for new models and approaches in building a low-carbon sustainable society to deal with the issue of climate change. Professor Tim Jackson (2005) from the University of Surrey (2005) has highlighted that change in this matter is best pursued when communities and groups play part of it (Jackson, 2005). Thus, the role of the community in achieving sustainability cannot be under-estimated. As per DEFRA (2005), the social support is important and vital in breaking bad social habits and planning social norms to become more sustainable (DEFRA, 2005). Therefore, supporting civic engagement initiatives, adopting SL programs, and being generators of research, universities are expected to be leaders in developing frameworks for engaging the community in sustainability programs. In addition, campuses are grounds for demographic diversity, staff and students, which makes them microcosmic societies. A sustainable university campus can be defined as: “[...] a higher education institution [...] that addresses, involves and promotes [...] the minimization of environmental, economics, societal and health negative effects in the use of their resources [in] its main functions of teaching, research, outreach and partnership, and stewardship [...] to [help] society make the transition to sustainable lifestyles (Velazquez Contreras, 2002).

Monash University is an example of university sustainability initiatives. The university was evaluated as the greenest university in Australia in 2011 (Too and Bhishna, 2015). The university, which has launched several sustainability initiatives such as the 2010 Premier’s Sustainability Award, the UN Association Education Award and the 2009 Banksia Environmental

Award, stated that involvement and support of its community members was a primary driver of its achievement in sustainability. This was done through the support of its established Office of Environmental Sustainability (TOES), that aims at developing a sustainability program and implementing sustainability projects within the university campus (Too and Bhishna, 2015). On another end, Cornell University in New York, USA, has “sustainability” at the core of its courses, research, outreach, and campus management. The university has adopted Cornell Climate Action Plan to guide the university’s sustainability progress and aims at becoming carbon-neutral by 2050 (Cornell University, 2008). According to the university, sustainability efforts mainly involve the wide participation of students and staff members, who have played the role of catalysts for change, through forming different groups to answer and solve social needs such as local food production, composting benefits, and renewable energy (Cornell University, 2008).

However, there are three main challenges highlighted in literature review about when universities choose to be socially responsible urban neighbors. First, true problem-solving requires collaboration between the university and its neighbors, and among actors in the neighborhood. Within the university itself, this requires interdisciplinary collaboration. However, despite the fact that universities and academic leaders do praise interdisciplinary collaboration, yet very few do practice it when solving neighborhood problems (Choueiri and Myntii, 2012). Second, in this challenge the questions of “whose priorities count, and how are they determined?” rise. Universities have often acted and took measures according to their priorities and without any consultations. That is through locating practice sites for students within their surrounding neighborhoods, facilitating campus expansion, or increasing the safety of neighborhood streets only in the aim of protecting their campuses (Maurrasse, 2001; Rodin, 2007). Third challenge is the university’s capability of finding an intersection between meeting university interests and the

neighbors' needs and aspirations. Universities should engage with their communities in a 'democratic, mutually beneficial, mutually respectful partnerships' to tailor their work and resources to meet the public good (Harkavy et al., 2009). The issue as stated is not as problematic as to when neighbors perceive the university to have a bottomless bank account to respond to their needs. For this reason, it is important that universities ensure listening and not imposing when creating these partnerships with neighborhood communities (Adams, 2003; Axelroth and Dubb, 2010). It is also essential that trust and clear ongoing communication is built up over time (Axelroth and Dubb, 2010).

To overcome these challenges, as per Choueiri and Myntii (2012), universities should have internal set-up to ensure that they support collaborations and help in making things happen (Choueiri and Myntii, 2012). Presidents and deans encourage problem-focused community-based research through providing funding and other incentives; however, to be sustainable over the long term, support must become institutionalized figures who are able to persist despite changes of administration (Bok, 1982; Axelroth and Dubb, 2010). Corporate Social responsibility (CSR) has come to encourage organizations of many types, including universities, to look within and reinforce their own social practices, where **social** and environmental concerns become part of their operations and interactions with their stakeholders (Leitão and Silva, 2007). One of the major lessons on strategic CSR is knowing how the CSR programs in an organization should operate, from corporate culture to daily operations (Heslin and Ochoa, 2008).

Literature review has revealed several success stories stated above in terms of universities who have adopted CCE approaches to ensure the application of CE and SL in their missions. However, one of the major measurements to be taken in solving the challenges of CCE, is the evaluation of the work done under it and the way these programs operate. Very few studies that

have evaluated this work highlighted on the positive and negative effects of its initiatives to serve as a guide for those who are committed to advancing community engagement. In “The Transformation of Metropolitan Universities: A Case Study of Rutgers University-Newark (RUN) and its Community Engagement Programs, 1967-2010”, Diane Hill (2011), traced the community engagement of the campus of RUN from 1967 till 2010. Her research was guided by the question “How has Rutgers-Newark's commitment to community engagement evolved since the 1967 Newark disorders?” The study showed how community engagement within educational institutions in urban contexts can change overtime, affected by on and off campus factors. She based her research on archival documents and one-on-one interviews. She concluded that three major factors have influenced the advancement of community engagement in RUN: leadership, vision and mission. She believes that “Visionary Leadership” was the key in developing community engagement at the institution; the leadership she mentions is one that understands the value and importance of connecting campus scholarly assets and campus community for advancing community engagement. That is seen done through integrating the concept of CCE into the institutional mission. Furthermore, the results showed the need for policy implications at the level of university officials, administrators, faculty, and other stakeholders in higher education for understanding and supporting community engagement (Hill, 2011).

In “Auditing and Evaluating University–Community Engagement: Lessons from a UK Case Study” by Hart et al. (2011), the author presents a case study of the University of Brighton’s experience of evaluating its campus-community partnership. Hart et al. (2011) believe that, in the growing importance of campus community engagement activities in universities, there is a major need for an effective evaluation of these campus community partnerships, which she sees are still at formative stage. Hart et al. (2011) take the University of Brighton, UK, as a case study for

evaluating such partnerships. They built their study on a review of the literature and an analysis of published measurement frameworks. They argue that the problem in measuring CCE is in the lack of focus on the outcomes of the adopted initiatives, a lack of standardized instruments and tools; and the variety of approaches currently being adopted (Hart et al., 2009). The authors also argue that today the aim is not to focus on the CCE “*activities*”, but the aim should be to measure the “*Impact*” and “*Change*” that these CCE activities have contributed to.

CE and SL in the Arab region are recognized as extracurricular programs rather than being part of the teaching and research activities. Part of the Arab culture is social solidarity, which is seen by the public, as an approach mostly lead and built by universities (Ibrahim, 2014). Despite the fact that the political situation in the region and governments do not encourage the development of civil society; however, most university institutions seek civic services, such as food and medical supplies. Yet, still a very small number of universities run centers or initiatives that are committed to serving the communities, most of these services come as short-term student service projects. Examples of the very few universities in the Arab region that offer centers for community service are Center for Environmental Studies and Community Services created by University in Yemen in 2003 and the Center of Volunteerism and Civic Responsibility launched by Qatar University in 2012. On the other hand, rare are the universities that offer SL courses and core missions of infusing civic engagement throughout the institution. Examples of these universities are Zarqa Private University and Al-Bayt University in Jordan, the American University in Beirut, and the University of Balamand in Lebanon (Brown et al., 2000).

AUB is seen as one of the very few universities in the Arab region to offer SL courses and infuse civic engagement in its mission, in addition to dealing with the issue of sustainability at university, neighborhood and country level through its different initiatives and programs. Below

is an exploration and representation of the different motives that AUB has adopted to play part in CE, SL, sustainability.

2. History of AUB's Civic Missions

In the case of AUB, how is AUB promoting environmental responsibility and accessibility in its neighborhood abiding to the CSR norms? The Neighborhood Initiative (NI), The Center for Civic Engagement System (CCECS) and Agricultural Research and Education Center (AREC), and the Environment and Sustainable Development Unit (ESDU) have been launched as centers, within AUB, that adopt the norms and values of the CSR and aims at taking note of the concerns of society, set its priorities accordingly, and then identify university talents and knowledge to respond.

AUB's mission statement today is "The American University of Beirut (AUB) is an institution of higher learning founded to provide excellence in education, to participate in the advancement of knowledge through research, and to serve the peoples of the Middle East and beyond" (American University of Beirut, 2011). Being located in the center of Beirut, the university seeks to be a good neighbor through using its academic and intellectual resources to solving local problems; becoming a role model in supporting green designs and environmental sustainability; and minimizing the overcrowding caused by the movement of employees, students and hospital patients (Myntii, 2013). The social responsibility, seen in community service and engagement at AUB, has been present since AUB was found and as a reflection of change. It started with humanitarian projects such as charity to the underprivileged, contributed to national development and innovation, and enhanced academic programs to meet SL and community engagement outcomes (Myntti, 2012).

Going back through history, when AUB was founded, it was first established on hills overlooking the Mediterranean Sea beyond the city walls. As the city expanded over the years, the region around the university grew with settlements and streets. Before that, up until the mid-nineteenth century, the city was farm lands and most of the community were farmers. Mid-twentieth century, the city became a dense, mixed-use district, with educational, commercial, retail, and entertainment venues, in addition to, residential areas that host high-rise buildings. Prior to the civil war, the town-gown relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut was interconnected, where most university employees and students were living nearby and famous meeting places for professors and poets took place. Post-Civil War, the university lost many of its connections to its neighborhood because the neighborhood suffered from physical damages, staff and students were kidnapped or murdered, and most residents were replaced by families escaping violence. All these factors forced AUB to become enclosed and turn inward.

Up until Year 2007, the Neighborhood Initiative (NI) was launched to reverse the segregation of the university from its neighborhood and to encourage AUB staff and students to contribute in solving problems of the neighborhood behind campus walls. The three main rationales for the Neighborhood Initiative are: First, AUB's responsibility towards the neighborhood, given its almost 150 years of connection to the neighborhood and for being Beirut's largest private employer. Thus, keeping its surrounding district stimulating, pleasant and affordable to its employees and students. Second, strengthening AUB's connections to its neighborhood is mutually beneficial. It enhances the livelihoods of the local communities, and at the same time, promote SL and CBPR activities as an important educational tool for civic engagement and community involvement, thus enriching AUB's core academic mission by offering local, "real-world" examples for analysis and debate. Third, such engagement encourages

citizenship, produces individuals who feel responsible for their city and are prepared to act, whether individually or communally, for the public good. The work of the Neighborhood initiative is to respond to local concerns and needs rather than putting academic priorities above all.

3. The Neighborhood Initiative

The Neighborhood Initiative, in addition to all the mentioned reasons above, was established as a response to the challenge by the president of AUB, John Waterbury, in 2007, when he asked **what kind of neighbor was AUB?** (Myntii et al.,2009).

The Neighborhood Initiative is assisting AUB in playing the following roles in its neighborhood:

- a. Promoting an atmosphere among staff, faculty, and students that change is possible through a targeted outreach and straightforward activities that show AUB's commitment to the neighborhood;
- b. Providing the knowledge platforms and the motivation to faculty and students for research on problems facing the neighborhood;
- c. Creating positive and sustainable change through a strategic action plans and focused projects that would have many positive secondary effects;

The scope of work of the Neighborhood Initiative is participatory, where community involvement and civic engagement are at its core. Intensive interviews with neighbors have defined many problems that need to be solved. An action plan was put to prioritize objectives and work accordingly. For example, neighbors complained the increase of buildings and the lack of

greenery, so the Initiative has supported faculty and students, especially in the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, department of landscape design, in horticulture and landscape, to develop a 'Greening the Neighborhood' project.

Other Initiatives at AUB confirm the university's commitment to service, such as the Center for Civic Engagement and Community Service (CCEC) and the Advancing Research, Enabling Communities: AUB Outreach from the Bekaa Valley (AREC).

4. Center for Civic Engagement and Community Service (CCECS)

In response to the war with Israel in 2006, which caused extensive damage to the people and property across the country, in addition to forcing many people living in the southern suburbs to leave their homes, AUB was most involved to provide backup care for those most affected by the violence. Right after the one-month war, the president of AUB formed a Task Force for Reconstruction and Community Service (Mabsout, 2008; Mabsout, 2009). The Task Force offered support to students and faculty members involved in the massive task for immediate relief and reconstruction. In addition, it has helped in raising funds for community-based projects to strengthen sustainable livelihoods in affected areas. As a result, the involved group asked the university to establish a center for community service and engagement (Task Force for Reconstruction and Community Service, 2007).

The Center for Civic Engagement and Community Service (CCECS) was launched in March 2008. The CCECS aims to develop the service and civic leadership at AUB. Thus, primarily ensuring faculty and students of all disciplines, are studying, researching, and responding to social and civic issues that are critical and affecting the people of Lebanon and the Middle East. The hub

for community service and civic engagement at AUB (CCECS). The Center's functions include:

- a. Supporting community-based research initiatives;
- b. Developing of and supporting service-learning;
- c. Supporting the organization of a strong student volunteer outreach program.

The CCECS has been linking students with many volunteering opportunities, either short- or long-term community-based projects. As per Myntii et al. (2009) in "Beyond the Walls: The American University of Beirut Engages its Communities", the issue of whether community service should remain voluntary or become a requirement for students at AUB is not on, neither, the Center's nor AUB's agenda at the moment because they represent logistical challenges that are beyond the capacity of AUB and the CCECS (Myntii et al., 2009). In summer 2008, a workshop attended by AUB faculty in Costa Rica discussed the benefits and requirements of implementing service or community-based learning (CBL) at AUB as students' coursework. Discussions with department chairs and deans proceeded in the aim of formulating a model of CBL at AUB, taking into consideration its institutional and cultural context.

5. Advancing Research, Enabling Communities (AREC): AUB Outreach from the Bekaa Valley (Faculty of Agriculture and Food Sciences 2009; Zurayk 2009).

The Agricultural Research and Education Center (AREC) is AUB's campus in the Bekaa valley. It was established in year 1953 on 100 hectares of land. It was first created for students, faculty and local communities to play role and collaborate in the development of innovative solutions to agricultural problems. AREC is the AUB campus in the Bekaa Valley. It aims at promoting experiential learning, adaptive research and community outreach. AREC students, who are mainly agriculture and landscape design students, are able to turn theory into practice through hands-on learning experiences in the Bekaa campus. AREC's courses include a service component

that puts students in direct contact with the surrounding rural communities of the Bekaa valley.

Being set in one of the poorest areas of Lebanon, AREC offers a platform for AUB to practice its commitment to improving the lives of the people of Lebanon and the region. The current outreach programs implemented from AREC contribute to the social and economic development of the poor surrounding communities. Recently, AUB has taken steps to work on the topics that are of most concern to disadvantaged rural communities such as initiatives that entail organic and community supported agriculture, emphasizing on the need for the enhancement of rural livelihoods and the importance of sustainability and equity in rural development.

AREC has been found to engage students in SL activities for the development of the livelihood of the local community through student projects in neighboring villages. It also has multifaceted tasks in terms of the local communities. AREC has mobile medical ‘clinics’, extension programs, education classes offered to local residents, and outreach to farmers’ and women’s cooperatives. As AREC seeks to strengthen its social justice agenda, the next set of challenges have to do with the ways of working with local communities, a certain reflexivity about questions of participation and accountability, and the nature of partnerships developed with people and communities in the Bekaa.

6. Environment and Sustainable Development Unit (ESDU)

ESDU is an inter-disciplinary research and development centre, established in 2001, specialized in community development and sustainable agriculture hosted at the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FAFS) at AUB. As per Dr. Shady Hamadeh, Director of ESDU, "Our philosophy is to link and to embed research into development. The processes of research and development should be intertwined. And it's possible to conduct development projects with limited

resources." ESDU supports participatory approach to development, which is a strategy towards ensuring that research is grounded in the needs of local people, in addition to, putting their research findings into the hands of the community ("ESDU", 2020).

One of AUB's also major projects in regard of increasing greenery and supporting sustainable food systems are the UA projects established by ESDU. The ESDU has brought the concept of UA to Lebanon and is now the centre of UA in the Middle East, as per Dr. Shadi Hamadeh, Professor of Agriculture and Founder of the ESDU. In addition to UA, the ESDU has several running projects that aim at responding to the needs of the community and the opportunities of that are outside the conventional research frameworks of individual disciplines ("ESDU", 2020). Most common of these projects are:

- a. CLIMAT Project and REEF Initiative which aim at improving the skills and building the capacities and livelihoods of the vulnerable Lebanese and Syrian refugees in Northeast Baalbeck and West Beqaa. In addition to, developing national strategies for mapping and networking different joint projects of the same objectives.
- b. KariaNet (Knowledge Access for Rural Inter-Connected Areas Network) which is a regional networking platform for the management and sharing of knowledge, information and experience in agriculture and rural development, covering 10 countries of the MENA region.
- c. Food Security and Economic Resilience which is one of the famous projects called "Reducing Vulnerability of Syrian Refugees and Lebanese in Lebanon" and aims at supporting the development of home-based productive activities or small businesses related to agriculture production and food processing. One of the projects, mentioned

earlier in the literature reviews, that addresses UA as a tool towards supporting vulnerable communities, build their capacities on agriculture and local food production.

7. Factors Influencing Social Responsibility Programs in Universities

Myntii et al. (2009) in their paper “Beyond the Wall: The American University of Beirut Engages its Communities” present an overview of AUB’s history in community engagement at AUB, shedding the light on AUB’s famous community engagement initiatives: Neighborhood Initiative, Center for Community Engagement Services (CCECS) and Advancing Research, Enabling Communities (AREC). The authors then analyze the difficulties of community engagement within a university context and the challenges facing both AUB and its community engagement initiatives.

AUB has marked a long history while prioritizing the services activities as part of its mission and goals. However, too many questions rise about the issue of accountability, to who the social responsibility is addressed, and to what extent the university faculty and students should seek to change the status quo. There are three main challenges that AUB is facing in this sense.

First, in general, service as a humanitarian act may lead to the alleviation of suffering but rarely seeks to change the status quo. The extent to which service and engagement as concepts are seen as part of a “political” project. What is meant by “political” is that faculty members should act as citizens-scholars who take critical positions, relate their research to larger social issues, encourage students to engage in community projects and become socially responsible, and, build in the students the confidence that they are capable of making a difference in society and the world (Giroux and Giroux, 2006). For example, in the field of agriculture, engaged academics are joining social movements around the issues of community supported agriculture, organic food and the

environmentally sustainable practices to ensure equality (Constance, 2008)”, not just base their research on the issue of organic food and sustainable agriculture without taking measures on fixing or developing these fields in their community.

Second, students in curricular and extracurricular programs are urged to participate and produce the required academic work to pass their courses. Given their aim to pass a course, when it comes to involving students in projects for solving problems and making the world a better place, it makes sense to ask the question to whom are they accountable? In this sense, they are accountable to their professors. Thus, this accountability remains within campus walls and contradicts the aim of the university in engagement and SL. At the same time, faculty members are accountable to their superiors who evaluate their performance in terms of teaching, research, and service activities. For example, AUB’s archives and libraries have millions of good works that has been recorded about life changing experiences to many students and faculty members. However, little was shown of whether this work was indeed service-related and seen as priority to them or it was just a project to finalize their academic years. In addition, if a project was funded by an external agency, AUB, whether students or faculty, are accountable to this agency and for delivering project outcomes as in the agreed-upon use of fund.

The third challenge addresses the question of social responsibility to, or for, whom? AUB has always aimed at increasing its academic standards. Its performance has been measured by prevailing international norms, however, evaluation of certain academic production has become more valued such as research over teaching and service; individual research output over institution building efforts; research published in international peer reviewed journals over local or regional outlets; research on theoretical or methodological questions over development research aimed at solving local problems or improving the conditions of the poor. Critics of this approach have called

this system of evaluation as a ‘publish or perish’ rat-race (Dupeyrix, 2009), and unfortunately, as Myntii et al. argues in “Beyond the Walls: The American University of Beirut Engages its Communities” (200), AUB has fallen under this evaluation system (Myntii et al., 2009).

8. Factors Influencing the Social Responsibility programs: The Case of AUB

Given AUB’s challenges in practicing engagement and service activities, its three main initiatives, to support engagement and SL for solving problems of the society, have fallen under different challenges also. As previously mentioned, the issue of “accountability” is profound at university level. The first challenge to the Neighborhood Initiative, CCECS, and AREC falls under finding the most effective way to involve the AUB faculty. In outreach activities, if the faculty is not involved, any initiative is often seen as “not serious”. To get the faculty involved often puts the initiatives in an effort to find the right incentives to encourage the faculty in building research and action agendas on neighborhood questions.

Second, when speaking about “accountability”, the funding issue was stated among AUB’s initiatives’ challenges. Funding is usually big when serving underprivileged groups in poor areas. When speaking of Ras Beirut, the area is not seen as disadvantaged enough, which puts AUB and its initiatives in the loop of looking for funds, tailoring proposals, and allocating budgets with very strong arguments for the need of service and engagement activities in Ras Beirut.

Another major challenge is the issue of participation. As in previous section of the literature review, participatory approaches are critical to the success of the university in building the relations and engaging communities both inside the university and beyond the university walls. Yet, the work of AUB’s initiatives are still circulated and guided by senior faculty and administrative staff and every activity is defined and carried out with academic units in

collaboration with administrative units of the University. For example, with the Neighborhood Initiative, a survey to analyze how much AUB students spend in the neighborhood was organized with the Office of Student Affairs. Yet, despite the importance of participation, in literature on university-community partnerships, it becomes complicated when powerful parties try to engage with disempowered citizens and those who feel they are impacted negatively by these powerful parties (Kromer and Kerman 2005; Rodin 2007). In the case of the university-community partnerships, the communities often fall under the arm of the university.

9. Principles for building and sustaining campus- community relationships and AUB

When university leaders started realizing the importance of partnering with the world beyond campus walls to deliver knowledge and service to the public, this “two-way” approach was referred to as “engagement” to describe interaction with community partners and address societal needs (Boyer, 1996; Kellogg Commission, 1999).

This philosophy was meant to emphasize a shift in the role of universities from being the experts who deliver knowledge to the public towards becoming more collaborative entities where community partners play a significant role in creating and sharing knowledge to the mutual benefit of the university and society (Weerts and Sandmann, 2008). These changes were made to ensure the health and survival of higher education, politically and financially, and at the same time “serving the community, to extending and reaching out to it, to engaging it in bi-directional relationships and interactions” (Roper and Hirth, 2005).

Bringle and Hatcher (2002) have argued that the best means towards building campus-community partnerships is through SL. As previously stated in the literature review, SL is education that is tied to social action (Schuetze, 2012). Zlotkowski (1999) argues that service-

learning “(a) encompasses the most central part of the mission of higher education, teaching and learning, (b) leads to additional forms of civic involvement that can improve other scholarly activities (Benson et al., 2000), (c) involves faculty and students in educationally meaningful service activities that address community issues, (d) values community agency professionals as co-educators, and (e) requires ongoing dialogue among all partners to ensure successful implementation” (Zlotkowski, 1999).

In the case of AUB, given its social initiatives and the set of challenges that are, by default, weakening AUB’s SL and CCE missions, **what are, then, the terms of engagement that AUB campus and its neighborhood community should seek?**

According to Suarez et al. (2004), there are ten principles for building and sustaining campus- community relationships (Suarez-Balcazar et al., 2004).

- a. Develop a Relationship Based on Trust and Mutual Respect: Partnerships with the community includes a set of diverse stakeholders such as funders, executive directors, community leaders and residents and participants). Working with different groups, thus a multi-layer of decision makers, requires flexibility to ensure successful partnership (Mattessich and Monsey, 1992). Despite if they were involved in different stages and aspects of the collaboration, all interested potential partners should be involved and informed throughout the partnership -building process. To establish trust, partners should identify, together, a common vision and goals for their partnership, clarifying their expectations and the time commitment and resources needed to develop sense of belonging and ownership over the collaboration.
- b. Maximize, Use, and Exchange Resources: Typically, faculty and students bring access to resources for funding, knowledge and research, and access to technology, whereas, community partners bring in the knowledge of an area, its history, population of interest, their experience

(Bond, 1990; Jordan, Bogat, & Smith, 2001) and of course access to information on key informants, community leaders, and networks in the community (Suarez-Balcazar et al., 2002). Because access to resources is a critical issue between partners, it might at one point create an unequal and unbalanced relationship of power and control, an issue to be given full awareness and addressed in this partnership (Nelson, Prillettensky, and MacGillivray, 2001).

- c. Build a Two-way Learning Relationship: Whether campus or community partner, each of the two entities has its own knowledge. Knowledge that is residing in academia based on research and studies and knowledge existing in the community based on traditional knowledge and experiences. Often community knowledge is underestimated and devalued, given the superiority of academia expertise, however, experiential knowledge and academic knowledge should complement each other (Bond, 1990; Serrano-Garcia, 1990).
- d. Establish Open Lines of Communication: For successful campus-community relationship, it is important to establish open and frequent communication platforms by providing updates, openly discussing all issues, and conveying all information to one another, in and outside team (Mattessich and Monsey, 1992).
- e. Respect and Celebrate Diversity: Campus and community members come from diverse populations, ethnicity, race, and ability level. Real engagement should entail respecting diversity and recognizing that people have the right to be different from one another (Nelson et al., 2001; Rappaport, 1981). Thus, respecting the diversity includes abiding to appropriate research measures and protocols in development (Marin, 1993).
- f. Learn about the Culture of the Organization: It is highly essential for both parties of the engagement to understand the culture and background of where they come from or been raised. Whether neighboring communities or campus communities, both have cultural features

particular to the setting, its members' background, education, areas of expertise, and the community to which they belong. To respect the cultural differences, both communities need to devote sufficient time to understand each other, listen to one another, volunteer in the organization or community, and get to know the community by touring it and visiting with its different constituents (Suarez-Balcazar et al., 2002).

g. The Research Collaboration is Based on the Needs of the Community: For a successful university-community partnership, it needs to meet the needs of both, the community and the university, which is most likely to result in increased use of findings and social action (Panet-Raymond, 1992; Perkins & Wandersman, 1990; Selener, 1997). Both parties need to have clear goals and commitments, as well as, the potential of using the common knowledge and data gathered from their collaborative projects (Mattessich and Monsey, 1992).

h. Understand the Multidisciplinary Nature of Partnerships: University-community partnerships are engaging people from different disciplinary, cultural, and historical backgrounds. This multidisciplinary nature provides an opportunity to benefit the partnership through the diverse skills, perspectives, and experiences (Suarez-Balcazar et al., 2002).

i. Use Both Qualitative and Quantitative Research Strategies: Both qualitative and quantitative strategies complement each other and provide the research with multiple levels of analysis. Quantitative methodologies provide numerical data descriptive of participants and qualitative methodologies provide the rich stories and voices that help explain or illustrate those numbers. In fact, community and campus partners are interested in using both methods to obtain information on an ongoing basis and remain invested.

j. Share Accountability of Partnership Success and Opportunities: Partnership and engagement activities outcomes need to be shared between campus and community partners. Both have the

right to celebrate successes and learn from failures. Partners should be accountable to each other and share responsibility for problems, misunderstandings, and conflicts that may happen throughout the process.

Dr. Maria Abunnasr, Doctor of Philosophy, has examined the memory and history of Ras Beirut and the various claims to its exceptionalism. In “The Making of Ras Beirut: A Landscape of Memory for Narratives of Exceptionalism, 1870-1975”, Dr, Maria Abunnasr explains that Ras Beirut’s fascinating landscape inspired Anglo-American missionary to become the site for Syrian Protestant College (known as AUB today). They have called it the *college on a hill*. In her dissertation, she highlights archival research and sources that have changed Ras Beirut’s architectural and urban environment. She has also captured and relied her study on oral history and memory that have played a role in the multi-disciplinary making of place such as war, religion, Middle East and US connections, the landscape, and the finding of the AUB (Abunaser,2013).

In chapter 5, “Narratives of Coexistence”, Dr. Abunnasr highlights on the consideration, value, and memories of Ras Beirut shared between its local community, who are the longest-standing inhabitants who rested on the belief in their exceptional coexistence and unity (Abunaser,2013). Despite their different religions, they shared the same memories and attachment to the land of Ras Beirut. Although, they grieve the loss of what they call idealized landscape, yet they still work to recover Ras Beirut from post-war effects through contributing to building a collective identity of Ras Beirut, when almost the oldest inhabitants are dying or dead (Debouzy, 1986).

During her study, she had the chance to speak to most of them and understand better the exceptionalism of Ras Beirut from their perspective. Dr. Abunnasr explains that some of the

inhabitants of Ras Beirut were happy with the presence of AUB, however they lacked the recognition for having a role in its presence. Another group believe that AUB has taken a lot from them, it has changed the landscape in where they lived, which was once farmlands and agriculture fields back in the 1940's. These fields were a source of income for those inhabitants and they have donated most of them to the expansion of AUB. Despite the fact that the presence of AUB has increased real estate costs and lands that still belong to Ras Beirut original inhabitants, today, these families still mourn the past of the area.

Although AUB's mission, since its establishment, was to support the society of the area and engage students to be innovative in solving problems of the society, yet AUB is still surrounded by rigid, concrete walls separating the campus from Ras Beirut Neighborhood. Today, AUB is not only one building, a small campus, it is the largest campus in Beirut allocated in one of the busiest areas of the countries. The campus stretches over a hill connecting Ras Beirut to Ain Mreisseh area, thus the sea. There were one existing stairs between both areas that people used to go down to Ain Mreisseh and up the hill to Ras Beirut. Today, these stairs belong to AUB and unfortunately only campus community are allowed to access and use it to cross from Ras Beirut to Ain Mreisseh. Having said this, what measures can be used that these initiatives succeed in sustaining and enhancing CCE?

10. Urban Agriculture: A tool for civic engagement, service learning, and sustainability at AUB

As per Levkoe et al. in "Collaboration for Transformation: Community-Campus Engagement for Just and Sustainable Food Systems", the topic of sustainable food systems (SFS) is argued to bring together common goals and diverse groups, especially between community groups and academic institutions (Levkoe et al. 2016). Researchers see *food movements* as networks that bring together individuals, organizations, and groups to challenge the threats to the

food system and to create practical solutions for a more socially and ecologically sustainable world (Levkoe, 2014). Research approaches and knowledge taken by academics and community practitioners on sustainable food systems has contributed to developing critical and informed analysis for both theory and practice (Wakefield, 2007). Campuses, since the world food crisis, have become more vibrant spaces for projects on sustainable food and platforms for campaigns on SFS (Barlett, 2011; Friedmann, 2007). Universities who are advocates of SFS believe that, to make a lasting change on the issue of food, solutions must come from communities whose democratic participation and knowledge facilitate research and enhance learning in regard to food systems projects and campaigns (Levkoe et al. 2016). Levkoe et al. in their study on how the growth of CCE can strengthen food movements, found out that CCE based on mutual benefit and reciprocity, can play an important role in building sustainability (Levkoe et al. 2016), thus, an “exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015). In five case studies on universities in Canada, who employed CCE for the support food movements, the authors found out that academic and community-based actors both made important contributions to CCE, and when both parties built their collaboration on mutual benefit and reciprocity in their relationships, significant successes were observed in the food movement goals (Levkoe et al. 2016).

Mougeot (2000) also argues that sustainable and effective UA initiatives are ones that are seen by the community as an approach towards community development. Engaging local communities in the design and implementation will strengthen their local capacities (Mougeot, 2000). More effective UA initiatives are ones that are driven by conflict resolution through multiple stakeholder analysis, where research, policy formulation, and the practical intervention meet. This is when the participatory dimension in UA is emphasized to fit different social,

economic, political, cultural, and natural contexts. Given that, can AUB, through its food movements and sustainable food system, play a role in enhancing the CCE?

One of the Neighborhood Initiatives' pilot projects at AUB was to explore AUB neighborhood landscape and research its potential for greening (Makhzoumi, 2008). A field survey was conducted by the Neighborhood initiative to understand Ras Beirut community's perceptions and need for greening activities. Their findings revealed various levels of interests among residents in greening activities. This project was viewed as a benefit to both campus and Ras Beirut community through activities that can have positive impact and a role model of AUB to support urban greening in its surrounding neighborhood. On another note, the ESDU at AUB is also promoting UA to students and rural communities as an approach that enhances the lives of the local community, sustains the environment, ensures better quality of food, endorse sustainable agriculture, and of course provides a learning platform to students, creates social cohesions between refugees, Lebanese host communities, and definitely students. In addition, the unit organizes a Farmers' Market for local and healthy products called "Souk aal Souk". The markets aim at promoting organic and healthy food produced by local farmers from different Lebanese areas and also to spread awareness and build linkages between urban residents and rural producers for the access to healthy traditional food. Thus, UA can be a tool used by AUB for promoting CCE with Ras Beirut community.

CHAPTER III

THE CURRENT STATUS OF CCE AT AUB: THE PROBLEMATIC

Literature review has revealed that urban universities are aware of the physical and socio-economic challenges behind their gates. Their missions and actions are reflecting on their role as “anchor institutions” to contribute to local and regional social and economic problems through civic engagement. Universities and their civic missions have revealed to face a set of challenges, which have played a role in weakening universities’ SL and CCE activities such as the issue of funding, accountability, trust, evaluation system, power, and the emphasis on the question of “Doing *For* or Doing *With* the Community?” However, it was found that the topic of SFS has been a tool adopted by universities to bring together common goals and diverse groups, especially between campus and their neighborhood communities. These food movements have helped in creating practical solutions for a more socially and ecologically sustainable world. One example of these food movements is UA. Campuses have supported UA initiatives, as mutually beneficial projects and platforms for SL and CPBR, that allow diverse knowledge and resources to meet and generate solutions for complex problems with the aim of increasing community capacity and social capital (Ward and Wolf-Wendel, 2000; Bringle and Hatcher 2002).

AUB’s history shows the social responsibility, seen in community service and engagement, up until today, through its different initiatives. However, AUB and its initiatives have been subject to the many challenges stated above. These challenges have influenced its CCE missions. AUB’s campus presence has changed the landscape of Ras Beirut and impacted the livelihoods of the local

community whose lands were their only source of living. Having said this, **how can AUB best develop a mutually beneficial UA approach that can enhance and sustain campus-community relationships?**

AUB has the chance to excel in connecting, sustaining, and enhancing the partnership between campus and Ras Beirut community, linking global science to local priorities in its civic engagement activities, through a mutually beneficial UA initiative as follows:

A. Sustainability Initiatives

There is several sustainability related initiatives that AUB is adopting to support the “Sustainable Food” issue that can complement and expand on connecting campus and neighborhood community. The farmer’s market that already occurs on a monthly basis on AUB campus is organized by the Environment and Sustainability Development Unit (ESDU), Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FAFS). The UA initiatives can contribute to such a market and probably expand it further. On May 4, 2016, the AUB Campus was officially designated as a botanic garden and arboretum (AUB, 2017). AUB joins universities around the world engaged in initiatives to promote native plants and sustainability. The UA initiative can focus on local typology of agricultural plants that can complement the AUBotanic initiative. In addition, AUB’s agricultural education was first initiated in the 1930’s as the “Institute of Rural Life” established by the University in collaboration with the Near East Foundation. The Institute kept the faculty and students of AUB in touch with the situation existing in the rural districts and stimulated their interest in improving the agricultural, health, and social conditions in rural areas (Myntti et al. 2012).

B. Production Potential: The Landscape of AUB

The urban campus of AUB is situated in the densely built urban part of Beirut. It is one of the largest remaining green areas in Beirut with extensive vegetated surfaces and an abundant area of flat roofs. The project will identify at a broad scale potential land area for food production (open land or green houses) and identify suitable roofs for roof gardens and green houses. Types of agricultural production will be defined based on the analysis of the campus food system as well as questionnaires of the stakeholders.

C. Community Engagement

Since AUB was founded, it has always been entwined with its neighborhood, Ras Beirut, sharing common identity and place within the city of Beirut. The ESDU, the Neighborhood Initiative (NI), the Center for Civic Engagement and Community Services (CCECS), and AUB4Refugees are AUB's arms to engage proximate and distant communities. This is AUB's way of giving back to the neighborhood and community by activating the University's resources for the public good in Ras Beirut and beyond. All these programs include outreach and volunteerism, research, community and participatory engagement, and refugee relief.

D. Liberal Arts Curriculum and Service Learning: Facts and Theories

AUB is in the process of further developing its liberal arts mission focusing on well-roundedness of the student learning experience. This includes service-learning and hands-on experiences that contribute to the holistic academic life at AUB.

E. Established on-campus Food Service

The University includes a food service department that serves daily hot meals across its cafeterias and canteens on campus. This includes the main campus cafeteria, cafeteria in the medical center, Engineering, school of business and the canteen at FAFS. The AUB food service provides daily fresh produce in the form of salads and vegetables in sandwiches (“AUB Cafeteria”, 2018). As such there is ample opportunity for an UA initiative on campus. The opportunity to use the agricultural produce in the campus food system lies in campus and neighboring community understanding and support to the importance of UA for sustainable food production at one hand, and maintaining relationship between both communities at the other.

The following section will detail the aims, objectives and research question of the research followed by the methodology that I intend to pursue.

CHAPTER IV

MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGIES

CCE is argued to be the most meaningful and enduring when both parties contribute effectively and in a meaningful approach to activities that have a positive impact on important civic and campus outcomes (Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988). The literature review has highlighted the importance of Participatory approaches, especially CPBR, and SL in building campus and community relationships. Campus-community partnerships are complex because each of both communities thrive in different cultures, in terms of how each generates knowledge and solve problems (Bender, 1993). Renewing CCE happens through developing better partnerships between both communities in the first place (Kellogg Commission, 1999). UA initiatives are adopted by universities to act as a platform and participatory approach that provides numerous mutual benefits to stakeholders from both sides, what is seen to promote successful CCE.

Having examined the theory of the approaches and initiatives to build CCE within the context of AUB and Ras Beirut, challenges addressing and threatening this relationship have been highlighted. The methodology will encounter research on the dynamics of this relationship. The final outcome will provide a better understanding of the institutional and community action steps that need be taken to be initiated, developed, maintained, and nurtured to build a healthy partnership with the community.

The aim of the study is to investigate the different elements and stakeholders that are challenging the principles for enhancing and sustaining the campus-community relationships of AUB, while highlighting on AUB's mission in civic engagement, service learning, and supporting sustainable food systems as mutually beneficial initiatives. Given that food insecurity is a

worldwide problem, especially in over populated cities such as Beirut, UA is a tool that can be explored as a platform to support sustainability, and ensure reciprocity of campus-community relationship through CE and SL. Thus, abiding to the multiple objectives that are in line with the mission of the university and reviving the agriculture history, knowledge, and sense of ownership and belonging of the Ras Beirut Inhabitants.

This research will outline the core elements and stakeholders that have a direct impact and influence decisions that affect the relationship between campus and Ras Beirut Community. Investigating and engaging different stakeholders will give an insight on the system through which the relationship between campus and Ras Beirut community functions, its challenges and potential solutions through an UA initiative. It will allow assessing their respective interest (and involvement), in enhancing this relationship, through identifying and analyzing the issue of food insecurity, giving UA as a tool to seek sustainability and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

To achieve this aim, the following research question will direct the process of investigation:

How can AUB best develop a mutually beneficial UA approach that can enhance and sustain campus-community relationships

A qualitative research approach was chosen as the methodology to describe and explore the campus-community relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut. The methodology will give a further understanding and interpretation of the CCE based on stakeholders' perceptions and willingness to participate in an UA project as a mutually beneficial initiative to enhance campus-community relationship.

To be able to answer the research question, the following objectives will be achieved through the method of investigation.

- Develop a conceptual framework for CCE
- Develop a general understanding of the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut CCE
- Map out factors influencing AUB and Ras Beirut CCE
- Understand and gather insights of stakeholder perception and input of this relationship
- Understand the potential of an UA initiative as a mutually beneficial project to enhance campus-community relationships

The methodology will constitute a triangulation approach of qualitative methods, literature and experimentation to collect data, analyze and evaluate research findings to answer the research question. In order to accomplish the objectives of the study, survey questionnaires of closed and open-ended questions will be conducted to collect data and elaborate on them. In addition, to shift from theory to action, a CBPR exercise, within the questionnaire surveys and while conducting the surveys, will be implemented as a practical and collaborative approach between campus and neighborhood community stakeholders. The exercise will give insight to campus and community key stakeholders on UA, as mutually beneficial initiative for CCE, to come up with a set of recommendations and a proposal to develop a best model of an UA project. Employing a mixture of methods avoids the limitations of single methods and overcomes the biases of qualitative methods where the data is derived from and restricted to a small number of observations. Triangulation in this study validates the results of the survey questionnaires and adds weight to conclusions (Adams et al., 2008).

A. Literature Review

The literature review aimed at gaining an understanding of the existing research and debates on CCE, and to build knowledge on topics that have impacted or are impacted by this engagement. It also allowed introducing the research and expanding understanding on universities' position in connecting to their surrounding neighborhoods and their contribution to sustainability. In addition, it assisted in building further understanding about UA and its contribution to CCE. As a result of the literature review, a theoretical framework was developed to explain and develop further understanding on the topic of CCE, its challenges, and expanded existing knowledge on subjects that are bound to the topic. Furthermore, it provided a better understanding on how UA can contribute to CCE and its applicable typologies within the context of dense urban areas.

Given the case of AUB and Ras Beirut, review and overview on AUB's history with Ras Beirut and its current relationship with the neighborhood was developed based on archival information backed up by a set of meetings and communications, in addition to pointing out issues related to the campus-community relations, successful precedents, and failed precedents. Data was reviewed, validated, and compared to AUB's current status with a set of meetings with assigned and responsible stakeholders such as Mrs. Mona Hallak, Director of the Neighborhood Initiative, Dr. Maria Abunnasr, Doctor of Philosophy and who has examined the memory and history of Ras Beirut and the various claims to its exceptionalism in "The Making of Ras Beirut: A Landscape of Memory for Narratives of Exceptionalism, 1870-1975". This section allowed for pointing out issues that demonstrated problems in CCE, which has helped later in building the questionnaire survey questions.

Deeper research was followed on Social Responsibility Programs at AUB was completed to understand further the efforts that AUB is putting through its programs to help enhance campus-

community relationships and to explore main issues, perceptions, constraints and potential areas as seen by key stakeholders from AUB and Ras Beirut. Thus, assessing the current campus-community relations and assessing understandings and perceptions of key stakeholders on UA.

The data included publications by and Meetings with:

1. Neighborhood Initiative
2. The Center for Civic Engagement System (CCECS)
3. Agricultural Research and Education Center (AREC)
4. Environment Sustainable and development Unit (ESDU)
5. General Factors that Influence Social Responsibility Programs at Universities Level
6. Factors that Influence the Social Responsibility programs at AUB
7. Principles for enhancing and sustaining campus- community relationships at AUB

This research helped in mapping out elements, factors, and challenges currently influencing AUB and Ras Beirut CCE and identifying main stakeholders from AUB who influence/impact the relationship between the campus and Ras Beirut.

B. Questionnaire Surveys

Questionnaires are a specific tool for gathering information through a series of fixed set of questions. The questions carry specific concepts and elements of interest needed for an investigation on a topic of interest (Slattery et al., 2011). Every participant is asked the same set

of questions in the same order. Questionnaires, also known as structured interviews, are used when the goal of the study is developmental and the major issues of a research are well understood (Wilson, 2013), then, a list of hypotheses is developed to help generate questions and obtain responses to help answer the research question. Questionnaires often serve to measure abstract or not directly observable constructs such as perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge (Bornstein, 2018).

Questionnaires serve best in studies that carry assessment of knowledge about a subject, thus help determine the level of knowledge and understanding of individuals, understand their relationships, gather specific information about stakeholders and their attitudes towards a subject, collect uniform data from a large sample of participants, and compare the results gathered from different the groups (Wilson, 2013). Survey questionnaires are the main tool used to complete this study.

Survey questionnaires with AUB Stakeholders and Ras Beirut community are essential to discuss the depth and level of information available with both groups and between them. As a result of the literature review, the objectives, uses, and target audience of the questionnaires were defined. The questionnaires were set to provide the study with detailed understanding of the different elements, factors, and challenges that are currently shaping the campus-community relationship.

The approach followed was mixed questionnaires developed based on the findings and established frameworks from the literature review on the topic of CCE, its challenges and subjects that are related to it, with special focus on UA as a tool used to influence CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut.

1.Questionnaire Design Instrument

Two versions of the questionnaire were developed targeting 1) AUB Stakeholders 2) Ras Beirut Community, and both consisted closed-ended questions and open-ended questions. As per Foddy (1994) in " Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theory and practice in social research", close-ended questions bound the respondents to the set of alternatives and options offered in a questionnaire, while open-ended questions allow the respondents to express more their opinions without being influenced by the ideas presented by the researcher (Foddy, 1994). Thus, open-ended questions help in avoiding biases due to the suggested options in close-ended questions (Urša, 2003). For this reason, the survey questionnaires included both closed-ended and open-ended questions.

The mixed questionnaires included a set of questions or discussion points to generate and validate data or information to open up new dimensions of the problem or issue of CCE as perceived by AUB Stakeholders and Ras Beirut Community. The methodology provided a better understanding of the work that AUB is doing, through its programs, to revive the campus-community relationships and explore the main potentials and challenges for this engagements seen by key stakeholders from AUB and Ras Beirut. Thus, assessing and understanding the perceptions of AUB Stakeholders and Ras Beirut Community on 1) CCE in general 2) the current campus-community relations of AUB and Ras Beirut 3) UA in general 4) UA contribution to CCE and 5) the typology for a best model of an UA initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut.

Therefore, through this approach, key informants were asked to provide information on 1) their perception of the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut 2) limitations and challenges facing the CCE 3) potential approaches to solve these challenges 4) their understanding about UA and 5) their perception of how UA can contribute to CCE.

The closed-ended questions in the survey included a variety of questions with Yes/no questions, Multiple choice questions, Ranking questions, and Intensity scaled questions. The open-ended questions were simply straight forward questions of the respondents' opinions, understanding, and perspective on the topics of CCE and UA, with often the option of adding an alternative in any of the closed-ended questions. The questionnaires included a demographic section which gathers relevant data about the respondents and introductory statement with a brief summary of the study, its purpose, and expected outcome of the survey.

2. Sampling and Selection Module

Probability sampling methods are one of the most powerful ways to decrease bias in samples. Random techniques are known as probability approaches. Systematic sampling is when the subjects are chosen based on specific criteria (Wilson, 2013). Given that the aim of the study, the survey questionnaires 'main target audience will be Ras Beirut Community and AUB community.

What is a community? A community is a group of individuals who share a common identity; they may share geographic, political, religious or social similarities (Brown, 1993). When selecting Ras Beirut and AUB community that best represent what I am looking for in the study, several steps prior to the selection process were taken. First, it was important to specify what characteristics I am looking for in each of the two communities. For Ras Beirut community, participants/informants should be residents or have businesses in Ras Beirut neighborhood. This specific characteristic was important for the study. Ras Beirut residents or business owners live and have daily overview on the area, get in contact with students and staff members of AUB, and are more or less affected by AUB's presence in the neighborhood. Given their availability in the

area on daily basis, they are envisioned to impact and influence decision making in the neighborhood. As for AUB community, it was important to select the group of individuals who may impact or influence decision making, have contributed or can contribute to campus-community engagement, and have impacted or have the ability to impact campus-community engagement. Having said this, the chosen community representing AUB was mainly faculty/admin/ program directors, in addition to the Students' Club Presidents.

The second step was identifying "sites". What is meant by "sites" is the places, areas, organizations, or services that members of these communities' use. For Ras Beirut, the target places were residential buildings and businesses on the streets that stretch from Bliss Street up to the streets of Abdul Aziz, Jean D'arc, Makhoul, and Souraty. The reason behind this selection is because students and AUB staff members are often seen studying, eating, gathering, or probably living in these streets of Ras Beirut Neighborhood. Whereas for AUB stakeholders, related organizations, programs, initiatives, and faculties at AUB that support the key elements of my research were listed such as NI, CCECS, ESDU, FAFS, FAH, etc..., in addition to the Students Club Presidents. Directors, deans, and presidents of the previously stated "sites" were selected to be recruited.

There was a difficulty identifying the number of target sample for this study to be representative. As per Bauer and Aarts (2000), a qualitative research, may be dealing more with meaning or interactions rather than being restricted to a fixed population selected by known variables (Bauer and Aarts, 2000). In the case of Ras Beirut and AUB sampling, it made more sense to ask how many people should be representing each of the social entities rather than how many should be part of a sample for the sample to represent a population. In this case, a sample size of 100 survey questionnaires was the adequate sample to represent both communities. To be

fair, the target recruited participants from each entity was 50 persons from Ras Beirut and 50 persons from AUB.

All selected participants from AUB were contacted through email and asked for their approval and consent to conduct the survey questionnaire. Whereas, a random systematic sampling selection was made from Ras Beirut community to give each member of the community an equal probability of being selected.

A sample size of 100 surveys questionnaires was decided to be completed, however there were challenges in completing the 100 survey questionnaires. One of the main limitations of the research study was the data collection. The data collection process took place during the summer season, AUB's target audience were less responsive. Most of the selected list of participants were on summer vacation. On the other hand, despite that Ras Beirut community were more available because most of them live in the neighborhood, they were also not very responsive. The challenge was gaining the trust of the random representatives from Ras Beirut for filling the survey questionnaire. Some of the people refused to be part of this study because they simply didn't have time, but the majority refused arguing that they have filled so many other survey questionnaires to students and up till today nothing has changed and none of their concerns were raised. After two months of data collection, a total of 44 survey questionnaires were conducted covering and presenting the wider range of stakeholders and community members.

3. Data Collection

AUB Stakeholders were recruited through phone calls to their offices at AUB followed by a detailed email of the research study and aim of the survey questionnaire. Upon their consent, a

suitable time and place was set for the survey to be conducted. Ras Beirut Community Members were recruited randomly and upon their consent the survey was conducted. Participants from both communities were fully informed of the study and its aim, and were given the right to sign a survey consent for the use of their names, their participation, and the dissemination of data.

For those who preferred to stay anonymous were fully respected for their decision and the use of their accounts remained aggregate. Survey questionnaires were conducted in a private place, upon the convenience of the participants from both groups, where no one could see or hear their answers. The survey questionnaires took no more than 30 minutes each, covered within two months of time frame.

A consent form was prepared as an agreement with the respondents presenting a brief of the study, its aim, and the roles and responsibilities of each of the researcher and respondents throughout the whole research process. The consent form was signed by the respondents who were interested to participate and if they approve on referring their names in the analysis of the survey questionnaires. As a result of the signed consent form, the survey questionnaires were conducted.

4. Methods for Analysis

The data collected was in the form of filled questions and notes. Interpretation was followed based on the type of the questions in the mixed questionnaire. Data was compiled within spreadsheets with the use of preset codes for the easy interpretation and the use of data.

a. Open-Ended Questions:

- Surveys were collected, explored and read.

- Data was divided to parts and labeled according to similar words, phrases, sentences, sections or actions, activities, concepts, differences etc...
- All data was then categorized and coded to identify main themes addressed
- Related themes were grouped in similar codes and exported into Microsoft Excel
- These groups were put in hierarchical category system to follow a certain frequency (example: most important to less important aspects)
- After category groups were organized, data was represented in tables

b. Closed-ended Questions:

- Main findings were derived.
- Since these are closed-ended questions, data was coded according to the options available in the questionnaire
- Data was then collated and entered in a simple grid
- Evaluation of data was done using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences)

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS

A. Ras Beirut Community Sample

1. Sample Descriptive

The Ras Beirut community sample consisted of $N=26$ participants. The age of participants ranged between 28 and 78 with mean age ($M = 47.05, SD = 16.61$). As depicted in table 2, participants worked in various fields such as hospitality, art, healthcare, services, management, education and freelance. In addition, few participants were either housewives, unemployed or retired. All participants lived in apartments in Ras Beirut. Specifically, one participant (4%) lived in an apartment with one bedroom, 24% had apartments with 2 bedrooms, 48% with 3 bedrooms and 24% with 4 bedrooms. Moreover, the vast majority of participants (87.5%) were permanent residents of Ras Beirut while only 12.5% were not permanent residents of Ras Beirut. Finally, the number of years lived in Ras Beirut ranged between 6 and 76 with mean ($M = 37.96, SD = 16.41$) (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1					
<i>Descriptive of the Sample Characteristics of Ras Beirut Community</i>					
Demographics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	22	28.00	78.00	47.05	16.61
Years of Residence	25	6.00	76.00	37.96	16.41
Valid N (listwise)	22				

Table 2: Sample Descriptive of Ras Beirut Community		N	%
Occupation	Art	1	4.3
	Cashier	1	4.3
	Ex-flight attendant	1	4.3
	General secretary	1	4.3
	Housewife	2	8.7
	Jewelry	1	4.3
	Marketing Coordinator	1	4.3
	Mayor	1	4.3
	Office Manager	1	4.3
	Optician	2	8.7
	Program Coordinator	1	4.3
	Real estate representative	1	4.3
	Restaurant	2	8.7
	Retired	1	4.3
	Secretary	1	4.3
	supplement Distributor	1	4.3
	Tailor	1	4.3
	Teacher	1	4.3
Trader	1	4.3	
Unemployed	1	4.3	
Household	Apartment	25	100
Size of Residence	1 Bedroom	1	4.0
	2 Bedrooms	6	24.0
	3 Bedrooms	12	48.0
	4 Bedrooms and above	6	24.0
Permanent Residence	Yes	21	87.5
	No	3	12.5

2.General Understanding of CCE

a.Definition of CCE:

The definition of CCE as per Carnegie (2006) is as following

“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, 2006).

When the participants from the community were asked about the definition of CCE, six participants (23.1%) reported that they don't know and five participants (19.2%) didn't answer this question while one participant (3.8%) gave an off-topic answer, as per below:

- *“there is no engagement of the whole world, there was love and respect, there was peace since civil war and the situation has changed”*

Moreover, five participants (19.2%) provided a brief definition of CCE as building a relationship between AUB and the community.

- *“to engage the community with university activities”*
- *“collaboration”*
- *“if there are activities between AUB and the community”*
- *“common activity”*
- *“common activities between university and Ras Beirut”*

Eight participants (30.8%) reported that the CCE is an initiative that is uni-directional; one-way relationship; thus, AUB benefitting the community by positively enhancing the community and benefit its society members, as per below:

- *“Working towards initiatives that positively impacts the community”*

- *“Campus projects that help the community around it”*
- *“AUB benefitting the Ras Beirut area”*
- *“activities that benefit the society where all society members participate in”*
- *“It is important issue that allow communication between Ras Beirut citizens and students”*
- *“enhancing the area”*
- *“common beneficial activities between the university and neighborhood community”*
- *“make the local citizens participate in various activities directed by the university (participation of students)”*

Finally, two participants (7.7%) reported that CCE is a bi-directional relationship; two-way relationship; between AUB and the community, that is based on common activities, and that it holds mutual benefits for both entities, as per below:

- *“merging campus community as one entity for benefits for both parties mutual benefit to each other”*
- *“common beneficial activities between the university and neighborhood community”*

b. Adjectives Describing CCE

When participants from Ras Beirut community were asked to list three adjectives that describe the CCE, one participant (3.8%) reported that he/she doesn't know, while one participant (3.8%) didn't fill out this question. The rest of participants gave adjectives that fell into seven main categories and terminologies on “Civic Engagement”, please refer to Table 3 for definite adjectives responses of Ras Beirut Community on CCE:

- **Social Capital and Citizenship:**

Social Capital are the features of social organization and networks of common norms

and values that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putnam, 1993).

Citizenship implies that the citizen is part of a community, and takes an active and interested role in affecting that community through Having a role and responsibility in making the rules of the community, common life and values of a community, and the ability and act of engaging with others in common tasks of importance to the community (Barber, 1992; Boyte and Kari, 1996)

Under this category, participants reported that CCE *“brings color together and fosters good relations and engagement.”*

- **Civic Engagement:** Working to make a difference in the civic life of a community through developing its members’ combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation, and through promoting the quality of life in a community while addressing political and non-political processes (Ehrlich, 2000).

Participants whose answers fell under this category believed that CCE is needed by both parties and is based on building collaborative (common) activities that bring common benefits.

- **Empowerment:** It is to engage in the transformation of reality in the aim of supporting and humanizing women and men, also seen as "liberation of the oppressed" as per Paolo Freire (Freire, 2018).

Participants in here saw that CCE is a positive initiative that is highly impactful in fostering social advancement, allowing access to university for all people, and creating volunteering opportunities.

- **Community Development:** It is when community members work together to achieve long-term benefits for the community and an overall stronger sense of community (Ife and Smith, 1995).

Participants who were grouped under this category believed that CCE has economic and social benefits in terms of enhancing the livelihood between students and community, instilling social cohesion, creating job opportunities and participation of local community in core activities.

- **Civic Education:** The development of community skills and knowledge and their encouragement engage actively in community issues (Niemi and Junn, 2005).

Participants grouped under this category saw that the concept is about social learning, social learning for students and the transfers the knowledge from the university to the local community and vice versa.

- **Tools and Approaches:** Some of the participants provided specific tools and approaches that would contribute to CCE such as agriculture and art activities.

- **Common Challenges:** Other participants expressed their understanding through providing main challenges affecting CCE such as the carelessness of students, political situation, the projects being undervalued and lack of respect.

Table 3: Adjectives responses of Ras Beirut Community on CCE		
Type of Adjective	Lists of Adjectives	Freq.(N)
Social Capital and Citizenship	Brings color together	1
	Good Relations	1
Civic Engagement	Engagement	2
	Needed by both	2
	Common benefits	2
	Build common activities/Collaborative/Mutual	5
Empowerment	Positive	1
	Impactful/Effective/Efficient	3
	Society advancement	1
	Allows access to university by all people	1
Community Development	Creating volunteering opportunities	1
	Economically and Socially Helpful/Beneficial	4
	Enhances livelihood/ Students and community living together/social cohesion	5
	Participation of the local community in activities	1
Civic Education	Creating Job Opportunities	2
	Participation of specialized people	1
	Core	1
	Knowledge Sharing/Transfer the knowledge from the university to the local community	2
Tools and Approaches	Social learning/Service learning	2
	Agriculture	1
Common Challenges	Art Activities	1
	Lack of respect	1
Non-Relevant Adjectives	Fear	1
	Carelessness from students	1
	Hard to Achieve in the presence of this political situation it is hard, politics are everything	1
	Undervalued	1
Non-Relevant Adjectives	Dorms next to University	1
	Religion	1
	Nationality togetherness	1
	People/Students	1

c. Strengths and Challenges of CCE

Participants reported that the main strengths of CCE are bringing campus and neighborhood together (65.4%) and students gaining real world experience (50%). In addition, participants reported that the major challenge to achieve a meaningful CCE is the misunderstanding of the real concept by both university and community members, followed by neighborhood community's unwillingness to engage (42.3%), students' participation for courses/thesis purposes (30.8%) and lack of enough engagement from AUB (23.1%). (**Table 4**)

Table 4: Strengths and Barriers to the implementation of CCE as perceived by Ras Beirut Community			
		N	%
Strengths	Students gain real world experience	13	50
	Dissemination of university knowledge to public	5	19.2
	Brings campus and neighborhood together	17	65.4
	Missing	1	3.8
Challenges	Student participation for courses/thesis purposes	8	30.8
	Neighborhood community's unwillingness to engage	11	42.3
	Misunderstanding of the real concept by both university and community members	13	50
	Lack of enough engagement from AUB	6	23.1
	Other (Not completing the Project)	1	3.8

d. Dimension of Campus-Community Partnership as Perceived by Ras Beirut Community

When participants were asked about the positive effects of AUB presence in Ras Beirut, they reported that first it causes high real estate prices (42.3% most important) followed by creating employment opportunities (38.5% most important and 30.8% very important). In addition, participants reported that AUB is creating civic engagement activities (46.2% moderately important) and it serves as a recreational space and a getaway from the busy city (26.9% very important and 26.9% moderately important). In other words, participants ranked the answers from most important positive effects to least important positive effects as per below:

- High real-estate prices
- Employment opportunities
- Civic Engagement Activities
- As a recreational space and a getaway from the busy city.

When participants were asked about the negative effects of the presence of AUB in Ras Beirut, they reported that first it causes high real estate prices (53.8% most important and 42.3% very important) followed by high cost of living (50% most important and 38.5% very important). In addition, participants reported that lack of engagement in community service activities (53.8% moderately important) and lack of access to AUB and other campus facilities (slightly important 57.7%) are among the negative effects of campus-community achievement. In other words, participants ranked the answers from most important negative effects to least important negative effects as per below:

- High real-estate prices
- High cost of living
- Lack of engagement in community service activities

- Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities

Please refer to **Table 5** for a definite analysis of Ras Beirut Community responses on the Positive and Negative effects of AUB in Ras Beirut.

Table 5: Positive and Negative impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by Ras Beirut Community					
			N	%	
Positive Effects	High real-estate prices	Most Important	11	42.3	
		Very Important	2	7.7	
		Moderately Important	1	3.8	
		Slightly Important	7	26.9	
		Least Important	5	19.2	
	Civic Engagement activities	Most Important	1	3.8	
		Very Important	5	19.2	
		Moderately Important	12	46.2	
		Slightly Important	5	19.2	
		Least Important	4	15.4	
	Employment Opportunities	Most Important	10	38.5	
		Very Important	8	30.8	
		Moderately Important	2	7.7	
		Slightly Important	3	11.5	
		Least Important	3	11.5	
	As recreational space and a gateway from the busy city	Most Important	3	11.5	
		Very Important	7	26.9	
Moderately Important		7	26.9		
Slightly Important		7	26.9		
Least Important		2	7.7		
Attract refined society and members	Slightly Important	1	3.8		
Negative Effects	Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities	Most Important	4	15.4	
		Very Important	1	3.8	
		Moderately Important	6	23.1	
		Slightly Important	15	57.7	
		Least Important	0	0.0	
	Lack of engagement in community services activities	Most Important	4	15.4	
		Very Important	2	7.7	

Cont. Table 5: Positive and Negative impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by Ras Beirut Community

			N	%
Negative Effects		Moderately Important	14	53.8
		Slightly Important	6	23.1
	High real-estate prices	Least Important	0	0.0
		Most Important	14	53.8
		Very Important	11	42.3
	High cost of living	Moderately Important	1	3.8
		Slightly Important	1	3.8
		Least Important	0	0.0
		Most Important	13	50.0
		Very Important	10	38.5
		Moderately Important	2	7.7
		Slightly Important	1	3.8
		Least Important	0	0.0

When participants were asked about how they think they may influence AUB’s civic missions, more than half of them reported that they agree/strongly agree that that their influence is through participation in civic activities (50% agree), availability (34.6% agree and 15.4% strongly agree) and proposal of new ideas for better civic activities (46.2% agree and 11.5% strongly agree). Participants reported, however, that they strongly disagree (11.5%) and disagree (50%) with the statement “refuse to engage” (Table 6).

Table 6: Ras Beirut Community Responses on how they perceive they may influence AUB’s civic missions			N	%
Influencing AUB’s Civic Missions	Participation in Civic Activities	Strongly Disagree	3	11.5
		Disagree	4	15.4
		Agree	13	50.0
		Strongly Agree	0	0.0
		Not Applicable	6	23.1
	Availability	Strongly Disagree	2	7.7
		Disagree	5	19.2
		Agree	9	34.6
		Strongly Agree	4	15.4
		Not Applicable	6	23.1
	Proposal of New Ideas for Better Civic Activities	Strongly Disagree	4	15.4
		Disagree	3	11.5
		Agree	12	46.2
		Strongly Agree	3	11.5
		Not Applicable	4	15.4
	Refuse to Engage	Strongly Disagree	3	11.5
		Disagree	13	50.0
		Agree	3	11.5
		Strongly Agree	3	11.5
		Not Applicable	4	15.4

3. Participation

a. Participation of Community Members in Civic Engagement Initiatives in Ras Beirut by AUB

Regarding participation, more than half of participants (53.8%) reported that they never heard of civic engagement initiatives in Ras Beirut that are studied/implemented by AUB. Moreover, 96.2% of participants reported that never participated in surveys that commit to study their preference in civic engagement initiatives launched by AUB. In addition, all participants (100%) reported that they never got involved in the design and the implementation of such initiatives (**Table 7**).

Table 7: Participation Perception of Ras Beirut Community			N	%
AUB Implementing Civic Engagement Initiatives	Heard of Them	Yes	12	46.2
		No	14	53.8
	Participated in Surveys	Yes	1	3.8
		No	25	96.2
	Involved in the design and implementation	Yes	0	0.0
		No	26	100.0

b. Reasons that Motivate Participants to Participate in Community Service Activities

Participants were asked to list three primary reasons that would motivate them to participate in community service activities between AUB and Ras Beirut community. Six participants (23.1%) didn't answer this question. Participants listed many factors that were grouped into either **Barriers to Participation** or **Motivators to Participation**.

The main barriers of participation were mainly **personal issues, communication issues, structural issues** and trust issues as per below:

- **Personal issues:** participants reported that lack of time, lack of interest, age and traveling most of the time serve as barriers to participation.
- **Communication issues:** participants reported that lack of knowledge and awareness about community service activities as well as lack of readiness of projects serve as barriers to participation.
- **Structural Issues:** Other barriers of participation are the projects being for free, not motivating, and not taking the opinion of the local community.
- **Trust Issues:** One of the barriers of participation is the project having unclear intentions.

The main motivators to participate in community service projects were seen to fit under three categories mainly **personal satisfaction, project rationale, and societal motivation**, as explained below. Please refer to **Table 8** for a detailed history of the respondents' answers.

- **Personal Satisfaction:** The individual's sense of fulfillment and benefit of a need or want (Liddie, 2010). Participants reported that seeking knowledge, learning leadership, understanding one's role in the community motivated them to engage in community service initiatives.
- **Project Rationale:** Facts explaining the background of a project ("FundsforNGOs", 2012). Other factors that motivated participants to participate in community service initiatives are the seriousness of the project, advertising, seeing efforts from all parties, having project that is result-oriented and beneficial for the community.

- **Societal Motivation:** Individuals who favor the benefits to society (Liddie, 2010). Participants are motivated when their participation results in having a better environment, achieving sustainability of the community, creating job opportunities, keeping the country clean and renovating the neighborhood.

Table 8: Barriers and Motivators of Participation as perceived by Ras Beirut Community			N	%
Barriers	Personal Issues	Lack of Time	8	30.8
		Traveling most of the time	2	7.7
		Age	1	3.8
		Lack of interest	3	11.5
	Communication Issues	Lack of knowledge and awareness about such activities	3	11.5
		Lack of readiness of projects	1	3.8
	Structural Issues	Not agreeing with the goals of the projects	1	3.8
		Projects not taking the opinion of the local community	1	3.8
		Not motivating	1	3.8
		Free	1	3.8
	Trust Issues	Unclear intentions	1	3.8
Other Barriers	Economic Situation	2	7.7	
Motivators	Personal Satisfaction	Seeking knowledge about the projects and its benefits	4	15.4
		Personal Interest	1	3.8
		Engage and participate with the community	1	3.8
		Learn leadership	1	3.8
		Understand one's role	1	3.8
		Encourage my children	1	3.8
		Project Rationale	Seriousness of the Project	1
	Societal Motivation	Advertising	1	3.8
		Project is result oriented	1	3.8
		See Efforts from all participants	1	3.8
		How Beneficial for the community	1	3.8
		Have a better environment around the community	1	3.8
		Sustainability for the community	1	3.8
		help/benefit the community/neighborhood	2	7.7
		Renovate the neighborhood	1	3.8
Job opportunities	1	3.8		

Cont. Table 8: Barriers and Motivators of Participation as perceived by Ras Beirut Community			
		N	%
	Keep the country clean	1	3.8
	Enhancing the society	1	3.8
	Keeping the atmosphere of living together peacefully	1	3.8
Other	No reason not to be engaged with the university	1	3.8

c. Contribution to AUB Civic Activities in Ras Beirut

When participants were asked on how they can contribute to AUB's civic activities in Ras Beirut, they answered that first they can provide new ideas (42.3% highest rank) and participate (38.5% highest rank) followed by being available and responsive (38.5% middle rank and 38.5% low rank). As such, participants rated their contribution to AUB's civic activities in Ras Beirut from highest to lowest as per below:

- Provide new ideas
- Participate
- Be available and responsive

The majority of participants reported that they agree/strongly agree that AUB can enhance its relationship with Ras Beirut community by understanding, respecting, and exchanging the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut Community (65.4% agree and 26.9% strongly agree). In addition,. AUB can develop platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups, chat rooms etc... (69.2% agree and 15.4% strongly agree). Finally, AUB can develop initiatives that are beneficial to campus and Ras Beirut community (53.8% agree and 38.5% strongly agree) (**Table 9**).

Table 9: Contribution to AUB Civic Activities in Ras Beirut			N	%
Contribution to AUB's Civic Activities	Be available and Responsive	Highest Rank	4	15.4
		Middle Rank	10	38.5
		Low Rank	10	38.5
		Lowest Rank	1	3.8
	Participate	Highest Rank	10	38.5
		Middle Rank	8	30.8
		Low Rank	6	23.1
		Lowest Rank	0	0.0
	Provide New Ideas	Highest Rank	11	42.3
		Middle Rank	5	19.2
		Low Rank	8	30.8
		Lowest Rank	1	3.8
Enhancing Relationship with Ras Beirut	Understand, respect, and exchange the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut community	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		Disagree	1	3.8
		Agree	17	65.4
		Strongly Agree	7	26.9
		Not Applicable	1	3.8
	Develop platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups, chat rooms, etc..	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		Disagree	4	15.4
		Agree	18	69.2
		Strongly Agree	4	15.4
		Not Applicable	0	0.0
	Develop initiatives that are beneficial to campus and Ras Beirut Community	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		Disagree	1	3.8
		Agree	14	53.8
		Strongly Agree	10	38.5
		Not Applicable	1	3.8

4. Urban Agriculture

a. Definition of Urban Agriculture

According to UNDP, Urban Agriculture (UA) is *“the practice of growing productive plants and raising animals within and around city boundaries”* (Mougeot, 2000).

When participants were asked about the meaning of Urban Agriculture (UA), nine participants (34.6%) reported that they don't know and six participants didn't answer this question (23.1%). One participant said that there is no UA while the rest of participants (10 participants “38.5%) gave definitions that were in harmony with the UNDP definition. These definitions were grouped to separate categories in order to have a better understanding of how the responses are different and provide connections between the similar and different ideas as per below:

Broad Understanding

- *“psychological comfort I prefer to walk in a street that's full of trees rather than buildings”*
- *“Parks”*
- *“to make use of spaces in the city for environmental purposes”*
- *“oxygen to the city”*
- *making the city green”*

Specific Understanding

- *“creating a sustainable community with reciprocal benefits through agriculture”*
- *“planting in the city by the citizens”*
- *“having enough supply for area and benefiting the environment”*
- *“planting the city”*

Specific to the case of Lebanon

- *“trees above the houses great idea but it is not applied in Lebanon”*

b. Adjectives Describing Urban Agriculture

Participants were asked to describe, using three adjectives, their understanding of Urban Agriculture (UA). Participants answers fell into 7 main categories based on the types and benefits of UA as explained in the literature review (social, economic, ecological, and commercial), one extra category was added where participants gave specific explanation of the case of UA in Beirut.

Table 10 shows the variation of the adjectives defined by the Ras Beirut participants (**Table 10**):

- **Typology:** participants reported that Urban Agriculture can be organic, natural, roof gardens and sustainable.
- **Food Security:** participants reported that UA can provide enough supply for demand and makes the community less dependent on external supply.
- **Social Development:** UA can also result in social development in terms of social cohesion, social benefit, and social engagement. It can also have health benefits, both physically and psychologically.
- **Ecological Development:** participants reported that UA is highly essential for ecological development. It can restrict the poisons in the city, clean the city, benefit the environment, foster greenery scenery, and decorate the city with beautiful landscape.
- **Economic Development:** UA can also create job opportunities, increase money return and production.
- **Recreational:** UA is also considered a recreational amusing activity that is good to look at in public spaces.

- **Case of Ras Beirut:** two participants reported that Ras Beirut lacks areas specialized for planting and that UA is good to look at from the plane, but it is not beneficial.

Table 10: Adjectives defining UA by the Ras Beirut participants		
Type of Adjective	Lists of Adjectives	Frequency (N)
Typology	Roof gardens	1
	sustainability	2
	Important	1
	Organic	1
	Natural	1
Food Security	Enough supply for demand	1
	Becoming less dependent on external supply	1
Social Development	Engagement	2
	Social benefit	1
	Social Cohesion	2
	Social engagement	1
	Healthy/health benefits/physically and psychologically important	5
	Social cohesion	2
Ecological Development	Very important for environment	1
	Restrict the poisons in the city	1
	Greenery over buildings	1
	Balance between nature and non-nature city factors	1
	Reduce eye pollution	1
	Better environment	1
	Cleaning the city	1
	Benefit the environment	1
	greenery/more green areas	6
	good environment	3
	Decorating the city	1
	Beautiful landscapes/scenery	1
Economic Development	Creating job opportunities	6
	Money return	1
	It is good production	1
Recreational	Recreational activity	1
	An amusing activity in general	1
	It is good to look at	1
	in public spaces	1
The Case of Ras Beirut	The lack of areas specialized for planting	1
	You're going to see them from the airplanes and won't benefit us	1

c. Urban Agriculture Initiatives

23.1% of participants reported that they do practice Urban Agriculture while 69.2% of participants don't practice UA. Participants reported that the main reasons behind not practicing UA are: lack of knowledge of its availability, plausibility and benefits, lack of spaces in Ras Beirut and lack of time. Moreover, 80.8% of participants believe that UA initiative can serve as an opportunity for CCE (**Table 11**).

Table 11: Ras Beirut Perception of their Participation in Urban Agriculture				
			N	%
Practicing UA	Yes		6	23.1
	No		18	69.2
	Other		2	7.7
UA Initiative as an Opportunity for CCE	Yes		21	80.8
	No		5	19.2

Participants reported that the main reasons behind their belief are: AUB has enough resources to serve the Ras Beirut Community, UA is a common activity that will benefit the community, and it opens the opportunity for everybody to improve his/her surroundings.

Participants ranked the contribution of UA initiative to CCE from highest to lowest as per below (also seen in **Table 12**):

- Mutually beneficial initiative (46.2% highest and 11.5% moderately high)
- Platform for civic engagement and service learning (15.4% moderately high and 23.1% slightly high)

- Accessible for both communities (23.1% moderately high and 7.7% slightly high)
- Has an economic pay back (23.1% slightly high and 11.5% moderate)
- Platform for recreational activities for both parties (19.2% slightly high and 11.5% moderate)
- Contributes to AUB civic missions (15.4% moderate and 15.4% slightly low)
- Contributes to Ras Beirut stewardship to the area (11.5% slightly low, 23.1% moderately low and 26.9% lowest).

Participants reported that the best model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut should be permanent (96.2%). It can also be located on private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden (46.2%), on roofs/balconies of residential areas (42.3%), on private property in Ras Beirut rented for the garden (34.6%) or on campus property (30.8%). The majority of participants reported that they prefer the type of initiative to be community garden (80.8%) with mass production for both campus and neighborhood activity (80.8%). Furthermore, the majority of participants preferred that the type of produce be organic (69.2%) and that the production be donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc; 69.2%) and volunteers receive share of harvest in return for work (53.8%). In addition, participants preferred that this initiative be managed by participants from Ras Beirut community and AUB (88.5%). Half of participants (50%) reported that students, faculty/staff and food department from AUB engage in this initiative, similarly 46.2% of participants preferred that local residents, schools, business owners and students from Ras Beirut community engage in this initiative. Finally, 61.5% of participants reported that this initiative should be funded from university budget, 38.5% of participants preferred that this initiative be funded from fund-raising events and general donations while 34.6% preferred that the government and external grants fund this initiative (**Table 13**).

Table 12: Ras Beirut Perception on the contribution of UA initiative to CCE			
		N	%
Mutually beneficial initiative	Highest	12	46.2
	Moderately High	3	11.5
	Slightly High	0	0.0
	Moderate	2	7.7
	Slightly Low	2	7.7
	Moderately Low	1	3.8
	Lowest	2	7.7
Accessible to both communities	Highest	2	7.7
	Moderately High	6	23.1
	Slightly High	2	7.7
	Moderate	4	15.4
	Slightly Low	2	7.7
	Moderately Low	2	7.7
	Lowest	4	15.4
Platform for recreational activities to both parties	Highest	1	3.8
	Moderately High	2	7.7
	Slightly High	5	19.2
	Moderate	3	11.5
	Slightly Low	5	19.2
	Moderately Low	2	7.7
	Lowest	4	15.4
Platform for civic engagement and service learning	Highest	1	3.8
	Moderately High	4	15.4
	Slightly High	6	23.1
	Moderate	3	11.5
	Slightly Low	3	11.5
	Moderately Low	4	15.4
	Lowest	1	3.8
Has an economic payback (through produce)	Highest	4	15.4
	Moderately High	3	11.5
	Slightly High	6	23.1
	Moderate	3	11.5
	Slightly Low	4	15.4
	Moderately Low	1	3.8
	Lowest	3	11.5
Contributes to AUB civic missions	Highest	0	0.0
	Moderately High	4	15.4
	Slightly High	2	7.7
	Moderate	4	15.4
	Slightly Low	4	15.4
	Moderately Low	6	23.1
	Lowest	2	7.7

Cont. Table 12: Ras Beirut Perception on the contribution of UA initiative to CCE			
		N	%
Contributes to Ras Beirut stewardship to the area	Highest	2	7.7
	Moderately High	0	0.0
	Slightly High	1	3.8
	Moderate	3	11.5
	Slightly Low	3	11.5
	Moderately Low	6	23.1
	Lowest	7	26.9

Table 13 : Best Model Urban Agriculture as per Ras Beirut Community			
		N	%
Life of Initiative	Permanent	25	96.2
	Temporary	1	3.8
Location	On campus Property	8	30.8
	On private property in Ras Beirut rented for the garden	9	34.6
	On private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden	12	46.2
	On a university farm or experiment station or roof	5	19.2
	On roofs/balconies of residential areas	11	42.3
UA type	Roof Garden	9	34.6
	Community Garden	21	80.8
	Vertical Gardens (on balconies)	9	34.6
	University farm or agriculture station	5	19.2
Size/Scale	Family Use only	6	23.1
	Mass Production for both campus and neighborhood community	21	80.8
Type of Produce	Organic	18	69.2
	Non-organic	7	26.9
Production	Volunteers receive share of harvest in return for work	14	53.8
	Produce is sold or used in on-campus dining facilities	9	34.6
	Produce is donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc.)	18	69.2
	Produce sold at farmer's market/farm stand	4	15.4
Operations and Management	Managed by participants from Ras Beirut Community and AUB	23	88.5
	Managed by AUB Faculty/Admin Students	1	3.8
	Managed by Ras Beirut Community only	1	3.8
Engagement from AUB	Students	8	30.8
	Faculty/Staff	4	15.4
	Food Department	4	15.4
	All of the above	13	50.0
Engagement from Ras Beirut Community	Local Residents	10	38.5
	Schools	5	19.2
	Business Owners	3	11.5
	Students	2	7.7
	All of the above	12	46.2

Cont. Table 13 : Best Model Urban Agriculture as per Ras Beirut Community			
		N	%
Funds/Support	Student fees for participating with the garden	1	3.8
	Fund-raising events	10	38.5
	Government	9	34.6
	Farmers Market	0	0.0
	University budget	16	61.5
	Student activity fee per credit hour	1	3.8
	External funding: grants	9	34.6
	General Donations	10	38.5

It is important to note that 53.8% of participants reported that they are ready to participate in a workshop, where Ras Beirut and AUB key stakeholders participate to give an insight and ideas on a best model for an UA initiative as a mutually beneficial project for CCE (**Table 14**).

Table 14: Participation in Workshop			
		N	%
	Yes	14	53.8
	No	12	46.2

B. AUB Community Sample

1. Sample Descriptive

The AUB sample of the study consisted of $N = 18$ participants. The number of years spent at AUB ranged between 2 years and 35 years with mean ($M = 12.25$, $SD = 10.87$). One third of AUB sample was Research Assistants (33.3%) and 2 participants were faculty deans (11.1%) and 2 participants were directors of centers at AUB (11.1%). The rest of participants were Presidents of clubs, record officer, communication officer, graduate student and instructor (**Table 15 and 16**).

Table 15: Descriptive of the Sample Characteristics of AUB Stakeholders					
Demographics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	18	2	35	12.25	10.87
Valid N (listwise)	18				

Table 16: Sample Descriptive of AUB Stakeholders			
		N	%
Occupation	AVP for communication	1	5.6
	Dean	2	11.1
	Director of Centers	2	11.1
	Graduate Student	1	5.6
	Instructor	1	5.6
	President of Clubs	2	11.1
	Research Assistants	6	33.3
	Student Record Officer	1	5.6
	Missing	2	11.1

2. General Understanding of CCE

a. Definition of CCE:

When AUB participants were asked about the definition of CCE, all of them provided definitions that are comparable to the actual definition of CCE. Precisely, six participants (33.3%) provided brief definitions that focuses on building relationship between the university and the community to provide service learning for students and help the community as per below:

- *“Relationship between university and larger surrounding community”*
- *“All the interactions between AUB and the community from students to projects, smallest to biggest things”*
- *“Now it is getting structured at AUB and being introduced into academic programs”*
- *“How both community (university and neighborhood) work together”*
- *“How far can campus help within and outside university”*
- *“Findings ways to intentionally build relationships between campus and the community”*

Six participants (33.3%) provided in-depth definitions of CCE that are uni-directional; one-ways relationship; stressing on how AUB can benefit the surrounding community such as giving back to the community, provide community services, awareness and knowledge and limiting the negative influence in terms of traffic and housing prices as per below:

- *“Frequent interactions between campus members and the community around it; a campus that cares about not having negative influence on the neighborhood (traffic and housing prices)”*

- *“Engaging members of the AUB community whether students, faculty or staff in activities and programs to give back to the community around them”*
- *“Provide community services, good knowledge and experiences, social engagement and awareness etc...”*
- *“How much the campus can help the community each in their field, I feel it is a responsibility and duty to campus and neighborhood”*
- *“AUB’s role in providing the right education, learning skills, and tools to its students to be active members of the society and good-doers for their communities. In addition, the activities, scholarships, projects, and research that AUB does to develop or engage the community”*
- *“When members of a campus and members of the surrounding community work together to have a positive cooperative relationship that enriches the community”*

Finally, six participants (33.3%) provided in-depth definitions of CCE that are bi-directional; two-way relationship; thus, AUB contributing to the development and wellbeing of the community and the community enriching the life and disciplinary experience of students, faculty and staff. This can be achieved through breaking the barriers (boundaries and borders) between AUB and the community to create symbiotic, mutual, learning and beneficial relationship that is based on mutual engagement. The community can also provide ideas for the improvement of campus environment and students at AUB can benefit from the CCE by being exposed to transformative learning, as per below:

- *“Ways to linking development planning that is aimed but help the marginalized with experimenting learning that is aimed at enhancing transformative education among university students”*

- *“Trying to involve the community at university in its immediate neighborhood and break the boundaries with community not only physically but practically and create symbiosis mutual benefit”*
- *“With the members of community, sense of ownership, responsibility, shared identity between both providing all kinds of engagement”*
- *“University campus connecting to nearby or far communities in a bi-directional way, campus contributing to the development and wellbeing of communities and communities enriching the life and disciplinary experience of participating students, faculty and staff”*
- *“It is when the campus is involved with the community and they provide ideas for the improvement of campus environment and work on enhancing relationship among AUB community”*
- *“Get through the barrier that exists (borders at AUB) open it up to communities around AUB and all-around Lebanon. Impact communities and learn from them at the same time, not just exploitation rather an engagement”*

b. Adjectives Describing CCE

When AUB participants were asked to list three adjectives that describe CCE, their answers fell into six main categories as explained earlier based on the terminologies on “Civic Engagement”, per below:

Please refer to **Table 17** for definite adjectives responses of AUB Stakeholders on CCE:

- **Social Capital and Citizenship:**

Social Capital: The features of social organization and networks of common norms and values that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putnam, 1993).

Citizenship: Implies that the citizen is part of a community, and takes an active and interested role in affecting that community through Having a role and responsibility in making the rules of the community, common life and values of a community, and the ability and act of engaging with others in common tasks of importance to the community (Barber, 1992; Harry & Nancy, 1996)

Under this category, participants reported that CCE is a collaborative interaction that is based on share identity responsibility and hard work. CCE fosters the sense of ownership, social cohesion and coherence.

- **Civic Engagement:** Working to make a difference in the civic life of a community through developing its members' combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation, and through promoting the quality of life in a community while addressing political and non-political processes (Ehrlich, 2000).

Participants whose responses fell under this category reported that CCE is a participatory initiative that is based on involvement and mutual benefits of AUB and the community.

- **Empowerment:** It is to engage in the transformation of reality in the aim of supporting and humanizing women and men, also seen as "liberation of the oppressed" as per Paolo Freire (Freire, 2018).

Participants here saw that CCE is a transparent initiative that is equitable and that has positive impacts.

- **Community-based learning:** Known as CBL, is the academic approach through which learning and teaching is connected to the community context in which service is provided (Ife and Smith, 1995).

Some of the participants believed that CCE fosters community-based learning in terms of exchanging of ideas and resources, sharing of experiences, bridging the division between academic and real world. It also allows students to learn about the needs of the community, engage in community research and help communities (economically and socially).

- **Outreach:** The programs, activities, and skills provided to those outside the university campus, often seen as a one-way approach where the university provides a service on a reduced or no-fee for the community (Niemi and Junn, 2005).

Participants whose answers fell under this category reported that the CCE helps in dissemination of information, provides assistance to the community and fosters communication.

- **Community Development:** It is when community members work together to achieve long-term benefits for the community and an overall stronger sense of community (Niemi and Junn, 2005)

Participants here revealed that CCE is an approach that provides job opportunities to the community.

Table 17: Adjectives responses of AUB Stakeholders on CCE		
Type of Adjective	Lists of Adjectives	Freq.(N)
Social Capital & Citizenship	Collaborative	1
	Interaction	2
	Neighborly	1
	Shared identity	1
	Coherence	1
	Involvement	2
	Sense of ownership	1
	Responsibility	2
	Accountable	1
	Social cohesion	1
	Hard work	1
	Historical	1
Necessary	1	
Civic Engagement	Mutual Beneficial	4
	Participatory	2
	Involvement	1
	Bilateral	1
Empowerment	Positive Impactful	2
	Equitable	1
	Transparent	1
	Openness	1
	Empowerment	1
CBL	Exchange of ideas and resources	1
	Share of experiences	1
	Bridging the division between academic & real world	1
	Preparing young graduates with tools needed to enact positive & meaningful interventions in complex settings	1
	Learning about the needs of the community	1
	Service learning	1
	Help communities (economically and socially)	
	Providing degrees and programs that are actual beneficial and needed for the community	1
	Rewarding	1
	Research	1
	Being relevant to the context	1
Outreach	Dissemination of Information	1
	Provide assistance to community	1
	Communication	1
	Sharing of knowledge	1
Community Development	Providing job opportunities to the community	1
	Livelihood	1
	Environmentally friendly activities	1

c. Strengths and Challenges of CCE

Participants reported that the main strengths of CCE are bringing campus and neighborhood together (100%), dissemination of university knowledge to public (77.8%) and students gaining real world experience (77.8%). Participants listed other strengths of CCE as per below:

- *“Researchers and faculty members develop access to firsthand information and development innovative and progressive research”*
- *“A good representation of community engagement and involvement on country and university level”*
- *“Neighbors will become aware of the value of the research being conducted at AUB, thus raising the knowledge of the general public in all sectors*
- *“Uncovers beneficial historical ties between students (past & current) and residents (past & current), thus enriching the intangible experiences of both students & residents”*

In addition, participants reported that the major challenge to achieve a meaningful CCE is the misperception and understanding of CCE, in general, by both university and community members (83.3%), followed by their perception that there is lack of enough engagement from AUB (66.7%), students’ participation for courses/thesis purposes (50%), and neighborhood community’s unwillingness to engage (33.3%) (**Table 18**). Participants also listed other challenges of CCE as per below: These participants seemed to have deeper understanding and are more aware of the challenges that AUB is facing to achieve a meaningful CCE.

- *“Funding and legal permits”*
- *“AUB is trying its best but because of community resistance we were seeing that “social responsibility”*

- *“Not completing the project”*
- *“AUB students’ unwillingness to engage”*
- *“Findings ways to approach the engagement equally between the university management, university students and the neighborhood community”*

Table 18: Strengths and Barriers to the implementation of CCE as perceived by AUB Stakeholders			
		N	%
Strengths	Students gain real world experience	13	72.2
	Dissemination of university knowledge to public	14	77.8
	Brings campus and neighborhood together	18	100.0
	Other	2	11.1
Challenges	Student participation for courses/thesis purposes	9	50.0
	Neighborhood community’s unwillingness to engage	6	33.3
	Misunderstanding of the real concept by both university and community members	15	83.3
	Lack of enough engagement from AUB	12	66.7
	Other (Not completing the Project)	1	5.6

d. Dimension of Campus-Community Partnership as Perceived by Ras Beirut Community

When participants were asked on how AUB is positively impacting Ras Beirut community; they ranked the answers from highest to lowest as per below (**Table 19**):

- Employment opportunities (33.3% most important and 27.8% very important)
- Civic Engagement activities (22.2% very important and 33.3% moderately important)
- As a recreational space and a gateway from the busy city (27.8% moderately important and 22.2% slightly important)

- High real-estate prices (38.9% slightly important and 16.7% least important).

Participants were given the choice to add other options they believe AUB is positively impacting Ras Beirut. They have focused their answers on the issue of “*culture*” and the presence of AUB making Ras Beirut a “*multicultural area*”. Their answers have brought other dimensions to the question as per below:

- *“Cultural life and intellectual life around AUB because individuals are embedded in the city around us”*
- *“Being a world-class university, it has been attracting the best international students from around the world for a very long time. This has kept Ras Beirut community very vibrant and cosmopolitan- in other words, an attractive place to live.”*

When participants were asked on how AUB is negatively impacting Ras Beirut community; they ranked the answers from highest to lowest as per below:

- High cost of living (50% most important and 11.1% very important)
- High real-estate (16.7% most important and 50% very important)
- Lack of engagement in community service activities (44.4% moderately important and 27.8% slightly important)
- Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities (22.2% moderately important and 33.3% slightly important).

Participants also reported other negative factors affecting the community of Ras Beirut such as the issue of “*Traffic*” and the lack of parking lots to carry this huge quantity of cars coming in and out of the area every day, which has also added pressure on the area. Their answers were as per below:

- *AUB creating unbearable traffic*
- *Lack of parking spaces around AUB campus*

When participants were asked on what are the challenges/barriers that affect AUB's civic engagement activities, more than 50% of them agreed or strongly agree that lack of available funds to support initiatives (33.3% agree and 27.8% strongly agree), accountability of AUB to small term civic engagement activities rather than long term sustainable ones (50% agree and 22.2% strongly agree) are among the main challenges. Participants added that lack of clear communication strategy between AUB and Ras Beirut community (50% agree and 27.8% strongly agree), and evaluation of academic performance is more important than real work on the ground (22.2% agree and 55.6% strongly agree) are among the main challenges/barriers that affect AUB's civic engagement activities (**Table 20**).

Participants also reported that there are other challenges/barriers as per below:

- *"AUB was a traditional method of education which focuses on grades and memorization instead of learning and experience"*
- *"laziness of students for this reason we should engage all students in community engagement how ready is university for doing high impact long term interventions for absorbing large grants per year"*
- *"culture aspect is impacting the decision of social commitment (what is more important)"*
- *"Acknowledgement of the importance of civic engagement- it was a relatively new concept when I was at university. It was in those days that universities worldwide began demanding that students show records of volunteering & community engagement alongside their academic grades. Thus, in my time I saw the inception of the AUB Center for Civic Engagement and Community Service, which was a step in the right direction."*

Table 19: Positive and Negative Impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by AUB Stakeholders				
			N	%
Positive Effects	High real-estate prices	Most Important	2	11.1
		Very Important	3	16.7
		Moderately Important	1	5.6
		Slightly Important	7	38.9
		Least Important	3	16.7
	Civic Engagement activities	Most Important	3	16.7
		Very Important	4	22.2
		Moderately Important	6	33.3
		Slightly Important	3	16.7
		Least Important	0	0.0
	Employment Opportunities	Most Important	6	33.3
		Very Important	5	27.8
		Moderately Important	3	16.7
		Slightly Important	0	0.0
		Least Important	1	5.6
	As recreational space and a gateway from the busy city	Most Important	3	16.7
		Very Important	3	16.7
		Moderately Important	5	27.8
		Slightly Important	4	22.2
		Least Important	1	5.6
Other	Most Important	3	16.7	
	Very Important	1	5.6	
	Moderately Important	1	5.6	
	Slightly Important	1	5.6	
	Least Important	1	5.6	
Negative Effects	Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities	Most Important	3	16.7
		Very Important	2	11.1

Cont Table 19: Positive and Negative Impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut as perceived by AUB Stakeholders					
			N	%	
Negative Effects	Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities	Moderately Important	4	22.2	
		Slightly Important	6	33.3	
		Very Important	2	11.1	
		Moderately Important	4	22.2	
		Slightly Important	6	33.3	
		Least Important	2	11.1	
		Lack of engagement in community services activities	Most Important	1	5.6
			Very Important	3	16.7
			Moderately Important	8	44.4
			Slightly Important	5	27.8
	Least Important		0	0.0	
	High real-estate prices	Most Important	3	16.7	
		Very Important	9	50.0	
		Moderately Important	1	5.6	
		Slightly Important	3	16.7	
		Least Important	1	5.6	
	High cost of living	Most Important	9	50.0	
		Very Important	2	11.1	
		Moderately Important	3	16.7	
		Slightly Important	2	11.1	
Least Important		1	5.6		
Other	Most Important	1	5.6		
	Very Important	1	5.6		
	Moderately Important	1	5.6		
	Important	1	5.6		
	Slightly Important	1	5.6		
	Least Important	1	5.6		

Table 20 Challenges/Barriers affecting AUB’s Civic Missions as perceived by AUB Stakeholders			N	%
Challenges	Lack of available funds to support initiatives	Strongly Disagree	2	11.1
		Disagree	5	27.8
		Agree	6	33.3
		Strongly Agree	5	27.8
		Not Applicable	0	0.0
	Accountability of AUB to small term civic engagement activities rather than long term sustainable ones	Strongly Disagree	1	5.6
		Disagree	3	16.7
		Agree	9	50.0
		Strongly Agree	4	22.2
		Not Applicable	1	5.6
	Lack of clear communication strategy between AUB and Ras Beirut community	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		Disagree	3	16.7
		Agree	9	50.0
		Strongly Agree	5	27.8
		Not Applicable	1	5.6
	Evaluation of academic performance is more important than real work on the ground	Strongly Disagree	2	11.1
		Disagree	0	0.0
		Agree	4	22.2
		Strongly Agree	10	55.6
		Not Applicable	2	11.1
Other	Strongly Agree	1	5.6	

3. Participation

The majority of participants (77.8%) reported that they didn’t conduct surveys that study/studied Ras Beirut community concerns prior to civic engagement initiatives design and implementation, while only (16.7%) had conducted surveys. Participants reported that they didn’t conduct such surveys because this doesn’t fall in the scope of their work or because their projects only involve rural communities outside Beirut or disadvantages communities in the suburbs of Beirut.

The majority of participants (72.2%) reported that they never involved Ras Beirut community in the design and implementation of civic engagement initiatives, while only (22.2%) did involve the Ras Beirut community. Participants reported that they didn't involve Ras Beirut community because this doesn't fall in the scope of their work or because their projects only involve rural communities outside Beirut or disadvantages communities in the suburbs of Beirut (Table 21).

Table 21: Participation as Perceived by AUB Stakeholders				
			N	%
AUB Involving Ras Beirut Community	Conduct Surveys	Yes	3	16.7
		No	14	77.8
		Other	1	5.6
	Involving Ras Beirut Community	Yes	4	22.2
		No	13	72.2
		Other	1	5.6

The majority of participants reported that they agree/strongly agree that AUB can enhance its relationship with Ras Beirut community by understanding, respecting, and exchanging the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut Community (44.4% agree and 50% strongly agree). In addition, AUB can develop platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups, chat rooms etc... (44.4% agree and 44.4% strongly agree). Finally, AUB can develop initiatives that are beneficial to campus and Ras Beirut

community (33.3% agree and 66.7% strongly agree). Participants also reported that AUB can also enhance its relationship with Ras Beirut community by solving the problem of traffic (**Table 22**).

Table 22: Perception of AUB stakeholders on measures to enhance relationship with Ras Beirut community			
		N	%
Understand, respect, and exchange the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut community	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
	Disagree	0	0.0
	Agree	8	44.4
	Strongly Agree	9	50.0
	Not Applicable	1	5.6
	Develop platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups, chat rooms, etc..	Strongly Disagree	0
Disagree		1	5.6
Agree		8	44.4
Strongly Agree		8	44.4
Not Applicable		1	5.6
Develop initiatives		Strongly Disagree	0
	Disagree	0	0.0
	Agree	6	33.3
	Strongly Agree	12	66.7
	Not Applicable	0	0.0
	Other	Agree	1

4. Urban Agriculture

a. Definition of Urban Agriculture

When participants were asked about the meaning of Urban Agriculture (UA), all participants (18 participants “100%”) gave definitions close to the UNDP definition, These definitions were grouped to separate categories in order to have a better understanding of how the responses are different and provide connections between similar and different ideas as per below:

Broad Understanding

- *“Agriculture in the city”*
- *“Plant within the city”*
- *“Producing agriculture in urban areas”*
- *“Agriculture within the city”*
- *“Providing greenery areas in the city”*

Specific Understanding

- *“a way to adapt crop production to the urban way of living”*
- *“planting in the city, edible or ornamentals”*
- *“root gardens, balconies etc...”*
- *“Growing fruits and vegetables in the city (urban environment) to feed people, green the environment and improve health and wellbeing of involved individuals”*
- *“Agriculture practiced in cities at a smaller scale from balcony root to vertical hydroponic systems, more crop and livestock based”*
- *“farming the cities”*
- *“using agricultural products from campus for the benefit of both communities”*

- *“planting in the city with the aim of enhancing livelihood, creating social cohesion and a better and more sustainable environment”*
- *“vertical horticulture, landscape, horizontal agriculture”*
- *“Agriculture that can be done vertically, on roofs, balconies, small urban gardens, etc.”*
- *“Growing your own food in the city”*

Understanding as a Need

- *“a missing component in the city that needs to be introduced and emphasized on”*
- *“tastes better, good and rewarding activities opportunities for UA should be pushed, funded, and made available for everyone because growing food in the city is a universal thing and people has lost engagement with and it will bring people together”*

b. Adjectives Describing Urban Agriculture

Participants were asked to describe, using three adjectives, their understanding of Urban Agriculture (UA). Participants answers fell into 7 main categories based on the types and benefits of UA as explained in the literature review (social, economic, ecological, and commercial), one extra category was added where participants gave specific explanation of the case of UA in Beirut

Please refer to **Table 23** for AUB Stakeholders’ definite adjectives responses on UA.

- **Typology:** participants reported that Urban Agriculture (UA) is a modern, adaptive, productive, compact and sustainable initiative that is based on intensive growing in small spaces in the city.
- **Food Security:** participants reported that UA is an urban food production that produces healthy organic products and gives better chance for food security.

- **Social Development:** UA is an empowering, service-learning, social engagement activity that fosters social cohesion and community building.
- **Ecological Development:** UA is an urban greening initiative that is eco-friendly, environmentally friendly and useful.
- **Economic Development:** UA is an economic alternative for poor communities which creates free of charge community spaces. UA also creates job opportunities for community members.
- **Recreational:** UA is a relaxing, fun and enjoyable initiative that creates recreational activity areas.
- **UA in Lebanon:** UA is a complicated initiative that was proven to be inefficient in Lebanon.

Table 23: Adjectives defining UA by AUB Stakeholders		
Type of Adjective	Lists of Adjectives	Freq.(N)
Typology	Adaptive	1
	Modern	1
	Productive	1
	Sustainable	1
	Compact	1
	Small scale	1
	Concentrated	1
	Primary crop based	1
	Agriculture in mobile containers and do not require big space	1
	Intensive growing	1
	Flexible & creative location	1
Food Security	Better chance for food security	1
	Urban food production	1
	Healthy organic product	1
	Food production/food safety	1
Social Development	Empowering	1
	Service-learning activity	1
	Community service	1
	Social engagement activity	1
	Interaction/social cohesion	3
	Community builder	1
	Health/ healthy people	2
	Intergenerational	1
Ecological Development	Urban greening	1
	Clean environment	1
	Gardening Landscaping	1
	Eco-friendly	1
	Green initiative (better environment)	6
	Environmentally friendly	1
	Plant something useful	1
Economic Development	Good use of space	1
	Economic alternative for poor communities	1
	Free of charge community spaces	1
	Job opportunity	1
Recreational	Relaxing/mediation	2
	Recreational activity areas	1
	Fun/enjoyable	2

Cont. Table 23: Adjectives defining UA by AUB Stakeholders		
Type of Adjective	Lists of Adjectives	Freq.(N)
UA in Lebanon	Complicated in Lebanon	1
	Proven to be inefficient in Lebanon	1
	the way it is being perceived by researchers as reminisced style	1

c. Urban Agriculture Initiatives

The vast majority of participants (94.4%) reported that a common UA initiative is possible between AUB and Ras Beirut community. Participants explained the possibility of such initiative summarized in **Table 24**. Their input was categorized in order to have a better understanding of how AUB Stakeholders see UA is possible between AUB and Ras Beirut. The categories will provide connections between similar and different ideas as per below:

Equal Initiative

- *“we are neighbors we have space, and it is a win-win opportunity”*

Complimentary Initiative

- *“AUB has the resources and the community could be receptive”*
- *“the space is available in Ras Beirut. The resources are available at AUB. The Ras Beirut community will be receptive”*
- *“AUB has the space for such an initiative with students in this field that could help implement such a project”*
- *“AUB provides the knowledge and experience only not the space”*

Communal Initiative

- *“Since Beirut is an urban space and that especially lacks parks, gardens, green areas, etc, it is very important to have UA initiatives”*
- *“(1) Rooftops (2) walls and (3) unused derelict sites can be used in the Ras Beirut community, as well as places at AUB such as (1) Middle Campus that are slowly being urbanized by the expansion of new buildings (2) the Greenhouse Area (3) New/Old building rooftops & walls can be assigned for such an initiative”*

Similarly, 94.4% of participants believe that Urban Agriculture initiative could be an opportunity for CCE as per below also summarized in **Table 24**. Their input was categorized in order to have a better understanding of how AUB stakeholders perceive UA can be an initiative that would contribute to CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut.

Joint Initiative

- *“Project with the two sides can work together on the beauty of agriculture with both having a hand in the outcome creates a bond”*
- *“both communities come together under one activity”*
- *“of course, both communities work together; AUB gives the knowledge and Ras Beirut community does the work”*
- *“create social cohesion”*
- *“Since AUB is a research and academic center employing professionals and scholars in that area (agriculture), the knowledge needs to be shared with the community to encourage UA and make sure of its right practice, not to mention a clear plan that entails the sustainability of the project.”*
- *“A lot of the residents of the Ras Beirut community already come from the rural areas so they would know how to grow things (organically even!) and hold the secrets to our food heritage. Students could learn from this. In exchange, students could trial out new methods and give technical advice on urban farming in the assigned spaces and could also provide the latest advice on improving nutrition (from babies to the elderly). Due to the lack of space, both Ras Beirut community and students suffer from sedentary lifestyles. Working on urban agriculture together will provide an option for an active lifestyle in nature (rather*

than at the gym for example). It could also positively affect the mental health of all stakeholders as growing things has proven benefits (Eco therapy etc).”

Participatory Initiative

- “It can’t be achieved/done any other way. The community has to participate”
- “because both parties could be gaining from this experience in terms of real-life applications and use of fresh produce”
- “yes, if AUB is ready to really open its doors to the community and if there is someone paid to launch the project, at least for the 1st year or 2”
- “AUB students would benefit greatly from this initiative, though whether the administration would support it is questionable”

Table 24		N	%
Common UA Initiative is possible between AUB and Ras Beirut Community	Yes	17	94.4
	No	1	5.6
UA Initiative could be an opportunity for CCE	Yes	17	94.4
	No	0	0.0
	Other	1	5.6

When participants were asked to rank how UA initiative best contribute to CCE, they ranked the answers from highest to lowest as per below (**Table 25**):

- Mutually beneficial initiative (38.9% highest and 11.1% moderately high)
- Platform for civic engagement and service learning (16.7% highest and 27.8% moderately high)
- Contributes to Ras Beirut stewardship to the area (22.2% highest and 11.1% moderately high)
- Has an economic payback (through produce; 16.7% slightly high and 11.1% moderate)
- Platform for recreational activities to both parties (27.8% slightly low and 22.2% moderately low)
- Contributes to AUB civic missions (22.2% slightly low and 27.8% moderately low)
- Accessible to both communities (22.2% moderately low and 33.3% lowest)

Table 25: AUB Stakeholders Perception of how UA initiative can best contribute to CCE			
		N	%
Mutually beneficial initiative	Highest	7	38.9
	Moderately High	2	11.1
	Slightly High	3	16.7
	Moderate	4	22.2
	Slightly Low	1	5.6
	Moderately Low	0	0
	Lowest	0	0
Accessible to both communities	Highest	0	0
	Moderately High	2	11.1
	Slightly High	2	11.1
	Moderate	1	5.6
	Slightly Low	2	11.1
	Moderately Low	4	22.2
	Lowest	6	33.3
Platform for recreational activities to both parties	Highest	2	11.1
	Moderately High	1	5.6
	Slightly High	3	16.7
	Moderate	1	5.6
	Slightly Low	5	27.8
	Moderately Low	4	22.2
	Lowest	1	5.6
Platform for CV and SL	Highest	3	16.7
	Moderately High	5	27.8
	Slightly High	3	16.7
	Moderate	5	27.8
	Slightly Low	0	0
	Moderately Low	0	0
	Lowest	0	0
Has an economic payback (through produce)	Highest	1	5.6
	Moderately High	2	11.1
	Slightly High	3	16.7
	Moderate	2	11.1
	Slightly Low	1	5.6
	Moderately Low	3	16.7
	Lowest	4	22.2
Contributes to AUB civic missions	Highest	0	0
	Moderately High	3	16.7
	Slightly High	0	0
	Moderate	2	11.1
	Slightly Low	4	22.2
	Moderately Low	5	27.8
	Lowest	3	16.7

Cont. Table 25: AUB Stakeholders Perception of how UA initiative can best contribute to CCE			
		N	%
Contributes to Ras Beirut stewardship to the area	Highest	4	22.2
	Moderately High	2	11.1
	Slightly High	3	16.7
	Moderate	2	11.1
	Slightly Low	4	22.2
	Moderately Low	1	5.6
	Lowest	1	5.6

Participants reported that the best model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut should be permanent (88.9%). It can also be located on campus property (61.1%), private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden (55.6%), on roofs/balconies of residential areas (55.6%), on a university farm or experiment station or roof (33.3%) or on private property in Ras Beirut rented for the garden (27.8%). The majority of participants reported that they prefer the type of initiative to be community garden (77.8%), vertical gardens (on balconies; 77.8%), roof garden (66.7%) and university farm or agriculture station (55.6%). Participants also reported that the size/scale of the UA initiative be family use only (61.1%) or mass production for both campus and neighborhood activity (55.6%). Furthermore, half of participants preferred that the type of produce be organic (50%) and that the production be donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc; 77.8%), volunteers receive share of harvest in return for work (77.8%), produce is sold at farmer's market/farm stand (66.7%) and produce is sold or used in on-campus dining facilities (55.6%). In addition, participants preferred that this initiative be managed by participants from Ras Beirut community and AUB (94.4%). The majority of participants (83.3%) reported that students, faculty/staff and food department from AUB engage in this initiative, similarly 88.9% of participants preferred that local residents, schools, business owners and students from Ras Beirut community engage in this initiative. Finally, 66.7% of participants reported that this initiative be funded by fund-raising events, 61.1% by external funding (grants) and general donations, 50% by university budget, 44.4% farmers market and 38.9% by student activity fee per credit hour (**Table 26**).

Table 26: Best Model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative as per AUB Stakeholders			
		N	%
Life of Initiative	Permanent	16	88.9
	Temporary	2	11.1
Location	On campus Property	11	61.1
	On private property in Ras Beirut rented for the garden	5	27.8
	On private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden	10	55.6
	On a university farm or experiment station or roof	6	33.3
UA type	On roofs/balconies of residential areas	10	55.6
	Roof Garden	12	66.7
	Community Garden	14	77.8
	Vertical Gardens (on balconies)	14	77.8
	University farm or agriculture station	10	55.6
Size/Scale	Family Use only	11	61.1
	Mass Production for both campus and neighborhood community	10	55.6
Type of Produce	Organic	9	50
	Non-organic	6	33.3
Production	Volunteers receive share of harvest in return for work	14	77.8
	Produce is sold or used in on-campus dining facilities	10	55.6
	Produce is donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc.)	14	77.8
	Produce sold at farmer's market/farm stand	12	66.7
Operations and Management	Managed by participants from Ras Beirut Community and AUB	17	94.4
	Managed by AUB Faculty/Admin Students	1	5.6
	Managed by Ras Beirut Community only	0	0
Engagement from AUB	Students	2	11.1
	Faculty/Staff	2	11.1
	Food Department	0	0
	All of the above	15	83.3
Engagement from Ras Beirut Community	Local Residents	0	0
	Schools	0	0
	Business Owners	0	0
	Students	1	5.6
	All of the above	16	88.9

Cont. Table 26: Best Model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative as per AUB Stakeholders			
		N	%
Funds/Support	Student fees for participating with the garden	2	11.1
	Fund-raising events	12	66.7
	Government	1	5.6
	Farmers Market	8	44.4
	University budget	9	50
	Student activity fee per credit hour	7	38.9
	External funding: grants	11	61.1
	General Donations	11	61.1

It is important to note that 77.8% of participants reported that they are ready to participate in a workshop, where Ras Beirut and AUB stakeholders participate to give insight and ideas on a best model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative for CCE (**Table 27**).

Table 27		N	%
Participate in a workshop	Yes	14	77.8
	No	2	11.1
	Other	2	11.1

5. Ideas to Improve and Develop the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut

Participants gave ideas that can improve and develop the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut that were divided to six main themes according to the relevance and context of each of the answers as per below:

Theme 1: Task Force Support

- *“AUB and Ras Beirut need to enhance communication perhaps through the creation of a task force that works on creating civic engagement opportunities in Ras Beirut that also benefits AUB. The AUB neighborhood initiative is a good example of CCE as it allows for*

mutually beneficial projects. All that is missing is for students to become more involved in the process, perhaps through student clubs and societies, or through work with NGOs

- *“Setting up a committee and working groups between both and meet once a month to discuss these issue”*

Theme 2: Active Communication Strategy

- *“there should be clear communication/ a set goal who is involved, responsible parties, designating proper/specific people for follow-ups, updates and establish good communication between the two parties, get paid, recognition, incentives, motivation, to people involved (what?why?how?where?when?) clear strategy to start implementing urban agriculture”*
- *“Have frequent think tanks and meetings with the municipality and local activists where mutual needs and benefits are shared.”*
“Nothing concrete. I recommend expanding the network of engagement and raising awareness within AUB and the community”

Theme 3: Governance Support and Management

- *“but all doesn ’t work if without municipality support”*
- *“Alumni from Ras Beirut should also give back to AUB: - hard to build relationship with this attitude, municipality is terrible as they don ’t bring people together where they can always bring communities together, very poor work of municipality doesn ’t create this sense of ownership in their own area”*

Theme 4: Knowledge exchange, shared learning and capacity building

- *“students show their work to Ras Beirut community, give info back and show it to community, each in their field”*
- *“indirect pass the knowledge to students coming from the community, what about the direct? make AUB a social/cultural Hub”*
- *“Start 1st with meetings and social interactions, exchange knowledge and information then build ideas and projects/initiative”*

Theme 5: Elements of Engagement

- *"AUB has to be sensitive to needs challenges and expectations of community.*
- *“the neighborhood initiative is a great first step for AUB engaging with the Ras Beirut community, however the project should focus more on the sustainable aspect”*
- *"Invite the community for tours inside AUB, promotion for AUB programs... explain for them why there is a wall, convince them to come in and see what there is ... let them participate in competitions with students example ma3rad el fananiin in Beirut”*
- *“AUB giving to community-based solution to the Ras Beirut area, unlimited provide employment and ensure accessibility”*

Theme 6: Civic Action Planning

- *“schools (cross cutting all social statuses/you reach students and their parents/ our entry point to any project (public and private) targeting different social statuses”*
- *"concerts for community at AUB “*
- *“events from AUB but in Ras Beirut”*
- *“contribution from AUB and neighborhood (plants, pots and soil)”*

- *"No angry tensions between AUB and Ras Beirut. You can build on ideas done by other universities worldwide. Also build on what AUB is already implementing. Souk al Souk is one of the great ideas."*
- *"Community garden particularly for schools but price of property is hard (who will donate) schools are easier to organize and manage, it is still community but not just any residence."*
- *"Recycling wastes green walls, could help to draw attention on how to use spaces."*
- *"Shuttle to improve transportation in Ras Beirut for employees and patients (AUBMC)"*
- *"balance between keeping the campus safe and opening it up and question! Future master planning need to be prioritized accessibility to campus but also positive impact towards the community... people should not see a wall but actually a technological solution; example electronic card system but with approved application from people outside campus with the role to use campus responsibly."*
- *"very successful (Jean D'arc) because it is an urban city"*
- *"Souk al Souk is very important engaging both communities together win-win situation"*

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The aim of the study is to examine the different features that are influencing the principles of CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut, in addition to explore the people who may have a direct impact and may influence this relationship with using UA as the bridging element for this relationship. Through investigating and engaging different stakeholders, the study gave an insight on the system through which the relationship between AUB campus and Ras Beirut community functions, its challenges and potential solutions with special focus on a mutually beneficial UA initiative. The participants were mainly Staff, admin, faculty members, and student club presidents from AUB, whereas, a random systematic sampling selection was made from Ras Beirut community, mainly inhabitants and business owners from the geographical area that stretches from Bliss Street up to the streets of Abdul Aziz, Jean D'arc, Makhoul, and Souraty. A total of 44 questionnaire surveys were conducted with an 18 sample from AUB and 26 Sample from Ras Beirut.

The findings of the survey questionnaires with AUB Stakeholders and Ras Beirut community have presented the complexity of this relationship and the level of information about CCE and UA they have and share. The questionnaires provided the study with detailed understanding of how AUB functions its social responsibility programs, the work it is doing to maintain its relationship with Ras Beirut, and the perception of AUB and Ras Beirut community of this relationship. UA was a tool used to foresee how both communities will engage in its presence.

A. Findings and Interpretation

The survey questionnaire was divided into two versions. The first version was established to target Ras Beirut Community and the second one was established to target the AUB stakeholders. The aim of the two versions of the survey questionnaire was to have an understanding of the perceptions of both communities, separately, on the topics of CCE and UA, in general, and the case of AUB and Ras Beirut, in specific. The open-ended and closed-ended questions of the survey questionnaire allowed for a rigorous measurement and fair comparison between perceptions of the heterogeneous communities. The discussion section will examine and compare the different variables and perceptions as seen by AUB and Ras Beirut Community to enhance and maintain partnership, with a special focus on a mutually beneficial UA initiative. This section will be divided to different discussion themes as presented in the survey questionnaires.

1. General Understanding of CCE

As per Mattessich and Monsey (1992), "Collaboration is a mutually beneficial and a well-defined relationship entered by two or more organizations to achieve common goals" (Mattessich and Monsey, 1992). In the case of CCE, a mutually beneficial partnership would be when the university and its neighborhood engage in a common research or project endeavor based on the reflection and analysis of their common needs and values of the community, in the aim of supporting social change (Jason, 1997; Roussos & Fawcett, 2000).

On the understanding of CCE, only 2 out of 26 of the Ras Beirut participants had their understanding about CCE as a mutually beneficial approach for both communities, whereas the majority had no clue of the definition or didn't answer the question. 8 out of 26 participants see it as a uni-directional partnership, thus, they see this relationship as a one-way relationship where AUB provides civic activities and Ras Beirut is the recipient and direct beneficiary of this

relationship. This shows that despite AUB's historic civic missions and its contributions to Ras Beirut neighborhood, there is still a miss-understanding of the concept of CCE by the neighborhood of Ras Beirut.

Morton (1995) explains that CCE is always seen as a charity approach rather than a justice one. Charity is when support and resources are provided from one community to another, whereas justice is when this support and resources are seen mutual and they are shared within the same community (Morton, 1995). Despite that AUB participants have had close understanding to the actual definition of CCE, yet it is alarming that almost half of the participants see it as a charity approach rather than a justice one. On this specific question, almost all AUB participants gave definitions that are similar to the actual definition of CCE. 6 out of 18 participants had brief definitions that focused on building relationship between the university and the community to provide SL for students and help the community, 6 out of 18 saw CCE as a uni-directional emphasizing further on how AUB can contribute to Ras Beirut community, and another 6 out of 18 saw it as bi-directional where both communities can benefit each other in this relationship. Therefore, a total of 12 out of 18 participants see it as an approach that AUB adopts and contributes to helping Ras Beirut community, hence proving Morton's theory, AUB mostly follows a charity support rather than a justice one in the case of CCE.

After explaining a brief of the concept of CCE to the participants, they were asked to list three adjectives describing their understanding of CCE. The aim of this question was to explore whether the concept has been understood well from their behalf. Their answers were categorized to see under which theme they see CCE belongs more, and whether they can make links with existing initiatives that contribute to CCE. In the case of Ras Beirut community, 14 out of 26 participants (highest percentage) gave answers that fell under the category "*Community*

Development” and 9 out of 26 participants (second highest percentage) gave answers that fell under category “*Civic Engagement*”. This indicates that Ras Beirut community’s concern about CCE is mainly focused on the need for the community to work together to build efficient and self-sustaining initiatives and developments that address social and economic needs of the community. In addition, to the need for developing their knowledge and skills in order to make a difference and promote the quality of life in their community.

As for AUB participants, 16 out of 18 participants have listed three adjectives describing CCE that fell under category “*Social Capital and Citizenship*”. According to Boyte (1996), citizenship is defined as “the act of joint public work that brings citizens together to form and reform their community” (Boyte and Kari, 1996). On the other hand, social capital is defined as the “features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam, 1993). Thus, the majority of AUB’s participants classify CCE as the relationship of a group, who share the same norms and values, and work together for the benefit of the entire community. Some of the adjectives they used under this category to describe CCE were “*collaborative, neighborly, shared identity, sense of ownership, responsibility, accountable, social cohesion*” which explains their belief that a real CCE would be most successful when both AUB and Ras Beirut community work together as one community, or as a group who shares common goals and visions for the benefit of this one community. Second most used adjectives fell under category “*community-based learning (CBL)*”, with 9 out of 18 participants. CBL is “an academic approach to learning and teaching that combines community engagement with explicit academic objectives” (Mooney and Edwards, 2001). Thus, half of the participants see CCE best practiced through the students’ connections to their academic work and the community context in which social service is provided. These understandings are

contradicting, at one end, CCE is seen by AUB participants as an established approach between a group of people with shared identity whose vision is mutually beneficial, while at the other hand, it is seen as a concept that allows community engagement and used for academic learning and research purposes. It is regarded that AUB participants are aware that CCE is successful when both AUB and Ras Beirut community work together as one community, however its application on the ground often falls under the purpose of academic objectives.

One of the most important strengths of CCE is to foster a collaboration that is positive and beneficial for both the university and the community participants, definitely through building connections and expanding them to support research and help communities (Suarez-Balcazar, 2004). After brief explanation about what CCE to the participants, when Ras Beirut participants were asked what they believe are the strengths and challenges of CCE with a list of options, almost ½ of the participants chose the option that says the concept *“brings campus and neighborhood together”* as a strength; while also ½ of the participants revealed that the main challenge to the concept was the *“Misunderstanding of the real concept by both university and community members”*. When AUB participants were asked the same question, 18 out of 18 believed that CCE *“brings campus and neighborhood together”* as the main strength, and 15 out of 18 believed that the *“Misunderstanding of the real concept by both university and community members”* is the major challenge faced for a successful CCE. The similarity between Ras Beirut and AUB participants answers in this question reveals that both communities agree that CCE brings both communities together and the main challenge that is preventing a successful implementation of CCE is the misperception of the concept by both communities.

2. Dimension of Campus-Community Partnership as Perceived by Ras Beirut Community and AUB Community

Zooming in to the case of AUB and Ras Beirut, it was important to understand the perception of Ras Beirut community about this specific partnership. AUB's mission statement says:

"The American University of Beirut (AUB) is an institution of higher learning founded to provide excellence in education, to participate in the advancement of knowledge through research, and to serve the peoples of the Middle East and beyond." (American University of Beirut 2011)

When asked about the positive effect of AUB's presence to Ras Beirut neighborhood, participants of Ras Beirut ranked the options addressed in the questionnaires from the most important positive effect to least important positive effect, given that the sum of "most important" was not equal to 100 % because some participants rated more than one answer as most important. Almost ½ of Ras Beirut Community perceived AUB's presence as "highly important" in terms of *"increasing real estate prices"*.

The Initiative for a Competitive Inner City and CEOs for Cities has reported in the meeting of six broad universities in 2002 that they have generated big economic impacts on their neighborhoods. These impacts included purchasing goods and services, providing employment, developing real estate, raising and advising businesses, building networks, and developing workforce (Cortes, 2004). Literature has also revealed that urban universities are important players in a city's land development plans. They are considered as growth devices of land development, especially in areas surrounding their campuses (Cortes, 2004). Urban universities' growth has important impacts on the supply and demand for housing in neighborhood areas, thus affecting the housing market in these neighborhoods. Decrease in the supply for housing to fulfil the increase in the demand would effectively raise housing rent and buying prices. Urban universities'

neighborhoods have become residential areas not only for neighborhood residents, but also university students and staff who move to the area. As per his study, Cortes found that the effect of universities on the housing market is associated with campus-community partnerships. These activities or initiatives usually tend to improve neighborhood conditions and enhance the general well-being of residents. Campus-community partnerships are more likely to make those neighborhoods more attractive and productive places, thus attracting more residential and commercial investments in the area (Cortes, 2004). Given that the Ras Beirut community, who filled out the questionnaire surveys are mainly landlords, they have seen the increase in real estate prices as a positive impact of AUB's presence because the housing market demand is increasing and they have the asset to rent and sell their houses at high prices. Ras Beirut neighborhood is a hub for many students and employees who come to AUB. With this population increase, the demand for houses has increased. Already crowded with its local residents, the supply for houses has become limited in Ras Beirut, thus, raising house-real estate prices for newcomers to the area, who are mainly AUB students and staff. In this sense, the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut community is seen negative because the housing issue is a one-way beneficial campus-community partnership, affecting positively Ras Beirut community and negatively AUB community.

Whereas, AUB participants when asked how AUB is positively impacting Ras Beirut Community, "*employment opportunity*" was perceived as the "most important" option positively impacting Ras Beirut Community. Indeed, facts and figures of AUB report that AUB and AUB's Medical center contributed to the employment of 4435 persons in the year 2019 (AUB Facts and Figures, 2019). In addition, given AUB's presence, the huge campus covers huge tract of land from Ras Beirut (25 hectares of land). Around this huge campus, a variety of businesses have

opened to cater university faculty, staff, students, and visitors. Thus, AUB is contributing to employment not only on campus, but off campus communities especially the neighborhood of Ras Beirut.

Urban universities have been reported to employ more than 2.8 million people in 1997 in the U.S, which is more than 2% of total U.S. employment (Cortes, 2004). The World Bank (2019) recorded 2.5 million of the Lebanese population, which is 6.84 million, is in the Labor Force, (World Bank, 2019). Given facts and figures of AUB report about employment, as stated previously, and the labor force in Lebanon as documented by the World Bank, AUB contributes to a percentage of 1.6% of the labor force in Lebanon. As per the perception of Ras Beirut community, “*employment opportunities*” was also perceived as a “very important” factor positively affecting Ras Beirut Community. Employment as seen by Ras Beirut community was not only the job opportunities at AUB, but also the businesses and commercial networks surrounding the campus.

Köksal (2008) in “Housing Conditions and Preferences: A Survey of AUB Employees” mentions that in 1970, 80% of all AUB employees lived in the neighborhood; this number has decreased to only 20% because Ras Beirut has become an expensive place to live in over the years. He argues that luxury housing has replaced middle income housing and driven up property values in the area. In his study, the author tried to estimate housing demand by AUB employees; looked at the factors that are influencing decision-making processes and attitudes of respondents towards where they want to live; and last, it assessed their attitudes toward the different, possible residential areas (Köksal, 2008).

When the participants, who are AUB and AUB Medical Center (AUBMC) employees, were asked where they currently live, the majority (46.4%) live in West Beirut. According to the

researcher, West Beirut included areas of Minet al-Hosn, Ain Mreisseh, al-Zarif, Hamra, Manara, Jal al-Bahr, Raouche, Qoreitem, Snoubra, Mounla, Moussaitbeh, Tallet al-Khayat, UNESCO, Ramlet al-Baida, Mar Elias, Dar Mouallimeen, which more or less, the area of Ras Beirut and few streets around it (Köksal, 2008). In addition, when participants were asked where they prefer to live, about 75 % said they preferred to live in West Beirut (Köksal, 2008). This shows that AUB is really ensuring employment opportunities to people living in Ras Beirut, at the same time, it is an area where AUB employees, from other areas around Lebanon, wish to live. Ras Beirut neighborhood is seen as an attraction for all AUB employees. Therefore, AUB employees' interest in residing in Ras Beirut neighborhood is already a step towards re-nurturing the neighborhood spirit, and making the Ras Beirut area a connecting place for all people.

As per Cortes (2004), universities help build the human capital and certainly provide access to opportunities such as skills trainings and capacity building through its lecture halls and classes, student dorms, recreational and athletic facilities, and medical and technology centers which may improve the neighborhood's skills and attract businesses seeking these skills (Cortes, 2004). However, given these facts, how far is AUB providing similar skills and building the capacities of its employees from Ras Beirut community and contributing in attracting new businesses and socio-economic development initiatives in the area?

“Civic engagement activities” and *“a recreational space and a getaway from the busy city”* were seen less important in terms of their role in positively affecting Ras Beirut community. Ras Beirut community do not see *“civic engagement activities”* provided by AUB positively affecting their livelihood, neither does the use of the campus. Whereas, AUB participants perceived *“civic engagement activities”* as a *“very important”* positive contributor to Ras Beirut community. This indicates that there are opposing opinions in terms of how each community

perceives “*civic engagement activities*”, this indicates that there must be a lack of communication and public documentation of any civic activities established or implemented by AUB.

On the other hand, when participants were asked about the negative effects of the presence of AUB in Ras Beirut, they ranked the options in the questionnaire with most important negative effects to the least important positive effects.

The option of “*high real-estate prices*” was also seen as the most important negative contributor to Ras Beirut community. They believed it is a double-edged sword. As per Cortes (2004), campus-community partnerships are set to improve neighborhood conditions and enhance the neighborhood community’s wellbeing. Cortes believes that these activities make those neighborhoods more attractive and productive places to live and work. Thus, current residents are more likely to stay and new comers to the neighborhood find it an attractive and satisfying place to live in. In this sense, the university neighborhood begins to revitalize, renting and housing values will probably increase (Cortes, 2004), making it a highly populated area. This justifies why the community of Ras Beirut has also perceived that “*high real-estate prices*” act as a negative effect. The area has become over-populated and renting and housing prices have increased, which has become a burden to those from Ras Beirut who wish to buy new houses for their family members to settle in the same neighborhood. In addition, the bigger the community, the higher the demand, thus, the higher the cost of living. Ras Beirut community are residents who are expected to stay, as per Cortes (2004), but their potential of carrying the higher costs of living has become a burden, and this is why they ranked “*high cost of living*” as a “most important” negative impact by AUB.

When AUB Participants were asked about the negative impacts of AUB on Ras Beirut community, ½ of the participants (9 out of 18) saw that “*High Cost of Living*” was the most important and “*High-real Estate Prices*” as very important. This confirms further that Ras Beirut

neighborhood is more expensive than other neighborhoods in Beirut, explaining the need for livelihood enhancement initiatives.

Again, the “*lack of engagement in community service activities*” and “*lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities*” were perceived as less important to Ras Beirut community in terms of negative effect of AUB on Ras Beirut Community. “*Lack of engagement in community service activities*” and “*Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities*” were seen as less important too by AUB participants because most AUB participants believed that AUB is engaging with Ras Beirut in its community service activities at one end. At the other end, AUB participants saw that AUB, despite that it is a university that aims at enhancing its civic missions and community engagement, yet it cannot open its doors fully to whoever wishes to access the campus, and that is for the safety measures taken to protect its students and staff, given the often unstable political situation of the country.

Given the first and second question, the positive and negative effect of AUB on Ras Beirut Community, it is well seen that Ras Beirut community’s concerns are living and sustainability, rather than engaging in civic or community service activities, or even having access to AUB and its facilities. The question here rises whether **Ras Beirut community believes in AUB’s civic missions and its potential in serving people and enhancing their livelihood?** Yet a promising comeback would be in the question after, when they were asked about how they think they may influence AUB’s civic missions, more than half of them reported that they agree and strongly agree that that their influence is through “*participation*” in civic activities.

Additionally, AUB participants were asked about the challenges/barriers that they believe may affect AUB’s civic engagement activities. More than ½ of the participants believed and strongly agreed that it is an issue of the “*lack of available funds to support initiatives*” whereas

another ½ agreed that it is an issue of “*accountability of AUB to small term civic engagement activities rather than long term sustainable ones*” and the issue of “*lack of clear communication strategy between AUB and Ras Beirut community*”. Participants also reported that there are other challenges/barriers such as AUB focuses more on traditional education methods rather than learning, experience, and social commitment, and that the concept of civic engagement and the involvement of students in it was a new concept recently introduced in its programs. Here, one might argue that AUB’s civic engagement programs might truly be suffering from external factors such as funding; however, the issue of accountability and the real implementation on the ground are questionable and need further to be explored.

3. Participation

Nelson, Prilleltensky, and MacGillivray (2001), see campus-community partnership as “value-based, striving to advance caring, compassion, community, health, self-determination, participation, power sharing, human diversity, and social justice for oppressed groups” (Nelson et al., 2001). Campus-community partnerships is seen most successful when having faculty, students, community leaders, and community residents increase their skills and enhance their ability to study, understand, and address issues that matter to society by working together in a participatory approach (Suarez et al., 2004). However, despite AUB’s civic missions and the concern of the university about accountability and participation are being raised (Myntii et al., 2012), yet more than ½ of Ras Beirut participants have never heard of the civic engagement initiatives done by AUB, and almost all participants were never engaged in neither surveys that commit to study their preference in civic engagement initiatives launched by AUB nor were they ever engaged in the

design and the implementation of such initiatives. This also opposes one of the most important principles of CCE, which is “participation”.

Under this section, Ras Beirut participants were asked to list reasons that would motivate them to participate in CCE initiatives and others that are seen as barriers preventing them from this engagement. Almost ½ of the respondents had their main barriers fall under “*personal issues*” such as “*lack of time, lack of interest, age and traveling most of the time*”. Whereas, more than half of the respondents would be motivated for “*personal satisfaction*” and for “*societal motivation*”. Under personal satisfaction, the option with the highest percentage was “*Seeking knowledge about the projects and its benefits*” with 4 out of 9 participants. Under societal motivation, the option with the highest percentage with 2 out of 9 participants was “*help/benefit the community/neighborhood*”. These variables show that Ras Beirut community is missing the motivation in participating in the community service initiatives provided by AUB and that they certainly have the intentions to be part of it and contribute to benefit themselves and their community as a whole.

One of the characteristics of a collaborative CCE is “*Maximize, use, and exchange resources*” (Suarez-Balcazar, 2004). That is when community shares knowledge and experiences about its area, the issues involved, as well as knowledge of the cultural and contextual characteristics of the community and the neighborhood. When given the option to contribute, Ras Beirut participants ranked their contribution through 1) providing new ideas 2) Participating and 3) being available and responsive with the highest to the lowest, respectively. Thus, having Ras Beirut community involved and providing ideas for CCE would be of great benefit to this relationship and certainly meets the principles of a collaborative CCE, especially that it will be built upon their needs and perspectives. When asked how they see AUB can enhance CCE, most

participants “strongly agreed” with 10 of 26 participants choosing the option “*AUB can develop initiatives that are beneficial to campus and Ras Beirut community*” and the highest “agreed” option with 18 of 26 participants went to “*Develop platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups, chat rooms, etc..*” The results here show that Ras Beirut community see the need for a communication platform between the neighborhood and the university, and the need for the development of initiatives that are beneficial to both campus and Ras Beirut community.

In the case of AUB participants, $\frac{3}{4}$ of the participants reported that they have never conducted surveys that study or have studied Ras Beirut community concerns prior to civic engagement initiatives design and implementation, neither involved Ras Beirut community in the design and implementation of initiatives, and that was because it was not relevant to their field, department, scope of work, or area of work. Almost $\frac{1}{2}$ of the participants “strongly agreed” that AUB can enhance its relationship with Ras Beirut community by “*understanding, respecting, and exchanging the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut Community*” and “*developing platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups, chat rooms etc*”. It is conceivable that AUB participants are aware of the needs for enhancing their civic engagement activities, especially those that contribute to CCE. Strongly agreeing with the above two options and seeing them as very important fall under four of the CCE principles as suggested by Suarez et al. (2004), which are: “*Build a two-way learning relationship*”, “*Establish open lines of communication*”, “*Respect and celebrate diversity*”, and “*Learn about the culture of the organization*” (Suarez-Balcazar et al., 2004).

4. Urban Agriculture

The definition and use of the concept of UA to establish and explore an UA initiative in the city is a challenge. Santandreu (2001) points out that it is important to define UA in the context through which it is going to be explored rather than relying on previous definitions (Santandreu, 2001). He believes that this process gives the chance for different stakeholders to share knowledge and come up with a mutual understanding of the elements that need to be addressed in an UA initiative in order to fit the context or area of intervention (Santandreu, 2001).

When trying to define UA from the perspective of Ras Beirut community, 16 of 26 participants either had no clue what UA is, didn't answer the question, or gave an irrelevant answer. Only 10 of 26 participants had answers close to the definition of UA by UNDP, these answers were categorized as 1) broad understanding; too general thoughts about UA; 2) specific understanding; thoughts that hit elements and factors about UA; 3) specific to the case of Lebanon; thus, describing how they see UA is in Lebanon. After giving a brief explanation of UA, the participants were then asked to define UA using three adjectives. Their listing was divided into categories. 19 out of 26 participants' listed adjectives that fell under the category "*Social development*". Even after an explanation of what UA means, they mainly perceived UA as an approach that is healthy for the society (physically and psychologically) and brings the society together through social cohesion and engagement. UA is a multidisciplinary approach that has social, economic, and ecological benefits as previously explained in the literature review. Ras Beirut respondents' high perception and focus on the social development issue reveals that UA is seen by them as a need for personal and societal wellbeing, just as their willingness to participate in CCE for benefiting themselves and their society.

Despite that most of the participants don't practice UA activities due to the lack of knowledge of its availability, plausibility and benefits, lack of spaces in Ras Beirut and lack of time, almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of the participants believed that this approach can contribute to CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut Community. When asked to rank how UA would contribute to CCE, almost $\frac{1}{2}$ of the participants said it is a "*mutually beneficial initiative*". This indicates that Ras Beirut community is aware that UA can contribute to CCE only if it was planned and implemented as a common initiative were both AUB and Ras Beirut community would benefit from it.

With AUB Participants, 18 out of 18 participants gave definitions that are in accordance to the UNDP definition of UA. Being an educational institution, it is understandable that all participants were aware of what UA and gave definitions that are concise and explanatory. The adjectives they provided to explain their understanding on UA, mostly fell under categories "*typology, social development, and ecological development*". However, 3 out of 18 participants complained about UA and its implementation in Lebanon. They believed that the activity is complex in Lebanon, proven to be inefficient, and the way it is being perceived by researchers is a replicated style that does not fit the Lebanese context. Their answers distressed the point of whether an UA initiative would actually work between AUB and Ras Beirut, given the examples in the literature review on UA initiatives in Lebanon, their success stories and challenges.

Almost all of the AUB participants believed that a common UA initiative is possible between AUB and Ras Beirut community. They claimed that it is a win-win situation where AUB can provide the skills and knowledge, and Ras Beirut community will be receptive for this initiative. They provided answers that fell under different categories. First, some perceived it as an "*equal initiative*", thus a two-way beneficial approach. Others saw it as a "*complementary approach*" where AUB provides either the space or the knowledge and Ras Beirut community will

benefit from that in the implementation of an UA project. Third, it was perceived as a “*Communal Approach*” where both communities work together and share the knowledge, experience, or even the space for a successful initiative. Similarly, almost all AUB participants believed that UA can contribute to CCE. Their answers were categorized as “*Joint Initiative*” or “*Participatory Initiative*” because they believed it is an initiative that cannot work unless both communities work together, it creates social cohesion, and both communities will have to share the experiences and knowledge they know, in addition to working together on a real-life application project. However, despite that they mostly believed that UA will support CCE, yet some of their explanations emphasized some arguments of the literature review about AUB. Their concern was whether “*AUB is ready to really open its doors to the community, whether the administration would support this initiative, and that the knowledge needs to be shared with Ras Beirut community to encourage UA and make sure of its right practice with the support of a clear plan that entails the sustainability of the project.*” It is conceivable that AUB participants are aware of the challenges ahead that are impacting or may impact CCE, and they have permitted the argument of whether the “University is *in* the community or *of* the community?”

When asked to rank how UA would contribute to CCE, about 7 out of 18 participants said it is a “*mutually beneficial initiative*”, in addition to two options that scored the highest in their ranking which are: “*contributes to Ras Beirut stewardship to the area*” and “*Platform for civic engagement and service learning*”. As seen by Zlotkowski (1996) SL stimulates implications that are healthier and mutually beneficial that enhance CCE (Zlotkowski, 1996). Thus, they believe it gives back the community the sense of responsibility and belonging to their area, at the same time it meets the teaching objectives of AUB, SL, hands-on-experience, and its civic missions, as a service identified and built by the community.

5. Best Model

One of the questions addressed in the survey questionnaire asked participants to provide their feedback on how they perceive a best model of an UA initiative that would act as a mutually beneficial initiative for CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut. This question was seen as a CBPR exercise. The feedbacks of both groups were important to compare with the framework built through the literature review on UA as a tool for CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut. A typology based on findings was developed to encourage its application in a larger experiential context in the future. The table below shows the findings of how AUB and Ras Beirut participants perceive a best model of a mutually beneficial UA initiative. The chosen options are based on the highest percentage of participants' choices. If two options are selected, this indicates that the same percentage was given for both choices. Please refer to **Table 28** for a summary and a comparison of the answers chosen by AUB and Ras Beirut Participants (**Table 28**).

Table 28: Findings of a Best model of UA (mutually beneficial initiative for CCE)		
Description	AUB Responses	Ras Beirut Responses
Life of Initiative	Long-Term	Long-Term
Location	Campus property	On private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden
UA Type	1-Community garden 2-Vertical gardens (on balconies)	Community garden
Size/ Scale	Family use only	Mass production for both campus and neighborhood activity
Type of produce	Organic	Organic
Production	1- donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc... 2- volunteers receive share of harvest in return for work	Donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc
Operations and Management	Managed by participants from Ras Beirut community and AUB	Managed by participants from Ras Beirut community and AUB
Engagement	AUB: students, faculty/staff and food department Ras Beirut: local residents, schools, business owners and students	AUB: students, faculty/staff and food department Ras Beirut: local residents, schools, business owners and students
Funds/support	Fund-raising events	Funded from university budget

It is seen that AUB and Ras Beirut community both believe the UA initiative should be for a long term, organic, managed by participants from Ras Beirut community and staff, students, faculty, and food department from AUB and local residents, schools, business owners and students from Ras Beirut shall be engaged. In terms of the location, AUB see the initiative on campus property, while Ras Beirut Community mostly see it on a private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden. Regarding the UA type, AUB participants see it both as a community garden and as vertical gardens in Ras Beirut neighborhood, whereas, Ras Beirut community prefer it to be as a community garden for they believe that their balconies and roof tops are either too small or not qualified to carry UA. AUB participants believe it can only cover the scale of family use, Ras Beirut community, in order to make a real change and difference to livelihood, it shall be of mass production. For the produce, AUB and Ras Beirut see it shall be donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc... however, AUB has also chosen the option of volunteers to receive a share of harvest in return for their work as a fair way to encourage Ras Beirut community to participate in the project. Another dissimilarity was the issue of the funding/support. AUB participants believed a long term and sustainable initiative would best be through fund-raising events, while Ras Beirut community believe that the initiative shall be funded by the university since the university will issue this project, they believe it is their responsibility to maintain and assure funds for it.

6. Ideas to Improve and Develop the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut through UA

AUB participants were separately asked to provide ideas on how to improve and develop the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut. There were different suggestions provided by the stakeholders. These suggestions were categorized to different themes in order to create a clearer

picture of what is seen as most important and initial steps towards ensuring and sustaining CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut Community. Below, I discuss how their input and the categories used can contribute to a common UA initiative that would sustain and enhance CCE between both communities.

Theme 1: Task Force Support: Have groups that will regulate, support, monitor and facilitate research on UA, in addition to reporting, evaluating, and ensuring the ongoing function of any UA project that will facilitate CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut within a given period of time.

Theme 2: Active Communication Strategy: Planning to achieve communication objectives, such as active networking between AUB and Ras Beirut community to bring both communities together under one platform that will allow them to communicate, share, and evaluate experiences on the planned UA project, in addition to proposing new ideas and fixing unsuccessful ones.

Theme 3: Governance Support and Management: The application of a set of policies, regulations, and responsibilities that will manage the establishment and control of projects, programs, and initiatives of UA and CCE. Bartone et al. (1994) claim that there is need for adequate governance and the institutional capacity to ensure an effective planning, management, services, and education over UA, in addition to remaining accountable to the public (Bartone et al., 1994).

Theme 4: Knowledge exchange, shared learning and capacity building: To ensure a two-way learning experience, where AUB provides the scientific approach and research on UA and Ras Beirut provides the traditional knowledge and experience to support mutuality and reciprocity.

Theme 5: Elements of Engagement: Ensure steps, take action, support programs that guarantee a collective action to address the issue of CCE through an efficient and well-planned UA initiative.

Theme 6: Civic Action Planning: Provide an action plan, a set of recommendations, projects, implications, or proposals on UA for ensuring an active CCE and sustaining current partnerships.

B. Implications and Recommendations

Findings from the survey questionnaires are summarized and categorized under themes as per the below. The themes used for categorization will help in developing a set of recommendations that will support AUB in best developing a mutually beneficial UA approach that can enhance and sustain campus-community relationships. Below are important findings from the results of the survey questionnaire.

1. Mis-perceptions and Understandings of CCE

- There is still a mis-understanding of the concept of CCE by the neighborhood of Ras Beirut.

Both Ras Beirut Community and AUB believe that the main challenge that is preventing a successful implementation of CCE is their misperception of the concept.

2. AUB's Charity Role

- AUB's social responsibility approaches are seen as a one-way partnership rather than two-way partnership with Ras Beirut community.
- AUB is aware that CCE is successful when both AUB and Ras Beirut communities work together as one community, however often its application on the ground fall under the purpose of academic objectives, academic learning and research purposes.
- AUB's civic engagement programs are facing challenges especially those that are related to funding, the issue of accountability, and the easy implementation, evaluation, and follow up of the projects on the ground.

- AUB's presence is positively impacting Ras Beirut community through the increase in real estate prices. The housing market demand in the area is increasing because of it being a highly commercial area, and Ras Beirut landlords have the asset to rent their free apartments at high prices. Thus, the rents they receive will provide them monthly mortgages, and possibly other expenses.

3. Knowledge Sharing and Skills Development

- Ras Beirut community's concern is mainly focused on the need for developing their knowledge and skills in order to make a difference and promote the quality of life in their community, in addition to, working together to build efficient and self-sustaining initiatives and developments that address the social and economic needs of their community.

AUB is contributing to employing people on and off campus, especially in the neighborhood of Ras Beirut. However, many questions here rise if whether AUB is contributing in building the capacities of its employees, especially its employees from Ras Beirut, to give them the opportunity to develop innovative socio-economic initiatives that will enhance their livelihood and nurture further campus-community relationships

4. Communication and Public Documentation of the Civic Activities

- It was indicated that there is a lack of communication and public documentation of the civic activities established or implemented by AUB in the area of Ras Beirut. Ras Beirut community see a need for a communication platform between the neighborhood and the university, and the need for the development of initiatives that are beneficial to both campus and Ras Beirut community in this concern.

5. Livelihood Enhancement and Sustainability

- There is a need for a livelihood enhancement plan for Ras Beirut neighborhood for it has been perceived by Ras Beirut Community that the neighborhood is more expensive than other neighborhoods in Beirut as a result of being a highly commercial area within the presence of AUB.
- A successful CCE, as per Ras Beirut community, is one that is built upon the needs and perspectives of the local community, the community of Ras Beirut.

6. Accessibility

- One major issue that has been pinpointed from the survey questionnaire is the fact that AUB cannot keep its doors open and accessible to everyone for safety and protection measures. Making it difficult for Ras Beirut community to access the campus facilities, thus have access to AUB's expertise, knowledge and research.

7. Participation and Engagement

- Ras Beirut community believe that they can influence and ensure better civic missions of AUB through their “participation” in its civic initiatives, yet, they lack the motivation in participating in the community service initiatives provided by AUB.
- AUB can enhance its relationship with Ras Beirut community by “*understanding, respecting, and exchanging the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut Community*” and “*developing platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups, chat rooms etc*”, thus abiding to the CCE principles as suggested by Suarez et al. (2004).

8. Mutually Beneficial UA Initiative

- There is a lack of understanding of the concept of UA by Ras Beirut Community
- It was seen by AUB and Ras Beirut community that UA contributes to Food security, Ecological development, Socio-Economic Development, and a recreational activity, despite the fact that most believed that it is a complicated initiative in Lebanon.
- After a brief understanding on the concept, Ras Beirut community believed that UA would contribute to CCE, especially if it was an initiative that is planned and implemented by both AUB and Ras Beirut.
- UA was seen by Ras Beirut community as a need for personal and societal wellbeing.
- An UA initiative is believed by Ras Beirut community to give them back the sense of responsibility and belonging to their area, at the same time it meets the teaching objectives of AUB, service- learning and hands-on-experience, and its civic missions, as a service identified and built by the community.
- AUB stakeholders foresee that UA is possible between AUB and Ras Beirut if the initiative was an equal opportunity to both, if it was complimentary to what AUB can provide from knowledge and skills or probably the space, and communal where both community work together on a joint project.
- AUB Stakeholders also predicted how UA can contribute to CCE by highlighting that it should be a joint and participatory initiative.

C. Significant considerations to achieve a Mutually Beneficial Initiative

Findings of the research study have shown that prior to developing a mutually beneficial UA, there are drawbacks in the perceptions and elements shaping this relationship in the first place. By critically examining the theories and research behind CCE and the principles for a successful approach, the dynamics of this relationship were explored, and a better understanding of the institutional and the personal needs were highlighted in the findings for an immediate action plan. In order to initiate, develop, maintain, and foster a healthy partnership between AUB and Ras Beirut Community through an UA initiative, there are initial steps that need to be considered.

Being able to start an efficient partnership between two parties there are certain competencies that need to be considered at first, as per Buhrmester et al. (1988). The competencies include 1) the ability to declare any displeasure with the other party 2) provide support and advice and 3) manage social conflicts (Buhrmester, Furman, Wittenberg, & Reis, 1988). According to Kelley et al. (1983), close relationships are seen as interdependent between two parties and their relationship is highly described through the frequency of their interaction, the diversity of interaction, and the strength of influence of the other party's behavior, decisions, plans, and goals. According to Bender (1993), universities have become more isolated and less accessible to the world outside campus walls (Bender, 1993). This has resulted in significant challenges of communication and action towards mutual goals and missions with their surrounding communities. In order to overcome the issue of isolation and reach an effective close relationship that is well communicated between the campus and its neighborhood, Walshok (1999) calls for 1) a clear sense of identity and purpose such as program priorities, strategic plans, and learning objectives between both parties, 2) procedures

such as policies and service-learning contracts, and 3) resources such as time and facilities (Walshok, 1999).

Having said this, CCE is seen to grow closer when the relationship between campus and the neighborhood community grows beyond its original reason and focus, which for example may be service learning and community based learning, to become a relationship that would identify additional projects on which to work, and develop a broader network of relationships for collaboration (Milardo, 1982), such as an UA initiative.

As per Krikser et al. (2016), UA within communities is described to restructure societies, allow self-improvement of individuals, provide ecosystem services, and positively affect local economies. Despite that UA benefits have been reported in literature through evidences from case studies, yet there are rare publications that show rigid forms of concepts or typologies built on UA (Krikser et al. 2016). Typologies are seen as approaches that meet the criteria of theory building (Dotty & Glick., 1994; O'Raghallaigh et al., 2010). According to Doty and Glick (1994), typologies are established to improve understanding on a certain subject of research, especially when associated with model development and application on the ground in the form of a best model (Dotty and Glick., 1994). In this sense, typologies are viewed as conceptual models, which are typically mixed with other methodological approaches (Lin, 1976) for the purpose of the development of a direct operational initiative.

In their study “Urban Agriculture Oriented towards Self-Supply, Social and Commercial Purpose: A Typology”, Krikser et al. (2016) aimed at having a better understanding of the different concepts of UA, by separating the complexity of the different forms of UA and the motivations behind every form, and proposing a dynamic dimension, a new typology, not part of any existing typology, but based on individual motivation patterns and the different

characteristics of UA properties. For the development of a typology for UA, the researchers found that two major issues need to be pursued on UA, 1) improve the understanding of UA and 2) provide a significant approach for operational decision making for stakeholders, planners and policymakers, thus provide a clear UA model addressing the multiple scales and actors, interests and motivations, and variables and their interactions (Krikser et al., 2016).

The study and its findings have shown that a mutually beneficial UA initiative is not a “one size fits all” approach. Results have shown that there are many factors that merit the discussion on how far AUB can pursue CCE with Ras Beirut through UA. The context of AUB and Ras Beirut, in addition to other factors highlighted, is certainly influencing the institutional adoption of UA to ensure CCE. Therefore, to achieve a mutually beneficial UA initiative, mixed methodological approaches should be adopted to meet the requirements for a successful CCE. Contributions are seen to start one step at a time, a bottom-up approach towards a complete plan of a mutually beneficial UA initiative.

Changes in the landscape, development, population, and commercial activities in the area of Ras Beirut will certainly affect how this model is going to be implemented. A best model of an UA will highly be influenced by the diversity of AUB and Ras Beirut as two social groups, whose livelihood patterns differ, in addition to their dynamic perspectives and complex incentives and influences. Therefore, a best model of an UA initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut for achieving efficient CCE should be a conceptual model aiming to provide improved understanding of the interrelations between the interests of both communities and, at the same time, distinguish attributes on UA and CCE based on arguments and theories developed from the literature review.

The intended UA initiative shall be built upon the motivation patterns that have called for this UA initiative to exist in the first place. Here, it is not only a food movement adopted by the university for food security awareness, however it is a call for SL and outreach, and definitely CCE through the interaction and intersection of the thoughts and interests of both AUB and Ras Beirut community. Therefore, the best model of an UA initiative, here, should not be restricted to the type of produce, its location, size, scale, etc... but on the operational initiatives behind it and the motivational dimensions that brought the UA as a concept to deal with CCE in the first place. Once a good basis for an UA initiative is formed in this context, every other element (type of produce, location, size, scale etc...) will become secondary concerns that are changeable to fit different contexts and desires. Creating a typology of UA and applying it between AUB and Ras Beirut is a first step before implementing a true project that carries all the different characteristics of a functioning UA project as suggested in the survey questionnaire. The multiple features proposed by both communities, and the relevant dimensions and concepts of UA, have contributed to a typology that will determine the potential for CCE and approaches towards sustaining this relationship.

The typology suggested will aim at achieving the following:

- a. Provide a conceptual clarity on UA between AUB and Ras Beirut community. This contributes to knowledge sharing and mutual understanding of the issues to be addressed to achieve a best model of UA. As per Santandreu (2001), it is important that UA initiatives do not rely on pre-established definitions of the concept, because in every context, UA should be re-defined to fit efficiently (Santandreu, 2001).

- b. Build an active and coordinated CCE of members from both communities to facilitate development, build trust among them for analysis and action research, and ensure mutuality.

D. Best Model of a Mutually Beneficial UA Initiative that can Enhance and Sustain CCE at AUB

Prior to proposing a best model of an UA initiative to solve the case of CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut, it was important to connect to one of the case studies in other universities. Building on and comparing to the Ithaca College Model, New York, I was able to situate the suggested framework of my study and bring out better implications, recommendations, and contributions. The Ithaca College is a private liberal arts college in Ithaca, New York. The college was founded by William Egbert in 1892. Swords et al. (2018) in “Community-Campus Collaborations for Food Justice” have done a study on the benefits and challenges of CCE through a food justice education action research project called Food Dignity, launched in 2011 and funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to incorporate educational programming on community engagement at an institutional level. Accomplishments in this project mainly included developing a curricular approach, preparing students for community partnerships and CBR, strengthening institutional commitment to CCE, and establishing community and institutional networks, all through food movements. Sword et al. (2018), mention that in this way, universities can offer gardens, technical assistance, produce local foods, ensure sustainability, address short-term community needs, and most importantly build campus-community relationships.

The project aimed at ensuring the students’ revision of their values and attitudes about the food system and their ability to change it, discuss challenges, including academic authority and

unequal power relations with communities, and offer recommendations for future community-campus food justice initiatives. The university has entered the Food Dignity project in the aim of bringing the gap between community members and students to create mutually beneficial relationships, experiences, and collaborations with respect to food justice. The project aimed at ensuring the students' revision of their values and attitudes about the food system and their ability to change it, discuss challenges, including academic authority and unequal power relations with communities, and offer recommendations for future community-campus food justice initiatives. The university has started the project by, first, offering students learning opportunities to get involved in a local food justice effort. Second, they developed programs for students to work successfully with food justice related community engagement projects. The steps they have taken to accomplish the goals of the project came as addressed below with a list of recommendations for academic stakeholders who are considering CCE for food justice.

- **Institutional Change and Professional Development:** They believed that faculty, student, and community-led initiatives are inadequate without institutional support and change. To do so, they have learned from their experience that good campus-community collaborations are ones that are built upon communication bridges for dialogue between both communities to assess common interests. They mention that the institution should move from the academic charity model (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000) to what they called “transformative” relationships (Clayton et al., 2010), which sets a high standard for such relationships, including setting dimensions of outcomes, decision-making, achieving common goals, resources, power, and satisfaction. List of recommendations include:

- Seek early support for CE

- Develop strategic plans for engagement and insert engagement goals into wider institution strategic plans.
 - Train faculty and students on CE
 - Create administrative structures that facilitate efforts of the faculty in building collaborations with communities.
- **Community-Campus Relationships:** For building relationships between campus and community for Food Dignity, they have implemented many of the best practices aiming for reciprocity, and building trust between both communities. They have worked with diverse community organizations to respond to their needs and establish common project goals to shape curricular approach. List of recommendations include:
- Build relationships based on active listening and respect
 - Build relationships among multiple faculty disciplines and multiple organizations.
 - Ensure an equitable partnership model based on justice and not charity model.
 - Recognize food justice deals with the community's resources for survival.
- **Pedagogy in Service-Learning:** The SL paradigm suggested by the university was one based on the three-phased model for course design of Howe et al. (2014). The SL activities proposed were not only for general educational purposes but applied developmental theories of learning to food justice. They made sure students get prepared well to meet community members and organizations. As a start, students were taught in a way to shift their behavior towards buying local food. Second level, students learned to define food dignity and to describe the structure of the food system to where they live. Next, they

learned to understand the separations between community and campus, value connections with the community behind campus walls, and identify their abilities and roles for contributing to community change. At higher levels, students took full responsibility over long-term projects requiring commitment and involvement with community organizations.

List of recommendations include:

- Provide a framework for SL programs, offering increasingly deeper forms of involvement and responsibility.
- Emphasize the issue of accountability.
- Create different and innovative forms of involvement, from class-based projects to engagement across several semesters and academic years reaching to internships and practicums.
- Connect students across disciplines to address complex challenges of the food system.

Another important model to be addressed is the Santa Clara University's (SCU) Bronco Urban Gardens (BUG) program. The BUG program works with diverse schools and community centers through a garden-based education approach. The program is seen as the institution's commitment to social justice and to building strong networks with community partners through a campus garden that has become a food justice outreach program. Gray et al. (2012) in "Critical reflections on experiential learning for food justice" explores the challenge of working with students and community partners through food justice, where the interests of both groups must be served, with a special focus on the BUG program at the SCU.

They have concluded that experiential learning in the context of food justice, with special focus on garden education, can successfully provide opportunities for students to engage with

marginalized communities. In addition, they believed that university garden-based education programs can promote CBL initiatives and provide low-income communities with knowledge and services around nutrition and sustainable agriculture techniques (Gray et al., 2012). They mention that for such an initiative that to serve, benefit and support the students and communities, wise coordination with communities' members is important for a better and more meaningful engagement. They see that engagement and coordination between both communities should be based on the community-building groundwork, through developing the right and most effective activities, classes, and learning experiences for the community and students. Such will include, for example, faculty and staff members attending neighborhood association meetings and community events, working with the community and engaging them in a participatory manner in the design and implementation of these gardens. Gray et al., (2012) also argue that without community support and engagement, many garden programs have failed. When communities support specific programs, they will certainly run effectively and smoothly, benefiting both campus and off campus communities (Gray et al., 2012).

The model presented below is based on the literature review, research results, and the Ithaca College and SCU Case Studies. It is a three-pronged model based on clear communication lines, building on current initiatives, and service learning initiatives. The aim of the model is to answer the research question and ensure the sustainability of the campus and neighborhood relationship.

1. Communication Strategy

As a start, this study has revealed that to ensure reciprocity of the campus-community relationship, there is lack of “**communication and public documentation**” for AUB and Ras Beirut communities that would 1) frame the concepts of CCE and UA and 2) discuss current work

being done for CCE. A “*communication strategy*” can be more reflective of reciprocal, valued campus-community partnerships where both communities can discuss, share, and reflect on ideas and experiences through a two-way flow and access to knowledge. A “*communication strategy*” will be perceived as a two-way interactive model of engagement and participation that will bring both communities together, ensure connectivity, draw attention on achievements, and most importantly motivate Ras Beirut to be part of a joint effort. This approach will contribute in creating networks, build justice, and motivate both communities to work together on achieving a successful UA initiative, where the campus and Ras Beirut will have a 1) a better understanding of and theory building on CCE and UA 2) explore together the different applications of an UA initiative for CCE based on the different elements collected from this research 3) and together “propose” and decide on the characteristics of a collaborative UA project based on mutual benefits and a shared vision, with a structured approach for its operation to achieve CCE and reflect on both communities’ desires. This is seen to help transport the nature of this relationship to a true partnership between AUB and Ras Beirut. Open communication is important to clarify roles and objectives of AUB and Ras Beirut, keeps all parties in the loop, and influences the processes of their collaboration (Buys and Bursnall, 2007); thus, clarify the direction of the partnership and resolve issues through which an UA initiative is to be implemented.

In order to accomplish an efficient mutually beneficial UA initiative, every stage of the partnership between the campus and the neighborhood community must rely on interactive factors such as mutual respect, communication, and trust (Sargent and Waters, 2004). To ensure that CCE is successful and the goals of a mutually beneficial project is met, it is important to create clear roles and responsibilities to understand the needs and perspectives of a community and its agencies (Buys and Bursnall, 2007; McDonald and Dominguez, 2015). In addition, UA initiative is believed

to be effective and aims at ensuring CCE, when both communities have their roles and responsibilities set and agreed upon. Developing strategies for communication between the university and the neighborhood community is one part of this process (McDonald and Dominguez, 2015). “Communication” is a best practice through which UA is promoted and encouraged. A “*communication strategy*” will give the opportunity for both communities to 1) be informed about a particular issue or project 2) measure both communities’ opinions and prioritize actions 3) collect ideas and feedback and 4) deliberate planning issues. Therefore, it is seen as the initial step towards the initiation of an UA initiative where an open-discussion and exchange of ideas is shared between AUB and Ras Beirut, which is an effective way to communicate individuals’ and stakeholders’ perspectives and articulate a fully developed UA project.

Components of the communication strategy:

a. Develop an AUB and Ras Beirut Community Task Force:

Elect a steering committee representing AUB and Ras Beirut community that consists of skilled representatives, monitoring group, and advisory group. The aim of the steering committee is to facilitate CCE and compile information on this partnership to make right decisions for better UA initiatives and approaches. Specifically, in this study, the steering committee will be coordinating UA activities, developing policies and UA frameworks, building urban management capacity, providing advisory services and technical and logistical assistance in UA, and offer monitoring and allow the access to related facilities in this regard.

The steering committee will be divided as follow:

- **Skilled Representatives:** Skilled representatives are professionals from both communities whose mission is to act as networks that will provide the information and knowledge about the assets of both communities, in general, and when conflicts arise, these individuals will act as mediators to facilitate communication, problem solving, and engage in planning issues. Representatives from AUB may be the NI, the CCECS, and the ESDU for their long-term experience in civic missions and community engagement. As for Ras Beirut community, representatives would be the “Mokhtars” of Ras Beirut because they know enough to help facilitate communication and encourage Ras Beirut community to play part of joint initiatives. In addition to, representatives from the Municipality of Beirut, especially the departments that deal with the community development and environment issues, for they are decision makers and may highly impact decisions taken.

- **Advisory Group:** A group to monitor partnerships and ensure that no inappropriate dependency, power differences in decision making, and any exploitation is happening (Freeman, 2000). For similar reasons mentioned above, representatives from AUB may be the NI, the CCECS, and the ESDU. As for Ras Beirut community, representatives would be the “Mokhtars” of Ras Beirut and representatives from the Municipality of Beirut.

- **Monitoring Group:** A selected group who follow up on initiatives and programs of CCE through gaining regular feedback from both communities and then communicate the feedback to the Skilled Representatives and Advisory Group. It includes separate meetings for the evaluation of the work done. Representatives from AUB in this group will be professors, faculty members, and students who are engaged and involved SL activities or

research and who will be more involved on the ground. As for Ras Beirut community representatives will be selected representatives from the community by the Mokhtars of the area, mainly community leaders.

b. Provide Mutual Information: For a communication strategy that is more reflective of reciprocal, valued campus-community partnerships, there is a major need for developing a platform that ensures transitioning from a one-way outreach model to two-way model of interactive engagement. That is seen done through the following:

- Developing a centralized campus **Web site** with resources for community partners. In addition to AUB's current website, it is important that the website serves not only the audience of AUB but also Ras Beirut community. The website will act as a networking platform for providing information and sharing results and publications on findings that (a) can easily be found by Ras Beirut community from the university homepage and through keyword searches using language easily understood by them b) provide information on the different approaches to engaging with or becoming a member in AUB's CCE initiatives and UA projects, SL activities, community services, CBR, and training programs and seminars (c) allow for a two-way communication through providing feedback and answer questions (ex. Q&A podium) with partners interested in asking questions or providing feedback d) represent all aspects of running projects of a joint effort, draw attention to achievements, and promote awareness.

- The establishment of a **database on UA** with information on successful projects, policies, appropriate technologies used for different UA types, effective and participatory planning and research methodologies, and available expertise contact list.

- For Ras Beirut community members who do not use the internet in search of information, it is also important to provide areas of conversations that are held regularly about project processes and outcomes. This is organized by AUB, specifically the NI, through sponsoring or hosting **boards of conversations** among interested AUB and Ras Beirut members to documentation and exchange of experiences, reflect and criticize projects, ask questions, receive answers, celebrate achievements, and most importantly, build networks.

- The development of monthly **newsletter** to be distributed on campus and around Ras Beirut streets for publicly sharing successful stories of CCE and highlighting on outcomes of UA projects.

2. Urban Agriculture initiatives as the Common Ground

In order to start implementing a “communication strategy” there should be a designated point of contact between the campus and their neighborhood community. This point of contact shall be used to build this bridge of knowledge and communication gaps between both communities. To promote the overall objectives of a “communication strategy”, the point of contact, in this study, is an UA initiative. UA cannot be done in a top-down approach, there are means of persuading, encouraging, and promoting UA. In the end, the concept is new to Ras Beirut community, embedding UA and asking people to be part of it, communicate their thoughts and

knowledge, share their experiences, and suggest plans to ensure engagement and partnership between AUB and Ras Beirut is nearly not attainable. Starting to bridge communication gaps between AUB and Ras Beirut may not be an easy process, but it will be essential for achieving the full potential of UA. A dynamic tool of UA need to be adopted, as an evidence of the social, economic and nutritional benefits of UA and the sustainability goals attached to it, to continue to involve Ras Beirut community and achieve CCE.

a. Building on Existing Initiatives:

- ESDU has already established “**Souk Al Souk**”, which is a Farmers' Market for local and healthy products that occurs on monthly basis on campus and in one of the main streets of Ras Beirut Neighborhood, Jean Darc street. “Souk Al Souk” aims at promoting organic and healthy food of local farmers and small producers from different Lebanese areas. The idea behind the farmers’ market is to link urban residents and rural producers through offering urban dwellers the access to healthy food and the interaction and direct contact with the producers. This is one of the forms of social interactions that “Souk Al Souk” promotes. In addition to the engagement and interactions between the visitors themselves, who are mainly AUB and Ras Beirut community members. Hence, considering and building on “Souk Al Souk” can be one of the bridges between AUB and Ras Beirut. The market can play the role of a stabilization plan for long-term engagement UA strategy. It is also seen as a stimulator of reciprocal learning and an advocate for community research and SL activities where the local knowledge of Ras Beirut community is joined with the knowledge of expertise (faculty and students) to reach innovative solutions to community problems through UA.

- Continue building on the previously established NI project “**Greening the Neighborhood**”. Greening the Neighborhood is an interdisciplinary and multi-pronged project initiated by the NI, the CCECS, and the Department of Landscape Design and Ecosystem Management (LDEM). It aims at developing traditional rainwater catchment systems, and green walls and roofs for institutional and residential buildings in Ras Beirut. The project involves research and outreach on different subjects: Water, Soil, Plants, and Structures. The assigned team in the project has done research on native drought resistant plant species that can be planted on roof gardens and discovered ways of designing and managing planted spaces in Ras Beirut, as a way to improve the visual and environmental quality of AUB's neighborhood through landscape approaches. In addition, in collaboration with the LDEM, the NI initiated workshops to teach on vertical agriculture to students of a variety of schools in the neighborhood to raise awareness among the students on the concept of UA. This, nevertheless, it is an approach that provides a better understanding of UA to the neighborhood, residents and institutions, and with them, explore ways of introducing and applying UA through different elements collected from research.

b. Building an UA Policy Strategy:

Provide a set of rules for rational decision making and enabling policies for the development of UA. The policies will be set by the steering committee to ensure that any lack of compliance by any of the two parties or miscommunication about expectations and lack of commitment to any of the suggested initiatives is shared and specific measures are taken into

consideration. The policies shall have a clear basis of the UA missions that would identify the purpose, goals, and objectives of this engagement.

c. Short Term UA Projects:

The promotion of multifunctional household use in the neighborhood and the encouragement of Ras Beirut community to participate in the management of these activities. Different short term projects can be designed by the NI, with the help of Ras Beirut community, steering committee representatives and residents, to encourage sustainability initiatives. Such projects would be seen as short-term UA, at household level, combined with other urban functions such as recreation, water storage, nature conservation, and composting. In this way, with the expert assistance of professors from the FAFS, Ras Beirut community members will become more aware of the importance of UA as a sustainability trigger, at the same time it will persuade them to become part of bigger joint projects. The engagement of the NI and FAFS professors with interested members from Ras Beirut will promote a broader scope of networking between AUB and Ras Beirut, and between the neighborhood's residents as well.

d. Long Term UA Projects:

Community gardens are "...plots of urban land on which community members can grow flowers or foodstuffs for personal or collective benefit" (Glover, 2003a). Mark Winne (2008), former executive director of the Hartford Food System, argues that the role of community gardening is "in community with others...to achieve something that benefits all" (Winne, 2008). Community gardens are more about the "community" rather than about "gardening". They are seen as "third places" where people can be other than home and work. Community

gardens are seen as facilitators of social interactions and foster reciprocity and trust (Fukuyama, 1995; Putnam, 2000). Having said this and based on findings from the survey questionnaire, the suggested long-term UA project is the **Establishment of a Community Garden between AUB and Ras Beirut Community that:**

- Will play the role of connecting both communities, fostering a sense of responsibility to their neighborhood, building community leadership, facilitating social interactions, and ensuring reciprocity and trust between AUB and Ras Beirut.
- Will be designed and implemented by AUB and Ras Beirut representatives based on their interests, incentives, and motives.
- Will be a continuum project that will develop community partners' service work, and provide students with skill-building opportunities that enhance their personal and professional development with special focus on food as an element for social justice.
- Will serve as an on-site meeting space to raise awareness among other Ras Beirut members and institutions to provide them with reliable data and example of a "best practices", and to develop a broad perspective on UA.

Having said this, the community garden and farmers market will also play the role of a "**garden-based-service-learning partnership**" that can assist campus and community to do more to ensure community building and networking.

3. Garden Service-learning Partnerships

The growth of SL on university campuses during the 1990s was seen as the most logic indicator of a renewed emphasis on CCE (Bringle et al., 2002). SL stimulates the transition of the relationship between a university and its neighborhood towards a healthier and mutually beneficial

partnership (Zlotkowski, 1996, 1999). Successful SL classes are ones that demonstrate reciprocity between the campus and neighboring community, designed and organized to meet a two-way learning experience for the university and the service needs identified by the community.

In the case of AUB, the university has long been integrating SL as a major part in its programs; however, as seen in the literature review and analysis, there has been several challenges affecting the competency of SL, such as the issue of accountability. Therefore, SL in the case of AUB and Ras Beirut should be “critical” approach that encourages students to see themselves as part of the social change, and use their experiences and skills of service to respond to addressing social needs rather than a “traditional” approach that works from a “charity mindset” and does not allow students to think about the roots of the social problems rather than working on solving and addressing them (Poppendieck, 1998). Hence, SL in the case of AUB and Ras Beirut should be based on avoiding control, demand social change, work on redistributing power, and develop innovative and already existing relationships between the classroom and community experience (Mitchell, 2008b). Thus, applying classroom knowledge to develop good citizenship and community-building skills, and most importantly, strengthening campus-community ties through community gardening and farmers’ markets.

The Garden-based- Service-Learning Partnership in the case of AUB and Ras Beirut will be built on new and already existing initiatives (such as the to be established community garden and the already existing “Souk Al Souk” to achieve the following:

a. Community-Engaged Research:

That is through infusing public issues and community needs into the research activities done by the faculty, department, and research units. Being part of the community will provide important context and insights that enrich research conducted in the public interest.

- Ras Beirut community Task Force will help the NI and FAFS in identifying important research questions to ask highlighting the issues of food security, UA, environment, sustainability, and community development in the area. They will help in determining which instruments and measures should be used to answer these research questions, provide assistance in the interpretation of findings and implications for future research and practice, and sometimes, probably, provide access to hard to reach populations, and secure greater trust among other community members.

- Ras Beirut community Task Force along with the NI, ESDU, and FAFS will collaborate in the design and implementation of a community garden in the area. They are the most aware of the situation and can help in developing a clear analysis of the neighborhood's main problems and act as forceful critiques for what needs to be done exactly in the suggested community garden for more efficient mutually beneficial UA initiative and a more enduring CCE.

- As for the farmers' market "Souk Al Souk", it can play as a place where representatives from the NI, ESDU, and FAFS meet with local random residents of Ras Beirut who come to visit the market, they will observe, explore, and evaluate Ras Beirut

community's actions and opinions, specifically about the issue of local food production, UA, and CCE in the area in order to work on producing significant community research and SL outcomes.

b. Community-Engaged Teaching:

Building a university garden SL program that is incorporated into more courses beyond the senior-level and develop curricular programs to engage students in civic missions. Such programs will include project-based learning or field studies, internships or practicum, where students will develop knowledge and skills that cannot be achieved through classroom curriculum only. Through these experiences, students, faculty, and staff will have more opportunities to learn about Ras Beirut neighborhood, expand their understanding of the area and its community, become more aware of its social issues, and aim at developing and implementing action plans that will act for changing the current situation in the area.

- Combine most students courses with “lab/ practicum” complementary courses, in all majors and programs, to promote basic experiential education, community SL, and promote PAR methods.
- Provide a training to faculty members, of all majors, by the NI and CCECS, on participatory development approaches and ways of engaging communities in research and the best approaches that can be used to teach students how to reach out to communities in their studies.
- For graduate courses, in all majors, ensure a practicum course/internship is completed, in collaboration with organizations outside the campus, in real projects on the ground for hands-on experiences.

- Provide training and capacity building workshops for interested representatives from Ras Beirut community on projects related to food security, UA, environmental awareness, and community development, in addition to, trainings on leadership positions and staff positions in community organizations, who would be responsible for implementing project plans.

c. Community-Engaged Service and Outreach:

Furco (2010) in “The Engaged Campus: Toward a Comprehensive Approach to Public Engagement” highlights that building an engaged campus can be enhanced when research, teaching, and public service goals meet (Furco, 2010). He mentions that not all public service or outreach activities in higher education should involve the community or serve the public good. They mention that public service and outreach can be provided through the service that the faculty members provide thus, it can be the service of participating on a university committee, serving on external advisory boards, assisting community-based agencies, or providing expert demonstration on governmental panels (Furco, 2010). In the case of AUB and Ras Beirut these activities will include:

- The NI will play the role of a facilitator between professors of all majors and agencies and organizations serving community needs outside campus, for providing consultations, expert advice, in addition to, providing expert testimonies or offer presentations on their areas of expertise to these agencies.

- On the other hand, the NI will facilitate seminars and workshops by professors and AUB program representatives for Ras Beirut community members to present to them the results and findings of different research studies, and provide a floor for sharing ideas and thoughts for future research that will target rising social needs. In this way, all faculties will have the chance to present their findings and disseminate scholarly work in ways that can better reach the community members and for those who do not have easy access to the academic peer-reviewed publications.

E. Limitations

A sample size of 100 surveys questionnaires was decided to be completed. One of the limitations of the research study was the data collection. Stakeholders from AUB were not as responsive as expected. Most Professors, Faculty, Admin, and Staff members were on summer vacation which made it difficult to reach to them. Phone calls and invitation emails were the tools used to reach to the biggest number of selected AUB stakeholders, however; little were responsive. In the case of Ras Beirut community, the approach for conducting the survey questionnaires was direct approach, which has made it easier to achieve. However, the challenges faced in the case of Ras Beirut community was mainly their lack of interest, lack of time, and unwillingness to participate for they see no benefit from the survey. After two months of data collection, 44 survey questionnaires were conducted covering and presenting the wider range of stakeholders and community members from AUB and Ras Beirut.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Urban Universities' missions and actions are reflecting on their role in contributing to potential solutions to local and regional socio-economic problems through their civic engagement missions. However, urban universities are often seen as if they are “in” the community and not “of” the community (Ward and Wolf-Wendel, 2000; Bringle and Hatcher 2002). Universities and their CCE missions have revealed to face a set of challenges. These challenges have played a role in weakening universities' service-learning and CCE missions such as the issue of funding, accountability, trust, evaluation system, power, and the emphasis on the question of “Doing *For* or Doing *With* the Community?” In the literature review, it was found that the topic of sustainable food systems can bring together common goals and diverse groups, especially between community groups and academic institutions. These approaches, such as campus community gardens and roof gardens, as mutually beneficial projects, have proved to make a lasting change on the issue of food through bringing together campus and their surrounding communities as an “exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (*Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015*). AUB through its historic civic missions, has long been contributing to local communities, especially its neighborhood, the neighborhood of Ras Beirut. Yet, AUB still falls in the dilemma of bridging the gap between the service activities it provides and the reality on the ground (Myntti et al. 2012).

This study aimed at exploring and investigating the different elements that are seen as potentials and current challenges for enhancing and sustaining CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut.

Special focus has been given to UA as a tool to support sustainability, and ensure reciprocity of CCE.

Findings showed that there is a set of issues affecting the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut such as the mis-perceptions and understandings of CCE and UA, AUB's Charity Role towards Ras Beirut, Lack of knowledge sharing and the need for skills development, the need for communication and public documentation of civic activities, the need for livelihood enhancement to Ras Beirut community and sustainability of their relationship with AUB, the issue of accessibility to AUB and its facilities, and lack of complete participation and engagement between both communities. Given the question "**How can AUB best develop a mutually beneficial UA approach that can enhance and sustain campus-community relationships?**" a set of implications are needed, however, as first measures towards establishing a best model of a mutually beneficial UA initiative that would contribute to enhancing and sustaining CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut. The first step suggested was a "*communication strategy*" that would support an interactive participatory planning process of an UA initiative for CCE. The "communication strategy" will give both communities the opportunity to present knowledge, information, and share experiences in an engaged manner, allow a two-way flow of information and relationship, provide various opportunities for providing input and ideas, and most importantly provide a platform for ongoing participation and engagement between both communities. Second step is a "*Urban Agriculture initiatives as the Common Ground*". The suggested UA approaches and initiatives will act as a set of recommendations that will facilitate the process through which UA will contribute to engagement. In addition, they will act as a platform where both communities will meet, share their skills and knowledge about agriculture, and most importantly, engage and interact to address societal problems and look for possible measures for solving them. In the essence of

reciprocity and mutual benefit that the garden will offer, a “*Garden-Based-Service-Learning Partnership*” has been suggested, with a strategy towards social justice-oriented approach to learning for both AUB and Ras Beirut communities. The program will be built based on the exchange of research, teaching, and service and outreach on the issues of sustainability between the community of AUB and Ras Beirut, and among them.

October 17, 2019, was a turning point in Lebanon’s history since the civil war era. The Lebanese government proposed to impose a six dollars monthly tax on WhatsApp services which has led to an uprising in the entire country. Lebanese citizens, from all areas, protested demanding social justice and the change and replacement of the corrupted political elite. Protestors set up tents in Martyr's Square and Riad El Soloh, Beirut, and the country went into complete lockdown, academic institutions, businesses, and roads were closed. Following this uprising was the Covid-19 epidemic that also put the country into complete lockdown. Lebanon is facing its biggest economic and health crisis since its independence.

Businesses have stopped operating, import and export practices were paused, transfer of agriculture and local food production became limited, prices have increased, and most importantly the Lebanese Lira collapsed. Livelihood has become really expensive, salaries have decreased, and there was a cutdown on employees in almost all businesses. As a per a study by the ESCWA (2016), about 49% of the Lebanese reported that they are concerned about their ability to pay for enough food and 31% of the population reported that they do not have access to nutritious food at all times (ESCWA, 2016). Therefore, Food insecurity has been a burden to the Lebanese community since 2016, the 2020 economic and Covid-19 crisis, food prices have increased even more, and has surely led to more critical social conflict.

In response, the NI has launched a campaign called Al Jar Lil Jar in March 2020. The aim of the campaign was to support needy families in Ras Beirut in collaboration with AUB faculty and staff members and different “Mokhtars” and some inhabitants of Ras Beirut. They worked together in identifying a list of needy families and those who were severely impacted by the crisis. 85 families suffered from lost jobs, lost their income, haven’t paid their monthly rent, or are elderly people living alone, who were in terrible need to buy food, medication and basic needs. Few families were also threatened to leave their homes, and homeless people were started to be spotted in Ras Beirut neighborhood. In April 2020, the NI arranged a set of vouchers to be used at any COOP to get food and supplies. It is expected by the NI that the number of needy people will increase due to the crisis (“Al Jar Lil Jar Campaign”, 2020).

In addition, a Mouneh Box initiative, established by the ESDU in collaboration with the Lebanese League for Women in Business, the Food Heritage Foundation, and Zico House under the Ardi Ardak Initiative. The boxes included important food items, locally produced by small scale producers in Lebanese rural area. On March 30, 2020 the first batch of Mouneh boxes were sent to 40 elderly recipients. The recipients were unable to leave their homes and to families in need in the West Bekaa region. Ardi Ardak team have also distributed a total of 1500 seedling to 100 small scale farmers in Rachaya and West Bekaa regions to be grown in homes as an approach to promote home grown agriculture and support families through local food production. The seedlings were grown in the CLIMAT project demo plot in Ras Baalbek (“ESDUMounehboxes”, 2020).

Having said this, it is urgent and important to adopt approaches and initiatives that will 1) support the work already being done by the NI to support Ras Beirut communities in this crisis and 2) ensure AUB community coming together to support Ras Beirut vulnerable community. In this

case, an UA initiative is seen very important to act as a tool towards socio-economic development, through the promotion of local agriculture and food production, decrease food insecurity in the area, and ensure and sustain better connections between both AUB and Ras Beirut community.

CHAPTER VIII

FUTURE RESEARCH

Participatory development is meant to increase the involvement of marginalized peoples in decision-making over their own lives (Guijt, 1998). Participation is seen as a process through which communities influence and have control over any development initiatives and decisions that will affect their lives, thus their sustainability, relevance and empowerment. (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). Rapid Appraisal for Agricultural Knowledge tool-RAAKS is a method used to explore how a system functions and understand the system's main actor's roles and interactions. It emphasizes on the analysis of all constraints and opportunities which help in formulating strategies to improve the functioning of a system. The main objectives of any RAAKS exercise are 1) Identify the constraints in the functioning of the system and possibilities for improving its performance 2) Identify the actors who could help to improve the performance of the system 3) Create awareness among relevant actors concerning the identified constraints and opportunities of the system (Hulsebosch, 2001). Engagement in a participatory process encourages participation and the empowerment of local communities and is an opportunity for the development of project proposals. Having said this, participation avoids any misfit between intervention and need in any proposed initiative, through capturing main problems and complexes that need to be solved (Martin et al., 2002). One of the Methods to identify and explore stakeholder interests is a Joint focus groups (Martin et al., 2002).

In university context, participation to achieve civic missions is known as "Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR), which is "Action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to

people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities” (Reason and Bradbury, 2001). Through this approach, universities ensure that education and learning are best reflected through the involvement of diverse stakeholders, thus shifting from theory to action on the ground. As per Bringle Hatcher and Clayton (2006), they see community involvement is when civic missions allow the community to be part of the design, implementation, and assessment of a research (Bringle et al. 2006). One of the participatory methods to identify and explore stakeholder interests is a Joint focus groups (Martin et al., 2002).

As per Morgan (1997) in “Focus Groups as Qualitative Research. London: Sage Publications “explains that focus group can be used in two methods: stand-alone method or in triangulation methods. In combination with other methods, focus group discussions come as an exploratory tool or as a follow-up method (Morgan, 1997). Merton (2001) sees focus group discussions, when conducted after survey questionnaires or interviews, help in interpreting and understanding further the data (Merton, 2001) or survey results (Lucas and Lloyd 1999).

A focus group exercise in the project should come as an experimental joint learning event and a participatory approach for putting things to practice. A Focus group discussion and participatory workshop will come as an event among the various AUB and Ras Beirut stakeholders to elaborate on the findings on CCE problems, analyze constraints, develop better understanding of UA as an opportunity to promote CCE (Engel and Salomon 1997), and develop a proposal of a mutually beneficial community garden between AUB and Ras Beirut for sustaining and enhancing campus community engagement. The exercise’s main objectives should be the following:

- 1- Present data collected from the survey questionnaires of this study
- 2- Set in place a network that represents the neighborhood and campus

- 3- Investigate the set of actors, how the dynamics of the research play, and understand the stakeholders together
- 4- Engage and involve the identified groups in exploring and giving an insight on the research question and the results collected
- 5- Transfer results into practice; come up with an action plan and a set of recommendations to enhance this relationship using a community garden as a mutually beneficial approach for campus community engagement between AUB and Ras Beirut

As per Flick (2018), the following steps are adopted for Focus Groups for Feeding Back Results from Interviews or questionnaire surveys:

1- Stimulation: Brief presentation of research project, methods used, and a selection of the results of the conducted questionnaire surveys.

2- Presentation of the barriers: List a selection of barriers, threats and potentials present in the data analysis of the survey questionnaires that are influencing the relationship between campus and neighborhood communities that stimulated the need for a focus group discussion.

3- Ranking: Ask participants to rank barriers and picking the most important ones using flip charts and cards. The results are taken as a starting point for the following discussions of the focus group.

4- Discussion: Participants are asked questions as a stimulus for the discussion of the findings.

Questions for discussion

such as: **How do you see your position in the results presented? What of the challenges do you think can be explored as a first step towards enhancing CCE? What of the potentials do you think can be explored further for enhancing CCE? What is still missing for you? How can you move one with the best model of a mutually beneficial UA initiative?**

5- Results: At the end of the session, the main results of the discussion must be documented as a commonly produced result and finally validated with the group. Results of the Focus Group discussion will be translated to a project proposal as an initial step towards enhancing and maintaining CCE between AUB and Ras Beirut Outcomes through a full mutually beneficial UA initiative. The project proposal will translate findings into a real on ground project, transferring theory to action.

Appendix

I. RAS BEIRUT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Urban Universities' missions and actions are reflecting on their role in contributing to potential solutions to local and regional socio-economic problems through their civic engagement missions. However, urban universities are often seen as if they are "in" the community and not "of" the community. It has been proven that Urban Agriculture (UA) is a tool and a community engagement approach that urban universities have adopted in the aim of enhancing sustainability in the city and supporting educational missions across university campuses as a mutually beneficial initiative that contribute to campus-community engagement. Given the case of AUB and Ras Beirut neighborhood, this study aims at investigating and engaging participants from AUB and Ras Beirut community to give an insight on the system through which the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut functions, its challenges and potential solutions through an Urban Agriculture initiative. It will allow assessing your respective interest in enhancing this relationship, giving UA as a tool to seek sustainability and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The survey will take no longer than 20 minutes of your time. If you wish to participate in this survey questionnaire, a consent form is attached for your signature in participation.

Please Do Not refer to any sensitive information or any information that might identify specific individuals or incidents.

Basic Information:

1. **Name:**
2. **Age:**
3. **Occupation:**
4. **Household:** Apartment House Roof
5. **How big is your residence/apartment?**
 1 bedroom 2 bedrooms 3 bedrooms 4 bedrooms and above
6. **Are you a permanent resident of Ras Beirut?**
 Yes
 No
7. **How long has your family been living in Ras Beirut?**

General Understanding of Campus-Community Engagement:

8. **What do you think is campus-community engagement?**

9. **This survey is about the engagement between urban universities' communities and their surrounding neighborhood (called campus-community engagement)**

list three adjectives that best describe your understanding about campus-community engagement?

-
-
-

10. What do you think are the strengths of community-campus Engagement?

- Students gain real world experience
- Dissemination of university knowledge to the public
- Brings campus and neighborhood communities together
- Other:

.....
.....

11. What do you think are the challenges to achieve a meaningful campus-community engagement?

- Students participation for courses/thesis purposes
- Neighborhood community's unwillingness to engage
- Misunderstanding of the real concept by both university and community members
- Lack of enough engagement from AUB
- Other:

.....
.....

Dimension of campus-community partnership as perceived by Ras Beirut Community

12. Given AUB's presence in Ras Beirut, how do you think AUB is positively affecting you? (Please rank from 1 – 5 with 1 as the most important)

- High real-estate prices
- Civic Engagement activities
- Employment opportunity
- As recreational space and a getaway from the busy city
- Other:

.....
.....
....
.....
....

13. Given AUB's presence in Ras Beirut, how do you think AUB is negatively affecting you? (Please rank from 1 – 5 with 1 as the most important)

- Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities
- Lack of engagement in community service activities
- High real-estate prices
- High cost of living
- Other:

.....

14. Being the neighbors of AUB, how do you think you may influence AUB’s civic missions? (Please rate the level of agreement with Strongly Disagree SD, Disagree DA, Agree A, Strongly Agree SA, and Not Applicable N/A)

	SD	DA	A	SA
N/A				
a. Participation in civic activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Availability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Proposal of new ideas for better civic activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Refuse to engage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>				

.....

Participation

15. AUB has been studying and/or implementing several civic engagement initiatives in Ras Beirut such as roof gardens, waste management, parking capacity studies, Pedestrian friendly streets etc... have you:

- Heard of these Initiatives? Yes No
- Participated in surveys that commit to study your preference in this matter? Yes No
- Got involved in the design and implementation of such initiatives? Yes No

16. Give three primary reasons that would motivate you to participate in community service activities between AUB and Ras Beirut Community?

-
-
-

17. How do you think you can contribute to AUB’s civic activities in Ras Beirut? (Rank from 1 – 4 with 1 as the highest rank)

- Be available and responsive
- Participate
- Provide new ideas

.... other:

18. How do you think AUB can enhance its relationship with Ras Beirut community?

(Please rate the level of agreement with Strongly Disagree SD, Disagree DA, Agree A, Strongly Agree SA, and Not Applicable N/A)

	SD	DA	A	SA	
N/A					
a. Understand, respect, and exchange the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut Community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
□					
d. Develop platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups chat rooms etc...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Develop initiatives that are beneficial to campus and Ras Beirut Community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
.....					
.....					
.....					

Urban Agriculture

19. What do you think is Urban Agriculture?

20. Given the few pictures shown to you on Urban Agriculture, how can you describe, using three adjectives, your understanding on UA

-
-
-

21. Do you Practice UA?

- Yes
- No
- Other:

.....

Please explain why or why not?

.....
.....
.....



22. Do you think an UA initiative could be an opportunity for campus-community engagement, where both AUB and Ras Beirut communities participate in it?

- Yes
- No
- Other:

.....

Please explain why or why not?

.....
.....
.....

23. How do you see an UA initiative would best contribute to campus-community engagement? (Rate from 1 – 7 where 1 is the highest)

- Mutually beneficial initiative
- Accessible to both communities
- Platform for recreational activities to both parties
- Platform for civic engagement and service learning
- Has an economic payback (through produce)

- Contributes to AUB civic missions
- Contributes to Ras Beirut stewardship to the area
- Other:

.....

24. What do you think is the best model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut? (Please check your preference)

Life of Initiative: Permanent Temporary

Location: On campus property On private property in Ras Beirut rented for the garden On private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden On a university farm or experiment station or roof On roofs/balconies of residential areas

UA Type: Roof Garden Community garden Vertical Gardens (on balconies) University farm or agriculture station

Size/ Scale: Family Use only Mass Production for both Campus and Neighborhood Community

Type of produce: Organic Non-organic

Production: Volunteers receive share of harvest in return for work Produce is sold to or used in on-campus dining facilities Produce is donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc.) Produce sold at farmer’s market/farm stand Other (please specify):

Operations and Management: Managed by participants from Ras Beirut Community and AUB Managed by AUB Faculty/ Admin Students Managed by Ras Beirut Community only

Engagement: From AUB: Students Faculty/Staff Food Department All of the above Other:.....

From Ras Beirut Community: Local Residents Schools Business Owners Students All of the above Other:.....

Funds/support: Student fees for participating with the garden Fund-raising events

Government Farmers market University budget Student activity fee per credit hour External funding: grants General donations

25. Would you participate in a workshop, where Ras Beirut and AUB key stakeholders participate to give an insight and ideas on a best model for an UA initiative as a mutually beneficial project for campus-community engagement?

- Yes
- No
- Other:

.....

Appendix

II. AUB SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Urban Universities' missions and actions are reflecting on their role in contributing to potential solutions to local and regional socio-economic problems through their civic engagement missions. However, urban universities are often seen as if they are “in” the community and not “of” the community. It has been proven that Urban Agriculture (UA) is a tool and a community engagement approach that urban universities have adopted in the aim of enhancing sustainability in the city and supporting educational missions across university campuses as a mutually beneficial initiative that contribute to campus-community engagement. Given the case of AUB and Ras Beirut neighborhood, this study aims at investigating and engaging participants from AUB and Ras Beirut community to give an insight on the system through which the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut functions, its challenges and potential solutions through an Urban Agriculture initiative. It will allow assessing your respective interest in enhancing this relationship, giving UA as a tool to seek sustainability and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The survey will take no longer than 20 minutes of your time. If you wish to participate in this survey questionnaire, a consent form is attached for your signature in participation.

Please Do Not refer to any sensitive information or any information that might identify specific individuals or incidents.

Basic Information:

1. **Name:**
2. **Years at AUB:**
3. **Position:**
4. **Role:**

General Understanding of Campus-Community Engagement:

5. Please define campus-community engagement:

6. **This survey is about campus-community relationships, list three adjectives that best describe your understanding about campus-community engagement?**
-
-
-
7. **What do you think are the strengths of campus-community Engagement?**
 - Students gain real world experience
 - Dissemination of university knowledge to the public

- Brings campus and neighborhood communities together
 - Other:
-

8. What do you think are the challenges to achieve a meaningful campus-community engagement?

- Students participation for courses/thesis purposes
 - Neighborhood community’s unwillingness to engage
 - Misunderstanding of the real concept by both university and community members
 - Lack of enough engagement from AUB
 - Other:
-

Perception of AUB Faculty/Admin/Initiatives of campus-community partnership

9. Given AUB’s historic civic missions, how do you think AUB is positively impacting Ras Beirut Community? (Please rank from 1 – 5 with 1 as the most important)

- High real-estate prices
 - Civic Engagement activities
 - Employment opportunity
 - As recreational space and a getaway from the busy city
 - Other:
-
-
-
-
-

10. Given AUB’s historic civic missions, how do you think AUB is negatively impacting Ras Beirut Community? (Please rank from 1 – 5 with 1 as the most important)

- Lack of access to AUB campus and to other campus facilities
 - Lack of engagement in community service activities
 - High real-estate prices
 - High cost of living
 - Other:
-
-
-
-
-

11. What do you think are the challenges/barriers affecting AUB’s civic engagement activities? (Please rate the level of agreement with Strongly Disagree DS, Disagree D, Agree A, Strongly Agree SA, and Not Applicable N/A)

	SD	D	A	SA	N/A
a. Lack of available funds to support initiatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Accountability of AUB to small term civic engagement activities rather than long term sustainable ones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Lack of clear communication strategy between AUB and Ras Beirut Community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Evaluation of academic performance is more important than real work on the ground	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
.....					
...					
.....					
...					

Participation

12. Do you conduct/ Have you conducted surveys that study/studied Ras Beirut community concerns prior to civic engagement initiatives design and implementation?

- Yes
- No
- Other:

.....

Please explain why or why not?

.....

13. Do you involve or have you ever involved Ras Beirut Community in the design and implementation of civic engagement initiatives?

- Yes
- No
- Other:

.....

Please explain why or why not?

.....

26. How do you think AUB can enhance its relationship with Ras Beirut community? (Please rate the level of agreement with Strongly Disagree SD, Disagree DA, Agree A, Strongly Agree SA, and Not Applicable N/A)

SD DA A SA

N/A

- a. Understand, respect, and exchange the different experiences, opinions, and cultures of Ras Beirut Community
-
- d. Develop platforms for communication such as weekly meetings, online networking, discussion groups chat rooms etc...
- e. Develop initiatives that are beneficial to campus and Ras Beirut Community
- h. Other:



.....

.....

.....

.....

Urban Agriculture

14. What do you know about Urban Agriculture?

15. Given the few pictures shown to you below on Urban Agriculture, how can you describe, using three adjectives, your understanding of UA

-

-
-

16. Do you think a common UA initiative is possible between AUB and Ras Beirut Community?

- Yes
- No
- Other:

.....

Please explain why or why not?

.....
.....
.....

17. Do you think an UA initiative could be an opportunity for campus-community engagement, where both AUB and Ras Beirut communities participate in it?

- Yes
- No
- Other:

.....

Please explain why or why not?

.....
.....
.....

18. How do you see an UA initiative would best contribute to campus-community engagement? (Rate from 1 – 7 where 1 is the highest)

- Support Mutually beneficial initiative such as Urban Agriculture
- Allow Accessibility to all campus and Ras Beirut Community
- Provide platform for recreational activities
- Provide platform for civic engagement and service learning
- Provide an economic payback (through produce)
- Contribute to AUB civic missions
- Contribute to Ras Beirut community stewardship of the neighborhood
- Other:

.....
.....
....
.....
....

19. What do you think is the best model for a mutually beneficial UA initiative between AUB and Ras Beirut? (Please check your preference)

Life of Initiative: Permanent Temporary

Location: On campus property On private property in Ras Beirut rented for the garden On private property in Ras Beirut donated to the garden On a university farm or experiment station or roof On roofs/balconies of residential areas

UA Type: Roof Garden Community garden Vertical Gardens (on balconies) University farm or agriculture station

Size/ Scale: Family Use only Mass Production for both Campus and Neighborhood Community

Type of produce: Organic Non-organic

Production: Volunteers receive share of harvest in return for work Produce is sold to or used in on-campus dining facilities Produce is donated to community (food bank, homeless shelter, etc.) Produce sold at farmer’s market/farm stand Other (please specify):

Operations and Management: Managed by participants from Ras Beirut Community and AUB Managed by AUB Faculty/ Admin Students Managed by Ras Beirut Community only

Engagement: From AUB: Students Faculty/Staff Food Department All of the above Other:.....

From Ras Beirut Community: Local Residents Schools Business Owners Students All of the above Other:.....

Funds/support: Student fees for participating with the garden Fund-raising events Government Farmers market University budget Student activity fee per credit hour External funding: grants General donations

20. Would you participate in a workshop, where Ras Beirut and AUB key stakeholders participate to give insight and ideas on a best model for an UA initiative that will contribute to campus-community engagement?

Yes

No

Other:

.....
.....
.....

Do you have ideas on how to improve and develop the relationship between AUB and Ras Beirut Community?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Appendix

III. IRB APPROVAL



Institutional Review Board | لجنة الأخلاقيات

www.aub.edu.lb

APPROVAL OF RESEARCH

June 3, 2019

Yaser Abunnasr, PhD
American University of Beirut
01-350000 ext.4578
Ya20@aub.edu.lb

Dear Dr. Abunnasr,

On June 3, 2019, the IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial, Expedited
Project Title:	Campus-Community Engagement: The case of an Urban Agriculture Initiative at AUB
Investigator:	Yaser Abunnasr
IRB ID:	SBS-2019-0204
Funding Agency:	None
Documents reviewed:	Received May 24, 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposal• Survey for residents (English version)• Survey for stakeholders and presidents of student clubs (English version) Received May 27, 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• IRB application• Consent document (English version)• Email invitation script (English version)• Phone script (English version) Received May 31, 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Survey for residents (Arabic version)• Consent document (Arabic version)

The IRB granted you approval from June 3, 2019 to June 2, 2020 inclusive. Before April 2, 2020 or within 30 days of study close, whichever is earlier, you are to submit a completed "FORM: Continuing Review Progress Report" and required attachments to request continuing approval or study closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of June 3, 2020 approval of this research expires on that date.

Please find attached the stamped approved documents:

- Proposal (received May 24, 2019),
- Survey for residents (English version, received May 24, 2019),
- Survey for residents (Arabic version, received May 31, 2019),
- Survey for stakeholders and presidents of student clubs (English version, received May 24, 2019),

Page 1 of 2



Consent document (English version, received May 27, 2019),

- Consent document (Arabic version, received May 31, 2019),
- Email invitation script (English version, received May 27, 2019),
- Phone script (English version, received May 27, 2019).

Only these IRB approved consent forms and documents can be used for this research study.

Thank you.

The American University of Beirut and its Institutional Review Board, under the Institution's Federal Wide Assurance with OHRP, comply with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Code of Federal Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects ("The Common Rule") 45CFR46, subparts A, B, C, and D, with 21CFR56; and operate in a manner consistent with the Belmont report, FDA guidance, Good Clinical Practices under the ICH guidelines, and applicable national/local regulations.

Sincerely,

Lina El-Onsi Daouk, MSc
Senior Regulatory Analyst/ IRB Co-administrator
Social & Behavioral Sciences

Cc: Michael Clinton, PhD
Co-Chairperson IRB Social & Behavioral Sciences

Fuad Ziyadeh, MD, FACP, FRCP
Professor of Medicine and Biochemistry
Chairperson of the IRB

Ali K. Abu-Alfa, MD, FASN, FAHA
Professor of Medicine
Director, Human Research Protection Program
Director for Research Affairs (AUBMC)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, Joanne, and Irene Guijt. *Changing views on change: participatory approaches to monitoring the environment*. No. 2. IIED, 1998.
- Abunnasr, Maria B. *The making of Ras Beirut: A landscape of memory for narratives of exceptionalism, 1870-1975*. University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2013.
- Adam-Bradford, A., Femke Hoekstra, and René van Veenhuizen. "Linking relief, rehabilitation and development: A role for UA." *UA* 21 (2009): 3-10.
- Adams, Anne, and Anna L. Cox. "Questionnaires, in-depth interviews and focus groups." (2008): 17-34.mat
- Adams, Carolyn. "The meds and eds in urban economic development." *Journal of urban affairs* 25, no. 5 (2003): 571-588.
- "Al-Jar-Lil-Jar Campaign", Online database, AUB
<https://www.aub.edu.lb/Neighborhood/Pages/Al-Jar-Lil-Jar-Campaign-Covid-19.aspx>, (accessed on May 13, 2020)
- Alkon, Alison Hope, and Kari Marie Norgaard. "Breaking the food chains: An investigation of food justice activism." *Sociological Inquiry* 79, no. 3 (2009): 289-305.
- AOAD (Arab Organization for Agricultural Development). (2007). Arab agricultural statistical yearbook. Khartoum: Arab Organization for Agricultural Development.
- Armar-Klemesu, M. "Urban agriculture and food security, nutrition and health (pp. 99-117)." *Feldafing: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (DSE), Zentralstelle für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft* (2000).
- Aubry, Christine, Josélyne Ramamonjisoa, M-H. Dabat, Jacqueline Rakotoarisoa, Josette Rakotondraibe, and Lilla Rabeharisoa. "UA and land use in cities: an approach with the multi-functionality and sustainability concepts in the case of Antananarivo (Madagascar)." *Land Use Policy* 29, no. 2 (2012): 429-439.
- Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance. (2006). Universities and community engagement: Position paper. Unpublished manuscript.
- Association of Commonwealth Universities. *Engagement as a core value for the university: A consultation document*. Association of Commonwealth Universities, 2001.
- Barber, Benjamin R. *Aristocracy of Everyone*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, p. 265.
- Barlett, Peggy F. "Campus sustainable food projects: critique and engagement." *American anthropologist* 113, no. 1 (2011): 101-115.

- Bartone, Carl, Janis Bernstein, Josef Leitmann, and Jochen Eigen. "Toward environmental strategies for cities. Policy considerations for urban environmental management in developing countries." (1994).
- Bauer, Martin W., and Bas Aarts. "Corpus construction: A principle for qualitative data collection." *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound: A practical handbook* (2000): 19-37.
- Baum, Howell S. "Fantasies and realities in university-community partnerships." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20, no. 2 (2000): 234-246.
- Bellows, Barbara C., Rex Dufour, and Janet Bachmann. "Bringing local food to local institutions." *ATTRA, National Sustainable Agriculture Information Service* (2003).
- Bender, Thomas. *Intellect and public life: Essays on the social history of academic intellectuals in the United States*. JHU Press, 1997.
- Birley, Martin, and Karen Lock. "The health impacts of peri-urban natural resource development." (1999).
- Bok, Derek Curtis. *The trouble with government*. Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Bond, M. A. "Defining the research relationship: Maximizing participation in an unequal world." *Researching community psychology: Issues of theory and methods* (1990): 183-186.
- Bornstein, Marc H., ed. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Lifespan Human Development*. SAGE Publications, 2018.
- Bortolin, Kathleen. "Serving ourselves: How the discourse on community engagement privileges the university over the community." (2011).
- Bowen, Howard. *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education*. Routledge, 2018.
- Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton University Press, 3175 Princeton Pike, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648., 1990.
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11–20.
- Boyte, Harry, and Elizabeth Hollander. "Wingspread declaration on the civic responsibilities of research universities." *Providence, RI: Campus Compact* (1999).
- Boyte, Harry Chatten, and Nancy N. Kari. *Building America: The democratic promise of public work*. Temple University Press, 1996.
- Brennan, John, Roger King, and Yann Lebeau. "The role of universities in the transformation of societies." *Synthesis Report. Centre for Higher Education Research and Information/Association of Commonwealth Universities, UK* (2004).

- Bringle, Robert G., Richard Games, and Edward A. Malloy. *Colleges and universities as citizens*. Allyn and Bacon, 160 Gould Street, Needham Heights, MA 02494-2315, 1999.
- Brown, L. "The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary Oxford." (1993).
- Brown, David W., and Deborah Witte. "Higher Education Exchange." (2000).
- Buechler, Stephanie, Gayathri Devi Mekala, and Ben Keraita. "Wastewater use for urban and peri-UA." *Cities farming for the future, UA for sustainable cities, in: Veenhuizen R. van (Ed.), RUA Foundation, IDRC and IIRR 9* (2006): 243-273.
- Buechler, Stephanie, Gayathri Devi Mekala, and Ben Keraita. "Wastewater use for urban and peri-UA." *Cities farming for the future, UA for sustainable cities, in: Veenhuizen R. van (Ed.), RUA Foundation, IDRC and IIRR 9* (2006): 243-273.
- Business/Higher Education Round Table (2006). Universities' third mission: Communities engagement, B-HERT position paper No. 11. Retrieved June 2007, from <http://www.bhert.com/documents/B-HERTPositionPaperNo.11.pdf>
- Buys, Nicholas, and Samantha Bursnall. "Establishing university–community partnerships: Processes and benefits." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 29, no. 1 (2007): 73-86.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2015). Elective community engagement classification, first-time classification documentation framework. Retrieved from http://nerche.org/images/stories/projects/Carnegie/2015/2015_first-time_framework.pdf
- Cassman, Kenneth G., Achim Dobermann, Daniel T. Walters, and Haishun Yang. "Meeting cereal demand while protecting natural resources and improving environmental quality." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 28, no. 1 (2003): 315-358.
- Chambers, R., Pacey, A. and Thrupp, L. A. (eds) (1989) *Farmer First: Farmer Innovation and Agricultural Research*. Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
- Chambers, Robert. *Challenging the professions: frontiers for rural development*. Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd (ITP), 1993.
- Chambers, Robert. "The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal." *World development* 22.7 (1994): 953-969.
- Chambers, Robert. "Poverty and livelihoods: whose reality counts?" *Environment and urbanization* 7.1 (1995): 173-204.
- Chaminuka, Nyasha, and Ernest Dube. "Urban agriculture as a food security strategy for urban dwellers: A case study of Mkoba residents in the city of Gweru, Zimbabwe." *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences* 3, no. 2 (2017).

- Clayton, Patti H., Robert G. Bringle, Bryanne Senor, Jenny Huq, and Mary Morrison. "Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 16, no. 2 (2010): 5-21.
- Cofie, Olufunke, A. A. Bradford, and P. Dreschel. "Recycling of urban organic waste for UA." *Cities farming for the future, UA for sustainable cities, RUAF Foundation, IDRC and IIRR* (2006): 209-242.
- Cofie, OOea, Gordana Kranjac-Berisavljevic, and Pay Drechsel. "The use of human waste for peri-UA in Northern Ghana." *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems* 20, no. 2 (2005): 73-80.
- Constance, Douglas H. "The emancipatory question: the next step in the sociology of agrifood systems?." *Agriculture and Human Values* 25, no. 2 (2008): 151-155.
- Cooke, Bill, and Uma Kothari, eds. *Participation: The new tyranny?*. Zed books, 2001.
- Cornell University (2008), Advancing sustainability action plan FY 2009, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, available at: www.sustainablecampus.cornell.edu/docs/RPT_9-12-08_ASAP%20Final.pdf (accessed 18 March 2020).
- Cortes, Alvaro. "Estimating the impacts urban universities on neighborhood housing markets: An empirical analysis." *Urban Affairs Review* 39, no. 3 (2004): 342-375.
- Cronley, Courtney, Elissa Madden, and Jaya B. Davis. "Making service-learning partnerships work: Listening and responding to community partners." *Journal of Community Practice* 23, no. 2 (2015): 274-289.
- Debouzy, Marianne. "In search of working-class memory: Some questions and a tentative assessment." *History and Anthropology* 2, no. 2 (1986): 261-282.
- Declaration, Talloires. "University Leaders for a Sustainable Future." (1990).
- Defra, U. K. "Securing the future: UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy." *United Kingdom Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs* 40 (2005).
- "Demands raised by certain groups who participated in the October 2019 Uprising", Online Database, AUB, <https://www.aub.edu.lb/ifi/news/Pages/20191112-demands-raised-by-certain-groups-who-participated-in-the-october-2019-uprising.aspx> (accessed on May13.2020)
- Dixon, John, Aidan Gulliver, David Gibbon, A. Carloni, J. C. de Grandi, C. Spehar, G. Majella et al. "Global farming systems study: challenges and priorities to 2030, Rome: FAO, 2001.

- Doty, D. Harold, and William H. Glick. "Typologies as a unique form of theory building: Toward improved understanding and modeling." *Academy of management review* 19, no. 2 (1994): 230-251.
- Draper, Carrie, and Darcy Freedman. "Review and analysis of the benefits, purposes, and motivations associated with community gardening in the United States." *Journal of Community Practice* 18, no. 4 (2010): 458-492.
- Dubbeling, M., and H. De Zeeuw. *Multi-stakeholder policy formulation and action planning for sustainable UA*. Working Paper 1. RAUF, 2007.
- Dube, Ernest. "UA as a food security strategy for urban dwellers: a case study of Mkoba residents in the city of Gweru, Zimbabwe." *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences* 3, no. 2 (2017).
- Dupeyrix, Alexandre. "Pour une recherche bling-bling." *LeMonde*, February 18 (2009).
- Ehlenz, Meagan M. "Gown, town, and neighborhood change: An examination of urban neighborhoods with university revitalization efforts." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* (2017): 0739456X17739111.
- Ehlenz, Meagan M. "Neighborhood revitalization and the anchor institution: Assessing the impact of the University of Pennsylvania's West Philadelphia initiatives on University City." *Urban Affairs Review* 52, no. 5 (2016): 714-750.
- Ehrlich, Thomas, ed. *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000.
- Ekboir, Javier. "CIMMYT 2000-2001 World wheat overview and outlook: developing no-till packages for small-scale farmers." (2002).
- Ellis, Frank, and James Sumberg. "Food production, urban areas and policy responses." *World Development* 26, no. 2 (1998): 213-225.
- Enos, Sandra, and Keith Morton. "Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships." *Building partnerships for service-learning* (2003): 20-41.
- ESCWA (2016), Strategic Review of Food and Nutrition Security in Lebanon.
- ESDU (Environment and Sustainable Development Unit), Online Database. AUB. <https://www.aub.edu.lb/fafs/esdu/Pages/default.aspx>. Accessed on 10 April 2020
- Faculty of Agriculture and Food Sciences, AUB (2009) AREC Brochure. "ESDU Mouneh Boxes", Online database, AUB https://www.aub.edu.lb/fafs/news/Pages/2020_ESDUMounehboxes.aspx (accessed on May 13, 2020)
- "Facts and Figures 2019." Facts and Figures. American University of Beirut, 2019. <https://www.aub.edu.lb/AboutUs/Pages/facts.aspx>.

- Fader, Marianela, Dieter Gerten, Michael Krause, Wolfgang Lucht, and Wolfgang Cramer. "Spatial decoupling of agricultural production and consumption: quantifying dependences of countries on food imports due to domestic land and water constraints." *Environmental Research Letters* 8, no. 1 (2013): 014046.
- Fals-Borda, Orlando, and Muhammad Anisur Rahman, eds. *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action-research*. New York: Apex Press, 1991.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) (2008b). FAOSTAT. Online database. Rome: FAO. <http://faostat.fao.org/>. Accessed 15 October 2019.
- Flick, Uwe. *An introduction to qualitative research*. Sage Publications Limited, 2018.
- Foddy, William, and William H. Foddy. *Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theory and practice in social research*. Cambridge university press, 1994.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury publishing USA, 2018.
- Friedmann, Harriet. "Scaling up: Bringing public institutions and food service corporations into the project for a local, sustainable food system in Ontario." *Agriculture and Human Values* 24, no. 3 (2007): 389-398.
- Fukuyama, F. "Trust: the Social Values and the Creation of Prosperity, 1995."
- Ganapathy, R. S. "Development of UA in India: Public Policy Option." (1983).
- Ghosh, Santosh. "Food production in cities." In *International Conference on Urban Horticulture 643*, pp. 233-239. 2002.
- Giles, Jr, Dwight E., and Janet Eyler. "A service-learning research agenda for the next five years." *New directions for teaching and learning* 1998, no. 73 (1998): 65-72.
- Gillespie, Gilbert, Duncan L. Hilchey, C. Clare Hinrichs, and Gail Feenstra. "Farmers' markets as keystones in rebuilding local and regional food systems." *Remaking the North American food system: Strategies for sustainability* (2007): 65-83.
- Giroux, Henry A., and Susan Searls Giroux. "Challenging neoliberalism's new world order: The promise of critical pedagogy." *Cultural studies? Critical methodologies* 6, no. 1 (2006): 21-32.
- Glover, Troy D., Kimberly J. Shinew, and Diana C. Parry. "Association, sociability, and civic culture: The democratic effect of community gardening." *Leisure Sciences* 27, no. 1 (2005): 75-92.
- Gockowski, James, Julie Mbazo'o, Glory Mbah, and Terese Fouda Moulende. "African traditional leafy vegetables and the urban and peri-urban poor." *Food policy* 28, no. 3 (2003): 221-235.

- Goddard, John, Louise Kempton, Paul Vallance, R. Cappello, A. Olechnicka, and G. Gorzelak. "The civic university: Connecting the global and the local." *Universities, Cities and Regions, Loci for Knowledge and Innovation Creation* (2013): 43-63.
- Goodall, Leonard E. "The urban university: Is there such a thing?." *The Journal of Higher Education* 41, no. 1 (1970): 44-54.
- Gray, Leslie, Joanna Johnson, Nicole Latham, Michelle Tang, and Ann Thomas. "Critical reflections on experiential learning for food justice." *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development* 2, no. 3 (2012): 137-147.
- Gutiérrez, José. "PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH (PAR) AND THE COLOMBIAN PEASANT RESERVE ZONES: THE LEGACY OF ORLANDO FALS BORDA." *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review* 22 (2016).
- Haluk Koksak, Mehmet. "Assessing Demand by AUB Faculty and Staff for Housing in Ras Beirut." (2008).
- Hamadeh, Shadi, Salwa Tohmé Tawk, and M. Abi Said. "UA and Food Security in the Middle Eastern Context: A Case Study from Lebanon and Jordan." *Babar and S. Mirgani (eds.) Food Security in the Middle East* (2014).
- Harkavy, Ira, E. Birch, G. Alperovitz, N. Cantor, G. Clancy, C. Coletta, and J. Weeks. "Anchor institutions as partners in building successful communities and local economies." *Retooling HUD for a catalytic federal government: A report to Secretary Shaun Donovan* (2009): 147-169.
- Hart, Angie, Simon Northmore, and Chloe Gerhardt. "Briefing paper: Auditing, benchmarking and evaluating public engagement." *National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, Bristol* (2009).
- Harrigan, Jane. "Did food prices plant the seeds of the Arab Spring?." *SOAS Inaugural Lecture series, www. SOAS. Inaugural lecture series* (2011).
- Heslin, Peter A., and Jenna D. Ochoa. "Understanding and developing strategic corporate social responsibility." *Organizational Dynamics* 37 (2008): 125-144.
- Hinrichs, Cynthia Clare. "Introduction: Practice and place in remaking the food system." In *Remaking the North American food system: Strategies for sustainability*, pp. 1-15. University of Nebraska Press, 2008.
- Hodges, Rita Axelroth, and Steve Dubb. *The road halftraveled: University engagement at a crossroads*. Michigan State University Press, 2012.
- Hood, Jim. *An Examination of the Relationship between Campus Involvement and Perception of Community among Seniors Attending Mississippi's Public Universities*. ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106, 2013.

- Hou, Jeffrey, Julie Johnson, and Laura J. Lawson. *Greening cities, growing communities*. Landscape Architecture Foundation in association with University of Washington Press, Seattle & London, 2009.
- Huesca, Robert. "Tracing the history of participatory communication approaches to development: A critical appraisal." *Communication for development and social change* (2008): 180-198.
- Ibrahim, Barbara. "The Role of Higher Education in Societal Transformation in Arab States." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Ife, James William, and Meg Smith. *Community development: Creating community alternatives-vision, analysis and practice*. Vol. 182. Melbourne: longman, 1995.
- Jackson, Tim. "Motivating sustainable consumption: A review of evidence on consumer behaviour and behavioural change." *Sustainable development research network* 29 (2005): 30.
- Jordan, Lisa C., G. Anne Bogat, and Gloria Smith. "Collaborating for social change: The Black psychologist and the Black community." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29, no. 4 (2001): 599-620.
- Jason, Leonard. *Community building: Values for a sustainable future*. Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997.
- Kahane, Rémi, Ludovic Temple, Pierre Brat, and Hubert De Bon. "Les légumes feuilles des pays tropicaux: diversité, richesse économique et valeur santé dans un contexte très fragile." (2005).
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State, Land-Grant Universities, National Association of State Universities, and Land-Grant Colleges. *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Vol. 3. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Office of Public Affairs, 1999.
- Kessler, A., and J. Helbig. "Adding value to compost from urban household and market refuse in Lomé." *Waste Composting for Urban and Peri-UA-Closing the rural-urban nutrient cycle in Sub-Saharan Africa* (2001): 133-136.
- Kilani, Hala, Serhal, Assaad, Llewellyn, Othman, Abd-ar-Rahman. "Al Hima: A Way of Life" *IUCN, Regional Office for West, Central Asia and North Africa, Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon (SPNL), LB*. 2007
- Kirby, E. (2008). Seeing green. In E. Kirby & E. Peters (Eds.), *Community gardening* (pp. 6–17). Brooklyn: Brooklyn Botanic Garden.
- Krikser, Thomas, Annette Piorr, Regine Berges, and Ina Opitz. "Urban agriculture oriented towards self-supply, social and commercial purpose: A typology." *Land* 5, no. 3 (2016): 28.

- Kromer, John, and Lucy Kerman. *West Philadelphia initiatives: A case study in urban revitalization*. University of Pennsylvania, Fels Institute of Government, 2005.
- Lampietti, Julian A., Sean Michaels, Nicholas Magnan, Alex F. McCalla, Maurice Saade, and Nadim Khouri. "A strategic framework for improving food security in Arab countries." *Food Security* 3, no. 1 (2011): 7-22.
- Langhout, Regina Day, Julian Rappaport, and Doretha Simmons. "Integrating community into the classroom: Community gardening, community involvement, and project-based learning." *Urban Education* 37, no. 3 (2002): 323-349.
- Leitao, Joao, and Maria José Silva. "CSR and Social Marketing: What is the desired role for Universities in fostering Public Policies?" (2007).
- Levkoe, Charles Z. "Learning democracy through food justice movements." *Agriculture and human values* 23, no. 1 (2006): 89-98.
- Levkoe, Charles Z. "The food movement in Canada: A social movement network perspective." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 41, no. 3 (2014): 385-403.
- Levkoe, C. Z., McClintock, N., Minkoff-Zern, L. A., Coplen, A. K., Gaddis, J., Lo, J., F. Tendick-Matesanz & Weiler, A.M. (2016). Forging links between food chain labor activists and academics. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 6(2), 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2016.062.009>
- Liddie, Kristine M. "What Motivates People to Volunteer: A Case Study Using Coastal Cleanup Day in San Luis Obispo, California." (2010).
- Lucas, Kevin, and Barbara Lloyd. "Starting smoking: Girls' explanations of the influence of peers." *Journal of Adolescence* 22, no. 5 (1999): 647-655.
- Mabsout, Mounir. "Inception Report: Moving Forward and Looking Ahead." *The AUB Center for Civic Engagement and Community Service* (2008).
- Mabsout, Mounir. "Summary Report: The First Year (March-December 2008)." *The AUB Center for Civic Engagement and Community Service* (2009).
- Makhzoumi, Jala. "Greening AUB's Neighborhood I." (2008).
- Marín, Gerardo. "Defining culturally appropriate community interventions: Hispanics as a case study." *Journal of Community Psychology* 21, no. 2 (1993): 149-161.
- Martin, Adrienne, Nicolien Oudwater, and S. Gundel. "Methodologies for situation analysis in urban agriculture." In e-Conference on Appropriate Methodologies for Urban Agriculture: Research, Policy Development, Planning, Implementation and Evaluation, pp. 4-16. 2002.
- Marullo, S., and B. Edwards. "The potential of university-community collaborations for social change." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (2000): 895-912.

- Mattessich, Paul W., and Barbara R. Monsey. *Collaboration: what makes it work. A review of research literature on factors influencing successful collaboration*. Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 919 Lafond, St. Paul, MN 55104., 1992.
- Mauro, Tracy. "Helping Organizations Build Community." *T+ D56*, no. 2 (2002): 52-58.
- Maurrasse, David J. *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. Routledge, 2002.
- Maurrasse, David. "City anchors: Leveraging anchor institutions for urban success." *CEOs for Cities, White Paper. September* (2007).
- Mawois, Marie, Christine Aubry, and Marianne Le Bail. "Can farmers extend their cultivation areas in UA? A contribution from agronomic analysis of market gardening systems around Mahajanga (Madagascar)." *Land Use Policy* 28, no. 2 (2011): 434-445.
- Maxwell, Daniel, Carol Levin, and Joanne Csete. "Does UA help prevent malnutrition? Evidence from Kampala." *Food policy* 23, no. 5 (1998): 411-424.
- McDonald, James, and Lynn A. Dominguez. "Developing university and community partnerships: A critical piece of successful service learning." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 44, no. 3 (2015).
- Meenar, Mahbubur, Alfonso Morales, and Leonard Bonarek. "Regulatory practices of UA: a connection to planning and policy." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 83, no. 4 (2017): 389-403.
- Merton, Robert K. "The focussed interview and focus groups: Continuities and discontinuities." *The Public opinion quarterly* 51, no. 4 (1987): 550-566.
- Mitchell, Tania D. "Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 14, no. 2 (2008): 50-65.
- Mojtahedi, Mina C., Patty Boblick, James H. Rimmer, Jennifer L. Rowland, Robin A. Jones, and Carol L. Braunschweig. "Environmental barriers to and availability of healthy foods for people with mobility disabilities living in urban and suburban neighborhoods." *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation* 89, no. 11 (2008): 2174-2179.
- Mooney, Linda A., and Bob Edwards. "Experiential learning in sociology: Service learning and other community-based learning initiatives." *Teaching Sociology* (2001): 181-194.
- Morgan, David L. *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Vol. 16. Sage publications, 1996.
- Moses, Rebekah. "The current status of agricultural extension in Lebanon's Beqa'a Valley: key actors, major challenges, and opportunities in the re-establishment of public

sector extension International Agricultural Development Graduate Group." *University of California, Davis Google Scholar* (2011).

Mougeot, Luc JA, ed. *Agropolis: The social, political, and environmental dimensions of UA*. IDRC, 2005.

Mougeot, Luc JA. "UA: Definition, presence, potentials and risks, and policy challenges." *Cities feeding people series; rept. 31* (2000).

Nations, United. "World Population Prospects The 2012 Revision Volume I: Comprehensive Tables." *Econ Soc Aff [Internet]* (2013).

Nelson, Geoffrey, Isaac Prilleltensky, and Heather MacGillivray. "Building value-based partnerships: Toward solidarity with oppressed groups." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29, no. 5 (2001): 649-677.

Niemi, Richard G., and Jane Junn. *Civic education: What makes students learn*. Yale University Press, 2005.

Niewolny, Kim L., Julie M. Grossman, Carmen J. Byker, Jennifer L. Helms, Susan F. Clark, Julie A. Cotton, and Krista L. Jacobsen. "Sustainable agriculture education and civic engagement: The significance of community-university partnerships in the new agricultural paradigm." *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development* 2, no. 3 (2012): 27-42.

Novo, Mario Gonzalez, and Catherine Murphy. "UA in the city of Havana: A popular response to a crisis." *Bakker N., Dubbeling M., Gündel S., Sabel-Koshella U., de Zeeuw H. Growing cities, growing food. UA on the policy agenda. Feldafing, Germany: Zentralstelle für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft (ZEL)* (2000): 329-346.

Oberholtzer, Lydia, and Shelly Grow. "Producer-only farmers' markets in the mid-atlantic region." *Retrieved September 21* (2003): 2010.

O'Raghallaigh, Paidi, David Sammon, and Ciaran Murphy. "Theory-building using Typologies-A Worked Example of Building a Typology of Knowledge Activities for Innovation." In *DSS*, pp. 371-382. 2010.

Orr, D. (1991). What is education for? Six myths about the foundations of modern education and six new principles to replace them. In *Context*, 27, 52. Retrieved November 2, 2012, from <http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC27/Orr.htm>

Orsini, F., N. Michelin, F. Scocozza, and G. Gianquinto. "Farmers-to-consumers: an example of sustainable soilless horticulture in urban and peri-urban areas." In *International Symposium on the Socio-Economic Impact of Modern Vegetable Production Technology in Tropical Asia* 809, pp. 209-220. 2008.

Orsini, Francesco, Remi Kahane, Remi Nono-Womdim, and Giorgio Gianquinto. "UA in the developing world: a review." *Agronomy for sustainable development* 33, no. 4 (2013): 695-720.

- Panel-Ramond, Jean. "Partnership: Myth or reality?." *Community Development Journal* 27, no. 2 (1992): 156-165.
- Pachauri, Rajendra K., Myles R. Allen, Vicente R. Barros, John Broome, Wolfgang Cramer, Renate Christ, John A. Church et al. Climate change 2014: synthesis report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Ipcc, 2014.
- Perkins, Douglas D., and Abraham Wandersman. "'You'll have to work to overcome our suspicions': the benefits and pitfalls of research with community organizations." *Social Policy* 21 (1991): 32-41.
- Perry, David C. "Changing the research paradigm: From applied to engaged." In *University as Civic Partner Conference*. 2008.
- Pinderhughes, Raquel. "Poverty and the environment: The urban agriculture connection." *Natural assets: Democratizing environmental ownership* (2003): 299-312.
- Poppendieck, Janet. *Sweet charity?: Emergency food and the end of entitlement*. Penguin, 1999.
- Pothukuchi, Kameshwari, and Samuel A. Molnar. "Sustainable food systems at urban public universities: a survey of U-21 universities." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 37, no. 3 (2015): 341-359.
- Putnam, Robert. "The prosperous community: Social capital and public life." *The american prospect* 13, no. Spring), Vol. 4.
- Putnam, Robert D. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and schuster, 2000.
- Reardon, Kenneth M. "An experiential approach to creating an effective community-university partnership: The East St. Louis Action Research Project." *Cityscape* (2000): 59-74.
- Redwood, Mark, ed. *Agriculture in urban planning: generating livelihoods and food security*. Routledge, 2012.
- Rodin, Judith. *The university and urban revival: Out of the ivory tower and into the streets*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.
- Roper, Carolyn D., and Marilyn A. Hirth. "A history of change in the third mission of higher education: The evolution of one-way service to interactive engagement." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 10, no. 3 (2005): 3-21
- "Rooftop Gardens for a Palestinian Refugee Camp in Lebanon." ANERA. <https://www.anera.org/stories/nahr-el-bared-palestinian-refugee-camp-lebanon/> (accessed on May 8, 2017).

- Roussos, Stergios Tsai, and Stephen B. Fawcett. "A review of collaborative partnerships as a strategy for improving community health." *Annual review of public health* 21, no. 1 (2000): 369-402.
- Russell, Jill F., and Richard B. Flynn. "Setting the stage for collaboration." *Peabody Journal of Education* 75, no. 3 (2000): 1-5.
- Sandmann, Lorilee R., and David J. Weerts. "Reshaping institutional boundaries to accommodate an engagement agenda." *Innovative Higher Education* 33, no. 3 (2008): 181-196.
- SANTANDREU, A. (2001), El Diagnóstico Visual Rápido: una metodología rápida, barata y participativa de diagnóstico en agricultura urbana, Workshop on Appropriate Methodologies in Urban agriculture Research, Planning, Implementation and Evaluation, 1-7 October 2001, Nairobi, Kenya
- Sargent, Leisa D., and Lea E. Waters. "Careers and academic research collaborations: An inductive process framework for understanding successful collaborations." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 64, no. 2 (2004): 308-319.
- Scoones, Ian, and John Thompson. *Beyond farmer first: rural people's knowledge, agricultural research and extension practice*. No. BOOK. Intermediate Technology Publications, 1994.
- Selener, Daniel. *Participatory action research and social change*. No. Ed. 2. The Cornell Participatory Action Research Network, Cornell University, 1997.
- Selvaraju, Ramasamy. "Implications of climate change for agriculture and food security in the Western Asia and Northern Africa region." In *Climate Change and Food Security in West Asia and North Africa*, pp. 27-51. Springer, Dordrecht, 2013.
- Serrano-García, Irma. "Implementing research: Putting our values to work." (1990).
- Silka, Linda. "Paradoxes of partnerships: Reflections on university-community collaborations." *Research in Politics and Society* 7 (1999): 335-359.
- Sivakumar, Mannava VK, Rattan Lal, Ramasamy Selvaraju, and Ibrahim Hamdan, eds. *Climate change and food security in West Asia and North Africa*. Springer Netherlands, 2013.
- Slattery, Eric L., Courtney CJ Voelker, Brian Nussenbaum, Jason T. Rich, Randal C. Paniello, and J. Gail Neely. "A practical guide to surveys and questionnaires." *Otolaryngology--Head and Neck Surgery* 144, no. 6 (2011): 831-837.
- Smit, Jac, and Martin Bailkey. "UA and the building of communities." *Cities farming for the future: UA for green and productive cities* (2006): 145-170.

- Smit, Jac, Joe Nasr, and Annu Ratta. "UA: food, jobs and sustainable cities." *New York, USA 2* (1996): 35-37.
- Smith, I. F., Pablo Eyzaguirre, and Bioersivity International. "African leafy vegetables: their role in the world health organization's global fruit and vegetables initiative." *Developing Afrcan leafy vegetables for improved nutrition*(2005).
- Strand, Kerry J., Nicholas Cutforth, Randy Stoecker, Sam Marullo, and Patrick Donohue. *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
- Suarez-Balcazar, Y., G. Harper, and R. Lewis. "An interactive and contextual model of university-community partnerships." *Manuscript submitted for publication* (2002).
- Suarez-Balcazar, Yolanda, Margaret I. Davis, Joseph Ferrari, Philip Nyden, Bradley Olson, Jsefina Alvarez, Paul Molloy, and Paul Toro. "University-community partnerships: A framework and an exemplar." *Participatory community research: Theories and methods in action* (2004): 105-120.
- Sungu-Eryilmaz, Yesim. *Town-gown collaboration in land use and development*. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2009.
- Swords, Alicia CS, and Richard Kiely. "Beyond pedagogy: Service learning as movement building in higher education." *Journal of Community Practice* 18, no. 2-3 (2010): 148-170.
- Swords, Alicia, Amy Frith, and Julia Lapp. "Community-Campus Collaborations for Food Justice." *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development* 8, no. A (2018): 261-277.
- Task Force for Reconstruction and Community Service (2007) Draft Proposal. Establishment of a Center for Community Service at AUB.
- Thomas, Nancy L. "The institution as a citizen: How colleges and universities enhance their civic roles." (1998).
- Tixier, Philippe, and Hubert De Bon. "Urban horticulture." *Cities farming for the future: UA for green and productive cities*. Ottawa: ETC-UA/RUAF, IDRC (2006).
- Tolbert, C. M., Irwin, M. D., Lyson, T. A., & Nucci, A. R. (2002). Civic community in small-town America: How civic welfare is influenced by local capitalism and civic engagement. *Rural Sociology*. 67(1), 90–113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2002.tb00095.x>
- Too, Linda, and Bhishna Bajracharya. "Sustainable campus: engaging the community in sustainability." *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* (2015).
- Vidal, Avis, Nancy Nye, Christopher Walker, Carlos Manjarrez, Clare Romanik, Patrick Corvington, Kadija Ferryman, Stefan Freiberg, and Davis Kim. "Lessons from the community outreach partnership center program." *Washington, DC: Urban Institute* (2002).

- Wadkins, Thomas. "Bringing Urban Agriculture to the University of Cincinnati." PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 2012.
- Waha, Katharina, Linda Krummenauer, Sophie Adams, Valentin Aich, Florent Baarsch, Dim Coumou, Marianela Fader et al. "Climate change impacts in the Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA) region and their implications for vulnerable population groups." *Regional Environmental Change* 17, no. 6 (2017): 1623-1638.
- Walshok, Mary L. "Strategies for building the infrastructure that supports the engaged campus." *Colleges and universities as citizens* (1999): 74-95.
- Wakefield, Sarah EL. "Reflective action in the academy: Exploring praxis in critical geography using a "food movement" case study." *Antipode* 39, no. 2 (2007): 331-354.
- Ward, Kelly, and Lisa Wolf-Wendel. "Community-centered service learning: Moving from doing for to doing with." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43, no. 5 (2000): 767-780.
- Weerts, David J., and Lorilee R. Sandmann. "Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities." *The Review of Higher Education* 32, no. 1 (2008): 73-106.
- White, Geoffrey D. *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. Prometheus Books, 59 John Glenn Drive, Amherst, NY 14228-2197, 2000.
- WHO. "Guidelines for the safe use of wastewater, excreta and greywater: Volume II." (2006).
- Wiewel, Wim, and Michael Lieber. "Goal achievement, relationship building, and incrementalism: The challenges of university-community partnerships." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17, no. 4 (1998): 291-301.
- Wilson, Chauncey. *Interview techniques for UX practitioners: A user-centered design method*. Newnes, 2013.
- World Bank (2008b). World Bank online database. Washington: WorldBank. www.worldbank.org/data. Accessed 10 November 2019.
- Yoon, Chin Saik. "Participatory communication for development." Bessette, G. and CV Rajasundaram. *Participatory Development Communication: A West African Agenda*. Ottawa: IDRC (1996).
- Zeza, Alberto, and Luca Tasciotti. "UA, poverty, and food security: Empirical evidence from a sample of developing countries." *Food policy* 35, no. 4 (2010): 265-273.
- Zlotkowski, Edward. "A new voice at the table? Linking service-learning and the academy." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 28, no. 1 (1996): 20-27.
- Zlotkowski, Edward. *Successful Service-Learning Programs. New Models of Excellence in Higher Education*. Anker Publishing Company, Inc. 176 Ballville Road, PO Box 249, Bolton, MA 01740-0249, 1998.

Zlotkowski, Edward. "Pedagogy and engagement." *Colleges and universities as citizens* (1999): 96-120.

Zurayk, Rami. "AREC and community development." Task Force for Reconstruction and Community Service (2007) Draft Proposal. Establishment of a Center for Community Service at AUB (2009).

