**Resisting and assisting engagement with public welfare in engineering education**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study ID** | **indicators** | **methods** | **scale** | **practices** |
| ID75 | Engagement with public welfare with three components:  (a) identity;  (b) knowledge; (c) practice | Interviews and ethnographic observations | No scales were applied. They have collected narrative data and based on content analysis the authors have identified four salient themes relating to the metric of engagement with public welfare. | The study explored how students adopted, rejected, and grappled with public welfare engagement efforts in two  engineering programs. The research included 26 in-depth interviews with students and 110 hours of observation of 60 different program  events.  Good practice: the angle of the study (the focus was on students); the nature of the metrics (the so-called progressive metrics) |

This study is particularly interesting because it focuses on progressive metrics or indicators. As Bauer et al. argued„ such progressive metrics are intended to measure progress in areas where there is a need for development, but where neither traditional metrics nor next generation metrics capture the essence of it” (2020, p. 10). What makes it more relevant is the fact that it approaches engagement with public welfare which involves seeking an understanding of the complex beneficial and detrimental effects that engineering has on society. More importantly, the subject of developing engagement with public welfare is reflected from a student perspective rather than a community perspective.