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Two separate knowledge and policy communities…

**Domain:** Education and Research  
**Focus:** University as an institution  
**Seeking:** International Academic Excellence

---

**Domain:** Territorial Development  
**Focus:** City and regional development  
**Seeking:** Answers to societal ills
This book is based on original research into the experience of the UK and selected English provincial cities, with a focus on the role of universities in addressing the challenges of environmental sustainability, health and cultural development.

The case studies are set in the context of reviews of the international evidence on the links between universities and the urban economy, their role in ‘place making’ and in the local community.
Looking outwards from the university to society, 2016

An edited volume of case studies of 8 eight institutions in four European countries (Newcastle, University College London, Amsterdam, Groningen, Aalto, Tampere, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin Institute of Technology)

The focus is on the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of civic engagement, particularly the vision and mission, leadership, management and governance, organisation, financial and human resource policies and practises required to mobilise the academic community to meet the needs of the wider society locally, nationally and globally.
Universities as urban anchor institutions
Policy perspective: Universities as urban ‘anchor’ institutions

- ‘Anchor institutions’ are large locally embedded institutions, typically non-governmental public sector, cultural or other civic institutions that are of significant importance to the economy and the wider community life of the cities in which they are based.
- They generate positive externalities and relationships that can support or ‘anchor’ global economic activity in the locality.
- ‘Anchor institutions do not have a democratic mandate and their primary missions do not involve regeneration or local economic development. Nonetheless their scale, local rootedness and community links are such that they can play a key role in local development and economic growth representing the ‘sticky capital’ around which economic growth strategies can be built’ (UK Work Foundation).
- Institutions that are of the city not just in the city.
What does anchoring imply for universities?

• Relationships with other institutions that inhabit the city

• Normative questions about the need for academic practise (research & teaching) to be of relevance to the place in which practitioners live and work as citizens

• Exploration of a more broadly conceived territorial development process than just economic growth and competitiveness

• Interrelated physical, social and cultural dimensions
Tensioned themes
The normative question


“Why do so many scientists ignore the needs of our cities...researchers who benefit from the opportunities in cities should ask what can they give back” (pp 83-84)
The University and the public good

• “We treat our opportunities to do research not as a public trust but as a reward for success in past studies”

• “Rewards for research are deeply tied up with the production of academic hierarchy and the relative standing of institutions” BUT

• “Public support for universities is based on the effort to educate citizens in general, to share knowledge, to distribute it as widely as possible in accord with publically articulated purposes”

The public value of the social sciences

“Use of the adjective ‘public’ not only implies fundamental questions about accountability but also poses additional queries about to whom we as social scientists should feel accountable...Public social science has both a research and teaching agenda and involves a commitment to promote the public good through civic engagement”

Tensioned themes in the academic literature and policy on universities and cities

- **Passive** local physical, social and economic impacts (campus footprint, students in the city, employment generation) *vis a vis* active engagement in the development of the city

- Economic *vis a vis* more holistic views of engagement with civil society (community development, social inclusion, urban governance, health and well being, cultural life)

- The ‘external’ civic role of the university *vis a vis* ‘internal’ processes within the university and state higher education policies that shape these external relations
Thomas Bender on the University and the City

• “I propose that we understand the university as semi-cloistered heterogeneity in the midst of uncloistered heterogeneity (that is to say the city…). Because of this difference, relations between the two are necessarily tense, and they cannot be assimilated into one another. To do so, either practically or conceptually, is to empty each of its distinctive cultural meaning and falsify the sociology of each” (Bender 1988)
Elaboration of the themes

• The university as an institution *AND* a set of academic sub-groups (a loosely coupled organisation)

• The role of physical sites and regeneration projects in facilitating *or inhibiting* university economic and community engagement in the city

• Inter institutional relationships between multiple universities and other HEIs especially in large cities

• The inter-disciplinarity of many urban challenges and the institutional tension with existing disciplinary based academic structures (e.g sustainable or age friendly cities)

• The role of intermediary organisations inside OR outside of the university in linking the university and the city (e.g. Technology Transfer Offices / science park organisations/ on or off- campus theatres)

• The city and its various communities as *collaborators* or passive sources for academic research, teaching and knowledge exchange
Universities and the development of cities
Universities and the development OF cities

1. Place and community

2. Innovation and urban economic development

3. Social development

4. Opening out the university ‘black box’
Place and Community

- Expansion of HE in the 20th / 21st Centuries an important dynamic in the physical development of cities – including new university cities
- Suburbanisation of campuses and/or spatial fragmentation in large cities
- The traditional campus as a ‘semi-cloistered ‘ space in the midst of the city dedicated to meeting the work and leisure needs of student and academic communities
- But more recent pressures to open out the campus to the city
- University estate development practises reconciling the competing demands for teaching and research space and student accommodation with those of external communities
- University use of the status of an embedded “anchor institution” to lever non- HE funding for capital projects
Buildings and spaces that are conducive to collaborative innovative research: geography matters


+ business partners, interns, business advisors…?
Universities as urban innovation actors

- Shift from mode 1 (linear) to mode 2 (co-production) knowledge creation and open innovation raises opportunities of relations with local actors from the city
- Multi-faceted functions of the university as an educational and cultural institution not just a knowledge producer
- Joining up direct commodification of knowledge via spin outs etc. with human capital upgrades in the urban labour market and social capital that builds trust and co-operative norms in local economic governance networks
- The “developmental” as well as “generative” role of universities
- University influence on the city based political, institutional and network factors that shape innovation processes beyond input of knowledge capital
The way we innovate is changing

Elberfelder Farbenfabriken vorm.
Friedrich Bayer & Co

Bell Labs, Holmdel, NJ

User innovation

Innovation in services

Social innovation

Open innovation
Open Innovation

• “Open Innovation 2.0 (OI2) is a new paradigm based on a Quadruple Helix Model where government, industry, academia and civil participants work together to co-create the future and drive structural changes far beyond the scope of what any one organization or person could do alone. This model encompasses also user-oriented innovation models to take full advantage of ideas' cross-fertilisation leading to experimentation and prototyping in real world setting”

• European Commission
Citizens and 3 Os strategy
Open Innovation, Open Science, and Open to the World

Open Innovation
"An invention becomes an innovation only if users become a part of the value creation process. Notions such as ‘user innovation’, as coined by Eric von Hippel, emphasize the role of citizens and users in the innovation processes as ‘distributed’ sources of knowledge. This kind of public engagement is one of the aims of the Responsible Research and Innovation programme in Horizon 2020."

Social innovations as processes and outcomes

• “Social innovations are innovations that are social in both their ends and their means…new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs (more effectively than alternatives) and create new social relationships or collaborations.

• The process of social interactions between individuals undertaken to reach certain outcomes is participative, involves a number of actors and stakeholders who have a vested interest in solving a social problem, and empowers the beneficiaries. It is in itself an outcome as it produces social capital” (BEPA, 2010: 9-10, italics added)
A critique of the linear model

• “It’s complicated… Innovation happens in complex ecosystems. Too often, we imagine innovation in a linear way, as a pipe-line with inputs and outputs. But where we focus only on the pipeline, we miss the real needs of Europe’s more diverse and demand-driven innovators. We need more open collaboration, both globally and locally between citizens, governments and inventors at home”

• “Focus on People, Places and Processes. Europe needs better assets as well as a broader vision. We have to get back to basics: upskilling Europe’s people, using local strengths to underpin local innovation, and transforming public processes. Europe’s public sector must change faster. EU 1.0 cannot deliver Europe 2.0”.

• “Our innovation economy is not a Roman aqueduct but a muddy pond … it requires all actors, corporate, academic, civic and political”
The quadruple helix & digital

- “Quadruple Helix (QH), with its emphasis on broad cooperation in innovation, represents a shift towards systemic, open and user-centric innovation policy. An era of linear, top-down, expert driven development, production and services is giving way to different forms and levels of coproduction with consumers, customers and citizens.” (Arnkil, et al, 2010)
- “The shift towards social innovation also implies that the dynamics of ICT-innovation has changed. Innovation has shifted downstream and is becoming increasingly distributed; new stakeholder groups are joining the party, and combinatorial innovation is becoming an important source for rapid growth and commercial success. Continuous learning, exploration, co-creation, experimentation, collaborative demand articulation, and user contexts are becoming critical sources of knowledge for all actors in R&D & Innovation” (ISTAG 2010)
The triple helix + users model (Arnkil et.al)

- **Main goal of innovation activity**
  - To produce commercially successful high tech products and services

- **Type of innovation**
  - High tech innovations
  - Radical innovations

- **Initiators of innovation process**
  - Firms
  - Universities
  - Public authorities

- **Development/co-operation platform**
  - **High tech firms**
    - Develop commercial products and services
    - Utilize university research
    - Collects systematically information from user needs and user experiences
  - **Universities**
    - Produce internationally new knowledge relevant for the development of high tech applications
    - Train/produce high tech execs
  - **Public authorities**
    - Support the development of high tech firms
    - Support the development of university research relevant for high tech firms
    - Finance firm-university R&D projects

- **Users/citizens**
  - Give information about their needs and experiences
  - Test products/services at late development phase
The citizen centred quadruple helix model (Arnkill et.al)
Opening out the university black box
Business models of the university

• The **entrepreneurial university model** with a strengthened steering core, enhanced development periphery, a diversified funding base and stimulated academic heartland (Burton Clark 1998)

• The **academic capitalist model** with faculty engaging directly in competitive market like behaviour as state subsidised entrepreneurs, blurring the distinction between public and private (Slaughter and Leslie 1993)

• The **triple helix model** of universities, business and government with semi-autonomous centres that interface with the external environment supported by specialist internal units (e.g. technology transfer offices) and external intermediaries (e.g. technology and innovation centres) (Etzkowitz et. al. 2000)

• Strong focus on science, technology and business and a neglect of the humanities and social sciences, place based communities and civil society
The ‘Traditional’ University

The ‘Third Mission’ Activities

Hard Boundary between enabling and non enabling environments

Focus of management and leadership

Funding targets

The ‘Core’

The ‘Periphery’
The disconnected region

**PUBLIC SECTOR**

- Lack of coherence between national and regional/local policies
- Lack of political leadership
- Lack of a shared voice and vision at the regional/local level

**PRIVATE SECTOR**

- No coordination or representative voice with which to engage
- Motivated by narrow self interest and short term goals
- Dominated by firms with low demand or absorptive capacity for innovation

**HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR**

- Seen as ‘in’ the region but not ‘of’ the region
- Policies and practices discourage engagement
- Focus on rewards for academic research and teaching

**No boundary spanners**

- Focus on supply side, transactional interventions
- Ineffective or non existent partnership
- Lack of a shared understanding about the challenges
- Entrepreneurs ‘locked out’ of regional planning
The Civic University

Enhancement

Transformative, Responsive, Demand-led Action

Widening participation, community work

Socio-economic impact

THE ACADEMY

TEACHING

RESEARCH

ENGAGEMENT

SOCIETY

Soft Boundary
The ‘connected’ region

Generating intellectual and human capital assets for the region

Higher Education Sector

Developing coherent policies that link territorial development to innovation and higher education

Public Sector

Analysis of evidence and intelligence for planning

Evidence based policies that support ‘smart’ innovation and growth

Investing in people and ideas that will create growth

Private Sector

Skills development, commercialisation of research

Building the infrastructure for growth

The ‘connected’ region
Seven dimensions of the civic university

- Sense of Purpose
- Active Engagement
- Holistic Approach
- Sense of Place
- Willingness to Invest
- Transparency and Accountability
- Innovative Methodologies
The ‘Civic University’ Development Spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension X</th>
<th>Embryonic</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Evolving</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The spectrum describes the ‘journey’ of the institution against each of the 7 dimensions of the civic university towards the idealised model. It accepts that a university may be at a different stage of development on the different dimensions. This is intended to provide guidance in building a deeper understanding of where the university is currently positioned and help in future planning, and is NOT intended to be used as an assessment or ranking tool.
# Sense of Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embryonic</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Evolving</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution is ‘detached’ from the local environment with limited local linkages and lack of integration within the physical fabric.</td>
<td>There has been some ‘opening up’ of the campus to the local community but linkages are still relatively superficial.</td>
<td>Local communities are increasing using campus facilities the institution is making linkages with local businesses and groups to develop opportunities for research and placements etc.</td>
<td>The location of the institution is integral to its identity, it is viewed as an important asset by the local community, it physically ‘blends’ within the local built environment and is seen as a ‘living laboratory’ for research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The civic university as a normative model

- Not only excellent in terms of conventional academic criteria but also seeking to contribute to the public good.
- Responsibility to society is not new, but given greater saliency as the challenges facing society heighten in intensity.
- At the same time responding to the challenge of participating in a global higher education marketplace with its own internal logic in terms of competition for mobile students and academic staff.
- Managing the tensions between the demands from within and without higher education, including embedding external engagement into the internal process of managing the teaching and research undertaken by academic staff.
- Managing conflicting signals in the external policy environment, not least in terms of the degree of focus of national governments on the global higher education marketplace relative to contributions to society.
Designing the civic university

- Public role is (re)asserted through a set of top-down design principles matched by an intentionally wide scope for bottom-up creativity and entrepreneurship from faculty and non-academic staff.
- More complex interwoven structures which combine top-down and bottom-up decision-making and shared normative orientations being taken into discussions and practices by a range of actors inside and outside of the university.
- Innovative organisational structures, programmes, and activity-sets related to the pressing needs of society, interpretations of public values, and specific local and institutional contexts.
- Institutionalisation or stabilisation of new ways of working and de-institutionalising or modifying current behaviours, structures and procedures.
Academic practice
The Practice: How engaged is the academy?
UK Innovation Research Centre Survey of 22,000 UK academics -
External interaction and commercialisation activity (% of respondents)

The Urban Laboratory

- “The notion of treating our city and its region as a seedbed for sustainability initiatives is a potent one… the vision is of academics out in the community, working with local groups and businesses on practical initiatives to solve problems and promote sustainable development and growth’

- “This necessitates that we proceed in a very open manner, seeking to overcome barriers to thought, action and engagement; barriers between researchers and citizens, between the urban and the rural, between the social and natural sciences, between teaching research and enterprise”

Co-Director of Newcastle Institute for Research on Environmental Sustainability. Quoted in Goddard & Vallance, 2016
Academic leadership of place
Universities and the Leadership of Place
(Robin Hambleton)
NEWCASTLE CITY FUTURES 2065

ANCHORING UNIVERSITIES IN CITIES THROUGH URBAN FORESIGHT

Mark Tewdwr-Jones, John Goddard and Paul Cowie
Universities and the urban foresight process

• In the Foresight process universities and cities can identify assets and opportunities through:
  • the dissemination of existing data and intelligence to varied audiences;
  • the provision of new data and intelligence;
  • developing systems thinking across fragmented governance and delivery bodies;
  • promoting new networking relationships between actors and agencies;
  • undertaking futures work that relates more readily to circumstances in each city than thematic exercises relating
Capacity building

• A city futures perspective to get around all of the ‘here and now’ challenges of collaboration;
• A dedicated city futures partnership manager jointly between the universities and local authorities with access to senior officers in each organisation;
• Creation of a value added knowledge base linking primary research in HEI with policy and practice research produced by the public and private sector;
• A professional development programme for key individuals expected by institutional leaders to play a ‘boundary-spanning’ role between higher education and the city region, covering the ‘know what’ and ‘know how’ of futures work;
• An ‘action learning’ programme for those individuals around selected mid-term projects;
• Linkage of cities and universities nationally and internationally to create a community of practise around city futures.
Civic Universities: UK Policy context
NESTA Provocation, 2009

Reinventing the Civic University
Professor Emeritus John Goddard
PA Consulting Survey of VCs 2018

Significant number of institutional failures or closures
- Highly likely: 2
- Quite possible: 12
- Not very likely: 39
- Most unlikely: 47

Significant number of takeovers and mergers
- Highly likely: 4
- Quite possible: 25
- Not very likely: 53

Overall shrinking of provision and choices
- Highly likely: 18
- Quite possible: 57
- Not very likely: 25
- Most unlikely: 18

Greater stratification and specialisation of provision
- Highly likely: 25
- Quite possible: 47
- Not very likely: 37
- Most unlikely: 14

Substantial growth in institutional and academic alliances
- Highly likely: 37
- Quite possible: 56
- Not very likely: 14
- Most unlikely: 17

Substantial growth in commercial and business partnerships
- Highly likely: 49
- Quite possible: 37
- Not very likely: 27
- Most unlikely: 14
Higher Education Challenges: PA Consulting Survey of VCs 2018

- “The sector is at a pivot point. The very strong are getting stronger while the very weak are under considerable threat. Those in the middle are trying to figure whether to stick or twist. There could be carnage.”

- Expectations that some failures seemed inevitable were tempered by observations that many of the institutions known to be in difficulties from falling numbers and mounting losses were located in disadvantaged towns and cities where their closure would be politically and economically disastrous – notwithstanding the government’s rhetoric of institutions exiting the system.

- Yet the response of established providers, to judge from this survey, will be more of the same – consolidating around what they currently do most successfully, rather than rethinking their market propositions and business models for a different world. This seems likely to produce a more stratified and possibly smaller university sector but not a very different one.
Universities must become the Googles and Amazons of public life

“Universities must think beyond educational “products” and address how to ensure continued institutional involvement with the applications of knowledge and learning in the lives and work of individuals, organisations and communities. They must stop fixating on securing deficit funding to cover the costs of teaching and research and work out how to share in the far greater returns created from the outputs of those activities in business, public services and daily lives. And they must rise above the interests of their own stand-alone institutions to grow the roles of universities within interdependent systems of learning providers, businesses, public agencies and communities, working together to resolve shared needs and problems”

Mike Boxall (THES 15/3/18)
Truly Civic: Strengthening the connection between universities and their places

Context (1)

• Post 2008 crash austerity plus massive increase in fees
• Universities well resourced c.f. local government and able to support public services
• Widening economic and social disparities – left behind people and places
• Brexit and popularism: universities and ‘experts’ seen as part of the problem by leavers and Brexiteers
• Vice Chancellors salaries and perceived espousal of left wing causes
• Part of the evils of globalisation perceived to have undermined communities
• Universities lobbied to remain on grounds of narrow self interest – EU research funding
• HEA – greater emphasis on the H.E. market with the possibility of institutional failures in places where a university was an ‘anchor’ institution

• 2017 Election and Labour pledge to abolition fees leading to the Augar review

• Threat to support for non-core community services if fees are reduced

• ONS review of off balance sheet student debt ends myth that H.E is privately funded

• Over half university funding comes from the state means that universities will have to compete for public funding and justify what they do in return, not least for their communities

• Universities have the capability, opportunity and responsibility to respond to local needs not least to secure public support

• Places need successful universities and universities need vibrant and inclusive places
Methodology

- Focus groups in two cities
- UKGOV panel survey in 10 cities
- Written evidence and individual university visits
- Oral evidence in four cities – Manchester, Nottingham and Sheffield and Newcastle with universities and partners
- Themes – industrial strategy, internationalisation, health and well-being, culture
- Academic Roundtable
- Importance of territorial governance context and austerity in local government funding
CUC Focus Groups and written evidence

• “If I was paying out all of that money, I’d want it spent on me, not other people in the city”
• “Universities are now just another corporate entity there to make a profit”
• “They come, they study, they party, they go”
• “Institutions often suffer from a failure to listen. Too often, social action programmes are delivered without listening to key local actors and gaining understanding of the needs of local areas”
The Civic University: Alive but is it well?

- Lack of local accountability – ‘in’ but not ‘of’ the city
- Ignorance of local people about the contributions universities make to their community especially amongst less advantaged
- Fees for individual student benefit not public good
- Lots of bottom up engagement activity but a lack of strategic intent based on analysing and meeting needs of people who grow up, live and work locally, including for lifelong learning
- Short-term project funding mitigates against long term trust based collaborative partnerships including all schools and the community and voluntary sectors
- National funding silos mitigate against civic engagement: the metrics challenge
How do universities need to change to be truly civic institutions?

- Adoption of a holistic Engagement AND Place Strategy co-created with partners from the public, private and voluntary sectors and other local post 18 educational providers, including procedures for public accountability
- Clear internal processes for connecting teaching, research, internationalisation and civic engagement at Executive Board Level.
- An institutional framework that supports, recognises and rewards bottom up civic engagement and recognises this as part of normal business including the work of professional services
- Development of ‘blended professionals’ in finance, estates, communications etc. working with a research hub connected to the global discourse on universities and place and like minded institutions
- The locality as a site for co-creation of knowledge and a ‘living laboratory’
- Establishment of place based university foundation to support local public good actions
CIVIC UNIVERSITY TESTS

• **A public test:** Can people talk about ‘our university with pride and awareness? Is civic activity aligned to public wants/needs?

• **A place test:** How aligned is teaching and research to current and future local labour market needs? What populations is the university serving? How local and how diverse (including by age)? How are national T & R drivers/funding being used to meet local needs? (TEF, REF, UKRI)

• **A strategic test:** Can the university define the area it serves? Can it identify how it is linked to local leadership structures? Are plans based on shared analysis, priority setting and impact assessment?
1. The Civic University Agreement
2. Measuring and incentivising the success of the civic university
3. Funding the civic
4. Spreading good practise
5. What could be in a Civic University Agreement and how does government support it?
6. Civic Widening Participation and Attainment
7. A resurgence of adult education
8. A focus on recruitment, retention and attraction of public sector staff, especially in health
9. Strengthening local impact alongside international excellence
10. Role models as employer, procurers and brokers
11. Catalysts for local economic growth
12. A broadened strategy and narrative on culture underpinned by University Community Foundations
Civic universities should enshrine their analysis and strategy in a Civic University Agreement that is co-created and signed by other key partners

- Understanding local populations and asking them what they want.
- Understanding themselves.
- Working with other local anchor institutions, businesses and community organisations to agree where the short medium and long-term opportunities lie in a given area.
- A clear set of priorities.
- The output of all this strategic analysis, local engagement and prioritisation will be a clear plan of action. Part of this will include a funding plan.
Developing a framework for Civic University Agreements

- Working group of policy makers and practitioners from inside and outside of H.E (LGA, NHS, Arts Council, etc)
- On line survey of all signatories covering preparation of CUAs – what and how
- In depth interviews with selection of universities
- Consultation forum at UUK July 19
- Scoping a support hub to share knowledge and facilitate peer review
Place-based funding

By ‘place-based funding’ we mean targeted investment in defined geographic areas… That is, a package of support – which may comprise: multiple grants; particularly large investments; grants and additional activity (capacity building, networking, influencing work) – within a defined place.'

Appendix 1: Place-based funding framework

Using the findings from Phase One of our research, we produced a framework to support funders in the planning and implementation of place-based approaches. This is presented in the form of questions linked to key stages in the development of place-based working rationale, design and delivery. The aim is to help anticipate, address and resolve the challenges of place-based approaches in order to achieve their potential benefits.

The full framework and accompanying research report are available at www.ivar.org.uk
01. What does ‘place’ mean?

Street  District
Neighbourhood  Town
Ward  City
Village  Region
Borough  County

It’s important to develop a rationale for working in a specific place, thinking carefully about appropriate (and realistic) geographic scale, in order to fulfill, and deliver on, your ambition.

04. What is your attitude towards risk and uncertainty?

Risk averse  Comfortable with risk

This question focuses on your tolerance of failure/uncertainty. Place-based working takes time and outcomes may emerge slowly. Risk is about much more than due diligence and will need considering from multiple perspectives, for example: programme level; organisational level (for yourself as funder and for key partners); officer; lead; trustee; resident. It may be helpful to frame your place-based approach as exploratory and see ‘progress’ as a long-term journey.

02. Why are you considering, or using, a place-based approach?

Our research has found six overarching (and often overlapping) drivers for choosing to work in place:
1. To target a particular issue
2. To address cold spots
3. In response to changes in policy/external context
4. To test a model or approach
5. As a way of targeting areas of high deprivation
6. Because you are by definition a ‘place-based funder’ with a specific geographic remit/focus

05. What is your position on impact?

Tangible, measurable, difference  Learning about what happens

‘Success’ means different things to different funders. Place-based approaches can be an opportunity for learning and trying new ways of working. But this also means thinking about success in a different way: if you are embarking on exploratory or community-led work there may not be a predetermined end point to measure against, and different processes and monitoring systems will need to be in place.

03. What contribution are you seeking to make?

Responsive funding of ‘good things’  Building community assets  Strategic systems change

Understanding the contribution you hope to make will be closely linked to why you wish to work in a place-based way. Think about what you hope will happen. For example, are you looking to promote funds for services/projects that support people in the area, or are you looking to make investments towards systems change?

06. What is your existing knowledge of the area?

Low  High

Consider what you know, how you know it and what you might need to find out. There are different ways of doing this and it often depends on the scale of contribution.
07. What duration of involvement is required?

- Short-term
- Long-term

Consider how long you need to work in a place. Are you committing to working in an area in the long term or using geography to focus your work within a time limit? What are the implications for how long you need to be there and how to exit? Funding over multiple years can help give confidence to communities, enable a sense of security for organisations, and allow adaptation to new ways of working and building relationships.

08. Where will control sit?

- Fundar-driven
- Community-led

In answering this, you need to consider what is required to meet the overarching aims of the approach as well as the fit with your organisational values. Will the work be community-led or driven by what you – as a funder – have identified to focus on? Think about who has defined the need and response.

09. What will your role be?

- Arm’s length
- Embedded

Place-based working can be an opportunity to try new roles and reflect on what would best add value at different points in a programme. When working in this way it is crucial to communicate clearly about the role you intend to play and be aware of the implications this might have for others involved.

10. Who will you need to work with?

- Grantee only
- Multiple stakeholders

Relationships and partnerships working are a central feature of place-based approaches – whether in terms of having a trusted source of local information/insights or the co-design and delivery of initiatives. Place-based working is often about sharing power, respecting local knowledge, and a degree of pragmatism.

11. What kind of relationships are required?

- Contractual
- Relational/collaborative

What kind of relationship will help you to meet your motivation and desired contribution? Contractual (traditional grant-making), engaged (an informed and supportive grants process) or relational/collaborative (where you are working alongside grantees and other partners)?

12. What commitment of staff and trustee time/effort is needed?

- Low
- High

The commitment of staff and trustee time required in a place-based approach links closely with the choice of geographic focus, overall motivation and style of approach. Place-based working can be resource intensive; to engage meaningfully, and to work in a cooperative, exploratory way, takes time as well as skills.
Maximising universities’ civic contribution

A policy paper

John Goddard, Ellen Hazlekhorn with Stevie Upton and Tom Boland

November 2018
Wales Civic Mission Recommendations

1: Develop a strategic vision for the post-compulsory education and training system (PCET)
2: Use institutional compacts as a vehicle to promote civic engagement
3: Develop regional clusters of institutions as key enablers of regional development
4: Strengthen links within the PCET system and across the education system as a whole
5: Use civic engagement as an instrument to promote equity of access to higher education
6: Provide “seed” funding
VISION
NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY
We are a world-leading university, advancing knowledge, providing creative solutions and solving global problems

VALUES
EXCELLENCE  CREATIVITY  IMPACT

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
WORKING TOGETHER  VISIBLY LEADING  FREEDOM AND OPPORTUNITY TO SUCCEED  RESPONDING TO CURRENT AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

STRATEGIES
ENGAGEMENT AND PLACE
1  EDUCATION FOR LIFE
2  RESEARCH FOR DISCOVERY AND IMPACT
3
4  GLOBAL
Newcastle City Futures
Engagement & Place

- http://www.newcastlecityfutures.org/
- https://www.ncl.ac.uk/work-with-us/