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Speaker - Neal Juster: Good afternoon everybody, for those that don’t know me I’m Professor Neal Juster, Vice chancellor here at the University of Glasgow and thanks everyone for coming along to hear this lecture from our eminent guest Professor John Goddard OBE. I’ll do a very brief introduction because you are here to listen to him, not to me but it would be remiss of me not to point out some of the things that he has been successful in and which I presume will be part of his lecture on the Civic University and the City. Most importantly at the moment he is vice-chair of the Civic University Commission, trying to do some good work to up the civic engagement of universities across the UK. He’s a former deputy vice chancellor at Newcastle University but now has the wonderful title of Emeritus Professor of Regional Development Studies. He’s a founder and former leader of the Newcastle Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies and I think across the UK Newcastle has had the reputation for being a civically engaged university.

So looking forward to hearing about it, and link back to what’s happening in Newcastle, I guess you’re not going to forget about Newcastle at all in your lecture here; Glasgow is a good city as well by the way [audience laughter]. And he has worked all over the world including Ireland, Finland, The Netherlands and Iraq. He was awarded his OBE in 1986. And is an undergraduate of UCL and has a PhD from LSE. He is a very eminent speaker, I’m sure we’ll have a great lecture and have some questions at the end. Thank you John.

Speaker - Professor John Goddard:

Slide 1: The Civic University and the City

John Goddard, Emeritus Professor of Regional Development Studies, Formerly Deputy Vice Chancellor


Well thank you very much for inviting me. Just a little bit more about my biography in way, which is relevant to the topic. I was an academic working in a multi-disciplinary research centre on urban regional development. CURDS has its origin as a sort of spatial science research unit in Sussex where we try to think that innovation had a spatial dimension to it; you need to think about innovation as occurring in places, and we did a lot of work on that. We backed into the University as a source of innovation in our academic work and policy work. And then something really changed in the early ’90s when there was a commission on universities and the Lord Dearing review in 1996. The Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) - which was a predecessor for what is now called UUK (or in brackets Universities R Us) - that organisation came to us and said will you do a piece of work for us for input to the Dearing Review on universities and communities. So we had 10 people working on this, auditing what was going on – this was 30 years ago – on the civic role of universities.

Most of that went into the Dearing Review as an input and Dearing took it on board and had a whole chapter of his report. But many of his recommendations were not adopted and so the whole thing sort of went on the backburner. And subsequently, in 2000 we had a new VC in Newcastle, saw what we were doing and said ‘I want you to come from being the director of a research centre to being my DVC to translate some of your academic stuff in the practice of my university.’ So I went, I worked for 10 years, turning the theory and the policy stuff into practice as a new DVC, setting up Newcastle’s Science City, which came out of conversations we had with Gordon Brown when he was Chancellor. So we did a lot of work, and then I retired in 2008
when I was 65, and then went back into the academy doing academic work and research and policy and practice on all that sort of stuff. And I’m going to share with you some of my insights from that more recent period. But I would say, in the context of impact, I could not have written the stuff I have in books, if I had not, in practice, done it. So I learned from doing and so I think this whole process, by which the academy moves backwards and forwards between the world of thought and action, is pretty, pretty important.

Ok, I’m going to go through a lot of stuff. If you want to find out what I’m saying and you want to read it, that link there – QS Wow News - QS is the global rankings system for universities – you know that ranking system, league tables and all the rest of it. Out of the blue, they phoned me up and said they’re going around the world, and everywhere they are going collecting this data, everyone is talking about the civic university; how do universities re-engage with their communities is a global issue. And basically everything I am going to say, is in a more easy to consume form in that link, and it’s in a glossy magazine as well which will be in the VC’s office.

And the other thing I should say, partly why I am here and why this is a global issue; I spoke on platform in Torino with Anton Muscatelli. It was a conference on universities and cities. There are a lot of these conferences around the world, which this one was to bring together a European network of mayors of cities and vice chancellors or rectors of European universities, and I was the in-between, the bridge between those two worlds, and so out of that I discussed with Anton whether we could establish some sharing experience so that’s part of the reason I’m here.

Slide 2: Outline

- Research, policy & practice communities
- Universities as urban ‘anchor’ institutions
- Tensioned themes
- Universities and the development of cities
- Opening out the university ‘black box’
- International policy perspectives
- Academic practise
- Universities and the leadership of place
- UK policy context – The Civic University Commission, Civic University Agreements and learning from Wales
- Newcastle University Engagement & Place

So what I’m going to talk about is a lot of stuff and I’m going to go quite fast. Looking at the research, policy and practice communities; looking at universities as urban anchor institutions - and there are a lot of tensions in this, in the academic world and the city and regional development world - and think about the role of the universities in the development of cities, not just the university in the city but the development of the city. And my experience in my research, is that when I go and talk to local authorities and universities – I’ve done a lot of work around the world for the OECD and the European Commission - by and large the outside world doesn’t understand universities. They are ‘black boxes’ and the two worlds pass each other like ships in the night. By and large public authorities and municipalities don’t understand universities and, by and large, most universities don’t understand the cities and local government, so I’m going to open out the university black box.

The international policy context is evolving around that; what academics actually do as opposed to the practice, as opposed to the policy; something about the university on the leadership of place; an then end up with something from the Civic University Commission and particularly the civic university agreements...
which is one of our policy recommendations; and I’ve just got one slide on Newcastle. I’m not going to do a lot on Newcastle.

Slide 3: Two separate knowledge and policy communities...

Showing a see-saw diagram with the university at the top, pushing down, with this information

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

And the city at the bottom, pushing up, with this information

- Domain: Territorial Development
- Focus: City and regional development
- Seeking: Answers to societal ills

Ok, I think the first point, building on that, is that there are two separate knowledge and policy communities working here. There are the people who are interested, as I was, in the city and city and regional development, backed into the university as an institution for tackling some of the challenges confronting cities. On the other side is a whole body of... The policy domain around that tends to be people interested in city development, ministries responsible for cities and to a lesser degree those responsible for innovation... then the other body of knowledge a research is those people who study the university as an object of study and other policymakers around, and these two communities are totally separate. And I have spent most of my past 20 years straddling both of those worlds and its really quite challenging. You try putting a research proposal in to a research programme in higher education on city development and you’ll get knocked out of the research grant application by the people who are specialists in higher education research. And most the people interested in city and regional development – they will pooh-pooh the role of universities. It’s very interesting!

What have I done? I have written two books.

Slide 4: Cover of The University and the City by John Goddard and Paul Vallance, published by the Regional Studies Association and Routledge, and the text: “Looking into the university from the city, 2013. 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 into the university from the city, this is a book really that is an outside-in perspective, with a focus on the role of universities in tackling the challenges of environmental sustainability, health and cultural development with case studies of English cities.

Slide 5: Cover of The Civic University: The Policy and Leadership Challenges, edited by John Goddard, Ellen Hazeltorn, Louise Kempton, Paul Vallance, followed with the text “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.”

Then the next book I did was an inside-out perspective so these go to those wo policy communities. This is case studies of eight cities and the focus is on the what and how of civic engagement, particularly vision, mission, leadership, management, governance, organisation and human resources, and ‘how do you mobilise the academy and motivate the academy to work with their citizen communities?’ So that’s the second book and I’ll summarise some of the findings.

Slide 6: Universities as urban anchor institutions

The language - and I agree I could give a whole lecture on the language of anchor institutions but it has become the, and frankly I think we did coin it in the first book, the notion of the university as an anchor institution. It’s a concept that is quite helpful in bridging these two separate worlds.

Slide 7: 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

So anchor institutions – this was a definition that was originally developed by the UK Work Foundation – “Anchor institutions are large locally embedded institutions, typically non-governmental public sector, cultural or other civic institutions that are of significant importance to the community and” - I underline the and – “and the wider community life of the cities in which they are based.”

Two key phrases there – ‘locally embedded’ and ‘the economic and the social’ and so how do these two worlds come together? The classic example in the US is the discourse about what is called ‘eds and meds’. And so universities do not have a democratic mandate, our boards are not elected by the electorate, regeneration is not a core function of universities nevertheless our scale, local rootedness potential and community links are such that we can play a key role in local development and economic growth, and - a nice phrase here - in the context of the globalisation of the economy and society we still have sunk investment in our particular places and the scale of that is significant.

Slide 8: 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

So what does anchoring imply for universities? Well, it implies relationships with other institutions that inhabit the city.

Secondly, normative questions about the need for academic practice – research and teaching – to be relevant to the place in which the practitioners live and work as citizens. Now that’s quite a loaded phrase. Because I used to, when I was DVC, go round to the academy and say ‘what does it mean to you in terms of your research and teaching to be a citizen of Newcastle?’ ‘Oh I hadn’t really thought about that’. So this notion that you are a citizen as an academic of place is really quite important.

Thirdly, exploration of a more broadly conceived territorial development process than just economic growth and competitiveness. Most of the stuff about universities and cities has been about the economic impact, jobs generated, economic competitiveness. But it’s not just only about that; its also issues about social inclusion and community engagement.

And lastly, in thinking about anchoring you need to think about the physical imprint, you know, the buildings. It was an interesting experience this morning going to Olympia, I’m very interested in your science and innovation district, and social and cultural dimensions. And you can’t separate the economic, cultural, social, the built environment and it’s all interconnected.

Slide 9: Tensioned themes

Slide 10: The normative question. Nature Editorial (2010) “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” (pp83-84)

https://www.nature.com/articles/467883b

But there are tensions here. Let’s start with the normative question. A fantastic paper – way back in 2010 – in a top scientific journal called Nature where they wrote this piece, an editorial, asking ‘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’. That was stunning in my university. Many of the scientists were ‘hang on, wait a minute’. This was quite useful. This was their journal saying you’re benefitting from all the externalities, the vitality of the cities, what do you give back to it? Very interesting.

Slide 11: 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 researchers are deeply tied up with the production of academic hierarchy and the relative standing of institutions.”

“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 publicly articulated purposes.”


The reason why there’s not much, why academics, by and large, in certain universities turn their backs on the cities is this quote by Craig Calhoun who was the director of the London School of Economics

“We treat our opportunities to do research not as a public trust but as a reward for success in past studies. Rewards for researchers are deeply tied up with the production of academic hierarchy and the relative standing of institutions.”
So the whole hierarchy of universities – just a little anecdote to start with. The REF was introduced by Margaret Thatcher when Ken Baker who was Minister of Education. She wanted to classify universities into arts, research, and teaching institutions, and Ken Baker said you don’t need to do this from the top down, leave it to the academics – she wanted a hierarchy of institutions – the academics will produce it for you. [audience laughter] We produced the hierarchy through the REF and all the resource allocation that goes with it. So we’re guilty.

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 publicly articulated purposes”. Pretty important.

It’s in a journal called Thesis 11 and if you know your Marx, you’ll know what that thesis is about.

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0725513606060516

Slide 12: The public value of social sciences

“The 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.”

John Brewer: The public value of social sciences (2013)

Very interesting, a more recent book, is by John Brewer, in Belfast, a book on the public value of social sciences.

‘The 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’ – research and teaching – ‘and involves a commitment to promote the public good though civic engagement.’

So this is a challenge to the social scientists amongst us.

Slide 13: 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

But if you go and look at the literature, which I have reviewed, and there are endless papers about this and in the books. There’s quite a deal of tension in that. There’s a lot of emphasis on the economic impact of the university.

Loads and loads of money spent by universities with consultants saying how many jobs we generate, what’s the economic impact - and that is an important element – but it’s largely passive: we just happen to be here.

Versus an active engagement in the development of the city. To what extent is the university an active player in the development of the city, just not a passive player?
And economic versus a more holistic view is the engagement with civil society: community development, social inclusion, urban governance, health and wellbeing, and cultural life. So those are important holistically and that has to be in the ambit.

And the other bullet point, in the literature which I have already referred to, is the external civic role of the university; these are the internal processes in the university, and particularly, universities are mesmerised by state policies so we talked over lunch about the role of Scottish Funding Council, issues of research and the REF, and those systems, and so we are in those particular silos but there are other sets of agendas that are equally important.

Slide 14: 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)

I like this quote from the first book ever on the university and the city, by Thomas Bender, and I think it’s important that we understand that we don’t lose the identity of the university as an institution with in the city

He proposes that we understand the university as “semi-cloistered heterogeneity in the midst of uncloistered heterogeneity (that is to say the city...)”

Jane Jacobs and all that.

“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”

So what we’re saying is we have two entities – the city and the university – they are distinct but how you intertwine them is really very challenging.

Slide 15: 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

So elaborating on these themes, the university is an institution and a set of academic sub-groups. Most, you tend with universities like this one, are loosely coupled organisations.
The role of physical sites and regeneration projects – which we’ve been talking about today – in facilitating or inhibiting university economic and community engagement in the city. There are some science parks around the world which are basically not at all facilitating this boundary between the university. How you physically design these things is critically important.

Institutional relationships between multiple universities and other HEIs especially in large cities. We’ve had an interesting discourse here this morning about the universities in this city and how they are working together or not for the broader benefit of the city.

The inter-disciplinarity of many urban challenges and the institutional tension with existing disciplinary based academic structures. So if you take an example like an age-friendly city or a sustainable city those, by definition, are trans-disciplinary but we still sit mostly in disciplinary silos.

Next, the role of intermediary organisations inside or outside of the university in linking the university and the city. So, I had a fantastic morning at the Olympia site which seems to be a very good intermediary structure. For structures that are in or off campus, and you have many, inside the university, that are really quite challenging structures, particularly technology transfer organisations that are wedded to a linear model of research commercialisation, and relatively little support for the public engagement side.

Lastly you have the city and its various communities as collaborators. Or, as is often the case, passive sources for academic research, teaching and knowledge exchange so how do we collaborate with the external stakeholders in the co-production of knowledge?

Slide 16: Universities and the development of cities

OK let’s just unpack that a bit.

Slide 17: 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...

These are four themes in the book – the first book – and I haven’t got time to unpack all of these but I’ll just touch on some of them.

Slide 18: 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
Place and community: if you look at the history, it’s really very important. I didn’t realise that Glasgow University started off in the east end and moved into the city centre way back. I don’t think a lot of people know that so you have to understand the history of institutions and the development to their campuses.

And so we have new university cities, you have suburbanisation of campuses or the spatial fragmentation in large cities where you have multiple campuses.

I’m doing work with Birmingham University which is a campus university, doesn’t have a presence in the city centre. They acquired a building which is going to be their hub.

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. It is very, very interesting: all the money that has been invested as a result of fees in UK university campus, a competitive advantage has largely been fairly internally orientated. You know, how you make it a nice place for the students to come, and creating almost a separate world.

But there are pressures to open out the campus to the city. And where the university estate departments operate in all this is extremely interesting because they have their own dynamic, they do the estates. Once you start building buildings, I can tell you because we’ve built a big science centre, buildings get their own logic and the organisational processes are really quite challenging. And I was pleased to learn that there is a joint arrangement between the estates department in my university and the estates department in Glasgow University who are sharing experience, and I’ve only just found out about that, on how to do this sort of stuff.

And what quiet often happens is that universities want some extra money so they go to urban regeneration companies to get some money to do what they want to do and not what the urban regeneration companies want. So there are some quite tricky issues about how external funding is used in this domain.

Slide 19: Buildings and spaces that are conducive to collaborative innovative research: geography matters

Graphics showing geographical layout and networks of co-authorship and co-inventors

+ business partners, interns, business advisors...?

  https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179334

I threw this slide in because I do think – it’s from MIT – because part of the whole issue, and I and my colleague Georgiana Varna in planning and landscape at Newcastle and was here, the whole design of campuses is critically important in how you can get these different groups to come together, how your buildings are open to outside world. This from MIT shows for co-authorship, proximity matters, so actually how people get to together, not only within the academy but with the outside world. How you design buildings that are open to the outside world? I could go on at length about that!

Slide 20: 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

Then just a little bit about urban innovation. This is pretty well known I guess but basically the shift from mode 1 - linear – to mode 2 - co-production of knowledge and open innovation - raises opportunities of relations with local actors from the city.

So if you want to contribute to innovation you need to do some work with your local communities. And this implies that the university, multiple functions of the university, as an educational and cultural institution not just a knowledge producer. So I have been asking questions with my colleagues today in Glasgow ‘how does the work you’re doing get embedded in the learning and teaching programmes of the university?’ and we have uncovered a whole set of very interesting things about Masters dissertations with students working with community groups as part of their Masters programmes.

Joining up direct commodification of knowledge via spin-outs, which tends to be the focus of much of this stuff, with human capital development and the labour market – the skills agenda broadly speaking – we haven’t touched on that a lot but actually ‘how do you get - if you have innovations in the productive sphere – are you skilling people up to make use, in local companies, of those technologies?’

And also, very important this, the social capital that builds trust and -co-operative norms in local governance networks. What we have observed in many studies I have done of the universities is that this trust-based relationships take a long time to build. What tends to happen is that projects are funded, they are fixed term, you go in and do some work with communities and business and then you pull out again. And so this whole notion of building sustainable partnerships raises fundamental questions about how these sustainable relationships are funded. And this relates to, what is some times in the literature called, not just the generative role of the university in generating new models of knowledge, even with partners, but the developmental role of the university as a civic institution, its influence on the political, institutional and network factors that shape innovation processes beyond the narrow definition of knowledge capital and I think in this university – I’m going to flatter you now – it’s very important to have someone doing that sort of stuff in what Des [McNulty] does. You have someone who can walk between all of these worlds as an interlocutor in developing this broader perspective.

Slide 21: The way we innovate is changing

Picture of factory - Elberfelder Farbenfabriken vorm. Friedrich Bayer & Co - and of Bell Labs, Holmdel, NJ and an arrow pointing to other pictures labelled user innovation, innovation in services, social innovation and open innovation

And why is this all important? Because the way we are innovating is changing.

This is a Mickey Mouse slide from NESTA from a time ago but basically we are going from one model of innovation through to one where we have user innovation, innovation in services, social innovation and open innovation.

A lot of language about that and I could give you a whole lecture about this!

Slide 22: 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

But just a few headlines. Open innovation is (no longer) 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.’

So not just the university, not just the local government, not just business, not just citizens groups but the lot working together. It’s a ‘model that encompasses also user-oriented innovation models to take advantage of ideas' cross-fertilisation leading to experimentation’ - trying things out – you have the What Works centre here – ‘and prototyping in real world setting’.

That captures the sort of thing that I think is going on here, in a bit of, maybe, jargon.

Slide 23: 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."


I’m going to skip this.

Slide 24: 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)

And the other thing that comes up in the literature is social innovation; ‘innovations that are both social in their ends and means - new ideas, products, service and models’ - in the way in which services are delivered, particularly in the health area – ‘that simultaneously meet social needs (more effectively than alternatives) and create new social relationships or collaborations.’

So this whole notion of working together, participatively, to solve a social challenge empowers the actors to work together.

“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”

This is a very interesting slide. There’s a huge discourse out there in innovation literature about the death of the linear model and this is a lovely critique – how ‘our innovation economy is not a Roman aqueduct but a muddy pond … it requires all actors, corporate, academic, civic and political’.

So this report, European report, has been quite influential in thinking about how the European Commission operates in this space.

Slide 26: 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)

And much of this, and again I haven’t got time, to read this slide, you cannot think about all of this now without thinking about how digital technology is changing the way we work with external stakeholders. It’s fundamental.

Most of the citizens out there have access to smart phones, even most deprived people, and so the mechanisms about how innovations spread, What’s App, and all the rest of it, and various apps of various sorts. We have a big group in Newcastle of nearly 80 people, working on digital civics. How all of our relationships, with schools, with business, with civil society organisations, is increasingly being driven not just in AI and Big Data bit really pretty basic things.

Slide 27: The triple helix + users model (Arnkill et.al)

Shows a big circle labelled Development/co-operation platform. Inside the circle are three smaller circles. One is labelled ‘High tech firms’ and contains: Develop commercial products and services; Utilise university research; Collects systematically information from user needs and user experiences. The second circle is Universities: Produce internationally new knowledge relevant for the development of high-tech applications; Train / produce high tech experts. The bottom circle, which touches the other two, is 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. On the edge of the big circle is
Users/Citizens: Give information about their needs and experiences; Test products/services at late development phase.

At the side are three boxes on top of each other. Box one is Main goal of innovation activity: To Produce commercially successful high tech products and services. Box two is Type of Innovation: High Tech innovations; Radical Innovations. Box three is Initiators of innovations processes: Firms; Universities; Public authorities.

I’m going to skip over this. Well just a quick point about it. We tend to see about this as a triple helix – hi-tech firms, university and public authorities, delivering on platforms - that’s another bit of the language – platformed by which these collaborations are supported. And in a way users and citizens are out there - on the far right hand corner.

Slide 28: The citizen centred quadruple helix model (Arkkill et.al)

Shows a big circle labelled Development/co-operation platform. Inside the circle are three smaller circles and one more in the centre that overlaps the other three. The centre circle is labelled Citizens and contains: Create citizen relevant innovations; Decide which innovations are needed/developed. The first of the three outer circles is labelled ‘Firms’ and contains: Develop commercial products and services from citizens innovations; Support citizens’ innovation activities. The second is Universities, polytechnics and contains: Support citizens’ innovation activities; Support firms and public authorities in the utilisation of citizens’ innovations. At the bottom is Public Authorities, which contains: Support the development of citizen innovation; Provide tools and skills; offer dialogue forums to citizens and forums to participate in decision-making.

At the side are three boxes on top of each other. Box one is Main goal of innovation activity: To produce products and services relevant for citizens. Box two is Type of Innovation: Innovations relevant for citizens. Box three is Initiators of innovations processes: Citizens.

But the model which I’m particularly interested in is a citizens-centred quadruple helix one where citizens are relevant and contribute to the whole innovation process. And a very interesting example that I heard about this morning is about citizens come in, citizens groups come into the university with projects where they wanted research carried on, and I can’t remember with group it was but it was a very interesting idea that the citizens come in, you then get the firms involved, you get the universities and the public authorities. And this whole idea of how to produce products and service relevant for citizens. Innovations relevant for citizens, and they are part of the co-production process.

Slide 29: Opening out the university black box

So now coming to opening out the university black box

Slide 30: 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

If you read the literature, the academic literature on the universities, you get these sorts of things.

The entrepreneurial model of the university became compulsory reading for every vice-chancellor when they were appointed. And it was taught on the development programme for leadership and foundation, you had to read Burton Clark.

‘with a strengthened steering core, enhanced development periphery, a diversified funding base and stimulated academic heartland’ that was the model, you had to build that model into how you ran the university.

The it was the academic capitalist model which was a critical social science version of all of that where the faculty were out there earning pots and pots of money and behaving like entrepreneurs with tenured position, turning up with BMWs or whatever and parking on the university campus, so that is that model.

Then there was the triple helix model produced by Henry Etzkowitz and this is the dominant paradigm that is backed by treasuries and governments all across the world. There’s a global network called the Triple Helix Association and broadly speaking the focus is on science, technology and business, and neglect of the humanities and social sciences and place, communities and civil society. So my book was written basically as a critique of this particular model.

Slide 31: The ‘Traditional’ University, with two big circles – Teaching and Research. Underneath is smaller circle labelled ‘Third Mission’ activities with four very small bubbles coming of it. Linking all three is a circle called focus of management and leadership. Where it overlaps Teaching is the label ‘rankings’, where it overlaps Research is the label ‘Excellence’; where it overlaps Third Mission is the label ‘Funding targets’, running through the Third mission bubble between the ‘Funding targets’ label and the ‘Third mission activities’ label is a line labelled ‘hard boundary between enabling and non-enabling environments’. Above the line is ‘The Core’ and below the line is ‘The Periphery’

And we look at the traditional university, it looks like this. You have ‘teaching’ and ‘research’ in two totally separate places - DVC for teaching, DVC for research – and then ‘Third mission’ which is by definition an inferior mission because it’s third. And lots and lots of activities going on out there with community groups, below the radar screens of senior management, acting out there, people doing stuff.

And the focus of management and leadership is teaching satisfaction scores – how do you turn up in the Guardian rankings? - the research rankings - the QS rankings - and the role of management for the third mission is about earning money - how do you earn money and new research grants, contracts, commercialisation and spin-outs? And there’s a pretty hard boundary between the university and the external world. And that’s your classic ‘ivory tower’ university, and most universities, traditional universities, still look like that.

Slide 32: The disconnected region

Bubble called PUBLIC SECTOR which contains:

- 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

Bubble called PRIVATE SECTOR which contains:
• 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

Bubble called HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR which contains:
• Seen as ‘in’ the region but not ‘of’ the region
• Policies and practices discourage engagement
• Focus on rewards for academic research and teaching

Different circle connecting all three which contains:
• No boundary spanners
• Focus on supply side, transactional interventions
• Ineffective or non-existent partnerships
• Lack of a shared understanding about the challenges
• Entrepreneurs ‘locked out’ of regional planning

What it’s linked with, and some work we did for the OECD – for the European Commission actually – and that we codified that to connect universities to regional growth. We went around Europe doing lots and lots of stuff, and broadly speaking, many parts of Europe higher education was in the region but not of it, they had policies on practice discouraging engagement, were focused on rewards for academic research and teaching. But equally there were problems in many places about the public sector. It didn’t really have adequate political leadership, it clearly didn’t understand higher education, and the private sector was poorly articulated, dominated by firms with a low demand or absorptive capacity for innovation.

Many of the European regions looked like that, completely, and into that lots or European funding was tipped. Called Smart Specialisation; it’s been a disaster.

And critically, what we observed was very few people acting as boundary spanners between these three worlds. There was a focus on supply side, transactional interventions; ineffective or non-existent partnerships; lack of a shared understanding about the challenges; and entrepreneurs ‘locked out’ of regional planning process.

Slide 33: The Civic University. Three equally sized and overlapping bubbles of Teaching, Research and Engagement. Where teaching and research overlap is the label enhancement; where Teaching and Engagement overlap is the label Widening participation, community work; And where Research and Engagement overlap is Socio Economic impact. In the centre where all three connect is a different circle saying ‘transformative, responsive, demand led action’. Five little bubbles coming off Engagement are now spread throughout Teaching m, Research and their overlaps with Engagement and there is a wiggly line through the centre called a ‘soft boundary’. At the top is the label ‘The Academy’ and at the bottom ‘Society’.

So we have an alternative model which is in my book, and has really taken off, which is called the Civic University where all those projects out there that were being done as third mission activities get embedded into the core activities of teaching and research and engagement.

There are still somethings that are outside Engagement, still things that are pure teaching, things that are still pure research, but it’s about how you bring the whole lot together. So teaching, all the discussions about widening participation, and community work, through student community action. This is big stuff - student community action – you can’t graduate form a Mexican university without 400 hours of community service. It’s very interesting, it’s Latin America has done this extremely well.
Policy Scotland Public Lecture: The Civic University and the City: Transcript

How research and teaching enhance each other? - and that often isn’t the case – how research has social economic impact? – we have a big discussion about that, we can do – but the emphasis on management is ‘transformative, responsive, demand led action’ - how can we respond to the needs and challenges of our communities?

And how can we create a soft boundary between the university and the outside world, between the academy and society.

So that’s the heart of our civic university model.

Slide 34: The ‘connected region’

Bubble called PUBLIC SECTOR which contains: Developing coherent policies that link territorial development to innovation and higher education

Bubble called PRIVATE SECTOR which contains: Investing in people and ideas that will create growth

Bubble called HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR which contains: Generating intellectual and human capital assets for the region

Where PUBLIC SECTOR and PRIVATE SECTOR overlap is Building the infrastructure for growth

Where PUBLIC SECTOR and HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR overlap is Analysis of evidence and intelligence for planning

Where PRIVATE SECTOR and HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR overlap is Skills development, commercialisation of research

Different circle connecting all three in the centre which contains: Evidence based policies that support ‘smart’ innovation and growth

And if that works you will get a connected region. All sorts of things there, some of which you are doing here: Analysis of evidence and intelligence for planning, Skills development, commercialisation of research, building the infrastructure.

That’s how we want to get to an evidence-based policies that support ‘smart’ innovation and growth.

Slide 35: Seven dimensions of the civic university

- Sense of Purpose
- Active Engagement
- Holistic Approach
- Sense of Place
- Willingness to Invest
- Transparency and Accountability
- Innovative Methodologies

So in the book we identify, in the appendix for the book, there is a toolkit for making an assessment for how far your university is going down this route

And we have seven dimensions of the civic university:

- Sense of Place
- Active Engagement
- Holistic Approach
And all of those are important and I can’t have time to go through them

Slide 36: The ‘Civic University’ Development Spectrum

Arrows going from left the right over four columns headed Embryonic, Emerging, Evolving, and Embedded

Underneath these is another row, where the box in the preceding column (before Embryonic) contains the word Dimension X.

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.

But what we do, if you look at the Appendix of the book, we ask universities to recognise that if you really want to go to eh ideal model of the civic university embedded, universities have to go on a journey. You just can’t just do this overnight, it’s a process of institutional change and you take a series of steps. So we ask universities to assess where they are on this journey.

And its not ‘get a gold star’ like - many people are probably aware we’re nervous about the college exchange framework, they’ll do the same as they ‘ve done with the TEF, where you get a ‘gold star’ for your engagement. We’re not really about that.

Slide 37: Sense of Place. Under each heading is text as follows

- Embryonic: the institution is ‘detached’ from the local environment with limited local linkages and lack of integration with in the physical fabric
- Emerging: There has been some ‘opening up’ of the campus to the local community but linkages are still relatively superficial
- Evolving: Local communities are increasingly using campus facilities, the institution is making linkages with local business and groups to develop opportunities for research and placements etc
- Embedded: 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.

So just one of the dimensions, the Sense of Place.

To what extent - and at Glasgow ask these questions - is the location of the institution integral to its identity? The University of Glasgow, what does that of mean?

‘it is viewed as an important asset by the local community’ – How many people in Glasgow if you went out into the community, and said ‘do you see Glasgow University as a contribution to your life and to your community?’ How it physically ‘blends’ within the local built environment and is seen as a ‘living laboratory’ for research?

So that ‘s the ideal position, most universities are at different points along that spectrum and in the book there are scales for all of these.
Slide 38: 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.

What is critical for all of these, and this is quite challenging, this is not a description of how universities actually operate - you can go out and collect empirical work and study how they are operating – this is a normative model. This is challenging, this is what we should aim to be: ‘Not only excellent in terms of conventional academic criteria but also seeking to contribute to the public good.’

My previous vice-chancellor Chris Brink used to walk around the university, and used to ask, as he went into departments, I’m interested, not only in ‘what you are good at’, that’s the scientific agenda, but ‘what are you good for?’

What you are good at and what are you good for? It’s quite a challenging issue for the academy. This is not a new agenda but it is given greater saliency in the challenges facing society, and at the same time universities have to respond to these rankings. You can’t get good academics to come to you unless you are highly ranked. We are in a highly competitive global higher education marketplace.

So we have to try and manage those conflicts between the higher education world and our civic responsibilities and that’s really quite challenging because governments do tend to grab certain things so the British treasury thinks that if you pump lots of money upstream into science you’ll get lots of downstream societal benefits and business benefits. That’s patently not true; it hasn’t happened. We can argue about it but that’s where they come from.

And many local authorities, quite frankly, say pump more money into our universities and we’ll get on the map, we’ll get lots of people wanting to come here, we’ll get lots of passive economic impacts. That is common.

Slide 39: 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.
And doing all of this – designing the civic university – is a really challenging process. You need to have some general principles matched by an intentionally wide scope for bottom up creativity and entrepreneurship. So many universities have suffered in the 2000s by the introduction of New Public Management which have mechanisms of reward, key performance indicators.

In our survey what we found were many academics... universities would have civic engagement up there as a general principle, lots of academics were doing it down there as part of their below-the-radar-screens but when it came to resourcing the dead stop was middle management, because middle management is driven by ‘bums on seats’ and papers cited in scientific journals and this whole agenda was often stopped in universities by middle managers. And what you need in a truly civic university is a combination of top-down and bottom-up. So say ‘we encourage you to do it and we support it and we put resources behind it’ and you do need some pretty deep institutional change, bit of disruptive change. I’m not entirely sure you can always do it incrementally. But there you go, we can have some discussion about that.

Slide 41: The Practice: How engaged is the academy? UK Innovation Research Centre Survey of 22,000 UK academics - External interaction and commercialisation activity (% of respondents).

Diagram of survey responses for different activities:

People-based activities:

- Giving invited lectures 65
- Student placements 33
- Participating in networks 67
- Standard setting forums 31
- Curriculum development 28
- Enterprise education 6
- Attending conferences 87
- Sitting on advisory Boards 38
- Employee training 33

Community based activities:

- Lectures for the community 38
- Schools projects 30
- Community based sports 3
- Public exhibitions 15

Commercialisation activities:

- Licensed research 5
- Patenting 7
- Spun-out company 4
- Formed/run consultancy 14

Problem solving activities:

Informal advice 57

- Joint publication 46
- Prototyping and testing 10
What academics do – I always put this slide in because so much of the conversation about universities and engagement is around commercialisation – this is survey of around 22,000 academics about what percentage did the following things. Very few did the commercialisation stuff, very few. [30% of respondents]

They do lots of problem-solving, informal advice.

The people who kill off innovation, by the way, - I should have approved this before with technology transfer office - the people who often kill it off are the people who say we want to make sure you’re going to get a license or ‘you’re going to get some grant income, and they kill off some of these informal relationships.

Community-based activities [86% of respondents] – a lot of stuff that academics do – so there’s a lot of stuff going on out there which is relevant to this agenda but crucially, it’s not recognised as such.

Slide 42: 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

I like this – I always include this slide from one of our leading academics – because in a way I want more and more academics in my university to spontaneously think like this guy.

‘The notion of treating our city and its region as a seedbed for’ – he was director of an institute for sustainability - ‘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’.

He said that spontaneously in an interview and I just think, you know, we need more people thinking like that.

Slide 43: Academic leadership of place
Three overlapping circles labelled Political leadership, Managerial leadership and community leadership. In the centre is another circle, overlapping all three, labelled Intellectual leadership.

And I’ll now say something about how you can do something about this. Interesting academic at Bristol, Robin Hambleton, who has written this book about the leadership of place. And he talks about political leadership – politicians - managerial leadership – executives of local government - and community leadership, community leadership groups.

And then he puts on top of that – something quite distinctive which is what we can offer – it’s intellectual leadership and how do you translate intellectual leadership into the place.

Slide 45: Cover of report entitled ‘Newcastle City Futures 2065. Anchoring universities in cities through urban foresight’ by Mark Tewdwr-Jones, John Goddard and Paul Cowie.


And one of the ways we have done this in Newcastle is through a programme called Newcastle City Futures, Anchoring universities in cities through urban foresight.

Massive. Bringing the academics out in different disciplines to say ‘what in your discipline, your knowledge, is relevant to the long-term future of the city? So we had people from medical science, from engineering from social sciences, thinking about long-term futures. And it was a very instructive exercise.

Slide 46: 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.

Because ‘in the Foresight process universities and cities can identify assets and opportunities, sharing data, new insights, developing systems thinking across fragmented governance structure, networking, and so Newcastle City Futures was a very powerful catalytic influence in Newcastle.

Slide 47: 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 practice around city futures.

And it involved capacity-building and I’m going to skip that slide.

Slide 48: Civic Universities: UK Policy context

Now, I’m now going to, in the next 10 minutes, say something about the policy context here and now in the UK.

Slide 49: NESTA Provocation, 2009: Cover of ‘Reinventing the Civic University’ by John Goddard


Is started this journey soon after I retired when I was asked by NESTA to write provocation. And I wrote it and called it ‘Reinventing the civic university’. That was recognising that many of our great British universities, like Newcastle, Sheffield, Manchester, Birmingham, were created to meet the needs of the economy and society in the 19th century, so they were born out of ‘place’, funded by local communities, subscriptions by local people. And it was apparent to me that many of those universities, including my own, had during the 2000s and the 1990s, turned their base, they had nationalised and turned their back on the city. So I wrote a provocation saying can we re-invent the civic university. But that was a specific subset of universities ie those that had their foundation, but we have a big and complex higher education system.

Slide 50: PA Consulting Survey of VCs 2018

A series of bubbles illustrating the following:

Significant number of institutional failure or closure:

- Highly likely 12
- Quite possible 47
- Not very likely 39
- Most unlikely 2

Significant number of takeovers and mergers:

- Highly likely 25
- Quite possible 53
- Not very likely 18
- Most unlikely 4

Overall shrinking of provision and choices:

- Highly likely 25
- Quite possible 57
- Not very likely 18
- Most unlikely 0

Greater stratification and specialisation of provision:

- Highly likely 37
- Quite possible 47
- Not very likely 14
- Most unlikely 2
Substantial growth in institutional and academic alliances:

- Highly likely 27
- Quite possible 56
- Not very likely 17
- Most unlikely 0

Substantial growth in commercial and business partnerships:

- Highly likely 37
- Quite possible 49
- Not very likely 14
- Most unlikely 0

And that higher education system has evolved in the UK without any planning at all. Higher education has developed in a totally unplanned way. It’s where places have come up and said we want to go to university, the present structure, the large number of campuses, created because Tony Blair wanted participation rates to go to 50% and the only way to do it was setting up lots of new universities all over the place – Cumbria, Chester, blah, blah, Highland and Islands, it’s endless. But the consequences of that massive expansion without much planning, when you then introduce a marketplace into that system, with unevenly resourced institutions, some quite weak, with an external environment changing is that there are risk, that the system shakes out.

And this is a survey that’s done every year by PA Consulting of vice chancellors asking - opinions, it not a database thing - and 47% in 2008 said that institutional failures and closures were quite ‘possible’, and 12% ‘likely’.

Overall shrinking of provision and choice, takeovers and mergers, greater stratification, and really a quite challenging environment largely introduced by the Higher Education Act, which was passed recently.

Slide: 51: 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.

And this is quote from them, I think it’s quite important that we understand this because it’s a lot about what’s going on at the present time.

‘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.’
The ‘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.’

So the Act allows universities to leave. So there are some really big and challenging issues around all that.

**Slide 52: 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)

And I like this quote because Mike Boxall who was a consultant worked with that report, in this piece in the Times Higher Education Supplement, I think it does speak to the civic university agenda. If we do not think about fundamental institutional transformation, some universities, indeed many, even bigger universities, are under severe threat. We have to think about deep-seated change, and he says “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.”

The issue is for Glasgow how the various FE and HE institutions can work together in a way to meet the demands of the society.

**Slide 53: Cover of report ‘Truly civic: Strengthening the connection between universities and their places’**

Now I’m going to ends up with a few words about, and it was in that context of institutional failures, in the context of the Act, that the University Commission was set up.

There was a genuine concern in government that this Act had been introduced, driven by Joe Johnston (Boris’s brother) driven though the House of Lords with very little regard to what the consequences of what the further marketisation would be. Particularly the place-based consequences, and the civil servants warned ministers about this. They created the Office for Students. The Office for Students in England at least, has no powers to bail out institutions, it’s a competition regulator. You have a complete separation of the research side in UKRI [UK Research and Innovation]. There is no longer, in England, a unified funding council for higher education so this has really been quite challenging. This was the context of setting this Commission up.

**Slide 55: 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
So the context was the post-2008 crash which produced austerity and a massive increase in fees. So we had a situation where universities, post about 2010 onwards had pots and pots of money, pots and pots of money, compared to local government which was facing austerity. And so local government was asking ‘What are you guys doing? You’re building all these student halls of residences’ so the only cranes on the skyline in many cities in England were university cranes.

You’ve got widening economic and social disparities – left behind people and places.

Brexit and popularism: citizens out there – you just have to read the Daily Mail and popular press, and Michael Gove’s comment about ‘we’ve had enough of experts’ – and universities and ‘experts’ seen as part of the problem by leavers and Brexiteers.

Vice chancellors’ salaries and the universities’ perceived espousal of left-wing causes is in the press all the time, it’s the same in US, So popularism and universities – universities are regarded very poorly by the ‘electorate’.

We are seen to be part of the evils of globalisation that are perceived to have undermined communities. We are seen as international institutions and we have lobbied – fatal, fatal mistake – universities lobbied to ‘Remain’ on grounds of narrow self-interest – we want European research institutes; if you look at the submissions, we did not think about the public good ort that Europe was important for all sorts of other reasons.

So we are, our reputation out there with the electorate, including an electoral system which is place-based. OK. It’s important. Our electoral system is place-based and if we’re going to get the support of politicians we need to have place-based support for universities.

Slide 55: Context 2

- 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

I’ve already talked about this - the Higher Education Act - and then what kicked it all and stirred it all up again was the Labour pledge to abolish tuition fees leading to the Augar Review. The consequence of the Augar Review – I don’t know exactly how that will play out in Scotland, I haven’t done enough thinking about that – but the Augar Review in England means that many universities that do put money into public good will stop spending on it, it will just disappear. And there’s lots of evidence coming out from that.

The other thing is that the ONS review of student debt, which was off the balance sheet is now on the balance sheet. Student debt is no longer off balance, its in public expenditure. So half of university funding
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comes from the state, so universities will have to compete for funding and justify what they do in return, not least in their community, so increasingly going forward we are competing with the health service.

We have the capability, opportunity and responsibility to respond to local needs not least to secure public support, so it’s in part self-interest but we do have moral commitment.

We need our places and our places need us.

**Slide 56: 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

So what we did in this report, very quickly, focus groups, panel surveys, written evidence, oral evidence in cities.

Bob Kerslake, Lord Kerslake, ran it like a select committee going outside Parliament.

We had a number of themes: we had industrial strategy, internationalisation, health and wellbeing, and culture.

I chaired an academic round table, getting academic ideas into it. And we noticed very clearly, how the way in which cities were governed, most of the evolving governance structure, universities sit, in England, in totally different, some are in combined authorities with a mayor, some are only in districts, it’s a mess so that the context is really quite problematic.

**Slide 57: 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”

And these are some of what came from our focus groups.

‘If I was paying out all of that money, I’d want it spent on me, not other people in the city.’ This is individual populations talking to us.

‘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 area’.

**Slide 58: The Civic University: Alive but is it well?**
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- 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

So what did we find?

In our work, and this is some conclusions from our report, the lack of local accountability of universities to their cities. There was an ignorance of local people about the contributions universities make to their community especially, especially, amongst less advantaged. Fees for individual students were for their benefit – me, me, me, me – not the 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 - which I have already mentioned - mitigates against long term trust based collaborative partnerships. National funding silos - from the Strengthening Places Fund to UKRI etc etc –

And each of these different funding streams having their own metrics associated with them which creates all sorts of problems.

Slide 59: 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

So how do universities need to change to be truly civic institutions?

First, ‘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.’ How are we together accountable to our publics? How do we tell them what we are doing and listen to them?

‘Clear internal processes for connecting teaching, research, internationalisation and civic engagement at the executive board level.’ That’s my civic university model.

‘An institutional framework that supports, recognises and rewards bottom-up civic engagement and recognises this as part of normal business including’ – very important - ‘including the work of professional
services.’ Quite often the professional services are in one box, the academics are in another box and there isn’t a clear structure for those who go across the two worlds.

These are ‘blended professionals’ in finance, estates, communications working with a research hub connected to the global discourse on universities and place and like-minded institutions.’ So that ‘s what we’re trying to get, to create.

‘The locality as a site for co-creation of knowledge and a ‘living laboratory’. Lots of things we could discuss about that.

‘Establishment of place-based university foundation to support local public good actions’. That’s a very important point. What is emerging in taking this forward is we need to look at the charitable foundations and charitable giving as an important source of funding for this type of activity.

Slide 60: 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?

And we have series of tests in the report, a public test and a place test and strategic test. I’m going to skip over that.

Slide 61: Civic University Commission Final Report Recommendations

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

We have a series of recommendations, the most important was the Civic University Agreement. And I’m just going to end by saying something about the Civic University Agreement because this university has signed up for it.

Slide 62: Civic University Agreements: 53 VCs have committed (incl. Scotland, Wales & N.I)

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.
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- 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.

Civic University Agreements: 53 VCs including Anton Muscatelli, have committed. A Civic University Agreement should enshrine their analysis and strategy, that is co-created and signed by other key partners. ‘Understanding local populations and asking what they want’ from the university. ‘Understanding themselves.’ How are we doing this stuff? How is it organised? How is it resourced? How are we, how are we mobilising ourselves internally?

‘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.’ And that area could be quite small or it could be multiple areas.

‘A clear set of priorities.’ You can’t do everything. What are priorities now? What are the priorities? You have bit it off a step at a time.

‘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.’ How are we going to resource all of that, is critically important.

Slide 63: 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)
- Online survey of all signatories covering preparation of CUAs – what and how
- Indepth interviews with selection of universities
- Consultation forum at UUK July 19
- Scoping a support hub to share knowledge and facilitate peer review

So what we’re doing right now, just to bring it completely up-to-date. We’ve established a group policymakers and practitioners from inside and outside of higher education, Local Government Associations, NHS, Arts Council etc. I’m chairing this group looking at developing a framework, a national framework, including Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, a framework for civic agreements.

We’ve done an online survey of all signatories covering preparation of CUAs. How are you going about doing it, I think Des has filled it in for you, I hope he has.

We’re doing in-depth interviews with selection of universities, we have a consultation forum to which all universities which have signed are being invited at UUK on July 19th and we’re going to scope a support hub to share knowledge and facilitate peer review between universities.

Slide 64: Cover of Institute for Voluntary Action Research report ‘Working in Space: Collaborative funding in practice. Learning from five case studies’. The text “Place-based funding. By ‘place-based funding’ we mean targeted investment in defined geographical areas... That is, a package of support - which may compris : multiple grants; particularly large investments; grants and additional activity (capacity building, networking , influencing work) - within a defined place.” And “Appendix 1: Place-based funding framework”
And finally, I mean there’s a lot of stuff out there about how to do this and this so one I’ve just picked on. It’s an Institute for Voluntary Action Research. It’s a very interesting piece of work, how do you actually do this, what are the tools out there, and how you do this collaborative stuff. And this is an interesting one, it’s called the Institute for Voluntary Action Research, and I only discovered it over the weekend.

**Slide 65: Toolkit questions** from the Institute for Voluntary Action Research report ‘Working in Space: Collaborative funding in practice. Learning from five case studies’. What does place mean? Why are you considering, or using, a place-based approach? What contributions are you seeking to make? What is your attitude to risk and uncertainly? What is your position on impact? What is your existing knowledge of the area?

‘What does place mean? Why are you considering, or using, a place-based approach? What contributions are you seeking to make?’ It’s a set of questions which, I think we need some tools and this sort of work is what’s going to inform our framework.

**Slide 66: Toolkit questions** from the Institute for Voluntary Action Research report ‘Working in Space: Collaborative funding in practice. Learning from five case studies’. What duration of involvement is required? Where will control sit? What will your role be? Who will you need to work with? What kind of relationships are required? What commitment of staff and trustee time/effort is needed?


![Cover of ‘Maximising universities civic contribution: a policy paper’](https://www.wcpp.org.uk/publication/maximising-universities-civic-contribution/)

Finally, and just from the Scottish perspective, we’re trying to embrace the whole of the UK, and its quiet interesting what’s going on in Wales. I’ve been doing a report for the Welsh Government though the Welsh Centre for Public Policy, which is a bit similar to your network here.

Maximising universities civic contribution’ – a whole set of guidelines there which is now being taken up by the Welsh Government.

**Slide 68: 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

And our key recommendations – there might be some case for sharing experience between Wales and Scotland as much of what I’ve been talking about has mainly been England.

‘Develop a strategic vision for the post-compulsory education and training system (PCET)’ That’s for whole system including lifelong learning.

‘Use institutional compacts as a vehicle to promote civic engagement’ ie the state has a compact with the university, saying we are going to give you funding for this provided these are the things you are going to deliver. Not a formula, it’s a compact. That’s used, compacts are widely used in other countries. We eschew them in this country.
‘Developing regional clusters of institutions as key enablers of regional development’. So, cluster introduced in Glasgow city region.

Links across the whole system; as an instrument of equity of access; and providing seed funding.

Slide 69: Diagram of Newcastle University vision. Saying ‘we are a world-leading university, advancing knowledge, providing creative solutions and solving global problems’.

Values are ‘Excellence’, ‘Creativity’ and ‘Impact’.

Guiding principles are:

- Working together
- Visibly leading
- Freedom and opportunity to succeed
- Responding to current and future challenges

Strategies are 1) Education for life. 2) Research for discovery and impact encircled by 3) Engagement and place and 4) Global.

Finally, and it’s my last slide, this is Newcastle University. This is where we are at now. We have a place and engagement strategy as part of our vision, so the four pillars of our institution strategy are Education for life, Research for discovery and impact surrounded by Engagement and place and Global, because this is a global issue. So those are the four – and values, principles - and we have now appointed a Dean of Engagement and Place about how to take this forward.

Slide: Newcastle City Futures Engagement & Place

http://www.newcastlecityfutures.org/

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

And what I am hoping to do is, I haven’t got time to show it, there’s a video at the end here if you’ve got time on how we are taking that agenda forward, so I’m very keen to see whether in my university - where we have been a bit of a pioneer in this - to see if we can begin to share experience with the impressive range of things you are doing here.

Thank you very much!

[Applause]