

Civic University Agreements Working Group

Meeting: Friday June 14th, 2019, 10:00 - 15:30hrs, City View, Sheffield Hallam University

Chair: Professor John Goddard (JG),

Present: Alex Miles (AM), Peter Myant (PMy), Jane Robinson (JR), Kevin Richardson (KR), Laura Ottery (LO), Liam Keenan (LK), Michael Wood (MW), Morag Campbell (MC), Paul Manners (PMa), Peter O'Brien (PO'B), Pippa Coutts (PC), Richard Brabner (RB), Richard Eyre (RE), Sandra Booth (SB), Sally Randles (SR), Toby Wilkinson (TB)

Welcome:

Purpose of the meeting: Civic University Commission's (CUC) commitment to develop a framework and guidance for Civic University Agreements (CUA), and there is a desire amongst the sector to share experience and what we can learn from each other and the mechanism for doing so. Task Group has been formed at the request of the CUC to follow on from the work already done, and Lord Kerslake requested JG to form this small group of policy makers and practitioners from inside and outside the Higher Education sector to help shape a framework agreement.

19th July 2019 conference: invitations have been sent out to the VCs of the universities who have signed the pledge; to attend the conference in order to get a better understanding of what a CUA should be, how it should be structured and the process of creating it. The role of this group is to help develop the framework for an agreement which will be launched and discussed at the July event.

A summary of the key points raised today will be taken to the Task Group for discussion. After that, the Working Group will be looking to consult with some of the other members who were unable to attend today's meeting (e.g. the Local Government Association, the Arts Council and Office for Students).

Recap of Commission's Key Findings:

The UPP CUC was set up over a year ago. Civic Universities were originally developed in the 19th and 20th centuries by their place for their place. Some perception (both pre- and post-Brexit) that some institutions had withdrawn from that agenda and have lost sight of the active role they can play in their local society. Felt that the response from the sector to challenges experienced over the last couple of years, e.g. value for money, VC pay, etc. was inadequate and there now needs to be a focus on demonstrating the wider value of what Universities provide to the regional economy, regional societies and regional communities. In the policy context, rather than the PR context, given the major challenges that the nation faces at the moment, universities should be at the heart of those conversations regarding challenges societies currently face.

CUC visited various cities across the UK over the last year, had panel events, interviewed leading experts, generated written evidence from 60 universities. Engagement from the sector was significant and a number of private events were also held including academic roundtables. A lot of the narrative of the Commission is really embedded by the findings from the survey done in 10 cities and focus groups that were done at the start of the process.

There were 12 key recommendations in the CUC final report and the production of a CUA is the key recommendation from that report and the purpose of that links in with the top finding relating to strategy and ensuring that universities are really embedding a civic role within their needs and challenges of their places. The CUC report stated that civic universities should enshrine their analysis and strategy in a CUA that is co-created and signed by other key partners. 54 universities are now signed-up to the pledge to develop a CUA.

KR: in the current political climate this time can be used to reflect and think ahead and prepare for the changes that will shortly be happening at Westminster. Research and teaching: recent legislation means that the links between research and teaching aren't as close as they used to be. Looking at the big picture issues on the research-side and what is concerning government at the moment is productivity (levels are very low across the UK), the total expenditure, particularly for R&D, is very low which is at the top of government's agenda. Response from government has been to invest in historic budget increases for funding. Even though the budgets are getting bigger, primarily the focus is on national issues and the excellence agenda.

Government's target now is to invest and work with both the research community and with businesses to increase the total amount of expenditure on R&D from 1.7% to 2.4% of GDP. This sets a very clear policy direction and focuses people's minds and productivity in that direction. The Strength in Places programme which seeks to combine excellence and place; £115m currently in place but this could double in light of the spending review. Strength in Places require partnerships to come together (not individual institutions, has to be collaborative) and all partners need to be based in place and also require explicit support by local leadership. There is also the Expanding Excellence programme which looks to geographically spread the provision of excellent research. UKRI has been given very clear instructions to develop a Place strategy. Also need to reflect how multi-level governance will impact on the design of a strategy.

Within those innovation strategies there are some important opportunities:

- a) How do you build the collaborative capacity of the supply site?
- b) How do you build the demand for innovation from the bottom up; from firms and communities?
- c) How do you build absorptive capacity particularly through the developing institutions, systems and partnerships?
- d) How better can you use existing national assets in the locality?

Regarding teaching, there needs to be more focus on widening participation and we need to think about the relationship with FE, especially about the transition between FE and HE and engage the FE sector in the CUA. Also need to show that the

interests of the students are looked after should an institution go bust. The understanding of what happens in the inter-institutional relationships at the local level is quite weak. How can the agreements be used to do more to drive widening participation? How can graduate retention be improved? How can the agreements begin to build the framework for collaborative projects? How can local partnerships work together and look ahead in a way which is flexible but provides long-term stability and give confidence to the national funders that there is a partnership in place?

Survey & Interview Findings:

Need to think through how to offer practical advice and help to the universities which have signed the CUA. Want to be sure the July event is structured with practical help, especially with anything that is happening outside of the HE sector which could impact on these.

PMA advised that part of making this work is to see how these civic agreements are actually framed in the recommendations. First is about co-creation to come up with a shared sense of purpose. Secondly, what the agreement should enshrine is analysis and strategy (building agreements on profound understanding of context and place and devising an approach which will genuinely make a difference rather than sit on a shelf).

The universities who have signed up have been asked to share how they are approaching this and their plans to put these into implementation:

1. Consultation - talking to their own staff, students and partners;
2. Data and Intelligence gathering - to allow them to build the strategy;
3. Agreeing focus: what aspects of university work will be bringing into their agreements? Host of potential focal points that could be brought;
4. Striking agreements: What should agreements actually look like? How can we create a template to help focus people's minds and set goals of what we want to achieve?
5. Realising outcomes - how focusing on what change will actually be put into place? Just universities working as usual or putting something new in place?
6. Evaluation and measurement: this is a change process itself which will involve a lot of new ways of working and how will we effectively evaluate and monitor if those goals are being achieved;
7. Governance: how do we effectively implement accountability for the changes we're delivering?

Resourcing the process: resources universities are putting in place range from some which are not putting in any additional resources to others who have dedicated teams to implementing this. If resource is very limited for some institutions, the ambition of their CUA needs to be realistic to that resource. Also, we are asking a lot from our partners; how are we factoring in appropriate remuneration to reflect the work and time they will be giving?

LK: (paper 3.3) telephone interviews with 7 or 8 universities (so far).

Rationale: the universities spoken to were not all signing up for the CUAs under a universal heading of Civic Engagement. Some were thinking about cementing and finalising what they are already doing, some CUAs were seen as a method of self-assessment and Peer Evaluation, a way of holding your university to account that could be articulated to different stakeholders. We should not overlook why some universities are signing up for the agreements as this will shape what the agreements will look like, how they feel and function.

Partnerships and Stakeholders: 3 key issues:

1. Basic practicalities: managing expectations, dealing with different timescales, planning horizons, competing interests;
2. How the university sees themselves as part of the agreement; as anchor institution, a critical friend, broker? A lot of the universities want to move away from the university as a central institution. Needs to be a mutual agreement between the group of stakeholders;
3. Universities need to do away with the idea of civic engagement is about the university as saviour but to work collaboratively

Geography: spectrum of wants; some universities want porous boundaries and flexibility and some want hard boundaries. Need to see a lot of flexibility in these agreements. Capturing activity, i.e. where academics live, tensions between being a global university but agreements have impact on more local area. Spectrum between more formal approaches as oppose to more informal, decentralised.

Number of key questions regarding what the guidance will look like:

1. How to keep momentum together, how to inspire activities in this area when key people move on;
2. Greater clarity in terms of timescales; if doing an annual review, specific dates required;
3. Guidance or framework needs to be high-level; more about what works, what might not work as well, how it can be tailored to more local demands and needs rather than a specific blue-print and tick-box exercise.

Response from members:

Outside the HE Sector:

JR from a local government perspective, if really want to engage and make a difference in our places, working collaboratively with different groups and getting partner input is critical. Capacity within local authorities (LA) has been massively impacted in recent years. From a LA perspective, there is a great deal of interest and desire to work collaboratively with universities and other partners; however, from previous experience of partners engaging with universities, this hasn't been made easy. Opportunities within the framework for a CUA to break down barriers and create opportunities to work collaboratively. It is about working with partners, not universities putting upon or doing things to their partners. It is easy to slip into the position of the University, who has capacity, to take over this due to lack of capacity and resource in LA. CUA can be the framework to say collectively what each partner can collectively bring to the table to make a real difference on key challenges. Changing governance around the country and relationships with local enterprise

partners can be complex. Universities have more convening power which historically LAs used to have.

MW gave NHS perspective: Many of the relationships between NHS and Universities are with the acute / big teaching hospitals with A&Es etc. in the local place, not with mental health or commissioners. There is still an issue of capacity, as with the LAs. Need to challenge traditional roles that bring universities and the NHS together (i.e. teaching). Question of how to get relationships off the ground when just working at Chief Exec level. Drivers for NHS: workforce (currently 100,000 vacancies in the NHS, 40,000 of those for nurses). Policies on place shaping are coming through from the NHS. Hospitals are now looking at address demands. Seeing in-sector anchor institution concept growing, looking at population health, how it employs people, how to address the demand for services. Now looking at how this can be translated in terms of the guidance and building a new relationship between the 2 biggest institutions (which the US terms as 'Eds and Meds').

From an LA perspective, the last thing LA's want to see is a lot of KPI's. The language used is very important. If looking at long-term strategy and primary care networks, start to try to move resources upstream in terms of prevention. Increasing strength on health and places. Productivity gain to be had from these conversations and the CUA can be a framework which helps to facilitate these conversations.

In Glasgow, current work is split: in the east end working with community groups and wellbeing and in the west end dealing with businesses and enterprise. The challenge is to bring the economic and the social and bridge the interconnected domains. PC advised of the Community Development Trust. Challenge of places which are unheard, or have been left behind. There is a real need to have an infrastructure in those places and to engage with them to meet the challenge. How to bring these different worlds / sectors together? Work has to be strategic and high-level and in order for this to happen, universities need to want to change. Unless there is recognition, it won't be taken on board at a higher level. Thinking about the guidelines, need to ensure the nature of the co-creational work is flexible. Two things are important: clear principles and case-studies. How to work with some people and some areas which hopefully will lead to internal reflection.

Inside the HE Sector:

SB from the Arts perspective: co-creation will not be an issue. One practical recommendation: bring in Art and Design departments to talk about their methodologies and practice on how they draw people together, stakeholders and outside the university. Specifically and practically on scoping aspect: user-centred design methodology. The Arts Council are in the 3rd stage of consultation on the next stage of their 10 year strategy focusing around social justice, disengaged communities, young people, having access to cultural capital and experiences in place. Particularly as arts in the curriculum is being squeezed out (other than in private schools). In Wales, the curriculum is currently being worked on with a place-based approach, in conjunction with government and universities. The Arts Council strategy also recognises it should be working with universities more. Driven by austerity, capacity and resources, diversifying in terms of content and ways of

engagement. Agreements are not seen in isolation but in context with other conversations happening nationally.

RE: Schools facing practical challenges about how to engage stakeholders in conversation and create an effective interface. Schools Policy in England makes it harder to engage with schools in an area en masse. Implication for that on CUA is that if universities want to engage schools, how can this be supported? Will need to do a lot of the leg work in terms of consultation, will have to expect that schools have quite limited capacity. We want to better co-ordinate and rationalise our activity in terms of the place we are in - difficult question for schools to engage with. Universities are reflecting why we exist and want to know from schools what they believe the role universities should play in helping schools. Role would be to facilitate the conversation as well as listening. What do schools want from universities and what would be useful? Universities are instrumental in delivering wider participation; the whole nature of how widening participation agreements could be used. Not place-based, doesn't matter where student comes from – no explicit geography involved. It is about working with all schools in the local area. Lots of small organisations: are there lessons for universities in working with lots of small institutions. Opportunity for universities to have the courage to say to regulators that we understand what the needs in our area are, have talked to the schools and why prioritising this activity as this is what schools want, even if alignment of national KPIs isn't straight-forward.

Schools and Education: In Scotland, LAs are still very well placed to be conveners for local schools. In England, LAs ability and legitimacy to do this is very much eroded. Scotland and Wales have more focus on inclusive growth which will help bridge the agenda. Need to have some future vision on how they want to see the place develop (foresight is key).

TB: concern around resourcing. In context where OfS is putting huge emphasis on value for money. Civic engagement comes at the bottom of the list as to what want money spent on.

AM: CUA is helping to bring relationship closer with NTU. In process of procuring some consultants to work on the CUA as a proper process.

1. Joint economic social cultural impact assessment as a benchmark.
2. Complementarity mapping with lens of place: where do things with NTU already, where could that potentially add value if joined up – targeting same companies but offering different support packages.
3. Where strategically internally and externally joint opportunities might make sense.

All of this is being communicated to both internal and civic stakeholders with shared strategies – some institutional differences but where the needs of the local area require both institutions to work together. Up to July 2020 working on this with civic stakeholders to see how this will look and how will work together. Thinking around how can local partners and big areas harness thinking power in more alignment.

PO'B: relationship between HE and FE. Hull currently developing pathways in nursing profession between college, university and NHS. Also working much more closely together in widening participation. Question would be this feels much broader

than widening participation. How sits alongside some more operational projects that are already being put into place / currently happening. How can this relationship be better aligned so can all see have same interests in HE and FE in getting more of a pipeline between FE and HE. In Wakefield, only 12% of children who are eligible to receive free school meals go into HE, compared to neighbouring area of Kirklees where this figure is 29%.

Some universities wouldn't want to be bound by definite hard boundaries; need to be mindful of this. Relationship between HE and FE is getting better but work still needs to be done. Raises a public policy question: potential threats to the sector of vulnerability of some institutions and how government does (or doesn't) intervene in that.

PMY: FE institutions should be more of a key stakeholder in the agreements to avoid a more fragmented approach from them. In terms of a test of the agreement, there should be some evidence that there has been consultation and involvement between HE, FE and schools, including life-long learning. RB mentioned it would be quite hard to have a civic agreement without FE being involved, particularly in a post-Auger world and looking at levels 4 and 5. Because of the sustained neglect, may not have the bandwidth to engage meaningfully just yet. Universities need to reflect differently in the way they approach and engage with smaller institutions. Need to offer guidance and support for this interaction.

KR: working with FE seen as easy and with positivity. Huge amount of enthusiasm for this across the institutions KR has spoken with already. Certainly don't want to be told how to do it and having standards, Gold, Silver Bronze, etc. or to be seen as a government initiative. Want it to be seen as bottom-up, sector-led; to be flexible, locally-designed but aware of the risks. Want to be seen as being inclusive but don't want to end up with a list of priorities but not spread themselves too thinly. Difficulties of internal comms and managerial authority; smaller universities have clearer lines of responsibility. Bigger institutions have less clarity.

Understanding organisational and institutional design is key. Some institutions are still deciding. Where restructuring is happening, happening around where REF and TEF silos are currently. How to get effective horizontal lines to cross these silos. Leadership level to look at how can feed bottom-level up into the leadership office. Terminology: 'Framework' offers flexibility; 'Guidance' seems to be more rigid. Need to lock into something, or leverage things that are already happening, challenge-driven approach relevant for the local place.

PMA: resourcing issue; if universities are going to enter into this, need to be clear putting money where our mouth is. What extra money can find to help top this up? Need to think about investing in place and how universities are going to invest in their place? How already spending money and making the decisions currently: Are universities able to say will co-invest in local places? Share decision making? If not prepared to do that, need to be clear. AM mentioned that this also needs to be thought about put our mouth where the money is. Money is already there and being spent but just need to monitor how this is still being spent. Decision making about future investment should be more open. All of the money is available for the activity itself rather than the decision-making point.

Challenges are different amongst the set of institutions: very diverse governance frameworks, clearly isn't a one-size fits all. A lot of it is about the process rather than the substance. How will go about doing these things and the skill set needed to do this and build capacity for people to work in new ways.

Case Studies:

Newcastle University:

Has been driven by NU vision, embedding it strategically around engagement and place, the approach trying to take is a collaborative place-based approach working with partners in Newcastle and wider area. Working with city council for a long time and working with NHS also with Northumbria University to bring together an approach based on needs. Agreed to work this through a joint strategic needs assessment which is a statutory requirement at LA. What are needs and opportunities and what are key challenges? Have got big organisations signed up to this and have already established a social justice advisory group – academics and Professional Service members alongside reps from community and voluntary sector – paying group members for their time also. September – March will be doing series of engagement events, shared vision for place, set of priorities and framework for delivery. Partners will sign up to how will deliver this and have some measurable outcomes so by next summer will have a 'Newcastle Agreement' (not calling it a Civic Agreement).

Culture and capacity across institution: established a core central team working on this where have pulled together people already working on this agenda already and a virtual team across academics and Professional Services. Building it into planning cycle and looking at way in which schools etc. are building it into their annual plan. Also linking it into professional and organisational development plan: how building culture and recognising value of this activity. Final part is around the governance and accountability of doing this and also the visibility of this. Big event with partners in mid-May to advise of intent of working in this way. Will have public event next summer which will be a formal agreement signing event and will critically be showing public what do and have achieved. Key points are about, in this process, how join up different objectives around economic and social impact and also the link between the local, national and the global. Universities are almost uniquely able / placed to link working at all levels.

Feedback: positive. Strategic needs assessment: every LA has a statutory requirement to build this: historically been on health drivers but also on national data sets. Working with the NHS, university and the city together with voluntary and community sector how to put more local nuance into understanding the local challenges. Have set up a joint policy and evidence centre asking how really get evidence-led policy making in this area, how to pull together data with research capacity at university into policy and practice. Hope to establish joint centre which will help to provide evidence for activities which will be undertaken and help evaluate the practice too. Capacity has gone from a lot of the organisations who would previously lead on this type of activity; the university can play a role in trying to fill this gap.

In Essex, a chief scientific advisor has been appointed to see how to address social and economic issues; post is based in university which has an appointed role in collaboration with the county council. Is this R&I unit a governance outside the universities or outside? How can create something which sits between? How will it be governed / governance structure? Other partners prepared to put resource into this? New approach to governance within city; establishment of new leadership board for city and group to identify where some of these ideas are implemented. Policy and evidence hub will be something developed jointly that will feed into that shared governance around the wider place agenda. Won't be part of the university but will be commissioned by that grouping which advise what the issues are that need to be worked on and will inform the future vision. Idea is there is a series of cogs which link together but the key issue is that it is not a research institute that is embedded within the university but is a shared hub. May well be a virtual thing in the short-term but hope it will be more free-standing in the long-term.

In practical terms: the university has 4 strategies: Education for Life, Research, Impact and Global. In terms of the capacity and resource, NU have brought together 3 existing small teams, communications and marketing, partnerships and funding, and a team which is focusing on the public engagement piece. 12 – 15 people working on the overarching strategy and have approx. 8 people who have an academic background in cross-cutting roles. Way they're deploying HEIF funding also into this.

Feedback: if really want young / disadvantaged people to engage with the process, need to get the pre-conditions to ensure there are equal voices at the table. Example: training students to interrogate professors – flipping of relationship.

Sheffield Hallam University:

Strategy implemented over 2 years ago and has been adopted well. 4 pillars: 1 of which is 'leading locally'. New governance structure to align with the new strategy that helps place the CUA work. Set as a Board of Governors objective in October 2018, has been helpful to ensure this is well mapped into work planning and institutional objectives. Spent several months to muse over this and the whys, etc. to ensure conversations done well with local partners. Talking about where this activity sits in organisation, who will be working on it, where it sits in terms of governance, using right language, staff engagement is high – issue now is that things happening almost too quickly. Changing mind-set internally from 'doing to' to 'doing with' need to ensure engagement with external stakeholders is done properly. Need to be more strategic. Top down saying what need to do, bottom-up saying how things could be done.

Since the new strategy, Metro Mayor in place and working on developing the Strategic Economic Plan and the Local Industrial Strategy - need to align with these priorities.

Intend to do a Public Opinion Survey to help measure impact over time as well as going out to talk to stakeholders. Speaking to students to gauge their impressions of the university. Don't want to hold ourselves up to things we can't deliver on. Not

about scrapping everything we're doing already and starting again. Some is about re-packaging.

Key issues at present: making sure this is not just a PR exercise. Not just about messaging, nice website, etc. Corral staff enthusiasm and need to find out what exactly is already happening. Looking at challenging ourselves to see how it is helping our region and do everything we can do to carry it forward after agreement has been signed. Need to ensure that go out to the surrounding towns such as Doncaster, Rotherham, Barnsley. Find out what do well, what could do better, purpose of university: perceptions of local people. Expecting to be very hard-challenged by other part of the region as the more affluent areas of the city are the ones who currently benefit the most of the funding we give. Need to possibly look at stopping doing things for that area and focus more on the other regions which have effectively been ignored.

In city region, other than 2 universities and teaching hospital, no other big-anchor institutions. Need to help external stakeholders see that universities aren't trying to solve everything but will facilitate the conversations and mutual working/ vision to implement these.

Example from Nottingham: stakeholder mapping 70 organisations into 13 categories; each one with one senior academic as the relationship owner and a professional services lead. Meets monthly with the VC who questions where that grouping is with planning, what is going on. Helps report into VC and helps draw activities all together to give a better picture of what is happening. Academics are tasked with what going to get out of the relationship, but working with council to say we need to be more structured and disciplined about the activities happening.

CUA Framework: Addressing Challenges:

Frameworks and scaffolds to help people focus on what they want and can go away and work on / build on. This is a first attempt having looked at the survey and the universities doing this: helpful to suggest this is a process. May be too constraining but want to get help from group members to take and adapt and put in front of people at the July event to help consider points.

Scoping process: time it takes to look at the process and try to do it well. Get to know yourself, partners, etc. "Know thyself". There are risks associated with this, the bad things coming up can contaminate the whole process. One of the challenges is the focus of this. How broad will the agreement be? Some people are focusing on the aligning of university research and teaching to local needs; others exploiting anchor effects of university assets and resources; helping the university deliver on government priorities (impact, innovation, skills, employability, widening participation). Thinking about the agreement itself, what might the agreement actually look like. Cardiff university have already got one as an example – can google it "It's the Way forward". Separating the scoping from delivery may not be the way forward but building the agreement gradually throughout the whole process.

Evaluation and Measurement: metrics and what processes can be put in place to set targets and KPI's without killing it. Governance is a significant challenge; how do you manage stakeholders, have process open, hold yourself transparent and open.

Need to ensure that we can give people really good examples and sharing practice between universities. Lots of people talk about it as consulting. More discussions about co-design might be best rhetoric to use to pull people in. What makes an effective agreement? How weigh up breadth vs depth? Might some national frameworks (for instance linked to education and health pathways and outcomes) help focus people on 'what works'? How might the impact of CUA's be tracked and evaluated? How is accountability best exercised in arrangements of this nature? What risks need to be identified and managed?

Capacity: what resources and capabilities are needed to deliver effectively?

Feedback from group exercise:

1. Co-constructed design: risk and danger in going out there saying it's up to external stakeholders to co-construct. Looking for win-wins otherwise there's a risk of being all things to all people. Need to ensure they are prepared to take risks with this. Framework must be clear and have a lot of rigor to it, throughout the whole process. Transparency about that rigor needs to be important.
2. Evidence and Data: outcomes and the idea that you do need to look at long-term outcomes, whether things in defined place are actually improving but it is difficult in practice to identify what the impact of those things actually are. Is there something that can be measured in a robust-enough way to see if what is being done is having the desired impact?
3. Setting goals: Public engagement – what are the catalysts and beacons which drive this agenda? Geographical scales, timescales driving each HEI. Structuring the agreement around themes is helpful but focusing them on activity or solutions to address challenges is also helpful. Typology in where universities can help with convening, thinking and doing. Different partners can adopt into, co-create, deliver. Each stage to check with coalition. Will restrict measuring to the doing. Need for a very flexible, agile scope – nothing rigorous like the TEF Framework.
4. What makes an effective agreement? About having a shared vision. Underneath that vision could have different projects. The agreement must be mutually beneficial for all partners.
5. Time issue: NHS has a 10 year vision / strategy. How is your partner flexible, agile enough to adapt to these strategies? Partners can feel disconnected to the agreement if they have massive change / national framework which governs their direction of travel. Delivery has to help your partners address their delivery in core ways too. What support can this network of universities need? Sector intelligence can be fed in a really accessible way – strong partnership around the national agenda that is being very well communicated to individual universities to ensure they have a good grip on national policy affecting their partners. The notion of scenario planning is a useful tool to take into account of all of the changes that can happen locally and nationally.
6. To make sure evaluation measurements is taken into account with the scoping phase this should be considered right at the start. Process of learning and giving and receiving feedback throughout the process

7. Length of the agreement and duration: if it is something for 10 years, can't be that detailed as region will change in that timescale. Is it that the agreement contains principles for the 10 year plan and then focuses on activities over 2 years or a more realistic period. External governance of this: over and above what have in terms of institutional sense? Can this body still hold institutions to account if these things change?
8. Resources: needing the right people to lead on this with the right capabilities and ability to communicate well with people, critically understand others than just themselves, building relationships with external partners. Needs expertise.

LO advised other universities spoken to are concerned about the timescales and would welcome some steer from the Group at the July conference. Need to do more about risks and make things more implicit; how to mitigate the risks and be realistic. Have institutions say where they are on the journey to implement this: should be prepared to say where they have got to and have some accountability. Suggestion for CUA's should be put in place within the following 12 months - some group members didn't believe this was realistic or feasible due to other deciding local factors. Suggestion for a further conference in a year's time which may help people have a timeline / date to have something more tangible to bring to that meeting.

Building capacity:

Institutional self-evaluation tool: sets out a number of ways universities might assess themselves. Somehow there has to be, as part of the CUA, to recognise that you do need to invest resources in building capacity. Who responsible, how resourced, vision statement on place, where does it fit together with research and teaching agenda? Capacity building is a clear issue and have a set of tools as to how to do this within institutions and between institutions. Another way of keeping it going maintaining capacity: having some targets to deliver something. Issue is that the conference is coming up, how do we plug in to other networks and conferences?

Building the network:

JR: Likes being able to say at the July conference that will be coming back together in 12 months. How does the group connect with big events that partner institutions may be running? Can come back a year later to see what has been done, what has been learnt and the things that will be taken forward.

SR: Need to show how this work / CUA / Civic agenda will feed into all levels of engagement – Local, National and International. AM advised held a lunch / meeting with representatives from 20 different countries to find out the work they are doing with their governments. Are there a number of activities that universities could do through their global connections? Scotland is a good example of this. How do we help universities in countries which have big challenges, develop their civic role as opposed to trying to crawl up one in the global standings. How we can benefit but how we can help other people? In areas where there are major challenges?

Next steps:

PMa and the team to take feedback from today and put together a framework for the event on the 19th. Members invited to contribute via e-mail in the meantime. If anyone has anything they wish to add / be delivered at that conference to contact RB.

Beyond that: how do we establish the network, where located and how to fund? Task Group that BK is chairing will be working on this over the next few weeks.

KR: believes there isn't a demand for a formal-type of institution / organisation. Recognition for a need for capacity building but not an explicit demand for a service. Critical that delegates who attend on July 19th have set deadlines / dates / milestones, etc. Should be a programme of activities for the institutions? Who would be responsible for organising these? Who has the capacity to assist with the organisation of this and put more resource into this? Need to keep the momentum behind this. Need to identify 4 or 5 areas where there is a real demand for guidance and will help group to know what gaps need to be filled; have a concrete network of activity.