National
Co-ordinating
Centre for
Public Engagement

NCCPE response to the KEF consultation

March 14th 2019

www.public.engagement.ac.uk

This document contains the NCCPE's final response to the KEF consultation that was launched in January 2019. We would like to thank the many people who commented on and contributed to this document.

We have also published a **Briefing pack about the KEF** to translate the consultation document for a non-HE audience, and to provide some prompts for a discussion about it:

https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/nccpe_kef_briefing_pack_march_2019_v2.pdf

If you would like to discuss this response, please contact: nccpe.enquiries@uwe.ac.uk

Q.4 KEF PURPOSE

Do you consider that the KEF as outlined will fulfil its stated purposes?

- To provide universities with new tools to understand, benchmark and improve their performance.
- To provide business and other users with more information on universities.
- To provide greater public visibility and accountability.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
To provide universities with new tools to understand, benchmark and improve their performance.				x			
To provide businesses and other users with more information on universities.			x				
To provide greater public visibility and accountability.				X			

Please provide a commentary in relation to your scores above. (400 word limit)

- We see potential in the KEF being used as a strategic tool by institutions to identify distinctive features of their KE provision and compare their activity with other similar institutions. In the case of Public Engagement, the proposed metric is of limited value, and we propose an alternative approach below
- The KEF will provide centralised and standardised information which partners and the public more generally could access. However, as currently configured, we aren't confident that the information is sufficiently tailored to the needs of these potential audiences, so it is not likely to achieve this objective. We suggest below how the content relating to Public Engagement and Local Growth might be configured differently to better meet this objective, but we think this will need user testing
- The proposed perspectives provide a broad articulation of the types of activity encompassed by KE, and treat these as equally important. This is a positive step, as it challenges a widely held view that KE is primarily about commercialisation and technology transfer. However, the proposed metrics are largely focused on financial value and the rationale for these 7 perspectives is not explained. We think this merits further thought, to ensure they best capture the variety of KE activity, and

provide the answers that external users of the KEF would find valuable. We were surprised that a technical rationale for the choice of perspectives was not provided in the consultation, as it was for the clustering methodology.

- While we appreciate the intention to minimise burden on HEIs, and to utilse existing data where possible, there is a significant risk that the KEF is foregrounding what can be measured rather than what really matters. The focus in university income in most of the perspectives excludes significant types of value generated through KE interactions. The provision of narratives for all 7 perspectives would increase the burden, but allow vital context to be provided.
- If the intention is to use the KEF to exercise accountability, then it makes sense to consider linking it to funding (longer term, once the methodology is proven). However, there are risks with doing this given how relatively crude the proposed metrics are, and the decision not to assess or evaluate the narrative statements, which provide more nuanced intelligence. If it is to be linked to funding, then some form of light touch review of these narratives would be necessary.

5. AIMS AND OVERALL APPROACH OF THE KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE FRAMEWORK (KEF)

Overall approach

The KEF consultation document describes the overall approach as being an annual, institutional level, largely metrics driven exercise, although noting that narrative will have an important role. More background may be found in the report summarising the recommendations of the technical advisory group. Do you consider this overall approach to be appropriate? *

| Strongly disagree |
| Disagree |
| Somewhat disagree |
| Somewhat agree |
| Agree |
| Strongly agree |
| No opinion |

Please provide a commentary in relation to your scores above. (400 word limit)

- We appreciate the considerate effort taken by RE to develop a framework that aims to both make use of existing data and reduce burden on institutions.
- However, until the proposed metrics are operationalised through the pilot it is hard to judge the robustness and usefulness of these metrics or to anticipate other (perhaps unintended) consequences of the proposed approach.
- The exercise is also seriously constrained by the availability of useful metrics. The current review of HEB-CI is clearly very significant as it could provide a much better long term solution by ensuring more robust and useful metrics are routinely

captured, which the KEF could benefit from. We would argue strongly that this iteration of the KEF should be viewed as a relatively crude 'demonstrator' with the expectation that it will evolve considerably over the next 3 years.

- Generally, the proposed metrics start from the assumption that income is a proxy for excellence. The substantial body of research into knowledge exchange does not corroborate this. The literature foregrounds the vital role of sustained partnerships; capacity building and 'absorptive capacity', and demonstrates that some of the most valuable outcomes for partners have a low 'unit price'.
- Given the above, we welcome the inclusion of narrative elements within the framework. However, the fact that these narratives will not be assessed limits their value. We suggest how this might be addressed below. We also argue that all 7 perspectives would benefit from accompanying narratives.
- External perspectives from HE partners are not currently captured by the KEF. It would be interesting to consider how, longer term, a systematic way of capturing such feedback might be captured (for instance, using the net promoter score, an approach used in other sectors).

- The limited involvement of partners in developing and shaping the KEF is a serious concern. There is a risk that the KEF ends up reflecting what the HE sector thinks is important, not what partners need from or value about the sector. We have attempted to canvas views from some partner organisations in relation to the public and community engagement dimension, but this is a very limited sample. We recommend that significant user involvement should be factored into future iterations of the KEF

6. CLUSTERING

The English higher education sector is very diverse. We therefore propose to create clusters of knowledge exchange peer groups. The proposed clusters and clustering approach is detailed in the KEF consultation document. Please use the following questions to provide your feedback on our proposals.

Please indicate your degree of support for the following aspects of our clustering approach. *

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
The conceptual framework that underpins the cluster analysis.					x		
The variables and methods employed in undertaking the cluster analysis.			x				

The resulting make-up of the clusters, i.e. the membership.					x		
That the overall approach to clustering helps Research England to meet the stated purposes of the KEF and ensures fair comparison.					x		

Please provide commentary on any aspect of your scores above. If relevant please incorporate suggestions for alternative arrangements. (400 word limit)

- We welcome the use of clustering in the KEF, linked to institution's assets and capabilities for KE, as it makes the task of comparing very different types of institutions more intelligent and fair. It could also allow for interesting intelligence to merge over time: for instance, do the different clusters have distinctively different approaches to community and public engagement, and if so, why is this?
- The approach taken to developing the conceptual framework seems broadly fair and logical.
- We agree with Million Plus that, perhaps inadvertently, the descriptors for Clusters J and M are expressed negatively (the use of the word 'limited') in particular. It would be better to describe all clusters in positive terms, and without implying comparison with other clusters.
- We did note that two very significant variables were missing from the clustering methodology.
- Firstly, we were surprised that the role of KE professional staff was not identified as a variable in the first dimension, '*Scale and focus of existing knowledge base'*. The literature makes it clear that these professional roles are a critical factor in delivering effective knowledge exchange. Universities invest significantly in these roles and this kind of expertise to deliver their KE strategies, for instance by employing specialists in public and community engagement, and in other roles to manage enquiries, pursue new opportunities, manage relationships, or deal with more technical issues such as licensing. It would be useful to explore the relative investment HEIs make into such specialist roles.
- We were also surprised by a significant omission in the second dimension, '*Scale and focus of knowledge generation'*: the proportion of submitting units achieving 3*/4* impact case studies in the REF. It focuses instead only on the proportion of 4* research submitted by individual researchers. Given that the quality of impact achieved by HEIs is critically linked to their KE capabilities we are keen to understand why this was not incorporated into the methodology, and whether including it would have any impact on the clusters.

7. Perspectives and metrics

Knowledge exchange covers an extremely diverse range of activity and it is appropriate that some HEIs will perform more strongly in different areas that align more closely with their mission and strategic goals. We have therefore proposed a range of seven perspectives. The following questions will seek your views on the number and range of perspectives and metrics proposed.

 Perspectives

- Research partnerships
- Working with business
- Working with the public and third sector
- Skills, enterprise and entrepreneurship
- Local growth and regeneration
- IP and commercialisation
- Public and community engagement

Taking into account the overall range of perspectives and metrics outlined in the consultation document, do you agree or disagree that a sufficiently broad range of KE activities is captured. *

• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Somewhat disagree
• **Somewhat agree**
• Agree
• Strongly agree
• No opinion

Comments:

• The perspectives provide a relatively helpful categorisation of different types of KE, with some provisos noted below.
• We agree that all seven perspectives should receive equal weighting. Their function is to capture the broad range of KE activities being undertaken. Weighting them equally will encourage a broad and balanced portfolio of KE activities across the sector.

- However, it would have been helpful if the consultation had provided a rationale for why these 7 perspectives were chosen. Compared with the clustering, which is robustly explained, the perspectives lack an explicit rationale. This begs the question of how they were derived:
  - Do they represent where the HE sector is currently investing its KE resources? Do they capture roughly equivalent blocks of investment and activity?
  - Alternatively, were they chosen as areas where metrics would be relatively easy to identify?
  - Or to represent, broadly, the types of interaction and impact which RE believes the HE sector should be attentive to?
  - Do they in any way represent what stakeholders in the system believe should be priorities for the HE sector to address – in effect, acting as a representation of 'demand' and 'need' from outside the sector?
- Our impression is that, currently, they are something of a pragmatic 'hybrid' of these different motivations. It would help if RE could provide a more robust articulation of why they were chosen.
- Building on the above, we have some concerns that the perspective of '**working with the public and third sector**' encompasses a disproportionately large portfolio of types of KE activity, incorporating as it does interaction with the cultural, health, local government, voluntary and education sectors, and potentially policy too. We wonder if this could / should be broken down further to allow more room for these areas of activity to 'breathe'.
- We note that **social innovation or enterprise** has a key role to play in building an inclusive economy and the metrics as currently presented do not reflect this.
- We are concerned by the lack of focus placed on **partnerships between HEIs.** Developing such collaborations and partnerships makes a critical contribution to the overall impact of the sector's KE performance, and the vitality of the KE system. If it is decided that an overarching narrative should be provided by HEIs to frame their KEF profile, then this might be included as an explicit prompt within this.

Research partnerships

Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document for this perspective, please provided any comments on the balance and coverage of the proposed metrics. (400 word limit)

- As argued above, we think that it could be helpful to include a third measure, to capture the extent and vitality of research partnerships with other HEIs.
- While we applaud the spirit of the metric to count numbers of co-authored papers we worry this may have unintended consequences, corralling partners into an activity that may not be meaningful or valuable to them, or for which they are not recompensed. It may skew activity away from other more valuable types of interaction.

- There is a significant tension in the KEF as a whole: its goal is to provide a robust, national picture and so HEIs are clustered nationally. However, many potential collaborators with HEIs will want to work with HEIs that are local to them – so may want to compare HEIs within a fixed geographical range. It would be useful to explore for this perspective, and for others, percentages for each of the proposed metrics that are in the local region. This would complement the local growth perspective.
- It is also important to note how activity often 'spills across' perspectives – for instance, the important contribution that public engagement can make to this perspective. If the perspectives are treated as mutually exclusive, some of the important vitality of the KE system might be suppressed.

Working with business

Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document for this perspective, please provided any comments on the balance and coverage of the proposed metrics. (400 word limit)

- No comment

Working with the public and third sector

Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document for this perspective, please provided any comments on the balance and coverage of the proposed metrics. (400 word limit)

- No comment

Skills, enterprise and entrepreneurship

Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document for this perspective, please provided any comments on the balance and coverage of the proposed metrics. (400 word limit)

- No comment

Local growth and regeneration

Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document for this perspective, please provided any comments on the balance and coverage of the proposed metrics. (400 word limit)

Note there is a separate question to consider the use of supplementary narrative.

The definition for this perspective includes the phrase 'spill-over outcomes that relate to local growth and regeneration' and activities 'targeted to make a difference locally…..this may include social inclusion'. Social inclusion and many other outcomes of local regeneration activity (community development, environmental improvement, etc.) cannot be captured by a metric focused entirely on income. Additionally, the focus on income suggests that universities should be profiting from their local area, rather than vice versa.

Additional or alternative metrics, such as % FTE involved in local activities, % of modules/courses with local placements, % academics on local boards, opportunities for the local community to engage with the university, etc., would show a fuller picture.

Other possible metrics which, over time, could be routinely captured include:

- We contribute financial, staff and other resources to the ongoing development of our Local Industrial Strategy. The estimated value of these resources is £X

- We have developed in partnership with other stakeholders, including neighbouring universities, a transparent and prioritised action plan of practical investments selected on their basis of their prospective contribution to the Local Industrial Strategy and/or Grand Societal Challenges. The value of financial investments made with own resources of our university in the period X to X was £Y

- We build our staff and financial capacity to attract and then invest external finances to part fund these investments and increasingly share this capacity with other local stakeholders. The value of external financial resources secured in in the period was £X. The cost of our staff capacity to attract and invest these external finances in the period was £Y

- We have a planned approach to the ongoing use of the Social Value Act within our procurement policies. We provided in the period X to X training to Y local firms to develop their capacity to submit successful tenders in response to our procurement programmes. Approximately X% of procured services and goods were bought from local firms.

- We are a Living Wage employer. Y/N

We provide further suggestions of meaningful indicators in our response to the narrative question below

IP and commercialisation

Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document for this perspective, please provided any comments on the balance and coverage of the proposed metrics. (400 word limit)

- No comment

Public and community engagement

Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document for this perspective, please provided any comments on the balance and coverage of the proposed metrics. (400 word limit)

Note there is a separate question to consider the use of supplementary narrative.

We have reservations about the proposed metric (time per academic FTE committed to events, performances and museums and galleries):

- These types of activities represent just a subset of the many types of public and community engagement which we would want to see reflected in the framework. For many HEIs these kinds of dissemination activities are just the 'tip of the iceberg', and don't capture more interactive and collaborative types of activity
- HEIs often do not have accurate ways of tracking staff time, raising concerns about the accuracy of the data
- The inclusion of events in museums (which need to be 'owned by the HEP') could unfairly bias the framework in favour of the relatively small number of HEIs who own their own museums

We think a more reliable metric could be provided by the use of a different HE-BCI metric: the survey already asks (Q.6): Does your HEP have a strategic plan for public and community engagement? HEIs are asked to self-report against a five point scale. The existence of a strategy is, in our view, a more robust proxy indicator of 'excellence' in public and community engagement than the proposed metrics of hours dedicated to events. The narrative account could require them to justify the ranking they have provided and to provide more details of their strategic support. There are of course limitations as this indicator relies on self-reporting. However, it is a sensible first step.

A further step would be to use the linked narrative statement to require more nuanced self-reporting against a broader set of indicators, allowing an overall aggregate metric to be created. In this way the narrative becomes a critical component in the assessment, rather than a de-coupled context setting device.

HEIs could be invited to self-assess against these indicators on a scale of one to four (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised). Their overall 'score'/metric would be the average of their assessments of their progress against the indicators.

We suggest that the indicators might cluster into four groups, capturing key factors in effective support for public engagement:

- Having a strategic plan and operational commitment to public and community engagement
- Providing community access to your facilities and expertise.
- Involving communities in your research and teaching
- Commitment to partnership working and social responsibility

We elaborate on this in the narrative section below.

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NARRATIVE

We consider that for two perspectives, that on their own, the existing metrics do not provide sufficient measure of the scale and variety of activities undertaken by higher education institutions (HEIs).

We intend to work with the sector to develop, where possible, metrics that will capture the outcomes derived from all types of knowledge exchange in the future. In the mean time we propose to supplement both the Local Growth & Regeneration and Public & Community Engagement perspectives by requesting a narrative statement from each provider to set out the main strategic goals, activities, outputs and potential outcomes achieved.

Do you consider it appropriate for HEIs to provide narrative text to support the metrics in perspectives that don't currently have fully developed metrics? *

• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Somewhat disagree
• Somewhat agree
• Agree
• <mark>Strongly agree</mark>
• No opinion

Public and community engagement narrative

Overall, is the guidance on the provision of narrative text for this perspective clear. *

• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Somewhat disagree
• <mark>Somewhat agree</mark>
• Agree
• Strongly agree
• No opinion

Please comment on the proposal to include narrative from HEIs for the public and community engagement perspective, in particular: - where further clarification is required- where refinements could be made- whether there are areas where more consistency across HEIs could be achieved (400 word limit)

We propose two possible routes forward. One is to use an alternative HEBCI metric (existence of strategy), and to use the narrative to evidence the infrastructure in place to support it. The second, to invite HEIs to self-assess on a numerical scale against a more extensive set of indicators.

As a consequence, we suggest the narrative template be adapted to:
- Focus on indicators representing good practice in engagement, inviting them to self-report against these
- Ensure these indicators address types of support which external partners most value
- Require that HEIs provide evidence and links, to ensure transparency and usability

We have published a draft template on our website.

Below is a sample of the kinds of indicators we are suggesting, derived from existing literature:

1. **Providing community access to your facilities and expertise**.
- We have a transparent process for communities to contact the university and to have their enquiries dealt with promptly
2. **Involving communities in your research and teaching**
- We provide a clearly signposted and high quality portfolio of learning and engagement opportunities for the public, robustly evaluated
3. **Commitment to partnership working and social responsibility**

- We have a strategy in place to direct our efforts to address equality and diversity in our interactions with wider society, and processes in place to monitor this
4. **Strategic commitment to public and community engagement**
- There is a strategic and operational plan in place for PE/CE

We would anticipate providing statements which allow HEIs to match their performance against levels, as we currently provide in our EDGE tool. We are aware of the risk that self–reporting will encourage HEIs to overestimate performance, for reputational gain. If KEF is implemented as a self-improvement tool and is not linked to funding, then this risk would be mitigated. We also suggest HEIs be asked to provide links to evidence to support their self-assessment. A further safeguard would be to review a sample of the submissions to monitor activity.

The benefits of this approach include:

- It would focus attention on critical characteristics of high quality KE activity, addressing the objective of improving practice
- If these indicators link to published information and resources / assets it would address the objective of supporting external organisations to navigate the HE sector

In the interim, the HEB-CI review would allow the development of more robust metrics which could be integrated into future iterations of the KEF

Local growth and regeneration narrative

Overall, is the guidance on the provision of narrative text for this perspective clear. *

• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Somewhat disagree
• Somewhat agree
• Agree
• Strongly agree
• No opinion

Please comment on the proposal to include narrative from HEIs for the local growth and regeneration perspective, in particular:

- Where further clarification is required
- Where refinements could be made

- Whether there are areas where more consistency across HEIs could be achieved (400 word limit)

We suggest that a similar approach might be taken to the narrative and metric for this perspective as proposed above. A set of indicators could be derived from the literature about effective KE practice in this domain to allow the generation of another self-reported metric, and a narrative which provides useful context and evidence / links to back it up.

A particularly useful source for these is the recently published final report of the Civic University Commission, which provides a useful typology of roles HEIs can play in their cities and regions. We recommend that these be used to structure the narrative account in the KEF for this perspective.

We provide some possible indicators below for four different dimensions:

Supporting the educational growth of a place: which encompasses the institution's interaction with school aged population, and with mature learners, such as adult, community and lifelong learning; and to support skills and employment outcomes for local people

- Our widening participation and 'outreach' activity seeks to actively contribute to attainment and employability of local populations
- We take a strategic approach to meeting the skills and development needs of local employers and facilitate KE through student placements in local organisations

Supporting the economic life of a place: which encompasses the institution acting as a model employer and its procurement practices, its local 'convening' role, and its role as a leading and model economic actor

- We are a living wage employer (4 or nothing)
- Our procurement policies activity seek to deliver value to our locality

Supporting the cultural wellbeing of a place: which encompasses the institution's participation in and contribution to the cultural life of their areas; support for the cultural and creative and heritage sector through work with local partners and helping them to contribute to 'place making'

- We maximise opportunities for our staff and students to actively participate in the cultural life of our region
- We have a strategic approach to supporting local cultural and heritage infrastructure, for instance museums and public libraries

In addition, we recommend that HEIs be invited to report on their overarching **strategic approach** and investment into this area:

Strategic investment to maximise our local impact

- There are partnership agreements in place that have been co-designed with local stakeholders that articulate shared targets and goals for your activity
- There is regular and systematic reporting on the activity and its impact, with agreed KPIs

The role of further narrative or contextual information

We welcome responses on what other types of narrative or contextual information would be helpful.

You may wish to consider, for example:

- Should the HEI or Research England provide other narrative information?
- How should we use other contextual information, such as information on local economic competitiveness described in section 5 of the cluster analysis report?
- Would other perspectives benefit significantly from further narrative information?
- Would the benefit of adding further narrative information be outweighed by the burden of doing so? *

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
Overarching institutional statement - provided by the HEI						X	
Overarching institutional statement - provided by Research England						X	

Comments:

- We could see the benefit of RE providing a narrative section for each of the clusters. This could provide an overview of the strengths of each cluster and provide a clear way for those outside the sector to gain an appreciation of the diversity of potential partners.
- We also think that other contextual data held by RE for individual HEIs could be made available to help external organisations better understand the sector and potential partners within it. Any such activity should however be conducted in close collaboration with such potential audiences for / users of the KEF
- In providing such context, there are a number of factors which impact on KE which could be foregrounded. One example concerns location, for instance when an HEI is in a rural location. Engagement with SMEs is far easier in clustered spaces (towns) in contrast to more spread communities (eg. rural). Similarly 'public engagement' is made more difficult by having more challenges around access in rural areas. HEIs in areas with high 'absorptive capacity' have a head start over those in areas without such capability and infrastructure etc

- We also believe that an overarching narrative statement from HEIs should be required, just as the TEF requires a provider statement, and the REF an Environment return. Intelligent alignment with these statements should be sought.
- This kind of background information is critically important. It provides useful contextual information, which would be of value to users of the KEF to help them understand the priorities, resources and infrastructure to support KE that is available within different HEIs and would help them to navigate the data presented for the 7 perspectives. It also helps to ensure that the KEF focuses attention not just on the 'ends' but the 'means' by which the outcomes have been achieved: the internal structures and capabilities to support KE (for example, KE offices) and the overarching strategic intent and context which would allow users of the KEF to interpret their results intelligently.
- We argue earlier in our response that all 7 perspectives would benefit from narratives to help users interpret the results.

9. VISUALISATION

We have provided further information including example visualisations of the KEF within the consultation document.

Please comment on the presentation and visualisation proposals, for example:

- Where further clarification is required
- Where refinements could be made
- Whether there are areas where more consistency across HEIs could be achieved- how narratives could be incorporated?
(400 word limit)

- In principle, the top level visualisations are good at showing cluster and individual institutional strengths. However, they will only be as robust and useful as the data affords. It will be important to test these visualisations with 'real' data to ensure they present a meaningful and fair comparison between HEIs
- The visualisations are somewhat helpful in terms of identifying quantity of activity but do not indicate quality. Visualisations are based on the quantitative metrics and do not take into account qualitative information – this is provided alongside rather being part of the scoring. The visualisations can therefore be misleading as a measure of quality knowledge exchange.

- The use of radar charts is good at demonstrating how each perspective has an equal weighting, something that a bar graph (for example) would not do as well due to the order that perspectives would be listed in.
- It will be important to test how useful provider dashboards would be to a prospective partner / collaborator from outside the sector. The information is very 'high level' and may be difficult to interpret meaningfully.
- As they are currently configured, it is difficult to see how the narratives (if they are two A4 sides) can be easily included in the visualisation. Potentially, the cluster description section on the left of the page could be adapted to present some narrative information.
- If however our suggestion of including a set of indicators in the narrative is taken up, then these indicators (and the HEIs self-reported score against them) could usefully be incorporated into a dashboard for this perspective, providing a more nuanced picture of that HEIs activity
- While the mocked up dashboards provide one useful 'lens' for inspecting the KEF data, a well-designed database and interface could allow very different user-defined dashboards to be created. It would be sensible to involve creative expertise in visualisation and user-focused design to contribute to the next phase of development.

10. IMPLEMENTATION

We will pilot the implementation with a group of HEIs as described in the consultation document.

Please provide any comments about the implementation of the KEF. (200 word limit)

We believe that the timeline proposed to implement the KEF is promising. We welcome the pilot exercise

We are concerned by the relatively low level of consultation that there has been to date with organisations outside higher education who are envisaged as potential audiences for and users of the KEF.

11. ANY OTHER COMMENTS

If you have any other comments, please share them here. (400 word limit)

We have drawn on various resources and reviews to compile our list of draft indicators for public and community engagement. Our sources include:

- The NCCPE's 'EDGE self-assessment tool', which was itself based on a extensive review of existing benchmarking frameworks (http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/support-engagement/strategy-and-planning/edge-tool)
- The NCCPE's 'Auditing, Benchmarking and Evaluating Public Engagement' report, which conducted a comprehensive review of benchmarking frameworks (http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/evaluatingpublicengagement_1.pdf)
- The NCCPE's Community Partner Network's 'Principles of practice for Community-University partnership working' (http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/principles_of_practice_for_cups.pdf)
- AHRC's 'Creating Living Knowledge' report (https://connected-communities.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Creating-Living-Knowledge.Final_.pdf)
- 'The Common Cause Principles for Community-University partnerships' (https://cpb-eu-w2.wpmucdn.com/blogs.bristol.ac.uk/dist/a/358/files/2018/09/CC_Enablers_Barriers_Poster_final-1f2iunj.pdf)
- The recent TEFCE report 'Mapping and Critical Synthesis of Current State-of-the-Art on Community Engagement in Higher Education'

(https://ris.utwente.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/76357596/TEFCE_Mapping_Critical_Synthesis.pdf)

We echo Praxis Auril's comments that there is lack of clarity about who the KEF is for and how it can present complex interactions accurately to policymakers, university management, business audiences and other publics in a single tool. Most significantly, the voice of the user is distinctly lacking in current discussion about the KEF and this needs to be captured if the exercise is to meet the second of its stated aims and provide universities with information on how KE performance can be improved.

We also agree that as institutions consider the next REF and TEF there needs to be a better conversation about how these frameworks fit together and work for institutions, their employees and external stakeholders. One very positive impact of KEF discussions to date has been the coming together of different groups to understand the reach and remit of KE within different types of HEI and how it reaches across research and teaching activities at the local, regional and international level. This conversation is welcomed and should be maintained.

Annex 1: draft narrative template for Public and Community Engagement

Narrative report					Comments	Links to evidence
1. Institution name						
2. Contact details: The contact details provided should be relevant to the public engagement activities of the institution. The information will be published as part of the narrative statement and can be a named individual or a generic contact point.						
3. Context: What is distinctive about how your institution approaches public and community engagement: • Internally: how is engagement reflected in your mission and embedded in your teaching and research? • Externally: what are your priorities in terms of place (your geographical reach); people (do you focus on particular communities); and outcomes (have you identified priority outcome areas)?						
4. Strategic commitment to public and community engagement: Please indicate your progress with the indicators below (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised)						
• There is a strategic and operational plan in place for PE/CE as a result of an inclusive process across the whole HEP and with external partner input	1	2	3	4		
• There is a budget allocated to PE / CE with explicit and ambitious targets	1	2	3	4		
• There is regular and systematic reporting on the activity and its impact, with agreed KPIs	1	2	3	4		

	1	2	3	4		
• There is a senior leader with formal responsibility for PE/CE (or that responsibility is distributed clearly across several senior staff)	1	2	3	4		
• There are specialist staff employed to provide support and advice	1	2	3	4		
• There are promotion / career pathways to support staff progression which are well used	1	2	3	4		
5. Providing community access to your facilities and expertise. Please indicate your progress with the indicators below (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised)						
• We enable the public to access and make use of our facilities and assets (e.g. sporting and cultural) and to signpost these opportunities	1	2	3	4		
• We have a transparent process for communities to contact the university and establish contact with our staff and to have their enquiries dealt with promptly and professionally	1	2	3	4		
• We ensure staff and student expertise is accessible to communities, and actively support our people to take up voluntary roles in the community	1	2	3	4		
6. Involving communities in your research and teaching: Please indicate your progress with the indicators below (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised)						
• We provide a clearly signposted and high quality portfolio of purposeful learning and engagement opportunities for the public which are robustly evaluated	1	2	3	4		
• We actively involve the public in our research activities, and provide expert support to facilitate this	1	2	3	4		
7. Commitment to partnership working and social responsibility						

• We have a systematic and managed approach to partnership working with civic, community and cultural partners in our region, and beyond. This includes a published set of partnership principles addressing issues such as payment, IP, equity and sustainability	1	2	3	4	
• We have a strategy in place to direct our efforts to address equality and diversity in our interactions with wider society, and processes in place to monitor this	1	2	3	4	
8. External recognition or awards: Have you received any external recognition for your activity as an institution or for individual projects? For example NCCPE's Engage Watermark or equivalent?					

Annex 2: draft narrative template for Local Growth and Regeneration

Narrative report					Comments	Links to evidence
1. Institution name						
2. Contact details: The contact details provided should be relevant to the local growth activities of the institution. The information will be published as part of the narrative statement and can be a named individual or a generic contact point.						
3. Context: What is distinctive about how your institution approaches local growth and regeneration: • Internally: how is this reflected in your mission and embedded in your teaching and research? • Externally: what are your priorities in terms of place (your geographical reach); people (do you focus on particular communities); and outcomes (have you identified priority outcome areas)?						
4. Strategic investment to maximise your local impact: Please indicate your progress with the indicators below (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised)						
• There is a strategic and operational plan in place for local growth and regeneration	1	2	3	4		
• There are partnership agreements in place that have been co-designed with local stakeholders that articulate shared targets and goals for your activity	1	2	3	4		
• There is regular and systematic reporting on the activity and its impact, with agreed KPIs	1	2	3	4		
• There is a senior leader with formal responsibility for local growth and regeneration (or that responsibility is distributed clearly across several senior staff)	1	2	3	4		
• There is investment in expertise and resources to support effective monitoring and evaluation, and a systematic approach to gathering evidence	1	2	3	4		

	1	2	3	4	
5. Supporting the educational growth of your location: *which encompasses the institution's interaction with school aged population, and with mature learners, such as adult, community and lifelong learning; and to support skills and employment outcomes for local people*. Please indicate your progress with the indicators below (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised)					
• Our widening participation and 'outreach' activity seeks to actively contribute to attainment and employability of local populations	1	2	3	4	
• We have a strategic approach to deploying our staff and student expertise, research and other assets to boost overall attainment in our region	1	2	3	4	
• We take a strategic approach to meeting the skills and development needs of local employers and facilitate knowledge exchange through student placements in local organisations	1	2	3	4	
• We provide a clearly signposted and high quality portfolio of learning opportunities for local people at various stages of life, which are robustly evaluated	1	2	3	4	
• We seek to actively involve local publics and partners in our research, teaching and knowledge exchange activities, and provide expert support to facilitate this	1	2	3	4	
6. Supporting the cultural wellbeing of our location: *which encompasses the institution's participation in and contribution to the cultural life of their area; support for the cultural and creative industries and heritage sector through work with local partners; and helping them to contribute to 'place making'.* Please indicate your progress with the indicators below (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised)					
• We seek to maximise opportunities for our staff and students to actively participate in the cultural life of our region	1	2	3	4	
• We have taken every effort to enable the public to access and make use of our sporting and cultural facilities and assets, and to signpost these opportunities	1	2	3	4	

• We make a significant contribution to the vitality and sustainability of local cultural and creative industriess	1	2	3	4
• We have a strategic approach to supporting local cultural and heritage infrastructure, for instance museums and public libraries	1	2	3	4

7. Supporting the economic life of our location: *which encompasses the institution acting as a model employer and its procurement practices, its local 'convening' role, and its role as a leading and model economic actor.* Please indicate your progress with the indicators below (where 1 is not in place; and 4 is fully realised)

• We are a living wage employer (4 or nothing)	1	2	3	4
• We actively support staff and students to take up voluntary roles in the community	1	2	3	4
• Our procurement policies activity seek to deliver value to our locality	1	2	3	4
• We contribute actively to a range of local strategic partnerships (e.g. LEPs)	1	2	3	4
• We provide significant support to local spin out companies and SMEs and help with attracting and retaining inward investors	1	2	3	4
• We ensure our estate development plans have maximum impact on local place making and economic development	1	2	3	4

8. External recognition or awards: Have you received any external recognition for your activity as an institution or for individual projects?

National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

The National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) is internationally recognised for its work supporting and inspiring universities to engage with the public.

We work to change perspectives, promote innovation, and nurture and celebrate excellence. We also champion meaningful engagement that makes a real and valued difference to people's lives.

The NCCPE is supported by the UK Higher Education Councils, Research Councils UK and Wellcome, and has been hosted by the University of Bristol and the University of the West of England since it was established in 2008.

National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

2nd Floor, Arnolfini
16 Narrow Quay
Bristol, BS1 4QA

Tel 0117 328 7190
Email nccpe.enquiries@uwe.ac.uk
Twitter @NCCPE

publicengagement.ac.uk

University of BRISTOL

UWE Bristol | University of the West of England

publicengagement.ac.uk | **@NCCPE**