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1. Executive summary

1.1. At its heart, this review has concluded that civic engagement is about the University making a difference to the place of which it forms a part: the Liverpool City Region. There is a symbiotic relationship between the University and the City Region: whilst a thriving University contributes to local economic growth and placemaking, a vibrant City Region helps to attract and retain top student and staff talent. Civic engagement activities must deliver mutual benefits to both City Region and University.

1.2. The rich and varied contributions of the University’s staff and students go beyond research, higher learning and the physical limits of the campus to help drive economic growth and make it a better place in which to live. This commitment is part of the University’s founding mission for ‘the advancement of learning and the ennoblement of life’. Engagement with the City Region also yields tangible opportunities to deliver distinctive projects, achieve research and teaching excellence and increase impact whilst also offering leadership and personal development opportunities.

1.3. The University’s biggest asset is its people: its students and its staff across its three Faculties and Professional Services are already engaged in a broad range of engagement activities. However, the University’s contribution is not limited to this and indeed becomes more powerful when combined with its networks, economic clout, physical assets and, crucially, its reputation. In this respect, it may be beneficial to view the University’s contribution in a more holistic manner and to understand civic engagement not as a discrete activity, but rather as an ‘ethos’ or ‘a way in which the University – as a whole – undertakes its business’.

1.4. The University’s configuration of assets affords it a unique position in the City Region. It is a major economic player, a ‘thought leader’, an international gateway, an honest broker and, critically, an attractor of knowledge and talent. A reinvigorated approach to civic engagement should reinforce this distinctive position, creating new spaces for interaction, driving traffic and business towards the University and generating opportunities for excellence and impact.

1.5. There is a significant level of enthusiasm amongst staff and students for civic engagement and a strong, varied portfolio of existing activity. Despite this, the University’s current approach to engagement is fragmented; there is a lack of clarity, both internally and externally around how it fits the University’s strategic objectives and no common focal point for internal and external users. Nevertheless, in renewing its civic commitment, the University should guard against adopting a prescriptive approach. Instead, there should be a focus on setting strategic direction and raising visibility, including celebrating success, showcasing innovative practice and highlighting opportunities.

1.6. The most effective approaches to engagement at UK and international HEIs respond to the context in which particular institutions operate. Nevertheless, certain ‘key principles’ are common to many institutions, forming a strong platform upon which ambitious projects can be launched. These key principles and the innovative activities they help to support can form the backbone of a strong University delivery plan to drive forward the University’s strong portfolio of existing activities, positioning itself for future funding and reaffirming its reputation as an engaged University.
2. Purpose and objectives

2.1. In a paper to SMT in December 2010, civic engagement was defined as part of the University’s central mission, an expression of its values and a means of providing opportunities to create unique research and learning projects, which differentiate the University from other HEIs. Following discussion, SMT agreed that an Action Plan for civic engagement should be formulated.

2.2. In order to provide a firm basis upon which to develop the Action Plan, the Public and Regional Team has conducted a “light touch” review of current civic engagement across the University’s three Faculties and Professional Services and analysed current approaches to engagement across UK and international comparator institutions. The review aims to:

- Establish conceptual clarity and raise awareness around civic engagement.
- Identify areas of good practice.
- Suggest avenues for the development of future activities contributing to the achievement of the University’s priority objectives, as set out under the Strategic Plan.

3. Approach

3.1. Scope: Part 1 seeks to capture the thoughts and experiences of civic engagement across the University’s three faculties, Professional Services and the Guild of Students, and the views of external partners. In doing so, it aims to focus upon the benefits of activities to both the University and external users, as well as their broader ‘public’ benefit; the review also takes account of activity taking place across various spatial levels (regionally, nationally and globally). Part 2 provides an analysis of current approaches to engagement across UK and international comparator institutions, whilst highlighting areas in which the University could build on existing assets or strengths to provide a more coherent and effective approach to civic engagement.

3.2. Methods: Following consultation with staff, it was agreed that a qualitative approach, via a programme of semi-structured interviews, would provide the best way of accessing a range of perspectives, providing greater richness of data and therefore a better understanding of the process of civic engagement. This approach was also viewed as beneficial in that it would begin to raise awareness of civic engagement from the outset of the review process, helping to generate a great degree of ‘buy-in’ amongst staff, students and external partners and providing a firm foundation for the implementation of the subsequent Action Plan.

3.3. 45 face-to-face, semi-structured interviews were conducted. Given time and resource constraints, interviewees were identified through previous research and documentation, including Making a Difference in the City Region (2010), the HEFCE Public Policy Micro-Study (2010) and Humanities and Social Sciences KE Audit, and through recommendations from the steering group (see 3.4). Interviews were split across the following categories:
3.4. Taking guidance from the steering group at an interim feedback session, the review then moved on to the analysis of approaches taken by comparator institutions, using them as a basis on which to suggest the development of future activities at the University of Liverpool.

3.5. **Management and governance:** The review has been conducted by members of the Public & Regional Engagement Team, Matthew Cliff and Jane Reynolds. It has been overseen by an informal, cross-University steering group, bringing together expertise and insights from academic and professional services staff (see Annex B for the group’s full composition).

4. **Context**

4.1. **External**

4.1.1. **Higher Education:** There is a renewed focus within the EU, Government and HE on the role of universities in society and their contribution to the places within which they are located. Engagement with a broad range of external partners and communities is increasingly viewed as a means by which universities can negotiate their positioning, reinforce their civic leadership role and maximise their contribution to society.

4.1.2. Recent years have seen a shift in modes of production of knowledge and Universities are no longer seen as the sole originators of new knowledge. In many instances, the notion of knowledge transfer has been replaced by one of knowledge exchange, which can involve co-design or co-production of research. Enhanced opportunities for genuine two-way exchange via engagement offer the opportunity to enrich research projects and increase impact, ensuring that Universities maintain their edge and enhance their ability to access more segments of the market.

4.1.3. This shift is reflected in the reference to public engagement in the REF Impact Pilot and with the recently publication of the HE Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research. The concordat aims to “recognise the importance of public engagement to help maximise the social and economic impact of UK research” and is based on four key principles:

- **Strategic commitment** – a shared understanding of public engagement, appropriate to context and communicated effectively internally and externally, with public engagement embedded within missions, key strategies and operational plans and fostered by senior public engagement champions.
- **Skills, support and opportunities** – researchers are enabled to participate in public engagement activities through appropriate training, support and opportunities including examples of good practice and the facilitation of networks and opportunities to engage with the public.
• **Reward and recognition** – benefits of public engagement recognised, public engagement appropriately represented in staff polices and processes. Staff supported to undertake public engagement activities and successes are celebrated and communicated across the organisation.

• **Implementation and impact** – regular reviews of progress in fostering public engagement across the UK and within organisations, including evaluating the efficacy of public engagement in supporting strategic aims, seeking feedback from staff, students and public, developing and sharing good practice.

4.1.4. **HEIs’ approaches to Public Engagement** differ, often as a response to their particular context (see part 2 for examples of UK and international interpretations). In order to unite these diverse approaches and signal a common HE commitment to contribute to society through public engagement, a Manifesto for Public Engagement has been developed by the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE). Current signatories include Manchester, UCL, Bristol and Edinburgh.

4.1.5. **Student experience**: With changes to student fees, it is likely that there will be an increasing demand for HEIs to deliver a more holistic experience before, during and after students’ time at university. Civic engagement activities provide opportunities to achieve this objective, generating distinctive opportunities to enrich the student experience, both within and outside the curriculum. Engagement by students as citizens is also growing in importance as they see themselves more and more as part of the local community.

4.1.6. **Policy and political context**: A number of global ‘grand challenges’ have been identified for the 21st century (many of which tally with the University’s priority research themes) including climate change, ageing and food security. The long-term solutions to these global issues need input from multiple sources and disciplines, including a major contribution from HE, and therefore require a broad approach to engagement. Many of the challenges manifest themselves in a specific manner in Liverpool, such as combating climate change in port cities and health inequalities. Current Research Council policy, such as the ESRC, reflects these global challenges and emphasises HEIs’ capacity to make an impact.

4.1.7. **UK public sector cuts**: Coalition Government policy and the impending cuts to UK public services mean that Universities will need to find funding from a greater number of external sources in the future. Whilst this increases the need for engagement, perhaps most notably with the commercial and third sectors, there will be a corresponding imperative to derive greater value from collaborative arrangements, whilst reducing duplication. This means HEIs adopting a leaner, more targeted and more coherent approach to engagement.

4.1.8. **21st century citizenship**: Across the UK, the relationship between citizens and the state is being redefined, with the public expressing a lack of confidence in both the state and the market economy. The debate appears to transcend the political divide: the Coalition Government’s plans for the ‘Big Society’ have been matched by Lambeth Council’s proposal for a Co-operative Council. In keeping with patterns in the shifting modes of knowledge production discussed above, there is a growing debate around the role of citizens in the design and delivery of public services. A key question for the University, alongside other third sector groups, is what place it wishes to occupy in this emerging landscape.
4.1.9. New ‘localism’ and City Region economic development: With a shift in government policy towards a more local approach to policy formation and delivery, the University, as a civic leader, site for connectivity and driver of competitiveness can play a critical part in a changing social, economic and political landscape. As a primary conduit for the flow of ideas and talent, and a focus for innovation, the University has a key role to play within the Knowledge Economy. This is reflected by the Vice-Chancellor’s position as Chair of the Knowledge Economy Group and the University’s representation on the board for the Local Enterprise Partnership for Liverpool City Region.

4.2. Internal

4.2.1 Strategic Plan: The University’s Strategic Plan 2009-14 takes account of the shifting external context through its approach to Research Performance, Knowledge Exchange and Student Experience. The new research strategy focuses upon interdisciplinary themes (below), which respond to a number of the global challenges outlined in 4.1.6.

- Changing Cultures
- Sustainable Energy
- Environmental Change
- Security and Conflict
- Materials for the Future
- Global Health
- Personalised Health

4.2.2 The Strategic Plan refers to a culture of support and collaboration that ‘will benefit the communities in which we operate, both at home and overseas’. Although the term ‘civic engagement’ is not expressly used in the Strategic Plan, the University’s civic mission is implied throughout the five priorities, and is specifically mentioned in respect of knowledge exchange and widening participation.

4.2.3 Engagement activities have the potential to extend the impact of the University’s research excellence. A recent briefing on the Science of Climate Change enabled a broad-based audience to access contributions from MPs, government advisers and broadcasters alongside University staff around issues including rising sea levels and increased carbon dioxide emissions.

4.2.4 Organisational structure: The University’s reshaped academic infrastructure, including the creation of the new Faculty for Humanities and Social Sciences, has sought to make it more legible to the outside world, facilitating its capacity to engage. This includes the establishment of new research institutes, such as the Liverpool Health Inequalities Research Institute and the Institute of Cultural Capital, which have an explicit outward focus and a remit to engage both locally and internationally.

4.2.5 In terms of professional services, the creation of the Department of Partnerships and Innovation brings together the activities of a number of outward-facing functions. The Department’s Public and Regional Engagement team has been established with a view to renewing, developing and promoting its civic contribution.
4.2.6 Existing strengths: The University’s recent publications *Working Together, Making an Impact* and *Making a Difference in the City Region* highlighted the breadth and depth of engagement activities across the University. However, the process of compiling the report made it clear that many of these are unrecognised and that there is no coherent narrative connecting them. This view was reinforced by the HEFCE-commissioned micro-study on public policy, which revealed that, whilst there is a good deal of enthusiasm amongst staff, much activity in this area is not recorded and not, therefore, rewarded.

4.2.7 Progressive programme of activity: The University and Guild of Students have recently taken a number of positive steps in order to increase engagement, including:

- An expanding public events portfolio (e.g. public lectures, policy provocations, John Hamilton Lecture Series, Science and Society)
- Professors of Practice proposal
- New research institutes with international expertise and local resonance (Liverpool Health Inequalities Research Institute, Institute of Cultural Capital)
- Guild involvement with City Council decision-making process and local forums
- Faculty level workshops e.g. Public Engagement Workshops in HSS
- Strategic University dialogues with City Region Councils
- MoU with the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic and the Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service

and to improve co-ordination, such as:

- Audit of corporate memberships and sponsorships
- Key Account Management process
- Joint volunteering strategy between the University and Guild
- Cross HE/FE collaborative volunteering placement programme: Volunteering Liverpool
Part 1: Civic engagement at the University of Liverpool

5. What is understood by civic engagement and why do we do it?

5.1. Understanding ‘civic’: Interviewees involved in a particular type of civic engagement activity were quick to identify the activity as ‘engagement’ of some kind, although the term ‘civic engagement’ was not widely used. When probed, they often described engagement in relation to place or “civil society” and that it involved engaging “with people who can make a difference for the city and local society”.

5.1.1. Heritage and values: In attempting to define civic engagement, many interviewees drew on the University’s heritage or referred to the University’s original mission “for the advancement of learning and the ennoblement of life”. It was recognised that the University had, through figures such as Eleanor Rathbone, made a significant contribution to the vibrancy of local life. Far from being a distant memory, this civic mission and the original basis for the University’s foundation still bore resonance for the 21st century:

“If you were to look at the history of this University…it would be interesting to trace the history of it as a red brick university, set up with that mission headlined, and then to see what’s different now about where we would position ourselves...that might well be thinking more in terms of supporting and delivering policy...to see what the problems are (within Liverpool) and how do you solve the problems...how could we address those and do it in a sort of, more creative fashion?”

5.1.2. In the eyes of some interviewees, the University’s “civic mission” should be an “ethos” permeating its activities. Rather than being an additional activity, engagement could be regarded as a critical means by which the University undertook its core business and delivered upon its key ambitions. This is similar to the approach taken by comparator HEIs, particularly in the US and Australia (see Annex C/D).

5.1.3. Importance of place: Although some interviewees understood civic engagement to be, quite simply, engaging with “civil society” at any spatial level, the majority talked of the University in relation to the city or region. The objective, in the broadest sense, of the University’s “civic role (was) to enhance the life of all the people in the local region” via an ethos of engagement. This approach reflects the definition of the ‘engaged university’ in the NCCPE manifesto, as being a “role that enables institutions... to rediscover their roots as active contributors to positive social change.”

5.1.4. It was widely acknowledged that, even if solely with regard to brand, the University and the city were inextricably linked. Many interviewees, however, identified a stronger connection:

“It’s hand in hand...the institution you work for actually sits at the heart of the city, and I’m certainly very keen to see that the city itself becomes a better place to live.”

5.1.5. The indication, from both internal and external interviewees, was that there was a symbiotic relationship between the University and the place of which it forms a part - whilst a thriving University can contribute to local economic growth and placemaking, a location in a vibrant city helps to attract and retain top student and staff talent.
5.1.6. Engagement, and the unique nature of the city in which it is located, provide opportunities for the University to deliver distinctive projects, produce new knowledge and provide students with a high quality experience. This portfolio of activities opens a route for it to differentiate itself from other providers whilst also helping to drive the City Region forward:

“To have a really good civic mission, that’s connected to these beautiful buildings outside Lime Street Station…that’s what built the city …There’s a new sense of ‘can do’ in Liverpool now, that the University needs to be part of and sign up to…in all honesty, you do get the sense that it is…a sense that the University can be a driver of civic pride in a great city…Use the fact that it’s Liverpool – that’s a great advantage.”

5.1.7. Liverpool has a stated ambition to become a ‘thriving, international City Region’ by 2030. Interviewees identified the role that the University could play in responding to this agenda, such as:

- Increasing economic resilience via international staff/student recruitment and attracting knowledge-intensive companies to the region.
- Raising the global profile of University to promote Liverpool as a “city of learning”.
- Acting as a conduit between Liverpool and the world for the “cross-fertilization of ideas”, which advance learning and benchmark practice in Liverpool, whilst exporting local successes to an international stage.

5.1.8. Despite this interrelationship between the local and the international, a tension was noted in terms of how projects with a local focus were viewed as contributing to the University’s international agenda. Nevertheless, some interviewees described Liverpool as a “laboratory” or “test-lab” for researchers, noting that unique local projects had the potential to have resonance and impact beyond their immediate spatial sphere.
University case study
Research with international resonance, aligned with local needs:
Building the Low Carbon Economy on Merseyside

“Liverpool is a good example of a post-industrial city that’s got problems, that needs to move from high carbon to low carbon, and other cities around the world look at Liverpool for lessons. So you can have a global impact doing that sort of local work.”

The University of Liverpool, Liverpool Vision (economic development agency), Liverpool Chamber of Commerce and Groundwork Merseyside (environmental regeneration agency) have worked in partnership on a policy project to understand the practical opportunities and constraints of building a low carbon economy in the City Region.

The project grew from existing University networks and built on a series of seminars held across the city. By working alongside partners and using participatory methods, it has sought to effect a fundamental shift in thinking about climate change and economic development amongst City Region policy-makers.

Whilst addressing critical local policy issues and reinforcing the University’s civic contribution to the development and well-being of the city, the project also carries an international dimension: Liverpool has been used as a case study by University staff to assess the global policy implications of the challenge posed by the demands of a low carbon future for port cities around the world.

Lessons learned
- **Networks are critical** – this project drew on personal contacts and the networks and contacts of other members of staff. This ensured a good range of external partners.
- **Local research** can be used as a springboard for **global impact**.
- **Local research** presents the opportunity to **engage directly with policy-makers** within the City Region, presenting opportunities to put forward “concrete proposals” for implementation.
- **Collaborative projects** with external partners often require a **build-up of momentum**, which does not result in immediate outputs. In this case, a series of seminars provided a springboard for the project.
- The **different timeframes** of external partners may necessitate **patience, understanding and negotiation**.

“Their timeframes are very short, they’re very busy…they think in terms of two or three months…As academics we’re thinking…this is like the Industrial Revolution – it’s a fundamental change in everything we’re doing…you’ve got to have a lot of skills to work with other partners.”
5.1.9. **The University as a City Region asset:** In terms of maximising the University’s impact and enabling this contribution to make sense to an external audience, it was suggested that it should be viewed as “an asset” or “a resource” in its entirety, for the City Region. Interviewees, both external and internal, identified a range of distinctive “assets” within or related to the University:

| The University as an asset: how the University contributes to the Liverpool City Region |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Asset**          | **Examples**                  | **Engagement activities**                                |
| People             | Staff, students, alumni       | Knowledge exchange, volunteering, placements, outreach and widening participation |
| Networks           | Personal contacts, professional networks, corporate networks | Convening different groups/contacts, bringing people to City Region, leveraging contacts/networks for new projects |
| Physical           | Land, facilities – VGM, Sports Centre, Libraries | Public access to/use of facilities, sports days, summer camps etc. |
| Reputation         | Corporate reputation/brand – international presence, thought leadership, neutrality | Sponsorship of events/organisations within City Region, corporate presence in City Region initiatives e.g. Knowledge Economy |
| Economic           | Major employer, purchasing power, tourist destination, staff/student/parent spend | Staff and student recruitment, procurement (through City Region suppliers), collaboration on visitor economy – Hope St Feast etc. |

5.1.10. **People and their contacts** were viewed as the most important asset of the University:

“I do think in a lot of things we underestimate the importance of people…it’s people and their contacts and their connections, I think.”

Interestingly, external interviewees frequently identified students as the University’s greatest contribution, both as the major source of future talent and skills in the City Region as well as volunteers and active members of civic society. This type of ‘people transfer’ was also highlighted as a key mechanism for developing and supporting engagement activity in comparator HEIs (see 11.7).

5.1.11. **Networks**, both personal and corporate, were viewed as being of critical importance. Interviewees frequently mentioned the power of the alumni network as well as members (and former members) of Council, the ULMS Advisory Board and the Knowledge Exchange External Advisory Board.

5.1.12. These strengths and reach were complemented by the University’s reputation for independence, impartiality and knowledge, enabling it to occupy a position which others in the City Region could not. Taken together, it was acknowledged that the University’s staff and students could play a number of valuable roles, both corporately and individually. These included:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate</strong></td>
<td>• Honest/neutral broker</td>
<td>• Facilitating City Region discussions with third parties – “the University can say things that politicians can’t”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Convenor</td>
<td>• Brokering dialogue between diverse policy groups; providing a neutral platform for expression and debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gateway connecting local and international</td>
<td>• Exporting excellent research / practice in Liverpool to a global audience; bringing international experts to the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a civic culture of learning</td>
<td>• Widening participation, Continuing Education activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anchor institution, amongst other civic organisations and agencies within the city</td>
<td>• Acting as a “driver of civic pride”; less susceptible to changing political environment, helping to “steady” the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Magnet for knowledge and learning</td>
<td>• Hub for talent and knowledge intensive business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>• Expert (including public policy)</td>
<td>• Providing advice to / engaging in relevant groups / committees due to research expertise (discipline-specific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Corporate representative</td>
<td>• Engaging in relevant groups / committees on behalf of the University as a city partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Citizen / resident</td>
<td>• Participating in residents’ fora / local school governing bodies; individual / corporate volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>• Advisor / evaluator</td>
<td>• Interchange, Liverpool Law Clinic, ULMS Student Consultancy (programme-specific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provider of skills</td>
<td>• Internships, work placements, KTPs; means to enhance employability and retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Citizen / resident</td>
<td>• Participating in residents’ fora / volunteering as member of local community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.13. Connecting activities across the University’s assets and drawing upon corporate, staff and student contributions was viewed as a means of both maximising the University’s civic contribution whilst also driving further opportunities to deliver against strategic objectives via engagement and bespoke projects. Also echoed in the approach taken by other HEIs (see 11. Engagement in Action), suggestions from interviewees included:

- Providing creative solutions to policy issues
  - People: expertise and evidence base in key policy areas
  - Networks: ability to access UK / international perspectives
  - Physical: neutral site for cross-sector policy dialogue / policy fora
  - Reputation: independence and impartiality provides a space for innovative thinking
- Reinvigorating the intellectual life of the city
  - People: the role of scholars in public life
  - Networks: attracting international speakers to Liverpool; maintaining and initiating clubs and associations (e.g. Philosophy in Pubs)
  - Physical: hosting range of public events on and off campus; exhibitions at VGM, access to libraries, archives and special collections
  - Reputation: research excellence and rigour; University sponsorship of / presence at flagship city events
5.2. **Understanding ‘engagement’:** The interview process revealed three broad, overlapping and self-reinforcing types of engagement in relation to the University’s civic role. Staff across the institution were engaged with City Region partners on a range of **specific projects** (e.g. policy research), which resulted in tangible outputs and direct benefit. However, in many cases, this was supported and often initiated by engagement in activities where there was little prospect of an immediate direct return in respect of the University’s strategic objectives. These **broader activities** would include participation in relevant networks, representation on external boards and volunteering. Their primary benefit was identified as being one of enhancing reputation - whether individual or institutional - and it was recognised that building and maintaining practitioner networks via these activities meant that they were then “primed” for when new funding opportunities arose.

5.3. A third broad area of **institutional and personal engagement** complemented these. The University’s corporate engagement in major City Region projects was perceived – particularly by external interviewees – as setting an important example, shaping perceptions of the University’s civic role and providing a platform for engagement opportunities for staff and students. Alongside this, staff and students were engaged in a range of activities unconnected to their area of expertise sometimes as a corporate representative. These activities were identified as contributing to leadership development and delivering personal satisfaction.
University case study
Leveraging the combined strengths of the University and city partners:
Policy Provocations Series

The University is acting as the lead partner for a series of ‘Policy Provocations’ which will form part of Liverpool’s themed year for 2011: City of Radicals. The series aims to bring speakers of national and international profile to Liverpool to debate issues of relevance to the City Region, whilst raising awareness of the University’s policy research strengths.

Following an approach by the Bluecoat, a brief was circulated to academic staff outlining the thinking and objectives behind the series. Staff then responded with proposals for events, which were fed into a steering group of representatives from the University, public, private and third sectors in the City Region. The steering group agreed on themes and topics for debate. The University’s Public & Regional Engagement Team then worked closely with University staff and external partners to develop the full programme.

The series draws on various University assets, including:

- **Reputation**: The strength of the University’s brand is a powerful magnet for attracting major speakers. Its reputation for impartiality and rigour means that it can occupies a unique position in the city, where challenging issues can be raised and viewed through new perspectives
- **Academic staff**, who provided research expertise
- **Professional Services Staff**, who initiated engagement with relevant city partners and co-ordinated the development of the series
- **Networks**: The networks of academic and professional services staff enabled the University to engage city partners from the outset. In turn, these partners used their networks to find speakers and publicise the events
- **Facilities**: The University can provide a ‘neutral’ venue for debates on controversial topics
- **Staff, students and alumni**, who form potential audiences for the series

“We provide the means to bring people together...we want to provide the right environment, the right stimulus... and really make people feel valued and welcome.”

Lessons learned

- **Involving external stakeholders from the outset** has proved invaluable in terms of developing the content of events, accessing new audiences and providing venues beyond the campus for the University to reach out to the city
- **Aligning research and policy interests with issues in the City Region** has ensured commitment from both staff and external stakeholders
- **The level of enthusiasm in the City Region** for this type of event has been made clear through the responses of external partners and speakers
- **Using City of Radicals, a city-wide cultural programme as a springboard** for University events widens promotion and marketing potential
Understanding engagement and its benefits

5.3.1. **Project-specific engagement**: Project-specific engagement could be defined as research and learning opportunities generated due to the University’s location within the City Region. Benefits from this type of engagement tended to be direct and interviewees were often able to quantify them. Examples of activities included:

- Unique policy research projects generated by links with local communities or organisations e.g. Arts and Health, ULMS, Civic Design
- Collaborative research projects with local partners
- Student placements at local arts and cultural organisations

5.3.2. Interviewees noted that in certain fields, such as arts and culture, “by virtue of our situation we have... relationships and access to internationally renowned institutions”. This was equally true of access to particular communities, service users or data. In these instances, the specificity of the University’s location in Liverpool enabled it to develop unique opportunities which had the potential to reach beyond this sphere in terms of impact.

5.3.3. In many instances, these activities were undertaken by individual members of staff and were heavily dependent upon personal relationships. Benefits therefore tended to be directed at Departmental level. However, in some cases, activity had been underpinned by a broader relationship, facilitated at corporate level, such as the University’s relationship with RLPS or the International Slavery Museum.

5.3.4. **Broader-based engagement**: This strand of engagement related more generally to the University’s role as a civic institution, or to an individual’s role, as they saw it, as an engaged scholar or citizen. Civic engagement was a “duty or responsibility”, part of being “not just an academic researcher, but also a human being” or simply “good practice”, both on the individual and corporate level. Activities included engaging with policy-makers or practitioners beyond specific projects, representation on external boards and volunteering.
5.3.5. Despite the altruistic motivation for this activity in some instances, it was acknowledged that this type of engagement often helped to launch and maintain project-specific engagement opportunities, including CASE studentships, publications, and co-production of research.

5.3.6. It was acknowledged that staff engaging in this kind of activity had to negotiate the demands of wearing these different ‘hats’. For example, when participating on an external board or commission, there was potential for a “problematic” conflict of interest/s at times, particularly if their academic findings didn’t chime with the University’s corporate position. There was, however, evidence of strong benefits from this type of engagement. These could be categorised as:

- Network development: the opportunity to build contacts and keep them “warm” for potential future projects
- Leadership development: engagement led to better communication, negotiation and leadership skills
- Reputation: recognition in professional networks, leading to future research opportunities
- Personal: interviewees undertook activities out of a sense of “civic duty” and had derived a sense of “personal satisfaction”

5.3.7. Despite interviewees being able to discern certain clear benefits following a period of engagement in these activities, they acknowledged that the outcome from this type of engagement was often more difficult to predict and harder to quantify. It was described as a “process” with “incremental outcomes”.

5.3.8. Institutional engagement: The University’s corporate engagement in major City Region projects was viewed as setting an important example both internally and externally, shaping perceptions of the University’s civic role and providing a platform for further engagement opportunities. Many interviewees described recent relations between “town and gown” as being much better than in the past, and related this to the significance of institutional leadership in key City Region initiatives, such as the Knowledge Economy or Capital of Culture:

“I think a lot probably has to do with corporate engagement...with Capital of Culture there was a sense that the University was more engaged...maybe [staff at senior level] always were and I just didn’t know about it...I guess those sort of big headline things suggest to me that the University is understood and recognised more as an important player in the city.”

5.3.9. Interviewees who mentioned this suggested that the fact the University was seen to be engaging made it more likely, in turn, that those in the City Region would want to engage with the University, thus creating further opportunities. This corporate image and reputation for engagement was viewed as having the potential to deliver a broader range of benefits extending beyond the City Region. These included a strengthened market position, particularly with regard to staff and student recruitment:
“I think they (some students) will buy on brand...they’ll say ‘I want to come to a University that is corporately and socially responsible and is really giving back’...so it could be a real benefit to the University if it is seen as internationally way up in there but also really connected to the local area.”

This idea of a strong, distinctive image and strengthened market position delivered through effective and visible engagement was also reflected across comparator HEIs, particularly with regard to the idea of creating a distinctive student experience and a recognisable, for example, ‘Liverpool graduate’ (see 11.7.2). Institutional or corporate engagement also appears to go some way, both at the University of Liverpool and at comparator HEIs, to setting the tone and direction of future activity.

5.4. **The University as an engaged institution:** It was noted that the University could derive greater value from its existing portfolio of engagement activity, maximising the potential of relationships and creating a USP as an “engaged University”, in terms of both reputation and delivery of business.

5.5. An “ethos” or “culture” of civic engagement, as a defining feature of the University, could enhance research, student and staff recruitment, graduate retention and, more broadly speaking, the University’s standing and reputation. Once again the University’s location in Liverpool could play a big part in this:

> “Of course it’s no longer just about your local audience, it’s about outside people. But it’s how to do things slightly differently, that your Manchester or your Sheffield hasn’t thought of...Liverpool’s always got that tradition of creative talent”.

5.6. In order to realise this, several future challenges were identified, which are explored in further detail in part 2. These included:

- How a common focal point for civic engagement can be developed for internal and external users.
- How corporate and individual engagement may be connected more effectively as part of a more structured approach.
- How to raise awareness and visibility of civic engagement activities, both within and beyond the institution.
- How to demonstrate the value of engagement to staff within Faculties and Professional Services, and recognise and reward good practice.
- How to set strategic direction for civic engagement activity, without taking an overly prescriptive approach.

5.7. This would also need to be complemented by an improved understanding and raised awareness of how ‘broad-based’ engagement in networks, for example, with little immediate gain, could lay the foundation for future engagement projects with direct benefits.
University case study
Engaged learning, making a difference: Interchange

Interchange, established in 1994 by two academics based at the University of Liverpool and Liverpool Hope University, aims to enhance student learning and offer local community organisations something useful in return.

Interchange is underpinned by an approach to facilitating learning where:

- Students are not passive recipients of knowledge.
- Students are part of the knowledge construction process.
- Understanding and knowledge generation is facilitated through collaborative processes with other students, academic supervisors, agency supervisors and the community.
- Students learn from the experience in the field; inductive ‘bottom-up’ knowledge that is specific to the situation and context that they are placed in.

Students in the Department of Sociology, Social Policy & Criminology can register for an optional accredited Interchange module to undertake a research/work project. Interchange assists the students in finding projects with Voluntary, Community and Faith Organisations across Merseyside. The students then work with Interchange to develop an idea for a project that is feasible - considering issues of access, research methodologies and obtaining ethical approval from the School of Ethics committee before gathering any data.

Students are supported through weekly workshops, individual supervision, fieldwork and meetings with agency representatives. The module is assessed through a Client Report, which presents and analyses the findings or activity undertaken with the VCFO, in addition to a reflective report, for academic assessment only.

Lessons learned
- Interchange’s ethos of collaboration and mutual benefit ensures practical outcomes for both students and partner organisations.
- Students and partner organisations benefit from good briefing and preparation, support and supervision – both practically and academically.

“Interchange has enabled us to get work done which is important but gets squeezed out due to the crisis we deal with as a charity. Quotes from the research have been used in funding applications. Two excellent pieces of work carried out by two wonderful students.”

Agency Representative, Ferries Family Groups Ltd.

“This year has been a great foundation for what I hope will be an interesting future. It has given me a backbone to research methodology which is of great importance for my chosen career path. I will take these skills with me and hopefully build upon them.”

Interchange student
6. Categorising engagement

6.1. In order to help exert a greater degree of clarity, the University’s existing portfolio of civic engagement activity may be categorised according to:
- the nature of the activity itself and how it is undertaken
- how it helps to support the University’s strategic objectives
- who the University engages with

6.2. In terms of the former, the NCCPE draws a distinction between three broad types of engagement:
- Informing: inspiring, informing and educating the public, and making the world of HE more accessible
- Consulting: actively listening to the public’s views, concerns and insights
- Collaborating: working in partnership with the public to solve problems together, drawing on each others’ expertise

6.3. Using this as a template, the table on the following page categorises civic engagement activities under the five key priorities of the Strategic Plan. In some cases interviewees noted a very clear association with the Strategic Plan; in others, one engagement activity could cover several objectives or offer the potential for various benefits relating to strategic objectives. Broadly speaking, although there were instances in which it was felt that civic activities weren’t always recognised, there was a sense that staff in particular had a feel for how civic engagement fitted into their work at an individual level.

6.4. The interviews revealed engagement with a multiplicity of partners across these activities. Broad categories included:
- **Policy & Practice**, including:
  - government and public agencies (e.g. European Commission, HMRC, Liverpool City Council)
  - commercial organisations (e.g. Unilever, Chambers of Commerce)
  - 3rd sector (TUC, Sefton Charity and Voluntary Services, Royal Liverpool Philharmonic)

  Engagement was undertaken directly with an individual organisation (e.g. Liverpool Vision) or via an association or network (e.g. CBI, Merseyside Social Enterprise Network).
- **Communities** – communities and members of the public (e.g. residents’ groups).
- **Media** – local, national and international.
- **Schools** – via individual contacts (e.g. representation on local school’s governing body) and formalised corporate relationships (e.g. North Liverpool Academy).

For a broader picture of University engagement with specific audiences, please see ‘Further University Highlights’ on p.33.
## How engagement activities contribute to the Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform (inspiring, informing and educating the public)</th>
<th>Research Performance</th>
<th>Student Experience</th>
<th>Knowledge Exchange</th>
<th>Widening Participation</th>
<th>Global University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of research findings via books / articles / web / press</td>
<td>Poster Days Guild promotion of events (concerts etc)</td>
<td>Public Lectures CPD e.g Law Clinic Media work Exhibitions</td>
<td>Festivals, Open Days, UCAS visits Continuing Education</td>
<td>Cultural awareness/languages training for city partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations and lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult (actively listening to the public’s views)</td>
<td>Community based research</td>
<td>Initiatives with city partners aimed at particular student groups. Student consultancy work e.g Interchange</td>
<td>Consultancy work – City Region partners/organisations e.g. Public debates</td>
<td>Outreach material developed in different languages e.g. FunMaths Roadshow</td>
<td>Conversation exchanges Contributing to events e.g. films at FACT, Chinese New Year etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate (working in partnership to solve problems together)</td>
<td>Co-authored research with City Region partners</td>
<td>Embedded and accredited student placements Graduate internships – SMEs</td>
<td>Public events organised with city region partners Policy for a Knowledge Transfer Partnerships</td>
<td>Working with schools/teachers to produce educational material e.g. Philosophy in Schools</td>
<td>Beyond Shanghai conference Using University networks to bring together city region and international partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Inform**: Dissemination of research findings via books / articles / web / press presentations and lectures.

- **Consult**: Community based research initiatives with city partners aimed at particular student groups. Student consultancy work e.g. Interchange.

- **Collaborate**: Co-authored research with City Region partners. Embedded and accredited student placements. Graduate internships – SMEs. Public events organised with city region partners. Policy for a Knowledge Transfer Partnerships.

- **Global University**: Cultural awareness/languages training for city partners. Consultation exchanges. Contributing to events e.g. films at FACT, Chinese New Year etc.
University case study
Connecting the local and the international:
Ambassador Preparation Training, Shanghai Expo 2010

The Shanghai Ambassador Preparation Training project began due to an article in a local newspaper and a bit of “detective work” on the part of the Confucius Institute.

Liverpool City Council was planning to send a delegation of local students out to act as ambassadors at the Shanghai Expo stand. The Institute spotted an opportunity for it to provide cultural awareness training for the ambassadors – a service it was uniquely well-placed to deliver.

Contact with Liverpool City Council was made through a “friend of a friend” who was able to put staff at the Institute in touch with the lead for the Ambassador Scheme. When the City Council heard what the Institute could offer, they were immediately enthusiastic about working together.

The Institute provided a number of preparatory sessions, free of charge, for the ambassadorial team. This proved “helpful” for staff and students. The introduction to Chinese culture ensured the students were well-prepared to get the most from their “once in a lifetime experience.” The University’s assistance extended to Shanghai, where it was able to help arrange visits to Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University and for the teams to meet Chinese and British students studying there.

A reunion event, held at the Victoria Gallery & Museum, with almost full attendance by the student ambassadors and representation from schools, City Council and other City Region partners. This is indicative of the relationships formed as a result of the project, including an ongoing contribution to the City Council’s ‘China Strategy’ and the recent collaboration around the ‘Beyond Shanghai’ conference, which explored the legacy of Shanghai Expo 2010 for the Liverpool City Region and featured several University academics as speakers.

Lessons learned

- External partners were not aware of what the University could offer. When they found out, they were enthusiastic and committed to the project.
- The success of the project lay in the alignment of City Region and University interests — in support of internationalisation and creating a more diverse economy and culture.
- Connecting University assets provides a comprehensive and unique service — student experience, staff expertise, resource materials, facilities and corporate partnerships/relationships.
- There are opportunities for the University to provide a valued contribution to the City Region, but external partners may not always be aware of this or know who to approach — personal contacts and networks can provide a way in.
- The engagement went beyond a ‘transaction’ or simple provision of service, and thus new ‘routes’ into the City Council and laying the ground for further activity.
7. Routes to engagement

7.1. Whilst the particular route taken to engagement varied according to the particularities of the context and, sometimes, the discipline/research area of the interviewee, some common themes emerged.

7.2. Networks and contacts: Access to networks and contacts was viewed as being of central importance to civic engagement. These could be networks which the University had access to at institutional level (e.g. with particular schools, organisations or businesses) or, as was widely the case with interviewees, personal contacts.

7.3. The significance of building and maintaining these networks was highlighted as being particularly important within the City Region. As mentioned previously, the benefits of these connections was often difficult predict. If successful, an initial interaction could “spill over” into new areas of activity:

“So then one thing leads to another...Liverpool is a small place...so I got to know people...so now they usually call me if they want something...they know me and I know them, that sort of thing. It’s not that we make a big deal about it, but it’s something to build on if we ever want to do something.”

“Oh all the places I’ve worked I think it (Liverpool) is the city that operates most on personal contacts...you’ve got to have a network, you’ve got to build on your networks all the time.”

7.4. Some interviewees mentioned how they had been able to make these networks work for the benefit of the wider University, taking on a role as an informal entry point to the University and signposting external users to the right people at the University:

“The one thing that people still say to me from outside the University is that the University is still quite an opaque place. They often contact me and then I put them in touch with other people...It’s difficult still to know who to talk to within the organisation, so one of the benefits of you having a big group of people that you know is that they also then know you, so if they want contact with the University, they’ll contact you, so then you can put them in touch with the right people.”

7.5. One interviewee described how, even though the activity within particular networks had “dropped a gear” due to changing priorities and a busy schedule, he was able to put people from different networks in touch with each other regarding new projects of mutual interest: “whether these things ever mature into any form I wouldn’t know, but sometimes I do that kind of catalytic activity.”

7.6. Keeping such contacts ‘warm’ was often achieved through informal activities/networking, shared interests/hobbies or external-facing work or appointments (the ‘broader-based engagement described in 5.3.4). In some cases, however, it was helped by University events and functions:

“We hold a mixer reception...and that’s a beautiful opportunity for people to talk one-to-one about what they do, about the value of what we do to society”
7.7. **Personality and style:** Almost all interviewees mentioned the significance of “personal style” or “personality”. An emphasis was placed on the importance of “putting the right people out there” with one interviewee asking:

“Do you want a couple of people who are good at doing it or as a requirement for everybody...an aspiration?”

Another interviewee described the process of starting a civic engagement project:

“I identified a couple of key people that I knew would be excellent. One...her talents were totally underused...she had fantastic people skills...the right type of personality and image...incredibly versatile, but also extremely professional, whilst also being very warm and engaging. ...she to me was just absolutely critical. (The other)...she’s a really, really hot academic but she’s also incredibly conscientious, and she’s a Liverpool girl as well...they were the two key people.”

7.8. This emphasis on personality and local knowledge did not necessarily mean that skills in engagement could not be learned. It was seen as crucial, however, to have a “willingness” or “understanding” of the needs of external partners and a degree of “flexibility”. One interviewee talked of staff and students who approached civic engagement “with great trepidation really, in the beginning” but investing time in the project led, ultimately, to enhanced skills and “positive feedback”.

7.9. **Reputation and word of mouth:** While some staff first became involved in civic engagement activity through personal contacts or the focus of their work, others were approached by external partners on the basis of University’s reputation, which was seen to carry a certain “caché”.

7.10. On a personal and corporate level, word of mouth and existing engagement also proved to be a route to further engagement. Staff who were engaged within the City Region were often seen as “representatives” of the University, and as such, asked to signpost external partners in the right direction (see 7.4). This expectation of external users for staff to adopt a broader corporate role again raised the question of how, or indeed, whether it may be possible to link different strands of civic engagement, or to coordinate them in a way which ensures that external partners are signposted to the right place.

In many cases ‘signposting’ will inevitably form part of the role of any external-facing or engaged member of staff. There are, however, examples in comparator HEIs of a dedicated central resource (see 10.2) or even an off-campus ‘one stop shop’ (11.6.3) helping to support a more coordinated approach to this, particularly for external users or partners.

7.11. **Visibility:** Closely linked to reputation was the notion of ‘visibility’. Public events and functions were cited as one manner in which to raise the profile of the University externally whilst at the same time keeping contacts “warm” (see 7.6). Many interviewees suggested that the University had a “narrative” or a “story” to tell around civic engagement that would demonstrate the University’s “value” to the City Region.
7.12. The University already informs identified audiences of civic activities via brochures, its website and the media. The publication *Making a Difference in the City Region* was a first attempt to give a flavour of the University’s civic contribution in a co-ordinated, corporate fashion. Nevertheless, alongside HEI comparators explored in part 2, interviewees pointed to other examples of how HEIs made themselves present in the life of the places in which they were located:

“I know a friend who, in Georgia, when he won a big prize, the President of the University announced it in their football stadium...it was a big show and the whole city knew that it was a big recognition of one of the alumni of the University...I don’t know if we could make use of saying something every month, every other month maybe – a breakthrough from the University, a message from the Vice Chancellor of the University...telling people what the value of the University is.”

7.13. This idea of a “civic structure” – engaging with other civic organisations and using them as intermediaries through which to achieve greater ‘public’ engagement – was a common theme throughout the interviews. This chimes with the NCCPE concept of civic engagement as focussing on “partnerships between regional strategic bodies and public services... working with the public through strategic partnerships with ‘intermediaries’” (e.g. local authorities, schools, museums, health bodies and visitor attractions).

7.14. Relevance of subject area: The interviews clearly revealed that the nature of civic engagement activity varied according to discipline area. Academic staff who engaged with policy makers or practitioners as a “natural” part of their role were more evident in certain disciplines (e.g. Law, Sociology, Public Health). Published articles in practitioner-based magazines and journals were mentioned as a starting point for or means of continuing momentum within certain professions. More broadly, media work, which linked to the University’s reputation, was cited by some staff as a route to engagement.

7.15. Interviewees’ own personal routes to engagement were often dependent upon the way in which they engaged with wider society through their research. In some instances, multiple forms of engagement (e.g. media work, external appointments, publication in practitioner-based journals) helped to maintain profile and generate future opportunities. In recognition of this and the need to adopt an approach responsive to the needs of particular users, there was broad agreement that a prescriptive approach to engagement would not be beneficial and that one type of engagement should not be valued more highly than another:

“It’s almost about recognising that this might be important, but almost not expecting everyone to do it in the same way.”

7.16. For this reason, many interviewees emphasised the importance of “connecting work back to departments and schools” or keeping any civic engagement initiatives “close to the ground”, whilst at the same time encouraging cross-disciplinary engagement. For this to be successful, any engagement would depend heavily on the sharing of existing networks and contacts amongst staff and across disciplines.

7.17. External appointments: Although external appointments are, in themselves, a form of civic engagement, many interviewees identified them as a good way to access external networks across the City Region and beyond.
7.18. In the same way that some interviewees stressed the importance of keeping civic engagement “close to the ground” internally, some also stressed that the only way to do this externally was to be involved in a “two-way” exchange; external appointments, usually by invitation through informal contacts, were one way of doing this. Just as the “headline” external appointments of senior University staff on City Region initiatives signalled the institution’s civic commitment, on a more personal level, external appointments demonstrated a willingness to engage, to listen and to understand the needs and requirements of external partners.

7.19. As with other engagement activities, external appointments demanded certain skills or attributes. In addition, opportunities often presented themselves only once staff had established a certain level of expertise or kudos within professional circles. However, notable benefits were identified by staff, including the opportunity to “think bigger”, to “know what’s of wider interest” and to make contacts, as well as providing a public face for the University.

7.20. Along with student and staff volunteering, external appointments formed the basis of many of the comparator HEIs engagement activity, with formalised ‘people transfer’ mechanisms (see 11.7) providing more structure, greater incentive and a raised profile around this type of activity.
University case study
A platform for engaged research:
engage@liverpool

engage@liverpool is a cross-Faculty initiative, which aims to highlight the breadth and depth of methodological expertise at Liverpool. It builds on the University’s traditions of being a place where researchers in a variety of disciplines have sought to engage with the big moral, social, political and philosophical questions of the day. engage@liverpool is Liverpool's contribution to 'Methods North West', a cross-university methods initiative, including methods@manchester, which forms part of a collaborative training infrastructure for PGR students and researchers.

Aims and objectives of engage@liverpool
- To highlight Liverpool's strength in engaged research methods in the social sciences.
- To promote interdisciplinary and innovative methodological development.
- To foster further innovation, including around training.
- To showcase (primarily via the website) the expertise in engaged methods within the university.
- To promote and facilitate methods-related events.

The core of engage@liverpool is the 'how to' talk series. The 'how to' talks feature experienced researchers discussing methodology in the context of research practice and linking questions of method directly to the substantive, analytical and theoretical problems they engage with through their work.

Aside from their content, the ‘how to’ talks also provide an opportunity for cross-University networking and the basis for an online resource repository, alongside resources like presentations, papers, 'toolkits' and further reading. A mailing list provides further opportunities to share best practice and disseminate information about methods-related research events.

What works well
- engage@liverpool is designed by researchers and content is generated by researchers.
- The approach of engage@liverpool is non-prescriptive and doesn’t force researchers to try or adopt a certain approach – it acts as a forum for ideas.
- engage@liverpool is brings together researchers with common interests and/or values and provides them with the space and opportunity to network and share best practice.
- engage@liverpool is visible, accessible and inclusive.
8. Barriers to engagement

8.1. As with the varied routes to engagement, barriers could differ according to discipline or background. However, there were again some common themes, which resonate with a number of the principles of the HE Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research.

8.2. **Strategic direction and co-ordination:** Both internal and external interviewees felt there was a lack of clarity and, therefore, awareness around civic engagement in relation to the University’s strategic objectives. A common question asked was “Where does [civic engagement] fit?” Many interviewees wanted “clearer steer” from the University on what it understood by civic engagement and how it would be valued (see 10.1).

8.3. In this respect, there was a clear concern that any civic engagement strategy or initiative may be introduced “on top of everything else” or as “something extra to add to another burden” and a feeling that this would be a strong disincentive to staff, in particular those not already involved.

8.4. Interviewees mentioned a “disconnect” between the University’s corporate activities and those of departments, with the overall approach to civic engagement described as “fragmented”. Whilst recognising the challenges posed by co-ordinating and communicating across a large organisation, it was noted both internally and externally that there was “no one place to go to” or a forum for civic engagement (see 10.2).

8.5. Despite recognition that a “one stop shop”-type facility could be beneficial, there were divergent opinions as to what role the University may be able to play centrally. Whilst some interviewees suggested that civic engagement should be co-ordinated institutionally (“it cannot just be based on individuals... it really needs to be done in a more pro-active way”), others suggested that this would not be appropriate, given the diversity of relationships and the importance of personal contacts:

“The kind of contacts that people want with the University are quite varied so it isn’t just about going to a particular office...people often want that kind of personal contact.”

8.6. Nevertheless, there was recognition that University staff shared certain common contacts, which resulted in duplicated effort; a more structured approach in some instances could prove beneficial:

“I think we do need to think about how we formalise those relationships, because we’re all running around trying to make contacts in all the different cultural institutions and then standing on each other’s toes.”

8.7. **Recognition and reward:** Although staff were very often enthusiastic about civic engagement activity and its actual or potential benefit for their own development and the University, there was a widespread feeling that it often went unrecognised and without reward:

“I feel I’m doing it, and I don’t feel the University knows what I’m doing.”
Interviewees commented that this was perhaps due to a lack of understanding of what public engagement entails, citing the amount of time required to nurture and maintain relationships. There was little evidence of staff recording activity via existing University data capture mechanisms.

Comparator HEIs offer some models regarding the recognition and reward of engagement activity (see 10.3 and 11.9).

8.8. Some interviewees said they would discourage early career researchers from undertaking engagement activity in the knowledge it may hold back their career progression. This was sometimes related to the notion that civic engagement was a distraction from research. Other interviewees mentioned the fact that civic engagement, with a local or regional focus, was perceived as “second rate” or a “poor relation” to international research.

8.9. It was noted that engagement did not currently form part of University promotion criteria and several staff suggested that there could be scope for broadening the scope of activities included under the administration section.

8.10. Time: Those already involved in civic engagement activities described constraints on time and difficulties balancing workload. However, this did not stop them from continuing their involvement. Many mentioned that the clear benefits for students, research outputs, personal development or teaching made it worthwhile. Lack of time did, however, seem to prevent staff from developing further engagement activities.

8.11. Skills development: Among those involved in some way in civic engagement activity there was a broad consensus that it required good communication skills, understanding of varying needs/timetables and, more often than not, a good deal of patience. It could be that those predisposed to engage, were, therefore, already in possession of these skills. There was a sense, however, that if engagement were to be encouraged, there would be a need to reassure staff, offer appropriate support and appreciate their efforts to engage:

“*I’ve done this before, I’m used to it, but I see [other staff], they’re… trying to explain it in clear language to a lay person, they’re obviously – they’re just not used to it…so I don’t know if there’s more support and encouragement could be done when people are taking those sort of steps that says ‘Absolutely, yeah, that is brilliant, that is part of what having an impact is about.’*”

8.12. Beyond these general competencies, staff also noted the importance of developing the right skills for different types of engagement activities in order for them to be delivered effectively and for positive relationships to be maintained. The skills template on page 30 was drawn up by staff at a specialist Public Engagement Unit aligned to Edinburgh University. Although it differs slightly from the categorisation used earlier in the report, a number of these skills were identified by interviewees as being highly relevant to engagement activities.
## FACILITATING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement skills</th>
<th>Project management</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 way (Inform)</strong></td>
<td>Writing funding applications, Budgeting</td>
<td>Press release, Funding proposals, Website, Newspaper articles, Communication skills, Lecture, Demonstration, Podcasts, Filming, Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 way (Consult / collaborate)</strong></td>
<td>Generating ideas, Collaborating on large bids</td>
<td>Blogs, Dialogue, Making activities interactive, Online discussion, External appointments, Networking, Adapting to audiences, Public meetings and discussion events, Panels and user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple</strong></td>
<td>Managing a number of projects</td>
<td>Complex events and procedure, Developing strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University case study

Harnessing talent and commitment to develop new perspectives:
School Arts Project, Liverpool Biomedical Research Centre

Public and patient engagement forms a “resonant strand” of the Biomedical Research Centre’s (BRC) funding applications to the National Institute for Health Research. Building on this ethos, the BRC wanted to develop a unique and meaningful project that went beyond the scope of existing engagement activities.

The School Arts Project aimed to bring new life to a practised form of engagement: school outreach work. Informed by a belief that thoughtful use of art can “act as a bridge, and create ways of transferring ideas”, the project presented research around three important areas (Sexual Health, Hospital Acquired Infection and Vaccination) to A-Level students, the majority of whom didn’t study science. The uniqueness and scope of the project presented a valuable opportunity to achieve meaningful engagement.

To do this successfully, the talents, experience and enthusiasm of a range of contributors had to be harnessed:

- **Senior University staff** provided strategic commitment and direction
- A **lay representative** on the BRC’s governing body initiated the idea, shaped the funding application and identified key people to involve in the project
- **Postdoctoral researchers** offered scientific and research expertise
- A **3d visual artist** worked ‘on the ground’, facilitating student responses to research, supporting researchers and providing weekly contact with students and teachers
- A **digital artist** trained students in recording and editing footage of the project
- **Teachers** bought into the project and adopted it as part of the course of study

Motivation for getting involved, on the part of the researchers, ranged from a belief in greater transparency around public spending on medical research, to awareness that there was an implicit expectation from senior staff that researchers should be involved, to a desire to communicate work to a new audience. Pilot sessions conducted allowed those involved, and the researchers in particular, to gain feedback from staff and students and adjust their presentations accordingly.

Although the project is only just reaching the end of its pilot year, overall feedback has been “really positive,” with the project described as having a “revitalising” effect. Researchers, in particular, have highlighted **personal and professional development** as a key benefit, with specific reference to:

- More effective communication and negotiation skills.
- A better understanding of the impact of their research.
- Enhanced teaching skills: “not just transferring knowledge but encouraging thinking.”
Due to the commitment and enthusiasm of others involved in the project’s facilitation and organisation, the researchers’ contribution was limited to where they could truly add value. For students, the project went beyond a straightforward visit to the school from researchers, providing a springboard for further engagement and culminating in an exhibition, to be held at World Museum Liverpool.

**Lessons learned**

- The *expectation* of both *funders* and *senior staff* that researchers engage gave the project real significance, providing a platform for success. The project’s real success, however, lay in the fact that it *went beyond a “box-ticking exercise”*, delivered a truly unique and innovative activity.
- **Alignment of needs and interests**: the project met the needs of the schools and the BRC, and found common interest and shared ground between researchers, students, and local partners.
- The involvement of a *lay representative* was critical in shaping the project in this respect.
- The project harnessed expertise and enthusiasm, and *played to people’s strengths*.
- The *target audience* of the project was key – it was aimed “at people who were interested” and well-equipped to cope with the demands of the project, without retreading old ground.
- The themes selected as a basis of the project *resonated with the audience* and lent themselves to *visual representations*.
- Researchers were helped with *practicalities*, in some cases even down to transport to and from the schools, to ensure demands on their time were minimal.
- Researchers appreciated *informal opportunities* to share their experiences of engagement.
Further University Highlights - examples of University engagement with specific audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Policy &amp; Practice</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student volunteering</strong> (Guild, Careers, Sport Liverpool) – emphasis on gaining broader experience and ‘giving back’, particularly for international students.</td>
<td>Maths Outreach – FunMaths Roadshow, activity-based, available in different languages, on and off-campus.</td>
<td><strong>Student volunteering</strong> (Guild, Careers, departmental) – emphasis on practical application of subject/discipline e.g. Sociology, Law, Music, History (accredited).</td>
<td>Public events, demonstrating research strengths and/or commitment to civic life e.g. Policy Provocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to facilities</strong> e.g. Ness Gardens, Sports Centre, Wyncote, VG&amp;M, libraries. Use of facilities for local festivals e.g. Anthony Walker Festival</td>
<td><strong>Physics Outreach Group</strong> – using student volunteers – enhancing employability, on campus activity and visits to schools</td>
<td><strong>Public events</strong> e.g. Climate Change Briefing, VG&amp;M dinners. University providing research expertise to policy makers and practitioners or convening various policy makers and practitioners.</td>
<td>Academic engagement with press on politics, local history, public policy and current issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public events and exhibitions</strong> – Chinese New Year at the VG&amp;M, public lecture series, Cafe Scientifique</td>
<td><strong>Philosophy in Schools</strong> – enhancing and enriching the school curriculum, providing resources for staff and students.</td>
<td><strong>Beyond Shanghai</strong> – playing a lead role in informing future strategy and bringing policy makers and practitioners</td>
<td>University reputation and global brand helps to promote Liverpool as world-class city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Clinic</strong> – providing free legal advice, 2nd year and final year students (accredited module) under supervision of qualified solicitor and academic manager, based on campus.</td>
<td><strong>Confucius Institute</strong>: promoting Chinese culture in City Region, including Shanghai Ambassadors, Dragon Boat project, Open Days, school visits.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic partnerships</strong> – Merseyside Fire &amp; Rescue and Liverpool Phil.</td>
<td>Visibility esp. on City Region initiatives in local and regional media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing Education</strong> – wide range of flexible learning courses, on and off-campus, some in collaboration with partners e.g. Walker/Tate, various discounted options available.</td>
<td>Educational Opportunities team: student and graduate advocates, Professor Fluffy, Year 12 Scholars, Superstars scheme etc.</td>
<td><strong>Secondments, external appointments and board memberships</strong> e.g. Bluecoat Display Centre, Liverpool Sports Forum, Lone Parent Forum, Sefton Community Board, Mersey Forest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Films at FACT for international community</strong> – enhancing experience of international students (in particular) in collaboration with external partners.</td>
<td><strong>School partnerships</strong>: e.g. North Liverpool Academy, South Liverpool Academy, Birkenhead. Directorships, undergraduate placements etc.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic engagement in major City Region initiatives and economic development e.g. Knowledge Economy, Capital of Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wide participation beyond school pupils – events, open days etc.</strong></td>
<td>Informal staff and student volunteering, including talks/visits and <strong>school governors</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPD</strong> e.g. Masters in Public Administration, police training, Masters in Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Policy &amp; Practice</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff volunteering</strong> and engagement in local communities, beyond schools and external appointments/board membership e.g. Liverpool South – Transition Network, charity involvement.</td>
<td><strong>School visits and open days</strong> to University and specific facilities, e.g. library.</td>
<td>Providing expertise to <strong>inform cultural organisations and exhibitions</strong> e.g. Customs &amp; Excise (Maritime Museum), Slavery Museum etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Festivals</strong> e.g. Philosophy in the City, involvement in city-wide festivals e.g. Light Night</td>
<td><strong>Work experience placements</strong> at University e.g. VG&amp;M, Sports.</td>
<td><strong>Alumni engagement</strong>, events and webinars e.g. Management School, Law School, Sociology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports team membership</strong> of local sports clubs – Runcorn Rowing Club, Sefton Park Cricket Club.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student-led consulting</strong> (ULMS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moving on With Life and Learning</strong> – promoting inclusion for people with learning disabilities and/or mental health issues, based at and links with Sociology.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SME graduate internship programme</strong> and local employer engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gradvantage bootcamps</strong> (Careers) – open to any graduate region.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement in global policy networks, exporting and importing good practice from and to the City Region e.g. Liverpool-Mulago Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hope Street Destination Group</strong> – working with major partners and ‘neighbours’ on the street to boost visitor numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: Developing a University Action Plan: Comparator Analysis

9. Overview

9.1. In order to assist the development of the Action Plan requested by SMT, the second part of the Civic Engagement review drew upon the findings of Part 1 and focused upon analysing current approaches to engagement across UK and international comparator institutions, whilst highlighting areas in which the University could build on existing assets or strengths to provide a more coherent and effective approach to civic engagement.

9.2. The most effective approaches to engagement respond to the context in which particular institutions operate. Nevertheless, certain ‘key principles’ are common to many institutions; these form a strong platform upon which ambitious projects can be launched. Broadly speaking, these may be categorised as:
   - Strategic commitment
   - Skills, support and opportunities
   - Reward and recognition
   - Implementation and Impact
   - Awareness and Visibility

Section 10 provides a summary of the principal messages arising from an analysis of UK and international comparator institutions. This is supplemented with in-depth coverage in Annexes C and D as well as further information on global HE networks focused on engagement (Annex E).

9.3. In terms of converting commitment into real action with tangible benefits, a number of common approaches have been adopted by HEIs, including:
   - Place-based strategies
   - Strategic themes for engagement
   - Public policy
   - Opening access
   - People transfer
   - Physical development
   - Celebrating success

Section 11 provides an overview of innovative activities delivered by UK and international HEIs across these categories, highlighting potential areas for future University development.

9.4. As detailed in the first part of this review, and highlighted by case studies throughout, there is already a strong and varied portfolio of engagement activity at the University which will provide a good basis upon which to develop any future activity.
10. Key principles

10.1. Strategic commitment: High-level support for engagement was evident across a range of institutions. This took several forms, including:
- An explicit commitment to engagement made as part of an HEI’s strategic plan
- A clear strategic direction, based upon a simple statement of values, such as ‘being a good neighbour’ or ‘putting the ladder down for others’
- A named senior lead for engagement (e.g. Vice President for Engagement at Chicago)
- Active leadership at VC level, demonstrating commitment and raising internal and external visibility
- Membership of a national or international network (see Annex E) or involvement in an engagement initiative (e.g. Manifesto for Public Engagement)

10.2. Skills, support and opportunities: Most HEIs had a dedicated, central resource to help increase the level and quality of engagement across the institution. Duties included:
- Providing advice and guidance
- Offering brokerage services, networking and other opportunities to share best practice
- Facilitating and co-ordinating engagement activities
- Raising internal and external awareness
- Celebrating engagement and providing communication mechanisms for staff
- Providing an initial point of contact for external stakeholders
- Building internal capacity, including communications training
- Supporting staff to deliver public events and disseminate information
- Evaluating engagement activities
In order to help drive operational activity, the activities of these central units were often reinforced by a network of academic champions and Departmental support staff.

10.3. Reward and recognition: A range of options to recognise and reward engagement across the length and breadth of institutions was identified. This included:
- **Staff**: Several UK universities are in the process of changing policy, procedures and promotion criteria in order to better recognise engagement undertaken by staff. In international universities, particularly in the US, there was broad recognition of the role engagement activities could play in professional and personal development.
- **Students**: There was an apparent shift towards more structured and accredited volunteering schemes for students. In the US, these options were commonly embedded within degree programmes.
- **University awards**: Several universities, particularly internationally, staged awards ceremonies for staff and students who had made notable civic contributions. Feedback from relevant Beacon institutions indicated they served to raise enthusiasm and awareness of engagement activity and its benefits.

10.4. Implementation and impact: In order to support engagement in action, a range of services were provided by HEIs in order to:
- **Share good practice**: Examples included mailing lists and mentoring as well as internal mixer events and conferences to showcase innovative activities
- **Evaluate activity and understand success**: Bristol and UEA offer advice to staff on how to evaluate their activities; the Manchester Beacon has developed an evaluation toolkit specifically for events
- **Assist staff induction**: Emory’s welcome packs cover volunteering opportunities
10.5. **Awareness and visibility:** All of the key principles above served to raise visibility and awareness. Senior leadership, a dedicated central resource, mechanisms to support implementation and an effective rewards package were typically supported by:

- dedicated webpages linked to the University homepage, providing a tailored service for different user groups
- a strong media presence, including blogs and other social media, reinforcing the University’s commitment and engaging communities to help shape University activity
- a high-profile programme of events
- a range of networks, bringing together relevant groups within and beyond the HEI

Taken together, these provided a platform upon which opportunities for engagement could be generated. The concept of providing ‘space’, both virtual and physical, in which different groups could meet and engagement take root was strong across almost all institutions.

11. **Engagement in action**

Drawing upon the key principles outlined above as a basis for engagement, Universities made use of a range of activities to help focus and catalyse engagement activities across the length and breadth of the institution. Examples and case studies are detailed below; potential opportunities for the University to take a lead from these activities are also highlighted.

11.1. **Place-based strategies:** Place-based strategies were particularly common in North and South American HEIs, enabling them to catalyse engagement and connect contributions from academic staff, Professional Services and students. At their heart, these strategies were built on the concept of ‘being a good neighbour’. They helped to deliver reputational benefits to the University as well as a range of research and teaching opportunities.

### The Comprehensive Community Action Programme for Vulnerable Areas, Buenos Aires

Aimed at vulnerable and deprived areas in the city, the programme used various University resources to:

- give 130 children educational support
- get 50 people back into work
- provide training for work to 192 young people
- hold 15 workshops on citizenship
- provide healthcare treatment for 1300 patients, including nutrition advice and clinics
- treat 150 people as dental patients
- engage almost 200 people in sports activity

‘Engagement Centres’ were developed in communities to encourage social inclusion, development and better access to existing resources. With an interdisciplinary approach, based heavily on student and staff involvement, the University now plans to extend the programme’s approach more widely across the institution.

### Emory University

Emory identified ‘highly-distressed’ areas where the University already had a presence and there was potential for cross-sector, multi-disciplinary collaboration. These areas had needs and opportunities aligned with Emory’s expertise and research interests, including housing, economic development and the environment. Their place-based strategy then adopted a strategic theme, such as healthcare, increasing potential for a cross-University project.

### Translating experience to Liverpool

Drawing upon these approaches, the University could consider adopting a cross-institutional approach to **North Liverpool**, an identified priority for regeneration in the city. Alternatively, there could be a focus upon areas where the majority of the student population live.
11.2. **Strategic themes for engagement:** Some HEIs adopted a broad strategic theme, often based around a global challenge, as a platform to encourage and publicise engagement. CUE East held a festival, involving more than 30 groups and organisations to kick-start its ‘Sustainable Living’ programme of activities and projects.

11.3. The University of Chicago used the theme of ‘Health and Wellness’ to launch a cross-university project, which served as a catalyst for engagement. In common with the place-based strategies detailed above, the project enabled the University to involve academic and professional services staff and students. The focus, which made sense to external groups, provided a useful vehicle for connecting university assets and engaging in an accessible and meaningful way with different stakeholders, including the media and communities. The presence of a unique point of contact or ‘one-stop-shop’ provided a common focus for interactions, serving to co-ordinate activities and raise internal and external profile.

**Translating experience to Liverpool**
Through the Health is Wealth initiative, the University led a city-wide initiative on an issue of real strategic significance to Liverpool, which has led to Liverpool’s Decade of Health and Well-Being. The approaches above suggest that this ‘commission’ approach could be broadened to other areas of strategic concern, such as raising aspiration or delivering a low carbon city, embracing contributions from academic and professional services staff as well as students.

11.4. **Public policy:** Public Policy activity is a focus for the activities of many UK and international HEIs. LSE and UCL generated significant engagement opportunities via events covering policy issues of critical importance to external audiences. A weekly programme of seminars, debates and public lectures, themed around a particular policy issue or in direct response to a current policy debate were promoted via a range of media, reinforcing the Universities’ reputation as a destination for policy-makers and practitioners.

11.5. HEIs developed further engagement opportunities via external appointments on formal bodies. These appointments could be secured on the basis of expertise in a particular policy area or, more broadly, in the University’s capacity as an engaged city partner.

**Office of Governmental and Community Affairs (OGCA), Emory University**
The OGCA serves as the voice of Emory University with all elected and appointed officials at local, state and federal levels of government, aiming to proactively and effectively influence public policy affecting academic and medical research, higher education and health care, students and patients. The OGCA’s remit also includes expanding and strengthening partnerships with local community organisations on issues of mutual interest.

**Global Policy, The London School of Economics and Political Science**
Global Policy is an interdisciplinary journal bringing together academics and leading practitioners to analyse both public and private solutions to global problems and issues. It focuses on understanding globally relevant risks and policy challenges that have global impact. It disseminates case studies with clear lessons for other countries and regions.

Global Policy’s Editorial Board comprises a distinguished panel of academics, who are supported by an International Advisory Board and a Practitioners’ Advisory Board of experts from around the world to ensure the focus remains on pressing and relevant global issues. The journal is supported by an extensive public events programme and a strong web presence. All outputs are related to 12 core themes, including global governance, health and social policy and population and migration.

**Translating experience to Liverpool**
A Public Services Institute could help to connect the University’s public policy activities and make them more visible. It would provide a common focus for interactions with major City Region partners and provide a natural ‘space’ for policy interactions and network development.
11.6. Opening access

11.6.1. Events and festivals: Many HEIs had a wide range of high profile public events or festivals that formed a key part of their civic engagement programme. By targeting specific audiences, events helped to reinforce key relationships and networks, thereby driving further engagement opportunities. They could be grouped broadly as follows:

- Cultural programmes: Buenos Aires held a ‘Museum Night’ to promote the University as a tourist destination and position itself at the heart of the city’s intellectual and cultural life.
- Making research more accessible: These events often involved off-campus venues and presented several events as part of a themed or annual series. SFU’s ‘Pych in the City’ annual series, for example, brings University psychologists into city venues to debate topics such as youth violence and sports psychology.
- Public policy: See above
- Festivals: Held over the course of a day, week or month, festivals could be themed to coincide with a University’s particular research strengths or interests and used at critical points in the year to engage ‘new’ communities (see MSU, below).

**UCL Public Events**
UCL has a range of accessible, well promoted public events with the aim of communicating research in an innovative and engaging way. Their ‘Brain Food’ public events and lunch hour lectures – including titles such as *Who enjoys shopping in IKEA?* and *Would you give your right arm to project your heart?* – are available to watch online and can be downloaded from iTunes.

The University’s ‘thinking man’s comedy club’, *Bright Club*, has gained national press attention, bringing together comedians and researchers around a particular theme (Lust, Crime, Sea) to stage a comedy show during which each academic gives a five-minute performance.

**One Book, One Community, Michigan State University**
Not dissimilar in motivation to The Reader Organisation’s ‘Our Read’ initiative, the ‘One Book, One Community’ festival encourages communities across the city and University to read the same book and then discuss it in a variety of settings. The author of the book visits campus, welcomes freshers – who are assigned the book as reading upon enrolment – and kicks off a month-long series of events around the book, held on campus and around the city to stimulate engagement.

**Translating experience to Liverpool**
The University already has a strong and varied portfolio of events, including Public Lectures, Policy Provocations and Science and Society Lectures as well as regular exhibitions at the VGM and a host of other activities, such as Philosophy in the City. Taken together, is there an opportunity to raise their collective profile to attract wider audiences and cement the University’s civic role in reinvigorating the intellectual life of the city?

11.6.2. Making resources and facilities available: Alongside events, HEIs used a variety of other methods to make their resources and facilities available. Libraries were made accessible to the public and discounted hire rates for University spaces were offered to nominated organisations. In Buenos Aires there are regular campus tours for the public, whilst residents can participate in local history trails around MMU’s new Birley Fields Campus.

**UCL Discovery**
UCL Discovery showcases the University’s research publications, giving access to journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings, digital web resources and theses from all UCL disciplines. Where copyright permissions allow, a full copy of each research publication is directly available.
11.6.3. **Off-campus facilities:** To encourage engagement from groups who had not previously engaged with the Universities, HEIs often engaged in projects which took them beyond the campus. This included hosting events in locations across the city and using existing community spaces. In some instances, a new and unique space was created to foster new interactions:

**ArcSpace, Manchester, and The Forum, CUE East**
As part of their Beacons project, both Manchester and CUE East developed off-campus ‘one-stop’ shops as ‘neutral spaces’ in which to bring together University staff and local communities. ArcSpace is a social enterprise run by local academics and artists, which brings together community groups, academic knowledge and creative industry. The Forum researches, networks and manages citizens’ input to academic research and engages local delivery partners.

**Translating experience to Liverpool**
How might the University make greater use of its physical (e.g. VGM, University Square, sports centre) and intellectual assets to reinforce its position in the civic life of the city? What is the place of the campus in the city? How may the University draw upon the facilities, networks and resources of city partners (e.g. North Liverpool Academy, Tate Liverpool) to extend its reach and generate new engagement opportunities?

11.7. **People transfer:** People transfer mechanisms were in operation across comparator HEIs for academic staff, professional services and students. In many instances, US HEIs lead the way in this area, with well-established schemes around ‘engaged scholars’ and ‘service learning.’ Activities delivered new research opportunities and a more distinctive student experience as well as contributing to the corporate reputation of the institution and delivering personal benefits, including leadership development and high levels of participant satisfaction.

11.7.1. **Academic staff:** Michigan State and Emory Universities are just two US HEIs to operate an ‘Engaged Scholar’ programme to encourage staff to undertake engaged research. Programmes offered support and rewarded staff for engaged research as well as providing webpages, publications and an ‘Engaged Scholar speaker series in order to showcase and profile activity.

**Community Engaged Faculty Fellows, Emory University**
A 9-month professional development programme for academics, the Fellowship programme provides six Faculty fellowships to develop a community-based research or teaching programme which expands the body of knowledge relating to Emory’s interests whilst addressing an issue of concern for the community.

11.7.2. **Students:** Several HEIs used the concept of an ‘engaged graduate’ as a unique selling point to potential students and employers. A ‘Melbourne Graduate’ is ‘knowledgeable across disciplines’ and an ‘active global citizen’. This is supported by a restructured curriculum incorporating degrees with a knowledge transfer component. Simon Fraser University is also in the process of developing the concept of an ‘SFU graduate’ of which engagement is a central element.
The Engaged Graduate, University of Chicago

Engagement is embedded throughout the University curriculum, including a range of opportunities for students to integrate with their local community. The University of Chicago Public Interest Fellowship Programme places top graduates in one-year programmes in public interest organisations around the city. The initiative is supported by the ‘Chicago Journal’, available online, which publishes the very best of students’ work of relevance to Chicago.

Translating experience to Liverpool

Given its existing broad-ranging portfolio of volunteering and employability opportunities, how could the University use civic engagement to offer students an experience which is distinctive because of its integration with the city’s unique profile? Is there a similar concept for academic and professional services staff?

11.7.3. Leadership development: The ‘Manchester Leadership Programme’ is open to students, researchers and staff. It explores 21\textsuperscript{st} century leadership challenges and includes 60 hours of community volunteering within neighbouring communities. LSE’s ‘Volunteering for All’ initiative offers staff up to 5 days’ leave per year to volunteer, including school governing roles, local charity work and positions on public bodies.

Translating experience to Liverpool

Should the University actively encourage staff volunteering? How might this connect to, and reinforce, other civic initiatives, such as place-based strategies or strategic themes for engagement?

11.8. Physical development: Major capital projects were often used as a common focal point and catalyst for engagement activity as well as providing a highly visible means to demonstrate HEIs’ commitment to meaningful engagement:

Birley Fields Community Campus, Manchester Metropolitan University

For this major capital development, planning and staffing for consultation were shared at all levels between the University and city. The project served as a common focus for teaching and research opportunities and generated a series of spin-off activities, including Public Engagement Fellowships, employment partnerships, community leadership programmes and walking tours.

Urbanadle Farm Project, Michigan State University

Two MSU professors set up the state’s first urban farm on disused land in an area where transport links and a limited range of food options had created a number of health issues in the local community. Helped by resident and student volunteers, the professors developed projects to grow food and explore how food and food systems impacted on the lives and health of urban residents. The farm provided one of the locations for the delivery of a new civic engagement course.

11.9. Celebrating success: As mentioned in ‘key principles’ above, engagement activities were supported with a variety of means to publicise the University’s role externally and raise profile and generate enthusiasm within the institution. Award ceremonies for staff and students were common place, alongside targeted media features and a strong web presence.

Public Engagement Stories, University of Bristol

As part of the University’s 2009 centenary, 100 stories were collected from staff, students and the public about their engagement with the University and its role in public life. Hosted on a dedicated website, the stories are regularly updated and provide a range of voices and experiences. The pages link to the University’s homepage and provide a range of public engagement resources.

Translating experience to Liverpool

How may the University raise the profile of its strong portfolio of existing activity and celebrate success internally and externally in order to generate enthusiasm and new engagement opportunities? Should it develop a dedicated web presence, as Bristol, or awards for engagement?
# Annex A: Breakdown of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Health &amp; Life Sciences</th>
<th>Science &amp; Engineering</th>
<th>Professional Services</th>
<th>Guild</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gill Howie (Philosophy)</td>
<td>Atif Rahman (Child Psychiatry)</td>
<td>Peter North (Geography)</td>
<td>Catherine Gibson (Corp Comms: Events)</td>
<td>Alan Roberts (Comms &amp; Policy)</td>
<td>2 LGoS volunteers (international students)</td>
<td>Nick Small (Liverpool City Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Billington (English and The Reader Organisation)</td>
<td>Alex Scott Samuel (Public Health)</td>
<td>Lynn Moran (Physics)</td>
<td>Ann Smith (Confucius)</td>
<td>Bex Turner (Volunteer Coordinator)</td>
<td>2 Careers Service volunteers (Sociology students)</td>
<td>Sara Williams (St Helens Chamber of Commerce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hughes (History)</td>
<td>Samar Hasnain (Biophysics)</td>
<td>Chris Marchant (Maths Outreach)</td>
<td>Anne Merry (CLL)</td>
<td>Sam Johnson (VP)</td>
<td>Jo McGrath (Social Enterprise Network)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rowe (Management School)</td>
<td>Cliff Stott (Psychology)</td>
<td>Dave Shaw (Civic Design)</td>
<td>Matthew Clough (VG&amp;M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony McGuirk (Merseyside Fire &amp; Rescue Service)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Stalford (Liverpool Law Clinic)</td>
<td>Jon Cole (Psychology)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andy Craig &amp; Stuart Wade (Sports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Corbett (Liverpool City Council)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Beveridge (Law and Social Justice)</td>
<td>Cheng-Hock Toh (Clinical Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark O’Brien (Ed Dev)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veronique Raingeval (Common Purpose)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu Arora (Law)</td>
<td>Jane Cloke (LivHir)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trish Lunt (Ed Dev/Careers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaenor Hall &amp; Arlene Blanchard (BRC School Arts Project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mair (Sociology and Engage@Liverpool)</td>
<td>Neill Liptrott (Post Doc – Clinical Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucy Wilson (Corp Comms: Alumni)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Davis (Head of School of Arts)</td>
<td>Adam Wright (Post Doc - Clinical Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Sykes (Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Annex C: UK comparator HEIs

#### Manchester Beacon
*(includes University of Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University, University of Salford, Museum of Science and Industry and Manchester: Knowledge Capital.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>University of Manchester</th>
<th>Manchester Metropolitan University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic commitment</strong></td>
<td>• Social responsibility (the University as “a force for good”) named as one of 3 key goals for 2015, alongside Research and Higher Learning. Goals are enabled by people, reputation, management, infrastructure, sustainability and funding.</td>
<td>• The University’s vision includes “developing a University of and for the region.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Culture Change Labs, held as part of the Manchester Beacon project, focussed on changing the institutional culture brought together executive directors, senior leadership teams and external partners to identify key themes and priorities in embedding public engagement into policies and procedures – work is ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward &amp; recognition</strong></td>
<td>• University of Manchester Development Awards reward Public Engagement.</td>
<td>• In process of changing policy and procedures, with a strategy for PE and changes to promotions criteria, job descriptions and recruitment literature to reflect importance of engagement activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early Career Researcher Awards, Community Science Awards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills, support &amp; opportunities</strong></td>
<td>• Beacon Project Manager is supported by dedicated Project Manager based at each University. Engagement projects draw on existing expertise, connections and briefs of PS staff – e.g. Development Education Project Leader at University of Manchester works closely with Beacon Team.</td>
<td>• Designated Public Engagement Manager within Corporate Development Team, supported by Development Managers in each Faculty which can offer advice to staff on PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation &amp; impact</strong></td>
<td>• Public engagement mailing list: practitioners share good practice.</td>
<td>• Good practice shared through networking events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Networking events held for Manchester Beacon staff.</td>
<td>• Public engagement mentoring scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public engagement mentoring scheme.</td>
<td>• Evaluation guide/kit developed for public engagement events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness &amp; visibility</strong></td>
<td>• High visibility through Beacons project and NCCPE website/literature. Profile translates into national and local press coverage.</td>
<td>• Strong website: “Community” publicises events, latest news and projects and emphasises the open, accessible nature of campus. “What is the role of a modern University?” highlights working in partnership, public health, sustainability and listening to local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presenters at Research Staff Conference 2011 placed emphasis on public engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **University College London**  
(=Public Engagement Beacon, includes Birkbeck College, Cheltenham Science Festival, Arts Catalyst,  
South Bank Centre, British Museum and City & Islington College.) |
|---|
| **Strategic commitment** | • Highly visible commitment from Vice-Provost Michael Worton, a strong advocate of ‘reciprocal public engagement’ and its benefits.  
• Part of UCL’s mission is “to engage fully with the world around us.”  
• Signed manifesto for public engagement.  
• Generating PE strategy through working groups which bring together staff across the University. |
| **Reward & recognition** | • Provosts Awards for Public Engagement – publicised and celebrated on UCL website. Feedback indicates indicating they were generally welcomed, raised enthusiasm and awareness of PE, with specific recommendations of targeted invites and better signposting to info on nominees. |
| **Skills, support & opportunities** | • Small Public Engagement Unit (3 staff) creates opportunities, provides advice and guidance, networking and brokerage, evaluation and evidence gathering and internal capacity building.  
• Recruitment and support of engagement champions across UCL and the PE Unit is currently tackling the issue of reward and recognition of PE. |
| **Implementation & impact** | • Symposium for staff to share experiences. |
| **Awareness & visibility** | • PE Unit have their own website, with a more internal or HE focus.  
• Particular programmes, notably public events and exhibitions, are well promoted on a user-friendly, engaging webpage linked to front page of main website.  
• Video introducing UCL’s approach to global grand challenges, examples of UCL academics quoted in the press and opportunities advertised for staff for policy secondments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London School of Economics and Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward &amp; recognition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills, support &amp; opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation &amp; impact</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Awareness & visibility** | • Focus on Public Events and Policy Journals via strong web presence. Social media and email subscription service.  
• Social media used to gain feedback from events-goers and publicise events.  
• Transcripts, podcasts and videos of events posted online. Brochure of full programme also available to download/in hard copy, along with info on ads rates for brochure. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Bristol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategic commitment** | • Engagement is “an essential thread that runs through the fabric of the University.”  
• Emphasis on linking public engagement to research and teaching, rather than as a stand alone.  
• PVC chairs “Engaged University Steering Group”.  
• VC is vocal on purpose and value of public engagement (on signing Manifesto: “Public engagement presents a huge opportunity for universities. This isn’t an additional activity - this is core to Higher Education’s mission.”)  
• VC’s welcome message on website reinforces commitment to society and role in generating “new knowledge that improves the world and illuminates our understanding of it.” Also emphasises relationship between vibrant University life and city of Bristol).  
• University’s vision and strategy includes chapter on public engagement and talks of being “engaged with society’s interests, concerns, priorities and inspirations.” Public engagement is highlighted in discussions and presentations at meetings of governing body and other key committees. |
| **Reward & recognition** | • Public engagement celebrated in University publications and prizes – annual awards for Public engagement. |
| **Skills, support & opportunities** | • Dedicated Centre for Public Engagement – 4 staff (Head, Academic Liaison Officer, PE Officer, Events Officer), supported by PE reps (sometimes up to 4) in each department – these provide local championship and are conduits for communication across the Uni.  
• Academic champions for engagement identified across University.  
• Informal public engagement ‘clinics’ cover: advice on funding/writing public engagement into grant applications, promotion of public engagement activity via social media, website, public engagement events guide or the bi-monthly Engager’s Digest, available by email, advice on impact and evaluation and training opportunities (Intro to Media course). |
| **Implementation & impact** | • Centre for Public Engagement encourages staff to:  
  – share good practice via forums, networks, events and communications.  
  – evaluate PE projects, providing support/info to help to do so.  
• Annual conference. |
| **Awareness & visibility** | • Excellent web presence – dedicated website is lively, engaging, easy to navigate and has valuable content for both public and staff.  
• Emphasis on telling stories that bring the topic to life”. Over 100 stories available on “Public Engagement Stories” website, created for 2009 centenary but updated regularly.  
• Uni research and events reported positively and fairly frequently in local press. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of East Anglia</th>
<th>(Part of CUE East Beacon, with 22 partners including Norwich City Council, BBC East, City College Norwich, Norwich Research Park.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategic commitment** | • Recognition of a “need to create greater senior level buy-in...so that this could cascade down the institutional hierarchy and into practice.”  
• The UEA’s Corporate Plan for 2008-2012 acknowledges the importance of enterprise and engagement. |
| **Reward & recognition** | • Enterprise & Engagement Tracker developed to monitor activity.  
• CUE East Awards acknowledge contribution of staff and students at UEA and Norwich Research Park.  
• Promotions criteria developed to recognise those who take action on engagement. |
| **Skills, support & opportunities** | • Small team of 2.6 staff at CUE East concentrated on encouraging and supporting staff and students to think about engagement and experiment – nurturing networks, listening, providing opportunities to experience public engagement and reflect on it for themselves.  
• Also concentrated on demonstrating benefits of public engagement to staff at all levels, connected to strategic and personal aims and objectives. |
| **Implementation & impact** | • Informal networking and extensive CPD programme developed.  
• Info on benefits of PE and opportunities for training/involvement collated by CUE East.  
• Advice offered to individuals on evaluation methodologies. |
| **Awareness & visibility** | • Limited internet presence - Beacon’s initial focus was on physical presence in local community - one-stop shop, events, festivals, not on raising profile on internet. Public events diary is linked to main page. |
# Annex D: International HEIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emory University, Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● “Creating Community, Engaging Society” is a key objective in Strategic Plan. Focus on culture, sustainability and professional and leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The framing principles detailed in the plan, which support further development, are named as strategic collaborations, internationalisation, creativity and societal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward &amp; recognition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Initiative launched to recognise individuals who cultivate community “We are Emory.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● CE viewed as mechanism/route to professional and personal development (staff and students).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● New Employee Orientation Guide includes section on ‘Community’ with information on the Office of University and Community Partnerships and Volunteer Emory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills, support &amp; opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Established Office for University and Community Partnerships (OUCP) – centralised resource creating engaged learning, teaching and service opportunities of benefit to the Atlanta community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation &amp; impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness &amp; visibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strong presence on main website, OUCP’s own website and departmental websites reflect fact that civic engagement is part of corporate approach and ethos (We Are Emory).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michigan State University

| Strategic commitment | MSU sees itself very much as an “engaged University”: “We work side by side with small businesses and corporations, hospitals and schools, and individuals and communities in every part of the state to make life better.”
| | Associate Provost and Office for Outreach and Engagement (13 departments).
| Reward & recognition | Outreach Scholarship Community Partnership Award - Recognises highly engaged community-based research collaborations that positively impact both the community and scholarship. Each year, one award is conferred upon an MSU researcher and her/his designated community partner ($1500).
| | MSU Curricular Service-Learning and Civic Engagement Awards - Recognise individuals who have demonstrated innovative and/or sustained effort in the area of academic, curricular, or co-curricular service-learning/civic engagement that is specifically linked with the mission and efforts of their colleges. Recipients are selected from faculty and staff by the deans of each college.
| Skills, support & opportunities | Extensive support for staff, students and communities who wish to engage. Associate Provost’s Office provides leadership and funding, develops strategy, participates in national and international networks and communicates successes of MSU in civic engagement.
| Implementation & impact | Associate Provost’s Office works with staff, students and communities to develop models of best practice and disseminate these across the University and beyond.
| | Networks at Faculty level supported and encouraged (sometimes themed around particular needs and research strengths).
| Awareness & visibility | Strong ‘selling point’ of MSU – prominent member of Campus Compact, seen as pioneer in civic engagement particularly with reference to ‘service-learning’ and concept of the engaged scholar.
| | Strong sense of place and of activity of wider relevance being grounded in Michigan State/region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategic commitment** | • Civic engagement strongly linked to brand and identity - “University of Chicago is uniquely positioned to contribute to, and draw from, the strength of this world-class metropolis.”  
“University of Chicago is shaped and inspired by the city of Chicago.”  
• Dedicated Office and VP for Civic Engagement. |
| **Reward & recognition** | • No information available. |
| **Skills, support & opportunities** | • Office for Civic Engagement with 10 staff – exact details of any networks/development opportunities unavailable. |
| **Implementation & impact** | • No information available. |
| **Awareness & visibility** | • Staff from the University’s Office of Civic Engagement acknowledged and celebrated in local press.  
• Web presence strong, well maintained, includes stories, news, pictures, blogroll of local community blogs, etc.  
• Dedicated tab on website (alongside ‘Research’ and ‘Students’) for Civic Engagement.  
• Chicago Studies Annual Journal – showcasing the best student original research projects on various aspects of Chicago. |
### Simon Fraser University, Canada

| Strategic commitment | • Andrew Petter (President and VC) is a strong advocate of the “engaged university.”  
|• VP positions for ‘Advancement’ and ‘Relations.’  
|• In the process of establishing a new strategic vision – “envision.”  
|• Currently describes its position as an “engaged research university” and its dedication to university-community research as one of its 3 key strengths, alongside teaching and research. The strategic vision will work on better communicating these strengths, identifying and maximising opportunities generated by them. One of the areas it will look at is considering the relationship between community engagement, research and teaching.  
|• Campus based engagement – being a ‘good neighbour’, local volunteering initiatives for students, ‘cultivating CE’ in certain communities, using University buildings (inc. sustainable campus) as starting point for regeneration and to reinvigorate intellectual life of community. |
| Reward & recognition | • HR webpage describes SFU staff as “dedicated, highly skilled and community-minded employees.” No further information available. |
| Skills, support & opportunities | • VP for ‘Advancement’ (inc. outreach, development, research chairs, new facilities) and VP for ‘Relations’ (government, media, public events etc.) – both have large teams of support staff. |
| Implementation & impact | • Engage blog highlights various ways students contribute through volunteering and civic engagement, with aim of getting others to do the same. |
| Awareness & visibility | • SFU’s civic contribution noted locally, nationally and internationally.  
|• Website doesn’t draw attention directly to ‘civic engagement’ but does underline that it is part of the ethos and values of SFU.  
|• Special features and projects of note – charity fundraising, outreach work, public events are profiled on homepage.  
<p>|• SFU have opened consultation about their strategic vision online (social media – Twitter, Facebook, the President blogs regularly) and through informal on-campus events, including local communities. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategic commitment** | • Member of Talloires Network.  
• A ‘public-spirited institution’, engagement is considered one of the three ‘strands’ of the University’s strategy, alongside Research and Learning & Teaching.  
• Engagement closely linked to the University’s international strategy, with a DVC for Global Engagement, while other engagement activity is under responsibility of DVC for University Affairs.  
• ‘Why choose Melbourne?’ – an online introduction for students and staff, highlights that “the University is known for fostering engagement across a range of activities” and that ‘The Melbourne Model’ provides students with “a well-rounded education that will help them meet their career aspirations and life goals.” |
| **Reward & recognition** | • Staff Engagement Excellence Awards (yearly) worth $5000 each. |
| **Skills, support & opportunities** | • Office of the Deputy VC for University Affairs supports various forms of engagement including Cultural & Community Development, Strategic Projects and Knowledge Partnerships.  
• The Office also manages relations with key external stakeholders, identified as government, media, business, alumni, the community and University colleges.  
• Events management training provided for professional staff at any level with little experience in events management. |
| **Implementation & impact** | • No information available. |
| **Awareness & visibility** | • Engagement, with a separate page for ‘Commercial Engagement’ highlighted on University’s homepage under ‘About us.’  
• Knowledge Partnerships webpages provide information about awards, grants and engagement news/events.  
• Section on homepage dedicated to ‘Community’ – the University’s own and wider community; the ‘Melbourne Newsroom’ showcases University news of wider relevance. |
### University of Buenos Aires

| Strategic commitment | • Member of Talloires Network  
| | • 3 pillars of UBA are research, teaching and engagement.  
| | • Statute commits UBA to civic engagement.  
| Reward & recognition | • No information available.  
| Skills, support & opportunities | • Office for Engagement and Student Welfare (SEUBE) supports engagement activity, offering funding, encouraging alumni donations specifically for engagement.  
| | • Each faculty also has its own office for engagement/outreach.  
| Implementation & impact | • Not much info but workshops advertised, documents available online, and sharing (and celebrating) best practice appears to be encouraged.  
| Awareness & visibility | • SEUBE has own website with engagement highlighted equally, if not more than, research and teaching on main website. Also has its own blog regularly highlighting and celebrating engagement activity.  
| | • Used particularly as USP to international students.  
| | • Specific projects have their own websites, blog and Facebook pages.  

### Catholic University Lille

| Strategic commitment | • Educational philosophy “based on excellence, humanist values, achievement and solidarity...act to serve mankind, society and the world in order to add their contribution to economic and social development.”  
| | • Key aims of mission include:  
| | – to get involved in service to society, humanitarian work and international cooperation,  
| | – to be a mainspring of economic development, especially at the regional level,  
| | – to be a place where meaning is sought and debate can take place, with respect for cultural diversity.  
| Reward & recognition | • No information available.  
| Skills, support & opportunities | • No information available.  
| Implementation & impact | • No information available.  
| Awareness & visibility | • Emphasised as USP to international students.  
| | • Strong local profile.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Amsterdam</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic commitment</strong></td>
<td>• “Characterised by a critical, creative and international atmosphere, the UvA has a long tradition of open-mindedness and engagement with social issues, in keeping with the spirit of the city with which it is inextricably linked.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward &amp; recognition</strong></td>
<td>• No information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills, support &amp; opportunities</strong></td>
<td>• KE supported by Technology Transfer Office (University based) and Amsterdam Centre for Entrepreneurship (ACE), whose mission is “to stimulate entrepreneurship in the Netherlands” by focusing on its two core activities of research and education. Brings together public, third and private sectors with students and academics and acts as the “gateway to academic knowledge”. Focus on the translation and application of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation &amp; impact</strong></td>
<td>• No information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness &amp; visibility</strong></td>
<td>• Civic engagement activity integrated into website – public lectures on front page, specific section for museums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Copenhagen</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategic commitment** | • Forms part of the regional collaboration “University of Oresund”, along with 13 other universities from Denmark/Sweden – the aim being “to form an umbrella for research cooperation” and to integrate universities, industries and the public sector.  
• Its vision, amongst other things, is to “develop the interaction and exchange of knowledge with private and public companies” and to “strengthen its position as a university focusing on internationalization without failing the national responsibilities.”  
• “Public Outreach” named as a key objective in strategic plan: “As a central repository of knowledge in Denmark, the University of Copenhagen has a special duty to share its knowledge with society at large, and therefore contribute to a more informed public debate.”  |
| **Reward & recognition** | • Effective dissemination of research regarded as a “fixed constituent” of the University’s routines.  |
| **Skills, support & opportunities** | • Central Communications Fund set up to which faculties can apply once a year for funding for innovative communication activities. University working centrally on new ways of using internet for dissemination – blogs, journals etc.  |
| **Implementation & impact** | • No information available.  |
| **Awareness & visibility** | • University visible in press, with emphasis on research/KE as opposed to CE more broadly.  
• 4 Campus areas in city and, as such, high visibility throughout – wide range of museums and gardens open to public. Plans to create world class museum of natural sciences to showcase University expertise and spread knowledge.  |
## Annex E: International HE Engagement Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talloires</th>
<th>Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
<td>GUNI was set up by UNESCO and the Technical University of Catalonia in 1999, following UNESCO’s World Conference on Higher Education. Linked to United Nations University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Talloires Conference was convened by Tufts University in 2005, out of which grew the Talloires Network. Talloires is partnered with regional networks including Campus Compact (USA) and Campus Engage (Ireland).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Objectives include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives include:</td>
<td>• To help bridge the gap between developed and developing countries in the field of higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To expand civic engagement through teaching, research and public service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To imbied public responsibility in higher education, through personal example, policies and practices.</td>
<td>• To foster networking among higher education institutions and cooperation between them and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To ensure that standards of excellence are applied to community engagement, in the same way as research and teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To foster partnerships between universities and communities.</td>
<td>• To facilitate higher education’s role for social transformation through institutional processes of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To raise awareness of universities’ contribution to society, and speak out on issues of civic importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>Access to/involvement in: I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and opportunities to (on a global level):</td>
<td>• Higher Education in the World report, an analysis of the key issues and challenges facing HE in the 21st Century, and of the role of HE institutions in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Network.</td>
<td>• Universities and Social Commitment Observatory, encouraging dialogue and sharing of good practice between those interested in the social responsibility of universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Share best practice.</td>
<td>• Annual International Conference on HE (Barcelona).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase visibility.</td>
<td>• Networking beyond other HE institutions, supported by on-site and online activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend annual conference (Madrid, 14-16 June), regular regional conferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enter MacJannet Prize which rewards civic engagement initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>Over 200 members. UK members include Newcastle University. Membership requires:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 200 members. UK members include Newcastle University. Membership requires:</td>
<td>• Overview of civic engagement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overview of civic engagement activities.</td>
<td>• Description of the University’s commitments or policies regarding community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Links to websites, reports or publications about civic engagement work in order to confirm the University’s commitment to engaging with its community.</td>
<td>• Links to websites, reports or publications about civic engagement work in order to confirm the University’s commitment to engaging with its community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>Over 179 members. UK members include Centre for Lifelong Learning at the University of Warwick, the University of Stirling and the University of Gloucestershire. Membership requires:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 179 members. UK members include Centre for Lifelong Learning at the University of Warwick, the University of Stirling and the University of Gloucestershire. Membership requires:</td>
<td>• Information on a University’s mission/vision and goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information on a University’s mission/vision and goals and objectives.</td>
<td>• Evidence of innovative projects in higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of innovative projects in higher education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>