The University and the City

John Goddard
Emeritus Professor of Regional Development Studies
Formerly Deputy Vice Chancellor
The civic university: the leadership and management challenges

An international comparative study

Goddard, Hazelkorn, Kempton & Vallance

Forthcoming: 2016
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The focus is on the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of civic engagement, particularly the vision and mission, leadership, management and governance, organisation, financial and human resource policies and practises required to mobilise the academic community to meet the needs of the wider society locally, nationally and globally.
Policy perspective: Universities as urban ‘anchor’ institutions

- ‘Anchor institutions’ are large *locally embedded* institutions, typically non-governmental public sector, cultural or other civic institutions that are of significant importance to the economy *and* the wider community life of the cities in which they are based.

- They generate positive externalities and relationships that can support or ‘anchor’ wider economic activity in the locality

- Institutions that are *of* the city not just *in* the city
What does anchoring imply(1)?

• Location of universities in cities implies a relationship with other institutions that inhabit the city

• It raises normative questions about the need for academic practise to be of relevance to the place in which practitioners live and work as citizens

• Requires exploration of a more broadly conceived territorial development process than just economic growth and competitiveness
What does anchoring imply (2)?

- Interrelated physical, social and cultural dimensions

- Relational visions of the city as constituted through diverse (and fragmented) sets of local and non-local linkages

- The university as a place embedded institution with connections to different social and institutional spheres of its locality (horizontal links) and a node in global flows of knowledge and people (vertical links)
The normative question


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

• “We treat our opportunities to do research not as a public trust but as a reward for success in past studies”
• “Rewards for research are deeply tied up with the production of academic hierarchy and the relative standing of institutions” BUT
• “Public support for universities is based on the effort to educate citizens in general, to share knowledge, to distribute it as widely as possible in accord with publically articulated purposes”

The public value of the social sciences

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

Tensioned themes (1)

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

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

- The ‘external’ civic role of the university vis a vis ‘internal’ processes within the university and state higher education policies that shape these external relations.
Tensioned themes (2)

- The university as an institution AND a set of academic sub-groups (a loosely coupled organisation)
- The role of physical sites and regeneration projects in facilitating and connecting university economic and community engagement to the city
- Inter-institutional relationships between multiple universities and other HEIs especially in large cities
- The inter-disciplinarity of many urban challenges and the institutional tension with existing disciplinary based academic structures (e.g. sustainable or age friendly cities)
- The role of intermediary organisations inside and outside of the university (e.g. Technology transfer offices / science park organisations or on or off cultural venues)
- The city and its various communities as an urban laboratory for academic research, teaching and knowledge exchange
Thomas Bender on the University and the City

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

1. Place and community
2. Innovation and urban economic development
3. Social development
4. Opening out the university ‘black box’
Place and Community

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

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

• Emerging holistic views of development embracing social equality and cohesion, environmental sustainability, health and well being and cultural vitality

• Social innovation as an alternative to technological innovation in the economy with the city as a constitutive element in the innovation process primarily from the sphere of local civil society

• Different parts of the academy may be active nationally in shaping various spheres of development beyond the economy (e.g. social welfare and the creative arts) through research and professional training but is activity linked to city development?

• University community engagement usually linked to service learning and not always driven by city needs
Models of internal structure

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

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

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

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

- Teaching
- Research
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Hard Boundary between enabling and non enabling environments
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The disconnected region

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

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

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

**No boundary spanners**
- Focus on supply side, transactional interventions
- Ineffective or non existent partnership
- Lack of a shared understanding about the challenges
- Entrepreneurs ‘locked out’ of regional planning
The triple helix is not enough as the way we innovate is changing.
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Social innovations as processes and outcomes

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

• The process of social interactions between individuals undertaken to reach certain outcomes is participative, involves a number of actors and stakeholders who have a vested interest in solving a social problem, and empowers the beneficiaries. It is in itself an outcome as it produces social capital”

• Board of European Policy Advisors 2010
The quadruple helix

• “Quadruple Helix (QH), with its emphasis on broad cooperation in innovation, represents a shift towards systemic, open and user-centric innovation policy. An era of linear, top-down, expert driven development, production and services is giving way to different forms and levels of coproduction with consumers, customers and citizens.” (Arnkil, et al, 2010)

• “The shift towards social innovation also implies that the dynamics of ICT-innovation has changed. Innovation has shifted downstream and is becoming increasingly distributed; new stakeholder groups are joining the party, and combinatorial innovation is becoming an important source for rapid growth and commercial success. Continuous learning, exploration, co-creation, experimentation, collaborative demand articulation, and user contexts are becoming critical sources of knowledge for all actors in R&D & Innovation” (ISTAG 2010)
The triple helix + users model (Arnkill et.al)
The citizen centred quadruple helix model (Arnkill et.al)
The Civic University
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Seven dimensions of the civic university

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embryonic</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Evolving</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution is ‘detached’ from the local environment with limited local linkages and lack of integration within the physical fabric</td>
<td>There has been some ‘opening up’ of the campus to the local community but linkages are still relatively superficial</td>
<td>Local communities are increasing using campus facilities the institution is making linkages with local businesses and groups to develop opportunities for research and placements etc.</td>
<td>The location of the institution is integral to its identity, it is viewed as an important asset by the local community, it physically ‘blends’ within the local built environment and is seen as a ‘living laboratory’ for research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Science With and For Society: Horizon 2020

- Betting on 'technology acceptance' by way of good marketing only, is no longer a valid option
- Diversity in Research and Innovation is a must for achieving greater creativity and promoting better results
- Early and continuous iterative engagement of society in Research and Innovation is key to innovation adequacy and acceptability
Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) is a process where all societal actors (researchers, citizens, policy makers, business) work together during the whole R&I process in order to align R&I outcomes to the values, needs and expectations of European society.

need not always be harmonious
A guiding vision for RRI

• “In tomorrow’s Europe, science institutions and scientists engage with society, while citizens and civil society organisations engage with science; thereby contributing to a European society which is smart, sustainable and inclusive”

• There is a need for a new narrative drawing on a broad-based innovation strategy encompassing both technological and non-technological innovation at all levels of European society, and with a stronger focus on the citizen and responsible and sustainable business - a quadruple helix and place-based approach to science, research and innovation.”

• Horizon 2020 Advisory Group
• “We call on public and private Research and Innovation Performing Organisations to implement institutional changes that foster RRI by:

• Review their own procedures and practices in order to identify possible RRI barriers and opportunities at organisation level;
• Create experimental spaces to engage civil society actors in the research process as sources of knowledge and partners in innovation;
• Develop and implement strategies and guidelines for the acknowledgment and promotion of RRI;
• Adapt curricula and developing training to foster awareness, know-how, expertise and competence of RRI;
• Include RRI criteria in the evaluation and assessment of research staff “
The Practise: How engaged is the academy?
UK Innovation Research Centre Survey of 22,000 UK academics -
External interaction and commercialisation activity (% of respondents)

Newcastle: “A world class civic university”

“The combination of being globally competitive and regionally rooted underpins our vision for the future. We see ourselves not only as doing high quality academic work … but also choosing to work in areas responsive to large scale societal needs and demands, particularly those manifested in our own city and region”

Chris Brink, Vice-Chancellor
The purpose of Newcastle University

• Paying attention to not just what it is good at but what it is good for
• Delivering benefits not just to individuals and organisations but society as a whole
• Putting academic knowledge creativity and expertise to work to come forward with innovations and solutions that will make a difference
• Combining academic excellence on the supply side with a range of regional and global challenges on the demand side
• Operating on a national & international scale but also recognising the extent to which location in the City of Newcastle forms the unique identity of the institution
Societal challenge themes

• Ageing
• Sustainability
• Social Renewal
Responding to societal challenges: Universities and sustainable cities

• The university as an actor engaging in the challenge of sustainable urban development – responding to economic development opportunities and the need to work with civil society
• The environmental footprint of the university in the city including involvement in off campus regeneration projects
• The university as a multi-level actor within the set of relationships that constitute urban environmental governance
• Local engagement of academics from different disciplines in the city as an urban laboratory
• The city as simultaneously the object of study, the setting or field for research and the site for collaboration and inter-disciplinary experimentation and intervention
The Urban Laboratory

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

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

Co-Director of Newcastle Institute for Research on Environmental Sustainability
The Importance Collaborative Leadership

- Leaders set the tone and vision of the whole process, they therefore need to be people who command respect and credibility in the region.

- Although their reputations will be partly based on their past achievements, they also need to champion new vocations for their regions.

- Leadership assumes many forms. 
  - political leadership (the people who are chosen by the electorate to represent us and to lead our governments);
  - managerial leadership (the people who manage the “enterprise function” in the public, private and third sectors); and
  - intellectual leadership (the people who play a leading role in connecting the knowledge base in universities to the worlds in and beyond their regions).
Universities and Leadership of Place

Political Leadership

Managerial Leadership

Community Leadership

Intellectual Leadership
Towards a universities and civic leadership programme

• Focus on developing the region as well as developing its leaders
• How to lead the region not just lead in the region
• “Leadership development, unless it brings people together around a common problem at an appropriate level of detail looses the point.”
• Leaders from the university and outside should identify a key challenge (e.g. removing barriers to social mobility, developing a sustainable city) and then hand over to an operational group of future leaders from the university and the region
• A single region/place focus for the programme within a national framework but learning from experience outside the country
An ‘action learning’ leadership development programme to build regional boundary spanning capacity
Lack of local demand for and supply of students

Demise of regional funding streams

Nationally driven policies and funding for innovation

Lack of demand and capacity in local SMEs

Recruitment vs widening participation

‘Severing’ the anchor?
The local response: a conjoint agenda?

- Greater emphasis on widening participation, the student experience and employment outcomes may drive greater involvement with the city.
- New emphasis on the demonstrable impact of research and ‘Science With and For Society’ in Horizon 2020 may encourage more involvement of academics with the city on their doorstep where such impacts should be more transparent and knowledge can be co-produced with civil society actors.
- Austerity in public finances leading universities AND cities to review their business models.
- Does this foreshadow a coming together of universities and cities on the basis of shared interests?