Enhancing place-based partnerships in public engagement

Stakeholder event
Tom welcomed everyone and gave a brief overview of UKRI’s ambitions for the new call Enhancing place-based partnerships in public engagement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Welcome and introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>Principles of practice: community university partnerships and place-based working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50</td>
<td><strong>Panel discussion</strong> Exploring place-based engagement, and the funding programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>Identify open space topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Lunch and refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Plenary review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td><strong>Q&amp;A</strong> with Louise Evans, Research England and Tom Saunders, UKRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principles of practice: community university partnerships and place-based working

Paul Manners, NCCPE
Theo Clay, NPC
Kim Aumann, Community Partner Network
Context for the call

Paul Manners, NCCPE
Countering the geography of discontent: Strategies for left-behind places

Britain's insecure towns aren't ‘left behind’. They hold the key to our future

John Harris

The desire for community and stability should not be dismissed as nostalgia. It’s our politicians who need to get with the times.
• The policy landscape
• The practice landscape
• Funding place-based working

Knowledge Exchange framework (KEF)
Priority areas for research and innovation

- **Health and wellbeing**: Access to good quality services, such as Health, Education, Transport, Housing, Employment etc.
- **Income and poverty**: Including in-work and out of work poverty. The lack of secure employment and opportunity.
- **Democracy and power**: Community governance, alienation from policies, and politics a sense of being ignored or put to one side.
- **Connectedness and belonging**: Often associated with social capital, it is noted that investment in social action can foster belonging. Fragmentation and divisions of distrust within communities.
- **Spaces**: Forums and spaces that facilitate exchange, interaction and shared commitment to goals.
- **Participation and social action**: Building on people’s ideas, creativity, skills and knowledge. Ensuring these are continually harnessed and involved in social change.
Three challenges in developing effective place-based approaches to research and innovation:

- **Citizen / community-led working**: we need to develop our understanding of how to conduct research and innovation in citizen-centric ways.
- **Addressing inequality**: we need to better understand how research and innovation funding can be targeted to contribute value to places experiencing significant disadvantage.
- **Working in system-oriented and collaborative ways**: how can HEIs work more productively with a host of types of organisation committed to achieving social outcomes?
Principles of good practice

• Alert to the **complex interdependencies** of social issues
• Articulate their **rationale and assumptions**
• Show consideration of the **wider ‘system’ of support and infrastructure** (including social infrastructure) that is already in place
• Consider **which roles they might** play within this wider ecosystem (e.g. contributor, leader, expert resource etc.)
• Articulate **who they have consulted** in developing their project, and who they are planning to collaborate with in delivering it
• Detail how they will take account of the **complexity of people’s lives and identities** and how they will provide them with **opportunity and agency** to help direct the activity
• Describe their approaches to **learning, evaluation and capturing impact**
• Clarify how they will ensure that **the costs of community partners and collaborators** will be reimbursed
Enhancing place-based partnerships in public engagement

Application deadline: 21 October 2019

Led by UK Research and Innovation, Enhancing place-based partnerships in public engagement is a competitive £500K pathfinder funding opportunity to support eligible research organisations UK-wide to pilot place-based public engagement partnerships and activities.

The call guidance document, including the bid template and submission instructions, can be found below.

Through Enhancing place-based partnerships in public engagement UKRI will support capacity building in collaborative place-based public engagement between research organisations, partner organisations and communities. Projects and partnerships will be driven by a geographically defined community’s need that can be approached by engagement with research and innovation and therefore shape and generate new learning.
Potential challenge areas to address (Annex B)

- Consultation and co-creation with community (partners)
- Data and intelligence gathering
- Innovation: new approaches
- Clarifying goals
- Evaluation and learning
- Governance and risk
- Capacity building
- Planning delivery
Theo Clay

NPC
PLACE-BASED WORKING—LESSONS FROM THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR
Theo Clay
WHAT IS A PLACE-BASED APPROACH?

Place-based approaches are characterised by:

• a shift away from centrally-dictated siloed policies,

• towards holistic solutions, which are defined, generated and delivered locally.
SIX PILLARS OF PLACE-BASED FUNDING

1. Seek specialist expertise in issues affecting the place
2. Collaborate with others to achieve impact in a place
3. Understand geographical context and meets local priorities
4. Learn and adapt based on changing local priorities
5. Pursue long term change for a place and people who live there
6. Recognise issues are connected and tackle them from multiple angles
THINK LONG TERM AND UNDERSTAND YOUR CONTEXT

Key characteristics

1. ‘Look before you leap’
2. Spend time on-site
3. Map the network
SEEK EXPERTISE AND LEARN AND ADAPT

Key characteristics

1. Value specialist expertise, including lived and learned experience
2. Work with existing assets
3. Let the community dictate the direction of travel

See case studies: Blackpool Pride of Place, Lambeth Together, Corra Foundation, Guy’s and St Thomas’ Charity, Hull Community Development Programme, Islington Giving, Preston Model, Children’s Zones, Sutton Plan
RECOGNISE CONNECTIONS AND COLLABORATE WITH OTHERS

Key characteristics

1. Recognise the complexity of the problem
2. Understand that addressing people’s complex issues may mean helping fewer people
3. Invest time in building connections and trust

See case studies: Blackpool Pride of Place, Lambeth Together, Corra Foundation, Guy’s and St Thomas’ Charity, Hull Community Development Programme, Islington Giving, Preston Model, Children’s Zones, Sutton Plan
BRIGHT SPARKS

Examples of good practice in place-based funding
THE CORRA FOUNDATION: PEOPLE IN PLACE PROGRAMME

Responsive place-based work with communities in Scotland

• **Long term:** Spends years with a single community.

• **Learn and adapt:** asset based model, which was evaluated using an asset based evaluation system.

  ‘We are not about predefined outcomes. Communities know what they need, we are just a facilitator. They know more about how their area works.’

For more information contact: hello@corra.scot
HULL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The Rank Foundation’s flagship place-based programme in Hull

• **Seek expertise:** Identify local leaders

• **Collaborate with others:** Focus on the relational nature of what you are doing

For more information contact: contactus@rankfoundation.com
QUESTIONS?

If you are interested in being involved please get in touch.

theo.clay@thinkNPC.org

nicola.pritchard@thinkNPC.org

katie.boswell@thinkNPC.org
KIM AUMANN
Community Partner
k.c.aumann@brighton.ac.uk
NEED A STRONGER VOICE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

“So, there are other community partners who also work in partnership with universities!”
WHAT HELPS?

• Acknowledge different cultures
• Clarify expectations
• Build capacity

• Put power & equity on the agenda
• Distribute funding
• Communicate and communicate again
• Identify and measure the value
• Commit - create legacy
NCCPE Partnership Tools

Conversation Starters
Partnership Planning Cards
Purposeful Partnerships
Match Event Facilitator Guide
Table discussion

- Your reactions to the presentations?
- What most resonated with you?
- What was missed, that really matters?

- Case studies of practice
- Questions for the panel
Enhancing place-based partnerships in public engagement

Panel discussion

• Tom Saunders, UKRI
• Theo Clay, NPC
• Kim Aumann, Community Partner Network

Chair: Paul Manners, NCCPE
How to guard against unethical ‘swooping in’ by researchers?
• The call is explicit about community partners need to be part of the framing and budget, and that mutuality is important, in line with the good practice principles outlined in the three presentations.

How important is the delivery of research outputs in this call?
• The focus is on engagement processes, not on research outputs

Which places are in scope?
• The focus should be on places experiencing deprivation, as captured in the IMD. They need not be in the immediate neighbourhood of the lead HEI / research institute. Rural is very much in scope

Does the call risk encouraging short-termism?
• The call is realistic about what can be achieved in the time available – this is about taking purposeful ‘steps’ as part of a longer journey, as spelt out in Annex B

Summary of the questions explored in the Q&A
Lunch
Delegates identified 8 topics for in depth discussion. They had the chance to join two tables during this session, to contribute their ideas.
Each table was invited to feed back one insight from the discussions

Table One, Communities of Interest vs Place
- This group explored how to work across communities of both interest and place, by identifying overlapping issues.

Table Two, Reaching Rural Communities
- This group explored a range of approaches to working in rural settings, and identified the potential of churches and other religious settings as potential partners.

Table Three, Civic University Agreements
- This group explored the overlap between this call and their activity to develop Civic Agreements, Linked to the UPP Civic University Commission. Don’t let the metrics define the issues, let the communities decide on the issues. Strip out unhelpful terms like ‘hard to reach’ places.

Table Four, Bid Writing for Newbies
- This group shared tips for people new to bid writing: don’t be vague, you need to be explicit about your aims and purpose.

Table Five, The Role of Intermediaries
- This group explored potential intermediary organisations, to help broker relationships with communities. They reflected that developing relationships should not be tokenism: you may think your research is world leading but what does that mean for a housing estate in Jarrow?

Table Six, Legacy within the HEI
- This table explored what might be meaningful legacies from the project internal to the host HEI: they identified the need to think about this at all levels of the HEI – from Early Career Researchers to senior managers.

Table Seven, Variants of PE & Research
- This group explored the relationship between ‘research’ and ‘engagement and impact’ in the call. They concluded that it is helpful to think about the projects having an impact on the way research is done, not on producing research outputs.

Table Eight, Legacy for the Community Sector
- This table explored various kinds of ‘community’ legacy. Examples included providing a platform, changing the current model, regular connections and contributions, celebrations/events.
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Q&A

- Louise Evans, Research England
- Tom Saunders, UKRI

Chair: Paul Manners, NCCPE
Summary of the questions explored in the panel

Opening reflections from Louise and Tom
• Thanked delegates for their positive and constructive input.

What is driving UKRI’s timescales?
• The funding comes from a pot of money from the BEIS PE budget – has to be spent by the end of this financial year.

What counts as match funding? Staff time? Other projects? Core funds?
• As long as specifically relevant to this project, all kinds of match co-investment, cash or in-kind, is permissible. For more information, please see the call guidance and FAQ.

Does the match funding have to be £40k?
• Worked example in updated FAQ - For example, where a project requests £10,000 of UKRI funding, match co-investment of a minimum of £5,000 (cash or in-kind) should be sourced – this is a total of £15,000 for delivery of the project over six months. Section 4 of the bid template should detail the £10,000 requested from UKRI and Section 5 should detail the £5,000 match co-investment.

Which English IMD results should be used, 2015 or 2019?
• The call guidance was published when the 2015 English IMD was still current, please use this in the first instance. If a partner is located in an area that has subsequently entered the bottom two quintiles of the English IMD please contact the UKRI team to discuss.

Would undergraduate teaching around public engagement be in scope?
• Not as a core focus since research is the main driver for this call, but could be one of the underpinning aspects.

How would a research organisation go about brokering a relationship with a community partner(s)
• LEPs, LEAs, large charities could be gatekeepers to smaller community organisations. Open to this, but has to be clear route to engagement on both sides.

Why does the proposal template have such a low word count?
• Timing: Research organisations only have 6 weeks to submit and UKRI only have 3 weeks to review it, so require a quick turn around. Make the most of the opportunity – be specific and present a clear rationale, using simple language, and avoid jargon.

Does the call’s focus on community and co-created research reflect a new direction for UKRI research funding?
• This call is an opportunity to model new ways of working, and new research methods. We hope the projects will create a convincing case for the value of this way of working.
National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

We help universities engage with the public
How can we help you with public engagement?
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