

Putting universities in their place: The ORPHIC Framework

1. Introduction <subheading>

As has been discussed throughout this book, the role of universities in their own regions is undergoing fundamental change. At a global level, the aftermath of the 2008 economic crisis ushered in a decade of austerity in public finances. This led to increased demand for explicit evidence of the returns from or value of public investments, including those from research and higher education. At the same time, international policy makers began to describe the emergence of 'grand challenges' (e.g. climate change, ageing, terrorism, sustainability) that are global in their scale and impact, and which orthodoxy suggests cannot be solved by government, academia or business alone. Instead, they require a multi-disciplinary and collaborative approach which includes the mobilisation of universities and civil society¹.

There is also pressure from external forces (political and financial) at local and regional levels in motivating universities to become more engaged². This can often be as a result of a particular 'crisis driver'³ (e.g. economic decline) that stimulates universities to make a public commitment to supporting the region. At the same time, local communities and taxpayers facing tough economic conditions might question the value of universities, especially in places where their direct benefits are less apparent (e.g. low levels of local student recruitment, weak levels of graduate retention). This has led to increasing expectations on universities to be proactively engaged in supporting their local area⁴ beyond the passive direct and indirect effects of their presence⁵.

More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic has transformed the role of universities in their places, as they have become essential repositories of science, equipment, knowledge, and ideas. The pandemic has had wider repercussions for the ability of students and university staff to create true learning environments through physical presence on campuses.

This chapter considers the role of universities in their place. It assesses the challenges for university-place collaboration and drivers of change, before going on to set out a new *ORPHIC Framework* for university and regional contribution. The remainder of this chapter also sets out the test of the framework in practice, by reporting on the results of a worldwide university survey of 100 academics. The chapter ends by highlighting some implications for policy makers.

2. Challenges for University-Place Collaboration <subheading>

Despite the increasing prominence given to the role of universities in social and economic development, and the range of models available (as set out in chapter 3), research reports and academic studies consistently find that practices are highly fragmented and uncoordinated⁶. There are both internal and external challenges to the effective engagement of universities in local and regional development⁷. Some of these challenges are intrinsic and structural, often driven from a national or even supra-national level and therefore difficult to overcome at a local scale.

The internal management of universities is in many cases heavily shaped by national funding and regulation of higher education, which incentivises and rewards achievements of esteem indicators for research and (to a lesser extent) teaching excellence (as measured by rankings and league tables) over engagement. Externally, the nature of the place in which the university is located (i.e. economic conditions, and the capacity of the actors in the regional innovation system), can have a profound effect on the contribution even the most well-meaning and motivated universities can make.

2.1 Internally derived challenges <sub sub heading>

Internal tensions in university systems and processes also can act as an impediment to academic engagement⁸; in the internal conflict between achieving esteem

indicators for teaching and academic excellence and regional engagement, excellence usually wins⁹. There are also various internal structural factors¹⁰ which, despite pronouncements from senior institutional leaders of their commitment, lead to regional engagement being seen as undermining the excellent, world-class reputation of the university. Individual researchers can have a strong impact on the nature of engagement and the characteristics of institutions also play an important role, for example through the size of departments, internal policies, and support mechanisms for collaboration¹¹.

Incentives, rewards and promotion criteria in universities¹² are important internal mechanisms in stimulating academics to engage with external partners in producing and sharing research. Promotion criteria¹³ is probably the most important of these, but one which - to a large extent - still rewards and favours teaching and especially research performance over knowledge transfer or regional engagement activities. This suggests that engaged academics are often acting despite, rather than because of, institutional mechanisms.

While policy makers have sought to motivate universities to become more engaged in local development and innovation through funding and other incentive schemes, these generally lack the scale and significance to sufficiently overcome the internal management issues and tensions.¹⁴ This, in turn, has a substantial impact on academics and their willingness and ability to engage¹⁵.

2.2 Externally derived challenges <sub sub heading>

The literature and evidence exploring the role of universities in local collaboration points to a range of external factors that limit the potential of (even the most well-meaning and motivated) universities playing a central and valuable role in local and regional development. Two of the most critical of these constraints are the nature of the 'place' and the impact of the policy environment¹⁶.

The nature of the place <sub sub sub heading>

The extent to which the research being undertaken in universities matches both the local industrial structures and the potential of local firms to apply it, is a critical factor in realising the 'promise' of regional economic development policies and the role of universities within them¹⁷. There is often a mismatch between the research taking place in universities and the innovation requirements of local firms¹⁸. But even where there might be overlaps between research specialisms and the nature and make-up of the regional economy, insufficient levels of demand-side capacity in the local private sector creates a 'wicked problem' for policy makers and regional actors (including universities).

The local impact of university research is severely limited if the business sector has insufficient capacity to absorb and utilise the research outputs (usually referred to as absorptive capacity) of their local universities for knowledge-led growth¹⁹. This phenomenon is characterised as the 'innovation paradox'²⁰. This refers to the contradiction between a need to invest comparatively greater amounts of public funds in innovation in peripheral regions, but where capacity to absorb these funds and invest in research is lower than in more developed places.

This tends to reinforce the dominance of successful regions and further widen the gap between them and peripheral or lagging ones, as research outputs from the former are absorbed by firms in the latter. This has also been described as the 'European paradox'²¹, evidenced by weak correlations between research quality and competitiveness, particularly in comparison to the USA. This is attributed to weak external demand-side factors due to sub-optimal capacity in local firms as well as insufficient supply-side internal drivers such as incentives and support mechanisms.

A further aggravating factor in peripheral places is one of "institutional thinness"²², which can be characterised as regions with weak or fragmented industrial clusters and a lack of critical mass of the kinds of organisations (public and private) that support innovation and development²³. This can lead to an over dependence on universities to play a dominant role in the local ecosystem, and even an expectation

that they fill the gaps created by a paucity of other regional innovation actors²⁴. It may further weaken the delivery of their 'core' higher education missions of teaching and research. This leads to the risk of universities becoming "quasi economic development agencies"²⁵. This is a role for which they may lack core competencies and indeed cause conflicts of interest, since they may compete for the same funds in which they have a role in governing.

Impact of the policy environment <sub sub sub heading>

Higher education policy is often based on national rather than regional needs. Students, particularly at research intensive, highly ranked universities tend to be recruited nationally and internationally. Thus, prioritising teaching and research around narrow, place-specific demands for human and knowledge capital could be seen to limit a university's ability to recruit students and attract research funding.

As we discussed earlier, incentives and rewards for generating high quality research do not tend to generate esteem working locally. Indeed, universities with an explicitly local or regional focus might be seen as 'second rate' by national policy makers whose concern is achievement against national and international measures of success²⁶. A further challenge is that policy makers (and even many commentators) tend to treat universities as relatively homogenous institutions and fail to recognise the significant diversity of university types²⁷ which is exacerbated by the different policy and place environments where they operate²⁸.

3. Developing a new framework for collaboration <subheading>

Policy makers, and even universities themselves, have perhaps fallen into the trap of over estimating the potential contribution of universities in driving local innovation and development, whilst at the same time underplaying the significant impacts of internal tensions and external barriers on their ability and willingness to engage. That is not to suggest they have no direct role as local actors. Rather, we contend that a more

realistic, honest understanding of the limitations of universities' contribution as local actors might lead to a more mutually beneficial relationship between them and their places.

As we highlighted previously in Chapter Three, there have been several attempts in recent years to create conceptual frameworks and models to help universities and policy makers understand the role and contribution of higher education to local and regional development. However, these models have failed to fully reflect (or give insufficient attention to) the impact of the regional context (economic, social, political), the policy environment for higher education and territorial development, and the diversity of management and leadership structures of universities themselves.

The current policy frameworks for understanding the potential role and contribution of universities to regional development are grounded in a 'one size fits all' approach that is often based on specific exemplar cases and empirical evidence from successful regions in the most developed economies (e.g. the UK's 'Golden Triangle' of Oxford-Cambridge-London, the MIT Corridor (also known as Route 128), and Silicon Valley in the USA) which severely limits their portability as policy instruments to other regions who do not enjoy the same precise conditions of economic success (endnote ref 7, op cit).

This has led to the development of static models that rarely work outside of the immediate context in which they were developed, and therefore risk leading to design of policies that are not fit for purpose. While there is a growing body of academic and policy or 'grey' literature that analyse these issues, so far, these have not been translated into a form that can help shape policy.

The overall purpose of this Policy Expo is to develop a new framework to guide policy makers towards a better understanding of the role universities in their regions currently play in regional development, and to identify what actions and policy instruments might best be levered to enhance their potential contribution. This was based on a systematic and comprehensive review of the literature that analysed the problems and challenges in mobilising universities for regional development,

particularly in less developed regions, the learning from which informed the development of a 'straw man' framework, articulated in figure 4.2.

The framework was tested by exploring the contribution of a HEI to regional development against a set of regional and institutional characteristics to understand if and, if so, to what extent, these impact on the contribution of HEIs. Workshops and seminars with academics, policy makers and practitioners at international conferences were used to develop and road test the key questions needed to build this understanding. This was then developed into an online consultation and call for evidence which was responded to by 111 Regional Studies Association members from institutions in Europe, North America, South America, Africa, Asia and Australia. The analysis of the findings from this consultation informed the 'build out' of a new framework which was presented to academics and policy makers before being finalised.

In terms of the contribution of a HEI, we asked the following questions;

- To what extent are core activities (teaching, research and engagement) aligned to regional need?
- How committed is the institution to supporting regional development? Is it seen as core to its mission or a peripheral activity?
- How are activities that support regional engagement organised? Are they managed and supported in a strategic or an ad-hoc way?
- How does the HEI envision its role in regional development? Does it consider itself a strategic leader or a responsive actor, providing support when asked?

The following regional and institutional characteristics were explored in order to test if and how they impacted on a HEIs contribution to regional development;

- Age and size of the HEI
- Regional configuration of higher education in the region (whether there are few or many HEIs)
- The economic context of the region
- The policy context for higher education and regional development within which the HEI operates

The breakdown of responses against the options for each classification can be found in Appendix 1.

4. Findings from the consultation and call for evidence <sub heading>

4.1 Does size and age matter? <sub sub heading>

HEIs were classified into four age groups based on how long they have been established¹ and four size categories based on the number of enrolled students².

| Age classification of HEIs | Size Classification of HEIs |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Young (less than 50 years) | Small (fewer than 5,000) |
| Middle-aged (50 to 99 years) | Mid (5,000 to 19,999) |
| Old (100 to 199 years) | Big (20,000 to 50,000) |
| Ancient (more than 200 years) | Huge (more than 50,000) |

Table 5.1 Age and size classification

Respondents from 'middle-aged' universities were most likely to see their HEIs' teaching as aligned with regional need, possibly reflecting their formation post-1945 when higher education policy in many countries had a more spatially-focused approach to new institution formation³⁰. Academics in young and middle-aged universities felt there was a strong alignment between their institution's research and the needs of the region. While those in older institutions acknowledged an alignment of their research, this was less unequivocal compared to respondents from their younger counterparts. In terms of engagement, there was little variation: people in institutions of all ages felt these activities were regionally orientated to a similar extent.

People working in big and huge institutions were considerably more likely (over 50

¹ In the case of merged institutions, the age of the oldest of the original institutions was used.

² Including under and postgraduate, full and part-time.

per cent in both cases) to report their HEI's teaching was totally or largely aligned to regional need compared to just over 30 per cent in the case of small and mid-sized institutions. This may reflect the fact that smaller institutions tend to be more specialised (e.g. colleges of art) or offer a more limited range of subjects (e.g. business and economics), which may not map particularly to the needs of the regional economy. However, research alignment tended to inversely correlate with size – the smaller the institution, the more likely it was considered that its research aligned with regional need. Alignment of engagement activities was broadly similar across each size group.

Respondents from young and middle-aged universities were more likely to see their HEI as 'deeply engaged' and 'playing a strategic role' in supporting regional development. While those from older institutions saw them making a contribution to regional development, this was more peripheral, and their focus was more on their national or international role. This is not particularly surprising as older institutions are more likely to be research intensive and therefore will be oriented towards opportunities for collaborations and funding that will often be outwith the region, as well as being concerned with their position and performance on various league tables.

People in small, mid and big institutions were far more likely than those in huge ones to see their institutions as strongly committed to regional development. The bigger the institution, the more likely it was seen to express a commitment to regional development; however that was not perceived to be matched in practice through delivery.

Academics in the youngest institutions were most likely to describe the organisation of regional engagement as 'strategic and purposeful' and central to everything they do. This might be because HEIs established in the past 50 years were, in many countries, part of an effort to address higher education 'cold spots' as well as support economic development in peripheral regions. However, it is interesting that people in young and middle-aged institutions were also more likely than those in older ones to report that, while there might be a commitment to regional engagement in principle,

this was not always borne out in practice. People from older institutions, especially those under 200 years old, were most likely to suggest that regional engagement depended on the motivations of individual academics.

Those based in huge institutions were least likely to describe their HEI's regional engagement as 'central to everything they do'. People in small, mid and huge institutions were most likely to say regional engagement was up to an individual's own motivations, while those from big institutions were most likely to report that activities were organised more centrally. This may be because of the likely national/international focus of huge HEIs and lack of central capacity to organise and deliver 'third mission' activities in smaller ones (e.g. dedicated teams for regional engagement).

The younger the institution, the more likely their staff were to describe them as a 'critical actor' in the region, probably reflecting the mission and founding principles of younger versus older HEIs. The older the institution, the more likely respondents were to see its role as 'leading by example' through 'spearheading new initiatives'.

Those based in younger institutions were also more likely to see it in a passive role, getting involved when asked but not necessarily playing a proactive role. Some research suggests that in places with multiple HEIs, small and specialist institutions can feel overshadowed by their older, bigger counterparts who tend to be the 'go to' place when policy makers want to involve HEIs in regional affairs.

Respondents from small and big institutions were far more likely to see them as critical actors in regional development while those in huge HEIs are most likely say their role is providing evidence and intelligence for decision making. Again, this probably reflects the likely national and international orientation of very large HEIs who need to look beyond their region for students and staff, and who intentionally seek national and international reputations.

4.2 Does the regional configuration of HE make a difference? <sub sub heading>

Regional HE configuration was defined in three ways: whether the HEI was the sole HE provider in the region; one of a few (less than five); or one of many (five or more). This was to test the assumption that a sole regional HEI was likely to have a closer relationship with its region and to explore whether being one of a few rather than one of many HEIs made a difference.

It would seem that HE configuration had no impact on alignment of teaching to regional need – 80 per cent of respondents said it was totally or largely aligned in their institution regardless of the number of HEIs in the region. Likewise, the responses in terms of engagement were broadly similar, although those from institutions that were one of few in the region were slightly more likely to see it as strongly aligned.

In terms of research, however, there was a very significant difference in responses between those from sole institutions and those that were in one of several HEIs. Those based in sole institutions were around three times more likely to say their research was totally or largely aligned to regional need. This might reflect a purposeful policy of establishing HEIs in what had traditionally been higher education 'cold spots', whose mandate was often explicitly regional. There was little variation between people in the different configurations in terms of their view of their institution's commitment to regional development, although those in sole HEIs and one of few were slightly more likely to describe them as regionally engaged.

Respondents in sole HEIs were far more likely (over half of all responses) to consider their institution deeply engaged in supporting their region. There was little difference between people based in institutions that were one of few or one of many in the region. Those in one of multiple institutions were far more likely to say engagement is dependent on the motivation of individuals, with those that were in one of many having the strongest response.

People based in sole HEIs were significantly more likely to say their institution is a critical actor that plays a central role in regional decision making and strategy development than those who are in one of multiple institutions. However, they were

also more likely to say their institution does not play a proactive role but gets involved when asked. Respondents from HEIs that are one of a few were most likely to describe it as leading by example through spearheading initiatives.

People in institutions who were one of many in the region were most likely to say it makes no formal contribution to regional affairs, though only in 10 per cent of cases. No one from a sole institution selected this option.

4.3 How significant is the regional economic context? <sub sub heading>

Four regional context options were defined, based on whether national GDP was above or below the OECD average and regional GDP was above or below the national average.

| Regional context classification | Definition |
|--|--|
| Developed region in a developed country | National GDP above OECD average, regional GDP above national average |
| Lagging regional in a developed country | National GDP above OECD average, regional GDP below national average |
| Developed region in a less developed country | National GDP below OECD average, regional GDP above national average |
| Lagging region in a less developed country | National GDP below OECD average, regional GDP below national average |

Table 5.2 Regional economic context.

The regional context seems to have some effect on alignment of each area of HE activity with regional need. Responses from people based in less developed countries suggest that teaching was more likely to be aligned than in developed countries. In terms of research, alignment was deemed strongest in lagging regions in developed countries and developed regions in less developed countries. It was seen as least aligned in lagging regions in less developed countries, which may be

due to lower levels of absorptive capacity in those places.

Similarly, alignment of engagement was considered strongest by people from HEIs in lagging regions in developed countries and developed regions in less developed countries. Weaker alignment in developed regions in developed countries may be attributed to greater “institutional thickness”, so less overt demands are placed on HEIs compared to those in less developed regions and countries.

People from HEIs in lagging regions in developed countries and developed regions in less developed countries were most likely to say their institution was deeply engaged in regional development, while responses from the other two classifications were most likely to describe its role as supportive, but with a greater emphasis on their national/international role. Respondents in HEIs in lagging regions in less developed countries were most likely to say their HEI was not concerned with regional development, although the number of responses to this was quite small in absolute terms.

Staff in HEIs in lagging regions in less developed countries were most ambivalent about the organisation of regional development, with more than 90 per cent saying it was not a big focus in practice or was dependent on individual motivation. People based in institutions in developed regions in developed countries were most likely to say it was not a big focus in practice. Those in lagging regions in developed countries and developed regions in less developed countries, were most likely to describe the organisation of regional development in their HEI as strategic and purposeful.

Respondents from HEIs in lagging regions in developed countries were much more likely to regard their institution as a proactive actor in regional development, either by playing a central role in strategic leadership or leading by example through spearheading new initiatives. Those from institutions in lagging regions in developing countries were significantly more likely (almost three quarters of cases) to describe a more passive role, with the institution getting involved when asked to or supplying evidence and data to help decision making. Those from HEIs in developed regions in developed countries were also more likely to see their institutions in this role.

4.4 What is the effect of the policy context? <sub sub heading>

There is an underlying assumption that HEIs in places with more devolved powers over regional development will be more likely to be engaged, not least because of the impact of devolution for resource allocation. This factor explored whether or not the higher education and regional development policy contexts, specifically the extent to which is it centrally or regionally determined, affected the way HEIs relate to their regions.

| HE policy options | Governance context options |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Totally or mostly national determined | Totally centralised Mainly centralised |
| Mix of national and regional | Mainly devolved |
| Mostly or entirely regional | Totally devolved |

Table 5.3 Policy context options

In terms of alignment of teaching to regional need there was little difference between the various levels of centralised/decentralised policy contexts. While this might at first appear surprising, it probably reflects the fact that HEIs will teach the subjects for which there is demand. For research there was also little variation; in fact, staff from HEIs in places with highly centralised systems were most likely to assess its research as aligned to regional need (although the difference was not very significant). The pattern in terms of engagement was much more distinct, with institutional engagement seen as far more likely to be aligned to regional need the more decentralised the system.

Respondents in HEIs in places where policy and governance is most devolved were most likely to class their institution as deeply committed to supporting regional development, though again there was not a vast difference between the various policy contexts.

Those based in HEIs in places where policy is mostly or entirely governed regionally were more likely to see regional engagement as central to and a core part of their institution's mission, but again this was not as strong an effect as might have been expected. There was little variation between the systems in considering engagement to be left to individual's motivations, with about a third choosing this option in each group.

In terms of the role of the HEI in regional development, there was again little significant variation with 30 per cent (+/- 3 per cent) in each policy context ascribing a proactive, leading role for their institution in regional development. One explanation for this might be that places with high levels of regional autonomy may have a denser landscape of agencies and institutions ("institutional thickness") who are focused on regional development and therefore the pressure for HEIs to actively contribute might not be as acute as in other, institutionally thinner, place.

5. Insights for policy making <subheading>

It is important to consider institutional age in regional policy making. Younger institutions may be overlooked by policy makers in favour of more established, high profile HEIs.

However, they are more likely to be regionally orientated as older, research intensive universities are concerned with national and global partnerships. But younger institutions may lack the institutional capacity and resources to support effective engagement.

Policy makers should consider how these activities can be supported and encouraged. They should also be aware that younger institutions, despite having much to offer regional development, may be overlooked in favour of more high profile, older HEIs. While older HEIs may bring credibility to regional initiatives, they might not be willing to engage unless they can lead them.

Size matters in understanding the role of HEIs in regional development. While intuitively it might be assumed that smaller institutions are more likely than larger ones to orient their teaching to regional need in practice, this is not necessarily the case. Smaller HEIs are more likely to be specialised in specific subject areas (e.g. art, business) which do not necessarily map on to the regional economic structure. Conversely, larger institutions are less likely to align their research to regional need, probably because they need to take a more national and international outlook in recruiting staff and students and may also look beyond the region for sources of research funding.

It is important that policy makers recognise the different roles that HEIs of different sizes play in regional development and that different mechanisms for engagement might be needed depending on how formally they organise regional activities and how stated commitments translate into practice.

Policy makers must consider the configuration of the higher education landscape in their region but bear in mind that its impacts are not always what might be assumed. HEIs that are one of several or many in the region are just as likely to align their teaching and research to regional need as those that are a sole provider. Likewise, there was little difference in commitment to regional development between the different classifications. While sole HEIs were much more likely to see themselves playing a central role in regional development, this was not unanimous.

Policy makers should not assume the automatic involvement of HEIs in shaping regional strategies purely on their status as the only one in the region. Where a HEI is one of several in the region, the organisation of engagement may be dependent on the motivation of individuals, and therefore may require complex mechanisms to ensure the right people get involved.

The regional context impacts on the way HEIs engage in regional development. Those in lagging regions in developed countries and developed regions in less developed countries are most likely to see their role as central and strategic and align their research accordingly. This might be because of greater demands placed on institutions in these places due to relative institutional thinness, but where there is sufficient absorptive capacity for the outputs of HEIs compared to lagging regions in developing countries.

The stronger alignment of teaching to regional need in less developed countries may reflect an emphasis on the human capital development role of higher education in these countries rather than their broader role in regional innovation and development that underpins regional strategy in many developed countries. The relative detachment of HEIs in developed regions in developed countries might be ascribed to institutional thickness in those regions, as well as a tendency towards a more national and international outlook across the economy and its actors more generally.

There can often be an implicit assumption that HEIs in places with greater regional autonomy and control over higher education policy will be more orientated to regional development. However, this is not necessarily the case. HEIs in these places will face the same demands as pressures (e.g. student recruitment) as those in places where policy is determined nationally. Furthermore, it is not necessarily the case that centrally controlled policy is spatially blind; HEIs can still be induced and incentivised to play a proactive role in regional development with the right policy design.

A final factor might be the wider institutional context for regional development. Places with devolved systems may have a wide breadth of organisations with a regional

remit and therefore the gaps and spaces for HEIs to fill may be more limited than in other, more central, regimes.

6. The ORPHIC Framework <subheading>

Based on extensive consultation and testing of our initial framework with policy makers and higher education practitioners, this Policy Expo has developed a straw man starting point into a more comprehensive framework which we have called *The ORPHIC Framework*.

'Orphic' is a word that means having an import not apparent to the senses nor obvious to the intelligence beyond ordinary understanding, reflecting the opaque and sometimes ambiguous nature of the relationships between universities and regions, and is an acronym of the six elements of the framework, namely:

Orientation of Higher Education Policy;

Governance of **R**egional development;

Characteristics of the **P**lace;

Type of **H**EI;

Institutional characteristics;

Contribution of the HEI.

Each element is explored through sixteen key questions which were identified as important during the Expo. Four classification options are offered against each for policy makers and their regional HEIs to consider when assessing the potential for cooperation. While some of these are clearly objective (e.g. the size of the HEI), others are more subjective or open to interpretation. To mitigate the latter the framework requires each response to be evidenced and suggest potential sources of evidence to support the option selected.

Rather than provide a fixed, normative model, our framework offers a flexible approach that can be adjusted to local and institutional conditions, based on a self-assessment process jointly undertaken between key stakeholders. The results of this

process can then help universities and their local/regional partners create a tailored and specific approach to contributing to regional development. The *ORPHIC Framework* can help guide policy makers and universities themselves to understand the implications of their *specific* context in determining the potential role and contributions of higher education to realising their regional development goals.

The ORPHIC Framework for University-Regional Collaboration

| Key questions | Options | | | | Evidence |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Orientation of Higher Education Policy | | | | | |
| To what extent is HE policy nationally or regionally focused? | <i>Totally financed and controlled regionally</i> | <i>HE is regionally controlled but HEIs need to contribute to national targets</i> | <i>HE is centrally controlled but there is some emphasis on and funding for regional activities</i> | <i>HE entirely centrally controlled and spatially blind</i> | National and regional HE policies Funding settlements and methodologies |
| Governance of Regional development | | | | | |
| How is regional development governed? | <i>Full autonomy or devolution to the region</i> | <i>Some formal autonomy at the regional level</i> | <i>Some informal autonomy at the regional level</i> | <i>Little/no autonomy</i> | National policies for sub-national development Fiscal powers Regional governance structures |

Characteristics of the Place

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| What is the economic character of the region? | <i>Developed region in a developed country</i> | <i>Lagging region in a developed country</i> | <i>Developed region in a less developed country</i> | <i>Lagging region in a less developed country</i> | Regional GDP National GDP |
| What is the industrial character of the region? | <i>Highly concentrated, thriving</i> | <i>Diverse, thriving</i> | <i>Highly concentrated, declining</i> | <i>Diverse, fragmented</i> | Data on regional businesses by sector and location |
| How 'thick' is the institutional landscape for regional development? | <i>Lots of public and private actors</i> | <i>Lots of actors, mostly public</i> | <i>Few actors, mix of public and private</i> | <i>Few actors, mostly public</i> | Regional intelligence Mapping exercises |

Type of HEI

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| How big is the HEI? | <i>Small, fewer than 5,000 students</i> | <i>Medium, 5,000 to 19,999 Students</i> | <i>Large, 20,000 to 50,000 Students</i> | <i>Huge, more than 50,000 students</i> | HEI website and annual reports National HE statistics |
| How old is the HEI? | <i>Young, less than 50 years old</i> | <i>Middle-aged, 50-99 years old</i> | <i>Old, 100-199 years old</i> | <i>Ancient, more than 200 years old</i> | HEI website Wikipedia |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| What is the balance between teaching and research? | <i>Highly research intensive (top 200)</i> | <i>Somewhat research intensive (top 1,000)</i> | <i>Mostly teaching focused (some research, not in top 1,000)</i> | <i>Entirely teaching focused, no research activity</i> | International league tables |
| What range of subjects are taught at the HEI? | <i>Full range of arts, humanities, science and engineering</i> | <i>Arts, humanities, and some science and engineering</i> | <i>Art and humanities focused</i> | <i>Technical/vocational focus</i> | HEI prospectus |
| What is its position in relation to the regional HE configuration? | <i>Sole HEI in the region</i> | <i>One of few (5 or less)</i> | <i>One of many (5+), (one of) the biggest</i> | <i>One of many (5+), (one of) the smallest</i> | Regional or national data on HEIs |

Institutional characteristics

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| To what extent is the HEI's research activity oriented to regional need? | <i>Totally</i> | <i>Significantly</i> | <i>Slightly</i> | <i>Not at all</i> | Research strategy Data on research collaborations Joint ventures |
| To what extent is the HEI's teaching activity oriented to regional need? | <i>Totally</i> | <i>Significantly</i> | <i>Slightly</i> | <i>Not at all</i> | HEI prospectus Industry involvement in teaching or |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | programme design |
| To what extent are there incentives or rewards for regional engagement? | <i>Highly rewarded and incentivised</i> | <i>Some rewards and incentives</i> | <i>Few rewards and incentives</i> | <i>No rewards and incentives</i> | Institutional policies Promotion criteria Internal funding |

Contribution of the HEI

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| What role does the HEI play in regional strategies and programmes? | <i>Strategic leader and anchor institution</i> | <i>One of a range of key actors</i> | <i>Manages regional programmes</i> | <i>Reactive, contributes when asked</i> | Institutional strategies Regional strategies |
| What is the institutional attitude to participation in regional initiatives? | <i>They are seen as core to its mission and important</i> | <i>One of the things it does</i> | <i>A small part of what it does</i> | <i>No or rare participation in regional initiatives</i> | Initiatives and projects Non-academic funding success Regional development offices |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>What contribution does the HEI make to regional human capital?</p> | <p><i>Students are mostly recruited from the region and retained after graduation</i></p> | <p><i>Students are mostly recruited from outside the region and retained after graduation</i></p> | <p><i>Students are mostly recruited from the region and migrate after graduation</i></p> | <p><i>Students are mostly recruited from outside the region and migrate after graduation</i></p> | <p>Data on student region of origin Data on destinations of graduates</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|

References <sub heading>

¹ Brennan, J., King, R. and Lebeau, Y.(2004). The Role of universities in the transformation of societies: an international research project. Centre for Higher Education Research and Information/Association of Commonwealth Universities, UK.

² Benneworth, P., Zeeman, N., Pinheiro, R and Karlsen, J. (2017). 'National higher education policies challenging universities' regional engagement activities'. *EKONOMIAZ*. 92(02), 112- 139.

³ Benneworth, P. (2012). 'The relationship of regional engagement to universities' core purposes: Reflections from engagement efforts with socially excluded communities'. In *Universities and regional development. A critical assessment of tensions and contradictions*. New York: Routledge.

⁴ Cochrane, A. and Williams, R. (2013). Putting higher education in its place: the socio-political geographies of English universities. *Policy & Politics*. 41(1), 43-58.

⁵ Power, D. and Malmberg, A. (2008). The contribution of universities to innovation and economic development: In what sense a regional problem? *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*. 1, 233–245.

⁶ European Universities Association. (2007). *Managing the University Community: Exploring Good Practices*.

⁷ Kempton, L. (2019). Wishful thinking? Towards a more realistic role for universities in regional innovation policy. *European Planning Studies*. 27(11), 2248-2265.

⁸ Foray, D. and Lissoni, F. (2010). 'University research and public–private interaction'. In: *Handbook of Economics of Technical Change*. North Holland: Elsevier.

⁹ Marmolejo, F. and Pukka, J. (2006). 'Supporting the contribution of higher education to regional development: Lesson learned from an OECD review of 14 regions through 12 countries'. Paper presented at the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education.

¹⁰ Benneworth, P., Zeeman, N., Pinheiro, R and Karlsen, J. (2017). 'National higher education policies challenging universities' regional engagement activities'. *EKONOMIAZ*. 92(02), 112- 139.

¹¹ D'Este, P. and Patel., P. (2007). 'University–industry Linkages in the UK: What Are the Factors Underlying the Variety of Interactions with Industry?' *Research Policy*. 36, 1295–1313.

¹² Lach, S. and M. Schankerman (2008). 'Incentives and invention in universities'. *Rand Journal of Economics*. 39(2), 403-433.

¹³ Stanton, T. K. (2008). 'New times demand a new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities'. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. 3, 19– 42.

¹⁴ Kempton, L. (2016). 'Institutional challenges and tensions'. In *The Civic University: The Policy and Leadership Challenges*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

¹⁵ Trippel, M., Sinozic, T. and Lawton Smith, H. (2015). 'The role of universities in regional development: Conceptual models and policy institutions in the UK, Sweden and Austria'. *European Planning Studies*. 23(9), 1722–1740.

¹⁶ Edwards, J., Marinelli, E., Arregui-Pabollet, E. and Kempton, L. (2017). 'Higher Education for Smart Specialisation - Towards strategic partnerships for innovation'. S3 Policy Brief Series No. 23/2017. European Commission Joint Research Centre: Seville.

¹⁷ Cohen, W. M. and Levinthal, D. A. (1990). 'Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 35, 128–152.

¹⁸ Harris, R., Fitzpatrick, K., Souch, C., Brunsdon, C., Jarvis, C., Keylock, C., Orford, S., Singleton, A. and Tate, N. (2013). *Quantitative methods in geography: making the connections between schools, universities and employers*. London: Royal Geographical Society with IBG.

¹⁹ Veugelers, R., and Del Rey, E. (2014). *The contribution of universities to innovation, (regional) growth and employment*. EENEE analytical report no. 18.

²⁰ Oughton, C., Landabaso, M. and Morgan, K. (2002). 'The regional innovation paradox: innovation policy and industrial policy'. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 27, 97-110.

²¹ European Commission. (2007). 'Improving knowledge transfer between research institutions and industry across Europe: embracing open innovation—implementing the Lisbon Agenda.

²² Tödttling, F. and Trippel, M. (2005). 'One size fits all? Towards a differentiated regional innovation policy approach'. *Research Policy*. 34 (8), 1203–19.

²³ Zukauskaitė, E., Trippel, M. and Plechero, M. (2017). 'Institutional thickness revisited'. *Economic Geography*. 93, 325–345.

²⁴ Goddard, J., Coombes, M., Kempton, L. and Vallance, P. (2014). 'Universities as anchor institutions in cities in a turbulent funding environment: vulnerable institutions and vulnerable places in England'. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*. 7(2), 307-25.

²⁵ Brown, R. (2016). 'Mission impossible? Entrepreneurial universities and peripheral regional innovation systems'. *Industry and Innovation*. 23(2), 189–205.

²⁶ Hazelkorn, E. (2016). 'Contemporary Debates Part I: Theorising Civic Engagement'. In *The Civic University: The Policy and Leadership Challenges*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

²⁷ Uyarra, E. and Flanagan, K. (2010). 'From regional systems of innovation to regions as innovation policy spaces'. *Environment and Planning C – Governance and Policy*. 28(4), 681– 695.

²⁸ Edwards, J., Marinelli, E., Arregui-Pabollet, E. and Kempton, L. (2017). 'Higher Education for Smart Specialisation - Towards strategic partnerships for innovation'. S3 Policy Brief Series No. 23/2017. European Commission Joint Research Centre: Seville.

²⁹ Marlow, D., Kempton, L. and Tewdwr-Jones M. (2019). *Inclusive Future Growth in England's Cities and Regions: Realising the Transformational University Dividend*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Newcastle City Futures.

³⁰ Boucher, G., Conway, C. and Van der Meer, E. (2003). Tiers of engagement by universities in their region's development. *Regional Studies*. 37, 887–89.