

We are extremely grateful for the readings of the esteemed reviewers, and the opportunity provided by the journal to respond. We welcome the chance to discuss the ideas presented in the book, and note that this creative review format aligns well with the ethos of an *Engaged Urban Pedagogy*. As Dr Crookes and Dr Kahn both recognise, the framing offered in this publication centres on the potential for greater social justice through mechanisms of education where diverse actors from the academic and beyond are involved. The ideas root in a wider inquiry of pedagogy studies about how to grow university students' knowledge and agency. Inspired by these reviews, we offer some further reflections and grapple with the points raised.

In general terms, the reviewer commentaries reaffirm the core mission of an *Engaged Urban Pedagogy*, as well as the practical value for educators and others. We focus on moments of engagement where there are different types of encounter between academic and non-academic actors, which create connections in higher education. At its heart, the work is indeed about the opening up the design of higher education and finding common ground in the approaches to teaching and learning, which can lift up the active learning of students and promote participatory planning. Putting the book together involved deep reflective research work to that for that end, which certainly did challenge us to think about the pedagogic world of 'higher education in planning and place-making' in a rounded way that accounted for the cultures, social norms, and our own positionalities within these.

It was interesting to hear reviewers picking up on the specific tools and mechanisms behind the cases in the book, and we find those reflections stimulating. It seems perhaps that deliberating on the aspirations of an *Engaged Urban Pedagogy* is in itself a further step in the mission of opening up the university. We certainly hoped the book might help enable voices of actors involved in higher education contexts to be heard by others, and clearly the diversity of perspectives provided useful insights. As such, we echo the points made by the reviewers about the challenges faced by students, in relation to a sense of alienation from utopian visions in light of their lived experience of dark-side politics in governance and underperforming urban environments, as well as the significance of the perspectives of local community collaborating with universities.

Two central questions are raised and we offer some reflection. The first question is, ***Who is an Engaged Urban Pedagogy for?*** This important point is raised by Dr Crookes in relation to whether the benefits might extend beyond education and into action on the ground. The encounters are positioned as engagement for higher education and directed towards participatory planning. Our contention is that universities should articulate the need for action or means to change the world and critically such positions should be co-shaped with others. This may be cautious but the hope is for eventually confident audacity in light of the social and cultural differences that exist, and the enormous power structures where universities are materially embedded. To answer the question though, we cannot say long term outcomes will be 'good for all' nor can we assume a generalised 'common good' in the direct activities resulting from involvement of non-academics. Where urban interventions are needed, universities' most important contribution will be a critical intellectual positionality for ongoing inquiry. This is the way for an *Engaged Urban Pedagogy* to grapple with power structures, and there may be more direct activism (e.g.) in economic processes underpinning education, all of those need to be visible and accountable. However, the threat is being co-opted into the dynamics of delivery failure (e.g.) of service for a public interest or professional interventions. For this reason, we point to the potential inherent in active

learning that is sufficiently connected yet independent enough to provide rigorous testing and explicit challenge to the fundamental norms of society. We highlight the unique value of the intellectual sandpit of the scientific methods that is needed for critical skills development. This goes beyond moments of education as it brings ‘real world’ power struggles into the sphere of knowledge building where those challenges can be assessed and accounted for through a range of perspectives. Briefly speaking, such *Engaged Urban Pedagogy* would recognise the diverse forms of knowledge, and provide a reckoning of those that respected, promoted and brought to bear in society, not all of which are scientific.

“Concerning the question of ‘impact’ via engaged urban pedagogy, who is engaged urban pedagogy for? Is it primarily for staff and students or can it effect real change on the ground? There seems to be a cautiousness about ‘action’ and a discomfort about such action as a diversion from the development of the student’s intellectual capacities (p.267)” Lee Crookes

The second question is the reasonableness of an Engaged Urban Pedagogy from the perspective of communities who are involved as much as universities? This relates to the earlier point, and both reviewers wondered about the broad sense of the endeavours from a community stakeholder perspective. This is a highly complex matter, and we are wary of setting out some pre-figured positionality for ‘the engaged’. Instead, we would point to ethical principles of participatory planning also seen in emergent place-making practice, where people work to ‘hold space’ for others and involvement is called up. We note that participation in any of the three action areas of an Engaged Urban Pedagogy, i.e. reviewing curricula, providing teaching, and embedding practices might ‘reasonably’ be initiated by external actors. Indeed, this can stimulate further lines for inquiry on the potentialities of connecting to the ecosystem of higher education, and ways that specific communities and environments matter, i.e. politically, symbolically and materially. The hope in a civic mission around universities’ capacities surely include its pedagogy. We agree with Dr Khan that the cultural sensitivities of more diverse urban contexts deserve further exploration and perhaps these can be linked to a more fundamental shifts of direction in educational provision. As far as possible we touch on those within the scope of the book, but we very much accept more work is needed as well as ongoing exchange.

“Whilst not wishing to emulate or augment the increased measurement of different aspects of university life, how can we evaluate and assess the quality of urban engaged pedagogy, particularly from a community perspective?” (Lee Crookes)

“involving communities only superficially, without genuine influence over outcomes. Simply put, what is there for the community and stakeholders in our engaged urban pedagogy? Managing expectations is key, but so is asking how we do justice to the different voices heard and perspectives captured? How do we incorporate making meaning of things within the pedagogy of urban placemaking?” (Matluba Kahn)

To conclude, we hope to take these ideas further, and continuing to exchange and expand on the insights in the book. Our reviewers have particularly noted the need to question the communicative and moral dimensions of an *Engaged Urban Pedagogy*, for instance around the cultures of language and norms embedded in urbanism. They also reinforce the critical need to unpack the implications about resourcing, including the need for energies and

commitments of those beyond the academy. There is a call to reflect on the connections with activism and lines of research, and as we move forwards in line with the ethos of the book we open out this invitation to others.