



Research England

Knowledge Exchange Framework

Clustering and narrative templates

Report detailing the clustering arrangements and providing narrative statement templates for the first iteration of the Knowledge Exchange Framework

2 March 2020



Knowledge Exchange Framework

To	Heads of Research England-funded higher education institutions
Of interest to those responsible for	Knowledge Exchange, including directors of knowledge exchange and PVC Research and Enterprise/Innovation
Reference	RE-P-2020-02
Publication date	2 March 2020
Enquiries to	Sacha Ayres KEF@re.ukri.org 0117 931 7385

Contents

Introduction	3
Eligibility for the first iteration of the KEF	3
Clustering.....	3
Narrative statements.....	6
Institutional context statement	9
Local growth and regeneration statement	9
Public and community engagement self-assessment and statement.....	12
Integration of the self-assessment scores into the KEF metrics	14
Annex A - Final cluster placements	20

Introduction

1. In January 2020 we published the '[Knowledge Exchange Framework: Decisions for the first iteration](#)'. The report set out how we will implement the first iteration of the KEF. It explained our decisions on its design, including the metrics, inclusion of narrative statements and how and when we expect to publish the results.
2. This document provides further detailed information relating to the clustering arrangements and the narrative statements.


Eligibility for the first iteration of the KEF

3. All institutions eligible for Research England HEIF funding in the academic year 2019/20 are eligible for inclusion in the first iteration of the KEF. The eligibility of Research England HEIF funding was determined by the [Terms and Conditions of Research England grant \(2018\)](#) that were in place at the time of the HEIF 2019/20 award in July 2019.
4. Eligible institutions that did not receive any funding during 2019/20 will be included in the sector wide cluster benchmarking calculations, but will not automatically have their individual institutional metrics published unless they participate by providing the three narrative statements. Institutions in this category who wish to take part by submitting narrative statements should email KEF@re.ukri.org to confirm their intention as soon as they are able and no later than **17:00 on Friday 27 March 2020** and return the completed templates by **17:00 on Friday 29 May 2020**. (Please note the submission deadline has been extended from the date given in the January 2020 KEF decisions report.)
5. Eligibility for future iterations of the KEF will be considered as part of the evaluation of the first iteration of the KEF.

Clustering

6. Following the publication of the [KEF decisions report](#), seven of the initial eight clusters were considered suitable for the purpose of meaningful and fair comparison. These seven comprise the five general clusters, plus 'STEM specialists' and 'Arts specialists' clusters as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Cluster groupings



7. Following the consultation feedback, we have revised the descriptions of the characteristics of the clusters to ensure greater emphasis on what cluster members *do*, rather than what they *do not* do. Note also that these descriptions highlight the main characteristics of the cluster members; they are not intended to be a complete list of attributes.

Table 1: Revised descriptions of cluster characteristics

Cluster name	Cluster characteristics
Cluster E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large universities with broad discipline portfolio across both STEM and non-STEM generating excellent research across all disciplines. • Significant amount of research funded by government bodies/hospitals; 9.5% from industry. • Large proportion of part-time undergraduate students. Small postgraduate population dominated by taught postgraduates.
Cluster J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid-sized universities with more of a teaching focus (although research is still in evidence). • Academic activity across STEM and non-STEM disciplines including other health, computer sciences, architecture/planning, social sciences and business, humanities, arts and design. • Research activity funded largely by government bodies/hospitals; 13.7% from industry.
Cluster M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller universities, often with a teaching focus. • Academic activity across disciplines, particularly in other health domains and non-STEM. • More research activity funded by government bodies/hospitals; 14.7% from industry.

Cluster V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very large, very high research intensive and broad-discipline universities undertaking significant amounts of excellent research. • Research funded by range of sources including UKRI, other government bodies and charities; 10.2% from industry. • Significant activity in clinical medicine and STEM. • Student body includes significant numbers of taught and research postgraduates.
Cluster X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large, high research intensive and broad-discipline universities undertaking a significant amount of excellent research. • Much of research funded by UKRI and other government bodies; 8.5% from industry. • Discipline portfolio balanced across STEM and non-STEM although less clinical medicine activity. • Large proportion of taught postgraduates in student population.
Arts specialists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specialist institutions covering arts, music and drama (as defined by a very high concentration of academic staff in these disciplines). A range of sizes of institutions, although many are relatively small and specialist.
Science, Technology Engineering and Maths (STEM) specialists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specialist institutions covering science, technology, engineering and mathematics (as defined by a very high concentration of academic staff in these disciplines). Often high amounts of excellent research, particularly in bioscience & veterinary and engineering. • <i>Note: This group has been further split into three groups to highlight the different nature of institutions within the 'STEM' umbrella.</i>

8. Each member of the former Social Sciences and Business cluster has been reassigned to one of the other seven clusters as follows (with the exception of Heythrop College, which has closed):

- University College Birmingham – Cluster M
- Bishop Grosseteste University – Cluster M
- London Business School – Cluster V
- National Film and Television School – Arts specialist

9. We recognise that the London Business School does not share many of the characteristics of other cluster V members (such as a broad academic discipline base including clinical medicine). This means that caution should be exercised when comparing its results to the cluster V benchmark. However, it was decided that, on

balance of evidence, this was still the most suitable cluster for this first iteration of the KEF.

10. HEIs entering the sector after the initial cluster analysis was conducted have now been allocated to a cluster based on available data as follows:

- Royal Academy of Dramatic Art – Arts specialist
- Lamda Limited – Arts specialist
- AECC University College – STEM cluster
- University College of Osteopathy – STEM cluster

11. All other cluster placements remain as proposed in the January 2019 [KEF consultation](#).

12. Annex A lists the final cluster placements for the first iteration of the KEF. This is also available as an excel data annex, which includes the trading name and UKPRN reference of each institution here: <https://re.ukri.org/sector-guidance/publications/knowledge-exchange-framework-clustering-and-narrative-templates>

Narrative statements

13. Participants are encouraged to submit three narrative statements as follows:

1. Institutional context
2. Local Growth and Regeneration
3. Public and Community Engagement

14. The main narrative statements covering local growth and public & community engagement are divided into sections containing a number of aspects, covering broadly strategy/planning (including identification of need as a means to understand intended achievement), activities and outcomes/impacts. The local growth and regeneration template comprises three aspects, whereas the public and community engagement template comprises five.

15. As indicated in the decision report the public and community engagement perspective will also incorporate a self-assessment score within the narrative statement. This seeks to assess both strategy and support structures (as a proxy for ability to deliver good quality public and community engagement), as well as tangible achievements and outcomes.

Information workshops for institutions preparing narrative statements

16. Research England will be hosting four identical KEF information workshops. The purpose of these workshops is to assist institutions in the preparation of the narrative statements by setting out expectations and giving an opportunity for discussion and questions.
17. Each HEI eligible to participate in the KEF may send up to two representatives to a workshop. The workshops have been scheduled for late morning and will last approximately two hours. The dates and city centre locations of the workshops are as follows:
- Wednesday 18 March 2020 – Liverpool
 - Thursday 19 March 2020 – York
 - Tuesday 24 March 2020– Bristol
 - Wednesday 1 April 2020 – London
18. As these workshops are aimed at institutions in scope for the KEF, registration will require an institutional 'ac.uk' email address. Additional registrations from a single institution, or from non-participating institutions will be accepted if there is sufficient capacity, but we reserve the right to limit numbers from a single institution for venue capacity reasons. A video of the slide presentation will be available online following the final workshop.
19. To register your attendance please visit: <https://kefworkshops2020.eventbrite.co.uk>

Submission

20. The submission of narrative statements is not compulsory in this first iteration of the KEF. However, if an institution chooses to provide contextual information, full versions of all three narrative statements and associated self-assessment must be provided. Any institutions that are within the scope of the KEF but who do not currently receive HEIF funding must notify Research England at KEF@re.ukri.org by **Friday 27 March 2020** if they wish to participate.
21. All narrative statements should be submitted in the format of the Microsoft Word templates available for individual download from the Research England website here: <https://re.ukri.org/sector-guidance/publications/knowledge-exchange-framework-clustering-and-narrative-templates>. We encourage institutions to include hyperlinks and graphical elements, which will be reproduced in the KEF results dashboard.

Audience

22. In line with the multiple purposes of the KEF, narrative statements should be written in jargon-free language that will be accessible to the following audiences:

- **Higher education sector** - for the purposes of understanding and benchmarking performance.
- **Business, public and third sector and other users of higher education knowledge** - to provide a source of information about potential university partners and their strengths.
- **General public** - for the purposes of transparency and public accountability.

23. During the development of the KEF dashboards, we will integrate the narrative statements to ensure that their purpose is clearly described, and the information is accessible to a range of users.

Timeframe for narrative content

24. The narratives for 'Public & Community Engagement' and 'Local Growth and Regeneration' should **focus on tangible activities undertaken or results achieved mainly in the previous three academic years**. The narrative covering institutional context has no such restriction.

Evidence based statements

25. To assist institutions to use evidence across multiple reporting platforms and to facilitate comparison between providers, we encourage institutions to make use of the 'style guide' within the RAND Europe report '[Guidance for standardising quantitative indicators of impact within REF case studies](#)', as well as considering use of other standardised data, such as those provided by the HE-BCI survey.

26. Evidence that supports your statements does not have to have been externally produced or audited. However, all statements should be factual and verifiable. The emphasis of the narrative statements should be on **quantitative indicators of activity, outputs and outcomes** by the institution. Use of relative terms such as ratios, proportions and percentage changes is encouraged.

27. Research England reserves the right to audit statements to ensure the accuracy of the evidence provided and may decline to publish or retract statements found to be erroneous or misleading.

Publication

28. Narrative statements will not be published in the format they are submitted, but will be integrated into the dashboard that displays the KEF metrics. We anticipate that each aspect of a response may be accessed independently via a heading link and could be read in isolation from the other aspects. Text will not be subject to copy editing by Research England, so institutions should take care to ensure that statements do not contain any sensitive or personal information.

Institutional context statement

29. The institutional context statement is designed as a brief statement containing contextual information about the institution that is common across all perspectives. The institutional context will be in two parts: an initial 120 word 'lay' introduction to the institution followed by a further maximum of 500 words setting out the institutional context. The template for submission is available here: <https://re.ukri.org/sector-guidance/publications/knowledge-exchange-framework-clustering-and-narrative-templates>

30. The information provided may be anything that the HEI considers relevant to the KEF such as mission, economic context, institutional strengths, history, or any particular knowledge exchange focus.

31. This statement submission must include:

1. An email address **to be published** which will act as a general institutional point of contact for anyone seeking more information about the institution's KEF results;
AND
2. A contact name and email address(s) that **will not be published** but will be the main point of contact for KEF-specific correspondence from Research England.

32. The perspective narratives may cross refer to the institutional context statement, but contextual information should not be repeated in the perspective statements.

Local growth and regeneration statement

33. The local growth and regeneration narrative statement should identify and make clear the strategically important geographical area(s) where the institution focuses any local growth and regeneration activities; include explanation of how needs of the local area(s) have been identified; and a description of the targeted activities undertaken to meet those needs and the outcomes achieved. It should not exceed 2,000 words.

34. We define knowledge exchange activities for local growth and regeneration as:

Targeted knowledge exchange activity where higher education institutions, businesses, public sector and the wider civil society work together to achieve a strategic goal with a primary focus on local growth or regeneration in a self-defined geographic area. This may include local economic development, social inclusion, public space or infrastructure improvements and reconversion of brownfield areas.

35. We encourage institutions to place a strong focus on the geographic area that is 'local' to your primary institutional location. However, if your institution has strategic economic growth or regeneration programmes beyond the local area these may also be included as follows:

- **Locally** – please define what you consider to be the 'local' geographic area of your primary institutional location(s)
- **Regionally** (including city region)
- **Nationally**
- **Internationally**

36. The local growth and regeneration narrative will be prefaced by an initial 120 word 'lay' summary of your approach to local growth and regeneration. This will be followed by the overarching narrative, not exceeding 2,000 words across all three of the below aspects:

1. Strategy
2. Activity
3. Results

37. The following tables set out the questions contained in the template and examples of evidence you may wish to consider. Please note that the 2,000 word limit is across all three aspects of the statement. With the exception of the 120 word lay summary, there is no minimum or maximum word limit for the individual aspects as long as they do not exceed 2,000 words in total.

38. The examples of corroborating evidence that we have provided is not an exhaustive list. They represent possible indicators you may wish to consider. They are not a checklist for inclusion and should not be treated as such.

Aspect 1: Strategy

Strategic approach

Information on your strategic approach to local growth and regeneration as a means to understand your intended achievements. This should include an outline of the geographic areas that you have recognised to be strategically relevant to your institution at a local, regional, national or international level. How did you identify the strategic importance of these area(s) and how have you identified the local growth and regeneration 'needs' of the area(s)?

Examples of corroborating evidence and information

Evidence you might include to corroborate your narrative. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.

- Description of the geographic area you consider to be your 'local' area.
- Link to a strategy & implementation plan for local growth and regeneration activity.
- Evidence of how you have identified needs, including through:
 - engagement with Local Enterprise Partnership(s) or Local Industrial Strategies.
 - engagement with local authorities or other civic groups.
 - consultation or other evidence gathering.
- Description of how local growth and regeneration activities support wider institutional objectives and/or how it features in other institutional strategies or plans.

Aspect 2: Activity

Delivering your strategy

Information on the focus of your approach and the activities delivered. How do you know it met the identified needs of the geographic areas you identified? Please focus on the last three years of activity.

Examples of corroborating evidence and information

Evidence you might include to corroborate your narrative. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.

- Highlights of key local growth activities that have been developed to realise your strategic goals - for instance the major programmes, themes or organising principles that underpin activity, including some description of the rationale behind these.
- Evidence of the investments you have made to deliver your strategy.
- Other external funding or grants you have secured to invest in activity.

Aspect 3: Results

Achieving and acting on results

Describe the outcomes and/or impacts of your activity. How do you communicate and act on the results?

Examples of corroborating evidence and information

Evidence you might include to corroborate your narrative. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.

- Evidence of the quality and impact of your key programmes, and the extent to which they meet their objectives. Please use verifiable numbers, links to published reports, evaluations or other outputs.
- Evidence that you have delivered on needs of the area, and feedback from local stakeholders

39. The local growth and regeneration template for submission is available at:

<https://re.ukri.org/sector-guidance/publications/knowledge-exchange-framework-clustering-and-narrative-templates>

Public and community engagement self-assessment and statement

40. Due to the absence of suitable metrics for this perspective, a self-assessment of the institution's performance in public and community engagement will be integrated into the narrative statement and used to provide a provisional 'score' for this iteration of the KEF.

41. For the purposes of the Public & Community Engagement perspective we are basing our understanding of public and community engagement on the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE)'s definition of public engagement. We have encompassed 'community' into the NCCPE's existing definition of public engagement, but we are not seeking to limit the forms of community with which a particular HEI may engage. We therefore define these knowledge exchange activities as below:

"Public engagement describes the myriad of ways in which the activity and benefits of higher education and research can be shared with the public [and communities]. Engagement is by definition a two-way process, involving interaction and listening, with the goal of generating mutual benefit."

42. The self-assessment will ask for a score out of five against each of the following five aspects:

Aspect	Description
Strategy	Developing your strategy with the needs of users in mind
Support	Practical support in place to support public and community engagement
Activity	Activities undertaken to deliver your strategy
Results	Evidencing outcomes and impacts
Acting on results	Communicating and acting on results

43. The scores 1-5 will represent the following broad stages of development (fuller definitions for each aspect are given in the guidance below):

Self-assessment score	Stage of development
1	Planning phase, nothing yet in place
2	Embryonic, in the early stages of development
3	Developing, and implementation taking place
4	Fully developed and implemented in most but not all areas with outcomes and impacts becoming apparent
5	Fully developed and embedded across the institution to an exemplary level, with a culture of continuous improvement and good evidence on outcomes and impacts

44. The public and community engagement narrative statement will be prefaced by an initial 120 word 'lay' summary of your approach to public and community engagement. This will be followed by narrative to corroborate your self-assessment scores in the five aspects described above.

45. The public and community engagement template for submission is available at:
<https://re.ukri.org/sector-guidance/publications/knowledge-exchange-framework-clustering-and-narrative-templates>

Integration of the self-assessment scores into the KEF metrics

46. We wish to include a score for public and community engagement in the KEF results visualisation to retain the visual prominence of this perspective relative to the other perspectives.
47. Self-assessment will be based on a 1-5 scale for each of the five aspects, giving a minimum of 5 points and a maximum of 25 points. To calculate the perspective score, we will scale the points to a 1-10 score to be represented on the KEF results visualisation, where x is the points out of 25 to give a single score (y) between 1 and 10.

$$y = 1 + \frac{9(x - 5)}{20}$$

48. Although this score will be presented on the KEF results visualisation to ensure equal visual prominence of the perspective to others with metrics, it will not be used to calculate a cluster benchmark, and will be marked as an experimental score in this iteration of the KEF.

Scoring criteria

49. The following tables set out the self-assessment questions contained in the template and examples of evidence that you may wish to include in your statement to corroborate your self-assessment. Please note that the 2,000 word limit is across all five aspects of the statement. With the exception of the 120 word lay summary there is no minimum or maximum word limit for the individual aspects as long as they do not exceed 2,000 words in total.
50. **The examples of corroborating evidence provided below is not an exhaustive list. They represent possible indicators you may wish to consider. They are not a checklist for inclusion and should not be treated as such.**

Aspect 1: Strategy

Developing your strategy

Information on your existing strategy, planning process and allocation of resources, including how you identified relevant public and community groups and their needs, and facilitated their ability to engage with the institution, as a means to help understand intended achievements.

Score	Criteria	Evidence and corroborating information
1	<p>Planning phase, nothing yet in place</p> <p>The institution indirectly supported public and community engagement, but had no strategy in place to focus their activity. Little evidence of needs identification.</p>	<p><i>Evidence you might include to corroborate your self-assessment. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.</i></p>
2	<p>Embryonic, in early stages of development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of any consultation and evidence gathering undertaken to inform your strategy. • Link to your strategy & implementation plan for public and community engagement activity. • Evidence of how public and community engagement strategy and activity has supported wider institutional objectives. • The governance arrangements that are in place to oversee delivery of your strategy and ensure accountability. • If and how public and community engagement is included in the responsibilities for senior academic and professional service managers. • Evidence of the resources you have allocated to deliver your strategy, including external funding or grants you have secured. • Details of facilities and services that are accessible to the public and how these are promoted. • Evidence of how you have handled enquiries from community organisations and members of the public.
3	<p>Developing, implementation taking place</p> <p>The institution has a strategy for public and community engagement and is beginning to implement it. The strategic priorities are informed by intelligence about who the institution is working with and why. There has been a commitment to resourcing engagement activity.</p>	
4	<p>Fully developed and implemented in most but not all areas with outcomes and impacts becoming apparent</p>	
5	<p>Fully developed and embedded across the institution to an exemplary level, with a culture of continuous improvement and good evidence on outcomes and impacts</p> <p>The institution has implemented a strategy and plan for public and community engagement informed by public and community needs, with explicit goals, strong leadership, robust governance and accountability arrangements. The strategy has been reviewed regularly, and improvements have been implemented as a result. Appropriate resourcing of activities is in place, and is an integral part of wider long-term financial planning.</p>	

Aspect 2: Support

Practical support to deliver your strategy

Provide information about the practical support you have put in place to support your public and community engagement, and recognise the work appropriately.

Score	Criteria	Evidence and corroborating information
1	<p>Planning phase, nothing yet in place</p> <p>There has not been specialist support in place or opportunities for professional development.</p>	<p><i>Evidence you might include to corroborate your self-assessment. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the practical support you have provided for public and community engagement such as networks, grants and other resources. • Evidence of the CPD or training you have provided, and steps you have taken to ensure that your staff, students and partners can access relevant learning and opportunities to improve their effectiveness. • Evidence of how your website or social media presence provide support for community organisations and members of the public wishing to engage with you. • Evidence of formal involvement of public/community in advisory or governance roles. • Evidence of how public and community engagement is recognised and rewarded – including staff, students and communities themselves.
2	<p>Embryonic, in early stages of development</p>	
3	<p>Developing, implementation taking place</p> <p>There has been some ad hoc support and development opportunities on offer, but this has not been systematically provided yet.</p>	
4	<p>Fully developed and implemented in most but not all areas with outcomes and impacts becoming apparent</p>	
5	<p>Fully developed and embedded across the institution to an exemplary level, with a culture of continuous improvement and good evidence on outcomes and impacts</p> <p>The institution has employed specialist staff to offer support and provide advice on strategy delivery. CPD, networks and practical resources have been provided and widely used to enhance practice aligned to strategic objectives. Participation in public and community engagement activities are recognised and valued by the institution leaders, and rewarded appropriately</p>	

Aspect 3: Activity

Delivering your strategy: activities

Provide information on the focus of your approach and describe examples of the activity delivered. How do you know activities have met the identified needs of public and community groups? Please focus on the last three years of activity.

Score	Criteria	Evidence and corroborating information
1	<p>Planning phase, nothing yet in place</p> <p>Some public and community engagement activity has happened, but often in an ad-hoc way, with little reference to wider strategy.</p>	<p><i>Evidence you might include to corroborate your self-assessment. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the key public and community engagement that has been undertaken, including the major programmes or organising principles that underpin activity, as well as examples of specific activity. Describe how this activity has met the objectives of your strategy and the identified needs of your target audiences, and, where appropriate, how it will be sustained.
2	<p>Embryonic, in early stages of development</p>	
3	<p>Developing, implementation taking place</p> <p>The institution has undertaken a variety of public and community engagement activities, most of which are linked to a strategy, with some central co-ordination.</p>	
4	<p>Fully developed and implemented in most but not all areas with outcomes and impacts becoming apparent</p>	
5	<p>Fully developed and embedded across the institution to an exemplary level, with a culture of continuous improvement and good evidence on outcomes and impacts</p> <p>The institution has delivered a significant portfolio of public and community engagement projects and activities which have comprehensively addressed needs as identified in its strategy.</p>	

Aspect 4: Results and Learning

Evidencing success

Describe the outcomes and/or impacts of your activities. How have you evaluated these individual activities to ensure you understand whether they have addressed your strategic objectives – and intended achievements for public and community? To what extent have you learnt from your approach and applied this to future activity?

Score	Criteria	Evidence and corroborating information
1	<p>Planning phase, nothing yet in place</p> <p>Some evidence of positive outcomes or impacts, but anecdotal evidence often used to determine success, with little investment in systematic evaluation.</p>	<p><i>Evidence you might include to corroborate your self-assessment. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.</i></p>
2	<p>Embryonic, in early stages of development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of KPIs/outcome frameworks or other measures which you have used to focus your evaluation activity.
3	<p>Developing, implementation taking place</p> <p>Evidence of potentially significant outcomes, most of which have been evaluated in some way to assess if and how they have delivered against project aims.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the outcomes of key activities or programmes, and the extent to which they have met their objectives. Where possible, use verifiable numbers, links to published reports, evaluations or similar.
4	<p>Fully developed and implemented in most but not all areas with outcomes and impacts becoming apparent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators or measures of success that you have used to monitor progress.
5	<p>Fully developed and embedded across the institution to an exemplary level, with a culture of continuous improvement and good evidence on outcomes and impacts</p> <p>Significant outcomes and impacts reported, with a strategic plan for evaluating interventions in a robust manner. Evaluations and other feedback from activities are shared widely across the institution to continuously improve delivery of future activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of how you have used this data or evidence to enhance your practice. • Testimony from public or communities.

Aspect 5: Acting on results

Communicating and acting on the results

How has the institution acted on the outcomes of activities or programmes to ensure it is meeting the wider strategic aims; to inform the development of this strategic approach; and to continuously improve and improve outcomes and impacts for public and communities? To what extent have the results of the work been shared with the communities involved, internally in the institution, and externally?

Score	Criteria	Evidence and corroborating information
1	<p>Planning phase, nothing yet in place</p> <p>Wider evaluation of strategic support for public and community engagement, or of the results of individual activities or programmes is not yet in place.</p>	<p><i>Evidence you might include to corroborate your self-assessment. This is not an exhaustive list. They represent indicators that you may wish to consider in your response.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of how you have reported on the impact of your activity to internal and external audiences, including staff, governors (or equivalent), partners, and the public. Evidence of reviews of your strategy and support for public and community engagement (e.g. use of NCCPE EDGE tool, surveys of staff or other benchmarking). Evidence of feedback being sought from staff, students, public and community partners, and how that feedback has influenced your strategy and plans. Evidence of KPIs or other outcome measures/data which you use to review the quality and effectiveness of your institutional support for public and community engagement, and hence will improve longer term outcomes.
2	<p>Embryonic, in early stages of development</p>	
3	<p>Developing, implementation taking place</p> <p>Some efforts have been made to review the effectiveness of the strategic support for public and community engagement, but this is not yet sustained or communicated to all parts of the institution.</p>	
4	<p>Fully developed and implemented in most but not all areas with outcomes and impacts becoming apparent</p>	
5	<p>Fully developed and embedded across the institution to an exemplary level, with a culture of continuous improvement and good evidence on outcomes and impacts</p> <p>The institution has reviewed its strategic support for public and community engagement, benchmarking its activity against other organisations. It has sought feedback from inside and outside of the institution, and has used (or will use) the results of this and evaluations of individual activities to inform future planning.</p>	

Annex A - Final cluster placements

Provided below is full list of the KEF cluster groupings (presented in order of UKPRN by cluster). An excel spreadsheet providing the cluster groupings by institution trading name and UKPRN is available as a downloadable data annex here: <https://re.ukri.org/sector-guidance/publications/knowledge-exchange-framework-clustering-and-narrative-templates>

A report detailing the analysis undertaken to determine the KEF cluster arrangements is available at: <http://re.ukri.org/documents/2018/kef-cluster-analysis-report/>.

Cluster name and key characteristics	Membership
<p>Cluster E</p> <p>Large universities with broad discipline portfolio across both STEM and non-STEM generating excellent research across all disciplines.</p> <p>Significant amount of research funded by government bodies/hospitals; 9.5% from industry.</p> <p>Large proportion of part-time undergraduate students. Small postgraduate population dominated by taught postgraduates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglia Ruskin University • Bournemouth University • The University of Brighton • University of Northumbria at Newcastle • City, University of London • Coventry University • De Montfort University • Goldsmiths College • Kingston University • Liverpool John Moores University • The Manchester Metropolitan University • Middlesex University • The Nottingham Trent University • Oxford Brookes University • Sheffield Hallam University • The University of Central Lancashire • The University of Greenwich • University of Hertfordshire • The University of Huddersfield • The University of Lincoln • University of Bedfordshire • The University of Portsmouth • The University of Salford • University of the West of England, Bristol • The University of Westminster • Aston University • The Open University • The University of Bradford • University of Plymouth
<p>Cluster J</p> <p>Mid-sized universities with more of a teaching focus (although research is still in evidence).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canterbury Christ Church University • Leeds Beckett University • London Metropolitan University • London South Bank University • Staffordshire University • The University of Bolton • The University of Northampton • University of Worcester • Birmingham City University • The University of East London

Cluster name and key characteristics	Membership
<p>Academic activity across STEM and non-STEM disciplines including other health, computer sciences, architecture/planning, social sciences and business, humanities, arts and design.</p> <p>Research activity funded largely by government bodies/hospitals; 13.7% from industry.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Gloucestershire • The University of Sunderland • Teesside University • The University of Wolverhampton • Roehampton University • University of Chester • University of Derby
<p>Cluster M</p> <p>Smaller universities, often with a teaching focus.</p> <p>Academic activity across disciplines, particularly in other health domains and non-STEM.</p> <p>More research activity funded by government bodies/hospitals; 14.7% from industry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bath Spa University • University College Birmingham • Buckinghamshire New University • The University of Winchester • Leeds Trinity University • Liverpool Hope University • Solent University • The University of West London • The University of Chichester • York St John University • Bishop Grosseteste University • Edge Hill University • Newman University • University of Cumbria • St Mary's University, Twickenham • Falmouth University • University of Suffolk • Plymouth Marjon University
<p>Cluster V</p> <p>Very large, very high research intensive and broad-discipline universities undertaking significant amounts of excellent research.</p> <p>Research funded by range of sources including UKRI, other government bodies and charities; 10.2% from industry.</p> <p>Significant activity in clinical medicine and STEM.</p> <p>Student body includes significant numbers of taught and research postgraduates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine • King's College London • The University of Birmingham • The University of Liverpool • University of Nottingham • The University of Sheffield • The University of Southampton • The University of Warwick • London Business School • The University of Oxford • Queen Mary University of London • University College London • The University of Bristol • The University of Cambridge • The University of Leeds • The University of Manchester • Newcastle University

Cluster name and key characteristics	Membership
<p>Cluster X</p> <p>Large, high research intensive and broad-discipline universities undertaking a significant amount of excellent research.</p> <p>Much of research funded by UKRI and other government bodies; 8.5% from industry.</p> <p>Discipline portfolio balanced across STEM and non-STEM although less clinical medicine activity.</p> <p>Large proportion of taught postgraduates in student population.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brunel University London • London School of Economics and Political Science • Loughborough University • Royal Holloway and Bedford New College • University of Durham • The University of Hull • The University of Kent • The University of Surrey • The University of York • Birkbeck College • Keele University • The University of Lancaster • SOAS University of London • The University of East Anglia • The University of Essex • The University of Exeter • The University of Leicester • The University of Reading • The University of Sussex • The University of Bath
<p>Arts specialists</p> <p>Specialist institutions covering arts, music and drama, as defined by a very high concentration of academic staff in these disciplines.</p> <p>A range of sizes of institutions, although many are small.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Arts University Bournemouth • Conservatoire for Dance and Drama • Lamda Limited • Leeds Arts University • The Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts • The National Film and Television School • Norwich University of the Arts • Plymouth College of Art • Ravensbourne University London • Rose Bruford College of Theatre and Performance • University for the Creative Arts • University of the Arts, London • Courtauld Institute of Art • Royal College of Art • Royal College of Music • The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama • Guildhall School of Music and Drama • Royal Academy of Music • Royal Northern College of Music • Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance • Royal Academy of Dramatic Art

Cluster name and key characteristics	Membership
<p>Science, Technology Engineering and Maths (STEM) specialists</p> <p>Specialist institutions covering science, technology, engineering and mathematics, as defined by a very high concentration of academic staff in these disciplines.</p> <p>Often high amounts of excellent research, particularly in bioscience & veterinary and engineering</p> <p><i>Note: This group has been further split into three groups to highlight the different nature of institutions within the 'STEM' umbrella.</i></p>	<p>Bioscience & veterinary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institute of Cancer Research • Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine • London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine • The Royal Veterinary College • St George's, University of London • AECC University College • University College of Osteopathy <p>Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cranfield University <p>Agriculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harper Adams University • Hartpury University • Royal Agricultural University • Writtle University College