

Part three: The case studies

CADISE: Consortium of Arts and Design Institutions in Southern England

The Consortium of Arts and Design Institutions in Southern England (CADISE) is a partnership of seven specialist higher education institutions. The Consortium was formed in 1999, initially by four founder institutions, with pump-priming support of £75,000 from the R&CF.

- ◆ Central School of Speech & Drama
- ◆ Kent Institute of Art & Design
- ◆ Ravensbourne College of Design & Communication
- ◆ Surrey Institute of Art & Design
- ◆ The Arts Institute at Bournemouth
- ◆ Trinity College of Music
- ◆ Wimbledon School of Art

Figure 11. CADISE institutions

50. History

The project has its origins in informal discussions initiated in 1997 by Professor Gary Crossley (then at the Surrey Institute) with the Director of Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication and the Principal of the Arts Institute at Bournemouth. The initiative was further developed in the margins of a Council for Education in Art and Design meeting. After this an approach was made to Wimbledon School of Art. The main drivers were:

- ◆ the role mapped out for HE in the new government's Green Paper on the Regions
- ◆ small specialist HE institutions' sense of isolation and vulnerability
- ◆ Professor Crossley's personal interest in strategy and planning.

During 2000, the four founding partners were joined by the Central School of Speech and Drama, Trinity College of Music and Kent Institute of Art & Design, the first two of these bringing a strong performing arts dimension to the Consortium.

51. Aims and Objectives

The goals of CADISE are to:

- ◆ provide a framework for collaborative activity amongst the members of the group
- ◆ become a representative voice for providers of specialist arts education, working to equip students with skills for the growing creative industries.

By working together, the CADISE partners create significant critical mass:

- ◆ in the regional context
- ◆ in the field of arts, design and communication education.

The detailed aims of the Consortium are set out in Figure

CADISE intends to:

- ◆ act as a focus for liaison with key regional, national and international agencies, consortia and funding sources
- ◆ maximise participation in developing and delivering key economic, social, cultural and environmental strategies within the region
- ◆ stimulate and promote relationships with the creative and communication industries and provide them with advice and training opportunities
- ◆ develop a coherent framework of regional opportunity and progression, which will enhance student choice, widen participation and encourage life-long learning
- ◆ develop teaching/learning and research portfolios and enter new markets by spreading costs and risks and by sharing expertise and facilities
- ◆ add value by the sharing of good practice
- ◆ build collaborative capability through the encouragement of personal contact and the support of enterprise
- ◆ encourage wider collaborative activity where this is beneficial both collectively and individually
- ◆ promote good practice in collaboration and publicise the role of the partners in this activity.

Figure 12. Aims of CADISE

52. Relationship to Institutional Strategy

Strategically, there is much that unites the member institutions:

- ◆ all share a vision of arts, communication and design shaping social and economic boundaries and breaking new cultural ground
- ◆ interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinarity is a developing feature of their teaching and research
- ◆ they all recognise the importance of strategic alliances for the future of small specialist arts colleges.

However, there are differences of emphasis on whether CADISE should be the primary glue that holds them together, or just one of several academic collaborations. CADISE is not exclusive and allows each of the partners to undertake other collaborations; for example:

- ◆ six have active bilateral academic links with their validating HEIs
- ◆ the Kent Institute of Art and Design collaborates sub-regionally (HEKAM)
- ◆ Wimbledon School of Art has strong bilateral collaborations outside the CADISE envelope.

53. The Role of R&CF

Early in the formative phase, Professor Crossley, as product champion, approached the HEFCE regional consultant and, through him, HEFCE Chief Executive, Sir Brian Fender, who gave strong encouragement. Although R&CF support for the Consortium Office has been crucial to the success of CADISE, the strong desire to collaborate suggests that ways and means would have been found to work together, albeit at a lower level. The institutions have used CADISE as a platform for several other successful joint bids to HEFCE initiatives.

R&CF grants:	
◆ Administrative Director and the Consortium Office	£75,000
◆ Creative Learning Futures project on training needs of SMEs	£20,000
◆ Pathways project to raise awareness of regions' FE and HE	£21,500
◆ Video-Conferencing Network	£405,000
Other HEFCE grants:	
◆ Widening Participation	£226,000
◆ Good Management Practice	£131,000
◆ HEROBC	£275,000
◆ Foundation Degrees	£430,000
◆ Joint Costing & Pricing	£105,000

Figure 13. Grants to CADISE

54. Governance, Management and Costs

CADISE is an unincorporated body:

- ◆ the seven institutions are equal partners
- ◆ a Policy Group, comprising the seven directors and the Administrative Director, meets four-five times a year and sends strong positive signals from the very top
- ◆ the Administrative Director, who provides the operational drive and continuity, chairs a Development and Operations Group, comprising senior managers from each institution.

From HEFCE's standpoint, £75,000 represents a good investment in terms of creating an infrastructure and a climate for institutional collaborations that are beginning to bear fruit in academic affairs as well as management matters. There are, however, concerns in individual institutions about the transactional and opportunity costs of some of the collaborations, which may outweigh the acknowledged benefits.

55. Achievements

There have been six significant outputs from the CADISE collaboration:

- ◆ a successful, subject-based Consortium with an effective Directorate
- ◆ a bidding platform for capturing funds for further joint initiatives
- ◆ a model of alternative collaboration management disseminated via papers on national, regional and local platforms and a conference on Collaborative Management (February 2002)
- ◆ publications from the Creative Learning Futures sub-project
- ◆ promotional materials and information from the Pathways sub-project
- ◆ contributions at national and regional levels on the process of good management, widening participation and foundation degrees.

The work of CADISE has led to six outcomes:

- ◆ improved infrastructure and connectivity across the institutions
- ◆ a more collegiate culture at Director/Principal level, which is now spreading to other academic and non-academic staff, though not generally to students
- ◆ critical mass in selected support services and administration; for example, joint procurement of legal services, joint costing and pricing and joint work on human resource strategies
- ◆ a broader academic community:
 - ◆ although enthusiasm for shared academic work lagged behind joint support services, this is now developing

- ◆ foundation degrees have provided a catalyst, and effective networking lay behind an ambitious but unsuccessful joint bid to the HEFCE Innovation Fund.
- ◆ new collaborative links with schools and other local partners arising from the Pathways project
- ◆ a growing realisation that collaboration is a comfortable middle position between the extremes of autonomy and merger.

56. Success Factors

The key success factors in CADISE are:

- ◆ institutional willingness, and in some cases desire, to collaborate
- ◆ leadership and consistent, clear signals of commitment from the top
- ◆ the HEFCE-funded Good Management Practice Project which, though time-consuming, developed the Chief Executives' collaborative management skills.

57. Prospects

CADISE is demonstrating the value of a regional institutional alliance based on subject coherence:

- ◆ strategically, the Consortium would be sustainable in its present form as long as the individual institutions remain committed to this sort of collaboration for facilitating their missions
- ◆ operationally, CADISE has proved successful as a focal point for planning, bidding for and managing discrete joint projects, which bring in sufficient overheads to maintain the Directorate
- ◆ CADISE is organic:
 - ◆ it could grow to include further partners as opportunities arise and the needs of the sector and of Southern England unfold
 - ◆ alternatively, if the Consortium were to disintegrate, the alternative for some of its members would be to seek closer relations with a nearby university.

A desire to deepen, and possibly widen, the Consortium is likely to be the main driver of future engagement beyond the present level of project-based collaboration. Some of the partners envisage a joint strategic plan and evolution towards some form of federation. This would require further formalisation of structures, perhaps aided by seeking a single degree-validating partner. Not all share this evolutionary vision and its destination. Kent Institute of Art & Design and Wimbledon School of Art are currently considering whether the benefits they gain from CADISE outweigh the costs of this additional collaboration. Like the European Union, the Consortium may have to accommodate different views by its individual members on the pace and trajectory of development.

University of Bradford and Bradford College

The R&CF project at Bradford builds on a long history of collaboration between the College and University. It enabled the institutions to expand their joint work more quickly and has set the scene for a new project to 'explore how closer collaborations might lead to a unique new form of institution not seen elsewhere in the UK.'

58. Context

The College and University occupy adjacent city centre campuses and:

- ◆ the University of Bradford has a strong research and teaching reputation in several areas, including management and social sciences
- ◆ Bradford College is one of the largest FE colleges in the UK and in association with the University of Bradford has developed its higher education delivery (Figure 14) and some research expertise.

The University and College share a joint ancestry in the Bradford Mechanics Institute founded in 1832. In 1957, the institution split into Bradford Technical College and the Bradford Institute, which went on to become Bradford University, gaining its Royal Charter in 1966. The institutions have a long history of association:

- ◆ they signed an agreement of association in 1994, enabling the College to provide degrees validated by the university
- ◆ they share student union and welfare services.

Both institutions are currently feeling financial pressure from the reduced unit of funding but remain committed to increasing participation in higher education. The University also wishes to maintain its strength in research.

Bradford College			Bradford University		
Student FTE	Adult education	1,500	6,900	Undergraduate	Student FTE
	Further education	5,800	1,300	Postgraduate	
	Higher education	3,700	8,200	Total higher ed.	
	Staff	2,100	2,600	Staff	
	Turnover	£40M	£67M	Turnover	

Figure 14. Institution statistics

59. The Role of R&CF

The R&CF funded project aimed to further develop opportunities for collaboration between the two institutions. It funded a number of joint activities, including six successful pilot projects (Figure 15). These projects were chosen because of their potential to create new opportunities and savings while being achievable within the time frame of R&CF. Most, if not all, of these projects would have taken place eventually, but R&CF funding speeded up the process and provided a central focus for developing collaborative activities. Following the success of the projects, the institutions announced in December 2001 that they have begun discussions to create a hybrid post-16 institution.

Harmonisation

- ◆ Creation of new central print service
- ◆ Review of central student record systems

Joint Courses

- ◆ Criminology and Forensic Science
- ◆ Cosmetic Science

Joint Projects

- ◆ Science foundation year
- ◆ Part-time engineering provision

Figure 15. Actions using R&CF funding

60. R&CF and Institution Strategy

One of the main reasons for the success of R&CF funding at Bradford has been its role in implementing commonalities in the strategy and vision of both institutions. Although there are differences in their size, missions and resources, the College and University have joint values and share beliefs in the:

- ◆ national agenda for increased participation in HE
- ◆ strong regional agenda and the need for the economic regeneration of Bradford
- ◆ need to improve the status of Bradford, particularly after the riots of Summer 2001.

Both recognise:

- ◆ the increasing difficulty in attracting HE students relative to recruitment targets
- ◆ the shortfall of funding in the FE and HE sector.

This joint vision has recently been strengthened by the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor and new Principal.

61. R&CF and Institution Values

This sense of shared values has enabled development of an effective governance and management structure for collaboration. Unusually for HE/FE collaboration, the institutions have developed a parity of esteem and both institutions recognise the value and potential of the other. The College and University Strategic Planning Group (CUSP), made up of representatives from each institution, oversee joint actions. The institutions recognised the need for dedicated resources to manage collaborative activities and appointed a half-time project officer in each institution to manage the R&CF projects:

'Bottom up' approaches are inevitably more time and resource intensive, which needs to be understood by both institutions and funding agencies: quick results will not always be possible.

They also recognised that, for staff to be committed to collaboration, the projects would need to be developed from the bottom up with involvement of staff from both institutions, rather than imposed from the centre. This has meant that the process of collaboration has been largely friction-free, though creating the ability to work together is inevitably an ongoing process. Some University academics still express concern that the focus on collaboration with the College might affect the status of their research and their collaborations with other research institutions. There has also been a view in parts of the University that the College is a 'poor cousin.' These concerns are diminishing as the nature of the collaboration becomes clear and resources are invested, but issues are more complex in some areas: for example, management and social work.

62. Success Factors

There are a number of lessons from the Bradford experience, not least that, in the right conditions, collaboration between HE and FE can be successful. Critical success factors in the collaboration are:

- ◆ close geographical location has promoted effective communication and a build-up of trust
- ◆ the common origin of the institutions and their co-location has led to a history of collaboration, allowing the institutions to quickly increase their collaboration in response to the current funding and policy climate
- ◆ straightforward areas of collaboration were tackled before moving into potentially problematical areas; this has led to initial successes and helped support morale
- ◆ a bottom-up approach to identifying projects and continuous vertical communication with staff has encouraged staff ownership of the projects and supported morale
- ◆ appointment of dedicated and committed project officers ensure that development of collaboration is not marginalized and signifies the institutions' commitment to the projects
- ◆ simple mechanisms can be developed for sharing resources, including splitting the MASN.

The Bradford R&CF project has shown that collaboration works well where institutions proceed from positions of mutual strength and respect.

63. Sharing Resources

One area that has created tension in other collaborations is the sharing of grant income between institutions. The cost bases of the College and University differ in many respects, including staff wages. This is a potential area of tension on joint HE courses but the University and College have developed a simple and elegant solution, shared MASN:

- ◆ for joint degrees, the institutions decide on their relative contributions: for example, 50:50 for applied criminological studies
- ◆ the student numbers are then split by this ratio for external reporting
- ◆ students are registered with one or other institution in the same proportion and benefit from facilities in both institutions.

This device has much to commend it for its simplicity and fairness, though it could be worth obtaining student views on being registered, for example, in a college rather than a university.

64. Prospects

The College and the University are perfectly positioned to deliver a new model of education in and for Bradford with new progression routes to benefit the local community and support the economic, social and educational development of the city and the region. Excellence in research and consolidating relationships with industry and commerce will be vital to ensure continuing national and international visibility for the institutions and the city. (Professor Chris Taylor, University Vice-Chancellor and Alan Hodgson, College Principal, December 2001)¹

The new 'comprehensive university' that Bradford College and the University of Bradford are now discussing will provide a new model for HE and FE provision. It will be a unique example of a merger across sectors based on parity of esteem and will result in wide-ranging provision by a single institution. It is being developed as the political agenda for social inclusion in Northern cities is being strengthened following the riots of 2001 and the government commitment to a 50% participation rate in higher education. The success of the model will partly depend on how extensive the local market for education really is. Failure to recruit may lead to tensions over limited

1 <http://www.brad.ac.uk/admin/pr/pressreleases/2002/vision.htm>

resources but there is no sign of such tensions at present. Critically, there is little tension between staff in the two institutions, morale is currently high and the institutions' leaders are strongly committed to a joint future. There will be a need, however, to ensure that staff have time and space to get to know each other and to develop trust. The proposed model also poses questions for government about the separation and different levels of funding between HE and FE.

The Council of Church Colleges

Since the 1960s, the Council of Church Colleges (CCC) has existed in some form as a national association. In 1999, it decided to encourage the collaborative activities of its members, assisted by the appointment of a Development Officer funded by a HEFCE R&CF grant. This has now led to agreement in principle to form a confederation.

Bishop Grosseteste
Canterbury Christ Church University College
University of Gloucestershire
Chester College of HE
King Alfred's College
Liverpool Hope
Newman College of HE
St Martin's College
St Mary's College
The College of York St John
The College of St Mark and St John
Trinity & All Saints College
Trinity College, Carmarthen
University College Chichester
Roehampton University of Surrey
Westminster Institute of Education

Figure 16. Members of the CCC

65. Context

Whether we are anticipating problems or seeking to exploit opportunities, there is much for the Colleges to gain from developing their collaborative strength.² (Lord Dearing)

The church colleges originated as teacher training colleges. While most have diversified since the 1970s, they are still major providers of teacher education. Their number has shrunk from around 60 in the 1920s to 15 today, largely through the merger of colleges with neighbouring universities and their consequent effective secularisation.³ Although they have been hit by the shift of emphasis in initial teacher training away from college teaching to school practice, the surviving colleges have shared in the recent expansion of HE student numbers. Collectively, they now have around 75,000 students.

66. History

Since the 1960s, CCC has been largely an informal network of college Principals. In the 1980s, colleges discussed ideas for more formal collaboration, including a national network with a jointly planned curriculum and a single validation agency. These were not widely supported. Instead, colleges pursued regional collaborations with secular institutions on a piecemeal basis that, in many cases, ended in merger. The national association remained very low key. Collaboration was given a higher priority on the agenda by a new generation of Principals responding to external pressures including:

- ◆ the historic erosion of the Church College sector

² Lord Dearing, President of the CCC and Chair of the 1997 National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, in his presidential address to the 2000 conference, 'The Church Dimension in Higher Education.'

³ The latest example is the incorporation in 2001 of Homerton College into Cambridge University.

- ◆ the influence of the Dearing Committee on Church Schools which reported in 2000
- ◆ encouragement from HEFCE through the Church Colleges consultant.

67. The Role of R&CF

A number of College Principals were members of the HEFCE/TTA Joint Advisory Committee for Church Colleges. Its remit is to advise HEFCE and the TTA on 'any matters of special concern to institutions of a denominational character.' In this context, the HEFCE regional consultant, who acts as Secretary to the Committee, suggested that the CCC might consider seeking support from R&CF to expand its influence and develop its role. The CCC obtained £75,000 over three years to enable it to appoint a Development Officer. After an unsuccessful open recruitment, the post was filled in summer 1999 by Dick Fisher on a part-time secondment from his post as Assistant Principal, St Mary's College. The then Chair of the Council was the Principal of the College.

68. Aims and Objectives

The first AGM after appointment of the Development Officer, in November 1999, agreed a set of Council aims. The five aims are:

- ◆ to provide a forum for a better understanding of the distinctiveness of Church colleges
- ◆ to support members in preserving their autonomy or their Christian identity in associations with secular institutions
- ◆ to argue the case for a diversity in higher education which enables Church colleges to develop their missions
- ◆ to research and promote excellence in Church colleges
- ◆ to increase the ability of Church colleges to respond effectively to new opportunities.

69. Activities

After appointment, the Development Officer:

- ◆ conducted a round of meetings with the leadership and staff of all the colleges, the church bodies and Lord Dearing (President of the CCC and former Chair of the 1997 National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education)
- ◆ undertook an exercise in data collection and analysis to provide an up to date profile of the Church college sector.

In his June 2000 report, he highlighted four issues:

- ◆ there was broad agreement on the distinctive ethos of Church colleges, emphasising:
 - ◆ a holistic view of education
 - ◆ Christian values
 - ◆ encouragement to worship
 - ◆ a strong sense of community within the college
 - ◆ a commitment to serve the community outside.
- ◆ there was less consensus on how that ethos should be translated into practice, for example in:
 - ◆ the curriculum, especially for teacher education
 - ◆ staff recruitment policy
 - ◆ links with local and diocesan structures.
- ◆ the colleges welcomed better data about the sector but identified a need to research the career progression of college graduates and the competitive position of Church colleges in attracting students.

- ◆ heads of institutions seemed cautious about practical collaboration between colleges, though some areas appeared potentially fruitful, including:
 - ◆ staff training and development
 - ◆ benchmarking performance
 - ◆ opportunities for cross-institutional contact
 - ◆ promotion and marketing
 - ◆ curriculum development.

70. Outcomes

The report was submitted to a CCC conference on 'The Church Dimension in Higher Education' in September 2000. The conference followed a HEFCE policy statement in August 2000 on sustaining and promoting diversity in higher education. It brought together, for the first time for some years, representatives of the CCC colleges, the Churches, government departments and funding bodies. One of its aims was:

To identify the potential for collaborative developments to strengthen the position of Church colleges as an important dimension of the diversity of higher education.

At its conclusion, the Chairman of Council identified a number of areas for progression, some of which were pursued over the next year as individual projects.

71. Projects

CCC has made progress with a number of projects:

- ◆ A successful bid to R&CF for development work on the extension to other colleges of the foundation degree for classroom assistants piloted at Canterbury Christ Church University College. Thirteen colleges expressed interest, five now share the £98,500 award.
- ◆ Mapping provision within colleges for theology and religious studies outside teacher training, stemming from concerns about:
 - ◆ the continuing viability of theology as a discipline for both teaching and research
 - ◆ its contribution to the distinctiveness of the Church college sector
 - ◆ the educational contribution of colleges to pre and post ordination training.

A survey has been supplemented by case studies of provision at ten colleges. Heads of theology in the colleges are now taking this work forward.

- ◆ Creation of an Education Network, spurred by the 2000 Report of the Church Schools Review Group which argued for more bilateral, trilateral or multilateral associations between colleges to secure their long-term viability. The Network made a joint response to the recent TTA consultation on teacher training and is now planning a conference on CPD.
- ◆ The CCC website, www.churchcolleges.org, was launched in March 2001 and is updated monthly with CCC information and news from individual colleges.
- ◆ A review of arrangements for parliamentary liaison, principally through the occasional meetings arranged by the Council for the Associate Parliamentary Group of MPs, with a reception for MPs planned for Spring 2002.
- ◆ The Development Office issue a two-page bi-monthly newsletter to Council members which reports progress on collaborative projects and alerts members to other news, including the work of the Joint Advisory Committee for Church Colleges.

72. Governance and Management

The governance of the Council comprises:

- ◆ the Council, comprising the Principals of the 16 colleges and representatives of the 'providing bodies' (the Church of England Board of Education, the Catholic Education Service, the Methodist Church) with a President; it meets twice yearly, at the November AGM and residentially in March
- ◆ an Executive Committee with five elected members—a Chair, Vice Chair, a representative of one of the providing bodies, a Principal from an Anglican College and one from a Catholic College—which meets three times yearly.

Day to day management is the responsibility of the unpaid Chair of the Council, who also chairs the Executive Committee, supported by paid staff on fixed term, part-time contracts. These are currently the Executive Secretary (devoting 80% of her time to CCC) funded partly by the Council and partly by R&CF, and the Development Officer (25%) funded wholly by the R&CF award. All work from St Mary's College, Twickenham, London.

73. Costs and Benefits

Annual expenditure is about £50,000: staff salaries, administrative costs, rent and the conferences. This is covered by subscription income, calculated as a flat rate plus a supplement per student, and the award from HEFCE. The cost excludes the time and materials contributed by member colleges' staff engaged in CCC business, which we were not able to estimate. The Council has reserves of about £70,000. It is clear that without resourced leadership, very little progress would have been made on the collaborative agenda. And implementing practical collaborations—which has been the Development Officer's role—has helped to strengthen the theoretical, principled arguments in favour of continuing cooperation.

74. Obstacles

Collaboration was forced onto the agenda by a combination of external pressures. The Council now faces a difficult judgment of how to internalise collaboration. If it moves too fast, some of the more cautious partners will want to leave and seek independence or other alliances. If it gives too little impetus, a combination of inertia and conservatism will mean that little will change.

75. The Future of Collaboration

In 2001, college Principals set up a working group to review the organisational options for greater collaboration. It considered three options:

- ◆ do nothing
- ◆ a consortium of colleges as exemplified by the Consortium of Art and Design Colleges in Southern England (CADISE)
- ◆ a federal university (exemplified by the University of London or the more recent Federal University of Surrey).

It reported to the CCC's national conference 'Collaboration for Distinctiveness' in September 2001 recommending that colleges choose the consortium or the federation as the necessary way forward: doing nothing was not a sensible option. The conference adopted a declaration that:

Believing in the value of the distinctive contribution of a Christian approach to education, we have resolved to develop a confederation of Church colleges and universities to add collective strength to our individual missions, and thereby better serve the needs of higher education, the Churches and society.

The working group was reconvened to produce a Memorandum of Cooperation, including a mission, aims and structure for the confederation, for consideration at the CCC's AGM in November 2001. This was approved as a basis for consultation with college governing bodies. One interviewee

characterised the debate as displaying 'ideological enthusiasm but pragmatic caution.' The timetable envisages rapid progress to establishment of the confederation, which will exist independently of the Council and may not include all the Council colleges, in 2002.

76. Prospects

*Is their future relationship to be that of spouses, siblings or cousins?
(College principal)*

The CCC clearly stands at a crossroads. All its members:

- ◆ value the Council's support in maintaining their particular ethos in the HE sector
- ◆ consider that the work of the Development Officer has focused and strengthened their role.

There is clearly scope for more joint work. Some members want to force the pace further and move to a more fully resourced, closer form of collaboration, even a new federal university. It seems doubtful that this would have the support of all Council members:

- ◆ some have already committed to association with other non-Church HEIs that would limit their participation in a more formalised Church college collaboration
- ◆ others may prefer to keep such options open or hope to maintain their independence.

CUC: Combined Universities in Cornwall

The Combined Universities in Cornwall is a partnership involving the Universities of Exeter and Plymouth, Falmouth College of Arts, working with the College of St Mark and St John and the Open University and the FE Colleges in Cornwall. The initiative aims to create a major increase in HE provision in Cornwall through an innovative 'hub and rim' model. R&CF provided £325,000 as a contribution to the costs of planning the £55 million cost of Phase 1 of the project.

Higher education	Role in CUC
Falmouth College of Arts	Hub
College of St Mark & St John	Rim
University of Exeter	Hub
University of Plymouth	Hub/Rim
The Open University	Rim
Further education	
Cornwall College	Rim
Truro College and Penwith College	Rim

Figure 17. Collaborators in the CUC

77. Context

Cornwall is the poorest county in terms of GDP per capita in the UK, but has above average A-level attainment. Currently 90% of Cornish school-leavers go outside the county for HE; of those 90% never return. The higher education institutions at the hub of CUC are:

- ◆ The **University of Exeter** has had a strong regional mission in Cornwall for over 50 years, expressed in the Institute of Cornish Studies and the Dept. of Lifelong Learning, both at Truro, and the Camborne School of Mines, which it took over in the 1990s.
- ◆ The **University of Plymouth** is also committed to the development of HE in Cornwall. The University achieves this part of its mission through collaborative partnerships with the further education institutions (FEIs) in Cornwall and through developments such as the Institute of Health Studies and the Peninsula Medical School (the latter jointly with the University of Exeter and part-funded under R&CF). In aggregate, there are 2,000 University of Plymouth students in the county.
- ◆ **Falmouth College of Arts** (FCA) offers an innovative range of undergraduate and postgraduate courses. It is an outward-looking institution, drawing its students from all parts of the UK and abroad
- ◆ **The Open University** (South West).

The FE institutions involved in CUC are:

- ◆ the large, distributed Cornwall College, which includes Duchy College (Rosewarne & Stoke Climsland), and centres at Camborne, Falmouth, Saltash & St Austell
- ◆ Truro College and Penwith College.

78. History

The origins of the present collaboration lie in a plan by the University of Exeter in the mid-1990s to increase HE provision in Cornwall with an expanded campus at Penwith College, near Penzance. This plan failed to win funding from the Millennium Commission and the European Union (EU). In any case, it did not have full support in Cornwall because of its relatively narrow base of partners. Subsequently, the Government Office for the South-West took the lead in developing a more inclusive plan—for the present CUC, which involved other HEIs and Cornish FEIs.

79. Aims and Objectives

CUC is seen by the partners as a 'strategic planning authority' for HE in Cornwall, allowing partners to participate in increasing HE provision in Cornwall whilst minimising competition between them. The CUC Academic Plan proposes:

- ◆ a major increase in HE opportunities in Cornwall, including:
 - ◆ Phase 1: aims to increase lifelong learning from 4,400 FTEs in 1999-2000 to 6,250 at a cost of £55 million, including £43 million to develop a campus at Tremough
 - ◆ Phase 2: to increase lifelong learning to 8,150 FTEs by 2007-08; no commitment has been made to Phase 2, which would provide another 1,950 places for an investment of £36 million
- ◆ a commitment to widening participation at all levels of HE
- ◆ a commitment to excellence in all areas of provision
- ◆ the means of building a knowledge-driven economy
- ◆ a strong and focussed research base of international standing
- ◆ meaningful programmes which equip students with transferable skills
- ◆ support for SMEs to secure new or improved business opportunities.

80. Drivers

The development of CUC has been driven by:

- ◆ **national agenda:** the changed national agenda in relation to regional development and the central role of HE in that process, following the 1997 Dearing Report on HE and the government's response; this provided a policy framework for the long-standing goal of expanding HE provision in Cornwall
- ◆ **regional agendas:** the economic and social regeneration of Cornwall through investment in HE.

The most important single driver was Cornwall's Objective One status for EU structural aid, and the South West of England Regional Development Agency (RDA), Cornwall County Council and the Government Office for the South West agreed that HE provision should be the cornerstone of their Objective One Programme. An Economic Impact Study, carried out by DTZ in 2001, and based on conservative assumptions, indicated positive Net Present Values (NPVs) for Phases 1 and 2 combined and for Phase 1 on its own. The study assumed that 1,000 jobs would be created at and around the Tremough Hub, that 30% of the new HE places would be filled by Cornish students and that 20% of the graduates would be retained in the local economy.

81. Relationship to Institutional Strategies

The broad aim of increasing HE provision in Cornwall aligns with the strategies of all the academic partners. However, they differ in their policies and approaches to the expansion:

- ◆ the University of Exeter and FCA are committed to a permanent physical presence at the Tremough Hub with its emphasis on research excellence and providing an innovative focus for Cornwall; Exeter believes that critical mass of students is needed to attract high calibre staff and inward investment
- ◆ the University of Plymouth sees as the twin planks of its strategy for Cornwall:
 - ◆ collaborative links with the existing network of FE institutions (the Rim), with more emphasis on vocational subjects linked to local business needs and smaller academic developments
 - ◆ the Treliske Health Hub at Truro.

82. The Role of R&CF

Interviewees were uniformly positive about the Fund and HEFCE. R&CF funding of £325,000 was relatively modest in relation to the size of Phase 1 but participants all judged HEFCE's role, especially the nature and timing of informal interventions, offers of funding and expressions of support as a critical success factor. In particular:

- ◆ HEFCE's early, clear message from Sir Brian Fender that increased HE provision in Cornwall could only be achieved by institutional collaboration; this helped to build the present broad-based partnership
 - ◆ funding for the Demand Study, which was undertaken by KPMG
 - ◆ clear expressions of support in principle, which were crucial in winning EU Objective One funding
 - ◆ commitment to fund increased student numbers
 - ◆ up-front working capital, which covers a two-year period of expenditure before student revenues begin to flow
 - ◆ the continual commitment and attention of the HEFCE regional consultant, who has been described as the 'unsung hero' of the initiative.

83. Governance and Management

CUC is an unincorporated association of all nine academic partners. They are joined in CUC's committee structure by representatives of four stakeholder organisations: Government Office for the SW, the SW RDA, Cornwall County Council and the Objective One Partnership for Cornwall and Scilly. Each partner will carry its own risk, for example, FCA as the contracting partner, carries the risk associated with the capital development at Tremough. For legal and contractual purposes, the two institutions employing staff on the Tremough Hub site, University of Exeter and FCA, are creating a company, the Tremough Delivery Vehicle (TDV) to manage the site. Because of the leveraging-in of other government and EU Objective One grants, the project represents very good value from the standpoint of the R&CF. In the wider local and regional contexts, the Economic Impact Study, carried out by DTZ in 2001, demonstrates positive outcomes in relation to both academic portfolio management and planned student numbers. But the success of the initiative in terms of an investment in HE can only be judged after five or so years of operation in the light of actual student numbers.

84. Achievements

The main outcomes of the CUC project to date are:

- ◆ a funded £55 million plan for 2,050 extra HE places in Cornwall by 2003-04
- ◆ new Rim building developments at Cornwall College and Truro College
- ◆ a CUC Office and Project Co-ordinator at Tremough Hub since March 2001
- ◆ physical development of the Tremough, Penryn site (construction started January 2002).

85. Success Factors

The main success factors in the early development of CUC are:

- ◆ the 'push' by the academic partners was reinforced by 'pull' from the strong political and socio-economic agenda in Cornwall
- ◆ involvement of local authority and regional development agencies, notably through independent Chairmanship of the Steering Group, was crucial to the successful outcome; the non-academic stakeholders were detached from academic issues and were able to act as mediators on some potentially divisive issues

- ◆ the timing and symbolism of HEFCE funding was more important than the quantity of the funding
- ◆ complementarity of the partners' missions reduces competition and facilitates collaboration in a buoyant market—but it could lead to tensions if the collaboration were strained, for example, by lower than expected student numbers, causing the institutions to retreat into their distinctive missions and cultures and compete with each other
- ◆ the proximity of three major national institutions: Tate St Ives, the Eden Project and the National Maritime Museum at Falmouth is:
 - ◆ creating a rich environment for new links and collaborations in the creative arts, design and communication
 - ◆ providing a boost to the local economy
 - ◆ increasing optimism about attracting students.

86. Obstacles

There are, however, a number of potential obstacles to the success of CUC:

- ◆ student numbers are crucial to the sustainability of CUC: low student demand would create competition between the Hub and the Rim and tensions between the HE academic partners
- ◆ because it is a complex partnership, offering degrees from several HEIs, marketing CUC will be a challenge, particularly given the pressure to achieve student numbers
- ◆ cultural differences at institutional level have the potential to slow progress and limit the extent of collaboration
- ◆ differing agendas between the stakeholders over the future status of CUC.

The CUC is perceived by many in Cornwall, including some of the academic partners and stakeholders, as a step on the road to full university status. The Universities of Exeter and Plymouth take a different view. Loss of their share of a successful CUC operation at some stage in the future would be a blow to both universities. The partners recognise that the loss is still theoretical. It would take a successful CUC 10–15 years to build up the sustained record of academic and other achievements needed to mount a successful bid for university status. But these sharply contrasted views of the evolutionary trajectory of the CUC are unsettling. This divergence has the potential to undermine the collaboration and the entire project, particularly if it were put under tension by lower than planned student numbers.

87. Future Collaboration

In addition to physical expansion of the Tremough Hub, Phase 2 of the CUC project envisages a health node, at the Treliske, Truro site, which will include the existing Institute of Health Studies at the University of Plymouth and Peninsula Medical School. Other forms of deeper collaboration in CUC have been mentioned, such as:

- ◆ joint quality assurance
- ◆ a single degree ceremony
- ◆ convergence/simplification of degree validating.

These three activities have been agreed for the Peninsula Medical School, which could become a model for closer integration of the different cultures and traditions within the CUC.

University of Essex and South East Essex College

The collaboration between the University of Essex and South East Essex College creates an equal partnership between two independent institutions, through a contractual joint venture. The partnership plans to offer 1,500 (FTE) new HE places by 2004/05, in the College's planned new building in Southend-on-Sea. The collaboration challenges the standard FE/HE model of forging several, shallow links by creating a single, exclusive partnership based around investment in infrastructure.

88. Context

South East Essex has no single HE institution. All the HEIs are in the north of the county but transport links run East-West, making access to HE in the south-east of the county very difficult. Local HE options are confined to a small number of courses offered by FE colleges, and participation is below the national average.

- ◆ **South East Essex College**, based in Southend, is the dominant FE provider in South Essex, and is in the top 5% of FE colleges nationally, with around 4,000 FTEs. It currently has 350 HE places in a narrow range of courses, some franchised and some directly funded. It has an established record in:
 - ◆ widening participation
 - ◆ innovative learning supported by extensive IT provision.
- ◆ **The University of Essex**, at Colchester, is one of the smaller UK universities, with around 6,500 FTEs. It has a strong reputation for teaching and research, especially in the social sciences, and an established record in widening participation and access.

89. History

The partnership was a strategic choice by both institutions:

- ◆ **South East Essex College** identified in the early 1990s the need for HE provision in Southend. They developed a number of links with other institutions, including franchising, but none of these met their strategic aims of delivering HE locally and becoming the dominant HE provider in the sub-region. Four years ago, they began to seek a new partner, with the aim of establishing a deeper, exclusive partnership. They held talks with all the regional HEIs and, when they approached the University of Essex, found it immediately apparent that the two institutions' strategies were coincident.
- ◆ The **University's** size makes it:
 - ◆ vulnerable to market forces: its strengths lie in a relatively narrow range of subjects
 - ◆ difficult for it to achieve critical mass and deliver on a wide range of agendas.

To overcome this, it has pursued a strategy of regional expansion, most recently through a merger with East 15 Acting School, and a partnership with Writtle Agricultural College. It had been searching for an innovative FE partner to:

- ◆ expand its regional provision
- ◆ boost student numbers
- ◆ deliver its widening participation agenda.

90. Aims and Objectives

Discussions between the two parties resulted in a Memorandum of Agreement, now being legally formalised into a Joint Venture Agreement. This sets out in detail the partnership's aims and objectives, which are broadly:

- ◆ to collaborate to provide higher education in the South Essex area through the establishment of a contractual joint venture on a campus in Southend
- ◆ to provide schemes of study on a full-time and part-time basis to first degree level
- ◆ the College to relocate to a new building in the centre of Southend and the University to participate in this development.

91. Role of the R&CF

R&CF provided:

- ◆ £70,000 to fund an external demand study
- ◆ £2 million toward the cost of the new college building.

The role of the demand study by KPMG, conducted in Spring 1999, was to:

- ◆ provide objective evidence of a genuine demand for HE in Southend
- ◆ provide external validation for the partnership.

The College saw the significance of the initial HEFCE funding as largely symbolic: the demand study provided external validation of the public interest case for the collaboration. The study also proved important in:

- ◆ securing further HEFCE support for the partnership
- ◆ leveraging other external funding
- ◆ raising support within the University
- ◆ identifying areas of curriculum development.

The regional consultant, Derek Hicks, played an important role as the University of Essex's point of contact with HEFCE, providing guidance on obtaining funding. Following the demand study, HEFCE has committed a further £2 million from R&CF toward the new College premises.

92. Outcomes and Outputs

To date, R&CF has part-funded only the demand study and business plan. However, we have considered the broader outcomes from the partnership. These are:

- ◆ new honours and foundation degree programmes created specifically for delivery by the partnership and developed jointly:
 - ◆ 17 have been validated for 2002/03
 - ◆ 10 are in development for 2002 entry
 - ◆ plans for new provision in 2003/04 are already in hand
- ◆ Essex has taken over validation of the College's existing HE provision
- ◆ students register with the College but benefit from a University of Essex award.

93. Governance and Management

The project has invested in a range of strategies to develop and validate new provision:

- ◆ the **Management Board** has equal College and University representation, including the heads of both institutions
- ◆ six small **sub-groups**
 - ◆ have equal representation

- ◆ cover marketing and publicity, quality assurance, curriculum and recruitment, legal and funding, business liaison and joint staffing matters
- ◆ their membership and responsibilities have been adjusted as the collaboration progresses
- ◆ several people sit on several groups, guaranteeing cohesion and continuity
- ◆ **project management** is carried out by a project officer at the College and one at the University
- ◆ **curriculum development teams:**
 - ◆ met formally three times with up to three representatives from each institution, employers, and external academics
 - ◆ in 2001/02, joint curriculum development is taking place through more informal routes but continuing the involvement of external academic and employer advisers
- ◆ a **Joint Staffing Committee**, comprising senior management staff from both institutions, evaluates the quality of teaching staff.

94. Quality Assurance

Quality assurance has emerged as one of the major substantive activities for the partnership, because of:

- ◆ Differences in **experience**:
 - ◆ College staff are experienced at delivering skills-based learning
 - ◆ University staff are more focused on content; some had to recognise that professional qualifications and industry experience may be more relevant for staff delivering vocational programmes than a postgraduate research degree.
- ◆ Differences of **approach** over determining the role of coursework and formal examinations. Essex is research-led and has a rule that 50% of a degree must be awarded against formal examinations. The partnership has now evolved a more flexible approach to assessment, which recognises the different requirements of vocational programmes.
- ◆ **Validation** had to be broader than degree content. The University had to adapt its existing validation procedures in order to cope with the scale and pace of curriculum development within the partnership. A generic validation of student support, book and journal provision and the College's facilities and IT resources took place to underpin individual subject validations. QAA has now issued a Code of Practice section on Collaborative Provision, but this was not available at the beginning of the partnership. Essex has continued to review its validation procedures in order to ensure full compliance with the Code.

95. Costs and Benefits

The costs of establishing the partnership were borne by the two sides. Both institutions' development costs were significant; the College estimated its direct costs at £125,000 a year and would have welcomed additional R&CF support for those costs. There are substantial on-going transaction costs in course and staff development, and quality assurance, which are increased by the relatively high travel time between the two institutions. The benefits, however, have been significant:

- ◆ close working relationships (on curriculum development, the validation of non-curriculum aspects of College provision, QA, recruitment and admissions, student support and administrative systems) have allowed a two-way exchange of expertise
- ◆ each institution has benefited from exposure to the other's strategic approach, ethos and experience whilst the cross-fertilisation of ideas has been mutually beneficial

- ◆ the partnership has strengthened the platform from which each institution can pursue further initiatives; specifically:
 - ◆ for the **College**, the partnership is an important source of professional development and advice on HE culture and practices as well as the HE curriculum
 - ◆ for the **University**, the partnership has helped it to achieve widening participation goals, with further benefits deriving from the sharing of good practice in learning and teaching, especially in the areas of vocational education and IT resource-based learning
- ◆ the University gains a physical presence in Southend: this will draw in employers, to both institutions' benefit
- ◆ the new students benefit from access to the University's Library, Sports Centre and social facilities—entitlements not open to students in traditional franchise arrangements.

96. Success Factors

The overall mood of the partnership is optimistic; both partners consider the model a successful one, despite their different cultures and differing views on the division of income. The factors important to its success are:

- ◆ the principle of equal partnership and parity of esteem
- ◆ the translation of that principle into equal allocation of responsibility: the College for the learning environment and resources, the University for quality assurance
- ◆ a governance and management infrastructure based on equal representation from both sides:
 - ◆ attendance by the two heads of institution demonstrates the level of commitment
 - ◆ other participants are senior enough to influence policy and take decisions.
- ◆ formalised planning processes from the first stages of the partnership:
 - ◆ formal sub-groups, with equal representation, worked through the details of each aspect of collaboration
 - ◆ groups were kept small so they could take ownership of problems, and flexible so they could take on board emerging issues
- ◆ mutual respect: each institution is highly regarded in its field
- ◆ investment in awareness-raising across both institutions, not just with the staff involved
- ◆ the difficulties either institution would face in finding another partner committed to the same strategy: both have a huge amount at stake
- ◆ the complementary strengths of the two institutions and lack of competition between them
- ◆ the principle of exclusivity, which allows both institutions to focus resources
- ◆ the formal consultations with employer representatives about vocational courses, skills and needs, which helped to persuade University staff of the appropriateness of integrated skills-based learning.

97. Obstacles

The partnership has not been plain sailing. This is unsurprising given the scale of the proposal, the cultural and managerial differences between the institutions and their physical separation. Specific difficulties have been:

- ◆ **Numbers.** Lower than anticipated student numbers (500 this year against the 750 anticipated). If the shortfall remains, this will strike at the rationale for the partnership: both sides may question whether the benefits of an exclusive partnership outweigh the investment in staff

time. However, the partners remain confident that the planned student numbers will be achieved over a slightly longer time period.

- ◆ **Time.** The time constraints on curriculum development and validation, which meant that firm offers to UCAS candidates in 2000/01 were made later in the recruitment cycle than either institution would have liked. This has been resolved for future recruitment and marketing.
- ◆ **Culture.** Differences in management culture:
 - ◆ the College has a stronger management ethos and sees this as a strength
 - ◆ Essex views the tight centralised focus of the College's management culture as a barrier to it responding to the challenges and flexibility demanded by HE.
- ◆ **Teaching.** Differing teaching and learning styles:
 - ◆ while University staff are already engaged with developments in learning, teaching and assessment, and Essex values the College's experience in skills-based learning, there is a continuing debate about traditional versus innovative practice within the vocational HE curriculum, which College staff can find frustrating
 - ◆ College academic staff have a limited but developing grounding in HE curriculum development and delivery but the costs of staff development are very high.
- ◆ **Equity.** Equality is an elusive concept, which the partnership constantly has to work at. The University is the awarding body and has a right of veto on issues relating to 'quality.' The interpretation of this causes tensions:
 - ◆ Essex staff are nervous about the possible damage to their strong academic reputation
 - ◆ College staff do not always recognise the contribution that active research makes to HE and can perceive University staff as out of touch with the 'real' world.
- ◆ **Geography.** The physical distance between the two institutions: one of the main rationales for the partnership is to deliver HE locally to overcome the poor north-south transport links. But the lack of transport creates difficulties for the partnership itself:
 - ◆ the transaction costs of staff travel time, for meetings and development, are very high
 - ◆ for students, distance is an almost insuperable barrier, even though College students have theoretical access to the Essex campus.
- ◆ **Funding.** the College used to be directly funded by HEFCE for HE provision. Student funding now goes to Essex, who pass on a percentage to the College. There are differences of opinion over what that percentage should be and the long-term issue was unresolved at the time of the fieldwork:
 - ◆ the College argues that it bears most of the cost of students, i.e. teaching and learning activities, student support, marketing, recruitment, admissions and supporting administration
 - ◆ the University argues that it bears substantial costs in quality control, senior management time, administration and support for the range of partnership activities, as well as the potential risk to its reputation.

98. The Future

The partnership seems likely to thrive and to grow, mainly because both institutions have so much at stake that they cannot afford to fail. Reaching agreement on the right division of funding is proving difficult but probably not mission-threatening. Tackling this issue earlier would have prevented loss of

goodwill. Assuming agreement on funding, there seems no reason why the partnership should not extend its provision beyond initial forecasts by both widening and deepening the collaboration:

- ◆ to develop new College courses complementary to those at Essex
- ◆ move out of curriculum development to other areas
- ◆ run courses developed at the College on the Essex campus.

The eventual outcome could be a blurring of the distinction between the College and the University to form a collegiate structure. It remains to be seen whether the two institutions can overcome initial differences in culture and style to reach the position of trust necessary to deliver that structure.

Collaboration Programme for Modern Languages

This is the most extensive collaboration funded under R&CF, involving:

- ◆ *cooperation at both programme and project levels*
- ◆ *collaboration across institutions, departments and subjects.*

Funding began in October 2001. We have included the programme because of its unique nature and potential relevance to other subject areas. Our evaluation covered both the overall programme and three of the ten projects within it: Virtual Department of Dutch; MA in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies; and the North West Centre for Research Training.

99. Context

Undergraduate applications for honours degrees have declined. This has caused particular problems for less frequently taught languages, many of which are provided by a few departments in geographically distant institutions. There has been a clear need for greater cooperation to:

- ◆ make better use of staff and other resources
- ◆ enhance quality of provision
- ◆ increase the attractiveness of language programmes.

But departments had been reluctant to engage in collaboration without start-up funding and in the absence of encouragement from institutions. The programme builds on two strands of activity:

- ◆ the Nuffield Languages Inquiry: set up in 1998 to review the UK's overall capability in languages, reported May 2000⁴
- ◆ Brian Fender's 1999 circular on under-recruitment in languages invited institutions to discuss regional cooperation.

The University Council of Modern Languages (UCML) responded by setting up a group to develop an overall strategy for languages. This took forward work on three fronts, including the Collaboration Programme.

The aims of the Collaboration Programme are to:

- ◆ bring about a series of collaborative and co-operative developments in modern languages
- ◆ embed these in institutional activities and funding mechanisms to strengthen less widely taught languages
- ◆ pilot a series of models for inter-institutional collaboration that can be applied across other subject areas.

Figure 18. Aims of Collaboration Programme

100. Programme Aims

UCML was founded in 1993 to provide a single voice for university modern language departments. Membership includes virtually all departments and subject associations in the UK. The UCML:

- ◆ developed the concept and framework for the Programme in discussion with HEFCE
- ◆ issued the call for individual project proposals and assessed those proposals with input from HEFCE's regional consultant.

The aim is to test the effectiveness of different models of collaborative working, through a two-tier approach:

4 <http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/languages/home/>

- ◆ R&CF funded a joint bid by the UCML and the Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies (University of Southampton) to run a three-year collaborative programme in modern languages
- ◆ the programme funded ten projects in six languages across 24 HEIs.

101. Governance and Management

The Collaboration Programme is based around two centres:

- ◆ UCML works closely with the **Subject Centre**, which administers the overall programme; the Centre was set up in early 2000 as part of HEFCE's Learning and Teaching Support Network
- ◆ the **National Co-ordination Team** (NCT) of the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF) acts as mentor to the Programme and projects; it is based in the Centre for Higher Education Practice at the Open University.

The University of Southampton is budget holder through the Subject Centre. A Steering Group provides supervision and direction. The Group meets twice a year and reports to the Management Group of the Subject Centre. The Centre provides light touch administration and support for the projects in partnership with the NCT

- ◆ the Centre will:
 - ◆ manage the overall Programme.
 - ◆ disseminate information (web-site and conferences).
 - ◆ arrange evaluation of programme and projects.
- ◆ the NCT will:
 - ◆ provide staff development through workshops for project leaders
 - ◆ monitor project progress and support project development, through written reports and annual visits.
 - ◆ provide support and consultancy to the Programme Manager.

102. The Role of R&CF

The programme was conceived specifically in response to R&CF, which is providing £482,950 over three years. This will fund:

- ◆ the individual projects
- ◆ programme management by the Subject Centre
- ◆ consultancy support from NCT.

The bid was developed through discussions with HEFCE funding officers. The HEFCE regional consultant with responsibility for modern languages played a significant role in steering UCML through the process and helping to ensure that the final proposal was likely to be acceptable to HEFCE.

103. The Individual Projects

- ◆ In January 2001, UCML invited members in England to submit bids. The Programme Steering Group, in consultation with HEFCE, selected nine projects, based on the merits of the proposals and the need to cover the range of collaboration and cooperation models, different languages and different institution types. Projects are in four areas and run for two or three years of the Programme. We interviewed the leader of one project from each of the first three areas: projects were selected to be both representative of the area and of broader general interest.

Project	Language	Partners
1. Undergraduate honours degrees		
Teaching collaboration in a virtual department of Dutch	Dutch	Lead: UCL, Hull, Cambridge, Sheffield
G62 undergraduate collaboration in teaching Italian culture	Italian	Hull, Leeds
Supply teaching database	French	Lead: Reading, Oxford Brookes, Southampton, Surrey, Royal Holloway, QMW, Warwick
Web materials in European area studies	German, Spanish	Lead: LJMU, Loughborough, Sunderland, Salford, Southampton, MMU
2. Postgraduate taught courses		
MA in Italian studies: culture and communication	Italian	Lead: Birmingham, Warwick
MA in Soviet and post-Soviet studies	Soviet studies	Lead: Surrey, Bath
3. Research training		
North West Centre for Research Training in Languages and Linguistics	Language and Linguistics	Lead: Salford, Edge Hill, Lancaster, Manchester
a) Materials for postgraduate research training in Romance Studies	Romance Languages	Lead: Institute of Romance Studies, QMW, UCL, Reading
b) Research training collaboration in French	French	Lead: Reading, Oxford Brookes, Southampton, Surrey, Royal Holloway, QMW, Warwick
4. Support Materials		
Database of current research in modern languages	Romance and Germanic	Lead: Oxford Brookes, CILT, Institute of Romance Studies, Institute of Germanic Studies

Figure 19. Collaborative Programme projects

104. Virtual Department of Dutch

Dutch is a small subject, not taught at A level and in decline in the UK. UCL maintains the only single honours Dutch course, although other universities have some provision. The aim of the project is to maximise the use of the limited staff resources, through:

- ◆ consultation about course design and accreditation
- ◆ experimenting with various other forms of collaboration:
 - ◆ staff and, if appropriate, student mobility
 - ◆ use of web-based communication and learning tools
 - ◆ video conferencing
- ◆ developing web-based course materials for use in the participating institutions and for autonomous and remedial learning.

The plan is to teach parts of two courses collaboratively by the next academic year (2002/03). The potential stumbling block to this is quality assurance. Students will be registered in their home universities, but if course content changes substantially, the project may face accreditation issues. This is a high-risk project, which depends on few staff delivering an ambitious agenda with limited funding. But, in the face of looming crisis, there is a huge motivation to succeed and considerable goodwill among staff.

105. MA in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies

Surrey has had an MA in Russian studies for several years. The Bath MA lapsed many years ago as a result of poor recruitment. The project will build on the strengths of both institutions to develop a jointly taught and administered MA, which is sufficiently attractive and high profile to recruit

higher numbers of UK and overseas students. The first joint cohort will be in Autumn 2003: first semester in Surrey, second in Bath, the summer in Russia. The new MA will be partially based on a virtual learning environment, using web-based teaching materials. It is too early to gauge the likely impact of the project but it has clear potential to succeed. There are good relations between the two departments and an imperative to succeed because of poor recruitment. But, the overload on the leading players may prove problematic and validation could be a source of tension.

106. North West Centre for Research Training in Language and Linguistics

The project builds on an existing collaboration between institutions. The North West Centre for Linguistics (NWCL) was established in 1997 at the University of Salford to:

- ◆ provide an umbrella organisation for research in linguistics in the North West
- ◆ develop a centre for research training.

The Centre drew together departments from universities in the North West, plus Edge Hill College of HE and University of Wales Bangor. It offered ad hoc research training including ESRC-funded workshops but had no core funding. The Subject Centre invited NWCL to put forward a proposal extending this provision. Four of the institutions, led by the Centre at Salford, are collaborating to provide:

- ◆ one and two week postgraduate training courses in theory, content and methodology
- ◆ a web site for postgraduate students with:
 - ◆ an information service
 - ◆ a postgraduate directory
 - ◆ a link to an electronic archive for the dissemination of research training event materials and postgraduate working papers.

The ultimate aim is to serve as a model for a network of regional training centres in language and linguistics, each with responsibility for specific areas of provision. The project is already delivering on its principal aims, with its first programme scheduled at Easter 2002. Other northern institutions have already joined the collaboration, while some southern institutions have sought advice on the model. Potential barriers to a broader network of centres are:

- ◆ institutional resistance to a subject-based collaboration beyond traditional regional links
- ◆ widely varying levels of commitment from linguistics departments and institution heads
- ◆ traditional suspicion within language departments of postgraduate training of this kind
- ◆ overload on staff: the project requires input from teaching and managerial staff over and above existing workloads.

107. Costs

The costs of individual projects were tailored to match the available funding through a process of negotiation. We have not been able to assess the costs of individual projects but it is clear that:

- ◆ the Programme has ambitious aims and slender resources
- ◆ a number of project managers may have under-estimated the transaction costs of collaboration, particularly their own time commitment.

In addition, a number of the resources underpinning the Programme are not being directly funded. These include the considerable inputs from the Programme convenor and other members of UCML. The true cost of the

Programme is thus likely to be considerably higher than the amount funded by R&CF.

108. Success Factors

The Programme is in its early stages and it difficult to assess the factors that will define its success. But it is clear that the following have been key in securing its early achievements:

- ◆ **Transparency.** The transparency of the process. UCML were always clear that their role was to defend and maintain the position of modern languages as a whole. Their openness appears to have alleviated suspicion among departments fearful of the motives behind collaboration and wary of rationalisation in a declining subject.
- ◆ **Personalities.** The lead personalities were key.⁵ They were trusted and respected within the language community for their independence of thought, strategic vision and absence of personal agendas.
- ◆ **Focus.** The existence of a real crisis concentrated minds and created interest in the strategic importance of language policy. Departments were already being closed, particularly at post-1992 universities. There was recognition among languages newly under threat that collaboration was unlikely to make things worse and could even be beneficial.
- ◆ **Presentation.** Presentation was critical. There was a lot of debate in UCML about how to present the programme to the subject community. Incorporating collaboration in a package of funded measures reduced suspicion about a hidden restructuring agenda.
- ◆ **Management.** The structure and approach, based around strong management by the subject centre on behalf of the national body. It struck the right balance between an approach tight enough to be accountable but flexible enough to keep the whole community on board.
- ◆ **History.** The Programme builds on a long history and various models of cooperation in languages, combining both precedence and experience:
 - ◆ FTDL had funded 10 projects across 19 institutions
 - ◆ UCML played a role in that funding process and the current Director of the Subject Centre chaired the co-ordinating group.
- ◆ **Monitoring and Evaluation.** There are strict monitoring arrangements. Given the time pressures on partners, projects would be less likely to deliver without the involvement of the TQEF NCT.

109. Barriers

Both UCML and HEFCE recognised the high degree of risk behind the Programme and responded through the involvement of the NCT. To date, there have been few barriers at Programme level. This is due mainly to the energy and commitment of the key stakeholders and their continuing good relationships. The initial suspicion among departments, which was based on a history of directed collaborations aimed at rationalising provision, has been largely overcome. The major remaining barriers are perceived as:

- ◆ the RAE: the broad aim of the Programme is to foster a collaborative rather than competitive culture but the funding pressures of the RAE militate against that
- ◆ lack of commitment from senior management to subject collaborations that cut across established regional links.

Other potential barriers are:

5 Hilary Footitt is the current chair of UCML; Professor Richard Towell is Chair of the Subject Centre Advisory Board and a former Chair of UCML; Professor Michael Kelly was the first chair of UCML and is Director of the Subject Centre; Professor David Robey is convenor of the Programme, chair of the Italian Language Association and a member of HEFCE's TQEF committee.

- ◆ a change in climate: despite recruitment problems, the community has remained positive; however, if there is no delivery post-Nuffield (see Note 9), the climate could change and endanger collaboration
- ◆ lack of communication between institutions at senior strategy level; there has been little communication between Vice Chancellors
- ◆ uncertainty over the long-term future of the Subject Centre: its role is to be a repository of knowledge, including on the Programme, yet its funding is guaranteed by HEFCE for only five years from 2000.

Any other barriers seem likely to emerge at project level:

- ◆ some will need to construct new relationships or extend existing ones to new participants; while the initial motivation is good, will partners be able to sustain the time commitment collaboration demands?
- ◆ critical mass: many subjects are small and heavily reliant on a few individuals; collaborations are unlikely to survive the departure of any of these or the closure of one of the participating departments
- ◆ some of the projects have not yet addressed potential areas of conflict in joint degree programmes: quality assurance, validation and splitting student funding.

110. Achievements and Prospects

It is too early to assess whether:

- ◆ the individual projects will deliver their expected outcomes
- ◆ the programme collectively will meet its broader aims.

It is clear though that:

- ◆ the group meetings with project leaders facilitated by the NCT are likely to engender a real spirit of collaboration
- ◆ the existence of the programme has led to a feeling among the community that people are working together rather than competing for fewer students
- ◆ the Programme is structured and managed in a way that will maximise the potential for success
- ◆ the level of commitment from individuals goes beyond the formal funding and will be a major contributory factor.

It is also too early to judge which of the projects are likely to become embedded in institutional funding or to be useful as models. Our initial assessment is that those projects based on organic growth are most likely to succeed. In these, partners were already working together and needed only external stimulus and additional funding. New collaborations are potentially more problematic, given the time demands on a few individuals. It remains to be seen whether the Programme can in turn deliver more than the sum of the individual projects and add value to them. It has a broad, ambitious agenda. Delivering on this agenda may be challenging, given the limited funding, the lack of homogeneity between projects and the constraints on individuals' time. But the Programme has already had a degree of success in creating a deeper sense of community in subjects under threat.

Leicester Warwick Medical School

The Medical School is both a teaching and research collaboration between the Universities of Leicester and Warwick. It aims to combine the strengths of both institutions to deliver a high quality medical curriculum across the two university sites, which includes a new medical sciences building on the Warwick campus.

111. Context

The University of Leicester is highly rated for both teaching and research. Its medical school has one of the best teaching reputations in the UK, with a strong emphasis on social and behavioural medicine. It has an emphasis on clinical learning, with a strong partnership with the NHS and the smallest clinical teaching groups in the UK.

The University of Warwick is an innovative, research-led university, with a strong reputation in:

- ◆ biological sciences: 23 in its subject review, 5A rating in all RAEs
- ◆ social sciences: 24 in its subject review, 5A for research.

It provides some postgraduate medical education but has no experience in undergraduate medical education.

112. History

The University of Leicester medical school is one of the smallest in the UK. Its former Dean realised that to maintain its competitive position, it needed to:

- ◆ combine innovation in teaching with excellence in research
- ◆ grow beyond its intake of 175 students a year: this was at the margins of viability for a fully-fledged medical school.

It had no potential to grow organically:

- ◆ there was little scope for expansion on its current site
- ◆ there were few options for increased clinical placements in the region, because of the large number of medical schools.

Leicester identified opportunities within the University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust (formerly the Walsgrave Hospitals NHS Trust) but the Trust had a history of close involvement with Warwick in the areas of postgraduate medical education and research. Leicester subsequently approached Warwick with the proposal to create a joint medical school. The University of Warwick had long wanted to diversify into undergraduate medical education, and had mounted an unsuccessful bid in the 1970s. It wanted to share in the recent expansion in medical provision but was not confident that a solo bid would succeed, given its lack of undergraduate clinical education experience. There was no other regional institution with which to mount a joint bid

113. Aims and Objectives

The mission of the Medical School is to:

Establish a large, internationally recognised medical school renowned for the quality of its medical graduates, its research excellence and its relevance to the NHS needs of the nation and the regions.

The key aim is:

To exploit the complementary strengths of the two universities to produce greater numbers of new doctors in an arrangement that enhances educational excellence as student numbers rise.

A secondary objective was to:

Develop a single over-arching medical research strategy to establish the LWMS as a leading centre in the UK for medical and health related research.

The School is committed to widening participation in medical education from those socio-economic groups with untapped potential. It has developed a four-year MB ChB program open to good graduates in the Biological Sciences. The four-year programme is taught exclusively at Warwick, although a variant of the programme open to graduates in the Health Sciences and delivered exclusively at Leicester will run from 2003/04 alongside the existing five-year MB ChB programme. HEFCE provided £2 million to fund the start-up costs of the school and cover any shortfall in income before standard revenue funding.

114. The Role of R&CF

Once the concept of the new medical school had been agreed, it was clear that there would be a funding shortfall before the revenue stream from students. HEFCE separately funded the capital costs of the school and agreed to use R&CF to provide working capital in the transition period, to:

- ◆ provide equipment needed to set up curriculum delivery
- ◆ fund initial staff costs for the school and a management structure
- ◆ pump-prime development of a research strategy.

115. Governance and Management

The new school is a joint venture of the two universities, which is formally managed by a Joint Committee with authority designated to it by the Councils of the two Universities. There is partnership in governance and funding, but operational management of the school is the responsibility of a single Dean of Medicine. Two committees oversee the collaboration:

- ◆ the Joint Committee is chaired by one of the two Vice Chancellors on an annually alternating basis and determines long-term strategy; it meets once a term
- ◆ the Dean's Management Group manages the day-to-day running of the School, including appointments and budgets; it meets 12 times a year, alternating between Leicester and Warwick.

Student numbers are split between each institution via agreements reached by the Joint Committee.

116. Success Factors

Operationally, the partnership has been successful. HEFCE funding has delivered:

- ◆ a new medical school to a very tight deadline
 - ◆ with high teaching and clinical standards
 - ◆ open to a broader student pool.

A number of factors contributed to success at this level:

- ◆ the absolute imperative of a deadline; the School had to have a building in place in time for the first intake, which meant driving through the agenda at operational level
- ◆ individual professionalism: when challenged to deliver, staff put aside doubts and differences and worked hard; this was helped by good relationships at operational level.

117. Obstacles

The key obstacle to the broader success of the School is structural. It is far from clear that a joint body is a sensible vehicle for a new academic unit. The original vision was for a semi-autonomous structure that would deliver its own teaching and research, drawing on the respective strengths of the two sides. As currently established, it is not certain that the School can deliver this broader vision. The obstacles are legal and cultural:

- ◆ **Legal.** The school discovered that the two institutions could not jointly employ staff: new appointments have on the whole been made within existing University departmental structures.

- ◆ **Cultural.** The research ethos at both Universities is not well suited to highly integrated collaborative working, and both sides are reluctant to put into a joint venture reputations and departments they have taken years to build. There is real concern that, because of the national shortage of clinical academic staff, the school will need to make sub-standard appointments that could threaten existing reputations.

Other difficulties during the process mainly stemmed from this flaw in the original vision. They have been largely overcome through sheer tenacity but at some cost to the goodwill between the two institutions:

- ◆ the original vision was not translated into a formal agreement, setting out the expectations and responsibilities of each side and as senior staff changed, people interpreted the vision in different ways
- ◆ few formal structures were set up to deliver the process; this led to poor communications between senior management staff who had developed the vision and academic staff who were responsible for delivering it
- ◆ the pace of delivery meant that strategic issues have remained unresolved and are only being tackled now
- ◆ the legal difficulties in appointing staff mean that academics have no ownership of the new school and little loyalty to it.

118. Future Collaboration and the Role of HEFCE

The collaboration is at a critical point. It has been hugely successful at the level of curriculum delivery, in increasing provision and widening access to medicine. A period of stability at senior levels in both institutions may help it to deliver on the broader vision. But this is unlikely without:

- ◆ a determination to revert to the concept of a semi-autonomous school, employing its own staff and with clearly defined parameters for action
- ◆ greater clarity over the long-term contributions and ambitions of both partners.

Leeds Law Library: The CASE Project

The Leeds Law Library collaboration is a pilot project aimed at exploring models of inter-institutional and cross-sectoral collaboration in the provision of law resource materials. It is led by Leeds University Library, and is a collaboration with several other regional university libraries, the British Library and the publishers Butterworths.

British Library Document Supply Centre
Butterworths publishers
Leeds Metropolitan University Learning Centre
Leeds University Library (lead institution)
Sheffield Hallam University Learning Centre
University of Huddersfield Library
University of Hull Library
University of Lincoln Learning Support Centre
University of Sheffield Library

Figure 20. CASE partners

119. Project Description

The Yorkshire/Humberside region has a history of collaboration between members of the Yorkshire and Humberside Universities Association (YHUA). Along with the other members of YHUA, Leeds University Library has been involved in a number of projects pioneering new methods of information delivery, such as the RIDING web-based gateway to library catalogues. The aim of the CASE project is to enhance access to legal research materials in the region (Figure 21). The expectations are that libraries can collaborate to each build collections in specific areas, thereby increasing access to legal materials for academics and students.

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ To investigate the potential for collaborative collection management for law resources ◆ To create a web-based national legal information gateway, including an online union serials catalogue. ◆ To develop policies for regional resource sharing, document delivery and access. ◆ To develop a policy for regional cross-sectoral resource sharing. ◆ To investigate electronic legal information resources which could be used in the UK higher education sector. |
|---|

Figure 21. Objectives for CASE

120. Project Rationale

Financial and space pressures are making it increasingly difficult for higher education libraries to provide fully comprehensive coverage of journals and other information resources in all subject areas. This problem is particularly acute in law, where academic journal prices are high and there are many specialisms. At the same time, improved information technology is now making distributed collection management a theoretical possibility. Leeds University Library has a forward-looking approach to the provision of library services and is a full member of the Consortium of University Research Libraries (CURL). It is keen on pioneering inter-library collaboration centred around information technology with a view to easing financial and space issues. The CASE project was conceived as a feasibility study designed to evaluate the possibility of enhancing access to legal research materials through increased collaboration.

121. Role of the R&CF and HEFCE

In July 1999, a delegation of law subject associations led by Sir Mark Potter met HEFCE to discuss funding of legal education, especially law libraries.

One proposal to emerge from the meeting was for a pilot project to establish models of collaboration and examine the costs. Leeds University Library led the design of the project and had anticipated funding from the Research Support Libraries Programme (RSLP) but HEFCE suggested an application to R&CF. It is highly unlikely that the project would have gone ahead without HEFCE funding of some form, given the tight pressure on library budgets in the participating institutions.

122. Outcomes and Outputs

The project is running to time and has achieved a number of targets including:

- ◆ a CASE website: www.leeds.ac.uk/case
- ◆ a survey of academics' research areas and needs
- ◆ a searchable online database of law reports, serials and statutes: case.leeds.ac.uk
- ◆ legal document delivery across the partner libraries
- ◆ an online document delivery service with the British Library.

Discussions amongst partners on further collaborative projects such as consortium purchase and customised legal resources are ongoing.

123. Governance and Management

The management of the project is founded on a 'project letter of understanding' signed by the participating Library Directors. A Steering Group comprising representatives from each of the strands of the project, including legal academics, librarians, information providers and cross-sectoral groups meets quarterly, and a Project Team of legal information specialists from all the partner institutions meets bimonthly. Most importantly, the project has appointed a full-time project manager based at Leeds University Library. A key success factor in this project is the enthusiasm and commitment of the project manager. She works closely with all the institutions to ensure that the project moves forward on time and that all participants and academics are kept aware of the project's aims and progress. The team takes an evaluative approach to its work; working with focus groups to evaluate and refine services. Communication is effective, staff feel closely involved with the project, can quickly identify and deal with operational issues and are optimistic about the benefits. The project produces six-monthly progress reports to HEFCE and its members, which are posted on the CASE website.⁶ These reports are models of clarity and provide succinct information on the project's progress towards its targets.

124. Sustainability

This kind of project will become increasingly necessary in HE libraries as financial pressures erode the old 'collecting culture' of librarians and academics. The outlook for the CASE approach therefore seems positive. However, there are strategic issues to be tackled before library collaboration can make the transition from joint delivery to distributed collections. At present, CASE increases access without affecting the content of collections held by individual institutions but:

- ◆ if institutions give up some materials and become more specialised in their collections, they may meet resistance from academics and senior management
- ◆ there is a risk that if collaborators pull out of such agreements, the consortium could be left under-resourced; withdrawal is, however, unlikely given the long history of collaboration between institutions in this region.

125. Generic Lessons

Inter-library collaboration will become increasingly necessary as the financial and space constraints on libraries increase. It will be important to monitor progress with CASE if it moves from the pilot to full implementation as this project may well be a model for other subject areas, both in its implementation and its management. CASE shows that for these kinds of partnerships:

- ◆ allowing library staff to feel they own the project is crucial
- ◆ committed and enthusiastic project managers are very important
- ◆ technical support from staff that are familiar with the field and understand the needs of librarians is vital
- ◆ academics need to know where they are in terms of collections access and be brought into the project at an early stage
- ◆ taking things at a steady incremental pace can prevent staff and academics feeling threatened by novel forms of collaboration.

There are issues to be resolved before projects like CASE will be fully successful:

- ◆ the licence agreements for many electronic resources do not allow use by researchers outside the subscribing institution, and are sometimes costed per user; neither of these arrangements encourage collaboration
- ◆ collaboration with commercial publishers or others with commercial interests that run counter to distributed collections can be problematic.

The University of Sheffield and Sheffield Women's Hospital

R&CF money was used here to support a long-standing project between the NHS and the University. to bring together the two academic departments of obstetrics and gynaecology, previously based at two sites, within the new Sheffield Women's Hospital. This is a restructuring project, with the university taking just less than a tenth of the floor area of the final building and being the junior partner throughout the process.

126. Context

The University has a strong medical tradition developed as elsewhere in collaboration with local hospitals, which are now managed by the Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust. The Trust, and its predecessors, has had plans to create a single, state of the art Women's Hospital for Sheffield since 1988. Opened in 2001, the new hospital brings all of the city's obstetric, gynaecology and neonatal services together on one site. At the same time, the University's Departments of Obstetrics and Gynaecology have been relocated from two sites to the same building, adjacent to the clinical services.

127. The Role of R&CF

The role of R&CF has been to supplant earlier promises of funding that were withdrawn due to delays. It has taken more than a decade for this project to come to fruition due to delays in NHS planning and resources, including at one point the need to test its costs against the Private Finance Initiative. The result was that a project conceived in 1988 did not proceed until 1998. Higher education funding for the university's contribution was originally promised by the University Grants Committee, then by HEFCE, but HEFCE was forced by the delays to withdraw funding in 1996. When the project was finally commissioned and underway, HEFCE suggested that the University apply to R&CF and a £1.5 million grant was awarded.

128. R&CF and Institution Strategy

The University has strongly benefited from the relocation of its department to the new clinical centre. The co-location is leading to new research collaborations between academics, and between academics and clinical staff.

129. R&CF and Management

This is an NHS project and the NHS has marginalized university input. The building was constructed to specifications agreed in 1993 and modified in 1998. Problems arose during the construction phase when changes or omissions were instructed by the NHS Trust without consultation with or reference to the University. These changes only became apparent at a late stage when it was either not possible or disproportionately expensive to reverse the situation. The University was not represented on the project team for the building. Representation would have ensured that the University's needs were better addressed; for example, if the University's area had been provided with separate metering for services, its running costs for the building would be lower. Air conditioning was also removed from the plans by NHS cost-cutting. Despite this, the University and Department staff are generally happy with the new building.

130. Sustainability

There are no problems with sustainability of this project. The University is, however, concerned about the service charges for its use of the building; these are three times the costs of its own premises.

131. Generic Lessons

The main lesson from this project is that universities should be properly represented on projects led by other organisations. For future restructuring projects with bodies like the NHS, it should be a condition of HEFCE grant that the university is represented on the project management board.

Staffordshire and Keele: Transfer of Physics

Staffordshire University transferred its physics department to the University of Keele as part of a radical re-profiling and strengthening of its provision in science, engineering and technology. HEFCE provided £2,185,000 from R&CF, of which £150,000 was ear-marked for the physics transfer. We considered only the transfer element.

132. Context

Staffordshire. The post-1992 University has over 15,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students recruited nationally and internationally who are taught on one of the two main campuses: Stoke on Trent and Stafford. The Corporate Plan positions Staffordshire as a university with a commitment to:

- ◆ learners in the region
- ◆ widening participation
- ◆ the economic and cultural regeneration of the region.

Keele is a pre-1992 university and small by national standards. It was founded to promote interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary scholarship, and makes a distinctive contribution to higher education by emphasising the strength of a broad educational programme. It currently has 6,900 full and part-time students.

133. History

Staffordshire. The school of science was created in 1992/93 and has its roots in manufacturing industry. From the mid 1990s, recruitment to chemistry and physics began to decline in line with national patterns. A period of strategic planning for science resulted in the closure of chemistry and the redeployment of the majority of chemistry staff in new multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary areas linked to vocationally orientated programmes and to industry. This was not an option for physics, where work was largely in esoteric areas, with the emphasis on 'big physics.' There was little scope for developing closer relationships with employers or with local industry, as envisaged by the Corporate Plan. In Autumn 1999, the University initiated discussions with Keele on a transfer of physics as a self-contained unit.

Keele had recently merged physics and chemistry into a single school. Within physics, there were three key areas: astrophysics, condensed matters and modelling. The last area had taken a hit as key members had been recruited out. Keele needed to develop a strategy for developing a new group that would ensure the viability of physics as a whole. The options were:

- ◆ to buy out a whole group: this was too expensive
- ◆ to build a group around a single star: this takes too long and results in the wrong culture.

Instead, the head of school began informal discussions with Staffordshire on the possibility of merger. Academic staff established the principles by March 2000 and stood back for the management team to negotiate the detail. Staff changed employer on 1 December 2000 and moved to Keele in September 2001.

134. Costs

R&CF funded support in two areas:

- ◆ decommissioning and recommissioning the equipment, in particular, the nuclear physics facility; funding the transfer of other equipment and library stock
- ◆ short term compensation for loss of student funding.

Subsequently, Keele felt they had under-estimated the cost of the transfer and absorption of new staff, in particular:

- ◆ new IT provision for the transferees
- ◆ adequate marketing of the course: this had potential consequences for recruitment
- ◆ time to review and merge library stock
- ◆ the hidden costs of transferring students, including travel.

135. The Role of R&CF

R&CF was used primarily to address the broader issue of re-shaping engineering and technology provision at Staffordshire, but HEFCE agreed to fund the physics transfer as part of the restructuring. There were differing views about the significance of the funding:

- ◆ it strengthened the business case and allowed both institutions to take on risk
- ◆ it provided a clear framework within which to discuss transfer and enabled achievement of the important goal of providing additional numbers to Staffordshire
- ◆ it was important, but not critical:
 - ◆ Staffordshire would still have talked to Keele but the absence of R&CF might have made the outcome less favourable
 - ◆ Keele might, for instance, have taken only some members of staff
 - ◆ the only other option would have been to close the department
- ◆ it was important in making transferees feel they were going to equal, if not better facilities
- ◆ it had unforeseen benefits: in giving Keele the impetus to rationalise all its equipment and library provision, not just that being transferred
- ◆ it was 'a small but essential catalyst'; the transfer process is not straightforward and is hugely demanding of senior management time:

If there hadn't been a financial incentive we might have given up and done something else.

136. Benefits

The merger has undoubtedly strengthened the position of physics in the region, for teaching, research and postgraduate work; and has maintained student choice. This is in contrast to other areas of the country, where unilateral closure of physics departments has led to large gaps in provision. There have been tangential benefits as well, notably the opportunity for the department at Keele to evaluate its existing offer and develop in new ways.

137. Obstacles

The staff have been transferred successfully and the merged department is recruiting reasonably well, guaranteeing continued access to physics in the region in the immediate future. There are two remaining issues:

- ◆ **Recruitment.** There is a continuing risk of a shortfall in student numbers. The two sides have now negotiated an agreement to share that risk, but this does not guarantee that recruitment will match expectations.
- ◆ **Cultural differences.** Keele staff are used to working on their own with little guidance. The former Staffordshire team were used to working within a clearly defined School strategic plan with well-defined outcomes and tasks managed by the Dean and the School Management Team. An 'away day' is planned to tackle these differences.

Other obstacles emerged during the process. These were significant, but have largely been overcome and they seem unlikely to jeopardise the success of the merged department:

- ◆ a **perceived** mismatch in commitment and expectations:

- ◆ both sides had a perception that the other was not affording a high enough priority to the transfer and that it was more important to them than to the other side
- ◆ in reality, commitment appears to have been equal on each side
- ◆ the departure of some of the senior staff at Keele led to some discontinuity of management:
 - ◆ combined with an inadequate degree of paperwork and record-keeping, this caused some problems in the later stages of the process
 - ◆ both management teams recognise with hindsight that it would have been helpful to have had more formal agreed notes of meetings
- ◆ the need to talk to staff about the move in advance of a guarantee of funding created uncertainty and lowered morale
- ◆ fundamental differences in basic terms and conditions, including pensions and pay, caused problems in grafting Staffordshire staff on to Keele pay scales
- ◆ differences in staff management practices, including promotion criteria, made it difficult to negotiate the positioning of transferees within the new department.

138. Success Factors

The single most important factor identified by interviewees was academic 'fit.' They believed that even staff transfers across the country, which carry high transaction costs and are disruptive on a personal level, are potentially valuable if there is a good academic match. Here, there was complementarity in:

- ◆ degree provision:
 - ◆ Staffordshire had an innovative single honours degree in which Keele saw an opportunity to expand their provision
 - ◆ Keele is one of the few departments to offer joint honours in physics
- ◆ research strengths:⁷
 - ◆ the Staffordshire physicists complemented existing provision at Keele.

Other factors critical to the success of this particular transfer were:

- ◆ openness in discussions between senior management and with academic staff and students: there were meetings with all students at the start of the process and on-going staff-student liaison groups
- ◆ key staff being transferred were:
 - ◆ enthusiastic
 - ◆ had management experience and strategic vision
 - ◆ were prepared to put personal issues on one side, to secure academic benefit
- ◆ a recent rating of 22 for both departments by QAA provided independent validation of the rightness of the match
- ◆ having a physicist on the management team at Keele, who understood the demands of the discipline, smoothed the process
- ◆ a track record of dialogue between the two universities over transacting business and academic planning facilitated debate— the two deputy Vice Chancellors have always recognised the value of talking issues through on a regular basis, despite staff changes

7 The department at Keele was rated 3a in 2001.

- ◆ geographical proximity means both sides are acutely aware of the regional agenda and are sensitive to it
- ◆ 'The imperative was nicely reciprocal': physics was not going to flourish at Staffordshire, while Keele needed to boost its own department
- ◆ the transferees took large EPSRC grants with them, which oiled the wheels
- ◆ physics was an autonomous research unit and could be transferred as a single entity: this made the process less painful
- ◆ TUPE was significant in providing a framework for agreement amidst all the differences in terms, conditions, management styles and culture
- ◆ transferring staff to a new building at Keele (funded by HEFCE capital project money) provided added commitment to the project:
 - ◆ staff took the exercise seriously
 - ◆ being in a single building will also help to reduce cultural differences: everyone will be part of one research space.

139. Future

The merged department is part of a new school, which is seeking a new identity and higher profile. It has good public engagement in science and widening participation programmes but needs to embed these in a broader strategy for regional development, working with Staffordshire. In particular, it needs to demonstrate that its offer is relevant to local students and the local ceramics industry, currently in decline. It remains to be seen whether the merged department can offer courses that are sufficiently attractive and relevant to local applicants and employers, and will buck the national trend in recruitment to physics.

Federal University of Surrey

140. Background

The Federal University of Surrey, established in January 2000, is a collaboration to advance academic development between two HEIs, which remain autonomous, and separately managed and funded. It builds on an existing association, dating to the late 1970s. R&CF contributed £50,000 to the costs of planning the federation.

141. Context

The **Roehampton Institute** was created in 1975 by the federation of four colleges, two of which had adjoining sites. The colleges' original missions were exclusively teacher training but although the Faculty of Education remains important, the Institute has diversified. Roehampton has eight formal associations with other institutions, mostly in education and counselling.

The **University of Surrey** was established at Guildford in 1966, around the Battersea College of Technology, which transferred to the new site. It retains a strong vocational ethos. From its foundation, the University fostered links with other institutions in the region, including Roehampton. It has 12 formal links, mostly with colleges of further and/or higher education.

There are similarities and differences between the two institutions:

- ◆ **student numbers:** Surrey 7,719 FTE students, Roehampton 6,207 FTE (1999/2000)
- ◆ **student type:** Surrey 35% postgraduates, 33% part-time; Roehampton 13% postgraduates (including PGCE) 16% part-time
- ◆ **disciplines:** there is broad complementarity:
 - ◆ Roehampton is strong in the humanities, education, art and design, and languages
 - ◆ Surrey is strong in law, mathematics, engineering, and physical sciences, subjects allied to medicine, and business studies
- ◆ **undergraduate degrees:** in the five fields where both institutions offer undergraduate degrees (dance, sociology, modern languages, psychology and music) there are material differences in approach
- ◆ **teaching:** Roehampton's teaching is more modular
- ◆ **research:** in the 2001 RAE Roehampton submitted 45% staff as research active and had 9% graded 5; Surrey submitted 81% as research active and had 60% graded 5.

142. History

*It is a way ahead that makes a great deal of sense and I hope that it will be a model for the development of similar flexible partnerships in other parts of the higher education sector.*⁸ (Dearing, 1997)

Understanding the history of the federation is important. The association dates to the early 1980s when the University of London withdrew from validating teacher training colleges. From validation, the association was progressively strengthened:

- ◆ 1983: Surrey commences validation of Roehampton courses
- ◆ 1991: Roehampton granted accreditation powers
- ◆ 1993: following QAA review, Roehampton granted taught degree awarding powers
- ◆ 1995: Roehampton designated an Institute of the University of Surrey and academic planning and cooperation initiated

⁸ Surrey/Roehampton report to HEFCE, June 2001, quoting a letter of July 1998 from Sir Ron Dearing to the Vice Chancellor and Rector.

- ◆ 1996: the Vice Chancellor of Surrey and the Rector of Roehampton established a joint group of senior staff to explore models for academic collaboration:
 - ◆ the institutions consulted HEFCE, the DfEE, the Privy Council and the QAA to keep them informed, seek their advice and gauge their reaction to options under discussion
 - ◆ internal consultations revealed little staff hostility
- ◆ 1998: again following QAA review, Roehampton was granted research degree awarding powers.

By 1998, Roehampton had the option of seeking independent university status. It had realised however, that it would be a small institution, with a limited range of disciplines, competing with other universities and colleges in Greater London. Instead, it decided to pursue with Surrey the options for closer association. From the start, the emphasis was on academic collaboration for academic benefit.

143. External Developments

The project was given added impetus through external developments:

- ◆ the Dearing Inquiry into Higher Education reported in July 1997; it recommended that Funding Councils, Research Councils and the QAA should seek to encourage, not inhibit, collaboration with a strong academic or financial rationale⁹
- ◆ Surrey had been reviewing its approach to regional collaboration, and in Spring 1998, the University Council approved a strategy for the development of partnerships and strategic alliances with complementary institutions, especially based on existing links, which would widen Surrey's recruitment base and graduate output.

144. The Collaboration Process

In summer 1998, the Councils and Senates of the two institutions formally approved the proposal for a federal partnership. The institution heads set a target date of 1 January 2000 for its implementation, and planning work moved into a higher gear. The institutions:

- ◆ established a Joint Board to oversee the work
- ◆ kept staff and students informed and involved through newsletters and seminars
- ◆ continued consultation with national bodies, particularly the Privy Council: importantly, in August 1998, the Privy Council agreed in principle that the federation could be established by means of amending Surrey's Royal Charter
- ◆ secured outside advice from:
 - ◆ management consultants on the constitutional framework
 - ◆ solicitors on the legal framework
- ◆ agreed that the performance of the federation would be subject to review by the QAA two years after its inception.

145. Role of R&CF

At this quite late stage, HEFCE offered a contribution of £50,000 from R&CF to the costs of planning the collaboration:

- ◆ in recognition of the potential significance of the federal partnership to other HEIs
- ◆ on condition that Federal University produce a report on the establishment of the Federation, to be published by HEFCE for the benefit of the sector as a whole.

9 Dearing: Recommendations 68 and 69.

146. Federation

The process itself took just over a year:

- ◆ December 1998: the Joint Board agreed a detailed framework for academic federation, approved by the two institutions' Councils and Senates
- ◆ January 1999: Privy Council and DfEE gave their approval to the necessary changes of the formal institutional statutes and of the change of title to University of Surrey Roehampton, with effect from 1 January 2000
- ◆ December 1999: the institutions signed the deed of federation
- ◆ 1 January 2000: the Federation came into formal existence and was launched at three events.

147. Aims and Objectives

The Federal Partnership is first and foremost an academic collaboration. Its objectives do not limit in any way the status of either Surrey or Roehampton as autonomous HEIs which:

- ◆ are separately funded
- ◆ employ their own staff
- ◆ manage their property
- ◆ admit their own students using similar admissions criteria (while students at both institutions continue to study for University of Surrey degrees).

Surrey/Roehampton Federation objectives are to:

- ◆ exploit opportunities arising from complementary and overlapping academic provision
- ◆ harmonise academic policies and practices relevant to the University of Surrey degree
- ◆ compete more effectively in the higher education market
- ◆ sustain the standard and reputation of the Surrey degree and other awards
- ◆ collaborate in the provision of academic support services
- ◆ permit other institutions to evolve in relation to the federation.

Figure 22. Objectives of the Federation

148. Activities and Outputs

The federation project was driven by strategic objectives. Among its proponents there was seemingly no agenda, open or secret, to achieve specific collaborations such as rationalisation of course provision, joint research or combined support services. Rather, there was a belief that creating a framework and encouraging a culture for collaboration would encourage actual collaborative projects. Over the first two years, the following have emerged as examples of practical collaboration:

- ◆ staff exchanges to bring new teachers into existing courses, including science staff at Surrey contributing to teacher training at Roehampton; joint PhD supervision, seminars and access to resources
- ◆ joint developments drawing on expertise and resources in both institutions, including a new Federal BA in Local History, joint research proposals in francophone studies, a common senior staff development programme and the development of distance learning
- ◆ mutual assistance, including supporting staff membership of the Institute of Learning and Teaching and marketing conference facilities at both institutions.

The institutions reviewed progress in practical collaboration at the end of 2000. Subsequently, the Vice Chancellor and Rector secured support for 12 targets for the development of the Federal University to be achieved by

September 2004, and assigned responsibility to nominated staff members from both institutions to pursue each of these strategic targets.

Federation Targets to 2004

- ◆ launch at least two jointly taught degree courses
- ◆ share staff development
- ◆ conduct joint research in at least three fields
- ◆ undertake federal market research and marketing campaigns
- ◆ draw up a federal communication strategy for internal staff and students, external stakeholders and prospective students
- ◆ develop shared video conferencing and IT systems
- ◆ harmonise academic policies and regulations
- ◆ collaborate on planning
- ◆ co-ordinate widening participation activity
- ◆ jointly promote regional links through the Surrey Higher Education Forum (which brings together the colleges associated with Surrey and Roehampton)
- ◆ develop a policy for associated institutions, foundation degrees and membership of the Federal University
- ◆ forge stronger links between the two institutions' students.

Figure 23. Federation Targets to 2004

149. Governance and Management

The formalities of federation required the creation of new federal institutions of governance to complement those existing and continuing for Surrey and Roehampton. These are:

- ◆ The **Federal Senate**, chaired by the Vice Chancellor of Surrey, meeting three times yearly; with 25 members, drawn largely from the Senates of the two institutions in the proportions of two-thirds Surrey, one-third Roehampton reflecting the fact that the federation has been brought about through amendments to the University of Surrey's Royal Charter.
- ◆ The **Federal Standing Committee**, also meeting three times yearly; responsible for monitoring, guiding and advising the Council on the operation of the federal arrangements; chaired by a Pro-Chancellor, with 10 members drawn equally from the Councils of the two institutions and including academic members.
- ◆ The **Federal Strategic Academic Planning Committee**, created to promote the academic development of the federation, meeting termly; chaired by the Surrey Vice Chancellor for its first two years and the Roehampton Rector now. Its membership comprises 20 members in equal numbers of senior academic and management staff of both institutions.

Day to day management rests with a Federal Secretariat. This has been kept slim to avoid creating a parallel bureaucracy and, in expression of the spirit of the federation, to facilitate and encourage, rather than direct, collaboration. The Deputy Secretary of the University of Surrey acts as Secretary of the Federation, assisted by a nominated Professor and administrator from each institution. All work part time for the Federation, a total of six person days a week. Other staff—for example, in the Registry and in Marketing and Public Affairs—also undertake federal responsibilities as part of their normal duties.

150. Costs and Benefits

The direct costs of creating the federation were around £100,000, mostly for professional fees and launch events. This excludes staff time, which we cannot estimate. The HEFCE grant contributed £50,000, the rest came from institutional funds. The two institutions each bear their own administrative costs for the continuing federal arrangements. But they have created an

annual budget of £200,000 for the support of collaboration, including federal staff costs. This can cover a range of expenses from catering at meetings and seminars to funding a team to develop a collaborative project. There appear to be no significant economies yet from federation, but there are benefits in strengthening and expanding the portfolio of learning and research opportunities on offer in the two institutions.

151. Success Factors

There are a number of specific factors critical to the success of the federation:

- ◆ external pressures, especially inter-HEI competition in Greater London and the South East, were an essential stimulus to collaboration
- ◆ complementarity of strengths and expertise in the two institutions fosters a win-win prospect; were they competing for students or research funding, prospects would be less favourable
- ◆ trust and mutual respect at the most senior level is a necessary condition but it cannot be sufficient: continuing collaboration must be maintained by a commitment throughout the two institutions, and that commitment has to be nurtured with extra resources and practical help for collaboration
- ◆ the development of a Federal Innovation Fund to provide small grants to academic staff for collaborative projects
- ◆ the role of independent agents was critical:
 - ◆ the QAA (a condition of DfEE approval) in reviewing academic quality outcomes
 - ◆ respected professional advisers (management consultants and solicitors) to focus thoughts on collaborative objectives, structures and processes
- ◆ federation offers a model for an equal partnership whereas mergers are usually a takeover of one by the other; this helps to lower sensitivities and reduce suspicion.

152. Obstacles

The geography of the collaboration—the two sites are 22 miles distant—is an absolute constraint on student mobility and a relative constraint on staff mobility.

153. Prospects

The federation has only existed formally for two years. Initially the leaders of the two institutions adopted a relatively hands-off, facilitative approach to practical collaborations within the Federation, recognising the need for cultural change. Now they wish to increase the pace, by:

- ◆ identifying priorities for collaboration
- ◆ setting targets for achieving them.

In the immediate future, the federation faces the QAA review in Autumn 2002. The QAA have agreed that this will focus on the arrangements established to fulfil the role of the federation, in particular, how responsibilities for quality and standards are being discharged. Beyond 2002, there are possibilities for:

- ◆ **deepening:** this could involve the reordering of teaching and/or research provision in the two institutions as well as the integration of support services; this would move the federation beyond a purely academic collaboration and arguably offer gains in both effectiveness and economy
- ◆ **widening:** this would mean bringing in new partners, either from among the colleges currently associated with Roehampton or Surrey (and the federal constitution has provision for this) or possibly other neighbouring HEIs.

It remains to be seen whether the options are mutually exclusive.

Unis4ne: Universities for the North East

Universities for the Northeast (Unis4ne) is the association of the six universities in the region: the five campus universities of Durham, Newcastle, Northumbria, Sunderland and Teesside, and the Open University in the North. It builds on an existing collaboration, dating to 1983. After 1997, with the prospect of a new development agency in the region, the universities felt a need for a stronger regional voice. They created Unis4ne in December 1998 to be a more authoritative body with wider ranging interests. R&CF provided £75,000 over three years to fund a development programme to expand the association's role.

154. Context

The five campus universities have over 60,000 full and part-time students (measured as FTE). There are no HE colleges in the region but 6,000 students FTE are on HE courses in FE colleges. All five universities take their regional mission seriously and have created regional development offices. They have been particularly active in:

- ◆ securing HE participation in the region's EU programmes
- ◆ developing specialised facilities for local industry
- ◆ the newer HE reach-out schemes.

The region:

- ◆ is a net importer of students
- ◆ is a net exporter of graduates
- ◆ has a relatively small academic research base: in the 2001 RAE only three of the universities had staff rated 5 and 5*.

155. History

The association builds on existing links. In 1983, the two campus universities and the three (then) polytechnics established HESIN (Higher Education Support for Industry in the North). The Open University joined in 1988. HESIN:

- ◆ developed a successful Integrated Graduate Development Scheme (early 1990s)
- ◆ established the Knowledge House (1995), offering a single point of contact for business to access the expertise and resources in the region's universities.

156. Role of R&CF

It was something of a coincidence of timing that the association was looking to expand its role when the R&CF was established. Unis4ne received development funding from R&CF of £75,000 over the academic years 1999/2000 to 2003/04. In due course similar support was offered to all the new regional associations.

157. Aims and objectives

Unis4ne describes itself as:

A collaboration between the region's HE providers... to support economic and social regeneration wherever they can through links with industry, commerce, education/training, the arts, sport, leisure and the heritage sector, and to harness their national and international links for the benefits of the region.¹⁰

This outward-looking perspective was expressed in the choice of a new name: Universities for the Northeast.

10 Universities for the North East: A Resource for the Region, 1999.

158. Strategy

In the last three years the association has delivered its wider agenda, most significantly through its engagement with the work of the new regional development agency One North East (ONE):

- ◆ ONE and Unis4ne started work on the same day:
 - ◆ Professor Derek Fraser, the Teesside Vice Chancellor, was appointed a member of the agency's Board
 - ◆ Dr Jim Lewis from the University of Durham was recruited as the agency's HE liaison officer
- ◆ in October 1999 ONE published its Regional Economic Strategy 'Unlocking Our Potential' in which one of its six regional priorities was 'placing universities and colleges at the heart of the regional economy', it claims no other regional development agency has accorded such a pivotal role to HE
- ◆ in December 2000, ONE and Unis4ne signed a Compact to express and elaborate their shared commitment.

159. Projects

The association has continued the work of the Knowledge House, now in its sixth year. Among other projects are:

- ◆ **continuing professional development:** for university staff engaged in outreach work
- ◆ **Lifelong Learning Awards:** pilot programme in SMEs
- ◆ **widening participation:** analysis, research and a best practice audit partly funded by a joint award from HEFCE of £1.7 million over 2000-2002
- ◆ **graduate retention in the North East:** support for employers and business start ups funded by ONE
- ◆ **music:** development of HE activities associated with the new Gateshead Music Centre, funded by R&CF
- ◆ **seed capital fund:** venture capital for the exploitation of commercial opportunities emanating from the region's universities
- ◆ **Teaching Company Scheme:** promotion of its graduate industrial placements in the region.

These initiatives have typically originated with one institution, which has seen the value in pursuing them collectively and has taken the lead. Participation has varied but most universities are involved in all projects. Funding comes variously from the European Commission, HEFCE, the RDA, Unis4ne itself and the member universities.

160. Continuing Work

Additional to its project work, the association has operated as:

- ◆ a forum for discussion of common concerns, particularly external pressures on the regional universities
- ◆ a network for exchanging good practice
- ◆ a broker in developing regional bids for funding schemes; examples are:
 - ◆ HE involvement in regional programmes under the EU's structural funds
 - ◆ a successful joint bid to the Arts and Humanities Research Board for the establishment of a North East of England History Institute (NEEHI)
 - ◆ bids to the DTI Science Enterprise Challenge Fund and the HEFCE HE Innovation Fund
 - ◆ co-ordinated bids for extra student numbers.

The universities continue to take unilateral action alongside the work of Unis4ne, particularly in science and technology, where the individual universities have diverse strengths and competition for funds is intense.

161. Governance

There is a four-tier structure of governance:

- ◆ the Board, comprising the Vice Chancellors of the universities, meeting quarterly, which provides strategic direction for the association and approves new projects
- ◆ an Executive, of mostly Pro Vice Chancellors, also meeting quarterly, which prioritises and develops the association's work programme; this is the level which drives the association
- ◆ standing committees on thematic issues: education and training, Europe, business and enterprise, sports, culture, lifelong learning, which steer existing and potential collaborations in their fields; an additional science and technology committee has been mooted
- ◆ project management committees.

162. Management

Unis4ne is a distributed organisation:

- ◆ its core staff comprises a half time manager, whose other role is as Director of the Knowledge House project, and two full time assistants; their job is to:
 - ◆ manage the association's work programme
 - ◆ liaise with the member HEIs
 - ◆ represent the association to outside interests
 - ◆ service the governing bodies
- ◆ another seven staff work individually on association projects:
 - ◆ all are on fixed term contracts, with the University of Newcastle upon Tyne acting as formal employer
 - ◆ most work in the association's offices.
- ◆ about 70 staff in the member HEIs are involved in some degree with the work of Unis4ne, plus others in local business, the RDA and local government.

163. Costs and Benefits

This year, the cost of Unis4ne was £166,000: core staff salaries, rent and administrative costs. This was covered by:

- ◆ £31,000 income from member subscriptions (£6,000 pa from each of the campus universities, £1,000 from the Open University)
- ◆ £25,000 from the HEFCE R&CF Fund
- ◆ £110,000 from management charges on the separately funded projects.

These costs do not cover the time and materials contributed by the staff of member universities and other organisations, which were impossible to estimate within the scope of the case study. Against the costs of funding the collaboration needs to be set the additional revenue from project funding. Unis4ne estimates that, since 1989 it (and HESIN as its predecessor) has helped to lever £13 million of extra funding into the region's universities. It is not clear how much of this income might have accrued to the universities in the absence of a regional association. Nor is it clear what has been the trade-off between the transaction costs of collaboration and the likely benefits.

164. Success Factors

We identify the following factors as contributors to the success of this particular association:

- ◆ a strong regional identity combined with a small number of HE players (only five universities and no colleges) makes collaboration more feasible; there is greater cohesion among the players and fewer cultural and other differences to overcome
- ◆ high level empathy and trust have been critical; four of the universities have new Vice Chancellors; their appointment transformed the commitment to collaboration

In the future, success will be increasingly dependent on:

- ◆ agreed criteria and ground rules for preferring collective over individual initiative
- ◆ a strong executive to manage the association's initiatives.

165. Obstacles

There have been instances in the past that have caused resentment among member institutions, including where one broke ranks after initial agreement to work on a co-ordinated bid. Tensions have also arisen from:

- ◆ the apparent wish of the RDA to work with HE exclusively through the association
- ◆ the role seemingly accorded to the agency by government, of adjudicating on individual institutions' bids to national programmes.

The major concern within the association now is that its structure may be impeding its development in the changing context of higher education, science, cultural and regional policies. The need is to move from operating in a largely responsive and opportunistic mode to one that is more strategic and pro-active in relation to regional and national agendas. In this case:

- ◆ more academic and other staff in the universities must become more committed to collaboration: a major cultural change
- ◆ there must be greater clarity about the circumstances in which collaboration, rather than individual initiative, is the appropriate way forward.
- ◆ the association's priorities need to become less driven by external funders, more consequent on its own strategic agenda.
- ◆ greater dependence on institutional funding may mean that institutions take the collaboration more seriously; university governors and managers may only start asking what they are getting or can get from collaboration, if funding the external association competes seriously with internal funding priorities.

166. Prospects

The policy context for collaboration is changing, in particular, the role of the Regional Development Agency. From 2002, it will have one block grant from government (the 'single pot'), to replace the present multiple funding streams and far more discretion over its regional expenditure. As a result:

- ◆ there is likely to be increased sectoral and spatial competition for public funding within the region
- ◆ the RDA might become selective in its investments in the region's HEIs: there is already a proposal for resourcing a limited number of centres of research excellence.

The association is proposing a new stage of development to anticipate the external changes and strengthen the position of the HE sector. Unis4ne propose to appoint both a full-time Executive Secretary and full-time posts in each institution, to work together on developing and delivering this more ambitious programme. The proposal is for the new structure, at least in its early years, to be funded equally by the universities (at a much increased level) and the R&CF, with a small contribution from the Regional Development Agency. Under this new phase, potential future collaborations could include:

-
- ◆ more openness and consultation on institutional planning
 - ◆ greater cooperation in student recruitment, bidding for extra student places, promoting learning in the region and forecasting
 - ◆ more joint projects in research, teaching, learning support and infrastructure.

List of Interviewees for Case Studies

CADISE

Professor Gary Crossley, Principal, Central School of Speech & Drama, Chairman, CADISE

Ms Bethan O'Neil, Administrative Director, CADISE

Professor Rod Bugg, Principal, Wimbledon School of Art

Professor Robin Baker, Director, Ravensbourne College of Design & Communication

Professor Elaine Thomas, Director, The Surrey Institute of Art & Design

Professor Vaughan Grylls, Principal, Kent Institute of Art & Design

Mr Gavin Henderson, Principal, Trinity College of Music

Collaboration Programme for Modern Languages

Programme level

Professor David Robey, School of Modern Languages, University of Reading, programme convenor

Professor Mike Kelly, Director, LTSN Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, School of Modern Languages, University of Southampton (former Chair, UCML)

Mrs Hilary Footitt, Department of Modern and Medieval Languages, University of Cambridge, Chair, UCML

Liz Ashurst, Manager LTSN Subject Centre, School of Modern Languages, University of Southampton

Dr Paul Martin, TQEF National Coordination Team (NCT), Centre for Higher Education Practice, Open University.

Dr John Selby, HEFCE Regional Consultant

Project leaders

Professor Peter Barta, Head of Russian Studies, University of Surrey

Professor Diane Blakemore, School of Modern Languages, University of Salford

Professor Theo Hermans, Professor of Dutch and Comparative Literature, University College London

CUC

Professor John Inkson, Pro Vice-Chancellor, University of Exeter

Mr Phil McVey, Government Office for the South West

Mr Gordon Kelly, Co-ordinator, CUC

Dr Ken Woodcock, Vice-Principal, Cornwall College

Professor Les Ebdon, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University of Plymouth

Mr Stephen Bohaine, South West Regional Development Agency

Professor Alan Livingston, Principal, Falmouth College of Arts

Dr Alan Stanhope, Principal, Cornwall College

CCC

Dr Arthur Naylor, Principal, St Mary's College, and Chairman of CCC 1999-2001

Dr Dick Fisher, CCC Development Officer

Liz Coombs, CCC Secretary

Dr Bernadette Porter, Rector and Chief Executive of Roehampton Institute (three of its colleges are members)

Ms Kate Murray, HEFCE Regional Consultant

Dr John Rea, Principal, College of St Mark and St John, Plymouth, and Chairman of CCC 1997-1999

Mr Philip Robinson, Principal, University College, Chichester, and Chairman of CCC 2001-2003

Dr David Langford, Principal, Westminster Institute of Education, Oxford Brookes University (formerly Westminster College)

Professor Paul Light, Principal, King Alfred's College, Winchester

Leeds Law Library Collaboration

Ms Jan Wilkinson, Head Librarian, University of Leeds

Elizabeth Kensler, CASE project manager, University of Leeds

Mr Brian Clifford, Chair of CASE steering group, University of Leeds

Leicester Warwick Medical School

Professor John Lauder, Dean, Leicester Warwick Medical School

Professor Malcolm McCrae, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Warwick

Professor Stewart Petersen, Head of Medical Education, Leicester Medical School, University of Leicester

Mr Chris Lindsay, Registrar, Leicester Warwick Medical School

Mr Andrew Smith, Finance Manager, Registrar, Leicester Warwick Medical School

Sheffield Women's Hospital

Dr Peter Hayward, Head of Estates Planning, University of Sheffield

Mr Malcolm Hodgkinson, Acting Head of Estates Design, University of Sheffield

Mr Derek Lowe, Building Design Manager, University of Sheffield

Mr Colin MacConnachie, Head of Estates, Royal Hallamshire Hospital

Professor Harry Moore, Department of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, University of Sheffield

Professor Bob Boucher, Vice-Chancellor, University of Sheffield

Staffordshire and Keele

Dr Susan O'Brien, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Staffordshire University

Professor Brigid Heywood, Professor of Inorganic Chemistry, Head of Physics and Chemistry, University of Keele

Professor Pat Robotham, Dean of School of Sciences, Staffordshire University

Dr Craig Adam, Department of Physics, Keele University

Dr Mike Bentley, Department of Physics, Keele University

Mr Steve Bloor, Personnel Director, Staffordshire University

Unis4ne

Mr Alan Sanderson, Manager, Unis4ne

Professor Derek Fraser, Vice Chancellor, University of Teesside, member of Unis4ne Board, member of the Regional Development Agency 1998-2001

Professor John Goddard, Deputy Vice Chancellor, University of Newcastle, member of the Unis4ne Executive

Mr John Dersley, Director of Regional Development, University of Newcastle

Dr Jim Lewis, NE Regional Development Agency

Mr Derek Hicks, HEFCE Regional Consultant

Sir Kenneth Calman, Vice Chancellor, University of Durham, Chair of Unis4ne

Professor Peter Fidler, Vice Chancellor, University of Sunderland, Member of Unis4ne Board

Professor Tony Dickson, Pro Vice Chancellor, University of Northumbria at Newcastle

University of Bradford/Bradford College

Professor Colin Mellors, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of Bradford

Mr Chris Toft, Project Officer, University of Bradford

Mr Alan Sutton, Project Officer, Bradford College

Dr Gordon Lakin, Director of Academic Programmes, Bradford College

University of Essex/South East Essex College

Mr Tony Pitcher, Chief Executive, South East Essex College

Mr Russel Pearson, Director of Curriculum (HE), South East Essex College

Liz Rushton, Director of Personnel, South East Essex College

Dr Tony Rich, Registrar and Secretary, University of Essex

Gill Statham, Project Officer, University of Essex

Federal University of Surrey

Dr Bernadette Porter, Rector and Chief Executive, University of Surrey Roehampton

Dr Peter Weston, Pro Rector (Academic), University of Surrey Roehampton

Mr Andrew Skinner, Academic Secretary, University of Surrey Roehampton

Peter Beardsley, Academic Registrar, University of Surrey, and Secretary, Federal Senate

Mr James Strawson, Deputy Secretary, University of Surrey, and Secretary of the Federation

Annex: Higher Education Sector Strategy Committee

167. Members

Mr Dick Coldwell (Chair, from summer 2001) HEFCE Board member
 Lord Sutherland (Chair until summer 2001) Vice-Chancellor, University of Edinburgh
 Professor John Tarrant, Vice-Chancellor, University of Huddersfield
 Ms Caroline Neville, Principal, Norwich City College of Further and Higher Education
 Professor Roderick Floud, Vice-Chancellor, London Metropolitan University
 Dr David Potter, Chairman, Psion plc
 Mr Tony Evans, Headteacher, Kings College School, Wimbledon
 Professor Eileen Baker, Principal, Bishop Grosseteste College
 Professor Alan Livingstone, Principal, Falmouth College of Art
 Professor David Vandelinde, Vice-Chancellor, University of Warwick
 Ms Marilyn Gallyer (appointed summer 2001), Vice-Provost, University College London
 Mr Graham Garbutt (appointed summer 2001), Regional Director Government Office for the West Midlands
 Professor Chris Edwards (appointed summer 2001), Vice-Chancellor, University of Newcastle
 Mr Mike Collier, Chief Executive, One North East
 Mr Stephen Marston (until June 2002), Director for Institutions, HEFCE
 Mr Rama Thirunamachandran (from June 2002), Acting Director for Institutions, HEFCE

168. Secretariat

Mr Rama Thirunamachandran (Secretary), Institutions and Projects Directorate, HEFCE
 Miss Sue Vaudin (Asst Secretary) Institutions and Projects Directorate, HEFCE

169. Terms of reference

1. To inform the Board on strategic issues not directly addressed by other HEFCE Committees. The SSC has a wide remit, as defined in its terms of reference:
 - a. To advise the HEFCE Executive on the desirable shape of the higher education sector, and in particular:
 - i. How to support a diverse range of higher education institutions both nationally and regionally, while maximising value for money and international competitiveness.
 - ii. How to maintain an appropriate distribution of higher education provision across the country, including at the regional and sub-regional level.
 - iii. How HEFCE should develop and implement policy for higher education at the regional and sub-regional level.
 - iv. The use of funds for restructuring institutions, and for supporting alliances and collaboration.
 - b. To advise on other matters as requested by the Board and the HEFCE Executive.
2. To provide an annual report of the Committee's work to the board.

List of Abbreviations

CPD	Continuing professional development
DfEE	Department for Education & Employment (now the Department for Education and Skills)
EU	European Union
FE	Further education
FEI	Further education institution
FTE	Full-time equivalent
HE	Higher education
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEI	Higher education institution
LTSN	Learning and Teaching Support Network
MASN	Maximum student number
NCT	National Coordination Team
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
R&CF	Restructuring and Collaboration Fund
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
RDA	Regional Development Agency
SME	Small to medium-sized enterprise
TQEF	Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund
TTA	Teacher Training Agency