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## Glossary of key terms as used in this study

**Collaboration**
an agreement between two or more organisations to work together in a specific activity for mutual benefit; this can involve a wide range of institutional and legal requirements.

**Governance**
‘... organisational responses to legislation, regulation and accountability ... The governing body is held ultimately accountable for the affairs of the institution and for ensuring that public funds received by an institution are used only in accordance with legislation, for delivering value for public money and for approving institutional strategic and financial plans.’ Governance includes assessing and mitigating risks, appointing the leader(s) of the institution and holding them to account; and ensuring the proper governance of collaborations.

**Leadership**
‘involves a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person [or group] over other people [or groups] to structure the relationships in a group or organisation.’ Bolden et al suggest that this definition ‘offers an acceptable definition of leadership [...] whilst leaving sufficient flexibility of application.’

**Management**
Mintzberg suggests leadership and management are ‘somewhat distinctive yet complementary processes, frequently carried out by the same people’.

### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPOS</td>
<td>Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AURIL</td>
<td>Association for University Research and Industry Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIHE</td>
<td>Council for Industry and Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuing Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Skills (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIF</td>
<td>Economic Challenge Investment Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE</td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCW</td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGM</td>
<td>Leadership, governance and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLN</td>
<td>Lifelong Learning Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRP</td>
<td>Natural Heritage Research Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEA</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIHR</td>
<td>National Institute for Health Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>Øresund Science Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Øresund University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Peer Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Strategic Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC</td>
<td>Scottish Funding Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPR</td>
<td>Scottish Institute for Policing Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLLN</td>
<td>South West Lifelong Learning Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UALL</td>
<td>University Association for Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEA</td>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYLLN</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1. Executive Summary

Introduction and context
This report examines and analyses collaborative activity between UK higher education institutions (HEIs) and organisations external to the higher education sector. HEIs have been developing collaborative relationships for many generations, and the scale and range of these activities have increased significantly in recent years. HEIs collaborate with a broad range of partners (such as industrial or commercial organisations, arts and cultural organisations, medical services and hospitals, research institutes, public agencies, international HEIs or other organisations). A variety of factors drive these collaborations in the UK (for example government policy, the ongoing internationalisation and globalisation of higher education and research, the growing privatisation of higher education). HEIs can take several approaches to collaboration, involving different activities, individuals and institutional levels – and they report a multitude of benefits and challenges. Collaborations enable HEIs to play a more effective role in the growth and development of knowledge-based economies and extend the scope of the activities which they carry out. There is evidence that collaborative activity is becoming more closely integrated into, and thus potentially prompting some changes to, the core structures, processes and strategic planning within HEIs. The findings from this report are based on a literature review, seven selected UK case studies and one European case:

1. Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre
2. INTO in London
3. Kaplan Open Learning
4. Northern Ireland Natural Heritage Research Partnership
5. Scottish Institute for Policing Research
6. Training Gateway
7. West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network
8. Øresund University and Øresund Science Region

Literature review
Literature on the leadership, management and governance of collaborative initiatives provides an important theoretical context for HEIs as they engage more widely in collaborative activity with a growing range of sectors and organisations. The following findings from the literature are particularly relevant.

Collaboration is a necessary response to 21st century operating conditions and the appearance of more complex, multifaceted challenges and goals, which require many organisations and individuals to respond. This is apparent across the public and many parts of the private sector – as well as within higher education. Beyond the necessity of collaboration, a number of benefits are offered to the participants and collaborating can help to increase competitive advantage.

Collaborations require individuals, teams and organisations to work alongside each other in the distinct environment of their collaborative venture; hierarchies of seniority, as well as who is ultimately responsible or accountable for what, may be unclear. A different set of ‘beyond authority’ methods and skills is useful when leading and managing collaboration successfully. Horizontal leadership is essential, as is using influence and establishing positive relationships with individuals at all levels, and from internal as well as external sources. In addition to adopting these subtler forms of leadership, other actions are crucial, for example gaining support and promoting the partnership externally through networks.

Leadership of collaborations works through structures and processes as well as through individuals. Outcomes of collaborations are significantly influenced by how the various processes and roles relate to each other and what boundaries have been set for discussion and activity.

The styles and skills required of leaders change depending on the stage of the collaboration, the types of problems which are being addressed and the individuals who are involved. Leaders may need to deploy many skills and styles simultaneously to deal with these requirements and with the changes they encounter from several directions – so some degree of flexibility is important.

Governance arrangements exist to manage the risks inherent in collaborations – this is particularly important in relation to HEIs’ commercial collaborations.

Summary of report findings
The report’s findings from the case studies, analysed in the light of the literature, present some clear pointers to the effective leadership of collaborations.

- Leadership in collaborations is essentially concerned with making things happen and focusing on purpose and outcomes. Theories of informal, shared or distributed leadership refer to this.

- Leadership can be exerted by individuals at different levels of seniority through influencing and negotiating as well as using positional power, and through their organisations’ systems and processes.

- Leaders within collaborations have to mobilise several types of skills and capabilities and adjust structures and processes; success is associated with a more flexible disposition to these factors.

- Leadership, governance and management within collaborations are unlikely to be distributed evenly (at
least in the early stages) and the distribution will fluctuate over time.

- The leadership hierarchies of the partner organisations may not be a suitable model for securing the effectiveness of a collaboration. Horizontal and ‘beyond authority’ methods may be more appropriate.

- Boundary-spanning roles are essential within collaborations; they ensure cooperation and communication and drive activities forward day-to-day. Individuals in these roles need well developed interpersonal skills and often use negotiation, brokering and influence to achieve results.

- The senior individuals involved at the very early stages of creating partnerships are responsible for building the support that is essential for the launch of their collaborations. They set the initial strategic direction and help to gain buy-in across the partner organisations and stakeholders.

- Open communication at all levels is an important responsibility for all participants in a collaboration, using formal and informal channels. This requires a commitment to sharing facts and ideas appropriately with colleagues, partners and stakeholders.

- Strong working relationships are essential within the collaborative team; these have to be proactively developed and maintained. Individuals need excellent interpersonal skills and should be capable of building and nurturing many different connections within the collaboration and outside it, with partners and stakeholders.

- The structures of the collaborative team itself and in the partners’ organisations, can cause friction, particularly if the partnership has to fit in quite closely with existing arrangements or is granted only limited autonomy. This can significantly affect the roles of leadership, governance and management, and the exercise of proper accountability, within the collaboration and in the partners’ organisations.

- Partners have to agree aims and expectations for their collaboration from the outset; this can take time and effort, but the process should help to develop valuable trust and avoid conflict later on.

- Building solid foundations for the partnership will help to ensure it can withstand challenges and conflicts. Experience of previous collaborative relationships and ‘doing your homework’ will help.

- Competition may occur between partners, particularly where two or more HEIs are participants within the same collaboration.

- Financial support for collaborations is a significant determinant of their effectiveness and progress. Those that use external grants may need to secure additional start-up capital or funds to underpin ongoing activities.

- The current financial climate is also affecting the sustainability of collaborations. Partners need to demonstrate yet more clearly the benefits and impacts that their joint efforts achieve, particularly given a focus on research and teaching activities.

- Collaborations have the potential to bring unanticipated and worthwhile innovations and benefits, such as creating new opportunities for teams and individuals to take initiatives, or to create a new research centre.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made for higher education institutions when embarking upon collaborative activity:

- Set clear guidelines about how collaboration will affect the individuals involved
- Ensure communications with partners and within the HEI are fit for purpose
- Ensure the institution sets a positive, supportive ‘climate’ for collaborative activity
- Ensure that lessons and outcomes from partnership working by the partners and from other collaborations elsewhere, are learnt and are fed back to the HEI and its partners, so as not to ‘re-invent the wheel’
- Make the most of the experience of setting up and running collaborations, which can also equip HEIs to boost the quality and effectiveness of other aspects of their organisation; leaders, managers and governors of HEIs are responsible for ensuring this knowledge transfer happens
- Actively consider the best options for moving forward where collaborations are successful
- Ensure individuals are encouraged and equipped with the information and skills crucial for effective collaborative working
- Ensure organisational processes, structures and systems are adjusted so as to enable more effective collaborative working
- Ensure solid governance arrangements, including alert attention to opportunities and risks
2. Introduction

In May 2010 RAND Europe was commissioned by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education to undertake an analysis of collaborative activity between higher education institutions (HEIs) in the UK and organisations external to the higher education sector.

This report presents the findings from this research. The introduction (Section 2) discusses the history and policy context of collaborative activity by UK HEIs, and outlines a typology through which to consider the scope of collaborative activity. The literature review (Section 3) provides a background for analysing leadership, management and governance in UK HEI collaborations. This is presented through a review of discussions of collaborative leadership, management and governance in higher education, business and management, and innovation literature. Section 5 presents a summary of the key findings and analysis from eight case studies of specific collaborations between HEIs and external collaborators. These case studies offer a range of collaborations from England, Scotland and Northern Ireland, some of which have the potential to transform HEI leadership, management and governance. The full case studies are available in Appendix A. Section 6 concludes with an analysis of cross-cutting themes and recommendations for practice.

2.1 Recent collaborative activity among HEIs follows on from a long history of joint working

Higher education institutions (HEIs) have been developing collaborative relationships for many generations, involving other higher education institutions (or HE providers) and organisations from other sectors. Internal motivations for doing so include a wish to increase the scale of teaching and research activities in current areas of strength, and to expand the range of teaching and research strengths. External circumstances that have encouraged some HEIs to form collaborations include political, economic and social factors such as economic regeneration, internationalisation and competition for limited public funding.

A study of higher education in OECD member states has drawn attention to four factors that are particularly likely to influence the future of higher education:

- Autonomy, funding and new providers.
- Mass education and the diversification of students.
- A more globalised and liberalised world and growing influence of the knowledge economy.
- Developments in information and communications technologies.

The need to demonstrate an economic rationale for higher education, and to make the rationale politically persuasive, has become particularly prominent in recent years. Some believe this focus risks neglecting the intellectual, cultural and broader social value that higher education continues to provide.

2.2 A range of types of collaboration is being developed

Many HEIs have turned to joint investments with industrial and commercial partners, to generate and expand profits earned by intellectual property associated with research activities. There are collaborations between HEIs and arts and cultural institutions, some of long standing. Many HEI medical schools have built relationships over time with their local NHS hospitals and primary care services, and there are many wider regional, national and international clinical health research consortia. Many HEI business schools collaborate with local firms and public agencies and third sector bodies on a wide range of teaching, training and brokerage initiatives. Student and staff international exchanges are well established, for teaching and research activities, and there is increasing coordination of educational and training qualifications, for example within the European Union (EU) and private sector collaborations. There is some evidence that private sector firms are seeking to play a larger part in higher education provision, particularly through language and foundation courses.

2.3 Collaborations can be organised by the type of activities targeted

It is impossible to be comprehensive in categorising the types of emerging collaborative activities in UK HE. Although the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) have provided some description of publicly funded collaborative research activity, this does not give a picture of the overall range of collaborations which can be formed with HE or non-HE organisations, which could be public, private, or not-for-profit and those involved within the HEI could be research groups, faculties or departments, or the institutional level leadership. Several research studies have sought to categorise HEI collaborations, based on the scope of institutional involvement (eg individual, department-specific, or involving more than one department/faculty) or the type of activities and outputs involved. There are other characteristics that could be considered when categorising collaborative activities.

---

4 A separate Leadership Foundation report examining collaborative working across higher education in Wales is being published alongside this report.
6 Geuna [2001] and Geuna et al [2003]
7 Kubler and Sayers [2010]
8 Oakley and Selwood [2010]
9 Fielden et al [2010]
10 Business and Community Interaction Survey: Interview.
11 see Fielden (2009)
with HEIs, such as objective(s), size, sector of collaborating organisations, or location.

To organise the collaborative activities discussed in this report, we have developed a typology containing seven categories, based on the primary purpose for collaborating and the activity in the HEI affected by the collaboration (eg teaching, research, consultancy, etc.) Clearly not a comprehensive categorisation, it simply offers one way to group the commonly recurring instances of collaborations, which currently exist in many variants within each of the types. This typology is based on the diversity of collaborative activity identified through expert interviews, case studies, and a literature review conducted for this report. The typology expands on work done by Fielden, which proposed three levels of collaboration:

- **Level One** – strategic from a whole-of-institution perspective; aiming to involve a wide range of faculties and departments; tends to be selected and promoted by top management.
- **Level Two** – initiated at faculty or departmental level.
- **Level Three** – one-to-one arrangements between individual academic staff or researchers.

It may be helpful to see the collaborations discussed in this report as mostly belonging to ‘Level One’, with some at ‘Level Two’. Our work also builds on work done by Fielden et al and HEFCE/HESA, but in our choice of case study we excluded categories of collaborations involving only HEIs. Hence the typology we propose here presents the activities involving HEIs and collaborators external to the HE sector.

The spectrum of institutional and legal arrangements employed by partners ranges widely, from the informal to the formal, the temporary to the time-limited to the long-term. Agreements to collaborate will contain various rights, responsibilities and duties for the leadership, management and governance of the collaboration, and by extension possibly for the senior managers, staff and governors in the participating institutions. The typology we have developed does not refer to formal structures and legal agreements, which we consider later in this report. However, it does provide an introduction to the type of activities at the centre of HEIs’ collaborative activities with organisations and groups external to the HE sector.

The vocabulary and usage in this domain have not yet settled. Various terms might be appropriate for institutional dimensions of the arrangements, and they may not always be used precisely. Terms currently include consortium, joint venture, strategic alliance, partnership, coalition, trading company, spin-off, offshore campus, consultancy service, merger or takeover, among others. The use of some of these terms may well vary over time and from place to place, partly reflecting fashions and trends in everyday language, partly the influence of comparable developments in other sectors, as well as the presence of policies and incentives to pursue particular forms and structures. In this report we use the generic term ‘collaboration’ and more specific terms in context as referred to in the wider literature or by participants.

The typology by ‘primary purpose for collaborating and activity in the HEI involved’ is listed below:

1. **Knowledge creation (research) collaborations** between HEIs and public and/or private partners to build critical mass in research capability, and to enhance profile and funding.
2. **Knowledge transfer collaborations (a) for service delivery** between HEIs, policy-makers and service providers to improve the take-up of academic research knowledge and skills for the benefit of policy and/or service users (eg Academic Health Science Centres in the NHS, Scottish Institute for Policing Research).
3. **Knowledge transfer collaborations (b) for private sector development**, including pharmaceutical, IT, and other manufacturing and service businesses, to assist the exploitation of intellectual property (eg Rolls Royce University Technology Centres); this can closely overlap with knowledge creation (research) partnerships as collaborations can promote both the development and transfer of knowledge.
4. **Collaborations in teaching and training, and degree awards** between HEIs, policy-makers, private providers and/or further education colleges to encourage participation in higher education by under-represented groups (eg Lifelong learning networks) or to expand training opportunities offered by the universities.
5. **Collaborations for student recruitment** between HEIs, private providers and/or community groups to assist the recruitment of international students to language and foundation courses leading to recruitment to mainstream university undergraduate and postgraduate courses (eg INTO in London).
6. **Collaborations to provide and/or develop infrastructure, facilities and equipment-related...**

---

12 Fielden et al (2010) categorise collaborations involving private providers of higher education, into those delivering academic content and awards, teaching international students, delivering content for university programmes, and other forms of academic support.
13 Fielden (2007)
14 Fielden et al (2010)
16 Huxham and Vangen (2000)
services between HEIs, public and/or private organisations to provide shared facilities (eg private student accommodation at Manchester Metropolitan University), or through shared use of facilities (eg the use of HEIs' digital media suites by private firms).

7. Community engagement and local regeneration collaborations between HEIs, policy-makers, local organisations and firms, and/or community groups to coordinate relationships in a city or region in order to create greater links and capacity to promote the locality (eg London Higher), contribute to economic regeneration (eg through the Universities Heads of the Valley Institute in Wales), or to respond to issues facing the locality (eg The Universities at Medway).

2.4 The number and diversity of collaborations with UK HEIs grew in the 1990s and 2000s

As we have said, collaborations between HEIs and their neighbours and communities are not new. Some suggest that HEIs emerged with a specific purpose to service a community and contribute to society, not as isolated ivory towers. Watson suggests that historically HEIs have engaged with their communities through the implications and effects of their research and teaching, and through specific contracts and joint arrangements (eg joint graduate programmes, R&D and consultancy, spin-out companies). However, from the 1990s, some observers perceive greater attention among more HEIs to forming collaborations with external partners, with a wider variety of organisations and types of arrangements.

This report deals mainly with strategic and more formally structured cases of collaboration, although of course collaborations do not need to be strategic (or formal) in order to be of value to HEIs.

2.5 UK higher education policies encourage collaborations and wider HEI engagement

UK central government policies and programmes through the 1990s and 2000s encouraged HEIs to engage more widely in economic development. The 1997 Dearing Report saw the role of higher education as creating a society committed to lifelong learning and widening participation in higher education in the UK. The report encouraged HEIs to support regional and local communities, while also undertaking internationally competitive work. Collaborations were further deemed central to the future of higher education in policy documents released after the 2001 general election. The White Paper *The Future of Higher Education* stated:

‘We believe that structured partnerships between colleges and universities – franchise or consortium arrangements with colleges funded through partner HEIs – will be the primary vehicles to meet these aims and will deliver the best benefits for learners.’

Such policies expected HEIs to engage more widely in society and the economy at local, regional and international levels. Higher education funding councils in the UK emphasise the importance of HEI collaborations and wider engagement. HEFCE’s strategic plan for 2006-11 expands its strategic aims to include employer engagement and skills, and suggests:

‘Our commitment to working in partnership with other funders, key stakeholders, and universities and colleges in England is central to the delivery of our vision. In doing so, we aim to recognise: the global and European context; national policy aims and priorities; HEIs’ individual aims and missions as autonomous bodies; our shared interest in delivering an excellent service to the nation; the needs of employers for the high-level skills required to compete in a global knowledge economy; the need and concerns of a much broader group of stakeholders, including direct and indirect beneficiaries of the services that the HE sector provides.’

With the 2010 Higher Education White Paper, one of the aims set out is to:

‘encourage greater collaboration between higher education institutions and employers to ensure that students gain the knowledge and skills they need to embark on rewarding careers.’

and the paper asks ‘universities […] to look again at how they work with business across their teaching and research activities’. In addition to the benefit for students and businesses of these collaborations, the paper sets out an

---

17 Watson [2008]
18 QAA [2010]
19 Dearing Report [1997]
20 UK DfES [2003] p62
21 See Parry [2006]
22 Leitch, S. [2006]
23 HEFCE [2009] para 34, p9
24 Browne, J. [2010] p33
expectation that collaborating in aspects such as ‘buying’ should be considered to help improve efficiency. A more detailed review into ‘how to make the UK the best place in the world for university-industry collaboration’ will be released later on in 2011 – so this clearly remains a key priority.

The Welsh Assembly Government’s strategy for higher education For Our Future26 and the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales’ corporate strategy for 2010-11 to 2012-1327 both state the importance of Welsh HEIs’ supporting social and economic development in Wales while remaining internationally competitive.28 The corporate strategy suggests collaboration can help to meet its strategic aims and make higher education more accessible.29 Similarly, promoting a regional and international perspective, the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) includes global engagement and engagement with Scotland’s priority industries, and public and third sectors in its vision for higher education. The Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland includes widening participation, knowledge transfer, and international activity in its higher education and research policy.30

2.6 Higher education has already become more internationally focused and competitive

UK HEIs engage in a variety of activities (research, student exchange, consultancy) with organisations internationally. Fielden31 reviewed the scope of international collaborations with UK HEIs and found that collaborations occur at multiple levels: strategic collaborations requiring senior management buy-in, collaborations within a faculty or department, and one-to-one individual collaborations.

Research expertise and resources are expanding regionally and internationally. HEIs have become more international in their scope and presence, for several reasons. This move towards international partnerships could be linked to a variety of political, economic, social and technological changes, including: student mobility programmes such as the European Commission’s ERASMUS mobility programme, applications for funding, and the desire for excellence.32 Internationalisation can direct attention towards further possibilities for overseas collaboration. Policies may not necessarily promote international collaborations explicitly, but they have removed barriers to setting-up and engaging in collaborative activity between UK HEIs and organisations internationally.33

HEIs are facing a wider range of organisations involved in providing and supporting higher education. Private providers are becoming involved in delivering academic content, providing academic support and sometimes in offering degrees, both individually and collaboratively with HEIs.34 In addition to increasing international engagements in higher education, this wider range of participants involved in supporting and delivering higher education in the UK offer still wider opportunities for competition and collaboration with HEIs.

2.7 Recent trends suggest the scale of collaborations and their integration into HEI activities are growing

Collaborations involving HEIs are likely to necessitate the acquisition and use of a broader range of skills, knowledge and capabilities in order for leadership, management and governance to be fit for purpose. The way academic and other staff at different levels in the collaborating organisations become involved in leadership, management and governance roles is therefore crucial.

Over the past ten years, the scale and profitability of HE collaborations seems to have risen, beyond growth explained simply by the increase in the number of HEIs. The policy context and emphasis is shifting too, with more attention on strategic and sustainable relationships, and more rhetoric on collaboration and cooperation.35 The collaborations usually require the participating HEIs to adjust aspects of their constitutions and/or to modify aspects of their leadership, management and governance arrangements in order to accommodate the relationships appropriately and legally. HEIs may have to compromise on some of the institutional benefits they would like to achieve, in order to secure agreement with the other parties. Industry-HEI collaborative centres created to exploit commercial returns from original research often require governance frameworks that span the sectors’ structural and legal boundaries; as a result, academics in leadership have to act as entrepreneurs, researchers, administrators and gatekeepers.

26 WAG [2009]
27 HEFCW [2010]
28 WAG [2009], HEFCW [2010]
29 Please also see the separate Leadership Foundation report into Higher Education Collaborations in Wales
30 http://www.delni.gov.uk/index/further-and-higher-education/higher-education.htm
31 Fielden [2009]
32 Rudzki [1995]
33 Fielden [2009]
34 Woodfield et al [2009]
35 Fielden et al [2010]
36 The Higher Education – Business and Community Interaction Survey finds that the total income from publicly funded collaborative research, as well as from contract research, continuing professional development and CE, and IP continued to rise between 2003-04 and 2008-09 http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2010/10_14/10_14.pdf
37 Woodfield et al [2009]
A study by the Council for Industry and Higher Education (CIHE) found a further type of shift, in HEI collaborations with businesses, which increasingly go beyond an HEI-developed technology being incorporated into commercial products, to re-engineering of the production process itself. The study found that ‘… technology-based companies may not need assistance from HEI researchers in the development of their technology, but may benefit from marketing and management science in the development and deployment of business processes involved in supporting their technology in the field’.

2.8 Leadership, management and governance issues in collaborations

Studies have given attention to the impact of collaborations on the flow and production of knowledge; however there has been less focus on the issues surrounding the leadership, management and governance of collaborations themselves, and the impact of collaborative activity across HEIs.

Typical tasks in the lifecycle of a partnership or collaboration, each of which may have significant implications for leadership, management and governance of the HEIs, are shown in Box 1.

For the purposes of this study we understand higher education leadership, management and governance to embrace the capabilities, arrangements and relationships, and the actions, necessary to maximise the quality and impact of all the work that HEIs do. At the highest level in HEIs there are individuals and teams with senior strategic and executive decision-making responsibilities for leadership and management. Although at times blurred and overlapping, there are distinct leadership roles and responsibilities in management and governance.

For HEIs, external collaborations can reshape and extend the relationships and arrangements at all levels in an institution. Collaborations with bodies outside the HEI involve bringing the institution into direct contact with differing structures, cultures, terminologies and strategic thinking. Commonly, such collaborations were not provided for in the original design of the leadership, governance and management structures within HEIs. Therefore the leadership skills, knowledge and capabilities of individuals, the HEIs’ leadership and management structures and processes and the governance arrangements may not be best suited for effectively developing, leading, monitoring and mitigating risks within the collaborative activity.

In order to govern and manage collaborations successfully, management and governance structures must work with those of the home institution, partner institutions and the new relationships and procedures involved in the collaboration itself. Complex systems of management and governance may become intertwined through the collaborations, possibly rendering existing leadership structures and institutions inadequate. Changes may be needed to enable existing leadership, management and governance to interact and align with the external governance and management structures, and the new relationships and procedures.

Box 1 Typical tasks in the lifecycle of a collaboration

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Having the idea or intention for the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Spotting or creating the opportunity for practical implementation of the idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Identifying potential players and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Opening discussions and negotiations with potential partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Making set-up and launch plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Identifying resources to initiate the venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Designing organisational structures and relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Harnessing the necessary approvals for commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Aligning trust, commitments and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Assessing risks and creating mitigation capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Specifying plans and budgets for launch and start-up phases of operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Assessing the partnership’s viability thus far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Formally creating the organisational structures and leadership, management and governance arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Moving into ongoing operational mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Sustaining continuity of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Reviewing and assessing performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Introducing changes to structures, roles or activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Planning and implementing the end of the collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9 The evidence base for this study
Our findings are based on a literature review (presented in Section 3), seven selected UK case studies and one European case (listed below and presented in Section 4 (summary) and Appendix A (full reports). The purpose of the literature review was to assess the recent relevant theoretical literature to inform an understanding of the motivations, activities, skills experiences and theories relevant to collaborations in the HE sector.

Case studies can potentially provide indicative findings, which may be relevant or adaptable to other instances. The use of case studies carries the limitation that findings cannot be regarded as representative of HEIs’ collaborations in general. Further, we could not locate and obtain agreement for a case study on collaboration failure which would have been an interesting addition and although we sought to triangulate findings from interviews with each other and with desk research, much of the detail on leadership, management and governance in the case studies is based on interviewees’ perceptions of these aspects of their collaboration. We have signposted the source of findings within the case studies to clarify the origins of the different findings.

2.10 Criteria for selecting the case studies
Given the great variety of stated aims and practical approaches that HEIs adopt in pursuing collaborations, categorising them accurately is not easy. Often, purposes and aims may not be precise, and different individuals within a partnership or collaboration may have their own understanding of what they hope to accomplish, no matter what the ‘official’ rationales may be. This uncertainty, and the diversity of aims and activities involved, made it difficult to select case studies solely on the basis of their primary activity, according to the typology outlined in Section 2.3 (page 6). Instead, to ensure diversity of cases, we sought to select case studies on the basis of the type of HEI and external collaborators involved, their location, and the size of the collaboration. The selection criteria used are outlined in Table 1. In addition to these characteristics, the case studies were also required to be instances which posed likely risks or wider opportunities for changing HEIs’ leadership, management and/or governance. Collaborations were only included if they appeared to take the HEI’s leadership, management and governance beyond their ‘business as usual’. We then considered the type of activities involved in the analysis of the case study collaborations, and their associated leadership, management and governance (see Section 4 onwards). The nine case studies are listed below.

Table 1. Case study selection criteria and considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>HEI collaborator</th>
<th>External collaborator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Different types of HEI</td>
<td>Public, private, third sector/not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Research group, department/faculty/school, institution-wide</td>
<td>Single or multiple collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/scale</td>
<td>Eastern England, Scotland, West Midlands, Wales, etc.</td>
<td>Local, national, international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential implications for leadership, management and governance</td>
<td>To what extent does the collaboration appear to take the HEI beyond ‘business as usual’ and challenge its leadership, management and governance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>HEI collaborator</th>
<th>Other collaborators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO in London</td>
<td>City University</td>
<td>INTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan Open Learning</td>
<td>University of Essex</td>
<td>Kaplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland Natural Heritage Research</td>
<td>Queen's University Belfast</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Institute for Policing Research</td>
<td>Edinburgh Napier University</td>
<td>Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian University</td>
<td>Scottish Funding Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heriot-Watt University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Gordon University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Gateway</td>
<td>Membership organisation open to all UK HEIs</td>
<td>Private UK-based educational/training providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network</td>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University</td>
<td>17 further education colleges; HEFCE, the then Learning &amp; Skills Council, Yorkshire Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds Trinity University College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Huddersfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øresund University and Øresund Science Region</td>
<td>Copenhagen Business School</td>
<td>Enterprises and government in the Øresund Region in Sweden and Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristianstad University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lund University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malmö University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roskilde University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal School of Fine Arts School of Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences / Alnarp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical University of Denmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Copenhagen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Literature Review

Literature on the leadership, management and governance of collaborative initiatives provides an important theoretical context for HEIs as they engage more widely in this type of activity with a growing range of sectors and organisations. This chapter reviews theories and issues highlighted in innovation, business, management, and education literatures, selected through a search of EBSCOHost and GoogleScholar, and recommendations of key texts from experts in the field.

The trends introduced in the previous section suggest that UK HEIs are likely to continue to form more numerous and deeper links with partners, particularly between HEIs, with FE and school sectors, and with the private sector. Through these collaborations, HEIs can play a central role in the growth and development of knowledge-based economies.

3.1 Collaboration as a response to 21st century operating conditions

The ‘triple helix’ theory about business-public-sector-HEI collaborations suggests that universities – concerned with research, learning, and teaching – have a particular role to play in growing a knowledge-based economy. More widely, growth of a knowledge-based economy provides an impetus for economic actors to work more directly with HEIs. Various authors from different disciplines refer specifically to the need for ‘collaboration’ within and across organisations as a response to 21st century operating conditions, and to solve the problems which arise in the increasingly globalised, interconnected and complex communities in which they now operate. These arguments offer a rationale for why the higher education sector – and indeed the Leadership Foundation as the funder of this research – is interested in collaborations and partnerships. The various literatures also suggest that to build successful collaborations, organisations need to build capacity for collaborative working in their internal structures, processes and systems and must develop the skills, capabilities and awareness of their staff to be able to work across boundaries and thus take advantage of the opportunities that arise in the new operating environment.

In 2003 Barnett argued that we were living in an age of ‘supercomplexity’ which requires not just the handling of overwhelming data and theories within a given framework, but also handling multiple frames of understanding, action and self-identity. This supercomplex world required universities to collaborate and engage with the broader community, with businesses and with increasing numbers and types of stakeholders:

‘The university has to engage with multiple communities, both because there are other producers of knowledge, and because there are increasing numbers of clients for its services.’

Barnett also highlighted the importance of collaboration and engagement within institutions, suggesting that developing and expanding ‘transdisciplinary interactions’ is another necessary response to the supercomplex world.

In 2005 Conklin argued that to resolve the ‘wicked problems’ facing our society, we need to adopt more socially complex forms of collaboration, working with diverse partners:

‘… solving a wicked problem is fundamentally a social process. Having a few brilliant people or the latest project management technology is no longer sufficient.’

The implications of Conklin’s argument for individual practitioners at different levels of the organisation is that they will need to develop new approaches to project work and problem-solving within and across the institution or organisation. Whitchurch’s studies of the changing roles of professionals in higher education settings suggest that this evolution is already taking place. Conklin also noted that such social complexity will raise challenges and make consensus difficult to achieve, instead, those engaged in the collaborative initiative will need to create coherence through building a new ‘shared understanding and shared commitment’.

Williams found that the increasingly complex nature of the policy problems which are being faced is a key driver of collaboration, and that collaborative working:

‘… offers the potential to devise interventions that are not only superior in quality and innovation through the combined knowledge, expertise and resources of different agencies working together, but also facilitates the delivery of solutions through mechanisms and frameworks based on participation, ownership and stakeholder involvement.’
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However, he also described how the private sector continues to report a high rate of failure in collaborative projects, and that there has been little research into the reasons for success or failure in the private, or public, sectors to date.

Nowotney, Gibbons, Scott et al.\(^{50}\) in their seminal works on new forms of knowledge production, argued that in a 'Mode 2' society, organisations that fail to collaborate would be irrelevant or cease to exist. Scott references:

> ‘... a shift from so-called ‘Mode 1’ science, of the kind traditionally undertaken in university and other specialized research facilities that is cognitively coherent and conceived of in linear terms, to ‘Mode 2’ knowledge production, which is much more widely distributed, socially complex and multi-linear.'\(^{51}\)

Their research highlights a number of properties of ‘Mode 2’ knowledge production which require greater collaboration and ‘openness’ from researchers and universities. They suggest that Mode 2 knowledge is generated ‘within a context of application’\(^{52}\) so that dissemination and contextualisation must be built in from the beginning\(^{53}\). This new knowledge is also trans-disciplinary in character so involves a broader set of perspectives and individuals in the process of creation. There is a ‘much greater diversity of the sites at which knowledge is produced’ and many new types of organisation are now involved in knowledge production and research. Further, Mode 2 knowledge is highly reflexive and can be seen as ‘a dialogic process, an intense (and perhaps endless) ‘conversation’ between research actors and research subjects.’\(^{54}\).

The authors also note that this type of knowledge can only be deemed reliable if a wide range of communities and stakeholders are willing to engage with it:

> ‘... reliable knowledge, the traditional goal of scientific enquiry, is no longer (self?) sufficient [...] knowledge also needs to be socially robust, because its validity [is] determined by] much wider communities of engagement comprising knowledge producers, disseminators, traders, and users.’\(^{55}\)

### 3.2 Benefits of collaboration

The necessity for collaboration, given 21\(^{st}\) century operating conditions, is one part of the argument. Beyond this, the theory of ‘open innovation’ suggests that some degree of collaboration is critical to firms for growing new business. Engaging outside the firm could help innovation by drawing on external input and allowing for the free exchange of ideas:

> ‘By opening itself up to the world of knowledge that surrounds it, the twenty-first-century corporation can avoid the innovation paradox that plagues so many firms’ R&D activities today. In so doing, the company can renew its current business and generate new business.’\(^{56}\)

A number of authors suggest that firms’ ‘competitive advantage’ could rely on their ability to engage externally with sources of knowledge, as this helps them to learn, reconfigure and innovate\(^{57}\). Collaborations are also variously found to: improve the efficiency of product development and entry into new markets; mitigate the cost of developing new products and penetrate new markets; reduce the time needed to improve efficiency and quality control\(^{58}\); and help firms to access skills, tacit knowledge or improve strategic positioning\(^{59}\).

Commercialisation partners can define the success or ‘benefits’ of collaboration in terms of definite payoffs should they be successful. However, the benefits of other types of collaboration (eg for research, innovation, cultural aims) are less straightforward. Establishing how far collaborative activity delivers greater benefits than would be gained by organisations working alone is an important consideration, particularly where external funding for the collaborative activity is involved.

Much of the literature further emphasises that realising collaborative benefits to their full extent requires cross-organisational learning to occur. Some argue that learning gained through collaborative processes may be more important to realising shared benefits than deciding legal and formal agreements\(^{60}\).

### 3.3 Challenges arising within collaborative activity

Huxham and Vangen’s research into collaborative processes and collaborative management provides an interesting insight into the ambiguity, complexities and dynamics that emerge as collaborative initiatives are undertaken. In their research, the authors present their ‘theory of collaborative advantage’\(^{61}\). This revolves around the dynamic tension between ‘collaborative advantage,’ which is the goal often cited at the beginning of a collaboration, to achieve something positive that could not

---

52 Nowotney et al [2003] p187
53 Nowotney et al [2003] p191
54 Nowotney et al [2003] p187
55 Nowotney et al [2003] p192
56 Chesbrough [2003] pxxi
57 Kogut and Zander [1992], Tece et al [1997], Rosenkopf and Nerkar [2001]
58 Hamel et al [1989]
59 Kogut [1988]
60 Hamel et al [1989], Hamel [1991]
61 Huxham and Vangen [2005]
have been achieved by any one of the organisations acting alone; and ‘collaborative inertia’, which is the all too common outcome of many collaborations where progress is negligible, extremely slow or is only achieved through ‘pain and hard grind’. The authors ask:

‘If achievement of collaborative advantage is the goal for those who initiate collaborative arrangements, why is collaborative inertia so often the outcome?’

Some common issues and areas of conflict within collaborations, as listed by Huxem and Vangen, include:

- Managing and understanding aims.
- Understanding power structures and processes.
- Building trust.
- Maintaining belief in the partnership when it gets complicated.
- Dealing with frequent changes (to goals, boundaries, members and structures).
- Managing leadership which is enacted through structures and processes not just individuals.
- Responding to the dilemmas and difficulties which arise in the leadership activities carried out within collaborations.

The authors advise those managing or leading alliances to give consideration to these potential points of conflict, to ensure they do not become barriers to the end goal of ‘collaborative advantage’. A number of the issues listed here by Huxem and Vangen reflect findings from the wider literature.

3.3.1 Understanding aims and goals

Many authors highlight the importance of knowing and sharing each organisation’s rationale for collaboration as well as the need to consider one’s own and others’ aims for the collaboration. Understanding each other’s purposes and aims helps leaders to assess how they will need to compromise and the extent to which they will be able to do so to fit with their partners’ approach and objectives. As several authors note, collaborations will often involve making trade offs. Huxem and Vangen, more pragmatically, urge caution in the ‘craving for a clear and agreed direction’ to be agreed by all at the outset and suggest that in practice this rarely happens. They note that:

‘... genuine collaborative aims exist, if at all, in an entanglement of other aims, both real and imagined. The interplay between these aims is a major factor leading to the difficulty of achieving sustained agreement about collaborative purpose.’

Oakley and Selwood also noted a tendency in many of the case studies they examined to ‘just get on with it’ before aims had been agreed. They found that while this was immediately productive, these discussions did generally need to take place at some point, so conflict was not necessarily avoided, just delayed. They also recommend approaching the agreement of joint aims with some flexibility, and suggesting leaders identify when it is important for partners to have similar aims, when differences might in fact be complementary, and when organisations can work collaboratively despite them.

3.3.2 Developing trust

Developing trust between partners in a collaboration is found to be essential across the collaborations literature. Trust was found to be vital in leading international collaborations in Fielden et al’s recent study and as a key capability among successful ‘boundary spanners’ in Williams 2010 research.

Oakley and Selwood noted that trust was:

‘essential in the ad hoc, or project-based, teams that accounted for most of [the case studies]. Mutual trust allowed them to get up to speed and to become effective relatively quickly, often in the absence of clear team roles.

Huxem and Vangen report that trust is one of the key issues in the ‘nurturing of collaboration’, and that there exists:

‘a gap between the common wisdom that trust is necessary for collaboration to be successful and common practice, which suggests that trust is frequently weak (if not lacking altogether).’

Huxem and Vangen explain that trust is built each time a partner is perceived to meet expectations and deliver expected outcomes, without any negative effects for the organisations involved or the partnership. Hence trust should be reinforced and grow with each positive engagement in a collaboration (‘the trust building loop’). However, in practice it is rarely this
simple owing to power relations being unequal between partners and the common manipulation of collaborative agendas by those involved. In a number of the case studies from the Fielden and Oakley and Selwood reports, strong previous relationships were noted as helping to build a solid foundation for a collaboration and helping develop trust between partners. Trust between partners is often developed through relationships between specific individuals – so personnel changes can further damage relationships between partners.

### 3.3.3 Significant resources are required to build a successful collaboration

Many authors note that ensuring collaborations are successful is extremely resource intensive, taking up a great deal of time and cost. Collaborations can involve different costs to individuals and organisations, such as costs associated with coordinating and managing activities, or the risk of appropriation of intellectual property or another form of comparative advantage. These can place particular burdens on the time and resources of senior management involved in leading the collaboration and Owen suggests that leaders must be able to negotiate effectively while balancing the costs and benefits of their investments (in time and resources). The Responsible Partnering Initiative suggests that partners may need to be compensated for their contributions to collaborative working, and this will add further to the resource implications.

Particular investment can be required at the early, start-up stages of a collaboration. Owen notes that successful leaders of regeneration partnerships ensured there were ‘firm foundations’ to build upon when starting up the collaboration and Fielden noted that the investment of ‘pump-priming’ funding to help start-up international partnerships was important.

### 3.3.4 Working with different structures, priorities and perspectives

As HEI collaborations bring together organisations which may have very different structures, priorities and perspectives, expectations of the benefits and risks involved in a collaboration may diverge, potentially contributing to misaligned interests and priorities, and possibilities for conflict. Collaborations inevitably raise some ambiguity about individuals’ and organisations’ responsibilities, roles and contributions to the shared activities. Individuals may have different levels of access to information, be involved in different ways, or be accustomed to divergent procedures and structures. Such discrepancies can contribute to differences in understanding and uncertainty between those involved and will be exacerbated by the lack of formal hierarchies within many partnerships.

#### 3.4 Leading collaborations

‘Questions of leadership and management must – at some point – be addressed [in a partnership]. For many, this may be a long-term, ongoing practice, while for others the answers may immediately be clear. Nevertheless, these issues are an inherent part of the process.’

Although there is a large body of literature on leadership within organisations, much less has been written specifically on leadership in collaborations. Generally, collaborative leadership is seen to involve sharing responsibilities. Yet, collaborations can involve very different organisations; as a result, leaders must engage with individuals and organisations outside their ‘sphere of control’. As leaders engage further away from their direct area of authority within their own organisation, and into a less structured environment, their authority and legitimacy to lead can diminish. This could challenge the potential for directive leadership within a collaboration.

Leaders involved in collaborations (as well as those who facilitate and create the conditions for partnership working) clearly play essential roles in locating necessary resources, bringing together individuals with required skills and capabilities, and ensuring that resources are used effectively towards achieving the desired objectives (Responsible Partnering Initiative, 2005). Literature highlights a number of types of leadership which may be involved in the successful leadership of collaborative activity.

#### 3.4.1 Leadership enacted outside vertical/hierarchical power structures

A significant body of work now exists describing the ‘horizontal’ and ‘non-hierarchical’ leadership roles which become necessary where individuals and teams are required to work alongside individuals from outside their own organisations and with different teams, departments, organisations, sectors etc.
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In ‘Leadership beyond authority’, which examines leadership across various sectors and types of organisation, Middleton suggests:

> ‘Increasingly, this [leadership which revolves around budgets, vertical authority and traditional line management] is not the only sort of leadership we are being called to deliver on. Often you’re not in charge: in fact no one is. There is no budget. And there are no people who have to work for you …’

She describes an increasing demand for leaders to ‘lead’ not simply within their own organisations (where they may have built up credibility) but outside their ‘circle of authority’, often as part of collaborative activities. This type of leadership is described as different in many ways from traditional leadership, and as requiring additional methods and ‘tools’ to achieve success. In ‘beyond authority’ leadership individuals typically use more power in relation to personality, ideas, communication and connection and less from other power sources such as position, investment or reward. Middleton notes a number of issues and challenges for those attempting to move from a traditional to a ‘beyond authority’ leadership position, for example, how to gain legitimacy (through experience, not hierarchy); she notes that it takes courage, self belief, passion and independence to lead successfully in this less-structured space. She also finds that people skills and relationship-building are critical, suggesting that successful leaders in this sphere gain ‘integrity and authenticity’ through their real interest in people, and that building networks and consensus are vital for ‘beyond authority’ leaders. As leading in these environments involves leading without the formal authority which comes from being in a hierarchical leadership position, many of the methods and tools which are utilised very successfully in hierarchies will not be effective and so instead, the focus must be on:

> ‘... earning legitimacy with ideas that resonate – and an approach to leadership that means people end up willingly granting authority to you.’

In their research into distributed leadership in higher education, Bolden et al similarly found that leadership was not simply enacted by hierarchical leaders who have formal line management and/or budgetary control and who exert ‘vertical influence’ (as is described in much of the traditional leadership literature). The authors also found evidence of significant numbers of individuals who exert a ‘horizontal influence’ with ‘cross cutting roles who depend on interpersonal and social influence’ and as well as individuals who were not in formal leadership roles but yet:

> ‘... command considerable respect and influence through their academic and/or professional credentials within and beyond the institution.’

As these leaders are not able to call on line management or budgets to make things happen, they ‘lead’ through influencing projects, systems, teams and individuals. The authors highlight the importance of informal networks and relations (or ‘social capital’) within universities (and for these alternative leaders), suggesting that these are ‘integral to the manner in which leadership and management are enacted’.

Huxem and Vangen further point out (as much of the broader literature suggests) that ‘traditional hierarchies do not exist in collaborative settings’ and that those engaged in collaborative ventures initiate and support change using ‘relational strategies’ rather than formal authority.

Williams notes that the management of alliances, joint ventures and partnerships often falls to dedicated individuals who are able to manage relationships and activities which exist across organisational boundaries. Williams describes these individuals as ‘boundary spanners’ and ‘key agents operating within interorganisational spheres’. He finds that they respond to ‘wicked’ issues through collaborative and entrepreneurial working outside traditional power structures. Such is the growth in collaborative projects (both within and between organisations) Williams notes, that while some ‘boundary spanners’ have a ‘dedicated job role’ to work between organisations or sectors (for example as part of a collaborative team), there are also a large number of individuals who find themselves ‘undertaking’ boundary spanning activities as part of a mainstream job role.

His detailed analysis of how boundary spanners work within collaborative environments found that they ‘focus [...] on the social aspects of alliance management and the pivotal role of personal relationships’, and can make sense of the
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many relationships unfolding across the various stages of a partnership. Communication, conflict resolution, building trust and looking for new partnership opportunities are key elements of their leadership activity and they use ‘influencing, bargaining, negotiating, mediating and brokering’ to manage direction and get things done as the environments in which they are involved often lack clear roles and hierarchies.

In terms of the skills and capabilities required, he found that these individuals often benefit from strong technical knowledge in a field related to the partnership since this provides legitimacy and credibility in the absence of a designated ‘leadership’ role. Legitimacy is cited as important in relation to leading collaborations in Fielden and Murray’s case studies of international collaborations in HEIs and in Oakley and Selwood’s case studies, particularly where research was a major outcome of the partnership. Bryman also found that legitimacy was particularly relevant for academic leaders in HEIs. Williams notes that effective boundary spanners often have previous experience working in different organisational contexts and with different organisational cultures. Previous experience within collaborations was found to be important in Fielden et al for key individuals.

Williams suggests more needs to be done to understand the specific capacities and capabilities required by boundary spanners and their role within collaborative activity to:

‘... inform the [currently limited] training, development and education of current and potential practitioners.’

Noble and Jones’ research on boundary spanners identified a subtle distinction between ‘champions’ and ‘boundary spanners’. Within the partnership projects investigated, ‘champions’ were senior members of the organisation who advocated the importance of partnerships and whose actions and behaviours created conditions that supported and encouraged partnerships. They worked to engage individuals directly in partnership working or opened doors to facilitate partnership opportunities. Clearly both parties are exercising leadership but it serves different purposes and is of a different kind.

3.4.2 Leadership through processes, structures and roles

Bolden et al found that the higher education sector ‘... is increasingly espousing the practice of ‘distributed leadership’ whereby the leadership process is conceived of as dispersed across the organisation (within systems and relationships) rather than residing within the individual traits and capabilities of formally recognised leaders.’

Hence, they suggest not only that individuals without formal leadership roles enact a leadership influence (as discussed above) but that systems also have a significant impact on outcomes and can be considered as exerting ‘leadership’.

Huxem and Vangen define leadership within collaborations as ‘the mechanisms that lead to the actual outcomes of a collaboration’, and note ‘the formation and implementation of the collaboration’s policy and activity agenda’ as key leadership mechanisms. The authors describe leadership as being enacted not just by people (leaders), but through the processes, structures and roles (referred to as ‘leadership media’) which have been set up within a collaboration to enable it to achieve the desired outcomes. They suggest that an agenda, for example, is led (and its outcomes will be decided) not just by the actions of individuals but ‘by the type of structure that is in place and the type of processes used’. This view of leadership once again looks beyond the actions of an individual delegator, inspirer, practitioner or negotiator (whether these are ‘top-down’, ‘bottom-up’, enacted through influence and relationships or through direction). Hence, the processes and structures which, once set up, are typically viewed as neutral in fact continue to affect outcomes and exert a significant influence on the collaboration. Viewed this way, leadership in collaborative situations is not controlled by any one individual, or indeed even a group of senior individuals. The collaborative environment which is created (which includes individuals from various partner organisations, their relationships, the processes and structures they have put in place to take things forward etc) controls outcomes and hence all the elements within it are significant. Given their significance in collaborative situations, Williams suggests that organisational and governance structures, processes and cultures should go further than just embracing collaboration, and be ‘designed around collaboration, partnership and networking’ to enable organisations to respond more effectively to the type of multi-faceted problems prevalent in 21st century society.
3.4.3 There are different styles and skills required of leaders in collaborations

Bolden et al report that alongside distributed leadership in HEIs ‘there is also a clear desire for strong and inspiring leadership from individuals in key roles’114, noting that distributed and hierarchical leadership are both necessary and complement each other. Oakley and Selwood found that where a charismatic individual leader was heavily involved in their case studies ‘these individuals were aware of the need for collaboration and their individual models of leadership always co-existed with other, more distributed, models.’115

This suggests that within collaborations, while non-hierarchical and horizontal leadership are vital from all those involved (particularly those working directly with partners to influence outcomes) support from external stakeholders, funders, the media and other communities may be leveraged more effectively by those who can utilise the power of their position and vertical leadership approaches as well.

The wider literature on leadership discusses the various styles of leadership which individual leaders can exhibit; for example: democratic or autocratic, participative or directive, relationship- or task-oriented, transactional or transformational116. In collaborative situations, it may not be possible to predict which leadership approaches will be required, and different approaches to leadership may also need to be used simultaneously within the collaboration to respond to changing requirements and a diverse membership base.117 Williams notes that leaders in collaborations may be required to encourage and mobilise members, as well as manage conflict, and manage potentially fragmented and contested power relations.118 Acting as a motivator while also seeking pragmatically to ensure collaborative working and minimise conflict can require individual leaders to invoke different leadership styles, depending on whom they are engaging with and when. This suggests that flexibility is important when leading collaborations. As the collaboration develops and activities change – a new ‘portfolio’ of competences and skills (or even new individuals) may be needed.

Williams refers to the existence of different stages in the ‘life cycle’ of alliances in which different capabilities and skills are required. Other authors also note there are different skills required at different stages of a partnership.119 Fielden suggests that more entrepreneurial skills are required for the early set-up phases while management, facilitating and relationship building skills are required early on to build trust among partners and monitoring skills are valuable when the activity is operating fully.120 Oakley and Selwood found that leadership could ‘shift’ between different individuals depending on the skills required for particular stages.121

3.4.4 The role of governance in collaborations

Specific governance skills and responsibilities are needed when collaborations with HEIs have a commercial aspect. The focus is often on how governance structures can effectively manage risk within a collaboration. Commercial or third-stream funding can carry greater risks than the more conventional reliance on funding for teaching and research (although this will change in future); these different risks carry implications for the importance and involvement of governing bodies in collaborative activities. In commercial initiatives, governance arrangements must be able effectively to monitor and control activities. This implies that there should be a separation between management and governance, as governors’ expertise helps to monitor and control the management of the activity, and ensure it remains linked to commercialisation as well as to academic and financial strategies. Governance can also be important in ensuring that there is a balance between the different partner organisations’ contributions to collaborative activity, providing the necessary skills to support the initiative and avoiding over-reliance on one partner for revenue and/or other resources.

3.4.5 Summary of key findings from the literature

- **Collaboration is a necessary response to 21st century operating conditions** and the appearance of more complex, multifaceted challenges and goals which require many organisations and individuals to respond. This is apparent across the public and many parts of the private sector – as well as within higher education.

- **Beyond the necessity of collaboration, collaboration offers a number of other benefits and can help increase competitive advantage.** However in many situations (eg research, innovation, cultural environments) defining the benefits of collaborating is not straightforward.

- **Collaborative activity often takes a great deal of effort to get right and a number of challenges can arise** (for example understanding and agreeing on aims; developing trust and ensuring a collaboration has strong foundations; managing to work with partner institutions’ different structures, priorities and perspectives.) Building a successful collaboration also requires significant resources (both time and financial) – often more than expected.

---
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As diverse individuals, teams and organisations are required to work alongside each other in the separate environment of a collaborative venture – hierarchies of seniority, as well as who is ultimately responsible or accountable for what, may be unclear. A different set of ‘beyond authority’ methods and skills is useful when leading and managing collaboration successfully in these situations. Horizontal leadership, using influence and establishing positive relationships with individuals at all levels, and from internal as well as external sources, are essential.

In addition to non-hierarchical leadership, other roles also need to be carried out – for example gaining support and promoting the partnership externally through networks.

Leadership in collaborations can be enacted through structures and processes, as well as through individuals. How the various processes and roles relate to each other and what boundaries have been set for discussion and activity will have a significant influence the outcomes of a collaboration.

The styles and skills required of leaders change depending on the stage of the collaboration, the types of problems which are being addressed and the individuals who are involved. Many skills and styles can be required simultaneously to deal with these different requirements and with changes coming from many directions – so some degree of flexibility is important.

Governance is particularly important in relation to HEIs’ commercial collaborations. The purpose of governance arrangements is to manage the risks inherent in collaborations.
4. Case Studies

The literature discussed in the previous chapter identified some of the main factors relevant to this study’s analysis of UK HEI collaborations with organisations external to the HE sector, and the implications for leadership, management and governance roles. This chapter presents a brief summary of each of the case study collaborations. The detailed case study findings, highlighting continuities and discrepancies with the theoretical explanations for effective leadership, management and governance in collaborative activity, can be found in Appendix A. All case study draft write-ups were confirmed by informants for factual accuracy. Further details on the study methodology and structure, interview protocol and list of interviewees are also shown in the appendices.

Table 3 provides a list of the case study collaborations, the organisations involved, and their basic structure and scope. Case study evidence comes from desk research and documentary analysis of annual reports, funding council publications and journal articles, as well as thirty- to forty-five-minute interviews with key individuals involved in management and governance in each collaboration.

Table 3. Description of case study collaborations: type, scope and structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>HEI partners</th>
<th>External collaborators</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Type of activity (primary)</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Financial support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>2007-2012</td>
<td>Knowledge transfer (service delivery)</td>
<td>Translational research partnership Managed by a director based in the NHS Governed by a Scientific Advisory Board, and by partners' regulatory and administrative frameworks</td>
<td>National Institute for Health Research (£13 million over a 5-year cycle) Additional support from the UK Department of Health's capital expenditure budget, industry, other NHS organisations, and Cancer Research UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO in London</td>
<td>City University</td>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>2006 – present</td>
<td>Teaching and training Student recruitment</td>
<td>Two joint ventures Governed by partners' governance arrangements</td>
<td>Partner contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan Open Learning</td>
<td>University of Essex</td>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>2007 – present</td>
<td>Teaching and training Student recruitment</td>
<td>An affiliate college of the University of Essex Governed through the University's Academic Partnership Board</td>
<td>Partner contributions; HEFCE employer co-funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland Natural Heritage Research Partnership</td>
<td>Queen's University Belfast</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Environment Agency</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2003-2008 (first agreement) 2009-2019 (current agreement)</td>
<td>Knowledge creation (research)</td>
<td>A 10 year research framework agreement to provide policy-relevant research to the NIEA Managed by staff located within each partner organisation who are members of a joint Project Board Governed jointly by senior staff from the School of Biological Sciences and the Natural Heritage Directorate</td>
<td>Natural Heritage Directorate, Northern Ireland Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>HEI partners</td>
<td>External collaborators</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Type of activity (primary)</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Institute for Policing Research</td>
<td>Aberdeen, Abertay, Dundee, Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Napier, Glasgow, Glasgow, Caledonian, Heriot-Watt, Robert Gordon, St Andrews, Stirling, Strathclyde, West of Scotland</td>
<td>Association of Chief Police Officers of Scotland</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>November 2006 – present</td>
<td>Knowledge creation (research) Knowledge transfer (service delivery)</td>
<td>A strategic research partnership between ACPOS and 13 Scottish Universities Governed by two agreements (one with ACPOS, and one between the universities) Managed by internally funded staff, and governed jointly by partners' senior management</td>
<td>The Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland (ACPOS); The Scottish Funding Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Gateway</td>
<td>Membership organisation open to all UK HEIs</td>
<td>Private UK-based education / training providers</td>
<td>UK-wide</td>
<td>July 2008 – present</td>
<td>Teaching and training</td>
<td>A membership organisation providing a brokerage service for UK HEIs, FE colleges and other CPD providers Based at the University of York, governed through two external advisory boards</td>
<td>HEFCE strategic development fund (£376,179 from 2008-2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network</td>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University, Leeds Trinity University College, Open University, University of Bradford, University of Huddersfield, University of Leeds</td>
<td>HEFCE; the then Learning &amp; Skills Council, Yorkshire Forward</td>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>March 2007 – 2011</td>
<td>Teaching and training Student recruitment</td>
<td>A lifelong learning network Day-to-day management by internally funded staff Governed jointly by partners’ senior management</td>
<td>HEFCE strategic development fund (£5.9 million from March 2007 – July 2010, extended to 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øresund University and Øresund Science Region</td>
<td>HEIs in Copenhagen, Kristianstad, Lund, Malmö, Roskilde, Stockholm</td>
<td>Enterprises and government in the Øresund Region in Sweden and Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark and Sweden</td>
<td>1997 – present</td>
<td>Community engagement and local regeneration</td>
<td>A business-public sector-university collaboration to promote regional development Owned and governed by senior management from university partners</td>
<td>Partner contributions; Co-funding from the European Regional Development Fund and other EU programmes (eg Marco Polo, the 6th Research Framework Programme)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of findings from the case studies

4.1 Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre

The Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre’s (BRC) primary aim is to translate research into changes in clinical practice; it promotes translational research across a range of research areas, investing in infrastructure, cross-cutting facilities in eleven thematic areas. A director based in the NHS provides central leadership, working with ten research leads from the University who direct the thematic areas, and scientific advisory boards (including experts from the private sector and international HEIs) provide advice and guidance.

Main leadership findings:

- The collaboration built on prior relationships between the two partners.
- Funding was leveraged from different bodies for various elements of the collaboration – maintaining relationships with funders was a key role for the lead individual.
- Position, knowledge, relationships and influence were important for the designated leader to help take the collaboration forward.
- Strong central leadership across member organisations was important for sustaining and guiding the ongoing collaborative activities.
- Future challenges in relation to how limited funding is shared among partners may become apparent – this will increase competition.

4.2 INTO in London

INTO University Partnerships (IUP) is a private company, set up in 2006, to create joint ventures with HEIs, for the purpose of increasing international student recruitment to those HEIs. IUP has two joint ventures in London, one with UEA called INTO University of East Anglia (London) and one with City University called INTO City University London. Both joint venture organisations are currently located in a single building, in London, leased by UEA in London, which also houses IUP’s own headquarters office.

The collaboration between UEA and INTO was launched in January 2010 to address the aims of ‘improving the employability of UEA graduates, further raising the University’s international profile and fostering links with influential government and business communities’. INTO’s joint venture with City University was negotiated in 2009, to provide English language and pre-degree programmes for international students leading to degrees at City.

Main leadership findings:

- Investing time and effort early on to build trust and underpin ongoing relationships at a senior level has been vital.
- Senior involvement was given from the outset from all partners.
- There is one individual undertaking day-to-day operational issues from each partner; they need to take initiative, anticipate needs, consult and confer, ensure buy-in and co-operation from those within and outside the collaboration on various issues, and act as ‘ambassadors’.
- In addition to the day-to-day leader a higher-level sign-off is needed to steer the strategic direction of the collaborative activity.
- Underpinning continuing working relationships has been a key activity.
- Collaborative projects such as this offer new opportunities for teams and individuals to take initiative and help unlock previously under-utilised skills – outside traditional organisational structures and spheres of activity.

4.3 Kaplan Open Learning

Internationally, uptake of online education has been growing, particularly in the US with nearly 30% of students taking one or more online courses in the autumn of 2009; this category is growing at a faster rate than the total HE student population. Almost all of this growth is within existing, rather than new, online education programmes. Kaplan Open Learning provides an example of collaborative activity between a private provider and HEI to help deliver online HE programmes, in this case contributing to degrees accredited by the University of Essex. It is an example of a partnership, like INTO in London, involving HEIs and private-sector firms in teaching and/or student recruitment, but with a focus on online education.

Students are enrolled in both Kaplan Open Learning and the University of Essex. Kaplan is responsible for the management, administration and delivery of the online education; the University’s role is focused on quality assurance and accreditation of courses. Courses are delivered through an online classroom, with interactive real-time online engagement and telephone communications with other students, tutors and academic advisers.

122 For the full cases please see Appendix A
123 These eleven thematic areas are: Translation of Biological Science to Medicine – Capacity Building and Training; Cancer; Cardiovascular; Diabetes; Obesity; Metabolic and Endocrine Disorders; Imaging; Infection and Immunity; Medical Genetics; Musculoskeletal disorders; Neurosciences; Transplantation; and Women’s Health.
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Main leadership findings:

- Support and buy-in from senior management and governance of the HEI partner was essential.
- In the early stages of the collaboration, leadership involved laying a foundation for building support, being ready to share evidence and being flexible to respond to challenges or questions.
- The collaboration was required to work within the HEI's current QA structures and other committees – to assure standards, communicate progress and share lessons learned.
- The individuals pushing forward the collaboration enabled effective relations and a shared vision between the two partners by being flexible; maintaining open communications; engaging with each other frequently; and deciding upon a shared vision and shared commitment to succeed.
- Obtaining buy-in from those not based within the partnership team (but within the organisations) was challenging, requiring dissemination of evidence about the collaboration’s benefits.
- Challenges were found in interacting with the different partners’ leadership and management structures (particularly in relation to funding and at the proposal stage).
- Workable funding arrangements (outside existing structures) had to be established.

4.4 Northern Heritage Research Partnership

The Northern Heritage Research Partnership (NHRP) is a framework partnership to support policy-relevant research. It is between the Natural Heritage Directorate (NIEA) and Quercus, a research body in the School of Biological Sciences, Queen’s University Belfast (QUB). The framework agreement was developed after a competitive tendering process in 2003, providing up to five years of continuous research funding, to be reviewed after three years. In 2008 the framework was reviewed and a competitive tender process was undertaken for a ten-year contract for continuous funding for research; Quercus was again awarded the framework agreement. The overall objective of the NHRP is:

‘to provide high quality research to underpin decisions relating to NIEA Natural Heritage’s statutory duties and to help deliver strategic targets relating to the Government’s key themes of sustainable development, biodiversity and climate change.’

Main leadership findings:

- Navigating the distinct institutional structures of partners was a significant challenge.
- Tensions between institutions were found in relation to funding, publicising findings, providing evidence of activity.
- Individuals and leaders involved adapted their day-to-day working to meet the specific requirements of the collaboration and of each of the partners.
- Developing an effective collaboration required investing time to identify mutual objectives – establishing agreement on expectations continued throughout the first five years of the collaboration; after this time setting future expectations became easier.
- Willingness to compromise or ‘give and take’ from all involved was an essential part of collaborating.
- Anticipating and preparing for personnel changes helped sustain the collaboration over time.
- No senior University management was involved in this collaboration; and rather than challenge and transform existing University structures, the NHRP has sought to work within existing structures and procedures. This ensures minimal conflicts but limits the scope for expansion of the collaboration and the scope of the collaborative working which takes place on a day-to-day level.
- Evidence of benefits from the collaboration are sought on an ongoing basis – but availability of future funding may lead to sustainability uncertainties.

4.5 Scottish Institute for Policing Research

The Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR) was established in November 2006 as a strategic collaboration between the Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland (ACPOS) and thirteen Scottish HEIs. Prior to the creation of SIPR, policing research in Scotland was fragmented, and communications between researchers and police were often ad hoc. The collaboration uses a pooling structure to organise resource sharing between the HEIs involved. SIPR’s objective is to offer:

‘a range of opportunities for conducting relevant, applicable research to help the police meet the challenges of the 21st century and for achieving international excellence for policing research in Scotland.’

127 The NIEA is made up of three directorates: Built Heritage, Natural Heritage and Environmental Protection. The NHRP is with the Natural Heritage Directorate.
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Main leadership findings:

- Promoting the benefits of the collaboration across partner organisations was an important activity in the early stages, particularly by senior individuals. This required effort and ‘energy’.
- Engaging outside their own sphere of influence, communicating priorities, managing expectations, encouraging trust and cohesion among those in the collaboration and supporting informal leaders were key leadership roles.
- Managing expectations of the partners and setting out a shared vision was considered important and took a great deal of time to get right.
- Informal leaders across the collaboration were supported and encouraged to help develop a shared vision and goals.
- Specific individuals have been important to build and maintain open communication channels, manage expectations and provide strategic direction.
- Formal structures for management of the collaboration were also found to be important from the ACPOS perspective – they felt these mitigated competition between HEI partners and helped make the outputs accessible to the police partners.
- Longer-term sustainability of the collaboration could be uncertain – as it is difficult to provide evidence of the added value of collaborative research or of any changes to behaviours taking place outside the collaborative working.

4.6 The Training Gateway

The Training Gateway is an online brokerage service provided through the University of York’s Continuing and Professional Development (CPD) Unit. It provides a training brokerage for national and international organisations seeking corporate, vocational and executive training from UK HEIs and colleges and, more recently, private training providers.

There are two main membership groups in the Training Gateway: service providers and buyers. HEIs, FE colleges, and Lifelong Learning Networks can become members as training providers. All UK HEIs, along with FE colleges, Lifelong Learning Networks and other training providers, are members of the Training Gateway. Businesses can join the Training Gateway free as buyers, to purchase CPD services from the Training Gateway’s network of training providers.

Main leadership findings:

- The Director of the collaborative organisation is the external face and provides central leadership and management.
- A strong vision, understanding of the sector and proactive marketing and communications help strengthen the collaboration.
- There are light governance structures, as the core leadership and management staff is small, and it is expected that this will allow freedom and scope to respond efficiently to diverse business needs and challenges.
- Wider senior management engagement with partner institutions, deeper engagement from other external bodies and a larger team to manage day-to-day activities are expected to become necessary as the collaboration aims to expand and deliver greater impact.
- If the collaboration is to become self-funding it is expected that more formal agreements, codes of conduct etc will be needed – and evidence of value will be sought.

4.7 West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network

The West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network (WYLLN) was formed in March 2007, after being awarded £5.9 million through the HEFCE Strategic Development Fund for three years to support the progression of vocational and work-based learners. WYLLN not only includes FE colleges and HEIs in the sub-region but also Aim Higher, sector skills councils, professional bodies, local authorities, employer groups etc.

To improve progression opportunities into and through higher education, as well as the relevance of higher education for employers and vocational learners, WYLLN funds and facilitates sector groups that engage with employers and sector skills councils and other employer intermediaries, considering how to develop curricula to meet learners’ needs. WYLLN has focused on developing Progression Agreements.

It implements activities to promote information, advice and guidance (IAG) for vocational and work-based learners.

132 http://www.thetraininggateway.com/buyer-pages
133 HEFCE does not specify a structure for progression agreements. Instead, HEFCE suggests the following principles: supporting learners’ legitimate expectations to progression from one programme/institution to another; establishing institutions’ commitment to meet these expectations; and enabling credit transfer; these are developed through a network: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/widen/lln/progress/
Main leadership findings:

- A balance of formal structures and flexibility in implementation helped mitigate tensions. A business plan developed after the set-up phase identified the priorities, aims and scope of the LLN and ensured all partners were working to the same ends – but institutions were able to decide how they achieved goals and responded to the plan independently.
- Aligning and linking priorities from all member institutions was necessary to ensure the future of the collaboration.
- Individuals continued to work within the existing structures and priorities of their own institutions while carrying out collaborative activity – day-to-day managers thus needed to communicate individual partners’ activities and ensure openness across the network.
- Engagement of senior managers from the member organisations helped to strengthen relationships, build trust, encourage buy-in and align priorities.
- Ambiguity around the direct collaborative benefits may make sustainability in the current ‘restricted funding’ climate challenging.

4.8 Øresund University, a cross-border collaboration

The Øresund region covers a population of 3.7 million people living on the Danish and Swedish sides of the Øresund, a strait connecting the Baltic Sea to the Atlantic Ocean. Historically, the regional economy has largely been based on traditional ‘low-tech’ activities, but now also has emerging biotechnology and medical research activity. While this case study was being undertaken Øresund University was undergoing significant re-structuring.

Øresund University (OU) was established in 1995. HEIs in Denmark and Sweden can join OU voluntarily. The aim of the collaboration is to build HEI cooperation and contribute to economies of scale in programme delivery.

Øresund Science Region (OSR) is an example of a triple helix, two-country collaboration as it involves governments, HEIs and the private sector. OSR functions underneath OU, but its focus is on promoting regional development. Its general objective is ‘to promote knowledge-based economic development in [the Øresund] cross-border region’. OSR has seven ‘platforms’ or thematic groupings where public, private and HEI bodies can cluster to engage in industry-specific research and knowledge-transfer activities.

Main leadership findings:

- Some previous collaborations and external funding helped to set up the collaboration.
- There is strong ownership of the collaboration at the top levels in HEIs – these individuals are represented on boards and commit a great deal of time to taking the collaboration forward.
- Managing relations and facilitating communications formally through board meetings and informally through ongoing communications is a large part of the leadership activity for the senior board.
- Those working on the research and teaching activities have less contact with the other collaborative partners (the incentives are not explicit, certainly within the university partners) – it is hoped that this will develop in the future.
- Finances have caused significant challenges for the collaboration – in terms of how activities are funded, how costs and funding are shared and ensuring incentives for collaborating are equal across the partners.
- Differing priorities cause challenges and high-level communication is needed to overcome them.
- There have been identifiable benefits to come out of the collaboration, for example a new research centre. Evaluating impact is carried out across the long term.
5. Analysis of Findings

The literature review highlighted some of the reasons for collaboration, the key challenges that arise and some of the leadership activities, methods and styles which are seen as having particular benefit in collaborative environments. It also examined some of the ways in which leadership is enacted in the context of collaborations – either through individuals (whether top-down, bottom-up or using a more distributed and interpersonal approach) or through the processes and structures found within a collaboration, in which case individuals will not necessarily have control over activities and outcomes. This section reviews and analyses the findings from the case studies in the light of the literature.

5.1 What differentiates leadership in collaborative environments?

How leadership is defined in any situation is much contested – there is no consensus about what can (or cannot) be classed as leadership; who or what exerts or exhibits leadership and how this takes place; or the extent to which leadership directly causes outcomes. Debates within the literature further focus on influence versus power; management versus leadership; the notions of hierarchical, vertical and horizontal leadership; individual versus system leadership; and of course a multitude of different leadership styles, skills, capabilities and activities.

The collaborations literature refers to informal, decentred, shared, distributed and relational leadership theories rather than classical leadership theories generally understood in terms of ‘making things happen’ and ‘influencing outcomes’. Bolden et al in their study of collective leadership note that ‘individuals lead’ through influencing projects, systems, teams and individuals, Williams describes how boundary spanners ‘drive direction and get things done’, Huxem and Vangen approach leadership as :

*the mechanisms that lead collaborative activity and outcomes in one direction rather than another [...] what makes things happen in a collaboration.*

Hence the focus in much of the relevant literature is less on individual leaders and what they do – and more about who or what is driving collaborations forward and how their outcomes can be influenced. In collaborations there appear to be many more points at which leadership is required and exerted than those which involve the formal leader, and boundaries between leadership, influence, power and the role of individuals and the structures which affect them become blurred. As Middleton notes, while ‘there is often no-one in charge’, leadership is still perceived to take place, and is required, at various points.

Collaborative environments are full of complex relationships and expectations. This complexity exists because of the different organisations, individuals and roles involved in any one collaborative entity (and hence the variety of ‘voices’ which must be taken into account at each stage), the number of different relationships and types of relationship which must be cultivated, the variety of explicit and implicit goals and aims which are present with the collaborative team and the different structures and processes that those in the collaborative team have to work with in their home organisation. Further, some individuals and partners may not be totally open about their own aims or reasons for being involved in the collaboration which can lead to ambiguity among the above. Hence leadership in collaborations incorporates and requires a number of styles, types, skills and capabilities from the various individuals involved to navigate different and sometimes conflicting demands. A range of structures and processes may also be required to ensure that the collaboration functions effectively internally, and so that it is also able to work alongside and meet the demands of partner organisations and stakeholders.

In order to respond to the complexities of collaborating, the literature suggests that flexibility by individuals and partner organisations is important. Oakley and Selwood note that flexibility in terms of agreeing aims is vital and Huxem and Vangen discuss the importance of flexibility to cope with the frequent changing goals, processes and personnel which take place within collaborative activity. The cases support the importance of compromising and being flexible in terms of leading collaborative activity, for example the Kaplan case study noted that flexibility was essential from those leading collaborative activity and the NHRP found ‘compromise or “give and take” from all involved was essential.’

The typical tasks in the lifecycle of a collaboration were given in section 2.8 (page 9) above. The case studies indicate that, at least initially, the burden of carrying out these tasks is likely to be unevenly distributed within and between the partners, depending on where expertise and ability lie. With time and experience, institutional memory and trust should grow. Those within the collaborative team and beyond should become more skilled at assessing how the leadership, management and governance of existing or new collaborative activities are best distributed between the partners at the outset and as the collaboration matures.

---
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It is a common finding in other contexts too that setting up new entities obliges leaders and managers to focus on managing several phases of organisational change, as the new entity develops from a concept to a tangible accumulation of functions and resources, which is launched and becomes operational, followed by a review and termination or renewal. These shifts of focus and emphasis require those leaders and managers to be alert to the developmental stages and transitions between them, and to be able to anticipate, adjust and adapt promptly.

5.2 Leading beyond hierarchies in collaborative environments

Within a collaboration, diverse individuals, teams and organisations are brought together as partners into a new environment and the hierarchies and leadership structures which exist within their partner organisations do not transfer over easily. Those who are attempting to drive the collaboration forward may be used to having a team working ‘for them’ (as would happen as part of their role within their home institution) and hence being able to direct the actions of individuals to meet their own aims. In the collaborative team, particularly at the early stages, there may not be an agreed hierarchy of roles, and individuals will only act if they are persuaded that a course is the right one. If no universal agreement is reached there is no one individual who can take a final decision, as all partners would want to have their say. Hence, for individuals looking to direct outcomes of a collaboration, utilising horizontal influence and ‘beyond authority’ leadership methods are likely to be more effective than attempting to use positional or vertical leadership.

Within collaborations, the role of ‘boundary spanning’ individuals (who manage to influence and drive action outside their own organisation and team) is vital for ensuring cooperation on a day-to-day basis between partners and those within and outside the collaborative team. To carry out such roles effectively, individuals require excellent interpersonal skills and to use negotiation, bargaining, brokering and influence to affect outcomes and exert leadership.

Many of the case studies discuss leadership within the collaborations using terms which describe horizontal or beyond-authority leadership. For example, the BRC found that ‘knowledge, relationships and influence’ were used to help take the collaboration forward; the ‘day-to-day’ leader from INTO took things forward by using ‘initiative, anticipating needs, consulting, conferring’. In SIPR individuals were ‘engaging outside their sphere of influence, communicating priorities, managing expectations, encouraging trust and cohesion’.

5.3 The supporting role of senior individuals

The literature suggests that distributed and ‘beyond-authority’ leadership (as discussed above) are important when working across organisational, team and other boundaries to circumvent the lack of formal positional authority. However, senior individuals from the partner organisations must also either be represented on the collaborative team or supporting it from the outside. Individuals who are able to call upon the authority that comes with their position are best able to champion and support collaborative activity and act as ambassadors, promoting the collaboration within partner institutions and to stakeholders. This supporting role would obviously also involve spanning organisational and hierarchical boundaries. It would, in addition, require the legitimacy and credibility brought by an individual’s position, and would be largely focused beyond the collaborative team to gain broader support and buy-in.

Within the case studies a balance of horizontal and vertical leadership and different leadership roles and activities were required to drive the collaborations forward successfully. They also highlight that there is a fundamental role for senior individuals specifically in supporting the collaboration, helping to gain buy-in from across partner institutions and stakeholders and steering the strategic direction of a partnership. The BRC found ‘strong central leadership across member organisations was important for sustaining and guiding ongoing activities’ and that one of the tools used by individual leaders was ‘position’; INTO noted that ‘in addition to the operational leader, an individual with higher sign-off is also needed to steer the strategic direction’. The vital (and sometimes challenging) role of gaining broad support and buy-in for collaborations, undertaken particularly effectively by very senior individuals, was noted in a number of cases. WYLLN found ‘engagement of senior managers from the member organisations helped to strengthen relationships, build trust, encourage buy-in and align priorities’; Kaplan found that ‘support and buy-in from senior management and governance of the HEI partner was essential to the overall collaboration’ and Øresund noted the positive impact of strong ownership for the collaboration at the top levels in HEIs.

The involvement of senior individuals appears to be important from the very early stages of setting up a collaboration. The SIPR case noted that ‘Promoting benefits across partner organisations was important in the early stages, particularly by senior individuals’; in INTO it was found that ‘the involvement of senior figures from each partner from the outset was essential’.
5.4 Communication and relationships

Given the number of individuals, teams, organisations and stakeholders involved in collaborative activity, communication at all levels is extremely important. This becomes particularly so where partners and those collaborating are located away from each other. Communicating is an essential role for those individuals who exert an influence across organisational and team boundaries (as discussed above), and an important element of leading beyond boundaries.

Communicating is noted in most of the case studies as a crucial leadership activity. Both formal and informal communications were cited as helping the ongoing success of the collaborations, and the importance of communication at all levels, and ‘open’ communication, are specifically noted. Kaplan found ‘maintaining open communications’ and ‘engaging with each other frequently’ were important roles for those driving the partnership forward; the Øresund case found ‘formal and informal […] communication’ to be vital; in WYLLN a key role for day-to-day managers was ‘to communicate individual partners’ activities’; and SIPR and Øresund count ‘maintaining open communication channels’ and ‘managing relations and communications formally and informally’ as essential leadership roles.

Given the importance of communication, interpersonal competencies must be essential for the individuals involved in collaborations. Several authors note the importance of developing positive and lasting relationships within the collaboration, and hence highlight the value of strong interpersonal skills among those taking on leadership roles. Aspects found to be particularly important for collaborative leaders include building and maintaining trust across organisations within a collaboration; networking and motivating; building and maintaining relationships across organisations; dealing with other (organisational or international) cultures; and bringing together the right individuals for specific roles. The INTO case found that ‘underpinning and securing positive working relationships has been key to making the collaboration work’; SIPR and Øresund also noted the importance of formal and informal relationships.

Given the nature of collaborative activity there can be a number of types of relationships involved, and various degrees of investment required to make these work. The summary of relationship types which may fall on individuals involved in partnership activities below (as suggested by the case studies and broader literature) highlights the complexity involved:

**Individuals who are solely based in the collaboration (where this is a separate ‘unit’) need to cultivate:**

**Internal relationships:**
- With each other.
- With individuals who are part of the collaborative team but based in other partner organisations.

**External relationships:**
- With individuals and teams from partner organisations who are not a part of the collaborative team.
- With stakeholders, funders and other external individuals and teams.

**Individuals who are a part of the collaborative team, but based in one of the partner organisations, need to cultivate**

**Internal relationships:**
- With those based solely in the collaboration.
- With others who are part of the collaborative team but based in the same partner organisation.
- With those who are part of the collaborative team but based in a different partner organisation.

**External relationships:**
- With those who are not part of the collaborative team but part of the same partner organisation.
- With those who are not part of the collaborative team but part of a different partner organisation.
- With stakeholders, funders and other external individuals and teams.

In addition, many of these types of relationship can be with either senior or junior colleagues (or with those not within existing hierarchies), informal or formal, with one specific individual or with various individuals from an organisation. Further, as noted elsewhere in this report, the types and intensity of relationships will change throughout a collaborative project depending on the stage it is at, and relationships will need to be built up again if significant individuals leave and are replaced (as happens often in such ventures) or if new partners or stakeholders join.
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5.5 Leadership, management, governance and accountability structures

Navigating existing leadership management, governance and accountability structures relating to partners and funders as well as developing new working structures within the collaborative team are given as a crucial challenge in the literature. Both Huxem and Vangen\textsuperscript{152} and Kezar and Lester\textsuperscript{153} (2009) note that navigating complex and different power structures and processes is one of the important areas of conflict in collaborative activity. Williams suggests that organisational and governance structures, processes and cultures should be ‘designed around collaboration, partnership and networking’\textsuperscript{154} to ensure organisations can collaborate successfully. Huxem and Vangen further note that leadership is enacted through the processes, structures and roles which have been set up within a collaboration\textsuperscript{155} so these are not only complex but also extremely influential.

Many cases found engaging with the leadership and management structures of different partners difficult. For example, Kaplan found challenges when they had to interact with the different partners’ leadership and management structures (particularly at the funding and proposal stages) and NHRP also found that navigating the distinct institutional structures of partners was a challenge. Many of the activities carried out within the collaborations in the case studies were required not just to complement existing leadership and management structures, but to work within them. In the case of the NHRP, the partners decided to ensure that all collaborative work was undertaken completely within existing HEI structures and procedures without creating a new collaborative ‘space’ at all. They note that this avoided conflict but limited the scope for expansion of collaborative activity. Other cases highlight the creation of formal structures and hierarchies within the collaborative team, to coexist alongside those of the partner organisations. For example in SIPR they specifically developed formal management structures for the collaboration to mitigate competition and ensure access to all outputs for all partners. WYLLN worked hard to develop a balance between internal and external structures by ensuring all institutions involved in the collaboration followed a business plan – but were able to arrange the specific activities within the structures of their own institution.

The cases include some collaborations whose partners decided to continue operating after completing the initial ‘period’ agreed for the collaboration by using a different structure or formal status, thereby altering the ownership and/or leadership, management and governance (eg by becoming a membership organisation). Some were set up as wholly self-financing long-term arrangements which the partners contracted to pursue together. Others have start-up funding that is time-limited, after which they have to generate funding from elsewhere. Some collaborations may need to adapt their shape or parameters over time, where the organisational status or objectives of the partner change, partly as a result of their joint activity. They would therefore need to adjust their objectives or structures.

Given the significance of existing and new leadership, management, governance and accountability structures in collaborations and for their leadership, a more nuanced understanding of the range of structures which impact upon collaborations would be beneficial. More research into the elements involved would no doubt be useful (and indeed the cases in this report probably do not reflect the full spectrum). Huxem and Vangen note that

\textit{‘In practice, the structure of collaborations is continually changing, partly because external pressures and changes within the member organisations have a direct influence on who can and should be a member, and partly because inevitable changes to the collaborative purpose imply different membership needs.’}\textsuperscript{156}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The collaboration remains within existing structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collaboration sits within existing structures of one or all of the partners. Individuals work on the collaborative ‘project’ while remaining within their own roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The collaboration works inside some of the partners’ structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collaboration fits within some existing structures (for example academic quality or the partnership board in HEIs) but it also creates some structures and roles which are specific to the collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The collaboration is a separate unit from partners with its own LGM structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collaboration is a new unit which has its own leader and LGM structures. The leader can direct activity and goals – hence the partners have more of an advisory or steering capacity and are not involved in signing off each decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within this report, there appears to be a spectrum of ‘structures’ which relate to how separate the collaborative entity is from partners and stakeholders, and who owns it. Where a collaboration falls on this spectrum would have a significant impact on the leadership, management and governance processes and systems which are required, the relationship with partners and stakeholders and in turn how governance is managed and structured. It may also affect financing and sustainability issues.

5.6 Agreeing aims and expectations between partners

While the aims and goals of all partners in a collaboration are unlikely to be the same, understanding what each partner hopes to get from the collaboration and discussing early on where goals are shared can deliver benefits later. Huxem and Vangen[157] suggest that there is often a perceived need at the outset of a collaboration to set and agree on common aims, but that in practice (given the ‘variety of organizational and individual agendas’ and the presence of hidden agendas as well as those which are explicit[158]), this is often difficult or impossible to achieve. However, they suggest at least finding ‘a way of stating the aims so that none of the parties can disagree’[159]. Oakley and Selwood also suggest that beginning without at least some agreement on aims ‘only works up to a point and inevitably raises questions about sustainability’[160].

Many of the case studies reported that agreeing aims was considered important to the future of the collaboration – but that this was also extremely challenging. For WYLLN ‘Aligning and linking priorities from all member institutions was considered necessary to ensure the future of the collaboration’; for SIPR, ‘Managing expectations of the partners and setting out a shared vision was considered important and took a great deal of time to get right’ and the Øresund case found that differing priorities between partners caused challenges. In one case (the NHRP) they found that ‘establishing agreement on expectations continued throughout the first five years of the collaboration’. It seems that reaching agreement on aims is not something which can always be completed before the collaboration begins to act, even if this is sometimes preferable.

5.7 Building on strong foundations

The literature found that there was a benefit to having ‘firm foundations’ to build upon when starting up the collaboration[161], and that good evidence gathering and strong previous relationships were noted as helping to build a solid foundation[162].

In many of the case studies, the collaborations either built upon existing relationships (for example BRC and Øresund) or found it necessary to invest time and effort in the early stages to develop a suitable ‘foundation’, trust and good working relationships. Some noted benefits in building upon previous relationships in which trust had already been established, while others invested time and effort early on in the partnership to ensure relationships were strong enough to withstand the pressures of collaborative activity. INTO invested time and effort early on to build trust and underpin ongoing relationships and Kaplan noted that in the early days leadership involved laying a foundation to build support.

5.8 Some competition is likely between the collaborating partners and can be anticipated and managed

UK HEIs are well aware that the economic and political contexts in which they operate nationally and internationally oblige them to be keenly alive to competitive forces. HEIs are developing ways to be better able to compete, and collaborating with bodies outside the HE sector is one route. In doing this, however, they may encounter competition from like-minded HEIs looking to collaborate in a similar way. These are normal features of markets, and there is a wealth of theory and practice about how to succeed in competitive circumstances. HEIs’ collaborations may encounter competition internally and externally, which may assist them or hinder them from maximising the effectiveness of the joint activity.

As the case studies show (for example BRC), external competition can arise if there are several HEIs within the collaboration, many capable of supplying a particular activity or expertise of the same quality. Alternatively, a collaboration may be entering a market where other players are already better known and established, or where the collaboration’s activity is not sufficiently distinctive. A commercial partner which has comparable separate collaborations with several HEIs may put more effort and investment into some rather than others, and vice versa for an HEI with several comparable collaborations with commercial organisations. Internal competition is also already a familiar part of the HEIs’ landscape: departments and individuals have to bid for posts, contracts, time and other resources, they have to shape their plans and budgets to the HEI’s priorities, and look outside the HEI for support for some activities.

Evidence from the cases suggests that ventures with shorter initial lifetimes tend to experience a more limited degree of commitment from the partners, and the leading figures tend to have to work harder at raising internal support for and
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confidence in the continuation of the activity. Some of the cases that had come to the end of their initial funding or soon would do so were struggling to find other sources to allow them to continue the activity, and that quest was taking up a lot of their time. Uncertainty about the sustainability of the project seemed not to have been anticipated in any detail when the venture was first planned and launched.

5.9 Funding and sustainability are key challenges for collaborations
Collaborations and partnerships take a great deal of resources to succeed – both time and money. Consulting with all members, co-ordinating responses, agreeing on actions, finding times to meet (particularly if partners are located far away), involving the time of senior individuals and updating each other on progress, can all be very time intensive. Further, trust and a strong relationship with partners will develop over time and only after a significant amount has been invested by all partners. Financial resources such as ‘pump priming’ funding are often needed to get a collaboration up and running in addition to the cost of the time involved.

As well as the time required, the case studies noted challenges relating to the financing of collaborations; in a number, the future sustainability of the collaboration was uncertain because of these challenges, coupled with the current funding climate. In the BRC it was felt that ‘future challenges in relation to how limited funding is shared among partners may develop – and competition between partners becomes an issue’; NHRP found ‘tensions between partners arose in relation to funding’.

The WYLLN case highlights that where funding needs to be continued to keep the partnership going, providing evidence of benefits and impact of the collaborative activity is vital, but extremely difficult. It notes ‘ambiguity around direct collaborative benefits may make sustainability an issue in the current “restricted funding” climate’ and in SIPR it was noted that longer-term sustainability was uncertain because ‘it is difficult to provide evidence of the added value of collaborative research or of any changes to behaviours taking place out of the collaborative working.’ The literature also reported challenges in terms of estimating the benefits of collaboration, and ascertaining whether the significant investment required was justified in terms of outcomes.

The cases which were able to report unambiguous and direct benefits found that ‘Collaborative projects such as this offer new opportunities for teams and individuals to take initiative and help unlock previously under-utilised skills – outside traditional organisational structures and spheres of activity’ (INTO) and that collaborating had directly enabled the ‘creation of a new research centre’ (Øresund).

5.10 Collaborations could contribute to transforming HEIs’ leadership, management and governance
It is also interesting to consider, in the light of the case studies, the transformative effects or potential effects that collaborations could have for HEIs, particularly in relation to leadership, management and governance. Our evidence indicates that it is premature to claim that the particular case study HEIs have yet achieved such transformative effects, although several of the collaborations have the potential to be transformative and some are described by their participants as having begun to be influential in that broader sense.

Evidence of transformative change, or evidence of whether or how a collaboration has contributed to wider changes in an organisation, could be more readily collected when the collaborative activity has become embedded in its hosts’ systems and structures. Transformative change depends on there being an internal analysis of the lessons learned and the new structures, processes and skills that are required for skilful collaborative activity and arrangements.

For some HEIs, collaborations help them to review their own identity and purpose, their strengths and weaknesses, which can be the precursors to transformation. They can be used as a mechanism for revitalising and refocusing their organisation’s culture and aspirations, using leadership, management and governance elements of their collaborative activities to underpin a broader re-thinking and redesign. For other HEIs, the decision to pursue certain collaborations may be the consequence of having already undertaken a self-evaluation and strategic review. In both instances the collaborations could potentially support transformative change in the HEI (and also perhaps partners) by being used to influence strategy and policy-making, on decision-making and new ways of working, and on the focus for leadership, management and governance.

In some instances, the effects of the collaboration on the HEI may depend on the HEI’s structure and managerial set-up, and the level of senior involvement and buy-in to the collaborative activities. In other cases, the effects may depend on the closeness of the relationship between the collaborative activity and the HEI’s strategic goals and priorities. Clearly, as individuals in leading roles will surely come and go in the partner organisations, the collaborative relationships will change, with consequences for the ‘organisational memory’ held by the collaboration. There may also be the criterion of ‘critical mass’ to consider, especially if the collaborative activity is at an early stage of development, and has yet to build all its functionality and establish its track record and networks of influence beyond the immediate participants.
5.11 Many models of governance can work in collaborations
Performance-monitoring requirements can vary greatly between collaborations, ranging from extensive layers of governance and supervision with frequent reporting, to very light touch oversight and much more delegation of responsibility. For some collaborations, setting up separate a new senior executive board is appropriate, while others find a shared board works well. Several of the case studies show that advisory (rather than supervisory) boards are built in to the design of the collaboration. In all types of collaboration, the legal requirements for governance will prescribe the minimum formal requirements with which the participating organisations will need to comply. But within that, there is considerable scope for adaptation. The case studies show that the ‘right’ arrangements can depend on how well the partner organisations judge the scale and scope of resources the project needs, its centrality to their respective and joint missions and strategies, and the reputational risks. Setting appropriate performance and monitoring standards is essential too, not least because outputs and outcomes often also depend on how long the collaborative activity has been underway.

5.12 Summary of report findings

- Leadership in collaborations is best explained by informal, shared or distributed theories – and is centred around driving results and making things happen.

- Leadership can be exerted by individuals at different levels (through influencing and negotiating as well as using positional power) – but also through systems and processes.

- A complex range of skills, capabilities, structures and processes are required to lead collaborations – and flexibility is key to navigate these.

- Leadership, governance and management within collaborations are unlikely to be distributed evenly (at least in the early stages) and the distribution will fluctuate over time.

- Within a collaboration the leadership hierarchies which exist within partner organisations will not apply and so hierarchical leadership methods may not be appropriate. Instead horizontal and ‘beyond authority’ methods may be more effective.

- Boundary-spanning roles which ensure cooperation and communication and drive activities forward on a day-to-day basis are essential within collaborations – individuals with these roles will require interpersonal skills and often use negotiation, brokering and influence to achieve results.

- Also important are senior individuals (involved from the very early stages in a partnership) to support collaborations and help gain buy-in from across partner organisations and stakeholders. They can also steer the strategic direction.

- ‘Open’ communication at all levels through both formal and informal channels is important for all those involved in a collaboration.

- Developing and maintaining strong relationships is essential for those within the collaborative team – and so interpersonal competences are essential for the individuals involved. A broad range of relationships must be nurtured within the collaboration and outside it with partners and stakeholders.

- Navigating structures within the collaborative team and working with the structures of partners can cause conflict. There is a spectrum within the cases presented here of structures which depend on how far the collaboration is a separate entity and how far it fits within the existing structures of partners. Where a collaboration fits on this spectrum will affect leadership, governance and management and accountability.

- Agreeing aims and expectations among partners can be a difficult and lengthy process but can help develop trust and avoid conflict later on.

- A solid foundation for the partnership will help to ensure it can withstand changes and conflict – previous relationships and ‘doing your homework’ will help.

- Competition may occur between partners, particularly where two HEIs are participants.

- Ensuring collaborations are properly supported financially is a significant issue. Where external funding is received, additional start-up capital may still need to be found.

- The current financial climate also makes ongoing sustainability uncertain; benefits and impact from collaborations need to be demonstrated and this can be hard to do given the focus (research, teaching etc) of many of the cases here.

- Where unambiguous benefits were noted these were exciting. One case (INTO) noted that collaborations offer teams and individuals new opportunities to take initiative and another collaboration (Øresund) led to the creation of a new research centre.
6. Conclusions and Recommendations

We now present the implications of the findings from this study for leaders, managers and governors in UK HEIs as individuals, and for leadership, governance and management within institutions. In collaborations, the individuals who are involved in driving forward outcomes have roles, responsibilities, skills and capabilities (it should be noted many individuals will have separate roles and responsibilities within the collaboration and in their home institution). Also within collaborations, the structures, processes and systems set in place drive outcomes forward in a particular direction and hence exert a leadership influence. In institutions, there are structures, systems and organisational capacity for initiating, developing and sustaining successful collaborations. Thus, roles and skills together with structures, systems and processes at individual, team and institutional level are involved in successful collaborations.

6.1 Set clear guidelines about how collaboration will affect individuals involved

The case studies showed that staff who will be involved in operational delivery of the service (eg teaching, research, information brokerage, administration, etc) want to know about the new context in which they may be working. They want to understand how their part in the collaboration will fit in to the whole, and how the whole fits in to the HEI. They want to know how their terms and conditions of employment may be affected, and what new opportunities (eg for promotion or for relocation) the new venture could offer them. Managers who communicate these types of evidence readily and clearly from the outset find that staff appreciate the openness, which in turn builds commitment to that venture and potentially to new ones in the future.

6.2 Ensure communication to partners and the home organisation is fit for purpose

The individuals who are spearheading the creation and implementation of the collaboration, the champions, need to ensure that they demonstrate to their respective senior managers and governing boards, and to their peers and other staff, the potential that the collaboration has to achieve the desired benefits and, subsequently, that it is performing satisfactorily. Information and evidence (appropriate to the stage of the negotiations and the level of commercial sensitivity) are powerful aids to building support and commitment to the new venture. Openness pays dividends in underpinning operational as well as supervisory commitment to the collaboration and securing its sustainability. Leaders, managers and governors each have specific responsibilities within their own HEI and between the HEI and the partner(s) as well as with the clients of the venture for ensuring these communications are fit for purpose and have impact.

6.3 Ensure the institution supports collaborations through setting a positive ‘climate’

Senior leaders in the HEI can set a climate, and/or specific strategic priorities, to support collaborative endeavours. They can also identify resources for such collaborations. And if ‘collaborative working’ or ‘building strategic collaborations’ becomes part of the life-blood of the HEI, then individuals who initiate and develop such collaborations successfully should be rewarded. There could be implications for HR systems and management. Similarly, finance systems will need to take account of collaborations, and ‘siloed’ financial structures could present obstacles to successful collaborations.

6.4 Ensure that lessons and outcomes are fed back to the central institution so as not to ‘re-invent the wheel’

As we have noted, for many HEIs collaborations are not new, but this study suggests that they are still a relatively peripheral activity in many cases, and that there is much scope to enhance proficiency of design and implementation, to increase the success rate. Many causes of failure or under-performance by HEIs’ collaborations are not mysterious or obscure: they are mostly due to basic, commonly occurring faults in leadership and management, and insufficiently alert governance. There may still be too much re-inventing of the wheel and too little active learning from their own and others’ experience. Some of the issues are to do with improving individuals’ skills and expertise; others are to do with the organisation’s structures, systems, culture and capacity. Furthermore, HEIs may need to improve their internal analytical capabilities, including systems and routines for managing teaching and research through the collaborations, so that they fully understand their options and can become more skilful and strategic. These skills can take time and experience to accumulate, and these systems require effort to set up.

6.5 Experience of setting up and running collaborations can also equip HEIs to boost the quality and effectiveness of other aspects of their organisation

The potential benefits of collaborating extend beyond the immediate participants in the joint activity, or the products of that activity. There should be considerable learning from the experience of engaging with the complexities of collaborating. These lessons should be captured, analysed and mobilised elsewhere in the HEI too. The knowledge and skills that collaborations help to build provide another kind of a return on the HEI’s investment of time, effort and money. To realise the return for the whole HEI, leaders, governors and managers at several levels and locations in the HEI need to be
alert to the opportunities for this kind of knowledge transfer, and to act upon them. These individuals are responsible for ensuring this knowledge transfer happens.

6.6 Consider how to move forward when collaborations are successful

Scaling up becomes an inevitable requirement for productive collaborations that have the potential to succeed, grow, become embedded and multiply in and beyond their original progenitors in the HEI and the other participating organisations. Leadership, management and governance structures need to provide for such scaling up, which may also involve changes in ownership and control of the joint functions. Anticipating changes in the external policy and market contexts may be particularly salient too, for example where previous sources of external funding, on which the collaboration has relied, cease to be available. Collaborations which can anticipate the need to switch to a different model of income-generation will be at an advantage.

The literature and the cases confirmed the common sense observation that leadership operates at several levels in collaborations, and in the partner organisations, ranging from the direction of day-to-day operations of activity through to broader, longer-term strategic planning and decision-making for growth and sustainability. Governance plays a central part in keeping collaborations functioning properly, especially in relation to risks, and there is some evidence that leadership and governance responsibilities are distributed among a very small group of individuals at the early stages of a collaboration’s life. Therefore, growing the ability to develop capable successors, and appropriate systems and structures, is significant. Different styles of leadership are very likely to exist in the participating organisations, reflecting partly the preferences of the individuals in those roles and partly the prevailing culture in their own organisations and sectors. For previous generations, the necessary experience and skills for these roles, which go well beyond academic and professional competence, might have been acquired mostly ‘on the job’. The programme of preparation for senior roles that academics and professional staff currently receive is likely to need to change still more radically.

6.7 Ensure individuals are encouraged and equipped to deal with the collaborative process

Leaders, managers and governors involved in collaborative working of the kind described in the case studies thrive more readily if they can embrace entrepreneurial attitudes, translate or adapt their language to business vocabulary, and articulate performance expectations and timetables in more commercial terms. The values and virtues of academic culture, including a focus on quality and rigour, count for a lot in collaborations with external bodies, and those in leadership, management and governance roles are visible ambassadors for those values.

Individuals need to actively nurture and develop their own entrepreneurial capability and that of their academic and other staff, many of whom may not have had much training in this area or relevant experience. This includes developing a sound grasp of the complexities of collaborating, and expanding and rethinking what they do and how they work in the context of collaborative activities.

6.8 Ensure processes structures and systems enable effective collaborative working

The various literatures also suggest that to build successful collaborations, organisations need to build capacity for collaborative working in their internal structures, processes and systems and must develop the skills, capabilities and awareness of their staff to be able to work across boundaries and thus take advantage of the opportunities that arise in the new operating environment.

Essential organisational functions can make or break a collaboration: the finance and HR functions, for example, play a considerable part in enabling systems and processes (such as employment terms for academics working for the new venture, or financial reporting protocols between the new venture and the HEI’s main channels) to adapt and facilitate cross-boundary working.

6.9 Governance

The governance arrangements are crucial too; one factor is whether the governance arrangements try to shoehorn the collaboration into existing structures and processes or whether they can be designed directly for the collaboration and, importantly, can facilitate the cross-boundary relationships that should fuel the collaboration.

Each partner has to take account of, and work with, the roles, understandings and culture, as well as the policies, rules and governance requirements, of the other partner. But corporate governing bodies have to be sure that their HEI’s entrepreneurial and collaborative activities are accountable and are carefully vetted for several types of risk (which could include poor quality of teaching or research or consultancy; project overruns; financial impropriety or inefficiency; overdependence and loss of autonomy or reputational damage). They need to decide on the stringency of criteria to set for assessing the level of governance and managerial scrutiny that different kinds of collaborative schemes must adhere to; and what higher levels of risk are acceptable in the case of new ventures. They should also proactively consider whether these entrepreneurial collaborative activities could be made more efficient by adjustments to existing conventions,
structures or policies within their HEI. There may be ways of working in professional support or academic departments, which have served well in the past, but which now present impediments to successful collaborations. Those who set and monitor academic standards and ethical procedures, also have to expand and rethink what they do and how they work in the context of collaborative activities.
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Appendix A

Full case studies

This appendix situates each case study within the typology set out in the introduction, describes its leadership, management and governance approach and structures, and then reflects on the implications of each case study's experience of effective leadership, management and governance in their collaborations. As outlined in the Introduction (Section 2), case study selection criteria included consideration of the potential to affect or change HEIs' leadership, management and governance. To help distinguish this aspect of collaborations, and how it might come about, we analysed the following stages of collaboration, with a view to exploring the challenges and opportunities for leadership, management and governance associated with these stages:

- The set-up and development stage.
- Ongoing collaborative activities and interactions.
- Achievements, sustainability and future aspects of the collaboration.

A.1 Case study 1: Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre

Main findings
- The Biomedical Research Centre provides resources for, and organises, existing collaborative research relationships
- Committed leaders help to ensure resources were allocated to meet original objectives
- Partner organisations’ existing structures provide regulatory oversight for collaborative research activities

The Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (BRC)’s primary aim is to translate research into changes in clinical practice; it promotes translational research across a range of research areas, investing in infrastructure, cross-cutting facilities in eleven thematic areas. Figure 1 provides an overview of the leadership, management and governance positions and structures for the Cambridge BRC. A director provides central leadership, working with ten research leads who direct the thematic areas, and scientific advisory boards provide advice and guidance.

A.1.1 Setting up the BRC benefited from a history of collaborative working between the two collaborating bodies

Collaborative working is not new to Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CUH) and the University. CUH and the University of Cambridge had established relationships prior to the BRC, and this collaboration built on that. The BRC bid was also structured to build on other funding opportunities for translational research. For example, one senior researcher reported that they used the BRC bid to request funding for areas that other funders were unlikely to support, such as clinical research infrastructure and posts (eg database administrators, research nurses).

BRC funding provided a mechanism and motivation for researchers and clinicians to cluster and deepen collaborative research activities. In particular, the BRC provided resources and a structure for such translational research.

A.1.2 Individual leaders from both partners helped to guide, and grow, the BRC’s activities

The BRC director, from the NHS, has helped to guide the allocation of funding and the scope of BRC activities. As funding goes to the NHS partner, interviewees found that the director’s location within the CUH became important in ensuring that funding was allocated as planned. Because of his position and knowledge of the CUH, the director could help direct funding and navigate CUH regulations and bureaucratic processes (interview, senior researcher).
The expansion of BRC activities through leveraging of external funding has in turn involved senior management from both the Trust and the University. For example, the Director of Corporate Development at CUH and the Secretary of the School of Clinical Medicine led many of the recent agreements with Merck, a global pharmaceutical company. Through a collaborative network of clinical cancer sites, the University of Cambridge, CUH and Cancer Research UK will contribute to clinical trials for Merck’s oncology products, exchanging research capacity and knowledge from the BRC for preferential access to investigator-initiated clinical trials. Also, Merck provided Cambridge with a PET-CT scanner, which benefits BRC activities as well as other research organisations. Merck, along with other industry bodies, NHS organisations and Cancer Research UK, sponsors research studies with the BRC.

A.1.3 Collaborative translational research is likely to continue outside the sustainability of the BRC

Collaborative research activity is embedded into teaching and research activities at the university and CUH. The BRC is one of many instances of integration. One senior researcher suggested the BRC contributes to collaborative working, but that in practice it is difficult to separate the BRC from wider activities involving CUH and university partners.

“We treat the BRC more or less as equivalent to the entire campus... the beauty of Addenbrookes and [the University of] Cambridge is that essentially the BRC reflects how we have been behaving for the last twenty years, as an interactive and collaborative academic medical centre” (interview, senior researcher).

In the future, tensions could arise over how to allocate further funding. Financial restrictions could continue to be a challenge for the collaboration. As funding opportunities are limited, competition for funding between research areas could increase. This could contribute to additional strain on leadership to organise funding and ensure it is spent according to the original proposals. The sustainability of the BRC could be affected by wider developments, such as the success of the National Institute of Health Research's BRC initiative as a whole.

The CUH BRC is unique among the case studies in the long-standing history of collaborative working that underpins translational research activity. Despite potential disagreement over future allocations of funding, interviewees emphasised that collaborative working is not optional, but necessary for the research and would continue regardless. As with the other case studies, strong central leadership across member organisations was important for sustaining and guiding these ongoing collaborative activities.

A.2 Case study 2: INTO in London

Main findings
- Investing at the outset in forming good relationships between the senior managers is crucial for the health of the collaboration
- The joint ventures are designed to be self-financing
- The joint venture contract does not have a termination clause

INTO University Partnerships (IUP) is a private company, set up in 2006, to create joint ventures with HEIs, for the purpose of increasing international student recruitment to those HEIs. IUP has two joint ventures in London, one with UEA called INTO University of East Anglia (London) and one with City University called INTO City University London. Both joint venture organisations are currently located in a single building in London, leased by UEA in London, which also houses IUP’s own headquarters office.

The collaboration between UEA and INTO was launched in January 2010 to address the aims of ‘improving the employability of UEA graduates, further raising the University’s international profile, and fostering links with influential government and business communities’167. INTO’s joint venture with City University was negotiated in 2009, to provide English language and pre-degree programmes for international students leading to degrees at City. City had a contract with Kaplan, a private education provider, as an additional channel for recruiting international students, and embarked on the joint venture with INTO to diversify its sources, since the commercial companies ‘fish in different pools’ (interview, City manager).

INTO’s two joint ventures established in London oblige the partners to resolve any deadlocks, as there are no termination clauses in their contracts. It is not clear how termination of the joint venture could be achieved. The broad division of labour between IUP and its joint venture partners is that the HEI supplies and underwrites the academic standards for admission and assessment of students and the accreditation of course content, and invests a proportion of the financial capital. IUP recruits the students, processes their admission to (mostly language and foundation/pathway) courses, and builds and manages teaching and student accommodation facilities, recruits teachers and runs the courses.

The main financial flows work as follows: IUP raises the finance for building the premises and the HEIs underwrite that investment. INTO University of East Anglia (London) holds the property and INTO City pays an occupancy fee (in other joint ventures there are different arrangements). The two joint ventures share the costs of delivery and support. The HEIs
and INTO receive fees from students attending courses and occupying residential accommodation. The HEI funds the time of mainstream academics involved in accreditation and others who liaise with or teach on the joint venture programme. City and UEA liaise daily with their opposite numbers on the main campuses and with the opposite joint venture, particularly to reduce London costs by making the most of opportunities to share development and delivery of services.

A.2.1 Building firm working relationships created the foundations of the collaboration
The senior managers of the collaborating bodies said that readiness to invest time and effort in building trust and underpinning continuing working relationships between individuals at senior and other levels are a fundamental requirement, around which all the other essentials (financial capital, student markets, academic input, operational management) cluster. At UEA and City, the main stakeholders interested in and affected by creating their joint ventures with INTO were the vice-chancellors and senior teams of pro-vice-chancellors, finance and estates heads, their respective university councils, language centres and individual academics. Functional managers recruited to the joint venture companies then undertake detailed marketing, property and operations management, and the liaison with the HEI and IUP.

Most HEIs already have relationships with FE colleges for foundation programmes for pre-undergraduate admission, so setting up admission criteria and levels with the Deans was largely in place. The pre-postgraduate programmes are new, and have required HEI academics to be involved in establishing admission criteria and requirements.

A.2.2 One senior individual in the HEI became the focal point for operational management
Two trends have so far emerged for HEIs’ governance, management and leadership arrangements. One concerns the interfaces and levels of decision-making between the HEI and the joint venture. Another concerns the employment of academic staff. UEA and City have each appointed an academic to be the (full-time) focal point for day-to-day management of the operational relationship between the HEI and INTO. These individuals have to ensure buy-in and cooperation on a range of academic and administrative matters; they reported that they have to take initiatives, anticipate needs, consult and confer. In some respects they act as ambassadors from the joint venture to the home HEI academics and managers, and from them to the joint venture. Although much authority is delegated to these individuals, a higher level of sign-off is also needed, through the HEI’s top management and Council, for strategic questions, such as which new programmes to introduce or what academic criteria to use.

Academic input to joint venture programmes may be provided by individuals employed by the HEI and working at the HEI, by individuals employed by the HEI and working at the London facility, and/or by academics employed by the joint venture and working at the London facility. According to INTO, the third type could become more prevalent. It raises questions about the terms and conditions, responsibilities and accountabilities of those academics compared with their peers employed by the HEI. INTO claims the joint ventures are helping to realise ‘the latent potential of HEI pathway operations, unlocking the skills of staff teams that are often under managed, under resourced and misunderstood’ (INTO Review).

A.2.3 The collaborations are driving further organisational changes
Reshaping programmes and services for international students at the London centre is likely to influence the design and arrangements of programmes for domestic and international students at the home campus. For its part, IUP is establishing a common structure, assessment criteria and academic reporting standards for its full-time English language courses. This will enable international students to be admitted to any of the HEIs in collaborations with INTO, with implications for the competitive relationships between HEIs, particularly if they are recruiting students to similar undergraduate degree courses.

A.3 Case study 3: Kaplan Open Learning

Main findings
- Close involvement from HEI senior management was necessary in setting up and obtaining institutional buy-in
- Individual leaders from each partner organisation mediate ongoing relationships, communicating each institutions’ main concerns and priorities
- Quality risks associated with collaborative working are managed by a Partnership Board in the HEI chaired by HEI senior management

Internationally, uptake of online education has been growing, particularly in the US with nearly 30% of students taking one or more online courses168 in the autumn of 2009; this category is growing at a faster rate than the total HE student population. Almost all of this growth is within existing, rather than new, online education programmes169. Kaplan Open Learning provides an example of collaborative activity between a private provider and HEI to help deliver online HE

---

168 This statistic assumes a definition of online courses as those with 80% or more of course content delivered online: Allen and Seaman (2010) p5
169 Allen and Seaman (2010)
programmes, in this case contributing to degrees accredited by the University of Essex. It is an example of a partnership, like INTO in London, involving HEIs and private sector firms in teaching and/or student recruitment, but with a focus on online education.

Students are enrolled in both Kaplan Open Learning and the University of Essex. Kaplan is responsible for the management, administration and delivery of the online education; the University’s role is focused on quality assurance and accreditation of courses. Courses are delivered through an online classroom, with interactive real-time online engagement and phone communications with other students, tutors and academic advisers.

A.3.1 Buy-in and support from the HEI’s governing bodies is required to alter the scope or structure of the collaboration

As for other innovative or new collaborations, establishing Kaplan Open Learning with the University of Essex needed the support and buy-in of the governance and senior management of the University. According to the registrar at the time this required laying a foundation for building support, and being ready with evidence and flexibility to deal with any questions or opposition as it arose.

Since establishing the collaboration, in the University, governance comes through the Joint Academic Management Board and the Academic Partnerships Board. The University of Essex establishes a unique Management Board for each of its collaborations. Quality and standards across all partnerships with the University are in turn managed separately through an Academic Partnerships Board, which brings together two representatives from each partner institution with which the university has a formal agreement to validate programmes, as well as ex-officio members of the University, specified observers, and University and partner student representatives. Through these committees, senior management from the University becomes aware of and oversees collaborative activity. Also, particularly through the Academic Partnership Board, those in the University involved in different collaborations can communicate progress and share lessons learnt. Those outside these two committees only become involved if there is a new proposal or change in the scope and structure of the collaboration.

D.3.2 Open and shared leadership helped to sustain the collaboration

Several characteristics of the individuals involved in maintaining communications seem to have enabled effective relations and a shared vision between Kaplan and the HEI. First, the individuals pushing the collaboration forward were aware of their institutions’ priorities and strategy, and could work to fit the proposal within the scope of these priorities. Also, those involved maintained open communications. They engaged continually through informal conversations, and formally in the Joint Academic Management Board, providing opportunities to tackle issues and challenges as they arose. Finally, individuals on both sides of the collaboration held a shared vision and openly displayed a desire to make the collaboration work. The manner in which individuals responsible for the collaboration engaged with each other – for example, with professionalism and openness – helped to ensure clarity on each partner’s expectations and priorities (interview, former managing director of Kaplan Open Learning).

A.3.3 Senior management buy-in has been crucial to setting up and maintaining a collaboration with a private sector partner

This collaboration brought something new to the University of Essex – a collaboration between an HEI and a private provider – and there were uncertainties about the implications of such a collaboration for existing academics within the HEI (interview, University registrar). Obtaining wider buy-in from the HEI’s Council and Senate was not straightforward. Because of this, although the collaboration was established through the existing structures for external collaborations at the University, it faced some particular challenges, including providing evidence of the collaboration’s benefits to the HEI, establishing workable funding arrangements, and agreeing on assessment procedures.

Primarily, challenges in interacting with the different partners’ leadership and management structures came at the proposal stage and at particular points when external developments challenged the basic structure and sustainability of the collaboration (e.g., funding challenges). A small number of individuals (two or three from each organisation) took responsibility for moving the proposal forward. In the University, this leadership came from the Academic Partnership Unit and the Dean of Academic Partnerships. These few individuals communicated the priorities of their respective institutions; for example, the Dean of Academic Partnerships helped to prepare the Kaplan Open Learning team to put forward their case to the HEI’s senior management (interview, former managing director of Kaplan Open Learning).

The University’s Partnership Board structure has been used to guide and manage relations. The partnership board structures allow the University’s senior management and senior management from its partners to come together, share lessons learnt, and communicate progress and challenges.
A.4 Case study 4: Northern Ireland Research Partnership

Main findings
- The collaboration was set up to organise and improve the effectiveness of ongoing research to inform policy
- The collaboration required academic staff to adjust to new ways of working, procedures and environments

The Northern Heritage Research Partnership (NHRP) is a framework partnership to support policy-relevant research. It is between the Natural Heritage Directorate, Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA) and Quercus, a research body in the School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast (QUB). The framework agreement was developed after a competitive tendering process in 2003, providing five years of continuous research funding, to be reviewed after three years. In 2008, the framework was reviewed and a competitive tender process was undertaken for a ten-year contract for continuous funding for research; Quercus was again awarded the framework agreement.

The overall objective of the NHRP is:

‘to provide high-quality research to underpin decisions relating to NIEA Natural Heritage’s statutory duties and to help deliver strategic targets relating to the Government’s key themes of sustainable development, biodiversity and climate change.’

A.4.1 Forming the NHRP required fitting collaborative activities within each institution’s administrative structures

The Natural Heritage Directorate and the School of Biological Sciences have distinct institutional structures. A major challenge in forming the NHRP was navigating through these structures (interview, Quercus director). First, the NRHP had to work with, and obtain approval from, the NIEA finance department. After the first framework contract ended, the Natural Heritage Directorate completed an economic appraisal to assess and evaluate options for delivering research.

Second, researchers had to adjust to the NIEA’s procedures and expectations. Some institutional tensions emerged in collaborative activities, for example, issues around cost reduction or publicising research findings. The Quercus director believed researchers adapted their activities to mitigate these challenges, for example by ensuring a paper trail of activities and a separate account for the NHRP. Other interviewees found that partners’ management and the Strategic Advisory Group mediated some tensions between the NIEA’s need for evidence and the University partners’ remit to do research, resulting in give and take between the two in the scope of work conducted through the NHRP.

The Natural Heritage Directorate’s assistant director of conservation science negotiated the terms for the collaboration with the head of the School of Biological Sciences. Developing an effective collaboration required that they spent time identifying mutual objectives, and that they were willing to compromise in order to find a workable agreement. Establishing agreement on expectations continued through the first five years of the initial contract (interview, assistant director of conservation science, NIEA). After these five years, the Directorate was able to be more specific about their expectations and terms of reference for the re-tendering process (interview, head of research and development, NIEA).

A.4.2 NHRP activities have been confined within the School of Biological Sciences

There is no University senior management involvement in the NHRP above the level of the School of Biological Sciences. Thus far, the Head of the school provided the link between the HEI and the collaboration. Also, rather than challenge or transform existing University management and governance arrangements, the NHRP has sought to work within existing structures and procedures. Acceptance of the NHRP within the University has come from observing existing administrative, management and governance requirements. This appears to provide flexibility for the researchers involved, and minimal

170 The NIEA is made up of three directorates: Built Heritage, Natural Heritage and Environmental Protection. The NHRP is with the Natural Heritage Directorate

171 http://www.qub.ac.uk/sites/Quercus/NaturalHeritageResearchPartnership/
conflicts with the University’s administration. However, it also limits the scope of the collaborative working. There is little evidence of the NHRP seeking to move beyond the School of Biological Sciences, to integrate with other University activities.

A.4.3 The sustainability of the NHRP is limited by the availability of public funding

Quercus has been involved in thirty-one active research projects since 23 June 2008; of these twenty-one are funded by or related to NHRP. The director of Natural Heritage commented:

‘[We view the NHRP as] a good example of government and academia working together... it is a win-win situation and both parties do stand to benefit. It comes at a cost, but I think it is proving to be a good facility.’ (interview, director of Natural Heritage)

In addition to evidence of continued outputs of collaborative working, the assistant director of conservation science commented that individual leaders from both partners help to sustain the collaboration over time, through institutional change and staff turnover. Within this, the Quercus director found that this sustainability becomes possible when such leaders anticipate and prepare for change of personnel.

However, looking beyond the ten years of the current contract, the sustainability of the NHRP is uncertain. The director of Natural Heritage observed that in a secure economic climate it would be likely that the NIEA would be interested in sustaining a research collaboration to provide evidence for policy-making. He thought that the main concern is not the value of the collaboration but the availability and flexibility of public spending.

A.5 Case study 5: Scottish Institute for Policing Research

Main findings
- Leadership has been tasked with managing collaborators’ expectations
- Perceived neutrality of the leadership helped to unify and sustain research-pooling activities
- The sustainability of SIPR beyond its current leadership remains uncertain

The Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR) was established in November 2006 as a strategic collaboration between the Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland (ACPOS) and thirteen Scottish HEIs. The collaboration uses a pooling structure to organise resource sharing between the HEIs involved. SIPR’s objective is to offer:

‘a range of opportunities for conducting relevant, applicable research to help the police meet the challenges of the 21st century and for achieving international excellence for policing research in Scotland.’

Figure 4. Management and governance structures for SIPR

172 Reid (2009)
173 The Universities of Aberdeen, Abertay, Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, St Andrews, Strirling, Strathclyde, and The West of Scotland, and

http://www.sipr.ac.uk/
A.5.1 Time and effort was required to set up the collaboration and achieve organisational buy-in

Prior to the creation of SIPR, policing research in Scotland was fragmented, and communications between researchers and police were often ad hoc (interview, SIPR director). Individuals in senior management and research positions within ACPOS and the universities helped promote the collaboration internally to their institutions. For example, a chief constable from ACPOS was closely involved in discussions between ACPOS and the SFC, and worked internally in ACPOS to promote SIPR.\(^{175}\)

In particular, interviewees from both partners agreed that effort and energy were needed to make SIPR visible to the police. In addition to establishing the post of a knowledge transfer officer, seminars and workshops were held to showcase research to the police. Also, new research projects directly supported by SIPR were based on a co-production model with the police service: researchers had to demonstrate that they had engaged in a dialogue with police forces to identify relevant topics for research and that the research process would involve continuing collaboration. Researchers had to show these benefits from the outset although such outputs can take time to emerge.

A.5.2 Formal leadership, supported by informal leaders, have built support for and sustained the collaboration

Collaborations require leaders to engage outside their organisational sphere of influence\(^{176}\). If a leader gains the respect of the organisations involved, this may increase his/her authority and strengthen unity. SFC and ACPOS interviewees thought this occurred in SIPR. They found that the SIPR director encouraged cohesion and trust within the collaboration. The SIPR director stated that he took responsibility for communicating SIPR’s priorities and managing partners’ expectations. This included engaging senior management through Executive Committee meetings, and also engaging in day-to-day communications with those directly involved in research. In this task, the director said that a shared vision can encourage day-to-day coherence in collaborative activities beyond what any one individual can achieve. Thus, he aims to build wider support for SIPR by engaging with and supporting informal leaders throughout SIPR.

A.5.3 Well-defined management structures organise collaborative activities

From the outset, SIPR set aside resources for management staff and structures, with both police and universities represented at each level of management. Formal structures can facilitate transparent, open communication throughout SIPR’s members. The interviewee from ACPOS found that the structure helped to mitigate possible competition between universities involved in the collaborative research, and also helped make the research accessible to the police.

A.5.4 The longer-term sustainability of SIPR’s collaborative activities is not yet proven

Through the past four years SIPR’s scope and activities have grown, adding a new HEI member in 2009, Heriot-Watt University. SIPR has also provided a body through which Scottish policing research could be represented internationally. SIPR has participated in international research collaborations, including the Policing Sub Group of the European Society of Criminology, the European Policy Information Centre (EPIC) network of police researchers, and the Knowledge Transfer Network, being created with the European Chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates.

Nevertheless, the longer-term sustainability of SIPR could be uncertain. First, it can be difficult to provide evidence of the added value of collaborative research activities; translating knowledge into behavioural change in the police service is not a direct process, and can occur incrementally. It is difficult to pinpoint the added benefit to policing practice achieved through collaboration. Second, specific individuals have been important to building and maintaining open and trusting communication channels between collaborators, managing expectations and providing strategic direction. The strength and sustainability of SIPR outside these individuals’ involvement has not been tested. It is uncertain if the research pooling has become accepted and institutionalised into the collaborators’ culture and practices, or if it requires the continued support from these few individuals.

A.6 Case study 6: The Training Gateway

Main findings
- One leader has been important to continuing and building collaborative activities
- There has been little involvement from HEI management in the collaboration
- The sustainability of collaborative activity is likely to depend on member organisations’ willingness to contribute funding and resources

The Training Gateway is an online brokerage service\(^{177}\) provided through the University of York’s Continuing and Professional Development (CPD) Unit. It provides a training brokerage for national and international organisations seeking corporate, vocational and executive training from UK HEIs and colleges and more recently, private training providers.
There are two main membership groups in the Training Gateway: service providers and buyers. HEIs, FE colleges, and Lifelong Learning Networks can become members as training providers. All UK HEIs, along with FE colleges, Lifelong Learning Networks and other training providers, are members of the Training Gateway. Businesses can join the Training Gateway free as buyers, to purchase CPD services from the Training Gateway’s network of training providers.

A.6.1 Ongoing activities are directed by very centralised leadership, with governing bodies taking an advisory role

The current director has provided central leadership and management of the Training Gateway from the beginning. The director finds that a strong vision for the collaboration, awareness of the sector, and proactive approach to marketing and communications help to engage and strengthen the Training Gateway’s collaborative activities. The director has often been the external face of the collaboration.

Governance structures are not well developed in the Training Gateway. The Operational and Strategy Boards provide advice and guidance, but their level of involvement is flexible and varies. The director thought that the small size of the Training Gateway reduced the need for formal structures for governance, and that flexible governance allowed the freedom and scope to respond to diverse business needs, and to respond efficiently to concerns (interview, Training Gateway director).

A.6.2 Engagement with HEI senior management has been limited

The extent to which the Training Gateway might have a wider impact on HEI management structures appears limited. The Training Gateway’s management team states that involvement of any particular HEI members in managing and governing collaborative activities has been intentionally restricted.

The Training Gateway primarily communicates with CPD staff in its HEI partners. Pro-vice-chancellors for external relations can become involved at a strategic level through the Operational Board. However, daily operations mainly involve communications with CPD staff through email alerts, newsletters and weekly tender alerts.

CPD is often only a small part of HEIs’ priorities and activities. The Training Gateway aims to facilitate effective growth and development of CPD in UK HEIs and FE colleges by providing a service that HEIs can buy into and use. However, as discussed, there is little interaction between the HEI and the Training Gateway’s management and governance. This limited engagement makes it difficult to identify how the Training Gateway might transform HEIs more widely, beyond how they conduct CPD.

A.6.3 Sustainability is likely to depend on partner contributions and the commitment of a small management team

The HEFCE Strategic Development Fund was due to end in early 2011. More formal agreements, codes of conduct, and subscription fees could become important to sustaining the service beyond external funding (interview, Training Gateway director; interview, Training Gateway manager). Sustainability could be bound up in the Gateway staff’s ability to communicate the added value of the service to different members. Evidence of value could be a means to encourage growth and diversification of the opportunities advertised and could help justify subscription fees for participation (ibid). The Training Gateway has launched an ‘early bird’ subscription rate for HE and FE members, beginning the transition to a subscription-based service.

Finally, throughout the past three years, the Training Gateway has sustained a small management team, with one director managing overall activities. This raises questions about the longer-term potential for the Training Gateway to contribute to transforming CPD in HEIs. Wider senior management engagement or deeper engagement from other external organising bodies might be needed to deepen collaboration among units such as CPD.

---

**Figure 5. Management and governance structures for the Training Gateway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Board</th>
<th>Operational Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities UK and business support organisation representatives</td>
<td>HEI and college representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Gateway Director: 20% FTE

Training Gateway Manager: Full time staffperson

---
A.7 Case study 7: West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network

Main findings
- Structured discussions and negotiations were important in agreeing and establishing the network
- HEI senior management is necessary for growing and sustaining collaborative activities
- The logic of the Network is closely tied to a specific funding initiative; and the sustainability of the formal network beyond this initiative is uncertain

The West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network (WYLLN) was formed in March 2007, after being awarded £5.9 million through the HEFCE Strategic Development Fund for three years to support the progression of vocational and work-based learners. WYLLN not only includes FE colleges and HEIs in the sub-region but also Aim Higher, sector skills councils, professional bodies, local authorities, employer groups etc.

To improve progression opportunities into and through higher education, as well as the relevance of higher education for employers and vocational learners, WYLLN funds and facilitates sector groups that engage with employers and sector skills councils and other employer intermediaries, considering how to develop curricula to meet learners’ needs. WYLLN has focused on developing Progression Agreements.

It implements activities to promote information, advice and guidance (IAG) for vocational and work-based learners.

A.7.1 Formal structures that provide some flexibility in partner engagement helped to encourage buy-in and support across a diverse membership base

Potential tensions have been mitigated through a balance of formal structures and flexibility in implementation. During the set-up phase, formal procedures were put in place to select Management Board members and the executive team. Since then, the Business Plan has provided a reference point for all partners to look to, to identify the priorities, aims and scope of the LLN (interview, independent consultant).

Institutions had flexibility in how they could respond to the business plan. Institutions were given responsibility for specific sector groups, and individuals were identified to manage activities and relations with WYLLN. Within these formal agreements, members then had flexibility in how they decided to contribute to WYLLN objectives. This allowed institutions to work with their existing structures and priorities to meet their targets (interview, WYLLN executive director). In turn, this gave day-to-day managers responsibility for communicating across diverse implementation plans and ensuring openness, transparency and complementarity of efforts.

A.7.2 Involvement from senior management has sustained and supported collaborative working

Interviewees agreed that member organisations’ senior management has helped to strengthen relations and build trust between collaborators in WYLLN. The Management

Figure 6. An overview of WYLLN’s management and governance structures.
Board includes pro-vice-chancellors from the four validating universities. The business plan specifies that senior representation is required on the Management Board, with no substitutions. Senior management could help to mitigate possible tensions between institutional and collaborative activities. The collaboration exists alongside the institutions and their individual priorities; sustaining the collaboration requires aligning institutions’ and the collaboration’s priorities (interview, WYLLN executive director). Through their positions on the Management Board, members’ senior management could discuss and seek ways to link collaborative and institutional priorities.

WYLLN has sustained high-level involvement from senior management throughout its duration, helping to encourage wider buy-in from the member institutions, and to align the Network’s objectives with institutions’ strategic aims.179.

A.7.3 WYLLN has met its initial targets but its longer-term viability is uncertain

Over its first three years, WYLLN delivered its targets (WYLLN, 2010). WYLLN has also provided a means to apply for further funding. For example, collaborative working provided a mechanism for the FE colleges to apply for Economic Challenge Investment Funding (ECIF). Prior to WYLLN there was no body for organising operational activities and dialogue between FE colleges and HEIs.

However, the sustainability of the LLNs is uncertain. The executive director commented that ambiguity around the direct collaborative benefits could make continuing collaborations within times of restricted funding challenging.

A.8 Case study 8: Øresund University, a cross-border collaboration

Main findings

* Senior management involvement was necessary for setting up and sustaining a large scale, cross border collaboration with public and private sectors
* Evidence of mutual benefit has been necessary for sustaining members’ commitment to a voluntary collaboration

The Øresund region covers a population of 3.7 million people living on the Danish and Swedish sides of the Øresund, a strait connecting the Baltic Sea to the Atlantic Ocean. Historically, the regional economy has largely been based on traditional ‘low-tech’ activities, but now also has emerging biotechnology and medical research activity.180.

Øresund University (OU) was established in 1995. HEIs in Denmark and Sweden can join OU voluntarily. The aim of the collaboration is to build HEI cooperation and contribute to economies of scale in programme delivery.181.

Øresund Science Region (OSR) is an example of a triple helix, two-country collaboration (see literature review) as it involves governments, HEIs and the private sector. OSR functions underneath OU, but its focus is on promoting regional development. Its general objective is to promote knowledge-based economic development in [the Øresund] cross-border region.182. OSR has seven ‘platforms’ or thematic groupings where public, private and HEI bodies can cluster to engage in industry-specific research and knowledge-transfer activities.

A.8.1 Political, economic and infrastructural circumstances encouraged regional collaboration

Before forming a region-wide collaboration, four HEIs in Denmark and Sweden established a trial organisation in 1995. Through the trial organisation, there was a flow of Swedish students to Copenhagen and the first platform, Medicon Valley, had some early successes in collaborative research projects (interview, former OU CEO). Medicon Valley is a platform for research in the life sciences, bringing together private- and public-sector organisations, hospitals, and HEIs.

External developments also helped to make wider collaboration possible. First, Øresund Bridge, a dual-track railway and road, was constructed between 1995 and 1999; this facilitated more efficient travel across the region (interview, former OU CEO). Also at the time, political authorities in Copenhagen, Malmö and Lund were engaged in discussions to form a large urban region founded on knowledge-based industries. Finally, the cross-border collaboration received funding from the European Regional Development Fund through the INTERREG initiative. This funding provided a means and justification for expanding cross-border collaboration through a triple helix structure.

A.8.2 Senior management own and direct OU, but there is scope for more bottom-up leadership with OSR activities

Formal authority for OU and OSR remains with the HE sector.183. Rectors from participating HEIs comprise the OU board, which is an umbrella body for the OSR. There has been strong ownership of the Øresund concept at top levels in HEI administration.184. HEI senior management are closely involved through the OU Board. In particular, the chairs of the OU and OSR boards (the rectors of Lund University and the University
of Copenhagen originally) commit a great deal of time to managing relations, and facilitating communications formally through board meetings and through informal, ongoing communications between board members (interview, retired rector of Lund University). In contrast, engagement has been much less among others in the HEI. For example, teaching and research activities and performance metrics for academic staff in HEIs do not encourage them to prioritise cross-sector engagement.

However, within collaborative research activities, there could be scope for wider leadership. An interviewee from the Technical University of Denmark’s (DTU) Office for Policy and Communications stated that the Office’s evaluation of platform activities found that new projects and ideas were initiated by individual researchers.

### A.8.3 There continue to be coordination challenges in collaborative activities, but members have continued to invest resources

Collaboration across sectors has not been straightforward in OU and OSR. A Peer Review Team (PRT) in December 2005 suggested three main cross-border barriers faced by those participating in OSR and OU collaborative activities:

- The cost of crossing the Øresund Bridge.
- A lack of regional statistical data.
- A requirement for co-financing of activities, while Danish and Swedish governments seek to prevent national funding being spent abroad.

The former rector of Lund University observed that priorities could differ; overcoming these differences involved difficult discussions at the board level. Challenges arise not only between the HEIs and other partners, but could also occur between the other partners, for example, central and local government.

The PRT found that partners’ commitment to collaboration could be challenged if internal institutional incentive structures did not support collaborative working, or if investments between partners appear to be unequal.

However, the collaboration has provided some identifiable benefits. Interviewees gave examples where sectors could realise mutual benefits. For example, The Medicon Valley platform has become an entity of its own. In this platform, the nature and history of the sector contributed to effective collaborative working. A former platform director stated that members of the biotechnology and medical industries already were travelling and moving between sectors, and had similar longer-term timeframes for evaluating impact.

Thus far OU and OSR have been able to mitigate risks and sustain the collaboration, while those involved can identify a benefit from collaborative working and are willing to continue to contribute resources to joint activities.

---

187 The Peer Review team reported on the progress, opportunities and challenges faced in OSR based on a visit to OSR in December 2005, the Self-Evaluation Report and other background material. The review was part of an Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)/Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) programme

188 For example, until 31 December 2010 the fee for a single trip was €39.00 including 25% VAT. The cost is reduced for commuters or multi-trip passes. See [http://uk.oresundsbron.com/page/2460](http://uk.oresundsbron.com/page/2460)

189 Garlick et al [2006]

190 Garlick et al [2006]

191 Garlick et al [2006]
Appendix B

Template for case study evidence

B1 Background
   a) Purpose, aims, partners involved
      Narrative describing the formation of the collaboration: who was involved, how were decisions made
   b) Challenges faced, skills needed in designing and forming the collaboration
   c) Original design and definition of leadership, management and governing bodies
      How did these original arrangements help/hinder the formation of the collaboration?

B2 Implementation of the collaboration
   d) Changes to the collaboration over time (aims, structure, status, participants, scope)
      Narrative about changes in structure, aims, status, scope, scale, etc. and emerging risks
   e) Interactions with the HEI LGM
      What challenges and opportunities emerged in relations between collaboration and HEI institutional LGM?
   f) Interactions with partners’ LGM structures, personnel
      What challenges and opportunities emerged in relations between collaboration and partner institutions’ LGM?

B3 Implications for leadership, management and governing bodies
   g) Leadership
      How has leadership changed over time? What skills/attributes have helped or hindered leaders’ abilities to navigate through risks?
   h) Management
      How has management changed over time? What skills/attributes of managers have helped or hindered their ability to navigate through day-to-day risks?
   i) Governing bodies
      How have governing bodies changed over time? What arrangements/skills/attributes have helped or hindered the governing bodies’ abilities to navigate through risks, and effectively govern the collaboration?

B4 Conclusion
   j) Accomplishments/challenges for each partner (thus far)
   k) Lesson learnt: LGM in the collaboration (skills, challenges, opportunities)
   l) Lessons learnt: LGM between collaboration and partner institutions (skills, challenges, opportunities)
Appendix C
Questions to interviewees

C1 Introduction
   a) Could you describe your role in the collaboration/partnership?
   b) Could you describe your position in your HEI/organisation?

c) Changes to ongoing leadership?
   i) What model of leadership is used in the collaboration/partnership in practice (e.g., distributed, individual, formal?) Has this changed?
   ii) How does this relate to the leadership structures and roles within each partner institution?
   iii) What is the involvement of different leaders in the HEI in the collaboration/partnership?
   iv) What challenges have emerged for leadership?

d) Changes to ongoing management?
   i) Who is involved in day-to-day management of the collaboration/partnership?
   ii) What are their responsibilities?
   iii) How do these compare with and fit with their other roles in the HEI?
   iv) Any management challenges?

e) Relationship with partner institutions’ leadership, governing bodies, and management over time
   i) How have relationships evolved or changed over time?
   ii) What is the level of engagement/overlap between institutional LGM structures and personnel and the collaboration’s LGM structures and personnel?
   iii) Has the collaboration, or either partner, adapted LGM structures in response to collaborative activities?

C2 Formation and design
   a) When was the collaboration/partnership developed?
   b) Who was involved in forming the collaboration/partnership? At whose initiative?
      i) In each organisation? At what level?
   c) What were the original aims of each partner?
      i) Did these differ between partners? Between individuals involved?
      ii) Were there primary and secondary aims? Stated and unstated aims?
   d) What rules and structures were established for the partnership/collaboration?
      i) What was the initial governance structure?
      ii) How were roles and responsibilities distributed?
      iii) Who was made responsible for day-to-day management?
   e) In the context of this specific collaboration/partnership, how would you define:
      i) Leadership
      ii) Management
      iii) Governing bodies

C3 Ongoing leadership, management, governance
   a) Have any aspects of the collaboration/partnership changed over time? Reasons?
      i) Aims?
      ii) Structure and status?
      iii) Participants: Organisations? Individuals?
      iv) Scope: Expansion? Cut backs? Timescale?
      v) Other aspects?
   b) Changes to ongoing governing bodies?
      i) How has governance of the collaboration/partnership worked in practice?
      ii) What has been the governance role of the HEI? The other partners?
      iii) How do these roles relate to the governance structures and roles within each partner institution?
      iv) Any governance challenges?

C4 Outcomes
   a) What has the collaboration/partnership accomplished for each partner? For other stakeholders?
   b) What has the collaboration/partnership failed to accomplish? Reasons?
   c) What else can we learn about – leadership, management, and governance – from your experience in this collaboration/partnership?
Appendix D
List of interviewees

Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre
Dr John Bradley
Professor Stephen O’Rahilly

INTO in London
Eamon Martin
Dr Richard Harvey
Steve Healy

Kaplan Open Learning
Alan Jenkins
Dr Aulay Mackenzie
Dr Tony Rich

Natural Heritage Research Partnership
Professor Ian Montgomery
Graham Seymour
Professor Howard Platt
Mark Wright

Scottish Institute for Policing Research
Ann Millar
Professor Nicholas Fyfe
Peter Wilson

The Training Gateway
Amanda Selvaratnam
Eileen Roddy
Louise Clayton

West Yorkshire Lifelong Learning Network
Joanne Beaumont
Lilian Black
Steven Challenger

Øresund University and Øresund Science Region
Bengt Streijffert
Göran Bexell
Jan Eiersted Molzen

Other interviewees
Adrian Day (HEFCE)
Alice Frost (HEFCE)
Keith Herrmann (CIHE)
Leadership Foundation for Higher Education

The Leadership Foundation's vision is that leadership, governance and management are regarded as world-class and the practice of excellence in leadership attracts the same high esteem as excellence in research, teaching and learning. The Leadership Foundation is a UK-based membership organisation and last year 97% of all UK universities and higher education colleges were in membership. Over 2,500 key individuals took part in a wide range of programmes, events, conferences or other form of leadership development during 2010. In addition to activities in the UK, the Leadership Foundation also engages in a wide range of events and development activities outside the UK. In the past few years this has involved events with participants from China, India, Pakistan, India, the USA, Canada, Australia, the UAE and Saudi Arabia among others.

It is the mission of the Leadership Foundation to deliver a significant and visible contribution towards equipping current and future leaders in higher education with the skills and the awareness of good practice to help them respond to current and future challenges: this is achieved by:

- Developing, commissioning and delivering leadership development programmes.
- Demonstrating the benefits of tailored development approaches for leadership teams in individual higher education institutions.
- Actively promoting a culture of organisational learning and reflection.
- Promoting equality and diversity by creating a larger pool from which future leaders, governors and managers within higher education can be drawn.
- Championing examples of excellent leadership, governance and management within higher education, wherever it is to be found and ensuring this is disseminated to the higher education sector.

Further details about the Leadership Foundation can be found at [www.lfhe.ac.uk](http://www.lfhe.ac.uk)

RAND Europe

RAND Europe is an independent not-for-profit policy research organisation that aims to serve the public interest by improving policy-making and informing public debate. Its clients are European governments, institutions and firms with a need for rigorous, impartial, multidisciplinary analysis. This report has been peer-reviewed in accordance with RAND's quality assurance standards.

For more information about RAND Europe please see:

[www.rand.org/randeurope](http://www.rand.org/randeurope)
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