



## 'Bridging' Social Capital Seminar Series

### Seminar 5: Bridging the learning divide

**Date:** 24 November 2008, 3.00 to 4.30pm

**Venue:** The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund, County Hall, Westminster Bridge Road, London, SE1 7PB.

#### Background

Our increasingly diverse societies have re-emphasised concerns around fragmentation and the importance of social cohesion. Social cohesion depends partly on being able to achieve the right balance between diversity and unity and on valuing the differences between people as well as the common bonds. Social capital, in its various forms, is the glue that can hold together individuals and communities.

This is the fifth in a series of seminar jointly organised by the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) and the Carnegie UK Trust Inquiry into the Future of Civil Society in the UK & Ireland. The aim of the series is to improve the understanding of the dynamics of social capital by exploring its operation in a number of different contexts.

The seminars will provide an opportunity for practitioners, academics and policymakers to share insights into how 'bridging' social capital is generated and how it can enhance the effectiveness of civil society associations and organisations committed to change and contribute to a more inclusive and socially just society.

The other seminars will look (have looked) at the following themes: *Building bridges* (12 June 2008); *Social capital and dimensions of equality* (31 July 2008); *Diversity and social cohesion* (29 September 2008); *Intergenerational connections* (20 October 2008) and *A more civil society* (13 January 2009).

#### Objectives

To explore the potential for educational institutions to innovatively contribute to the generation of social capital:

- To better understand the potential role of 'learning institutions' in generating/limiting social capital.
- To share learning from those who have viewed 'learning institutions' through the lens of social capital.

## Some questions to be addressed at this seminar are:

- How do learning institutions generate new and/or reproduce patterns of social capital?
- How are they explicitly addressing inequalities in social and human capital?
- Are learning institutions well placed to address issues of social/community cohesion?
- How have specific initiatives explicitly tried to generate 'bridging social capital'?
- What is the role of voluntary and community organisations and other civil society organisations in reducing social exclusion through learning experiences?

## Presentations

*Tom Schuller* (NIACE) explored how adult education can enhance or limit the generation of social capital and looked at some of the initially findings of the Inquiry into the Future of Lifelong Learning.

*Angie Hart* (University of Brighton) and *Sally Hiscock* (Brighton and Hove Community and Voluntary Sector Forum) explored how universities and communities can work together to create bridging social capital. The innovative work of the Community University Partnership Programme at the University of Brighton was explored, sharing the challenges and suggesting ways forward.

## In a nutshell

### Summary of Tom Schuller's presentation

- The development of human capital can provide a good opportunity to also build social capital and the Inquiry into the Future of Lifelong Learning hopefully will look at this under some of the themes it will explore.
- How might the discreet themes of the Inquiry link into the social capital debates? The presentation presented some key questions the Inquiry will grapple with:
  - Demography - ageing is one of the key demographic trends facing our society although we will be looking at others such as ethnic mix. Our changing population structure will open up new fissures and divides and how might learning contribute to bridging those divides?
  - Migration - fairly obvious issues here - what role is there for lifelong learning in addressing the challenges of bridging new and established communities?
  - Technological change - one of the key challenges here is to harness the huge potential of new learning technologies in ways that do not break our society down further into smaller and smaller segments? How can technologies enable bridging cross community interaction?
  - Crime and social inclusion - the re-integration of ex-offenders into the community - what kinds of training and education happen within our prisons and how successful are they in enabling people once they leave prison to get back into society?
  - How does the growing importance of the individualisation agenda impact on social capital? The key challenge is to combine the individualism of choice with the collective sharing of learning to

- provide the spaces for people to bridge within physical environments.
- Increasing diversity - What positive steps can be taken to enable lifelong learning to play a positive part in fostering bridges between our diverse communities?

### **Summary of Angie Hart and Sally Hiscock's presentation**

- The literature on community and university partnerships does not feature social capital.
- The key to the work of CUPP is knowledge mobilisation - this is a two way knowledge transfer and not simply about university knowledge going out to the community.
- In order to enable knowledge mobilisation the partners from university and community sectors need to interact and this obviously builds various forms of social capital.
- The bonding and bridging forms of social capital are more sustainable than linking forms. Although one way of strengthening the sustainability of relationships over time is by developing communities of practice.
- CUPP has been successful and sustainable given the commitment of the University of Brighton to core fund the programme and to integrate its aims into the University's corporate strategy.
- CUPP engages administrators, students, academics and individuals from the community and voluntary sectors in a range of different projects and roles within these projects

# Tom Schuller - Director of the Inquiry into Future of Lifelong Learning

## Introduction

Tom began by explaining his connection with social capital over a number of years and particularly related it to his time at the OECD where he found it a challenge to get the concept of social capital any priority in the education area given that the OECD being a hard headed economic organisation tended to view education exclusively through the lens of human capital.

Presentation aims to do two things:

1. To provide a brief description of what the Inquiry into Lifelong learning is doing
2. Locate within that some of the issues connected to social capital

## The Inquiry into the Future of Lifelong Learning

It is an independent inquiry sponsored by NIACE. The overall aim of the inquiry is to provide an overall strategic framework for lifelong learning; it is the strategy side rather than an immediate policy focus that is at its core. Due to report in mid-2009 and between now and the final report there will be a trickle of papers being released by the inquiry.

Four main strands of outputs from the inquiry:

1. A series of **themes** we are addressing. These give an idea of the breadth of the Inquiry.
  - Prosperity, employment and work
  - Demography and social structure
  - Well being and happiness
  - Migration and communities
  - Technological change
  - Poverty reduction
  - Citizenship and belonging
  - Crime and social exclusion
  - Sustainable development
  - The roles of the public, private and voluntary sectors

In each of these we have put out calls for evidence and have held one day seminars and for each the inquiry will produce a thematic paper to draw the discussions and evidence together.

2. The second strand focuses on **expenditure** and the inquiry is trying to piece together the total amount of expenditure invested in lifelong learning, by government in totality not simply the education departments, the private sector, the third sector and by individuals and households.
3. The third strand of the Inquiry is **sectoral** - so we want to see what contribution each sector within the education and training makes. Schools, local authorities, higher education, further education, voluntary &

community sector and private training providers. The inquiry will look at how these various bits of the sector do [or do not] fit together.

4. The final strand is what the inquiry has termed Social Productivity [or possibly **public value**]. That is what is the contribution of lifelong learning both now and potentially to the following areas. Cost-effectiveness analyses will be conducted to explore if numbers and pound signs can be put on to the public benefit accrued when lifelong learning is applied to the these areas:
  - Poverty
  - Health
  - Crime
  - Wellbeing
  - Modelling

### **How might the findings from the discreet themes of the inquiry link into social capital?**

Demography - ageing being the most striking demographic trend but the inquiry is also looking at other types of changes within the population such as, ethnic mix. The issue of ageing raises issues very germane to bridging social capital. In other words, where we have a changing population structure where are the fissures and divides that can open up and how might learning contribute to bridging those divides?

Secondly on migration, fairly obviously, issues there about divisions and particularly one of the challenges is the shifting patterns of inward migration to the UK - away from the traditional migration patterns from Commonwealth countries to A8 countries of EU - and where there are particular concentrations of migrants from particular countries within quite small communities in the UK - what role might lifelong learning play in addressing these types of challenges and bridging new and established communities?

Technological change - this is a huge subject - one of the challenges here is to how to enable the huge potential of new learning technologies to be used but in ways that do not break our society down further into smaller and smaller segments where individuals identify and communicate only with other like minded segments and/or individuals. How can technology enable cross-segment communications [bridging social capital]? What was striking from the seminar we held, which was populated by technically wizzo people, was that none of them wanted to paint a future that was purely technologically driven and they stressed location, location, location - a strong emphasis of geographic locations and interactions that are connected to technological change.

Crime and social exclusion and re-integrating offenders into society once they are released. There is an issue here about what kinds of training and education happen within our prisons and young offender institutions and how successful they are in enabling people once they leave prison to get back into society?

### **A conceptual pause**

As the seminar suggests this relates to bridging social capital but there are of course two other concepts connected to social capital; bonding and linking. Social capital tends to be conceptualised as the more the better but I think it is really

important to reflect on the inter-relationships between these different types of capital and to what extent they are in tension, contradiction or conflict with each other. So if we think about bonding social capital - to what extent does a higher grade of bonding social capital militate against bridging social capital - the more you associate closely or even exclusively with people who share your values / characteristics to what extent does that pose problems for making links and bonds with people who do not share your characteristics; so these two in particular, the bonding and the bridging, do have some tension between them. This was particularly well illustrated by piece of evidence submitted to the inquiry from Wales - the Community University of the Valleys, they were collecting evidence for us on social exclusion and as it happens two bits of the evidence follow directly on from each other and illustrate this point.

One person says '*lifelong learning - the opportunity to take part in community learning enables you to meet more people of all ages, it makes you a bit more tolerant with everyone and opens your mind up*'. That was followed importantly by another quote '*it is really important, it is very local, I met other people like me*' a different scenario but this too has benefits for the individual, such as restoring confidence and so on but I just wanted to make the point that there is a tension between a densely textured type of organisation and those that are more loosely textured but might be more welcoming to other people but maybe that is characterised by more superficial relationships [less bonding].

Just one word about the linking social capital - the vertical type that allows you to make connections to those above and below you in the power hierarchy and I wanted to draw your attention to another piece of evidence submitted to us but I think is available more widely published called Learning Power - a contribution to national skills strategy [Titus Alexander] Scarman Trust - but he has a nice metaphor that I have never heard before. '*The relationship between networks and hierarchies has been described as that of bees and trees. Hierarchies provide stable structures, shelter and predictable cycles while bees provide cross-pollination, enrich the wider ecology in which trees can flourish*'.

### **Three key issues for today?**

Personalisation and/or individualisation is not just a flavour of the month it has much stronger roots than that particularly in the policy world. A lot of emphasis on how to personalise curricula, how to personalise learning services; we had a dinner with parliamentarians where we raised the issue of individual entitlements to lifelong learning which is a very tricky issue that we are grappling with right now. And it was very striking that across political parties that parliamentarians leapt on to this as an idea as a means to empower individuals and extend their choices. I buy that and I subscribe to that and I think we are very likely as an inquiry to come out with some proposals for strengthening individual entitlements. But the question is just how far down this road of individualisation do we go? How far do we shift the responsibility down to the individual, however well it is backed up with information guidance support etc? And that is a genuine issue for us - it is an issue in the workplace with the individual vs collective responsibility issue but the same would be true in a community context. The key challenge is to combine the individualism with a collective sharing of learning to provide the space for bridge people within physical environments. Or will individualistic approaches mean that learners on specific courses are likely to only segment themselves from others?

The second question is about where we draw the line in the life course [age groups]? So if we take the highly successful University of the Third Age which caters for people of a particular age group and does so because older people want to learn in particular ways - how can we build this learning up but at the same time try to provide for intergenerational connection and communications? Our current education system is very front-loaded in the life course - we think of higher education students as being young people.

And finally the limits of diversity. We welcome diversity of all kinds, at least in this room -and tolerance is a fundamental part of our society. The question I am putting is what are the realistic limits on diversity where we can use terms like social cohesion in an active way rather than a passive tolerance. What positive steps can be taken to enable lifelong learning to play a positive part as it can in fostering bridges between our diverse communities? It is not a silver bullet, it can not do everything, so we need to think about what the limitations are and to work on those as fully as possible.

## **Angie Hart and Sally Hiscock, Community University Partnership Programme**

Angie began by explaining that she was surprised that the role of higher education had not surfaced in the futures phase of the Carnegie UK Inquiry into the Future of Civil Society. She reflected that CUPP were doing all this work around community and university partnership and there is a long history of this kind of work in the US and Australia and so it was puzzling that this was not surfaced in the futures events of the Inquiry. We feel strongly that universities can be key institutions in developing social capital in all its forms [bonding, bridging and linking].

One of the things we like to do at CUPP is to do all of our work in collaboration and so when I was invited to speak to you here I insisted on bringing Sally along too as a partner from the voluntary and community sector because this is absolutely the ethos of our work - mutual benefit - doing things together.

The presentation is in two parts it:

- first addresses the role of the university within the community and
- then explores the various definitions of social capital and will do this by showing a video that shows a couple of examples of CUPP projects and how these relate to the definitions.

### **Social capital and community university partnerships**

Within the literature on community-university partnerships, social capital does not feature. The kind of concepts used are; widening participation, the nature of modern democracies and the role of universities within them, partnership and communities of practice are some examples. So it is interesting that in the world of community-university partnerships the concept of social capital is largely absent.

Key to CUPP is Knowledge mobilisation between universities and the community, in the old language this was referred to as knowledge transfer. This does not reflect how we work at CUPP; we are very much around knowledge exchange rather than the idea that knowledge flows from the university to the community in one direction. This is of course linked to the social capital literature as knowledge

mobilisation implies that both partners are engaged in the production of knowledge and these interactions build social capital in its various forms.

All of our work at CUPP has to link into the core business of the university; research, teaching, curriculum development, professional training and development but it is also now linked to the corporate level of the university and so includes social engagement.

## **CUPP**

Set up 2003. Primarily due to a lot of internal championing from individuals within the university. Aim is to open up a dialogue and knowledge exchange between community and university to ensure the resources of the university are much more accessible to the local community; about developing an engagement between the university and its partners in the city for mutual benefit and to enhance the role of the university in the city with regard to reducing inequalities in Brighton and Hove.

Who is involved in CUPP? High profile both within Brighton University - it is championed internally by academics and administrators within the university - and in the City more generally. Certainly many community and voluntary organisations are aware of the work of CUPP and aware of how they can access the support that CUPP can offer. So it is a resource used by a wide range of organisations and people.

CUPP achieves its profile through a wide range of activities; events, newsletter and through the discreet projects it works on. CUPP is overseen by a steering group that has a cross-sector membership from the academic and administrative sides of the university and from individuals from the community and voluntary sector too.

Some of the initiatives that CUPP undertakes

- The research helpdesk which provides a very practical resource for 'the community' to access different parts of the university - in terms of both information and resources available.
- There is a student community engagement module that students can undertake and over 300 have gone through this so far. As part of this module students go on placements within local community groups. So this both helps local community groups but also provides some very grounded experience for students.
- There is the Brighton & Sussex Community Knowledge Exchange - provides an in-depth range of support to a range of different partnership projects.
- A number of communities of practice projects have been established.

CUPP recently won the Times Higher Education Award for outstanding contribution to local communities.

### **Example 1 - project funded by the Brighton & Sussex Community Knowledge Exchange**

Figures on the scope of the VCS in Brighton have only become available in the past two weeks and this has been made possible by a project called *Taking Account: an economic and social audit of the third sector 2008*.

- 1,600 third sector organisations
- Generates £96 million to the local economy

- Employs 8,000 people
- 43% income comes from grants, of which 62% comes from outside the city
- 31% of organisations have reported an increased in service contracts
- 19,200 volunteer positions, giving 57,600 volunteer hours per week, equivalent to an annual salary of £24 million

The partnership is between CUPP, CVSF, Working Together Project, SCIP, funded by BSCKE, with BHCC [local authority] and BHCPCT [primary care trust] The project was overseen by a steering group made of up of representatives of the various bodies involved - it had an academic supervisor and a community supervisor. The research consists of a Survey, case studies and national research to compare and contrast the local to more general trends nationwide. The methodology has allowed a great deal of knowledge mobilisation and knowledge transfer both ways and so the partnership has allowed the community sector to conduct future research projects based on this methodology without needing to go back to the university for academic support.

### **WHY WE DID IT!**

- Robust evidence base is essential for the development of a thriving third sector in B&H
- Enables us to plan more effectively
- Infrastructure to develop support services
- Local decision-makers more aware of the sector's role

### **Outputs**

- Data available for the sector and partners
- Development of skills, knowledge and experience around methodology
- Practice around reflective learning techniques and partnership working
- Franchisable model for third sector profiling

### **Outcomes**

- Empowering for under-represented groups
- Ensuring parity with other sectors

### **Social Capital**

- Bonding social capital: sector colleagues learning and working together to promote our collective voice and demonstrate local value
- Bridging social capital: establishing cross sector links and networks especially via the steering group.
- Linking social capital: developing a two way street between local academics as local third sector specialists
- Spreading social capital: trickle effect? although majority of social capital transfer was at the macro level (between academics and those 15 or so people directly involved in the project) groups will soon be able to access / update data online which will facilitate more contact with other groups / more understanding of wider sector / more collaboration and partnerships / offshoots

## Example 2. Resilient therapy community of practice

- Academics, parents and practitioners joining together to develop a new therapeutic methodology. Aimed at parents of some of the most disadvantaged
- Ground work - a joint project between academics and practitioners
- Evolving community of practice of people - community workers, parents academics, statutory agents.
- Sharing knowledge, offering mutual support, co-creating (fits with Putman's definition), challenging conventional relations of power (Cornwall and Gaventa)

The key aims of the Resilient Therapy community of practice is to:

The delivery of the RT methodology to a range of practitioners, parents and young people; the development of training delivered to a range of academic fields; the development of a website - to be developed further; the dissemination of the developed material both locally, nationally and internationally through conferences, workshops and the completion of a co-authored book; the cascading of the RT training to both practitioners and parents; and embedded and sustainable research and development partnerships between individuals and agencies.

Angie & Sally then showed video of parent responses to the group and how they worked with it. Angie then asked the participants to think about and identify the various types of social capital they saw within the video presentation.

## Questions and Answers

**Birkbeck College** [no name] - I have also been involved in try to develop partnership work with the voluntary and community sector so I am particularly interested in how you have achieved funding for your project

**Angie Hart** - Dave Watson our then vice-chancellor was on Radio 4 talking about one of the projects we had been working on and a philanthropic organisation came directly to him and said your work sounds really interesting we would like to help you fund this; so initially we got a big external grant. That then ran out and the university then made the unprecedented step, in a UK context, of actually core funding CUPP which is very, very unusual. But we have alongside that raised some project funds ourselves.

**Dave - Home office** - Just a question as to whether the two of you have found the tensions between the different types of social capital at any stage in the project and to Tom what sort of balance between this types is ideal?

**Sally Hiscock** - One tension was when we were recruiting people from the community sector to be involved in the project it was very hard to convince them of what was in it for them and they were coming into an already established project with a steering group of people who had been meeting for some time - so we were in an interesting space where we were establishing our connections and there were people coming in from the grass-roots community sector who were not part of that - so there was a slight tension in trying to sell the benefits to them of this kind of knowledge gaining.

**Angie Hart** - Thinking more broadly across the 70 projects of CUPP - so quite a big empirical reservoir to draw on - I think the bonding and bridging side of social capital has been relatively straight forward although this work is by no means easy - when we first started it there were 10 people saying 'don't do it' for two that said 'yes' - but it is the linking social capital that is harder to sustain but we do have examples of projects, especially the Resilient Therapy project that do achieve this - when we first met the parents they were in a very tricky place and there is a big difference between the academic doing the evaluation of this work and one of those parents and we have had other projects where we have worked with some very disadvantaged members of the community and worked with them with students and university academics - what we have found harder is sustaining those links over time and so that is why we opted to put a lot of work into the communities of practice - LGBT, Children and families, Disability and Older People communities of practice. This enables more sustainable relationships.

**Tom Schuller** - I can give you one very good example of the tensions - within the academic world 'bonding' would be connecting to other academics doing the same sub-sub-sub branch of work - say psychology and gender studies - because you share the same literature, concepts so you do not have to spend time explaining every thing so you can get on quickly. A more inter-disciplinary team where you have people from different backgrounds which has costs in terms of explaining concepts to each other, you do not have the same intellectual reference points but where the interactions may be very fruitful and this is not just a theoretical point because the research assessment criteria favours the former at the expense of the latter. Partly because the outputs from bonding academics are more readily recognized and therefore bring cash to the university and glory to the individual. I am not saying the former is wrong and inter-disciplinary work is better but there are pros and cons to both. This can be true of more applied examples than academia - what policy area do you work on at the Home Office?

Migration

**Tom Schuller** - Well there is a classic there - dispersion - do you make it easier for people or encourage migrants from a particular part of the world to all go to the same place where they will more easily bed in and speak the language and make connections locally or do you disperse them where there will be more obvious difficulties that arise but where you have a better chance of some of that bridging to go on? And there is a lot of empirical evidence that shows the economic success of migrants being based on having that type social capital so they can plug into networks that are established and might be able to employ their skills because others will recognise that they have those skills even if they can't speak English whereas if they go somewhere else where their language is one of 50 or so spoken so they can't find people to talk to then they might end up becoming isolated, not employing their skills and losing their confidence and so on and we know that happens quite rapidly.

**Andrea Ramod - Volunteering England** - do CUPP projects engage academics from all different disciplines? Do CUPP projects engage post-graduates?

**Angie Hart** - yes to both - we reach across the university and involvement from academics in every faculty. The Times award has helped raise the profile of the work among our academic community. We are trying to get a post-graduate module up and running - but in an ad-hoc way currently they are involved especially through the helpdesk - where community partners can ring up or come in and get

some help with particular issues or research and it will be filtered out to post graduates.

**John Griffith - University of East London** - a couple of observations - it looked like there were lots of good things happening from the film about the two CUPP groups and that there was lots of bridging and bonding behaviour but I do not see how on earth adding the term social capital helps in any way to understand any of that. Bridging and bonding behaviour has been widely observed by anthropologists and everybody else before the terms were in use - so bridging and bonding going on in those two groups and its great and it looks very useful but I do not see how the idea of social capital adds anything to it. That is the first observation. But if you are going to adopt the terms anyway - you can use them to describe a number of relatively educated middle class professionals do in their business with each other but I do not think that is what the government is interested in when they talk about social capital - they are talking about how to stop people killing each other and I think there is a disconnect between what you have been talking about and the problems that bonding bridging social capital are meant to be a solution to in the world outside.

**Home Office [no name]** - a related question as to whether you have measures that illustrate what social capital adds to your projects as this I think can help government assess the value added of social capital - can you evaluate this in a similar way to added benefits of say human capital?

**Tom Schuller** - it is beyond question that social capital is a very abused and over used term there are many times it is used as a label and stuck on something else to make it sound bigger so the first half of the article can be about the literature review and what others have said about social capital that is very evident. Since Erin has my book here - a rather un-thumbed copy of it I may say

**Erin van der Maas** - I just thought you would be impressed I had it!

**Tom Schuller** - what we tried to say in the introduction here is that potentially it does a number of things.

- Reclaims the notion of capital from the pure domain of economists - there are certain assets that reside in communities, people and relationships that do generate economic and social benefit in ways you would not be able to analyse if you just stay with human capital.
- The strongest merit of social capital is as a heuristic device - it opens up issues in ways cut across boundaries and disciplines and brings people together in ways that otherwise would not.

I am distressed by some of the social capital evangelists who run around sticking the label on anything and everything as soon as two people talk to each other but nevertheless I do think it is useful.

Including producing some quantifiable benefits of the kind that government and policy makers are interested - but there are quite strict limits on the extent to which you can do that.

**Angie Hart** - I am a bit of theoretical pragmatist and social capital is not something that has featured in the literature I am familiar with in community university partnership literature. But there are similar debates going on in the communities of practice literature so all I can say in my own small engagement with it just for

this seminar I do find it quite interesting actually to think about what we are doing in relation to these concepts - the bonding, bridging and linking are a bit of a yardstick and I can imagine an evaluation framework [which we have not got] using social capital but especially with regard to linking as this would really challenge us as this is one of our big aims - how do we get university knowledge out there for the public - but which public and how - and I think the social capital literature helps you get a handle on that pragmatically - it is a heuristic tool and some of the arguments from the New Economics Foundation recently around the credit crunch and different forms of engagement and how we measure capital in different ways - in our university work we are always trying to prove the worth of this in some way and social capital writ large is another discourse we can draw on to do this - so I don't know I might actually go on to write something about this using the social capital literature just to see what it might add - I would not rule it out.

**No Name** - A slight shift in topic but I was particularly interested in your last slide where you picked up on personalisation and individualisation and I think this is also quite contentious and I am aware of areas where a whole notion of individualising education - achievement of individual targets also becomes individualisation of blame for not taking up opportunities - so I am a little worried about you describe around personalisation and choice and I was not quite sure whether you are actually advocating this as a model as it will have knock on effects for small voluntary organisations delivering contracts in education.

**Tom Schuller** - I'd be interested in what other people think about this - what kind of connotations personalisation has if any for other people in the room. For me its important to avoid a polarisation of individualisation good or personalisation bad - it is a question of what degrees of personalisation and I certainly think there are issues about choice, leaving aside the schools choice aspect, that are definitely questionable if you have read the 'paradox of choice' [Barry Schwartz] it is a great little book that you can read very quickly about being overwhelmed by choice - he deals mainly with products like pairs of jeans and how much time you want to spend agonising over questions like if you visit one more shop would you get them cheaper or better or something. But it is more than that in regard to many of our public services, education being one of them where what most people want is the absolute assurance that they are going to get something of decent quality and choice is of a relative low priority against that background. Having said that it is hard to argue against saying well shouldn't we take thought about how we can meet peoples' individual needs as far as possible I mean even if we take your group who share some very powerful experiences about the kids they have they will have different circumstances coming from different backgrounds so it is not a one size fits all - there is a balance and this is not a weasel way of escaping the question but it is saying lets look at this and all the pros and cons - I think on a personalised care budget and I have had this discussion with a lot of people the evidence and evaluation do suggest that the actual act of giving people choice increases their confidence in themselves and that they are getting the services they want and that appears generally to outweigh the transaction costs, worries and so on. But I can see there being a lot of issues about degree of responsibility you ask people to take and what the accountability is on that - so this is an area where there is a lot of room for testing in a genuine experimental way and in ways that would build a knowledge base that would be really useful.

## Angie Hart

Angie Hart is the Academic Director of the Community University Partnership Programme at the University of Brighton. She is also Professor of Child, Family and Community Health in School of Nursing and Midwifery in the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences. She teaches on professional courses for health and social care practitioners and undertakes participatory research into inequalities in health and social care in relation to children and families. Until August 2008, Professor Hart was a part-time research-practitioner in the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS), Sussex Partnership NHS Trust, Brighton. She worked both in a specialist team supporting fostered and adopted children, and in a generic CAMHS clinic located in a socially and economically deprived area of Brighton. As the adoptive parent of three children from the care system, she has much experience herself as a service user of health and social care services in both the voluntary and statutory sector.

Professor Hart has published widely on health and social care services to disadvantaged children, their families and their supporters, especially in relation to fostering and adoption to midwifery and health visiting and in relation to the concept of resilience. She has also published her work on the development of community university partnership programmes.

### Selected recent publications:

Aumann, K., and Hart, A. Forthcoming 2009 *Helping children with complex needs bounce back: Resilient Therapy for parents and professionals*. Jessica Kingsley: London

Hart, A., Maddison, E., and Wolff, D.(eds) 2007 *Community-university partnerships in practice* Niace:Leicester ISBN 978-1-86201-317-9

Hart, A., and D.Wolff. 2006 'Developing communities of practice through community-university partnerships' *Planning, Practice and Research* 21(1) 121-138

Hart, A. and Blincow, D. with Thomas, H. 2007 *Resilient Therapy with children and families* Brunner Routledge: London

Hart, A., and Luckock, B. 2006 'Core principles and therapeutic objectives for therapy with adoptive and permanent foster families' *Fostering and Adoption* 30(2) 29-42

Hart, A. and Freeman, M. 2005 'Health 'care' interventions: making inequalities worse, not better?' *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 49(5) pp.502-512

Hart, A., Saunders, A. and Thomas, H. February 2005 'Attuning practice: Findings from a service user study of child and adolescent mental health services' *Epidemiologia e Psichiatria Sociale (EPS)* 14 (1).pp 22-31

Hart, A. and Luckock, B. 2004 *Developing Adoption Support and Therapy: New approaches for practice* Jessica Kingsley: London

## **Sally Hiscock**

Sally Hiscock is Chief Executive of Brighton and Hove Community and Voluntary Sector Forum. CVSF networks and represents the third sector locally and Sally is responsible for the overall management and strategic development of the organisation.

Prior to this Sally was responsible for learning and development strategies at the Governance Hub, part of the ChangeUp programme to support the voluntary and community sector.

Sally has worked in other infrastructure roles, including co-ordinating a capacity building programme providing support to voluntary and community organisations in West Sussex, at environmental regeneration charity Groundwork UK, and umbrella body BOND (British Overseas NGOs for Development). Sally is trustee of Urban Forum.

## **Tom Schuller**

Tom Schuller is currently the Director of the The Inquiry into the Future for Lifelong Learning NIACE (National Institute of Adult Continuing Education).

Tom is Head of the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), OECD, Paris. Formerly Dean of the Faculty of Continuing Education and Professor of Lifelong Learning at Birkbeck, University of London from 1999 to 2003.

He has worked also at the Universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow and Warwick, at the Institute for Community Studies and for four years at OECD in the 1970s. He has been an adviser to government on numerous issues, especially on lifelong learning.

Recent publications include

The Benefits of Learning: The Impact of Education on Health, Family Life and Social Capital (with John Preston et al, Routledge 2003);

International Perspectives on Lifelong Learning (edited with David Istance and Hans Schutze, Open University Press 2002); and

Social Capital: Critical Perspectives (edited with Stephen Baron and John Field, OUP 2000).