



University of Brighton

**Community
University
Partnership
Programme**

**On our
doorsteps**

Seed Funded Projects Self-evaluation Report

Length: Up to 3 sides of A4, with additional income and expenditure sheet. Please include direct quotes where applicable in sections 3, 4 and 6.

1. Brief Description of Project

This was a scoping project that produced initial strategies and designs for improving the 'triangle' of streets and houses in Brighton for which the Triangle Community Group has taken responsibility. It was intended to be a collaboration between the Triangle community, members of the Office for Spatial Research at the University's School of Architecture and Design, and post-graduate architecture students, some of whom live in the area concerned.

2. Project Progress

- What did the project partners and stakeholders plan to do?

Prior to this project, the Triangle Community Group had identified various challenges and needs that they wanted addressed:

- Neglected and shabby streets and housing
- A lack of green space, trees and plants within the immediate vicinity
- The impact of noise and traffic pollution on health and well-being
- Ways to improve the spatial environment for diverse resident groups and local business while preserving a historically interesting and vibrant area

Working closely with the Triangle community, the Architecture programme was to offer trained designers to generate specific proposals for the physical improvement of the Triangle neighbourhood, packaged in such a way as to be suitable for presentation to the council and others, both in the form of a document and an exhibition. The project would give the School of Architecture and Design's Office for Spatial Research a chance to acquire in-depth understanding of community needs and problems in an area of Brighton representative of many others. The architecture students involved would have the opportunity to participate in a live project with real 'clients', and engage in a collaborative, rather than top-down, design relationship.

- What did they actually do?

The Architecture programme did deliver specific proposals for the physical improvement of the Triangle neighbourhood, in the form of a presentation, a proposal document and an exhibition.

- Please describe the evolution of the project and reasons for any changes to the plan/timeline

The project suffered from a lack of time. As it involved Architecture students, it had to fit into an academic semester. It also had to fit into a pre-existing unit of study, in this case, Professional Studies. The requirements for the unit of study divided the students' time and attention between the course as it stood, and the Triangle project. A longer lead-in time would be necessary next time if students were to be part of the project: October-December - preparation, January to April – the project.

3. Partnership working

- Which partners and stakeholders were involved?

Triangle Community 'executive' group; Architecture Programme, University of Brighton; CUPP, University of Brighton.

- How did the partnership work?

The relationship between Triangle and the Architecture Programme was one that architects are entirely accustomed to: a professional one in which a client gives the architect a brief, and the architect fulfills that brief. There wasn't so much a partnership between Architecture and the Triangle community as occasional meetings between Architecture and the Triangle Community executive group. This consisted of four people, all of whom were themselves professionals, working either at the University of Brighton or the University of Sussex, or at other institutions, whose jobs for the most part prevented them from meeting when students were available. As the Triangle executive group consists primarily of university employees, the project was much more one in which two sets of university employees talked to each other, than one in which a university entered a partnership with a community.

- What knowledge was exchanged and developed?

The knowledge exchanged was again much more like that between architect and client: in this case, the client communicated knowledge about the area, and the architects communicated design solutions to some of that area's challenges. The *process* of arriving at these solutions was not shared. The *products* of that process will be very useful to Triangle, not only providing specific suggestions to create improvements, but demonstrating that a large proportion of what was suggested could be achieved by the community itself, with very little outlay, and with no need of formal approval.

- What did On Our Doorsteps contribute? What other support would have been useful?

On Our Doorsteps was the catalyst for this project, and its positive outcomes. The stakeholders would not have been brought together without it, and the support given was very helpful. The original choice of partners and the timeframe for their partnership looked feasible at the time of setting it up, but perhaps needed to be examined further before committing to the timeframe we'd chosen.

4. Neighbourliness

In what ways did the partnership promote an exchange between university and community that connects to themes and ideas of neighbourliness as set out in your original application? What were some of the challenges to this?

In providing a useful service to Triangle, the Architecture Programme has demonstrated to this particular group of people that THE University of Brighton has something to offer them, and that engagement with the University engagement can produce results. The final exhibition of the student project work at the Phoenix Gallery was a great success, well attended by the community, and much complimented by them.

The challenges were to find the time for a relationship between the partners to evolve, and for Architecture to get any sense of the community beyond/behind the Triangle executive group during the project.

5. Outputs

What did the project produce? (eg conference papers, articles, book, film, new courses/modules, community outputs such as training sessions and questionnaires)

- 1) Report containing specific proposals for the physical improvement and upgrading of the Triangle area.
- 2) Public exhibition of some the project work going into the report.
<http://artsresearch.brighton.ac.uk/research/centre/office-for-spatial-research/new-events/on-our-doorstep-project-at-the-phoenix-gallery>
- 3) Conference papers (to be presented).

6. Outcomes

What impact do you think the project had on:

- the community organisation/s and stakeholders

The small group that Architecture had contact were able to see that this particular part of the university was willing and able to help in concrete ways.

- the university

The Triangle project has become one of a portfolio of projects in which Architecture has engaged with parts of the Brighton community. It was the first in partnership with CUPP, and therefore the first to be undertaken by Architecture with certain explicit social – as opposed to design – aims in mind. As such, and because of the work's warm reception by Triangle, the project is an exemplar of a new way of working with our neighbours, one in which the community's needs are as important as the design outcomes.

7. Longer term knowledge exchange work

Please describe what your partnership plans to do next.

- How will the project and/or relationships develop at the end of this seed funding?

Triangle will use the report produced by the Architecture programme to lobby Brighton and Hove City Council for improvements they themselves cannot bring about.

- How will the role of volunteers be developed to support future work?

NA

8. Statement of Income and Expenditure

Please explain any discrepancies between the budget in the project plan and actual income and expenditure.

Income:

£5000.00

Projected expenditure:

Time of Triangle Group members: £1000

Time of Office for Spatial Research members: £1500

Venue Hire - £120 x 3 meetings: £360

Exhibition Space at Salvation Army: £60

Materials (to include possible need to leaflets to promote what is going on and printing of a special edition newsletter): £300

Conference attendance for Diaz and Winder - (fees £300 x 2) + (travel £100 x 2) + (subsistence £60 x 2 nights x 2 people) + (hotel £100 x 1 night x 2 people): £1,240

Total: £4,460 (say £4,500)

Actual expenditure:

£1000.00 to Triangle Community Group for expenses (publicity etc)

240.00 Phoenix Gallery

120.00 Butler's Wine Cellar Ltd

500.00 Student labour (to hang exhibition etc)

600.00 Printing materials and printing for exhibition

1500.00 Time of Office for Spatial Research members

60.00 Exhibition Space at Salvation Army

TOTAL SPEND SO FAR: £4020.00

FUNDS REMAINING: £ 980.00

EXPENDITURE REMAINING: conference x 2 (Luis Diaz and Maureen Winder)

The actual spend differs from the estimated budget because the exhibition was in a more expensive venue, and the costs of preparing it were greater than anticipated in order to achieve a quality appropriate to a commercial gallery. Given the success of the event, we feel this was justified.

The remaining funds have been ring-fenced and will carry over into the next academic year in the School of Architecture and Design's account. These are for Luis Diaz and Maureen Winder to present papers at a conference of their choice. If Maureen decides she doesn't want to give a paper, this will give Luis the opportunity of presenting at a more expensive international conference rather than at national one.

9. Quantitative evaluation

Please give an estimation of:

- The number of people involved in the partnership

- The number of people involved in events/workshops you have run
30

- The numbers of people who have benefitted from the activities you have undertaken

Difficult to say. The community and university guests at the exhibition numbered about 40. If the report succeeds in producing change in the Triangle area, then many more people will benefit, say, 120.

- The numbers of hours the partners have worked on the project and please indicate by how much this number was more or less than you initially planned for.

720 (30 partners x 3 hours/week x 8 weeks)

Where more hours were spent on the project than planned, please indicate how this time was paid for, or whether it was voluntary

The extra academic staff time was paid for out of the 20% of their contracts allocated for research.

The students worked on the project as part of a Unit of Study, that is, required academic work. A smaller group of students was paid an honorarium for putting up and taking down the exhibition.

The Triangle partners are not included in these calculations.

APPENDIX

Suggested Impact Indicators

1. University

1.1. Staff

- training of tutors
- staff promotion
- networking within university
- interdisciplinary connections and connections across the administrative divide

1.2. Teaching

- influence on teaching methods
- new course content on existing modules
- development work on new modules/courses
- validation of new modules/courses

1.3. Research

- RAE submission/facilitation
- influence on colleagues' research base

1.4. Student Learning

- student opportunities and experience in community practice
- student dissertations
- enrolment on new modules/courses

1.5. Dissemination

- conferences
- papers
- books
- email influence
- invitations to disseminate (eg as keynotes speakers)

2. Community

2.1. Staff

- experience teaching on university modules
 - continuing professional development
 - skills development support
-
- increased job satisfaction
 - increased staff/volunteer competence, credibility, employability & promotion

2.2. Service users

- benefits to local economy and quality of life for individuals
- improved access to services
- developed understanding of user need

2.3. Organisation

- savings to service providers
- organisational change
- increased funding
- increased ability to articulate and promote work

3. Joint

- Joint funding submissions
- Influencing local and national practices, strategies and policies
- Development of new services
- Ongoing relationships with project partners
- Community of practice development