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MESSAGE FROM THE EDITORS

The first magazine solely dedicated to university-industry innovation is published. An exciting moment!

We often look to the US in terms of knowledge and technology transfer and many countries aim to follow their successful examples. Everyone knows the technological success stories from the Silicon Valley, many of them coming from university research and the publication by the Kauffman Foundation that highlights that the aggregated revenues of companies founded by MIT alumni would rank as the eleventh-largest economy in the world. These success stories highlight the US technology transfer approach as the best practice, with many universities and regions worldwide aiming to replicate their eco-system and structures.

In comparison to technology transfer and commercialisation, relationship-based approaches towards university-industry interactions in US universities are still in their early stages. In this issue, Cameron McCoy and Mark Nolan look at the rise of Corporate Relationships Offices in US universities, highlighting their diversity, explaining their recent development and challenges.

The remaining articles in this issue deal with other relevant topics of university-industry relationships. Rebecca Allison, consultant in Technopolis, highlights the main aspects of the fifth University-Business Forum organised by the European Commission in Brussels. After this, Irene Sheridan, Director of the Cork Institute of Technology Extended Campus (Ireland), calls for enterprise engagement to be firmly embedded in the core of universities. This is followed by an interview of Manuel Cermerón, CEO of the international company Aqualogy, who describes their close collaboration with universities as part of their R&D strategy. Josep M. Vilalta, Director of the Catalonian Association of Public Universities (Spain), presents a platform that connects the region to enhance the economic and social development. Finally, Greg McPherson, Commercial Development Manager at Adelaide Research & Innovation – The University of Adelaide (Australia) poses the question of whether a university should be run like a business, offering diverse approaches in that debate.

We are happy to present this second issue of UIIM. The enormous positive feedback we received for the first issue and the number of downloads support our feeling that the magazine has already received quite awareness among those passionate about university-industry interaction. Many thanks for the positive response and the ideas on new activities to further develop the magazine.

We also received many interesting proposals to write on the different aspects and perspectives on university-industry interaction and we publicly want to thank all interested contributors for their article proposals. Unfortunately we are not able to publish all articles received straight away in the next issue, and thus we ask for your understanding that the publication might be postponed to the next issue. Concerning this issue, we hope you enjoy reading UIIM and are looking forward to receiving your comments and feedback!

THORSTEN KLIWE
Editor-in-Chief
hliewe@uiin.org
www.uiin.org

THOMAS BAUKEN
Editor-in-Chief
baaken@fh-muenster.de
www.science-marketing.com

VICTORIA GALAN MUROS
Managing Editor
galanmuros@uiin.org
www.uiin.org

ARNO MEERMAN
Managing Editor
meerman@uiin.org
www.uiin.org
In the most recent issue of University Industry Innovation Magazine, Todd Davey explored the core principles behind, and necessity for, University-Business Cooperation (UBC). While that article primarily focused on Europe, many of those same principles are relevant in the United States (US). Just as in Europe, where UBC continues to become an essential element for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) success, US HEIs are increasingly expected to facilitate public-private interactions as a means of offsetting increased demands and decreased federal and state support. Meanwhile, businesses are facing demands to efficiently improve shareholder value amidst increasing global competition, and governments are challenged to foster rapid regional economic growth. In addressing those and other going concerns, US HEIs and businesses have modified their expectations of university-business relationships beyond traditional philanthropic or “transactional” technology licensing engagements. The new expectation is one of enterprise-wide, or “holistic”, engagement that maximizes UBC across all possible areas.

To facilitate this move into long-term mutual value based relationship building, US HEIs have turned to offices now known commonly as Corporate Relations Offices (CROs).

US institutions are moving towards actively managed UBC

As it turns out, CROs in the US are not conceptually as nascent as they might seem. In fact, US HEIs have some foundational functions that simultaneously provide a basis for, and barriers to, CRO growth. Most have philanthropic based Corporate and Foundation Relations (CFR) offices, whose purpose has historically been to pursue monetary and in-kind gifts to the institution in support of any number of needs and opportunities. Further, business engagement has long been a core function of many
US HEIs, in particular at “Land Grant” institutions through extension programs and at private institutions, which have traditionally relied less on public funds to operate. Yet, the demand for enhanced UBC has never been greater, and as such none of these traditional capabilities appears to be enough to meet the rise in expectations.

So, how are US HEIs organizationally addressing this change in focus? Not surprisingly, most institutions are organizing differently, and with a multitude of CRO options available for each HEI, defining common approaches is nearly as complex as higher education itself. Nearly every approach is unique to the parent HEI, reflecting the complexities of higher education, institutional priorities, and a variety of other related legacy variables (organizational structures, practices, expectations, and internal alignment on perceived “best practices”). To address this challenge, a 2010 member survey of 45 US research universities undertaken by the US based Network of Academic Corporate Relations Officers (NACRO) gauged how HEIs were adapting organizationally to the paradigm shift towards managed UBC relations. Of the key indicators, 85 percent of respondents reported either maintaining or expanding their corporate relations mission and over 75 percent stated their institutions valued a comprehensive model of corporate relations. The responses reflect the current “state of the art” related to organized UBC facilitation: UBC is becoming an actively managed organizational activity for US HEIs. The results also provide identification of common model indicators by assessment of the interconnection of the five following elements:

1. **CRO organization location[s]** – indicates where the CRO(s) is/are located within the HEI organizational structure. UBC facilitation is either centralized (actively managed through one controlling HEI function) or decentralized (limited and/or distributed UBC management via multiple channels). Note: It is common for universities to have a de facto decentralized approach through their organic business facing assets (technology transfer, career services, research partnerships, development, athletics, etc.), thus decentralized is the most common legacy and contemporary approach.

2. **UBC focus** – indicates that the CRO is focused on a singular primary outcome or on building broader holistic HEI-wide engagement with multiple outcomes.

---

**Figure: Corporate Relations Office Operating Model Indicators**

Source: Own illustration
3. **Primary desired UBC outcome** – indicates whether the HEI has a de facto decentralized model (we label this as Varied), a Philanthropic model focused only on charitable giving, an Industry Research model focused on increasing industry related R&D activity and funding, or a Combination (hybrid) model focused on managed UBC across multiple areas.

4. **Reporting structure** – indicates where the CRO has primary, and in some cases secondary, reporting responsibilities within the HEI, which can influence focus, outcome, and metrics. As with outcome indicators, the de facto reporting is varied. Some CROs report primarily or secondarily to a specific college within the HEI. Others primarily report to the HEIs philanthropic, or advancement, function and (often) secondarily to a college OR to the R&D function. Still others report to the R&D, or research, function, and (on occasion) report secondarily to the philanthropic function. Finally, some CROs do not report to any of the more traditional structures and instead report to central administration in someway (for example, reporting to the HEIs Economic Development function).

5. **Metrics** – perhaps the biggest indicator of CRO approach is through assessing measured outputs. For example, within a philanthropic model, funds raised are the primary - and perhaps only - measure of performance. Conversely, a research model is concerned primarily with R&D related outcomes. A combined model is likely concerned with a mix of both of philanthropic and R&D, plus some additional elements that may include numbers of students engaged in UBC, numbers of internships and employment offers, and even technology commercialized. It is important to note that this example list falls significantly short of portraying the vast measurement options available to HEIs depending on their CRO approach.

The Corporate Relations Office Operating Model Indicator graphic below provides visual representation of CRO options, influencers, and interconnections. Dashed arrows represent secondary or optional connections while solid arrows represent the most common interconnections.

**The goals and approaches might be different but the activities are remarkably similar**

While primary goals of CROs depend on their operating model, at their core they work to facilitate and develop UBC to the benefit of both parties. To that end, CROs are involved in facilitating external facing activities, internal facing activities, and activities to coordinate both internal and external stakeholders in order to align mutual interests. These activities detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of facilitation</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description of facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Facing</strong></td>
<td>Point of entry</td>
<td>From &quot;Concierge&quot; service (thoroughly managed engagement), to &quot;Roadmap&quot; service (introduction facilitation and then hands-off), each intends to act as a point of entry for UBC, enhancing the relationship to the benefit of both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External education</td>
<td>Given the complexities of HEIs, CROs educate external partners about university operations, approaches, and opportunities. This activity is specific to event-based activity focused on institutional assets, restrictions, and its abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional knowledge source</td>
<td>Acting as an information-clearing house, CROs constantly gather information about the varied activities of the HEI to facilitate business interactions efficiently, analyze opportunities, and brand themselves as the “go to” point of entry for UBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Facing</strong></td>
<td>Internal resource alignment</td>
<td>CROs work internally to align university resources and encourage optimal UBC through internal communication related activities (coordination meetings, newsletters, presentations, hosted events, etc.). This enables the CRO to organize more effectively, encourage active participation, and alleviate political barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence &amp; analysis</td>
<td>Core to CRO function is intelligence gathering and analysis about opportunities, industries, and potential partners. These are essential, although the depth of research and the use of gathered data are specific to the needs and focus of the office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional education</td>
<td>CROs spend significant time educating the institution regarding UBC (planned presentations and ad hoc opportunistic effort) with varied audiences. The intent is to translate business to academia to create a common understanding of approach, language, and UBC related needs potential outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External &amp; Internal Facing</strong></td>
<td>Opportunity coordination</td>
<td>CROs work to coordinate internal assets to the benefit of the business partner and external activities to the benefit of the HEI. Each UBC opportunity is unique to partner and project, requiring the CRO to be trained in multiple areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leverage for Speed</td>
<td>CROs leverage relationships and alignments to move UBC opportunities swiftly and regularly. Internally this is referred to as moving the HEI at the “speed of business”. Externally, this is coordinated by efficient and regular engagement, communicated timelines, encouraging relaxation of requirements or stances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>CROs work to establish a legal framework that eliminates barriers and supports the intended UBC activity. Typically, CROs establish master and/or template agreements related to various aspects of potential UBC opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Types of Activities within US Corporate Relations Offices
Source: Own illustration
There are still key challenges and barriers facing CROs in their implementation and development

Clearly there has been an evolution in US HEI approach to UBC, but as we have noted, these new functions and requirements are complex leaving CROs with multiple change implementation barriers and operational challenges. Among them, variances in primary mission, differing metrics, skills development, legacy expectations and practices, and varied expectations of business partners all lead to barriers to change for HEIs and their CROs. While these are not all of the challenges being addressed currently, from our assessment, they are the five most influential.

1. **Variance in primary missions** – nearly all offices have the same intent regarding UBC, to build a relationship that has a positive end result but the reality is that their primary missions vary significantly. This leads to difficulty creating and/or observing commonality across HEIs. This variance is a gateway barrier to addressing the additional challenges below.

2. **Differing metrics** – a variance in primary mission leads to difficulty defining common CRO metrics. One office may be concerned primarily with giving related metrics, while another is concerned more with elements related to research funding, and yet another concerned more about the relationship holistically. Importantly, the combination of varied offices, lack of common metrics, and relative nascent move to an active approach make it difficult for CROs to explain what their responsibilities are clearly enough to navigate institutional politics and prove success (comparative or otherwise).

3. **CRO workforce development & skillset variations** – varied expectations also lead to a need for varied skillsets. Optimally, a CRO staff member develops broad skills related to R&D, philanthropy, workforce & economic development, and work to gain significant institution specific knowledge. This is particularly difficult if the CRO has a singular focus and specific desired outcome. Additionally, this type of skill development is time intensive, causes recruiting and training challenges, and limits career mobility (due to high training costs and limited upward progression). Varied expectations also make it difficult to establish optimal CRO workforce sizes and meaningful per employee outputs.

4. **Institutional understanding & adoption** – change can be challenging in any organization, particularly within HEIs with a legacy of organizational structures, legacy practices, and legacy relationships. Resistance to change, when combined with a lack of clear and realistic expectations, time intensive/long sales cycles, limited commonality in metrics, and the multiple skillsets requirements necessary to act on a wider range of goals, leads many CROs to be met with impatient administration and faculty. This limits adoption rates of best practices and can lead to high turnover in CRO workforce.

5. **Business partner adoption** – the above barriers also combine to create barriers for UBC optimization with business partners, sometimes serving only to add complexity. Limited approach consistency among HEIs, mismatched collaborative expectations, and lack of adoption internally can cause partner confusion and lead to a failure of the HEI to address the concerns of the variety of corporate-side stakeholders that need to be engaged. Simply put, for potential business partners the nascence of CROs may be a limiting factor for UBC, creating frustration rather than expedience.

**It isn’t all gloomy, in fact, it’s an exciting time to work in and study CROs**

Despite the challenges and barriers, there have been positive developments for CROs over the past few years. Significant growth of NACRO’s membership, the development (by NACRO) of “essential elements of success” for CROs, identification of common roles and responsibilities, and ultimately business’s positive response to active, centralized management are all indicators that this is an exciting time to be a part of (and impact) a growing HEI function.

1. **NACRO growth and the essential elements** – despite the challenges faced by CROs, these are exciting times in the development of a new career path and a new function for HEIs. The growth of NACRO membership over the past five years to include nearly 200 institutions reflects a demand for professional development, a unified “functional” voice, and peer-to-peer networking that indicates more institutions are moving towards the centralized CRO approach. Among the outputs of the organization is the 2011 whitepaper that identifies the “Five Essential Elements of a Successful Twenty-First Century University Corporate Relations Program” which are intended to be implementable by all HEIs. These include: a) gaining institutional support (particularly at the highest levels) to clarify roles and responsibilities; b) seeking mutual benefits in all UBC interactions; c) providing one-stop shopping for business partners to simplify their HEI interactions; d) engaging the R&D function to integrate research development such that UBC opportunities are maximized; and e) working internally to provide campus coordination for institutional knowledge development and internal/external brand management. One additional outcome, importantly, of NACRO’s growth is enabled the
identification of the above challenges and barriers that the group can now address cohesively.

2. Common staffing approaches and career development – identifying common CRO approaches has enabled the definition of common CRO roles and responsibilities that serve to manage HEI expectations, develop professional education, and encourage career mobility. NACRO members indicate several typical roles within CROs including (i) Director or Executive Director, (ii) Industry Liaison(s) responsible for managing all aspects of UBC (internally and externally), often along a specific set of university competencies, and (iii) Research Associate, responsible for fostering institutional research and analysis. Understanding these roles also enables best practice sharing, empirical data collection, and some career path clarification.

3. The move to centralized/holistic UBC and positive business response – as HEIs embrace the move to a centralized and holistic approach, greater progress can be made to address the barriers and challenges described above. More importantly, however, have been the response from business partners. A non-scientific survey of business representatives attending a recent NACRO conference, suggests that many partners wanting to pursue more cohesive UBC highly value having an internal advocate and source of institutional knowledge. This is value for CROs, as the work to establish a stronger foothold internally through UBC successes and positive, brand building relationships, with advocating business partners.

Is the US HEI approach to UBC transferable to HEIs worldwide?

The short answer is yes, but in reality that might prove difficult in the near term. As we’ve shown, implementation and development of these offices is an evolving and complex undertaking that is often unique to the parent HEI. It is typical for US institutions to start with either a decentralized or philanthropic approach, move to a centralized philanthropic approach (where most are now), and then to add R&D related responsibility. More commonly, offices are either dual report or are moving to a combination approach where philanthropy and research are both addressed either through multiple collaborative offices or through a single point of entry system that has responsibility for the entire relationship. These experiences are reflective of the significant room for experimentation and no “lock” on approaches to CRO development and that there are many different “right” paths and those paths are highly dependent on combinations of time relevant variables for each institution. This could prove to be a benefit to HEIs worldwide in that they can learn from US implementations, best practices, and empirical evidence as it becomes available. However, there may still be challenges related to legacy structures, relationships and practices to provide speed-limiting barriers to optimal CRO implementation. Some things are clear: having institutional support, a pipeline of talent that can speak the language of business AND the language of academia, is crucial to fostering UBC, and the patience to build institutional knowledge and skills, are essential keys to “transferability” of the US approach.
Assisting governments, universities and business in improving UBC

Combining the existing “State of European UBC” study results and a new analysis, individual organisations or regions can benefit from a personalised study of your university/region receiving:

1. a benchmark in terms of UBC of your organisation / region against others,
2. a comprehensive picture of the development of your own UBC ecosystem,
3. clear recommendations to advance the diverse areas of UBC within your organisation/region.

Provided to you in the form of a report and/or presentation/workshop, a state of the UBC report dedicated to your organisation/region can assist in developing greater financial and non-financial benefits from UBC.

For more information about a personalised study:

apprimo UG - Todd Davey - davey@apprimo.com
UIIN - Victoria Galan-Muros - galanmuros@uiin.org
New approaches to cooperation, technology and teaching and learning were all high on the agenda of the most recent University-Business Forum held in Brussels in June this year.

The European Commission established the University-Business Forum in 2008 to advance and facilitate interactions and exchanges between the academia and business by showcasing good examples of university-business cooperation (UBC). The Forums illustrate the rapid changes and developments happening in the field of higher education, innovation, entrepreneurship and UBC. Ideas have matured and the field constantly addresses new and interesting challenges such as the rise of the entrepreneurial university and the new modes of teaching and learning.

For over one and a half days this intensive conference engaged high-level representatives from top EU universities and business giants like Microsoft, Alcatel-Lucent, Nokia and Hewlett Packard. Under the title of “Strategic Partnerships for Innovation and Growth: From Dialogue to Partnerships” the European Commission gathered policy makers, universities, research institutes and businesses interested in exploring cooperation between universities and businesses from the perspective of education.

The opening speech by Ms Androulla Vassiliou, the Member of the European Commission responsible for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth, emphasised the success of the University-Business Forum. Now convening for the fifth time in Brussels, the Forum has been instrumental in the shaping of the Knowledge Alliances pilot projects, which encourage structured, result-driven cooperation ventures between universities and companies. The University-Business Forum has also led to the recent launch of HEInnovate, a new self-assessment tool for (higher education institutions) HEIs exploring their entrepreneurial potential. In a keynote speech, Tim Wilson, Former Vice Chancellor of the University of Hertfordshire and lead author of the Wilson Review, gave interesting insights into the increased emphasis given to UBC in the UK. Universities in the UK are very different from 10 years ago, and now cooperation is expected and instigated by the new generation of university leaders. Maria Garana, President of Microsoft in Spain stressed the importance of talent as the common denominator between business and academia.

With its focus on partnership for change, the forum themes included:

- Entrepreneurship
- Promoting change and impact
- People and innovation
- Spotlight on Knowledge Alliances and Massive Online Open CourseWare (MOOCs)

The highlights from the University-Business Forum are presented next.
Entrepreneurship

Developing entrepreneurship has potential impact at many levels: individual, institutional, economic, and more broadly social. The University-Business Forum highlighted the important role of universities in developing entrepreneurs and the entrepreneurial mindset. For aspiring entrepreneurs, there are many potential pitfalls along the road, from the first good idea to its final delivery to the market (e.g. fear of failure; inexperience and lack of credibility; finding a buyer for the product). HEIs can support entrepreneurship by helping graduates develop transferable skills and by providing a favourable ecosystem with access to the right facilities and external expertise. These conditions are not only important for start-ups and spin-offs, but also for students and staff from all disciplines who need to develop a more entrepreneurial attitude and skill-set. Professor Paul Hannon, Director of the institute for Entrepreneurial Leadership at Swansea University, underlined the importance of the entrepreneurial agenda in universities and reiterated two essential elements:

- Looking at institutions in an entrepreneurial way
- Creating environments in which entrepreneurial behaviour is developed across all stakeholders

Successful examples were explored including the Design Factories at Aalto University, where students and researchers are mixed together in shared spaces. Universities which piloted HEInnovate, the new self-assessment tool for HEIs, provided testimonials on its usefulness of the tool in future strategy and development.

Promoting change and impact

There is still little information on the modes or extent of cooperation between HEIs and its overall impact. Mr Adrian Healy from Cardiff University presented on the European Commission study on the outcomes and impact of educational cooperation between the higher education sector and the business sector. While most stakeholders value educational cooperation as much as research cooperation, the nature of the benefits and how they can be measured is less certain. Early recommendations from the study point to the need to develop new multi-criteria-based measurement methodologies to enable stakeholders to grasp the full extent of the benefits of cooperation and to better inform cooperation policies. This should result in greater transparency, comparability, and more informed strategic choices, though there is no one-size-fits-all methodology.

The University-Business Forum highlighted successful partnerships, such as the Knowledge and Innovation Communities of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT KICs), and some competitiveness clusters in Europe. These are delivering mutual benefits to the partners involved, and encouraging joined-up approaches to the use of public funding to deliver maximum value.

People and innovation

Focusing on design as a key driver of innovation competitiveness and growth and also the diverse skills needed for graduates in the new economy, the sessions on people and innovation included presentations from the Barcelona Design Centre and design faculties from Eindhoven University (The Netherlands), Staffordshire University and the University of the Arts in the UK.

The forum presentations and discussions showed how a focus on design allows local solutions to be found for local issues stemming from greater global challenges. Design is not a last minute add-on but part of the wider approach to innovation. It is particularly powerful when combined with other forms of new knowledge and activity. For example, when design is combined with technology and an awareness of the social environment, it can create a shift from a purely knowledge-based economy to one which builds on localised stakeholder cooperation for sustainability.

There are many elements to combine together in the quest to innovate and create competitiveness. Developing the right type of skills and allowing the exploration of
talent is crucial for successful UBC. This is not just an issue for big business but also for small and medium sized businesses who have a central role to play in innovation. Presentations from Vodafone and SAP represented business needs, and the Politecnico di Milano and the Copenhagen Innovation and Entrepreneurship Lab (CIEL) provided an overview of their approaches to talent spotting and collaborative skills development. CIEL runs the Thematic Entrepreneurship Excellence programme, similar to the Knowledge and Innovation Communities of the European Institute for Innovation and Technology’s (EIT KICs). In this programme students work on the societal challenges of local companies through long term partnerships which provides an ecosystem to upskill the students across a range of necessary entrepreneurial skills.

Spotlight on Knowledge Alliances and Massive Online Open CourseWare (MOOCs)

The final sessions provided the floor to the Knowledge Alliances, European-funded structured partnerships between businesses, HEIs and students. The first Knowledge Alliances were established in 2011 as one mechanism to bridge the gap between higher education and business to collaborate on common projects of mutual benefit. The strength of the approach lies in the quality and commitment of the partnership. The first set of Knowledge Alliances have already highlighted benefits include new perspectives on innovation and entrepreneurial skills development in students. Academics also benefit as they can create more dynamic and engaging curricula and develop sustainable relationships with business.

Finally the University-Business Forum introduced a session on MOOCs, Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) which are providing free higher education courses, online, without enrolment restrictions or physical barriers. They are proliferating fast, growing in popularity and interest and changing the nature of the learning environment. MOOCs first took off in the US in 2011, led by Stanford University. There are now MOOCs being developed in Europe by, for example, Leuphana University in Germany and the UK’s Open University which has recently launched FutureLearn. Other universities, like EPFL in Switzerland have joined existing platforms (COURSERA and edX) to offer their own MOOCs. MOOCs lead to many questions, some of which remain unanswered but are important to consider as a new educational model. These include the MOOC business model; the relationship to traditional education and the qualification system; the relative effectiveness of MOOC teaching and learning methods; and the validation and recognition of MOOC accreditation.

In conclusion, the fifth University-Business Forum succeeded in opening up a myriad of ideas, discussions and debates. Throughout the forum graphic design students and graduates contributed with their vivid and rich drawings, and there was a showcase of new inventions and creative innovations developed by young European entrepreneurs, providing a great balance in age as well as a good indicator of youth being involved.

SPOTLIGHT ON HEInnovate

In November 2013, the European Commission launched the first fully functioning version of HEInnovate. HEInnovate is a self-assessment tool for Entrepreneurial HEIs. It is an initiative of the European Commission, DG Education and Culture and the OECD LEED forum, and supported by a panel of six independent experts.

HEInnovate is intended for HEIs (Universities, University Colleges, Polytechnics, etc.) that are interested in assessing themselves against a number of statements of self-reflection related to the entrepreneurial nature of their higher education environment.

- Leadership and Governance
- Organisational capacity, People and Incentives
- Entrepreneurship development in teaching and learning
- Pathways for entrepreneurs
- University – business/external relationships for knowledge exchange
- The Entrepreneurial University as an internationalised institution
- Measuring the impact of the Entrepreneurial University
Call for interest

Until November 2014, as part of the launch phase, Technopolis is organising a series of interactive expert-led workshops across the Member States for groups of HEIs.

If you are interested in potentially participating, please contact Rebecca Allinson and they will keep you posted on workshops taking place in your country.

Web address

For more information on HEInnovate, please visit: www.HEInnovate.eu

Rebecca Allinson

Rebecca Allinson is a Senior Consultant at Technopolis responsible for projects/work in the field of European and UK public policy, specifically related to the Higher Education, Research and Innovation and Enterprise Policy. This includes research, project management and evaluation. Rebecca’s work in the last few years has concentrated on the interplay between education, research and enterprise. Recent work includes, the support for the development of HEInnovate, a guiding framework for European Entrepreneurial Universities and supporting the University-Business Forums through the development of policy background papers and analysis.

EMAIL: rebecca.allinson@technopolis-group.com  PHONE: +44 1273 204320  WEB: www.technopolis-group.com
In Ireland, as elsewhere, we recognise that building relationships between enterprise and universities has the potential to deliver value for the students, the enterprise, the university and society as a whole. In a challenging global economic climate, a small open economy such as ours relies on supporting development and growth of our indigenous enterprise as well as remaining an attractive destination for leading multi-national companies. The Irish National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 stresses the potential for higher education to play a pivotal role in enhancing Ireland’s economic competitiveness. Much depends on the quality, relevance and currency of our higher education, research and innovation systems. This article calls for ‘engagement’ to be embedded more firmly within the core of higher education in Ireland and indicates that in order to achieve this level of engagement the culture and business processes of the higher education institutions (HEI) will need to be changed.

In response to these findings and building on its expertise in this space Cork Institute of Technology (CIT) established the CIT Extended Campus in November 2011 with a mission to support two-way interactions of individuals and organisations with CIT for knowledge exchange, learning, research and development. Stimulating the demand for interactions from enterprise, providing a single point of contact and ensuring professional case management were the main aims. It has been an interesting two years and an interesting journey; in the normal way of these things it has been both satisfying and challenging.

Lessons and Challenges

CIT, like most academic institutions, consists of a variety of academic and research units and centres. In order to enhance the interactions between CIT and enterprises a first step was to try to understand how we looked when seen from the perspective of the external enterprise. Not surprisingly, the view from the outside is not one of a single coherent entity but actually of several interactions with separate academic departments without a coherent overview (and often with a feeling that one department does not know what the other department is doing). It is important to point out that the enterprise often looks like a series of disparate and not well-connected units as well, from the university perspective.

However, we did find that the external partners were, on the whole, very impressed with the openness to engage and the experiences that they had in working with CIT at the direct interaction level. Therefore, there were lots of good experiences and stories, and in stimulating the
demand for more interactions; the Extended Campus team needed to harvest those stories and use them to generate more queries. We also found that in trying to understand and codify the various kinds of interactions that happen it was useful to compare our experiences with those of other HEIs and with some of the published research in the area. We began with a long list of interactions and with a concept of a continuum of relationship building. Through our leadership of cross-institutional projects we gained an overview of the experiences of a broad range of HEIs and we were able to compare this with our own emerging experience to develop a view of three main categories of ‘engagement interactions’ as indicated in Figure 1 below.

We also wanted, for the first time, to be able to collate and analyse the potential interactions that did not lead directly to engagement activities and try to understand why. Exploring international practice and our own experiences in how this might best be achieved we very quickly concluded that we needed a customer relationship management system to support it and collate the day to day activities of the Extended Campus, the reporting and benchmarking and the analysis and development of improved practice. So our main challenges might be summarised as:

- Developing a clear picture of how the institute currently interacts with enterprise partners
- Compiling exemplars of good experiences to act as stimuli for more interactions
- Managing those requests for interaction in a professional and timely manner when they arise
- Reviewing practice in order to identify enhancements
- Contributing to institution strategy

Over the time, it has become very clear that, as the interface or single point of contact for interaction with enterprise, our work has an inward-facing and an outward-facing component. Looking at the inward-facing piece there are a few observations that I could make at this point.

- It is very important to view the establishment of this ‘single point of contact’ as a change management process with all of the attendant cultural and organisational implications.
- It would have been impossible to achieve any level of acceptance without the clear and regularly restated support of the institute executive.
- Internal processes are very unlikely to change unless value can be clearly demonstrated at the point of interaction.

In terms of the outward facing piece, not surprisingly, the industry base warmly welcomed an initiative that they
saw as offering ease of access, more timely responses and a broader range of interaction possibility. However, there are significant differences in their ability to interact successfully with higher education. Some of those difficulties relate to the size of the organisation and the reality that it requires the dedication of time and resources on both sides of the partnership. Some of it relates to the absorptive capacity and the readiness of the organisation to interact and act as a partner in the co-creation of knowledge, this seems to be influenced somewhat by the sector or by the nature of the core business and the expectations held.

Conclusion

In Irish higher education, there is strong awareness of the need for collaboration between higher education, enterprise and communities to contribute to economic renewal and social innovation but the National Strategy document states that ‘HEIs could be more dynamic and coherent in their approach to collaboration’. The CIT Extended Campus builds on the long-history of CIT as an ‘engaged institution’ and on a number of collaborative projects at the interface between academia and enterprise (Higher Education Authority-funded REAP Roadmap for employment-academic partnership project www.reap.ie). The approach taken is one that seeks to establish and build mutually beneficial partnerships leading to long term strategic relationships at an institutional level.

The developing national and international landscape in which engagement is clearly valued and benchmarked will, in addition to expediting the changes in culture and mindset needed, provide an impetus for a supportive framework to facilitate exchange of experiences, development of practice and the internal business process of HEIs. We would expect to see a framework to support communities of practice in engagement emerging in Ireland as well as a climate that supports and values diversity within higher education missions.

An important feature will be the connectedness of our approaches to the interactions between university and industry. Opportunities for interaction will be increasingly multi-disciplinary and global. We cannot expect our industry partners to understand or indeed respect the divisions between academic units and departments. At the first level we need to present an informed institutional view. We also need to understand that collaboration between HEIs can often present the most appropriate solution within a region and that enterprises operate on a multi-site, global framework and often our responses and collaborations need to mirror that. Therefore, building communities of practice at an institutional, national and inter-national level will support practice development within higher education and will contribute to a growing appreciation of the potential benefits of engagement from the enterprise perspective.

Irene Sheridan

Since 2007 Irene Sheridan has managed two collaborative projects aimed at engagement between higher education and enterprise (Education in Employment and Roadmap for Employment-Academic Partnership (REAP)). Both projects are funded by the Higher Education Authority under the Strategic Innovation Fund. In 2012, she completed a Doctorate on Change Management in Higher Education with the University of Middlesex. She is currently Head of the CIT Extended Campus, a unique facility established to stimulate and support all forms of engagement with enterprise, including customised learning development, research and innovation activity and enterprise support and development.

EMAIL: irene.sheridan@cit.ie  PHONE: +353 21 432 6568  WEB: www.cit.ie
UIIN Gateway helps you to increase your chances of funding by providing a sound dissemination, exploitation and sustainability strategy for your research project.

The UIIN Gateway concept and service portfolio has been developed based on many years of experience and also integrates latest management concepts. We take into account the very specific characteristics of publicly funded research projects whilst also adding a business management perspective which ensures the successful transformation of science into innovation.

Learning from experience
UIIN Gateway has been developed based on the experiences and needs of the members of the University Industry Innovation Network and has also been shaped by the knowledge and experiences of the Science-to-Business Marketing Research Centre (S2BMRC) in Germany which researches university-industry relationships and innovation for more than 10 years.

Integrating latest management concepts
Besides the knowledge and experiences made in the field of innovation-driven research projects, the UIIN Gateway concept has also been influenced by latest management concepts. For example, the concept has been designed similar to the Business Model Canvas of Osterwalder & Pigneur - the most used tool for developing, evaluating and communication business models around the world.

If you are interested in adding a professional strategy for dissemination, exploitation and sustainability to your funding proposal, please get in contact!

www.gateway.uiin.org
In words of Mr. Cermerón, Aqualogy is a group of companies that offers integrated solutions for water and environment companies, as well as owned technology offer in order to create a sustainable development. Aqualogy’s offering goes from design and built services, operation and maintenance solutions, smart metering, revenue management and optimisation, to R&D&I and business consultancy among others. This way, Aqualogy has a broad scope that covers the whole value chain for companies where water plays a key role in their business. Aqualogy operates worldwide in 19 different countries from North and South America, to Europe and Africa. Aqualogy has been collaborating with several universities and research centres for the last seven years and they have made these collaborations part of their business strategy.

Why do you do cooperate with universities and research centres?
They key to understand this reason is simply our current business model. For Aqualogy it is clear that knowledge is rapidly being created, and it is created in a network rather than just by a single organisation. Since no one can live from their own knowledge exclusively, it is important to take into account all relevant sources of knowledge. Cutting-edge innovation and technological development is the basis of our business model, so universities play now an essential role in our business strategy.

How is this collaboration being undertaken in Aqualogy?
We have developed our own network of technology centres, which directly collaborate with local universities in Barcelona, Santiago de Compostela, Málaga and Santiago de Chile (currently in development). Again, this shows how working in a network is essential in our strategy in order to take advantage of as many relevant sources of knowledge as possible.

The origin of this strategy of collaboration was a series of agreements that we had with the local universities in 2006. We realized the importance of having a long term stable collaboration rather than just framework agreements and we opted for the creation of these private-funded centres, each of which is managed by a company of the Aqualogy group, a specific local university and the Spanish National Research Council (CSIC) as an actor in all our centres. Therefore, this allows having a continuous and long-term strategy, as well as more solid and reliable partnerships.

To currently manage the different research centres there is both a global joint strategy and R&D plan but each centre has its own specialization and autonomy in managing their own projects. Not only the centres do not compete among them, but they can be considered complementary. Furthermore, each local manager has the responsibility to promote initiatives that are suitable for his/her technology centre.

What do you feel are the main barriers working with universities and research centres and how did you overcome them?
I don’t agree any more with the old stereotypes about universities. While years ago it was more difficult to cooperate with universities, luckily this has changed since 2008, when the university started to be more open to industry, for example now universities have gladly accept our suggested industrial PhDs when a few years ago the politely rejected them. Now universities accept project in which knowledge creation is not the only goal, but also its application and the return on investment of the project. Thus, we have left behind the “blank cheque” and put some stress and tension in order to comply with schedules. We plan milestones and based on them make decisions about the direction or continuity of the project. Knowledge creation, as one of the missions of universities, should not be left out but when working with a company, universities needs to readjust their settings. I think
most universities have understood that it is a different way of working.

The reason for this switch is without any doubt based on the availability of resources for universities. Universities realized that firms are interested in investing in R&D and technology, and could let them maintain their research groups, talent and activities. Without these funding-based needs, it would have probably taken much longer to reach the current situation. Universities need funding and firms need talent, so sharing this within a network is a good solution.

The highest difficulties still include intellectual property issues. The company is providing with resources to the university, which does not assume any risk, and even though sometimes want the intellectual property of projects. Conditions need to be clearly established since the very beginning, and despite it is a tough problem, we’ve ended up clearing up these obstacles. Based on the recent development I am optimistic, even when there is still room for improvement.

What would you recommend to other business people in order to successfully cooperate with universities?

The first tip of advice is to approach the university without considering any former experiences they might had with universities or any prejudice. It is important to start the contact with full predisposition to work with the university.

The second is that the company must clearly know what it wants. Companies should not go to universities asking what they have, but instead having a clearly defined goal beforehand. However, the goal should be open enough to avoid hindering the potential knowledge contribution from the university.

Finally, it is important that companies do an intensive and careful management of projects with universities. Researchers, either for curiosity or ambition, can diverge from the original path establish in search of new knowledge creation, and sometimes might not strictly consider finances or the project profitability. That is why the company should do this labour.

**Manuel Cermerón Romero**

Born in Barcelona in 1970, he got a degree in Industrial Engineering and a Master in New Information Technologies by the Polytechnic University of Catalonia, and also a degree in Strategic Business&People Development by the ESADE University. Once he finished his Industrial Engineering studies in 1995, he joined Accenture as a Consultant in Design and Implementing Reengineering Processes and Automation. In 1999 he moved to Agbar Group, where he worked with Bristol Water, a company within the Group in the UK, where he was in charge of the Organisation and Development Management. Now, he is the Managing Director of AQUALOGY Solutions and Technologies.

**WEB:** www.aqualogy.net
It may seem obvious that universities and higher education institutions play a key role in human capital development and innovation systems, as is equally decisive the role that industry and public administration play. Nevertheless, it is not uncommon in innovation systems around the globe that there be no joint space where these three actors communicate, discuss and work together for the benefit of the region. As the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) pointed out in the study “Higher Education and Regions: Globally Competitive and Locally Engaged” (2007), through their research teaching and community engagement, universities can be key actors fostering and supporting regional innovation. However, successful regional cooperation is reliant on the ability of all three key organizational players (universities, government/public authorities and business) to establish strong and feasible partnerships. The initiative we are about to present aims at tackling this problem by creating the necessary environment and space to allow universities, the industry and business sector and the public administration to enhance co-operation and long-term dialogue and allow for joint initiatives, discussions and specific actions to be created.

The Platform for Knowledge, Territory and Innovation (Plataforma CTI) is a strategic project to strengthen the economic and social development of Catalonia (Spain). Both reports included among their conclusions the need for an organized space for the interaction of universities, the business and industry sector and the public administration. The idea was that such interactions would highly enhance the creation of coherent system wide policies and initiatives.

Much is being done in Catalonia presently to overcome economic restrictions and to foster competitiveness: initiatives such clustering, smart specialization, concentration (facilities and institutions), etc. resulting in an outstanding and “lively” innovation ecosystem in Catalonia. The Plataforma CTI initiative places itself in this dynamic by connecting the university-business-administration.

The founders of this platform are convinced that overcoming the current crisis and the formation of a new social and economic scenario will largely depend on the level and characteristics of the collaboration between the three major players in the region: industry and business, universities and public administration. This initiative arises, therefore, at a critical time because the strategies for growth and development made during the ‘good’
economic years have faded along with the budgets that made it possible. We know that this crisis is changing the economic model although we do not know which will be the next one, but it will certainly require a change of culture and a more social approach of the economy. In this sense, the platform provides the ability to think and act on a long term social and economic strategy for Catalonia. The Plataforma CTI has three main objectives:

1. To promote economic activity and knowledge-intensive innovation;
2. Encourage the exchange of ideas, discussions and to enhance the creation of projects between universities, companies and public institutions;
3. To generate initiatives and projects strongly rooted in the needs of Catalonia based on knowledge and innovation.

The Plataforma CTI is promoted by the Catalan Association of Public Universities, the two main employer associations (Foment del Treball Nacional and PIMEC) and has the support of “la Caixa” and a group of companies based in Catalonia. The Government of Catalonia holds a collaborative role.

It was officially launched in March 2012 with the first edition of the Jornades Catalunya Futura – a conference organized for a restricted group of representatives from the industry and business sector, the Rectors and Presidents of Social Councils of the public universities of Catalonia and the invited speakers. The conference ended with the presentation of the Declaration of Poblet which the participants had elaborated during the conference to the President of the Government of Catalonia.

Since then the Plataforma CTI has engaged in a number of projects and actions that include an international seminar and a series of conferences on Knowledge and Innovation, and is preparing several projects among which is a pilot project to connect the needs for innovation of specific companies to the expertise of the member universities.

"RESEARCHERS NEED TO REFINE THEIR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SKILLS TO PROMOTE RESULTS OF THEIR RESEARCH (...) AND ACCELERATE IMPACT"
Implementing a University Business Cooperation (UBC) culture can be challenging, particularly when entrepreneurialism is in question. Most UBC practitioners may expect the question posed by this article to be answered in the affirmative. This is because the business relationship is fundamental to UBC. As a technology and knowledge marketer who works closely with university and industry partners, I have found quite different answers to the question depending on who is asked. Understanding the differing opinions and how it affects UBC is important for future research.

The use of evidence based advice when facilitating UBC was a major motivation for research I was involved with on University Industry Links (UIL) conducted with teams from the University of Adelaide Business School and the Science-to-Business Marketing Research Centre at Münster University of Applied Sciences. I use UIL research to help researchers and industry partners develop relationships and collaborations. Feedback from the translation of this research has prompted questions from partners – is a university a business?

While UBC is clearly vital for universities to contribute to the communities that fund them, the ideals of cooperation depend on universities and business doing business. An important principal of business is that customers are treated in a business-like manner; e.g. effective customer relationship management, efficient sales transactions, service, market research, product tailoring, after sales follow-up and warranties. The core business of universities is education and research, which means basic outputs are students with degrees and publication of research. In this environment UBC can sometimes depend on the capability, capacity and time available. So often university researchers and staff do not see industry as customers - they service industry only if it suits them, if the project is of interest, or if they have time. Relationship development relies heavily on partners getting on. In Crossing the Rubicon Valentina Tartari et al state that the different institutional settings between academics and industry highlight conflicting norms and incentives. The level of academic experience in being business-like and the entrepreneurial setting in the university are both hurdles.

CurrentUIL research is weighted towards the universities’ point of view. Looking from a business point of view, Anthea Lipsett writing in The Guardian states that industry sees hurdles from increased university bureaucracy and unrealistic expectations of the value of their IP.

When I talk to researchers about improving communication, trust and understanding (the success factors assessed in our research) questions arise; why should universities change? Shouldn’t industry understand us better? Should universities be businesses? Rather than relying on the “entrepreneurialisation” of university academics, perhaps knowing how to work with universities is an aspect of an innovative business.

I have explored these attitudes further through talking to academics and industry partners, listening to opinions at seminars and conferences and asking open questions about:

• What’s it like working with university/industry,
• how do they adapt the way they work,
• how important is the engagement,
• how business-like do they consider universities to be, and
• what was their attitude to universities as businesses.

Comments from academics suggest many find communicating with industry difficult, and this can be influenced by personality, distance between the partners and requirements for more detailed information. Adapting the way of working can involve adjusting to industry timelines (which are often tight) and requirements for more detail in proposals and documentation. Industry comments include difficulties and delays in setting up
projects and that they need to adapt to working with universities by allowing more time.

“Lack of speed and attention to detail, short on understanding of industry standards.”

Industry comment

“We need to accept they have different priorities.”

Academic comment

The importance of engagement for each side was a clear contrast. Some academics considered UIL’s to be of low importance to their normal work; however, academics with existing UIL’s stated engagement was important. For industry, engagement with universities is of high importance.

Some academics who consider UIL’s to be of low importance also tended to think that universities are not very business-like, and they are comfortable with this. Those considering that universities were becoming businesses felt this was not good. Eric Murphy writing in the Minnesota Daily supports this thinking by suggesting the university is not a business5. Businesses who considered university to be business-like, felt this was good; contrary those who thought university was not business-like said this was bad. This attitude was shared with academics considering UIL’s to be important and are well engaged with industry. A back of the envelope projection of the way different opinions may develop is shown in the figure; it may be that the different attitudes are at odds; the more universities become business-like, the further some academics move out of their comfort zone. However, a study to measure this phenomenon is required.

For UBC practitioners, there is a need to understand that many researchers may not feel comfortable with business and the high degree of adaptation required for them to engage with industry. Some businesses understand this and set up processes to ease the engagement with universities, such as appointing knowledge transfer champions to work with universities and allowing time to set up linkages. Having worked with many companies involved in UILs, there is a range of understanding and adaptation in industry. The companies that know how to deal with the nature of what a university is are the true innovators. An example of a company innovating in UIL is Agilent, the measurement technology company. Agilent have processes for involvement in interdisciplinary research with partners, success factors include understanding interests of the partner, assembling a motivated team from university and industry, focus on participation of both sides, and ‘mentoring’ technology transfer with champions and a culture of partnering. For many businesses, working with universities is very important. A competitive advantage must be an ability to form UILs effectively.

As organisations whose main products are graduates and research outputs that may not always align with what industry wants, universities should not be considered as market focussed businesses. So for UBC practitioners, the importance of helping industry to find its way into the university labyrinth is paramount. Perhaps the UBC focus needs to shift from trying to change the nature of universities, to understanding industry best practice better and how UBC practitioners can influence the business side of the UBC equation.

3 Valentina Tartari, Ammon Salter, Pablo D’Este, Crossing the Rubicon: exploring the factors that shape academics’ perceptions of the barriers to working with industry. Cambridge Journal of Economics. 3 April 2012.
5 Eric Murphy, The university is not a business, Minnesota Daily, 3 May 2012.
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The University-Industry Interaction Conference is the premier event for professionals dedicated to improving the interaction between Higher Education Institutions and Industry, and discovering new approaches for collaborative innovation. The conference provides a platform for collaboration and discussion amongst academics and professionals from industry. More than a dozen different organisations are contributing to the conference through participation in discussion panels, workshop organisation or hosting a track session.

Join over 300 participants and engage in rich dialogues with researchers, lecturers, technology transfer professionals, industry representatives, entrepreneurs and policy makers over two days full of discussions, workshops, presentations, networking and idea sharing. Learn about the latest research results through presentations from leading experts on University-Industry Interaction, discuss the current status of entrepreneurial universities and their environment and the way to move forward and have a drink with your newfound contact during the champagne reception.

The conference organisers have convinced the Barcelona Science Museum to open its doors for this unique event and allow it to take place on this unique event and
allow it to take place on this unique location. This old historical institute is a research centre focussed on international, economic, and intercultural corporation, with a large emphasis on knowledge transfer. As such the institute is the perfect location for this knowledge exchange event, allowing the participants to truly foster entrepreneurial universities and collaborative innovation.

Keynote speakers:

Professor Carl J. Schramm
American economist, entrepreneur, and former President and CEO of the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation of the Triple Helix Association

Professor Bob Cryan
Vice-Chancellor of the University of Huddersfield (UK Entrepreneurial University of the Year 2012)

Dr. Matthias Kaiserswerth
Director and Vice President, IBM Research – Zurich

Professor Keld Laursen
Professor for Innovation at Copenhagen Business School and Vice-president of the European Academy of Management (EURAM)

THE CITY OF GAUDI
Join us in Barcelona - learn, make new contacts, maintain existing ones, and just enjoy some days in this unique environment!

“ONE OF THE LARGEST EVENTS ON UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY INTERACTION, COMBINING BOTH SCIENCE AND PRACTICE!”

We wish all of you a pleasant journey and are looking forward to welcoming you in Barcelona!
SUPPORTING THE JOURNALS OF INDUSTRY & HIGHER EDUCATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION

The University Industry Innovation Network and IP Publishing Ltd. have agreed to support each other’s activities in the area of University-Industry Interaction, and Entrepreneurship and Innovation. In a personal meeting, Victoria Galan Muros (UIIN Director) and John Edmonds (Director at IP Publishing Ltd.) have expressed mutual interest in stimulating publications in the area of University-Industry Interaction. Recognising the need for both organisations and their activities, UIIN and IP Publishing will strive to support in each other in their activities.

MORE INFORMATION: www.uiin.org

UIIN GOOD PRACTICE CASE STUDIES

UIIN has published its first edition of the UIIN Good Practice Series. This study is a UIIN initiative, that is developed to support, develop and strengthen the interaction between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and business. The objective of the series is to highlight a wide variety of cases in different settings. As every environment is different (e.g. country, culture, stage of development) UIIN collects good practices on various subjects and levels, including organisational, departmental and project level. Presenting cases with diverse stages of development, types of interaction (e.g. collaboration in R&D, entrepreneurship), and types of activity (e.g. operational activities, structures and approaches) allows readers to get new impetus on how to foster university-industry interaction in their own organisation.

MORE INFORMATION: www.gps.uiin.org

THE STATE OF UNIVERSITY-BUSINESS COOPERATION COUNTRY REPORTS

UIIN in cooperation with its partners Science-to-Business Marketing Research Centre and apprimo, with the support of the European Commission (DGEAC), are proud to present 14 country-level reports on University-Business Cooperation.

The 6,280 European academics and HEI representatives who responded to our survey made it the largest study into cooperation between HEIs and business yet completed in Europe. After presenting the general European results, national reports have been created to provide an overview and specific insights of University-Business Cooperation in the following countries: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and United Kingdom.

MORE INFORMATION: www ub-cooperation.eu

UIIN CONNECT INCREASING YOUR NETWORKING EXPERIENCE

Starting today, all future UIIN events will feature “UIIN Connect”, a newly developed networking tool, designed to enhance your networking experience prior to, during and after UIIN events. The tool allows you to actively manage your conference schedule and to manage the sessions you will attend, and it helps you to easily find participants with similar interests and schedule meetings.

Use the UIIN networking tool and connect to all conference participants. Organize meetings, personalise your conference schedule and get in touch with other conference attendees through UIIN Connect. The tool will match you with attendees with similar interests, goals and profiles as yourself, allowing you to organize personal meetings and exchange information on research, projects or other cooperation possibilities. Register today for the 2014 University-Industry Interaction Conference or join us at the Entrepreneurial Universities Good Practice Event in Madrid and start creating cooperation!

MORE INFORMATION: http://www.uiin.org/index/uiin-connect
SEPTEMBER 29, 2014 - OCTOBER 1, 2014: MADRID, SPAIN

Following the recent publication of the UIIN Good Practice Case Study Series, and both its successful University-Industry Interaction Conference 2013 in the Netherlands (338 participants from 48 countries) and the upcoming 2014 conference in April 2014, UIIN and the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (UPM) are organizing the 2014 Entrepreneurial Universities Good Practice Event on ‘Driving Innovation and Entrepreneurship’. With the current financial crisis, youth unemployment and university budget cuts across Europe and beyond, the need for cooperation and interaction between university and industry has never been so large.

The UIIN Good Practice event will focus on good practice cases in both Europe as well as on a global level on Entrepreneurial Universities. Highlighting both well-known cases as well as the hidden treasures, and allowing both the presenters as well as the participants to network, share knowledge and ideas on Entrepreneurial Universities. The event also allows for a discussing on future joint proposals in the Horizon2020 and Erasmus+ programs.

The participants of the event are offered with a wide variety of benefits, in addition to the sharing of knowledge on best practices, the participants benefit from:

• Getting in contact with potential new partners for Erasmus+ or Horizon2020 projects
• Publication of case studies in the UIIN Case Study Series
• Presentation of the participant’s institution
• Getting to know a management framework for the implementation of the instruments learned about during the event

Keep an eye on www.uiin.org! More information about the event will be made available soon.
HANSE BUSINESS RELOADED

The HANSE, as an international association of cities in Europe, is represented by 181 cities in 16 countries with more than 20 million people. Being a rather tourist and culture-orientated association the HANSE now aimed at forming a strong basis for an international business network. To achieve this, the project “HANSE Business RELOADED” in cooperation with the Westphalia Hanseatic League, the regional development agency Herford, the Transferragentur (TAFH) of the Münster University of Applied Sciences (MUAS), MUAS and the Science-to-Business Marketing Research Centre Münster (S2BMRC) was initiated. The project was realised with 26 partner cities from 8 nations.

On June 12th 2013, the 2 year project came officially to an end. During this final meeting, which took place in Herford (Germany), representatives of MUAS presented generated results.

The results comprise a wide variety and thus can be applied on numerous occasions. Based on a comprehensive location analysis involving numerous different components (qualification levels, unemployment rates, infrastructure, present industry sectors, tax rates etc.) reports were developed outlining strengths, weaknesses and development potentials in the respective partner cities. Following this analysis, a pilot network, involving regional development agencies and companies located in the respective cities was developed. In total 48 international cooperation ideas were developed, either linking companies with each other or companies with higher education institutions.

The cooperation ideas are based on three innovative cooperation models – Creative Coupling, Hybrid Value Creation and Science-to-Business. In addition to these specific cooperation ideas, 5 tools were developed to support the management, organization and identification of potential cooperation partners.

CIAKL II

The Science-to-Business Marketing Research Centre has recently started its new project on Cinema and Industry Alliances, funded by the European Commission, DG Education and Culture as part of the ERASMUS programme. Together with the Lusofana University (Portugal) as lead partner and VU UC (Denmark), Avid Technology International (The Netherlands), AMPA (Spain), Tallinn University (Estonia), ZON Multimedia (Portugal) and Ukbar Filmes (Portugal) as project partners, the Science-to-Business Marketing Research Centre will be working on the development of a knowledge alliance in the cinema industry.

The project is based on a methodology that crosses three stages: identification; design and dissemination. All three stages involve cooperative work between all partners involved in the consortium. In the first stage exact training and project development needs will be identified; in the second stage content, curricula and collaborative solutions will be designed and on the third stage both materials, knowledge sharing and training activities will come together in different ways: in the context of the social network platform to be developed, in a 3 days’ workshop for teachers and trainers, and in a 2 days’ conference with lecturers from academic area and from industry, that will be recorded and shared on the social network platform.

With the CIAKL II, we pretend to leverage the Cinema and Industry Alliance for Learning and Knowledge to be a reference for the sector with as an active knowledge platform.

MORE INFORMATION: ciakl2.ulusofona.pt

D-POLiTA TE

d-PoLiTaTE is an Alfa III project funded by the EU, leaded by the University of Münster (WWU) in cooperation with the S2BMRC at MUAS, one partner from Spain and five from Latin America, which are together working in order to develop a Programme for Leaders in Technology Transfer for Latin America in partnerships with European institutions. The kick-off meeting took place in June 2012 in Münster and from then on, partners have been developing materials and contents for the pilot test that took place in Buenos Aires (Argentina) from the 9th to the 16th November 2013. The course is divided into six modules, which were developed by the different partners: Leadership and Environment, Technology Transfer Structure, Innovation and Knowledge Networks, Commercialisation, Intellectual Property and Soft Skills. Each of the modules uses three different methodological: in-person, online and through a manual. After the appropriate modifications, the course will be carried out again in March 2014 with a series of new partners also from Latin American countries. The re-
The results of d-PoLiTaTE pilot tests will be presented in October 2014 in a meeting in Pachuca (Mexico).

CONFERENCE COSTA RICA 2014

The results of the UniTransfer Executive Training Course will be presented in one of the track sessions of the Innovation Conference in Costa Rica from the 9th to the 11th of September 2014. This track of UniTransfer will be a close event for the participants and experts of the programme, and the last event in person of the three-year project that will officially end in December 2014.

UniTransfer Executive Training Course is a DIES programme funded by the DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) and the HRK (German Rectors’ Conference). The goal of UniTransfer is to create a course for leaders in knowledge and technology transfer (KTT) by training managers and decision makers in different areas related to cooperation and partnering with external stakeholders from HEIs in Mexico and Central America to improve their necessary skills to develop effective transfer, cooperation and partnering-strategies.

The participants of the Project, who are 20 experts from Mexico (9), Costa Rica (10) and Nicaragua (1), will present in this conference the results of their Personal Application Project (P.A.P.) that they are currently developing. Their P.A.P. is aimed to have an impact not only on their own performance as KTT leaders, but also within their universities and further on, on the region, society and economy.

MORE INFORMATION:
www.s2b-conference.com
A new cross-discipline event to promote best practice in university-industry-investor collaboration, technology transfer and start-ups.

Expert speakers • Case studies • Panel sessions • Interactive discussion • Networking space

Speakers include

- Anthony Boccanfuso
  Executive Director UIDP, National Academies, USA
- Els Beirnaert
  Senior Manager, New Ventures, VIB, Belgium
- Nicolas Carboni
  President, Conectus Alsace inc, France
- Kevin Cox
  CEO, Imanova Limited, UK
- Kevin Cullen
  Chief Executive Officer, New South Innovations Pty Limited, University of New South Wales, Australia
- Jacques Darcy
  European Investment Bank
- Peter Dobaon
  Principal Fellow, Warwick Manufacturing Group, University of Warwick, UK
- Sean Flanigan
  President, AUTM, USA
- Alice Frost
  Head of Knowledge and Skills, Higher Education Funding Council for England, UK
- Melanie Goward
  Finance Wales Investments Ltd (UK)
- Andreas Jenne
  CEO, BLACKFIELD AG, Germany
- Claude Kaplan
  Managing Director, IP Pragmatics, UK
- Cedric Latessa
  Aster Group, France
- Stephan Lensky
  Corporate Vice President, Boehringer Ingelheim GmbH, Germany
- Dr Erik Lium
  Assistant Vice Chancellor, University of California San Francisco, USA
- Greg Simon
  CEO, Poliwogg Inc, USA
- Malcolm Skingle
  Director, Academic Liaison, GlaxoSmithKline
- Tony Stanco
  Executive Director National Council of Entrepreneurial Tech Transfer, USA
- Scott J Steele
  Director of Research Alliances, University of Rochester, USA
- David Sweeney
  Director (Research, Innovation and Skills), Higher Education Funding Council for England, UK

Book now!

Register by 7 April 2014 to save on delegate fees

Network with international attendees including:
University Deans • Technology Transfer Officers • Heads of R&D Innovation and Commercialisation Officers • Senior Scientists • Investors Policy Advisors • Public and Private Funding Agencies.

www.idea2ipo-conference.com