Abstract
Today, there is a common understanding that universities and the stakeholders in the society need to collaborate in order to handle big societal challenges. Sometimes this is mention as a need of developing mode 2-knowledge. Other times it is describe as a need of developing triple helix processes. A general problem for these kinds of collaborations is different needs of knowledge and different conditions for knowledge production. University knowledge are mainly general and focal, are disseminated mainly through text. Knowledge among stakeholders outside the university, like citizens or professionals, is situated and tacit, and is mainly disseminate through practice.

The aim with the paper is two-fold. First, we would like to describe a model for knowledge development between urban researchers and professional public planners. The model was developed by a group of urban planners together with the authors of the paper, who were engaged as on-going evaluators of an urban regeneration project. The aim with the model was to summarize their personal experience of working with collaborative urban planning. The model could therefore be seen as a way for those urban planners to conceptualize their personal experience of an urban developmental project, with the help of urban researchers. During the work with the model, we need to handle the tension between theoretical knowledge versus tacit personal knowledge. How could we as researcher support the transformation of tacit knowledge into a more general model based on focal knowledge?

Based on this experience, we take a step back in the second part of the paper, and try to understand the process which leads to the development of the model. Here we will use this process as a way to illustrate what we see as the main challenge in university – society interaction: different needs of knowledge, and different ways to develop knowledge. We will argue that collaboration between university and the society, irrespective of which stakeholders is included in the collaboration, must handle the tensions between different conditions for knowledge production within the academia and outside it. Our way of working is one way to this.
Introduction

Today, some scholars argue that there is a need for new kinds of knowledge, which must emerge from processes of collaborative learning. This often refers to as the production of mode 2-knowledge (Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotny, et al. 2001). The development of mode 2-knowledge is context-driven, problem-focused and involves multidisciplinary teams brought together for short periods of time to work on specific problems in the real world. This is distinguished from traditional research, which is labeled as mode 1-knowledge. This forms of knowledge is the result from an academic, investigator-initiated and discipline-based knowledge production. In short, mode 1-knowledge production is investigator-initiated and discipline-based while mode 2 is problem-focused and interdisciplinary. Gibbons, Nowotny and theirs colleges originally formulated this for describe a shift within the knowledge production within the university.

There seem to be an increasing call for mode 2-knowledge from stakeholders outside the university. There is a demand on the university for develop knowledge that could be applicable to handle those big challenges that face the society for example when it comes to sustainable development. The university is a producer of focal knowledge – of text and speech. University knowledge is distributed through text and talk. But when you learn to master a practice, for example becoming a professional urban planner, you are dependent not only on focal knowledge, but tacit, situated and embodied knowledge. The main difference between university and the rest of the society is not between theory and practice, but between different modes of knowledge production.

In this paper, we understood this as two different ways of naming and framing certain aspects of the world in order to act. In short, naming and framing is a way of understood and describe the process of problem setting:

*Problem setting is a judgement about the problem situation – that is, a diagnosis that also contains the prescription of directions for action. We cannot make a judgement of this kind unless we apply a frame to a field of experience. This frame enables us to (1) highlight certain features of the situation, including certain worries that we select as symptomatic, (2) ignore, or select out, certain other features of the situation, including certain worries, as noisy and irrelevant, and (3) bind together the salient features of the situation, including the relevant worries into a pattern which is coherent and graspsable.*

(Rein & Schön, 1977: p. 237)

At the university, we name and frame phenomenon with the intention to solve empirical or theoretical research problem. As researchers, we relate to established theories or results from empirical research. When we do this, we must follow rigorous
methods, in order to achieve results that could be accepted by other researchers as valid and reliable scientific knowledge. Research is always collaborative knowledge production, and we name and frame problems in relation to general bodies of knowledge. But as a practitioner, you must be accepted as a member in a local community of practice (Wenger, 19988). This means that you name and frame problems in relation to local situations. Of course, focal knowledge is important here as well, but it is always tied to local contexts. When the research strives for a general understating of something, many other practitioners strive for solving problems here and now. These differences in time and scale when it comes to knowledge production are one of the main obstacles in collaboration between university and society.

Nevertheless, in this paper we will claim that these kinds of collaboration could benefit from the rigorous methods for knowledge production, used within the university. We will strike a blow for that collaborative learning between practitioners and researcher could improve from using the same procedures as traditional research, in this case improve the management of urban developmental project. We based our arguments on empirical material gathered from our work as on-going evaluators of large EU-project in Sweden, which aimed to support sustainable urban development.

The paper consists of three parts. We start with a presentation of our empirical case, which ends with a short overview of how we collected our empirical material. Then we will presents some theoretical perspective on professional learning in relation to urban development, which we see as process of naming and framing complex problems, and how this could be related to collaborative learning. Then we will finish with a presentation of a method for apply a research mode of knowledge production as a way of improve a process of collaborative learning. We will end the paper with a short summary.

The empirical case – the need for improving the management of urban regeneration projects

The last twenty years, the City of Malmö has gone through a remarkable transformation. During the 1990ties, Malmö was characterized as a post-industrial city on a steady downturn, with an increasing unemployment. The biggest employer, The Kockum shipyard, closes down in the end of the 1980tieas, and the city failed to replace it with other industries. In the end of the 1990ties, the leading politician decided to begin a groundbreaking transformation of the city. Today, Malmö has changed its identity in many ways. For example, the city hosts a new university, which has become the sixth biggest university in Sweden. The university is situated at the same area as the old shipyard, and it is surrounded by new companies, and more people work in the area today compare to the when the shipyard was the city’s biggest employer. Another sign of this
transformation is Malmö’s global reputation as a city which has worked with different kinds of sustainable urban transformation. The other side of the coin is the fact that Malmö also become known as segregated city were you could find some of the poorest neighborhoods in Sweden.

The majority of the urban developmental work in Malmö, especially those with a focus on sustainable urban development, has been founded through large scale EU-projects. Our empirical case is one of these projects: Fokus Rosengård. In January 2010 the city of Malmö received 28 million Swedish Kroner (around 4 million US dollar) from the European Union for this large-scale urban regeneration project. The condition for the founding was that the City co-founded with the same amount of money. The EU-founding was mediated by the Swedish Authority of Economic Growth (Tillväxtverket), and the overall goal for this EU-program is the support of economic growth. One condition was the use of on-going, formative evaluation. The aim was to function both as evaluator but also as a support to the project team. This kind of evaluation was a demand from the Swedish Authority of Economic Growth. The authors of this paper have been the on-going evaluators.

Rosengård is an area situated in the southeast part of Malmö. It consists of several large areas large-scale housing complex between four to ten floors. The whole area was constructed between the 1960s to the end of 1970s, and was a part of a national housing developmental program named “The Miljonprogram”. The program was intended to meet the need for affordable housing in Sweden, and the overall goal was to build 500 000 single family homes and 500 000 apartments. Originally, Rosengård was built for wealthy blue-color workers and their families, but when the area was finished, the City of Malmo was hit by the global transformations that led to a large-scale reconstruction of the base for the labor market in Sweden. Several of the main industries in Malmö, like the large shipyard that employed over 4000, closed down. This was the beginning of the decline in Malmo’s population, because of rising unemployment, and the fact that those who could afford a single home, moved to the smaller and wealthier municipalities that surround Malmö. The huge finished housing complexes in Rosengård were left empty, and soon they become home for newly arrived refugees and the poorer inhabitants of the city.

During the years, Rosengård has become a national symbol for segregation, unemployment, poverty and an illustration of the failures with the Swedish welfare model. Some portions of Rosengård are considered to be the worst and poorest in Sweden, with a high rate of child poverty and unemployment. Of course, the inhabitants of the area are well aware of its reputation, and many of them try to move. Many of the youths living in Rosengård feel that they do not belong to the rest of the society. From time to time, the frustration has exploded in conflict between groups of youth, often gangs of young boys.
and representatives of the city, in most cases the police. At the same time, both young and old are proud of the area, and talk about it as multicultural and creative melting pot. One of the main intentions behind Fokus Rosengård was to use physical urban regeneration as a starting point for social changes in the neighborhood. Local participation and community based learning was seen as essential by the municipality for supporting this kind of transformations.

The project was built up around three work packages: 1) developing structures for collaboration in local urban regeneration, 2) developing the infrastructure along a pathway; Rosengårdstråket and 3) An interactive process, supporting the development of a local plan for a part of Rosengård. Our empirical case is based on the work with the first work package. It was built up around following aims: a) developing a platform for collaboration in local urban development, b) create sustainable partnerships, c) developing plans for local investments and development tighter with those who lived in the area and d) developing a new model for collaborative action which could be used in other kinds of local urban development. In the project application, several arguments were formulated for the need of developing new models for collaborative action. One reason was the need of finding new forms for participatory planning, and involving citizens in local urban developmental project. But there was also an overall need of developing a better intra-organizational collaboration between different parts of the city administration, around urban developmental projects.

The application was made by the Environmental department, which also lead the project. At the first sight, this seems strange – Environmental departments are not usually those who initiate and lead urban developmental projects. The City of Malmö has developed a progressive approach to work with sustainable urban development, where administrators at the environmental department have become very successful in organizing and running developmental projects which take a broad grip on sustainable urban development. During the years, this group of administrators at the Environmental department has evolved considerable skills of getting EU or other kinds of founding to different urban developmental projects which take a broad grip on sustainable urban development. During the years, this group of administrators at the Environmental department has evolved considerable skills of getting EU or other kinds of founding to different urban developmental projects with a sustainable approach. In this specific case, there were an intention to use physical developmental projects as a tool for implementing sustainable approaches and solutions in the city. Another reason was the ambition to use those physical changes as a way of initiate social processes in Rosengård.

However, the Environmental department could not handle this project by themselves. Therefore, a project team was set up with representatives from the Environmental department, the City Planning office, Streets and parks department, the Department of internal service, and the City district of Rosengård. The City of Malmö is divide into ten local city districts, which administrate local health care, social issues and (until 2012),
the schools located in the district. The development of infrastructure, urban regeneration and other more “hard” urban issues use to be handled by the central city departments, without collaboration with the city districts. In this project, however, collaboration between the central departments (in this case, the Environmental department, the City Planning office, Streets and parks department) and the city district of Rosengård, around urban planning and regeneration issues, was seen as an essential part of the project.

This means that the project with the purpose of regeneration of a socio-economic vulnerable area in Malmö with the overall aim to support sustainable urban development consists a meta-project: the development of a general model for these kinds of urban regeneration projects. The project team needs to do two things at the same time: managing the project, and developing a model for how these kinds of project could be managing. From the start, the ambition was to develop a model possible to apply on three forms of collaboration: between stakeholders, between citizens and intra-organizational collaboration between different departments within the city of Malmö. The model should first and foremost be valid for urban transformations that include physical changes in an existing area, like urban regeneration in an existing neighborhood, and were the transformation needs collaboration between other stakeholders in order to be fulfilled. The project team formulated two main arguments for developing the model. The first reason was the need for the municipality to increase its capability to collaborate with other stakeholders. This is nothing radical, but something that could be traced back to the broader trend to talk about a shift from government to governance in public administration (Kooiman, 2003). Today, we could see an increasing formation of different kinds of formal and informal network, cross-sector collaborations and new institutional partnerships between public administration and external stakeholder which creates new demands for those who work within public administration to vitalize their professional role (Sörensen & Torfing, 2008).

New forms of innovative cross-sector collaboration were one important part in Malmös successful transformation during the first ten years of the new century. Within public administration of the City of Malmö, there was an agreement that collaboration was essential. Nevertheless, there was also a widespread opinion among public administrators that city officials need to become even better performing intra-organisational collaborating. An argument from the project team for this was that external collaboration was dependent on good intra-organisational collaboration. Established forms of collaboration could easily be eroded, if different parts of the city administration did not perform coherent in relation to the citizen. In this specific case, the success of the project Fokus Rosengård, was to large extent dependent on those city departments involved (the Environmental department, the City Planning office, Streets
and Parks department and the administration of the City District of Rosengård) could collaborate and act coherent in relation to those who lived and worked in the neighborhoods of Rosengård. The development of the model also functions as tool for the project team for managing the collaboration between those departments.

The biggest challenge with the development of the model could be illustrated if we remember the difference between mode 1 and mode 2 knowledge, and use this metaphor. Mode 1 claims to be general knowledge, at least in relation to a specific discipline. Mode 2 must always be understood as more or less situated, because it relates to a specific problem. Learning to managing a specific project could be seen as mode 2 knowledge. But the idea of developing a model which could be usable in other urban development projects could be seen as an attempt to produce knowledge which aspires to be more general. Of course, the model was not the result of a research project, and the project team has no ambition of that. But there was an ambition to produce something that was more than just a description of best practice. As ongoing evaluators, one of our aims was to evaluate this process in a way that at the same time supports it. We will describe this more in detail later on in this part of the paper.

The work with the model evolved gradually during the three years (2010 – 2013) the project was running. The project team regular presented the outlines of the model for an intra-organisational reference group that consist of representatives from the city department mentioned above. Three of the main goals in this part of the project were related to this work: develop a platform for collaboration in local urban development, create sustainable partnerships and develop a new model for collaborative action which could be used in other kinds of local urban development. By regularly refer to this goals, the project team could piece by piece move the collaboration between the city departments forward. The project team could also use the development of the model as a reason to initiate reflections among the members in the project and the reference group about the ongoing urban developmental work. The discussions about the model was also used as starting point for discussion of how the public administration could collaborate better with citizens and other external stakeholder.

This work could be seen as illustration of how collaborative learning could be seen as a process of naming and framing. Events and actions that happen during the work with the projects could be interpreted and discussed in relation to the need of developing a model. Because the model should be useable in other urban developmental project, the project team needs to generalize their experiences from this specific project. This could be seen as process of applying a frame to a field of experience. When the project team met the reference group and presented their ongoing work with the model, they highlight-
ed certain features of Fokus Rosengård as symptomatic and important for urban development in collaboration with external stakeholders. But they cannot do this without ignore, or select out, certain other features of the situation, as noisy and irrelevant. Of course, the represents from the other departments has their opinions of what was relevant and not, which mean that the development of the model become a process that creates opportunities for collaborative learning.

Ongoing evaluation is a formative method for evaluations. Different from summative approaches formative evaluation gives feed back to the project manager during the project, which opens up for the project team to adjust the project. This could also be understood as the fifth generation of evaluation. This relates to Guba and Lincolns (1989) notion of four generations of evaluations, which also could be traced back to four different traditions of evaluations: measure, describe, value and evaluation through dialogue. This development could also be related to a change from a instrumental view on knowledge to the growing insight that knowledge, especially those kinds of organizational and professional knowledge that are the focus for evaluations, are situated and tied to local context. A consequence is that the evaluator has to change how they work. One way to do this is to work more like an action researcher. Johansson and Lindhult (2008) identified two main traditions in action research: one critical and one more pragmatic. In short, the critical tradition has it root in critical research, and strive

for uncover hidden structure in order to support changes on structural level. The more pragmatic tradition could be traced back to theories on organizational development and learning. Action researchers who work with this tradition strive for improving existing practices. Our approach as ongoing evaluators was pragmatic, and we took two roles. We should of course evaluate the project, both the process and the result, but we should also function as critical friends for the project team, and support learning. As ongoing evaluator, we followed the project on regular bases, took part in meetings, read through documents and did interviews with key persons during the project. Based on our analysis, we gave regularly feed back to the project team. In the third part of the paper, we will describe this more in detail, because this feedback was a central part in the collaborative learning process.

Collaborative learning as a process of naming and framing

One of the big challenges today is to support sustainable urban development. In short, this mean a development of our cities that are ecological, economic and social sustainable. In order to achieve this, we need to develop capabilities for handle complex problems like segregation, unemployment, poverty, the need of reducing fossil fuels and developing new forms of transportation of people and goods in and out of the city and so on. Rittel and Webber (1973) once named these kinds of problems as wicked problems. Wicked problems have in com-
we learn that the solution had consequences we could not foresee, and we need to rethink our understanding. Working with wicked problems could therefore be seen as a never ending process of collaborative learning which characterizes of double-loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1992).

Chris Argyris and Donald Schön make a difference between single-loop learning, which could be described as process were you identified rules and routines for handling problems, and then learned to use them in similar situations. You name and frame something, and act based on this, and you keep your way of naming and framing, and continuing to act in a similar fashion. But this is only possible if the situation do not changes. Double-loop learning could also be described as a form of reflective learning (Schön, 1983), which in short could be understood as an awareness of that the way I understood and handle a problem, in one situation, may not be useful in other situations. Instead of learning rules, one has to learn how to understand and handle complex situations. A certain way of naming and framing, may not be useful in other situations.

Ellström (2001) makes a difference between adaptive learning and developmental learning. Adaptive learning means, in short, that the goal is to adapt to something where the content is already given. Adaptive learning could be described as a learning process when you know what you should achieve, and how you should act to reach the goal. Taking your driving-license is
Learning could therefore be understood as a process when you change your experience of something (Marton & Booth, 1997). But how you experience something also names and frames the content of your learning. Learning is something of a Catch 22, because we tend to direct our learning at what we think we is important to learn, which is based on our previous understanding of something. Dall’Alba and Sandberg describe the paradox as followed:

Depending upon the way in which work is experienced, particular knowledge, skills, attitudes will be developed. That is, different ways of experiencing the work produce different meanings for specific knowledge, skills and attitudes. (Dall’Alba & Sandberg, 1996:421)

Here, we could add another dimension to the dichotomy between adaptive and developmental learning. According to Ellström, developmental learning always begins with reflections. But these reflections seem to be limited by how people experience something – how they name and frame. Learning also presupposes that we become aware of the content of our own experiences; but that we also are aware of that we may not see the whole picture. When we do not understand how other people name and frame, we should resist the temptation of rejecting their views as “misunderstandings”. Instead, we should see this as something that could help us to enlarge our own naming and framing. This is especially important when we

an example. Developmental learning means that you aim for understanding something in a new way. Doing research is an example. Developmental learning takes time, and an organization with no space for reflection and criticism is not a fertile ground for this kind of learning. On the other hand, an organization where everyone put everything in question will not achieve anything. If you want your driving-license, you must make the test and learn how to drive. It would be tricky on our streets if everyone develop their own rules.

Professional’s ability to solve problems also seems to be dependent on how they experience and understand different working tasks. Becoming a professional is much more than obtaining rules – it is also a process of embodied understanding (Dall’Alba & Sandberg, 1996). Within a community of practice, one could identify qualitative different ways of understanding the same kinds of working tasks. Some individual seem to handle and solve problems in a more efficient ways than others. Some are more skilled than others. Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) described this as the difference between beginners and proficient workers, where the last kinds experienced their working task in a qualitative different ways comparing to a beginner. Proficient works handle problems in more intuitive way, based on previous experiences of similar situation and tactic knowledge. Beginners become more and more proficient, step by step, when they gained experiences from their work.
try to develop collaborative learning among different groups who are used to collaborate, like professional planners and citizens, or different groups of professionals. The model we will describe in the next part of the paper is one attempt to develop a method for supporting collaborative learning which may result in new ways of handling wicked problems, related to sustainable urban development.

Project management, especially when it comes to management of projects with the intention to solve complex problems that always changes when we try to handle them requires certain skills and competencies. As a project manager, you must be aware of that those kinds of projects are to some extend unique. It is therefore difficult to use lessons learned from one project when one try to manage next project. It is always necessary to improvise during the project. Project plans for projects aim to handle those kinds of complex urban developmental problems must be seen as a hypothesis about the project and its outcomes. The project team must be able to learn during the process in order to succeed. It must be learning processes that strive for double-loop learning, based on ongoing reflections on the project. As ongoing evaluators, we must support these kinds of reflective learning processes. In order to do this, the evaluation must be done in collaboration with those who are evaluated, and it must be a collaborative learning process. Here lies a risk. If we as evaluators become too involved in the project, we may lose tracks, and fail to be able to critical

evaluate the project and the results. On the other hand, if we keep the distant, and strive for a critical approach, we may fail to understand the context and what kinds of tacit knowledge that may be essential for succeed. We may also fail to foster a collaborative learning process. If we are too much researchers, we fail. If we become members of the same community of practice as the rest of the project team, we also fail. We need an approach that helps keep the balance.

A model for a process of collaborative naming and framing

The headline for this paper stated that we should present a model for collaborative learning between researchers and planners. In this last part of the paper, we describe how we worked as on-going evaluators of the project.

But before we do that, we need to remind you of the challenges we face when we try to handle wicked problems. In the first part of the paper, we understood urban developmental project, especially those who focus on handling wicked problems, as unique events and often impossible to repeat. One reason it that wicked problems always transforms when we start to work with them. A consequence is that it is difficult to transfer experiences and lessons learnt from one project to another. One must get a grip on what was unique and what could be used again. As we mentions above, developmental projects are complex, and are always necessary to improvise during the project.
Therefore project plans must be seen as hypothesis about the project and its outcomes. But for those project that we has worked with, the project plan would not be able to follow. The project team must be able to learn during the process in order to succeed.

Above, we understood problem formulation as process of naming and framing. In line with that, we saw learning as process hen we changed how we name and frame, and therefore as a process were we changed our problem formulations. A project plan could be seen as a way of naming a framing what must be done in order to handle some problems, in this case problem related to sustainable urban development. These kinds of problems are complex and multi-dimensional, and they could be labeled as wicked problems. These problems could be understood – named and framed – in many ways, which in turn affects which kinds of solutions we think is the proper way to choose. The project plan could therefore be seen as a picture of the stat of the art – how we named and framed the problems and challenges with something before we tried to handle it.

We have also stated that wicked problems always changes when we try to understand them. This means that our understandings of those problems always are unreliable. But how could we then be able to solve them? Will this mean that wicked problems related to urban sustainable development, like segregation, unemployment, poverty, the need of reducing fossil fuels and developing new forms of transportation of people and goods in and out of the city, in the end are impossible to solve? We think that those kinds of problems could be solved through processes of collaborative learning, which are situated in practice, and we also think that developmental projects are a useful area where those solutions could evolve. But we think that the best way to do this is to apply the mode of knowledge production that dominates within the university: rigorous testing of hypothesis. Let us introduce “The Matrix”.

“The Matrix” is a very simple and straight forward way to systematize the naming and framing of project, as it is formulated in the project plan. Here, we will remind our readers that we based this on our experiences of working with large scale EU-projects. In this context, the formulations in the decision from the foundation – in this case the Swedish Authority of Economic Growth which mediated the resources from EU – sets the name and frames around the project. The decision could differ from the application, and the project team has to follow the decision, and regular reports its progress. But this could end up that the project team just managing the project. But as we know, projects always changes. Opportunities for learning always dwell in situation when things are not going as planned. But with a strong focus on follow the project plans, the project team may work hard reducing those risks – and at the same time reduce learning opportunities. What we do as ongoing evaluators is just carefully read through the decision
and notes everything that has been promised. Applications for EU-founding are often written in a very persuasive way, and sometimes promises are hidden behind all rhetoric's. One way for the project team to handle this is to see this as just rhetoric, and the try to do something else with the money. On the other hand, if we take the decision serious, and also presume that there is lot of good thinking behind it, we need to be aware of what we actually have planned to do. By sorting up the text and writing down all promise in a matrix, we got a useful working document to refer to when we discuss the project. You could of course just use the project plan. This is maybe just a question of style, but we found it more useful to sort it out in a matrix.

The matrix is a tool for organizing the ongoing process of naming and framing when the project proceeds. First and foremost, it is tool for the project team to understand how their naming and framing change during the project. When the project is up and running, project leading very much becoming a process of muddling through. The daily management of complex project left little time for reflection. With the matrix, we create a frame for collaborative learning, because we have a document that we regularly return to during the project. It is used as way to relate the ongoing experiences of running the project to the hypothesis about the project. The Matrix could then be seen as rigorous method for testing the hypothesis about the project, and figure out what worked and what not. It is a rather simple, but effective method. By regularly return to the “hypothetical” naming of framing of the project (the project plan), the project team got a starting point when they try to get a grip on what they learned about the project when they try to accomplish the project plan.

This is also a way to challenge the paradox described by Dall’Alba and Sandberg: that we tend to direct our learning on what we already understand as relevant to learn. This means that we tend to experience what we expect to experience. When muddling through, there is a risk that the project team lose track of the originally idea, and then maybe just do as they always do, because they experience their work as usually. Here, the Matrix is a useful tool to problematize and call the projects teams’ experiences in question. By regularly be reminded of the originally goal with the project, the project team could be aware of what they take for guaranteed. This could then be a starting point for learning, if we see learning as a process of developing new ways of naming and framing a phenomenon or a problem.

Summary

In the introduction of the paper, refer to the difference between two kinds of knowledge production, mode 1 versus mode 2. Mode1 knowledge is the result from an traditional academic, investigator-initiated and discipline-based knowledge production. It is focal knowledge, which distributes through speech and text. Mode-2-knowledge emerges from a con-
The aim with this paper was to present a model for collaborative learning between university and society. Based on our experiences as ongoing evaluators, which is a method for evaluation in collaboration we developed a model for collaborative learning, “The Matrix”. The model is also a way of structure our work as ongoing evaluators. The essence in this model is that collaborative learning in compels project must be organized as traditional research, as a structured and rigorous testing of hypotheses. Here, we see the project plan as a hypothesis of the project. By rigorously sorting out and carefully describe the goals and aims with the project by presenting it in the matrix; we had a firm ground for discussing the progress of the project. When the project proceed, and the project team discovered that some of the goal could not be reached as planned, we could return to the matrix and discuss way, and what we could learn from this.

Another reason for collaborative learning is that many of those complex problems that must be handling in relation to sustainable development are complex, and difficult to grasp. They could be understood in many ways, which the consequence that there is difficult to set the best solution. Different ways of naming and framing excludes different salient features of the problem as relevant or irrelevant. In praxis, is it not unusual that naming and framing is just a result of routines, which mean that established practice could hinder us from solving problem in a innovative way. Another obstacle is our individual understanding of the problem – how we name and frame what should be done. Learning could be seen as process which results in new ways of naming and framing, which open up for seeing new solutions; because of we experience problems in a new way.

We could compare the original way of naming and framing the project and it goals, with the naming and framing that emerges from the experience of the ongoing project. By carefully and rigorously put the project plan against the practical experiences from the work with the project, the project team, and of course the researcher could learn what works and what is not. In this case, we must remind ourselves that everything we learn in one project, may not work in the next. But it could be the base for anew project plan, which could be seen as new set of hypotheses of how to solve complex problems, related to sustainable
urban development, Those hypothesis could then be tested in the next project, and so on.

The rise of the demands of new kinds of multidisciplinary and problem-focused knowledge, may be seen as critic of the traditionally way of producing knowledge within the academia. We agree that there is a demand for new ways of collaborative learning and new forms of knowledge production. But in this paper we claim, based on our own experiences, that new forms of knowledge production may benefit from the use of the old traditionally way of producing knowledge, or at least be inspired of it. There is a need of reminding ourselves that the university from the beginning was developed as institutions with the only aim of producing knowledge. When the university collaborate with the surrounding society, we may benefit from being a little bit conservative, and keep with our traditionally view on knowledge. Maybe the most innovative forms of collaborative learning stems from the traditional approach to doing research: together formulated and rigorously test hypotheses about how something may work or could be understood?
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