Public engagement, pedagogy and impact: joining the dots and realising common purpose

Paul Manners, Director NCCPE
Orientation

- Research
- Teaching
- Knowledge exchange
- Social Responsibility
We help universities engage with the public

How can we help you with public engagement?

Do engagement

Go here if you want to find:

- Engagement methods
- Funding sources
- Evaluation guidance

Find out more →

Support engagement

Go here if you want to find:

- Support for engagement professionals
- The EDGE tool: Assess your institution
- Manifesto for Public Engagement

Find out more →

“NCCPE are the people who really understand engagement. They offer structured, productive tools that really make a difference.”

David Sweeney
- Research England
Parallel tracks
Parallel tracks

**Research and knowledge exchange**

- Stakeholders / publics
- Research engagement
- Collaboration
- Evaluation
- Impact

**Teaching**

- Students
- Pedagogy
- Student engagement
- Assessment
- Learning outcomes
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Stakeholders / publics
Stakeholders / publics

CIVIL SOCIETY & THIRD SECTOR
Charities & associations; societies and clubs

POLICY
Policy makers, regulators, civil servants

BUSINESS
Companies, SMEs, entrepreneurs

PUBLIC SECTOR
Professionals and practitioners

PUBLICS
consumer
audience
citizen
customer
voter
employee
family member
supporter / member
life-long learner
pupil / student
service user
client
patient
volunteer
community of interest
community of place

A major change is needed in culture and understanding. The ‘public’ (ie, not-for-profit) market between local government and the research community is not working. Local government needs to be an effective and assertive client in claiming a share of the national research asset to support community well being and better public services.
POLICY
Policy makers, regulators, civil servants

PUBLIC SECTOR
Professionals and practitioners

CIVIL SOCIETY & THIRD SECTOR
Charities & associations; societies and clubs

BUSINESS
Companies, SMEs, entrepreneurs

Stakeholders / publics
family member
volunteer
citizen
voter
customer
consumer
audience
employee
supporter / member
lifelong learner
pupil / student
service user
client
patient
The UK Community Partner Network (UKCPN) is a network of people involved with community-based organisations interested in working with universities to tackle social concerns and inequalities.

1. Bureaucracy – universities are large institutions and can be unwieldy to work with
2. Expect barriers to securing funding - little or no funding for the community partner, problems with payments because there is no budget code and so on
3. Expertise can be valued differently - textbook knowledge vs. grassroots experience
4. University culture can promote complacency (some academics can think they are the sole source and validation of knowledge, and even well-intentioned academics who want to engage sometimes display this attitude)
5. University culture requires a different language from academics which may not be readily understood by lay people and can appear unnecessarily mystifying and excluding
6. It can be difficult to liaise with universities and make your way into the ‘ivory towers’ (for example, academics often do not have answer phones or ‘out of office’ emails and can be hard to reach)
7. Academics can appear threatened by non-academics knowing more than they do.

www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/ukcpn_resource_potential_problems.pdf
Stakeholders / publics

**POLICY**
Policy makers, regulators, civil servants

**CIVIL SOCIETY & THIRD SECTOR**
Charities & associations; societies and clubs

**BUSINESS**
Companies, SMEs, entrepreneurs

**PUBLIC SECTOR**
Professionals and practitioners

**PUBLICS**
consumer, audience, customer, employee, volunteer, citizen, voter, lifelong learner, supporter/member, pupil/student, service user, client, patient, family member, community of place, community of interest, community of interest, supporter/member.
Public support for the innovation system is too complex. The UK’s research and innovation support system has become excessively complex. Government and its funding agencies should seek to reduce complexity wherever possible, for example by consolidating schemes with similar aims. Where simplification is not possible, every effort should be made to ‘hide the wiring’ from businesses and academics seeking support.
### Top ten most highly cited barriers to collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top ten barriers for business</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top ten barriers for universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IP and other contract negotiations are difficult to complete, processes difficult to navigate, or take too long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>University metrics, including the REF, prioritise the production of high-quality publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business find it difficult to identify academic partners or where academic capability lies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IP and other contract negotiations are difficult to complete, processes difficult to navigate, or take too long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business and academia operate to different timescales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other pressures on academic time (teaching and research) limit resources for collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of alignment of objectives: tension between business and university needs or objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collaborative experience not valued as part of academic career progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of trust or mutual understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of time/resource for networking or project development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Businesses focus on the short term, rather than long term R&amp;D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Business and academia operate to different timescales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other funding issues (for example, SME eligibility, subjects within scope)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tension between academic desire to publish work, and business concerns about competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Low overall levels of business investment in R&amp;D, including a lack of absorptive capacity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of trust or mutual understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of understanding within business of potential benefits of working with universities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Low overall levels of business investment in R&amp;D, including a lack of absorptive capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Students
Research engagement and collaboration

Older People as Co-Researchers: Developing Age-Friendly Communities in Manchester

By 2030, two-thirds of the world’s population will reside in cities, with at least one-quarter of their populations aged 60 and over. This project involved a partnership with the University of Manchester, Manchester City Council and local community organisations, to develop neighbourhoods responsive to the needs of people as they grow older.

This project was unusual in involving older people as co-investigators leading a study designed to improve the quality of life in low-income communities. Older people were recruited and trained as co-researchers, taking a leading role in the design, implementation, analysis and dissemination of the research. The 17 co-researchers conducted 68 qualitative interviews with socially isolated older people living in low-income neighbourhoods in Manchester, who were experiencing isolation, poverty and/or health problems. The project led to tangible policy outcomes for the City Council to advance ‘age-friendly’ communities.
Engage

Build long-term, two-way, trusting relationships with those who will use your research and generate new knowledge together

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Kf7aBqIYj0
Knowledge exchange: a review and research agenda for environmental management
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SUMMARY

There is increasing emphasis on the need for effective ways of sharing knowledge to enhance environmental management and sustainability. Knowledge exchange (KE) are processes that generate, share and/or use knowledge through various methods appropriate to the context, purpose, and participants involved. KE includes concepts such as sharing, generation, repurposing, co-production, co-management, and brokerage of knowledge. This paper elicits the expert knowledge of academics involved in research and practice of KE from different disciplines and backgrounds to review research themes, identify gaps and questions, and develop a research agenda for furthering understanding about KE. Results include 88 research questions prefaced by a review of research themes. Key conclusions are: (1) there is a diverse range of questions relating to KE that require attention; (2) there is a particular need for research on understanding the process of KE, and how KE can be evaluated; and (3) given the strong interdependence of research questions, an integrated approach to understanding KE is required. To improve understanding of KE, action research methodologies and embedding evaluation as a normal part of KE research and practice need to be encouraged. This will foster more adaptive approaches to learning about KE and enhance effectiveness of environmental management.

INTRODUCTION

Knowledge, experience and learning are fundamental for effective environmental management. Irrespective of its origins, knowledge shapes decisions and implementation, while the learning that occurs through research and practice influences future action (Lee 1999, Salasvuo et al. 2002, Fahey et al. 2006). Over the last two decades there has been an acceleration of research in environmental management to guide theory and practice (Fahey et al. 2006; Lawler et al. 2006). But accumulation of knowledge and information is not enough: the effectiveness of environmental management depends greatly on how knowledge is exchanged, with whom it is exchanged, and how it is used (Pullin & Knight 2001, Cash et al. 2003; Francis & Goodman 2011). The importance of knowledge exchange (KE) is increasingly being recognized as key to facilitating social, environmental and economic impact of research. This is even in requirements for funding applications to identify potential beneficiaries and strategies and pathways to impact (Phillipson et al. 2012). Yet KE is often
Charting a course to an emerging field of ‘research engagement studies’: A conceptual meta-synthesis
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Typical methods include:
• Focus groups
• Advisory groups
• Co-design processes
• Network-building

Typical methods include:
• Consultation
• Co-production
• Citizen science

Typical methods include:
• Media
• Websites
• Databases / archives
• Social media
• Publications
• Performances
• Exhibitions
• Presentations
• Festivals
• Outreach
• Training and development
Charting a course to an emerging field of ‘research engagement studies’: A conceptual meta-synthesis
Jude Fransman – The Open University, UK
Key Principles
Sharing of power – the research is jointly owned and people work together to achieve a joint understanding
Including all perspectives and skills – make sure the research team includes all those who can make a contribution
Respecting and valuing the knowledge of all those working together on the research – everyone is of equal importance
Reciprocity – everybody benefits from working together
Building and maintaining relationships – an emphasis on relationships is key to sharing power. There needs to be joint understanding and consensus and clarity over roles and responsibilities. It is also important to value people and unlock their potential.

Key features
Establishing ground rules
Ongoing Dialogue
Joint ownership of key decisions
A commitment to relationship building
Opportunities for personal growth and development
Flexibility
Continuous reflection
Valuing and evaluating the impact of co-producing research
Charting a course to an emerging field of ‘research engagement studies’: A conceptual meta-synthesis
Jude Fransman – The Open University, UK
CREATING LIVING KNOWLEDGE

The Connected Communities Programme, community-university relationships and the participatory turn in the production of knowledge

Keri Facer & Bryony Enright
Q: Who ‘counts’ as ‘community’ for this project?

Our focus is on working with grassroots communities

Our focus is on working with organisations who represent and mediate communities
Q: What counts as a positive legacy?

- Our aim is to build theory that can travel beyond us
- Our aim is to develop ourselves and our capacities
- We will know we’ve succeeded if we’ve influenced policy makers and organisations
- We will know we’ve succeeded if we’ve changed the body of knowledge
- We want to create outputs that are useful and valuable to the people in the project
- We want to create outputs that are judged as valuable and useful to the wider public and can stand up to scrutiny by experts in the field
Q: Where do new ideas come from?

New ideas originate with community, academics evaluate, validate and disseminate/scale these ideas.

New ideas emerge from the theory and research of the academic field, and communities try out, test and disseminate these in practice.
Q: How should governance reflect our values?

- We have a hierarchical management structure premised on pre-existing experience and organisational roles.
- We distribute responsibility for leadership across multiple people aiming for democratic forms of decision making.
- The money is managed and rests with one partner.
- The money is managed transparently and collaboratively.
Community-based participatory research

A guide to ethical principles and practice

Centre for Social Justice and Community Action, Durham University
National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

Ethical Principles

**Mutual respect**: developing research relationships based on mutual respect

**Equality and inclusion**: encouraging and enabling people from a range of backgrounds and identities (e.g. ethnicity, faith, class, education, gender, sexual orientation, (dis)ability, age) to lead, design and take part in the research

**Democratic participation**: encouraging and enabling all participants to contribute meaningfully to decision-making and other aspects of the research process according to skill, interest and collective need

**Personal integrity**: participants behaving reliably, honestly and in a trustworthy fashion

**Making a difference**: promoting research that creates positive changes for communities of place, interest or identity

**Active learning**: viewing research collaboration and the process of research as an opportunity to learn from each other

**Collective action**: individuals and groups working together to achieve change
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Impact and evaluation
Impact and evaluation

“For the purpose of the REF, impact is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia”.
Impact toolkit

This toolkit is aimed at social science researchers applying for and receiving funding from ESRC. We define impact as the principles you should be aware of when applying for funding, and provide advice and guidance to help you communicate your work.

The toolkit has been informed by commissioned research and evaluations on effective knowledge exchange.

What is impact?

How we define impact and what you can do to achieve it

Support for making an impact

Resources to help you generate impact

Media training

Public engagement guidance

Tips for doing knowledge exchange
What is impact?

We define research impact as 'the demonstrable contribution that excellent research makes to society and the economy'. This can involve academic impact, economic and societal impact or both:

- **Academic impact** is the demonstrable contribution that excellent social and economic research makes in shifting understanding and advancing scientific, method, theory and application across and within disciplines.
- **Economic and societal impact** is the demonstrable contribution that excellent social and economic research makes to society and the economy, and its benefits to individuals, organisations and/or nations.

The impact of research, be it academic, economic and social can include:

- **Instrumental**: influencing the development of policy, practice or service provision, shaping legislation, altering behaviour.
- **Conceptual**: contributing to the understanding of policy issues, reframing debates.
- **Capacity building**: through technical and personal skill development.
A curious, critical, engaged and open-minded society

How we make sense of the world

A healthy, highly skilled society focused on human flourishing

How we act in the world

A society where innovation serves public & environmental interests

How the world works
Support evaluation

Evaluation is a key skill in the public engagement professional’s armory – find out how it can help you.

Evaluation is a real friend to the public engagement professional, and understanding its value and its use is a really important skill.

A common standard for the evaluation of public engagement with research

Mark S. Reed – Newcastle University, UK
Sophia Duncan – National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, UK
Paul Manners – National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, UK
Diana Pounds – Dialogue Matters, UK
Lucy Armittage – Dialogue Matters, UK
Lynn Frewer – Newcastle University, UK
Charlotte Thorley – Queen Mary University of London, UK
Bryony Frost – Queen Mary University of London, UK

Abstract

Despite growing interest in public engagement with research, there are many challenges to evaluating engagement. Evaluation findings are rarely shared or lead to demonstrable improvements in engagement practice. This has led to calls for a common ‘evaluation standard’ to provide tools and guidance for evaluating public engagement and driving good practice. This paper proposes just such a standard. A conceptual framework summarizes the three main ways in which evaluation can provide judgements about, and enhance the effectiveness of, public engagement with research. A methodological framework is then proposed to operationalize the conceptual framework. The standard is developed via a literature review, semi-structured interviews at Queen Mary University of London and an online survey. It is tested and refined in situ in a large public engagement event and applied post hoc to a range of public engagement impact case studies from the Research Excellence Framework. The goal is to standardize good practice in the evaluation of public engagement, rather than to use standard evaluation methods and indicators, given concerns from interviewees and the literature about the validity of using standard methods or indicators to cover such a wide range of engagement methods, designs, purposes and contexts. Adoption of the proposed standard by funders of public engagement activities could promote more widespread, high-quality evaluation, and facilitate longitudinal studies to draw our lessons for the funding and practice of public engagement across the higher education sector.

Keywords: responsible research and innovation, public participation, public understanding of science, co-production, monitoring and evaluation
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**Engagement**
Engagement is a two-way process where the participants share and build knowledge, understanding and skills.
Help!
Help!

- There is significant pressure on universities to increase the impact of their research and to factor public engagement in to their professional practice
- This is leading to real demands on their expertise – engaging ‘beyond academia’ has not traditionally been valued or expected for many researchers
- Generally, external organisations and individuals find universities really difficult to work with – we have a lot of ground to make up
- The way impact is framed in the REF risks oversimplifying it as a linear process that runs from ‘paper’ to ‘application’. Currently, ‘impact literacy’ is pretty rudimentary across large swathes of UK higher education
- There are pockets of real engagement expertise within universities but they tend to operate in silos
- There is real potential to draw more intelligently on the expertise of the education community in higher education to help address this challenge – but this doesn’t seem to be happening.... Could it?
“The scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers and to our cities...”
"The scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers and to our cities..."
Scaffolding good practice
Planning
There is a clear purpose to the engagement which is based on a shared understanding of participant needs and ambitions, and which builds on learning from others. Evaluation is used appropriately to inform the approach and assess its value.

Approach
The project is delivered in an ethical and professional way, using methods that are appropriate to the purposes and participants, and adhering to principles of inclusivity.

Participants
Understanding of the participants (including audiences, beneficiaries, and project team) animated the project design, approach and choice of activities.

Partners
The roles and expertise of collaborators and partners is recognised, defined and supported appropriately, with excellent communication between all parties and robust governance arrangements.

Value
The project generates mutual benefit, and steps are taken through the project to evaluate and reflect on what is being achieved and to share this widely.
Responsive
- You are motivated by other people’s curiosity, interests and needs
- You are curious about how other people make sense of the world (and of you!)
- You are committed to building shared understanding, and to reflecting on differences
- You adapt your communication for different people
- When appropriate, you provide feedback / assessment for those you are engaging with to support their learning and development

Respectful
- You listen and respond carefully and value other people’s contributions
- You find out about & build on people’s knowledge & understanding
- You are sensitive to issues of diversity and inclusion
- You respect differences in understanding and attitudes
- You have the capacity to build and sustain effective partnerships

Reflective
- You set explicit goals for your work and monitor these carefully
- You use evidence-informed approaches
- You evaluate your activity
- You welcome feedback and use it to adapt and improve your work
- You recognise when to seek advice or support
- You understand how your own values motivate your work

Responsible
- You are sensitive to social and ethical issues and plan your work to take account of these
- You approach your work professionally, ensuring that you can meet the commitments you make
- You are keen to learn new skills and to develop your practice / craft
- You are committed to excellence, quality and innovation
It is about the creation of a new public knowledge landscape where communities, and the universities that form part of those communities, can collaborate to question, research and experiment to create new ways of understanding, seeing and acting in the world.
Thank you

paul.manners@uwe.ac.uk
www.publicengagement.ac.uk