Research for Community Heritage Summit: Summary Report

10.30am-4pm, 23 October 2013

The Summit brought together over 80 representatives of Research for Community Heritage (RCH) project teams, All Our Stories (AoS) grantees who have been working with universities, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) staff and the project’s funders: the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF).

The event provided an opportunity to share some of the great work that people have been collaborating on, as well as an opportunity for critical reflection on how the projects have gone.

Aims

- To share some of the work of the AoS/RCH projects
- To explore the experiences of some of those involved in the projects
- To critically review the different models adopted by RCH grantees in developing their work with community based organisations
- To draw out learning from the partnerships to feed into potential good practice guides

What did we do?

The day included a variety of opportunities for delegates to share and reflect on their collective experiences. This report synthesises the content of these discussions, and offers (as appendices) a fuller record of what was discussed.

The view from here

Karen Brookfield (HLF), Sue Hanshaw (AHRC) and Jenni Chambers (NCCPE) formally kicked off the day with a brief reflection on the history of the project, followed by questions. Key points included:

- The HLF/ AHRC working together was an experiment – to explore whether a joint programme could lead to benefits for all involved
- It came out of an event held by the NCCPE, looking at new ways for arts and humanities researchers to engage with the public
- Michael Wood’s TV series on Kibworth’s heritage was the inspiration – “all projects should have a Michael Wood”; universities could provide that expertise
- There were 1069 applications for All Our Stories – HLF had set aside £1million but it was increased to £4.5million and 539 projects were funded
- The idea is that the practical outcomes of these projects and their legacy will feed into further funding ideas
- The diversity of models, methods and projects has been phenomenal, and we want to learn from what has happened to support project collaborations in the future
- Some of the projects have been built around existing relationships but a lot are new relationships which is really exciting
Group exercise

While booking a place for the summit, delegates had been asked to reflect on key lessons learned from the project. A synthesis of the responses is provided in appendix 1. Delegates were asked to join a group of fellow AoS participants or RCH staff and to reflect further on these prompts:

- What were their expectations of the project
- How were these met/ challenged/ not met
- What was the most useful thing about working together
- What was the most challenging thing about working together
- What practical things have/could be done to address these
- What would you pass on to others

Appendix 2 contains a summary of the notes from each of the tables.

Poster session

Over lunch the RCH teams were each invited to share posters describing their projects. They were asked to focus on a specific aspect of their collaborative work with an AoS project or to identify a particular issue of set of issues that would be of interest to other projects.

Reflections

After the lunch time poster session, delegates were also asked to record their impressions of the project on four different flipcharts:

- What’s inspired you?
- What you’ve learnt
- Great quotes
- Ideas you’ve loved

The ideas they recorded are in appendix 3.
Open Space session

After lunch, delegates were invited to take part in an ‘open space’ session where delegates suggested topics for discussion. Delegates were free to join one or more groups to contribute their ideas.

Topics discussed included:

1. Models of working
2. Cultivating relationships
3. Legacy/Legacies
4. Sharing Learning
5. Ownership
6. Remote working

Notes from the open space discussions are included in appendix 4.

Event Rapporteurs

Three rapporteurs were invited to provide their reflections on the event at the end of the day – to identity the most striking learning and to identify key themes that had emerged from the various conversations. Their reflections can be found in appendix 5.

Graphic facilitation

Two artists were invited to join the event to record visually the key themes and issues that emerged from the discussions. The finished artwork can be found in appendix 6. ‘Snapshots’ from the artwork are included in the summary of the key themes emerging from the day, below.
Key themes emerging from the day

The following themes emerged strongly from the various conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges with the scheme and potential solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential solutions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time and resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were a range of timing issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mismatch between funding schemes from AHRC and HLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time taken to confirm grant awards in both schemes, leading to delays, and an inability to manage the partnerships appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time to manage relationships on both sides. Also many universities became a ‘victim’ of their success and had far more community partnerships than originally anticipated, making resources really tight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mismatch of timing / availability of university staff and community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time required for travel for communities in rural locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The phase 1 and phase 2 funding for AHRC leading to delays in supporting AoS projects whose funding had been allocated several months previously
- AoS projects had to be completed in 12 months which restricted opportunities to do excellent work together
- Those people looking to do co-production of research projects did not have enough time to properly develop partnerships

**Potential solutions**
- Consider running the funding programme as a joint funding programme
- Provide longer grant periods e.g. 5 years to help sustain partnerships
- Recognise time invested by people in managing the relationship – and resource it adequately in the grant

**Communications**

A top challenge for both RCH and AOS teams was communication. This was in terms of what was communicated, to whom, when.

**Potential solutions**
Have one point of contact to manage the relationship at university and the community group
Agree how you will communicate, and make sure the communications are timely and relevant.

**Language and cultural differences**

There were several comments about the fact that different groups spoke very different languages – and that this was sometimes hard to bridge. There was a reflection that the cultures of academic and community heritage are very different, with different pressures and purposes, and that this requires flexibility in ways of working together. It was suggested that the term ‘heritage’ needed defining, and could put people off.

**Accessing new audiences**

Some people reflected on the difficulty of establishing relationships with new audiences, who are sometimes described as ‘hard to reach’. There was a concern that the timing contributed to this, as it took time to build trust between academics and community based organisations. There were also concerns about community gate keepers who sometimes acted as a barrier to more effective engagement with their community.

**Managing Expectations**

RCH teams reflected that the diversity of needs expressed by their AoS projects led to some difficulty – as the resources could not stretch that far. AoS teams suggested that there was a diversity in what universities were offering which made engagement harder.

**Potential solutions**
- Manage expectations from the start, and be clear what you can or can’t do
- AoS grantees suggested universities could make their ‘offer’ much clearer by offering a tick list of ‘services’ they could provide.

**Infrastructure**

A key challenge was resource to support logistics and practicalities. This ranged from geographically dispersed community groups needing travel bursaries to enable face to face meetings, to bringing multi-disciplinary teams together within the university. There was a real challenge of community
Potential solutions

- Teams who had administrative support worked really well, and ensured more efficient use of everyone’s time so consider how to resource this from the start
- Having named points of contact.

Ownership

There were some issues about ownership - both in terms of ownership of research and project outputs, and how these were shared with all the participants but also in terms of AoS teams ‘owning the interpretation of their heritage’. There was a concern that academic interpretations might undermine the value of the community group’s work.

Potential solutions

Need to manage this expectation right at the start of the project – and consider who owns what. One solution could be to agree to licence all content under a creative commons licence – however to do this, someone needs to legally own the content to be able to release it in this way. Also there are lots of different Creative Commons licences, so this will need to be agreed.

Confidence

There were some comments about the lack of confidence experienced by some community volunteers in accessing universities and their resources. Whilst many commented that the partnership had done a lot of develop confidence, this was not resolved for some groups.

Potential solution

Several groups talked about going out from the university and supporting community heritage groups in their own space, rather than encouraging people to come to the university.

False assumptions

Delegates reflected on how easily universities and community groups can have stereotypical views of what the other party are like. This misconceptions need to be challenged!
**Benefits**

**People and partnerships**
By far the most important benefit reported by AoS and RCH teams was working with new people, and developing new relationships. This was true of relationships between these groups, but also true of university staff working across different disciplines and functions. There was a real sense of celebration because of the opportunity to work with passionate and knowledgeable people.

**Sharing knowledge and expertise**
Tapping into different kinds of expertise and experience was key to both RCH and AoS teams. University staff reflected on how much expertise they discovered in AoS teams, and how inspiring this was; and AoS teams appreciated the specific expertise of academic staff able to share new ways of thinking about heritage.

**Skills development**
Once again this was common to RCH and AoS teams, with the development of a range of skills through training, and through working together.

**Ideas and inspiration**
New ideas for projects, for research and for community heritage. The partnership working stimulated lots of innovative thinking, as well as providing inspiration and motivation for heritage work.
## Benefits to AoS projects

### Facilities and workshops
AoS projects particularly appreciated being able to make use of university facilities, and the training offered by the university. There was also a sense that working with other community based organisations provided opportunity for peer support, and mutual learning.

### Encouragement and support
Having the support from RCH teams inspired and equipped the AoS teams to develop their projects and develop their confidence in community heritage research.

### Status/ Legitimacy
This enabled AoS teams to be confident in their project as well as providing status for others, including funders.

### Reaching wider audience
Working with the RCH team provided a wider audience for the work, as well as the development of outputs that had a wider use for other people.

## Benefits to RCH

### Improving university image
Perhaps an unanticipated benefit to the RCH teams. It provided teams with new ideas about how to open up the university to others.
Community knowledge and expertise
RCH benefitted from this both in terms of contributing to their research, but also helping them to find different ways to value multiple knowledges in their work.

Improving partnership working
Provided opportunity to develop more effective understanding of effective partnership working, as well as considering how co-production as a methodology can work. For some teams the development of joint research questions was a real highlight. It also encouraged teams to work with new people, providing inspiration to research and reigniting researchers’ enthusiasm for their subject.

Cultivating Relationships
There were some suggestions about how to do this well
- Co-production takes time, so invest time in cultivating partnerships before developing projects
- Establish dialogue and listen, listen, listen
- Have a main point of contact, and ensure they are flexible and open minded and know how to broker relationships
- Manage expectations from the start, and consider having a partnership agreement if it would help
- Build on relationships you already have
- Build sustainability from the start ensuring everyone knows what the plan is! Consider how the university can fund/facilitate this
- Recognise the difference between engaged research and dissemination. Co-production is one methodology that might be appropriate to your work
- Draw on resources for developing partnerships (eg NCCPE guide)
- Better dovetailing between AHRC/ HLF and NCCPE
- Support students to volunteer, but recognise as a ‘proper’ role to ensure commitment
- Learn from community organisations who work with universities
- Be realistic about the timescale, and build in lots of contingency time
Top Tips
- Expect the unexpected and embrace it
- Be realistic
- Community university partnerships take lots and lots of time for everyone
- Mutuality should be at the heart of the relationship
- It’s worth it!
- Communications are important, so plan them in
- Make use of what’s available
- Draw in the support you need.
- Relationships matter – so invest in them (and make lots of cups of tea)
- Consider the added value
- Work with existing networks to add value to the project. E.g. Some projects worked with museums, libraries and archives who were able to provide some of the training community organisations needed.

What next
The AHRC/HLF/NCCPE will continue to work together to ensure that the event will feed into the overall evaluation of the RCH programme.

The NCCPE is committed to developing the following resources – please let us know if you would like to contribute

- **Case studies**
The HLF and AHRC are creating case studies about RCH and AoS. If you have not participated in creating a case study and would like to let us know.
- **Guide to developing community university heritage partnerships**
The NCCPE partnership guide can be found here: www.publicengagement.ac.uk/how/guides/working-partnership
We plan to write an additional section of the guide focussed on developing heritage partnerships, based on the learning from this event
- **‘Navigating universities’ guide for community based organisations**
This guide is being developed by the NCCPE in partnership with the UK Community Partner Network – we plan to reflect learning from this project in that guide – which will be available by April 2014
- **Case to support community university partnerships**
The NCCPE will be creating a short document highlighting the case for institutions to support engaged research. If you would like to contribute please let us know.
- **Other reflections**
The event was a real celebration of the AoS and RCH projects and partnerships – however this project threw into relief some really tough challenges. If you have further comments or reflections we would love to hear from you.
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Research for Community Heritage Teams

1. What was the best thing about your Research for Community Heritage project?

### RCH: What’s been the best thing?

"Working with some amazing community heritage groups with great stories to tell about their historic buildings and seeing the difference that digital technologies can make to what they do."

"I feel the best thing about this project was to meet and work with people who are passionate about their history and local area. It was also a fantastic way for me to develop my own knowledge transfer skills."

"I see the project being of benefit to the wider community as a whole where the community has been involved. The process has been one also of personal development."

"Working with passionate and interested communities and seeing the direct transformative powers of heritage on people’s lives."

"Working alongside the groups, sharing expertise, exchanging knowledge and problem solving."

"The collaborations and strong partnerships which emerged between the groups. Many of our HLF-funded community partners have found moral and practical support from their colleagues in other groups and have been able to plan exciting new projects to take forward into 2014. The University has also made some strong (and we hope lasting) relationships."

### Relationships and collaboration

- The collaborations and strong partnerships which emerged between the groups. Many of our HLF-funded community partners have found moral and practical support from their colleagues in other groups and have been able to plan exciting new projects to take forward into 2014. The University has also made some strong (and we hope lasting) relationships.
- The interaction and genuine sense of partnership generated through fieldwork and landscape investigations.
- Meeting and working with a range of enthusiastic community groups
- Linking with heritage research groups
- Meeting and working with the Community Groups
- It has encouraged groups who would not ordinarily undertake heritage research to develop project with support from and in collaboration with university researchers.
- Working with some amazing community heritage groups with great stories to tell about their historic buildings and seeing the difference that digital technologies can make to what they do.
- Being able to get out across London to support community groups. Feeling that we helped the groups achieve the aims of their project.
- Working with people with similar interests inside and outside the university on a number of really interesting and fantastic projects.
- Working with passionate and interested communities and seeing the direct transformative powers of heritage on people’s lives
- The creation of a network of academics, heritage practitioners, community groups and schools that has begun to break down traditional barriers to participation
- Developing relationships with a wide variety of community researchers; learning new things about the First World War.
- Opportunity to work with a range of community groups
- I see the project being of benefit to the wider community as a whole where the community has been involved. The process has been one also of personal development.
The support we provide to the local community and the work we do together. The project enables us to engage with the local people and have a positive impact through project outputs.

Working alongside the groups, sharing expertise, exchanging knowledge and problem solving.

The opportunity to work with enthusiastic and knowledgeable people, working on a wide range of projects which has added to my own understanding of the county of Hertfordshire, being welcomed by all the AOS groups as part of their team and feeling that my contribution has helped to sustain that enthusiasm.

Meeting people from a wide variety of community groups to hear about their research ideas, helping a few make successful applications to the ‘All Our Stories’ programme and seeing some fantastic projects take shape.

To be able to facilitate a huge amount of sharing of knowledge and experiences and open up resources to people who would not usually access them.

The best thing was experiencing the enthusiasm of the groups and from this enthusiasm it was so easy to train the groups in new skills that helped with their research.

Building new links with over 30 different community groups and bringing them together to share learning experiences.

Working with a wide range of projects and meeting new communities.

I feel the best thing about this project was to meet and work with people who are passionate about their history and local area. It was also a fantastic way for me to develop my own knowledge transfer skills.

It allowed the Science Museum to reach new audiences and work with them in innovative, exciting and progressive ways. Allowed us to learn from these community groups and inform our practice.

The creation of a community of communities. It has been very gratifying to see representatives from the community groups forging contacts and offering advice and support to one another in their All Our Stories projects, and seeing the mutual and cooperative interests of community groups and researchers develop over the past year.

Helping to bring communities together, seeing a range of people both old and young from very varied backgrounds come together to work towards a common goal, making friends and feeling part of something.

Meeting a wide range of people from different walks of life who have a passion for investigating their local heritage. Exchanging ideas about the purpose of community heritage, the development of historical inquiry and community engagement.

Opening up new networks both externally and internally.

The enthusiasm from the members of local heritage groups to share their knowledge and to contribute to academic research.

Working with community projects to share ideas, generate new ones and to develop skills and share knowledge. Working with children involved in the community projects on interviewing skills and techniques.

Personal development

I see the project being of benefit to the wider community as a whole where the community has been involved. The process has been one also of personal development.

I feel the best thing about this project was to meet and work with people who are passionate about their history and local area. It was also a fantastic way for me to develop my own knowledge transfer skills.

Ideas

The opportunity to release innovative ideas, and some of the follow-on projects that emerged.

Getting new insights on research and research methods from a really diverse group of people.

It allowed the Science Museum to reach new audiences and work with them in innovative, exciting and progressive ways. Allowed us to learn from these community groups and inform our practice.

Working with community projects to share ideas, generate new ones and to develop skills and share knowledge. Working with children involved in the community projects on interviewing skills and techniques.

Meeting a wide range of people from different walks of life who have a passion for investigating their local heritage. Exchanging ideas about the purpose of community heritage, the development of historical inquiry and community engagement.

Sharing knowledge

Imparting new knowledge to eager receivers. This comment applies especially to work undertaken with the local junior school.

Learnt more knowledge and value of cultural heritage
2. What has been the biggest challenge for you in your work with community based organisations for the Research for Community Heritage project?

**Resources**
- Maintaining support for the 15 partner groups who wanted to work with us - from across the East Midlands but also including a group outside our immediate region.
- In our case it’s been managing the work packages for the relatively large number (eleven) community heritage groups we are partnering. If we were to do this again we’d probably want to restrict our engagement to about half that number given the same length of time and funding.
- The limited time and resources available for supporting the community groups.

**Communication**
- Developing an efficient communication system with our project partners and community groups living in remote regions.

**Time**
- The timescales have meant that we could not respond to groups' needs - for example, they had to produce digital record, but the workshop we staged, was sometimes after they had done this.
- Time. The project is supporting 15 AOS projects (I am the prime contact for 7) and very limited time available to do this as thoroughly as I would have liked.
- It was difficult retaining a focus on research, rather than offering general support, i.e., with the application procedure. Where possible we tried to coproduce the projects with researchers involved from the beginning, however the tight time frame was restrictive. Many groups wanted general advice on research, such as how to use an archive or record oral histories, rather than the involvement of a researcher with specific expertise.
- In our case it’s been managing the work packages for the relatively large number (eleven) community heritage groups we are partnering. If we were to do this again we’d probably want to restrict our engagement to about half that number given the same length of time and funding.
- The timing - a lot of groups had finished when we were just getting started in offering support.
- The timetabling between the AHRC funding and the HLF AoS funding did not always match and so for instance a number of HLF funded groups has finished their projects before our stage 2 funding was confirmed.
- The limited time and resources available for supporting the community groups.
• More to do than time allowed - the initial phase (February to June 2012) seemed rather arbitrary.
• General coordinating and finding times suitable for everyone to come together. Also - encouraging co-
production can be difficult if people would prefer to be told what to do.
• Time. Given more time per week we could work with more people and promote the projects to a larger
audience.
• Time pressures: in particular the difficulty of balancing the needs of the various organisations we work with.
• The timings of the AHRC and HLF funded projects not being coordinated.
• The gap in time between the AoS community groups being awarded their funding and the museum getting its
support grant meant we were playing catch up a lot and was hard to explain this to the community groups we
had arranged to work with. Caused a lot of frustrations.
• Finding time to keep in regular email contact, which is important for building and maintaining a relationship. This
takes a small amount of time, but frequently and this adds up to a lot of time overall.
• Co-ordination and timing.

Logistics
• The logistics of meeting up - everybody is very busy and community groups don't necessarily meet in office
hours. Understanding other people's aspirations and objectives of taking part.
• I have found the biggest challenge has been not being in the same country as many of the groups I have been
supporting.
• The geographical spread of projects (across Scotland) and the diversity of interests was challenging but also
offered opportunities to pilot different forms of engagement and support for both individual and groups of
projects.
• Co-ordination and timing.

Suitability of support
• To ensure that the training offered was adaptable across ability ranges
• It was difficult retaining a focus on research, rather than offering general support, i.e., with the application
procedure. Where possible we tried to coproduce the projects with researchers involved from the beginning,
however the tight time frame was restrictive. Many groups wanted general advice on research, such as how to
use an archive or record oral histories, rather than the involvement of a researcher with specific expertise.
• Meeting some very diverse training needs and expectations
• Effective co-ordination; responding to the varying needs of our partner community projects. We are working
with five community projects and there are eight people from different departments in the university project
team.

Other
• We've been able to resolve all the problems we've come across – however, developing co-produced research
from the projects is challenging.
• Finding ways to engage with non-traditional audiences
• Rolling out the idea of digital storytelling.
• I am not sure that challenge is the correct word, but I would identify a lack of confidence as one of the key areas
that needs addressing so that the early enthusiasm does not disappear.
• Our primary challenge, and greatest achievement, has been managing so many projects who successfully applied
for the All Our Stories grants following our support at the application stage. We found that projects we did not
work with as closely on their projects at the development stage have tended to be overambitious for a one year
project and under budgeted in key areas.
• Helping 'hard to reach' groups overcome barriers preventing them from engaging with community heritage
research and applying for funding, especially the lack of time and resources.
• The biggest challenge has been getting the community to come forward.
• The biggest challenge was figuring out how to teach the groups skills in technology (how to input data to 'Field
Trip' (Google) to have some of their project work published on a Global scale), considering that some had very
low level computer skills and some groups were very anxious about the process.
3. How have you dealt with these challenges?

RCH: How have you dealt with these challenges?

“We work together as a team to identify where our support is needed. We listen to the community and deliver what they ask to the best of our abilities.”

“We have tried to work with projects when they have needed assistance, but have been open about what we can and cannot achieve.”

“The most productive solution is the offer of a cup of tea.”

“We have used a range of strategies - in particular using creative and artistic activities to engage people with their heritage.”

“Regular communications with each of our partner projects; research team meetings; linking university team members with specific requests for particular kinds of support; being responsive to individual project requests; local networking events to share ideas & issues.”

“Taking an honest and forthright approach to how the research network can realistically support the community groups and acting as a facilitator for relevant aspects of project delivery, rather than taking a leading role.”

Communication

- Two dedicated Early Career Researchers, regular updates through e-mail correspondence and plenary events (launch - mid-term review - showcase/celebration event).
- We are working with a number of the groups.
- Regular communications with each of our partner projects; research team meetings; linking university team members with specific requests for particular kinds of support; being responsive to individual project requests; local networking events to share ideas & issues.
- We have worked with groups how and when it has been possible and sought to extend these into longer term relationships.
- We work together as a team to identify where our support is needed. We listen to the community and deliver what they ask to the best of our abilities.
- Through the co-construction of workshops with projects.
- Communication. We asked the groups what training they would like at the outset, and kept in contact as their projects developed and their needs changed. We then found people to help us to deliver that.
- We have tried to work with projects when they have needed assistance, but have been open about what we can and cannot achieve.
- I have tried to keep in regular contact with the groups via phone and email, and where possible have visited the groups.
- We worked with those who still wanted our support and made our research offer general enough that it could also be beneficial to those who had finished their particular projects but may be doing other projects in the future.
- Taking an honest and forthright approach to how the research network can realistically support the community groups and acting as a facilitator for relevant aspects of project delivery, rather than taking a leading role.
- Having fantastic project officers who work outside of office hours and act as liaison points between academics and community groups. To understand other people’s aspirations/objectives, I think it’s key to communicate really well at the start about what everybody wants to achieve.
Through involvement and engagement.
I have had to schedule events knowing that not everyone will be able to attend, but have then sent round relevant resources afterwards. We have used our partner organisations and relationship brokers to assist in making decisions and giving closed options to the groups.
I have been part of a team which has run practical workshops including how to find resources and the practicalities of visiting Archives and Record Offices, use of the census and other online data, oral history interviews - recording, indexing, transcribing, use of digital resources such as Historypin. These were all designed to build confidence and de-mystify the research process.

Flexibility
- We tried to tailor support on an ad hoc basis
- Flexibility and response nature of support

Further resources
- We've brought in further staff not funded by the AHRC to ensure that the project delivers on-time and that our Community Heritage partners are completely satisfied with their engagement with us.
- Having fantastic project officers who work outside of office hours and act as liaison points between academics and community groups. To understand other people’s aspirations/objectives, I think it's key to communicate really well at the start about what everybody wants to achieve.
- Working in my own time.
- Worked harder/longer!

Other
- Still working out the best way.
- We assigned researchers to each project after they had received the HLF grant. We provided skills based training sessions on oral histories but also invited researchers to participate who specialised in storytelling, narrative and memory.
- Prioritising those groups that needed most help.
- We have used a range of strategies - in particular using creative an artistic activities to engage people with their heritage
- Delayed this aspect of the project with the aim of showcasing the possibilities later in the year.
- We provided all the support we could whilst the project was running. But long term solutions continue to be difficult to find.
- The most productive solution is the offer of a cup of tea - then we get what we came for.
- I dealt with this by organizing a workshop, where each group worked one to one with assistants that I had recruited for the day. The one to one training resulted in a very successful workshop and each group left with new digital skills and a feeling of success.
- Learnt to become bit more relaxed in my expectations!
- Effective use of our researchers’ time, particularly capitalising on the additional allocation of resources towards Early Career Researchers, and running workshops on areas of heritage projects identified at the application stage which would be beneficial to many of our groups (e.g. oral history training, use of historical archives, running archaeological activities), which have been well attended and received.
- Made time, but it has been difficult and not always felt very personally rewarding.
4. What one thing have you learnt from this project that you would like to pass on to others?

**RCH: What would you pass on?**

"Community Heritage projects take a lot of time and attention to detail - you can’t plan the outcomes definitively but must allow for unexpected challenges or opportunities which lead you in unforeseen directions (usually good ones!)

"It's not true that most people think history is largely irrelevant! It’s really opened my eyes to what an impact historical research methods can have on a diverse audience.

"There’s no magic bullet to engage communities - it takes time, effort and continued commitment.

"The value of working together and sharing knowledge. Although the researchers and students shared their expertise, they also gained knowledge from the communities. I have also seen the positive impact that doing heritage research can have within communities, on building confidence, learning new skills and finding out more about themselves: the places they live, the things they own and the people that make up those communities.

"That working alongside community groups is very rewarding, that there is a lot of knowledge, skills & enthusiasm that can be tapped into and can enrich our research as academics."

**Expect the unexpected**

- Community Heritage projects take a lot of time and attention to detail - you can’t plan the outcomes definitively but must allow for unexpected challenges or opportunities which lead you in unforeseen directions (usually good ones!)
- Do not underestimate children's abilities to absorb and assimilate complex histories, ideas or new skills.
- It’s not true that most people think history is largely irrelevant! It’s really opened my eyes to what an impact historical research methods can have on a diverse audience.
- I think not to overlook the small things. What might seem unimportant to someone working in academia or full-time research may not be apparent to someone immersed in this field working with resources daily.
- Get plenty of buy in from your institution well in advance!! Don’t underestimate how much planning and logistical work will be needed.

**Be realistic**

- Not to be overly ambitious in your theoretical aspirations for the project.
- How much expertise and enthusiasm is contained within small community organisations.
- Peer learning between groups is important.
- There’s no magic bullet to engage communities - it takes time, effort and continued commitment.
- Giving support to community proposals is as much about listening as contributing - but the contributing is necessary (e.g. to avoid re-invention of wheels, to put groups in touch with others who can transfer good practice, to ensure basics are in place). Establishing friendly-but-frank reciprocal relationships is accordingly important; do not under-estimate the energy, time and goodwill needed to do this.
- Honesty.
- Create a realistic time budget with sufficient slack to allow for delays.

**Time**

- It takes time to develop good working relationships with community groups; it has to be remembered that they are volunteers doing this work for pleasure and interest. They do not have the same timescales and priorities as a paid employee; but can be wonderful collaborators when that relationship has matured.
For these relationships to work effectively in the direction of co-production and co-development you need time to build up good relationships and the flexibility of structures to be able to respond appropriately.

There’s no magic bullet to engage communities - it takes time, effort and continued commitment.

That working alongside community groups is very rewarding, that there is a lot of knowledge, skills & enthusiasm that can be tapped into and can enrich our research as academics. But that it really takes time, and this will necessarily involve making choices in relation to other parts of an academic’s job - i.e. devoting time to working with community groups that you might have spent writing an article or working in an archive.

Create a realistic time budget with sufficient slack to allow for delays.

Mutuality

The value of working together and sharing knowledge. Although the researchers and students shared their expertise, they also gained knowledge from the communities. I have also seen the positive impact that doing heritage research can have within communities, on building confidence, learning new skills and finding out more about themselves; the places they live, the things they own and the people that make up those communities.

Giving support to community proposals is as much about listening as contributing - but the contributing is necessary (e.g. to avoid re-invention of wheels, to put groups in touch with others who can transfer good practice, to ensure basics are in place). Establishing friendly-but-frank reciprocal relationships is accordingly important; do not under-estimate the energy, time and goodwill needed to do this.

The importance of building trust and listening to what the groups are saying (you might be interested in the blog one of our partners wrote after the September Community Partner Summit in Bristol http://blog.sopwellmemories.org.uk/).

The importance of listening to individuals and community groups and using the resources available through the University to help them shape heritage research in ways that meet their goals.

Listen to what the groups want to do rather than tell them what they should be doing. Several have expressed to me their desire to do ‘proper’ research, and it is our role to help them develop skills and an awareness of resources that they can continue to draw on once the immediate project is over.

Participants should not be afraid to draw on and learn from the experience of others.

It’s worth it

Do it! Community engagement in University research is hugely rewarding both at an academic and an emotional level.

There is a large appetite within the community to learn from and support current research and heritage professionals are able to act as a facilitator in that process.

That working alongside community groups is very rewarding, that there is a lot of knowledge, skills & enthusiasm that can be tapped into and can enrich our research as academics. But that it really takes time, and this will necessarily involve making choices in relation to other parts of an academic’s job - i.e. devoting time to working with community groups that you might have spent writing an article or working in an archive.

That working with the community is incredibly rewarding and an important form of research that can inform in a way that traditional academia can’t.

Communication

Communication. Email, telephone, visit, email and telephone the groups often. I found that maintaining contact with the groups on a regular basis helped us develop an excellent relationship.

By bringing different groups together on a regular basis they learn from each other as well as from the speaker, and the individual projects are strengthened as a result.

Honesty

I think not to overlook the small things. What might seem unimportant to someone working in academia or full-time research may not be apparent to someone immersed in this field working with resources daily.

The importance of developing relationships between researchers and representatives from community groups from the initial contact. We found that personal meetings and individual needs assessment with an allocated researcher was vital as a first step towards framing research objectives and activities ready for the application. We developed a detailed proforma for community groups to complete with guidance from researchers which enabled us to identify key areas to offer support, the likely costs involved and develop a schedule for undertaking projects.

Community interaction is hard work, and requires the constant attention and input to build meaningful relationships. This step is important, and should not be side stepped.
• Listening to people involved in community projects and working in response to their ideas and interests rather than imposing a predetermined set of workshops. I have also learned a lot about working with Early Career Researchers.
• The importance of regular engagement with community projects - 'little and often' - to establish good working relationships and to make the university project team members more accessible to members of community projects.
• Participatory approaches are useful models for this type of engagement
• You need to have a dedicated point of contact to get the most out of it, preferably full time.
5. In your opinion which of your resources has been most effective at supporting community university heritage projects?

**RCH: What resources have been most effective?**

"The kettle (seriously), followed by having an enthusiastic and sympathetic voices in the local press and radio."

"Our project partners and academic team. Having the ability to call someone with the right skills and knowledge and when you need them makes your job possible. The right team with the right skill set is essential."

"Access to tailored training."

"Externally we have good local, regional and national links across the heritage sector that enable us to put local groups in direct touch with specialist sources of skill and knowledge."

"Feedback on our programme of workshops has been very positive, but in addition just being able to offer the groups a space in which to meet with others and share knowledge and experiences of research has been one of the plus points from my point of view."

"Our website was incredibly useful as a means by which to establish a network and promote our events and activities."

**Expertise**

- Information Services have provided excellent support in terms of delivering workshops on using digital and audio media, promotion of groups via social media, training in oral history, intellectual property rights and copyright. All our participating groups have valued the chance to access high quality training and support and to meet one another through the training workshops.
- The utilization of people on the ground working closely with the groups.
- Support from Community partners - particularly Communities First
- Professional archaeologists willing to give their time and expertise to community projects
- Project officer & ECR time
- Our project partners and academic team. Having the ability to call someone with the right skills and knowledge as and when you need them makes your job possible. The right team with the right skill set is essential.
- The time and knowledge of academics, especially those with public engagement experience.
- Our expertise.
- Audience engagement experience
- All useful in different ways - co-ordination to link community groups to 'best fit' university resource; website design support; support regarding using different media to engage people in communities and to deliver projects; confidence building regarding interviewing skills
- It is the combination of skills in our academic, multi-disciplinary team which is the most valuable resource.
- Our time - used to offer guidance, support and advice both by email and on the ground.
- The range of expertise in our team of researchers, including Early Career Researchers, freelance researchers and those involved in Continuing Education, bringing together a wealth of enthusiasm and experience in developing and running community heritage projects. Meeting the researchers has been consistently the most popular response on feedback from open days and workshops. Our collaboration with the public engagement team at the University has been invaluable, drawing on their contacts and ideas for promotion and presentation of projects. It has also helped enormously to have an established and dedicated outreach group (Access Cambridge Archaeology) already working with many of the communities who successfully bid for All Our Stories projects.
The broad range of staff skills and expertise within the University of Leicester that we have been able to draw upon, from providing advice on conservation, cataloguing and copyright, to training in oral history and using documentary sources.

Feedback on our programme of workshops has been very positive, but in addition just being able to offer the groups a space in which to meet with others and share knowledge and experiences of research has been one of the plus points from my point of view.

Existing contacts/networks
- Existing links with museums and heritage organisations – been able to help deliver appropriate training
- Clearly the AHRC Grant awards for our University project come at the top of the list in terms of providing effective support and this has allowed us to make available a range of technical resources like 3D laser scanning 3D digital modelling and mobile phone app development to our community group partners. The opportunity to meet other University research groups involved in the programme has also been very beneficial as it allows us to better place our work in a national context and direct some community heritage groups to other Universities who can, in some cases help them more effectively than we can.
- Externally we have good local, regional and national links across the heritage sector that enable us to put local groups in direct touch with specialist sources of skill and knowledge. Internally our historic and evolving strengths in certain fields - such as heritage and mental health, oral and sport history - are appreciating assets.
- The kettle (seriously), followed by having an enthusiastic and sympathetic voices in the local press and radio.

Training and workshops
- Workshops targeted as specific needs
- Access to tailored training
- Feedback on our programme of workshops has been very positive, but in addition just being able to offer the groups a space in which to meet with others and share knowledge and experiences of research has been one of the plus points from my point of view.

Technology
- Our website was incredibly useful as a means by which to establish a network and promote our events and activities. I was employed as a project officer and spent time developing relationships with groups and connecting them with researchers - this, I feel, led to stronger relationships and more successful projects and may lead to subsequent collaborations.
- Information Services have provided excellent support in terms of delivering workshops on using digital and audio media, promotion of groups via social media, training in oral history, intellectual property rights and copyright. All our participating groups have valued the chance to access high quality training and support and to meet one another through the training workshops.
- Clearly the AHRC Grant awards for our University project come at the top of the list in terms of providing effective support and this has allowed us to make available a range of technical resources like 3D laser scanning 3D digital modelling and mobile phone app development to our community group partners. The opportunity to meet other University research groups involved in the programme has also been very beneficial as it allows us to better place our work in a national context and direct some community heritage groups to other Universities who can, in some cases help them more effectively than we can.
- All useful in different ways - co-ordination to link community groups to 'best fit' university resource; website design support; support regarding using different media to engage people in communities and to deliver projects; confidence building regarding interviewing skills
- I helped the groups with archaeological and archival resources but I think that the most useful was offering them digital training (on Field Trip (Google) simply because not many people know about this media yet.

Communication
- The time which we have to discuss and work with the AoS funded groups, especially the time of our funded ECRs whose input has been fantastic.
- Communication has been important in the support process.
- Externally we have good local, regional and national links across the heritage sector that enable us to put local groups in direct touch with specialist sources of skill and knowledge. Internally our historic and evolving strengths in certain fields - such as heritage and mental health, oral and sport history - are appreciating assets.
- Mouth to mouth and eye to eye contact.
- The kettle (seriously), followed by having an enthusiastic and sympathetic voices in the local press and radio.
Other

- Historypin.com
- Research seminars, targeted at using museum and archive material.
- The people who make up our team.
- Clearly the AHRC Grant awards for our University project come at the top of the list in terms of providing effective support and this has allowed us to make available a range of technical resources like 3D laser scanning, 3D digital modelling and mobile phone app development to our community group partners. The opportunity to meet other University research groups involved in the programme has also been very beneficial as it allows us to better place our work in a national context and direct some community heritage groups to other Universities who can, in some cases help them more effectively than we can.
1. What was the best thing about working with a university on your All Our Stories project?

New people
- Meeting some great people I would not have come across without the university supporting our project.
- Meeting the other groups and the workshops
- Sharing experiences with other projects and getting to know how the University worked with the community

Facilities and workshops
- Their range of knowledge and excellent facilities.
- Access to archaeological expertise and resources and training workshops

Expertise
- Technical expertise in a variety of areas, specifically the bespoke nature of how this expertise was delivered.
- Their constant encouragement and support for our project, giving use ideas and expert advice.
- Working with De Montfort has given us in the first instance a modern and exciting outcome for the project in the digital animation, easy to share with the larger community. In addition, in developing the background resources we have been able to connect with a diverse group of people in the community both local and away and bring together resources in one place which is a new development.
- Important connection and knowledge base, with experience.
- Having access to the knowledge and expertise of academic archaeology researchers.
- Their range of knowledge and excellent facilities.
- Access to archaeological expertise and resources and training workshops
- The additional skills that we were able to utilise to enrich the school learning project and the support at our community events.

Encouragement and support
- Their constant encouragement and support for our project, giving use ideas and expert advice.
The amount of support we received for the project and the number of different people who have supported the project in different ways i.e. Judith Mills and Liz Harvey at the start with shaping and delivering the project and Ian Wilson and Shirley Grimshaw with the technology elements.

Continuous contact

Practical support
- Practical support enabled us to record stories from orchard members and the wider community, and helped realise our ambition to re-map the orchard.
- Knowing that there was academic support if we met any technical problems or needed advice on a way forward
- A large resource in terms of research materials and knowledge of funding issues for projects and writing up research reports.
- Knowing that there were people we could call on for advice and technical support during the project. Our student support was also excellent, he entered into the spirit of the project and has found a piece of work which he expects to publish in the next 12 months.

Partnership work
- So many - including that we are truly working in partnership with each other - acknowledging and utilising each other’s different knowledge, skills, expertise, understanding, perspective......
- Their openness to learn about a very particular community and their ideas and interests
- This collaboration had led to an interesting three-part consortium (Catch22, Valence House and UCL), and specifically to a university community partnership to support the programme delivery with community research, knowledge sharing and capacity building.

Other
- Enthusiasm, teamwork, commitment
2. What have been the benefits for working with a university on your heritage project?

**All our Stories: What have been the benefits?**

- **Expertise**
  - Ability to conduct specific aspects of the project with greater confidence and professionalism.
  - They increased our awareness of archival sources and equipped us with new skills and knowledge. They gave us the confidence to try new activities and introduced us to similar community groups undertaking projects like our own.
  - Knowing there was support available.
  - The project has been enriched by the very different historical interests, connections, and practical skills of the academics and researchers we’ve worked with.
  - To start with, we did not know about the AOS Funding and therefore would not have applied for or received funding! The University Team told us about this and provided much-needed support in helping us put together our application. The two particular members of staff supporting us take both a personal and professional interest in our Project and, among many things, provide a perspective on what we are doing and hope to achieve that would not otherwise be there - based on their knowledge, experience and expertise. They've also made the necessary arrangements to use the University's facilities.
  - The discipline required by the university in sharing the data means we are learning, with their support, how to structure this record and archive it to preserve it for the future. We are becoming confident in dealing with copyright and many other aspects. In a small distant outpost far from a university town these developments are a real innovation.
  - Using specialist skills to bring the project to life in an easily accessible format for the general public.
  - Access to knowledge / specialisation / introduction to Community Showcase and the Arts and Humanities Research Council.
  - The ability to call on advice and technical support.
  - The ability to call on academic advice.
  - The partnership proved to be highly productive and a great catalyst on making a distinctive difference to the programme. Professors and doctoral students provided training to Catch22 staff and volunteers and helped with resources and tools on running the activities of the All Our Stories programme. Also, PhD researchers worked with the local service to deliver parts of the accredited training offered to young learners at the museum.
archives to facilitate familiarity with community heritage research techniques and improve their confidence at interviewing the elderly people.

- Access to libraries. Possibility of students working on our project and use of equipment and expertise.
- I think it lends an academic ‘weight’ to our project, and provides experienced support.

**Resources**

- Access to resources we would not have had the confidence to explore independently; having a reminder of the huge amount of material on our doorstep and the fact that the university is a part of the city as a whole and not an ivory tower!
- To start with, we did not know about the AOS Funding and therefore would not have applied for or received funding! The University Team told us about this and provided much-needed support in helping us put together our application. The two particular members of staff supporting us take both a personal and professional interest in our Project and, among many things, provide a perspective on what we are doing and hope to achieve that would not otherwise be there - based on their knowledge, experience and expertise. They've also made the necessary arrangements to use the University's facilities.
- The partnership proved to be highly productive and a great catalyst on making a distinctive difference to the programme. Professors and doctoral students provided training to Catch22 staff and volunteers and helped with resources and tools on running the activities of the All Our Stories programme. Also, PhD researchers worked with the local service to deliver parts of the accredited training offered to young learners at the museum archives to facilitate familiarity with community heritage research techniques and improve their confidence at interviewing the elderly people.
- Access to libraries. Possibility of students working on our project and use of equipment and expertise.
- We have been able to undertake a research project that would have been impossible on our own - partly because it involved an excavation that required Scheduled Monument Consent.

**Training**

- Training for volunteers
- That a number of volunteers from the World Heritage Site have been able to attend training sessions at the University
- The partnership proved to be highly productive and a great catalyst on making a distinctive difference to the programme. Professors and doctoral students provided training to Catch22 staff and volunteers and helped with resources and tools on running the activities of the All Our Stories programme. Also, PhD researchers worked with the local service to deliver parts of the accredited training offered to young learners at the museum archives to facilitate familiarity with community heritage research techniques and improve their confidence at interviewing the elderly people.

**Status**

- Added status of work of our society and discipline in our working methods
- I think it lends an academic ‘weight’ to our project, and provides experienced support.

**People and relationships**

- All the people who were involved with the project, running workshops, chaperones, lighting designers, students giving out flyers, university staff - it was the people that made this project with their hard work, enthusiasm and passion for community heritage.
- Building a relationship with the university staff and their commitment to helping us.

**Other**

- Mutual gain from both sides
- Allowing ideas to flourish
3. What has been the biggest challenge for you in your work with the university on your All Our Stories project?

**All our Stories: Challenges**

"Coordinating the provision of support alongside our busy and tight project timescale."

"The AOS projects are only a small part of the work of the researchers and are not necessarily a priority. Although plans and timescales were agreed early on, lack of communication about progress of tasks being done by university staff made it a harder project to run than anticipated."

"Distance and time."

"This is the first time we have undertaken a project of this type (collecting oral memories, scanning and photographing material and recording the collection). It has been a very steep learning curve but the assistance we received from the university helped break it down into manageable chunks."

Practicalities
- Travelling to attend the workshops, most volunteers do not want to travel
- Due to the number of successful projects the university had to limit places for each project for the training sessions they held. As we are a 15 mile World Heritage Site and have many community and voluntary organisations within the World Heritage Site it was difficult to limit the training sessions to 3 people from our project as more were interested. Then for some of the sessions when people dropped out it was too late to let our volunteers go along as they had other commitments.
- Understanding technology
- Distance and time
- Organising / logistics

Time
- Coordinating the provision of support alongside our busy and tight project timescale.
- There’s not been anything serious. Time probably the most challenging - for all of us. For example, they have been great in providing us with accommodation (e.g. for meetings and courses); however, there are many demands on such resources, probably most of which naturally have priority over us. So booking a room takes a while!
- Distance and time
- The lack of prior community university experience has been a great challenge which required plenty of time not only to build working relationships between the All Our Stories coordinator and the university staff but also a common language.
- Obtaining timely feedback on queries and reports
- Not always being able to communicate fully about issues that have arisen with the project, due to time pressures etc.
The AOS projects are only a small part of the work of the researchers and are not necessarily a priority. Although plans and timescales were agreed early on, lack of communication about progress of tasks being done by university staff made it a harder project to run than anticipated.

Confidence
- So far it has probably been getting my volunteers to overcome their lack of confidence in attending university run events.
- Young people accessing a large museum space can be quite intimidating

Finance
- Greater engagement with the University was limited because I am not paid in my role as orchard co-ordinator, and our members also have many other work and family commitments. The salaried often assume that everyone else is too, and this may raise expectations about response to communications and capacity, which can be difficult for volunteers to meet.

Communication
- Understanding exactly what they could do for us and how to explain this to others
- Understanding what was specifically possible within the remit and what was required from us to facilitate that.
- This is the first time we have undertaken a project of this type (collecting oral memories, scanning and photographing material and recording the collection). It has been a very steep learning curve but the assistance we received from the university helped break it down into manageable chunks.
- As none of us, all volunteers, had ever undertaken a project of this type before (collecting oral memories, photographing and scanning material and collating the collection) we were on a steep learning curve.
- The lack of prior community university experience has been a great challenge which required plenty of time not only to build working relationships between the All Our Stories coordinator and the university staff but also a common language.
- Keeping in touch
- Not always being able to communicate fully about issues that have arisen with the project, due to time pressures etc.

Other
- We have had no major challenges
4. How have you dealt with these challenges?

**Practical support**
- Offered expenses
- Aberdeen University staff travelled south
- Careful and close support adhering to individual needs.

**Communication**
- Good communication and flexibility within our programme where possible.
- I have tried to attend all events myself so that there would be a familiar face present.
- Our University colleagues have worked through this within their organisation and keep us fully informed (e.g. by e-mail)
- Having a meeting with people from De Montfort to give more details of the possibilities and to explain what they required. Also to continue researching and gathering as much information as possible.
- Giving time to briefs and preparation meetings and keeping records of any kind of collaboration and meeting
- When I realised that I could not assume that things that had been agreed were actually happening, I was quicker to ask/chase about progress.
- By developing a wider circle of contacts in the community to discuss problems, which is ultimately a good thing!
- By attempting to manage expectations!

**Training**
- We applied to the Challenge Fund at the university and had two separate training sessions in the World Heritage Site for our volunteers and 15 are now trained up. The training was specifically set around what our volunteers wanted to focus on - so audio and visual recording techniques and editing skills.
- Attending specialist courses arranged by the University.
- The specialist courses organised from within the university were of great help to us.

**Perseverance**
- Worked on it!
- I have tried to attend all events myself so that there would be a familiar face present.
Just doing it
- We have just gone with what the process, provided what they asked for and continued our own research and ideas
- Stoicism
- Just did
5. What one thing have you learnt about working with a university that you would like to pass on to others?

- **Make use of what's available**
  - Take advantage of everything that is offered
  - A great deal of contacts are available, who can provide advice, even if the people we were in immediate contact with weren't experts in certain areas.
  - Nottingham University have so many resources in many different departments and having those links means they are able to support a wide range of organisations for many different kinds of projects from research to training and support. That the university is supporting community projects means that our projects have a lot more guidance and support and it means they are more likely to be successful and achieve our outcomes.
  - Speak as much as you can with them - ask questions - learn
  - Ask for what you need either physical resources or information. You will be surprised how often you get it.

- **Mutuality**
  - They treat you as equal partners and genuinely want to engage with the local community and their projects.
  - At Nottingham the staff were there to help - not to patronise.
  - That you shouldn't be intimidated by it! The best such relationships are about sharing knowledge, and you may find that you have information you can share with the university, rather than it being a one way street.

- **It takes time**
  - Finding the sweet spot where the energy of a community project meets the research interests of academics takes time.
  - To appreciate that the university staff have busy schedules but will do what they can to help if people are patient and aware of time constraints.
Relationships matter
• It's the people that count! We have developed a very mutual, amicable, trusting relationship. Sarah and Julie provide both a knowledgeable, academic perspective on our Topic (History) plus an 'objective friend' for our Project.
• They aren't all on a higher plane than the rest of us. You can talk to them.
• You can talk to the people there, they aren't aloof!
• Realising the human face of a large institute.

Added value
• It has been a very positive experience and can raise the level of your project beyond an amateur interest
• That it is possible with the right funding to access an otherwise inaccessible area of expertise and technology. Which gives the project an added dimension that engages people in an enjoyable and memorable way.

Other
• The key thing I have learnt is the awareness of one more option on the delivery of high quality local services. Being responsible for several programmes in the local community of Barking and Dagenham and Lewisham on behalf of Catch22, I feel stronger at building on the challenges and successes of the first community university partnership and working out new ideas with the UCL to involve different ages and social groups.
• Not to expect specialist expertise to be available for every aspect of your study
• To do it
• Even though you are the amateurs working with professional, academic researchers you need to be prepared to take full responsibility for running your project - their expertise is not necessarily in project management.
• Do not be afraid in the initial stages of planning your project to ask for things to be explained in very simple terms. Try to think through at the beginning whether your project is realistic.
• You can't do everything yourself. At times you need to delegate tasks and trust the people you are working with.
6. What resources have you found most helpful for your heritage project?

All our Stories: What resources have been most helpful?

“The knowledge and experience of those we have worked with.”

“People”

“Access to different publicity networks and specialist equipment”

“The grant/funding enabled us to undertake activities which we could not otherwise have afforded, but the constant encouragement and assistance of the university representatives gave us the enthusiasm to get on with it!”

Advice
- Advice as required
- The personnel with whom we have had contact who have been able to direct us towards the ‘answer’, whatever that might be.
- The Cambridge Community Heritage Project ran a number of workshops for their AOL projects some of which were very useful to different people involved in our project. We have also had a lot of help and advice from our local authority HER & Archaeology Officer in planning and executing our project activities. Probably the best resource was the ‘on the spot’ involvement of the Cambridge researchers in our four day excavation - we could not have done it without them, and the 30 plus community members who took part learnt so much from them.

Knowledge and expertise
- The knowledge and experience of those we have worked with.
- Access to specialist knowledge
- Two very professional and personable people - who also offer many years of knowledge and experience. It’s great to be able to meet at the University. Not only does it add an edge of status and credibility but they have very good facilities.
- Knowledge from the ‘experts’ - in managing historical objects, messaging and intervention work around the object in order to tell stories and evoke an audience.
- The initial training days delivered at UCL (two full days) for delivery staff and volunteers have been very resourceful and provided useful handouts and guides to ensure a productive storytelling process
- Site monitoring of test pitting. Guidance and training workshops
- The knowledge of the individuals helping us.
- The initial training day was excellent and inspiring. Being linked to a prestigious university raises the profile of the project too. The network of knowledge in a university is very helpful.
Finance
- The grant/funding enabled us to undertake activities which we could not otherwise have afforded, but the constant encouragement and assistance of the university representatives gave us the enthusiasm to get on with it!
- The university funded trip to the National Archives was immensely helpful. It can be an intimidating place to visit for a first timer and having a group trip with guidance from those from the university who were familiar with the NA was invaluable.

Resources
- As we had to include a digital element to the project the technology department, resources and kit we have been able to use has been very helpful.
- Access to different publicity networks and specialist equipment.
- The initial training days delivered at UCL (two full days) for delivery staff and volunteers have been very resourceful and provided useful handouts and guides to ensure a productive storytelling process
- Access to a courier
- People

People
- The Cambridge Community Heritage Project ran a number of workshops for their AOL projects some of which were very useful to different people involved in our project. We have also had a lot of help and advice from our local authority HER & Archaeology Officer in planning and executing our project activities. Probably the best resource was the 'on the spot' involvement of the Cambridge researchers in our four day excavation - we could not have done it without them, and the 30 plus community members who took part learnt so much from them.

Other
- Need to think about this one
- Scran / Personal research and material / published stories and research / camera / access to printing / children's enthusiasm
APPENDIX 2: NOTES FROM MORNING DISCUSSION GROUPS

The following notes were recorded from the different discussions:

**Group 1: Facilitator – Paul McWhirter (AHRC). All our Stories projects**

*Expectation*
- Fulfil everything in the bid and do it well. Connect with communities to show a more positive heritage of the area by working with schools.
- Expectation of support from university team around digital support and dissemination hasn’t happened and won’t unless we do it...

*Challenges*
- AoS timeframe
- HLF objectives in containing projects within a year.
- Practical matters of organising volunteers and the sequencing of activities outside the control of the project team.
- Meeting resistance because we are an emerging company. No previous credibility or history for parents to feel reassured with.
- Middle man not passing on information.
- Not enough community/schools participating. Solution? University offering geo/phys or other excavations which might attract more participation.
- Obtaining timely responses from university partners – owing to congestion of AoS commitments.
• Benefit of partnership with university did not feel proportionate – HLF did not pay for “admin” and partnership development work

**Benefit**

• Universities offer an authenticity and gravitas to our stories projects
• The collaboration allowed us to present our story to a wider audience we otherwise would have had difficulty reaching
• It’s been good having an audience that we otherwise wouldn’t have, had we not been working with the Science Museum
• We developed new skills about telling stories and working with the public because of the partnership (with a museum), since they specialise in dealing with and presenting to public audiences.
• It was good being able to go behind the scenes at the science museum
• We were able to have some “behind the scenes” experiences which enriched our community group’s experience overall.
• We achieved something together which we can show others
• Seeing the capacity and confidence of the group grow
• Positive experience, lots of support throughout all phases of project
• Getting the group to undertake the project and develop their skills/capacity
• HLF advised to liaise with community representative on framing of application questions and breakdown of project budget categories. They are a better representation of project actualities.

**Projects**

• Digging deep: Looking at the mining history of the area beneath and around a city centre cemetery with the expectation of getting more local involvement and activities in this green space.
• Memories of Old Clydach: To provide oral archives of WW2 and 1950s for use in primary and secondary schools
• Toff historical society. Getting society members and the village communities engaged in practical investigation through together pitting to prove/disprove existing texts on the origins of settlement
• History of a community project, sharing stories of trees and connection to Orchard tradition.
• Our project is/was to achieve educational opportunities and communicate with the general public about gender diversity and transgender communities.

**Ownership**

• Check terms and conditions of funding
• It is odd to see our work mentioned in the university publications
• Ownership of research, tied up with emotions and identity – can become a management issue and source of tension
• Partnership agreements - from outset
• Can content be sold? Cannot be sold for profit
• Deposit locations – partners, libraries, museums.
• Partnership agreements may well be ideal but a step too far for small community groups
• Creative Commons licensing a useful way for community projects to start and to address ownership and usage of content

1. The Best Things

• Being in the Science Museum. Good place to collaborate. Readymade and new audience. Interesting place to work/behind the scenes.
• Do stuff you wouldn’t normally do: digs, going places
• Positive links/discovering new things – Jubilee Park!
• Outsider perspective
As the project grows, the project team grows – more engagement and interest
Submerging myself in this project
Support from university, point stuff out to you
More comfortable now with digital skills
Have resources and availability for all the digital issues within community

2. Conditions on the Ground
Steep learning curve – so much information – fascinating but what do we do with it?
Sloppy with their stories
Moving beyond the core group/community group – refreshing
Timeframe: is one year too short? Digging – access, weather, grazing. Things are out of our control. Not enough time (linked to the support) to train people as archaeological diggers.
Report writing and exhibition – trying to find space. Can’t house it, keeping an interest.
Image release consent
Conditions for possibility: Collaboration: co-planning and co-facilitating our sessions

3. Challenges and resolutions
Using QR, digital training, learning a new skill – do they work? Maybe need more research…
Who manages the Early Career Researchers assigned to support community projects? Is it the community partner or the university? This needs to be resolved
In one case, being approached by the university and suddenly finding ourselves part of the project – it felt like it was on the university’s terms and we were a ‘tick box’ to boost their numbers. This needs to be avoided!

Group 2. Facilitator: Karen Brookfield (HLF). University staff

1. Best thing
• Opportunity for chance to help
• Helping community groups – mutual benefits
• Inspiring experience for everyone involved
• Job satisfaction for academic/facilitators/liaisons
• Site specific nature of work – having a workshop on archives in an archive
• Improving the image of universities – not detached from ‘ordinary’ life
• How relevant academics can be actually (not all our heads are stuck up in the clouds all the time)

2. What conditions encourage a fruitful collaboration?

• Open-mindedness/personality/character of academic [entrepreneurial spirit]
• Ability to communicate in plain English
• Availability of funding and more importantly follow-on funding
• Admin support vital!
• A carefully cultivated relationship with a partner (this can take years)
• Short decision making timeframe = good

3. Challenges and stumbling blocks

• Timing – availability of staff at short notice
• Time – personal timetables/fitting in new work. Project management (always more complicated than anticipated). Is everyone available at the same time? Person-specific transferability of relationships

Group 3: Facilitator: Aretha George (HLF) All our Stories Groups

Conditions to create fruitful partnerships

• Local communities and contacts
• Making it easy for community groups to apply
• Time to get together
• Talk to researchers and tease out what is possible
• Work out the scope of the project
• The funding: crucial in providing expert involvement (e.g. archaeologists) that the project relied on
• Setting aside time to do work
• The opportunity to build on previous, smaller-scale projects = longer ambitions
• Working with under- and post-graduates who can do in-depth research (and potentially take the project further in future research agenda)
• Trust and mutual appreciation
• Respect
• Shared interests
• Be clear about what the roles are and what the limitations might be
• One contact in each partnership
• Create and agree a programme delivery plan
• Understand what each partner is bringing to the table and why
• Always evaluate/feedback during the project

Difficulties

• Communication
• Practicalities (distance, travel, work schedules)
• Detail of activity plans
• Researchers times was sometimes unclear
• Structure vs. flexibility
• Provision of facilities by universities was uneven
• Expectations can exceed what is practically possible
• Time to develop partnerships and deliver project
**Best things**

- Opportunity for small arts charities to work with large organisations (Science Museum)
- New audience
- Learning experience of research
- Social organisation = working with uni has given them new ways to deliver their service to the community
- New experiences and often good surprises as a result
- Many relationships won’t finish after the money runs out
- [under your current fourth bullet ‘social organisation’]...and given the universities the opportunity to understand the real needs of the communities

**Group 4. Facilitator: Sue Hanshaw (AHRC). University staff**

**What have we learnt from communities**

- How to open up the university
- The level of knowledge/expertise within the communities
- How to establish relationships internally and externally
- Developing new paradigms
- Fostering an interest in heritage – their enthusiasm was infectious!
- Developing joint research questions – explaining ideas collaboratively
- Groups learning from each other – picking up ideas
- Intangible...
- How to create and environment for co-production

**Benefits**

- Being more public facing
- Excitement and the thrill of community heritage
- Developing new skills
- Working with different ages
- Enabling
- Transformation
- Two way learning
- Learning from each other in teams

**Challenges**

- Diversity of needs
- Different resources/expertise within each community – sometimes assumptions of ways to work
- Managing what we realistically do for each group
- Working out how to be flexible
- Managing timescales of funding. Unable to develop co-research from the outset
- Open expectations from the start
- Positive attitude
  - Excitement
  - Feeling committed
  - Slightly daunting! Levels of interest were higher than expected (managing expectations)
- Unpredictable – responding to groups means not having too many preconceived ideas
- Opportunity to contribute to something new
- Capacity building
  - Collaboration has been a catalyst for capacity building within the university
  - Forming new relationships internally within the University
  - Cross-disciplinary relationships
- Transformation – knock-on effect

**Conditions for fruitful partnerships**
- Helpful to establish dialogue between groups
- Passions, enthusiasm, emotion
- Interfacing between AHRC, HLF and NCCPE could be improved. Better dovetailing.
- Timescales need to be right and match up
- Need a flexible lead in to help foster co-production
- Short turnaround time on AoS projects
- Useful knowing a framework and structure for brokering relationships
- Developing a network between universities
- Institutions pooling interests/expertise
- Sometimes it was useful to build on existing relationships
- University as skill centre? Good and bad outcomes
- We need to be able to input EARLIER to explore conditions for co-production with the groups.

Group 5. Facilitator: Morag Sullivan. (AHRC) University staff

Working together: Best things
- Cross disciplinary – breaking down boundaries between fields/subjects. Created new networks within and beyond universities
- Opportunities for student engagement – research dispersed
- Meeting people who hadn’t worked with universities before – human connection
- Sense of why history matters – how it functions outside academia (political commitment to role of history)
- Training/workshops triggered research ideas – learning from one another (wealth of knowledge in community)
- Changing as researchers – finding our role (and calling)
- Getting out of university

Stumbling blocks
- Cultural and physical distances – universities are not from or for the communities
- Managing co-produced projects
- Capacity in terms of research time
- Sustainability – what do we do when the money runs out?

Conditions
- Longer term commitment e.g. from universities internal funding
- Time to build partnerships
- Flexibility – work with the fluidity/unpredictability of community heritage co-produced projects
- ‘Academic’ flexibility – being prepared to modify your research interests

**Group 6. Facilitator: Kelly Spry-Phare (HLF). University staff**

**Stumbling blocks**
- Opening the doors – challenges
- Already had good groups and work going on – already offering, why more?
- Heritage
  - What is it?
  - Does it put people off? YES
  - Identity/community?
  - Britishness?
- Different approaches to the same topic
- Interpretations – can this undermine the value of the community group’s work? Groups can feel this way
- Would you do it again?
  - Yes!
  - More capacity – project officer (non-academic)
  - Brokerage – outside of university shared goals of partnerships
- Students involvement – treat like job as need commitment
- Reach out to the interested groups but not much to new groups – compounding issue
- Capacity issue
- Expectations of academic jobs ‘We’d love to but we can’t, not part of job’ – non-academic outputs
  - Funding enables this
- No one thought of bringing the community partner universities
  - 3rd sector involvement now more embedded through universities finding partners
- ‘Politics’ between groups, universities, within groups, sensitive over area, patch, subject. Collaborations can be difficult
- Easy to make assumptions about group e.g. community groups – bad term, lumping people together

**What has been the best thing about working together?**
- Feeding into research – different and interesting ways. Invigorating and inspiring
- Enjoyable, good to do – without intellectual justifications
- Developing new skills
- Working with interesting/different groups and heritage topics and themes
- Collaborations with departments/groups

**Conditions for good partnership working**
- Funding!
- Funding/income – respectability, higher up agenda in university
- Specialised skill at the university
  - The university can make a difference to the groups, the groups want access to:
    - Digital modelling
- Building capacity has to be part of this fruitful partnership
- Knowledge is co-produced. Without that understanding, difficult to go forward
- Community engagement is co-production not just dissemination
- Put agenda together
  - One direction/agenda for project
- Two funders meshing together (support)

**Additional notes**
- Digital reconstructions for heritage projects
- Mental health and history
• AHRC communities
• Scottish heritage and links to drama
• Leeds working with ?
• Newcastle University – not sure what to expect
• Good experience of community
• Wider outreach
• Hard to research
• Follow on funding
• Balance/academic/community engagement
• How to do new stuff? Public engagement
• Keep up academic research
• Capacity
• Project officer needed if f/t academic especially if hard to reach
• Not universally accepted within the university
• Influence of senior managers
• Enriches research
• Impact agenda – case study
• What are universities for?
• More interest in the wider community – higher up agenda now
• Research – practical value, income generation
• Wellcome funding and public engagement + research
• Not joined u thinking
• Community engagement in a silo – not sustainable
• Embedded in research

Group 7. Facilitator: Steven Barlow. (HLF) All Our Stories group

Best things about working together
• 1st time applicants
• For knowledge
• Named contact
• New opportunities to work together
• Support
• Partnership
• Training
• Skills and knowledge
• Legitimacy
• Networking
• Training you wouldn’t have accessed otherwise
• Access to tech knowledge
• Serendipity

Conditions
• Access to expertise/skills at universities
• Respect, mutual
• Don’t know that there was such a need
• Enthusiasm of universities
• Money

Challenges
• HLF
  o How to acknowledge your grant – too long for AoS
  o Timetable challenge for working with schools
One of timetable
- Simplify for people, list all requirements such as you need someone with digital expertise on community group and why
- Helpline not helpful
- Supply physical HLF signage or detail better instructions for budget
- More guidance, how to cost projects etc.
- Didn’t see PR before issued
- Period between decision and announcement not helpful
- HLF funded similar projects in same area
- The provision of a case worked to discuss project was excellent, perhaps to make the application process easier, a similar case worker could be provided?
- More help with working out costing. How do you get wider community participation? Forms are too off putting for some
- Clarity for AoS applicants on the way that the ? between universities and AoS grant holders were intended to work, should be more explicit

- Other
  - Need to be realistic academic Vs. volunteers
  - Capacity to support universities
  - Sometimes underestimate who they are dealing with (academic)

**Group 8. Facilitator: Hattie Allsop. (AHRC)**

*Best thing?*
- Seeing projects emerge/evolve from ideas to concrete and achievable outcomes
- Inter-group connections made; exchange info/ideas (use workshops and one-to-one sessions) learn from each other
- Range of people engaged – old/young; use archaeology to build relationships
- Privilege to be part of projects – help support/focus them (add skills/context/contacts)
- Interdisciplinary and work with new academic partners – make ‘impact’ real/tangible

*Conditions*
- Community groups with some knowledge/connection with universities or an idea they wanted to work with a university on
- Publicise assets/archives which university can offer to community groups
- Infrastructure – administrative support also a stumbling block if this isn’t available
- Funding support/partnerships
- Open-ended frameworks for working (flexible, time to listen/respond to developments and the unexpected)

*Stumbling blocks*
- Timescales – AOS v R4CH (+ academic year)
- AOS as a brand – already up and running
- Knowing who to approach (list of AOS winners/grant-holders)
- Funding the demand!
- Geographical demand variable: some areas had lots of groups/R4CH, some were isolated/sole R4CG
- Infrastructure – administrative support. A stumbling block if this isn’t available
- Disappointing expectations

**Group 9. Facilitator: Jill Mustard. (AHRC) University staff**

- Challenge traditional authority and knowledge – whose knowledge is valuable
- Opportunity for critical reflection – develop professional practice
- Seeing community confidence grow – people who have had no access or engagement with higher education/ research
• Parachuting in
• Sustainable relationships with (some of) the group
• Curators/ research staff seeing benefit of community partnerships
• Opportunity to work with other disciplines/organisations
• Groups own their projects – their grants, their decisions
• New ideas and directions – perhaps unexpected
• Transferable skills
• Time – short project. Large number of groups spread over wide research area
• Delayed start to follow-on funding – lost groups – trust
• Geography
• Community expectations
• Embedding engagement across organisations
• How to support development post-funding
• Ethical challenge – can we maintain community partnerships? What happens now?

Comment from Jill after the event:

‘On the whole the group considered that this call was one which challenged the traditional notion of where knowledge was held and who owns it and research was carried out. The group considered working with community groups to be a success particularly when the majority of communities grew in confidence and took forward further research themselves. They considered that they were fortunate that they had ‘buy-in’ from communities involved and that they were accepted as there to help and not just being ‘parachuted-in’ to do some work and leaving them to it. One of the major challenges identified was continuing support for these groups when the funding ended and identified that universities should be looking to embed public engagement into all research projects and consolidating work that has taken place in communities. Some of the group considered that a major challenge was losing the trust of groups due to the different time scales involved in getting funding notified and the difficulties of managing expectations. Working over a large geographical area was also challenging and they found that most groups were looking for and responded better to face-to-face support’.
APPENDIX 3: REFLECTIONS

The following reflections were recorded on flipcharts before delegates left.

What’s inspired you?

- Beetroots on the wall of Tesco in Toxteth
- Seeing the great range of projects (food for thought)
- Gooseberry archive
- Using AoS to engage a wider group with town history
- The enthusiasm of volunteers
- Very proud of my son Michael helping Huddersfield Uni
- The idea of a challenge fund for groups to ??? ideas/money
- Finding out third hand that one of our community heritage partners value us so much 😊
- Passion for people and community
- Community groups may help to give a great sense of belonging
- People’s passion for using new technology to explore the past
- Seeing a performance by prisoners based on research I had done
- Fascinating people, inspiring ideas, important work
- Town trail app
- Loved the apple tasting with Shannon
- Involving the often excluded
- Weaving musical threads
- Learnings about steam railway heritage project was inspiring
- Really cool and interesting – a part of heritage it never occurred to me to explore
- Opportunities for further (bigger) projects – the activity so far has acted as a catalyst
- Enthusiasm and passion for the project

What you’ve learnt

- Spending time networking
- How to do a range of IT things
- Inspired by the way many projects are working to exact some social change. To help either those ? with dementia/disaffected children etc
- Archaeology teaches you the value of Zen
- Pig’s snout, sheep’s nose, slack-ma-girdle = Somerset Apple variety
- 3D modelling of buildings good idea
- More control over managing project
- I used the Aurasma App
- Connections between historical theme and current time eg experiences of being a refugee
- The idea of holding a big conference to bring together groups at an early stage

Great quotes

- Key word reciprocal
- Expect the unexpected
- We’re not just researching heritage we’re creating it
• It’s the people that make the difference
• [We are ready for Research for Community Heritage phase 2] “We have the technology”
• Loved the idea of WW1 mapping in Bristol
• How community projects can really excite and inspire disadvantaged people in a community
• “It’s not about university and community, it’s about people”
• “Who am I?”
• We have the technology and the will
• Learning from the difference and leading by example!
• “More personal and engaging than a text book”
• “Doing it on an industrial scale”
• We want to make more space for us in the institution
• “How do you keep a project going when it runs out of money?” Well what is the answer to that?

Ideas you’ve loved

• The University of Sheffield Heritage Jamboree sounds great!
• Mobile phone app with short films
• ‘Hacking’ disrupting accepted understands, re-imagining
• Dancestry
• Idea for the next generation project
• The diversity of projects and what they all achieved
• How problems are similar over a large range of projects
• I loved the diversity of projects
• Swapping ideas and coming up with innovative future projects
• The importance of dialogue between communities
• The Challenge Fund is a great idea
APPENDIX 4: OPEN SPACE NOTES

1. Cultivating relationships (Hattie)

- Recognition of the knowledge/skills of community projects – knowledge transfer into universities
- Wider university support (“culture” fairly critical)
- Dilemma of whether (or how) to continue working with community projects that haven’t received Lottery funding
- Managing multiple relationships – becoming “victims of own success” (resourcing too many projects).
- Tailoring inputs and support as needs arise
- Accessible information about HLF funded projects – to support universities to make connections and vice versa
- Brokerage process – bringing together – community projects with the ‘right’ research team (“matching”)
- Local regional HLF workers played an important role in one area

Notes from Bryony Enright

- Sometimes there is an issue that the community partners want a relationship with the university that the PIs can’t manage – they expect too much.
- Funding can create exclusions – some of the projects that didn’t get funded the university has tried to include in some of the events but this is difficult
- With fluidity and flexibility comes misunderstandings and relationships can become difficult
- Trust is so important – what if that is lost, people can be left behind
- Is there a risk of the university filling the space or taking the place of other institutions – eating into other institutional bodies

2. Legacy/Legacies (Jill Mustard)

- Community groups ‘abandoned’ or without funded HEI support
- The web as a means of maintaining relationships?
- Loss of ‘expert’ ie ECRs as conduits between HEI and community groups (first port of call/gateway to expertise)
- Co-production as a future model/priority for funding
- Part of what HEI should be doing – tie into continuing commitment to community engagement
- Community groups that inspire universities and others through developing relationships

Comments from Jill after the event

“This group considered it important to celebrate what has already been achieved. They considered that one of the main areas for consideration was how to maintain the data/research etc that has been produced and who should be doing that. They considered that the resources created as part of this call needed to be embedded within communities at different levels, schools, interest groups, councils etc. Relationships with the communities was important as the academic members of this group acknowledged the work done by communities fed into their own research areas in different ways. The main concern was the delay in getting further funding to continue the work already done and the possible loss of the main contacts with community groups as they may move onto their next contract eg ECRs. Another concern was the loss of infrastructure support with the reduction in funding for local libraries and museums. Academic members of the group discussed how they can help prevent the knowledge from being lost and how the research materials produced can feed into academic outputs and co-produced research projects.”

Notes from Bryony Enright
• What do we do with the information we have produced/colllected
• How does legacy differ from sustainability? Legacy is about celebrating what you have done and what has happened, not necessarily what is to come.
• How do we get a long-term engagement from the community so that they can take up the project and take it forward in the future?
• Legacy has to be divers (not just backing up data on the computer or on a shelf). Legacy has to be usable, needs to be cultivating continued links.
• What if the PI or RA leaves (goes to a different job), risk that all relationships are lost with that person
• Should the university be funding this, is this part of the public engagement strategy.
• Also have to think about the academic legacy
• Important to build legacy into practice of the project from the beginning.
• There is a remaining legacy in the relationships that develop through the projects
• We need to think creatively about legacy but at the same time stuff does need to be stored and archived properly – where do we put the stuff we have created?

3. Sharing Learning (Sophie Duncan)

• Keep partnership working “can go far if you work together”
• Case studies of individual experience/lessons learnt, how to/practicalities share the learning from individuals
• Revolving relationships
• Interactions between people
• “Don’t always need funding”

What happens to case studies:

• NCCPE Community Partner Network
• Digital case studies: websites, documentary films, YouTube, podcasts [outputs]
• HLF digital record
• Successful case studies, what worked
• What would be the framework of the case study
• Bullet points – what would you need to know? [Top tips] – NCCPE
• What role does social media play? Careful – does it work/resources

Notes from Bryony Enright

• Limited time made it hard to do much output with the community partners – it would have been nice to be able to design some case studies about how to work together with your community partner
• Try and do more films, more podcasts, visible accessible outputs.
• Language is important – using the same language, same meanings.
• Some of the Community Partners have been to university and this is a way of them giving back to the university they went to, they want to be part of the university community again.
• Appreciating expertise as opposed to experts

4. Models of working

• Risk of universities moving into others’ space (eg existing infrastructure organisations) and displacing them and their income sources
- Single point of contact in university and single point of contact in community group
- Time to establish relationships before having to define closely areas for collaboration
- Agreeing expectations/objectives – realism
  - Understand where group starts from
  - Understand what university can/can’t bring
- Personal relationships are key (and grow and widen networks) and create resilience and self-sustaining networks

5. **Ownership**

- Intellectual property rights, copyright, outputs of the project (who do they belong to), terms and conditions of award, direction of project
- Emotional investment in the project can lead to a sense of ownership especially if you are using research or experience from previous work – need to have partnership agreements and a framework of understanding
- Creative commons licencing can be very useful

6. **Remote working in a dispersed group (Scotland and Northern Ireland)**

- Remote, at the edge – how to make sure this doesn’t lead to dissidence. Personal connections are important and geography can make these difficult to develop
- There needs to be further allowances and subsidies within the funding to take account of remote groups
- Advantages: have to bring their community partners together which means they can talk to one another and learn from one another
- More enabling and facilitating role of the uni – the community partners have to rely on themselves and each other a bit more
- When you do have a meeting the are really productive ad you want to make sure something will come of them
APPENDIX 5: Notes from the rapporteurs.

Three rapporteurs were invited to provide their reflections on the event at the end of the day – to identity the most striking learning and to identify key themes that had emerged from the various conversations

Notes by Rapporteur: Claire Adler

Listening across the Summit there seemed to be a number of key words that were coming out, and as a result there were a number of questions set that were not necessarily resolved.

New - Audiences.

New - Participation.

New - Opportunities.

New - Experiences.

All as a result of the project.

Change - the way we research.

Change - the way we work.

Change - our confidence [in a positive way].

Learn - peer-to-peer learning.

Learn - 'the University recognised that they had expertise but were not necessarily the experts'.

Learn - there was a discussion that the university brings skills and the community groups bring experience. There was a feeling that there was a skills exchange.

Learn - 'huge learning curve'.

People - new contacts.

People - communications. There is still a need for face-to-face meetings. People want to see faces, particularly in the preliminary stages of a project. Email doesn't always work. Therefore there needs to be extensive travel expenses.

People - the opportunities for intergenerational work was well received.

People - people rather than heritage is at the core of the projects. They boil down to what is of interest to the individuals and how well they work together.

People - what is community spirit? Will it always be a subset of the larger community?

People - there is enormous enthusiasm from both communities and universities.

Time - the timescales were not consistent. Several projects felt that their project could have been improved if the funding for both the university and community elements had been funded simultaneously.
Time - some community groups would like flexibility in terms of timescales; so that the project does not have to be completed by a set time. If there is some spare budget they would like to have the flexibility to spend it after the end of the period of the project, ie to carry out an archaeological dig the following spring.

Time - not all projects were seen as discreet projects with a start and end date as they were integrated into the work of the University.

Relationships - long term relationships.

Relationships - short term relationships.

Relationships - the difficulties of partners working together and having to clarify roles and expectations from the outset. Discussions about Partnership Agreements, there needs to be some training and examples of Partnerships Agreements.

Planning - some projects had an HLF style Activity Plan, the one that was monthly was found to be too cumbersome in development and delivery but some form of Activity Planning was deemed important.

Planning - universities need to be explicit about how much time and resources they can give the projects.

Planning - flexibility - funders must be aware that it may all change, someone may come along with fabulous new ideas that change the project at the last minute.

Confusion - whether they had a grant from AoS or R4CH?

Confusion - didn’t realise there as a link between HLF, R4CH and NCCPE.

Confusion - who is the grantee? Is it the principal fundraiser or the participant?

Funding - the problem of project funding when organisations want and need core funding to continue their work.

Funding - some would have preferred it to be joint funded and then they could develop the project together.

Funding - feedback is needed about why some projects didn’t get funding, so organisations can learn for next time.

Funding - trying to integrate work with communities into the core purpose of the museum/university so therefore can continue working with groups without being reliant on project funding.

Funding - should the project manager be paid?

Rules - the rules for handling objects in museums are ‘frustrating’.

Rules - ‘how can you measure intangible outcomes?’

Cuts - ‘we are going to give our material to the local library, but it is being closed down.’
Cuts - 'we were going to give it to the local museum but it was going to be closed down. So we have helped them in their campaign to stay open'.

Cuts - 'I only know that I have a contract until July.'

Questions left unanswered:

Are most of the projects in small communities? I.e. in small villages or distinct communities in large villages? Are projects successful in engaging with medium sized communities?

Does the legacy mean co-production or will it revert to a more traditional academic partnership?

Conclusion:

Is there or should there be a toolkit for how community groups should/ could develop a heritage project, to cover Activity Planning, Partnership Agreements, communication strategies, volunteer roles, digital records, storing heritage for future generations.
This is a short summary of my impressions and observations of the Research for Community Heritage Summit.

Overall impressions

The summit was a very positive experience for all of those who took part. Although NCCPE, HLF and AHRC wanted the All Our Stories partners to reflect on the challenges that they had faced and shared learning, there was a celebratory atmosphere amongst the participants, who were proud of their achievements. However, useful information about lessons learnt was identified and shared. My key question of the day was:

‘why are you not using existing funding sources (rather than the All Our Stories funding) to do this work anyway?’

The collective answer seemed to be that many participants had were unaware of how existing HLF and AHRC funding could be used and didn’t realise the flexibility that exists within these programmes.

Enabling a change in relationships

It soon became clear that one of the main outcomes of All Our Stories project was that it had enabled a positive change in relationships between universities and communities as a result of their shared experiences in delivering their projects.

Some benefits observed......

The community partners valued the expertise, rigour and framework that the universities applied to their projects. They also valued the technical and IT expertise brought by their university partners, as well as their interpretation skills, e.g. in archaeology projects.

The university partners valued the opportunity to work more closely with the community without the need to justify the time spent and perceived worth of this activity to other university colleagues and managers, and the development of interdisciplinary teams to support their community work. The universities were also amazed at how much knowledge exists in the community.

Developing a shared language

The All Our Stories partners were able to develop a shared language during their work together. I thought that this area would present a difficult challenge for the partners. The word ‘heritage’ did provide problems for all the partners. One university did say that initially how they presented information and communicated with groups had proved to be ‘unhelpful’. However these challenges had been acknowledged and overcome. The community groups felt that the universities helped them to interpret the HLF bidding process.

Developing shared approaches

The community groups did not raise any issues around having to learn how to work with their university partners. However some of the university partners did discuss the challenges that they faced when first working with the community groups. These challenges included sensitivities around the ‘ownership’ of the communities’ local history, dealing with gatekeepers and community leaders and challenging personalities, and navigating community politics and influences.

General comments about sustainability (notes from the table discussion)

Notable themes that emerged during the table discussion were:
The desire for funding cycles lasting up to 5 years
When asked if the universities would ‘guarantee’ to continue working and engaging with communities in the same way if they were simply given the money to do so and funding cycles were removed? After much discussion it was felt that this could work if the universities were given ring-fenced funding for this.

Projects last longer than the project funding
There was a sense of frustration that so much more work could be done after the project funding had ended.

Organic vs. farmed
Although everyone agreed that there were enormous benefits to be gained from collaboration, it was felt that projects should be able develop additional partners and activities organically. The project partners believed that any funding streams which forced collaboration could be counter-productive and lead to increased tensions between project partners.

The lack of digital preservation facilities for community groups was discussed as well.

The need for an overall programme evaluation to ensure that all of the learning was widely shared, rather than allowing all of the partners to produce their own evaluations which may not be disseminated as widely.

All Our Stories – Community Partners: sustainability and funding
None of the community groups (that I observed) said that they would have applied to HLF through its open programmes, and believed that the additional project shaping support given by the universities was essential for their funding success. All of the community partners were concerned about sustainability, and yet none of them were preparing bids to HLF.

All Our Stories – University Partners
Rather like the community partners, the university partners also felt that the All Our Stories funding was essential to the projects, and many were unaware that they could apply to the existing AHRC and HLF open programmes to continue with this work, despite concerns about sustainability.

The difficult questions
Throughout the day I posed ‘difficult questions’ to the participants, either to test my own assumptions, gain further information or to stimulate debate in certain areas.

Some of these difficult questions were:

- Why didn’t you apply to HLF anyway?
- How did you develop a common language? Were there many ‘faucet – tap’ incidents?
- Was this a real and equal partnership (asked to community groups)?
- If funding cycles were removed and the monies were incorporated into university core funding, could universities (as grantees) guarantee that their work with communities would continue in the same was and as equal partnerships?

My summing up
I felt that the day was an extremely positive experience and that all of the projects were very interesting. It seemed that All Our Stories had shone a light on the ability for universities and community groups to work together and find future funding streams to continue this work.
I hadn’t thought that it would be possible to develop a shared language, but that the project partners had been able to do this, and had communicated with each other extremely well during the programme.

I had found hearing about All Our Stories extremely inspiring and that I greatly admired what had been achieved.
Notes from Rapporteur 3: Bryony Enright

Notes on Research for Community Heritage summit

**Morning**

Discussion of shared learning from the HLF/AHRC experiment – 2 funders working together.

Chatting to Olivia Burgess she said that the finding had helped her clarify some of the ideas that she had about what she wanted to do. She had a lot of ideas and when the opportunity to get funding arose she was able to pin some of these down so they were more concrete and clear. She said that she put a lot of time and effort into the project and wanted to really get a lot done: “I always say I did a Tesco value project, I did everything for that £10,000, I did everything”.

What was a project highlight for you?

- This is pioneering research which has forced both community groups and academics to think about new ways of working.
- Meeting new people – all the people we have worked with have been fantastic
- Meeting great people from the university
- Working on such a strong team effort
- Finding an easier way for people to apply for funding (from AHRC)

**Speeches from:**

*Karen Brookfield:*

- This was an experiment in collaboration with the AHRC
- Michael Wood was inspirational – “all projects should have a Michael Wood”
- Initially there were 1069 applicants – they needed more than £1 million funding it became £4.5 million and 539 AOS projects were funded
- The ideas is that the practical outcomes of these projects and their legacy will feed into further funding ideas

*Sue Hanshaw:*

- This project has pulled together research processes and communities through positive commitment and good will.
- The diversity of models, methods and projects has been phenomenal

*Jenny – NCCPE:*

- Some of the projects have been built around existing relationships but a lot are new relationships which is really exciting – this is also where the NCCPE can help, they can make these relationships run smoother
- Hopefully one of the legacies of the AOS and R4CH projects will be even better projects in the future

Notes from table discussions split between AOS projects and R4CH reflecting on three things:

1) The best thing about working together
2) What has most encouraged/facilitated partnerships
3) Challenges/stumbling blocks
First table: R4CH (Sue Hanshaw facilitating)

Best things:

- Initial expectations: open, exciting, positive attitude, trepidation, daunting, who will we meet and how many people will want to work with us?
- There were so many different attitudes to the work
- Some of them ran workshops to find out about each other’s expectations.
- Managing expectations was important
- Working outside the university in a structured way was new to a lot of them and allowed them to draw in new projects and work across other departments. Some of the relationships built within the university were very product and one of the best parts of the project – they found people that they didn’t know existed, this was interdisciplinary – but require capacity building.
- Capacity building: capacity within the university to work with partners outside the academy or across disciplines wasn’t there in a lot of cases.
- This has been transformational it has allowed them to apply for other awards off the back of this, they have also been approached by other community partners.
- It has built new connections inside and outside the uni – allowing them to work with an even wider range of community partners.

Challenges:

- Diversity, range and types of people – syncing up with them is hard: “some of the don’t even have email but in other ways they are streets a head of us”
- Often this is not the community partner’s main job so you have to be flexible with time and resources (meeting them at the weekend)
- Hard to manage expectations and what the university could actually support – careful about what we promise.
- Sometimes they missed out on being involved from the beginning because of the way the funding for AOS and R4CH was structured and this fragmented the relationships a little

Plusses:

- Taking us into new areas that we wouldn’t have been able to work in or understand before
- People have been interested in the university helping them – “that’s what really gets me out of bed in the morning” – Douglass Cawthorne
- It is exciting and thrilling to be working with people who are doing stuff with communities.
- Skill exchange – but also going further than offering skills, there is real value added through interaction and our intervention made the project better for example by making people think about ethics, developing the legacy of the project, making it more useful, sustainable.

Second table: R4CH (Morag Sullivan facilitating)

Challenges:

- Managing expectations
- Management of the project – who takes control, who is responsible for the projects, sometimes the named person on the bid is not fully invested and there is no one in the academy of the community partner that is willing to take full ownership/responsibility
- Projects can be messy

Stumbling blocks:
Implications of people’s time – things take longer than expected, getting people to commit is not easy it can hinder co-production. One solution is to involve undergrads and post-grads but this comes with its own issues. E.g.: students lose enthusiasm, can be unreliable, end up spending a lot of time managing them, increases risk but not involving them goes against rhetoric of widening involvement and employability. Some people found that the work placement method worked well as a way of getting the undergrads to commit.

One of the student researchers round the table found that the community partners were a bit untrusting of him – they thought he was checking up in them and they wanted to know if they had done alright in their interviews. In this case he found he had no authority but a lot of responsibility.

Third Table R4CH (Hattie Allsop facilitating)

Stumbling blocks:

- Insufficient funds – doing it again they would have put more apps into HLF, more money.
- Issues of raising expectations amongst the community partners
- There needs to be more flexibility in the projects and in the funding – academics work to the academic year – very bust around September, would be good if this was accounted for. Maybe it would be good to have open ended frameworks for working – appreciating that there is no one size fits all for projects.

Conditions of engagement:

- Engagement was more likely if the likely if the community partner had an idea of what universities do – often they ended up only working with people who wanted to work with them – maybe it would have been better if there was some way of advertising the resources available to the community partners.
- When there was an administrator budgeted into the project this made engagement a lot easier – in a lot of cases earlier career researchers or PhD students could do this but it is a lot of work if the PI is left to do all of this especially if there are a large number of community partners. If not the PIs ended up putting a lot of time into this “the AHRC got a bargain because of the amount of time we put into this” (Richard Morris – Huddersfield).
- Having only a year has been a good thing because it means there is an end point – can manage exit strategy

Main points from each table:

- Interdisciplinarity – cross working, highlighting the benefits of this for other colleagues
- Working with community partners can change how you view your role as a researcher and how you do things
- Supports opportunities to network with university colleagues
- Working with community groups – building their confidence and realisation of their own skills (but challenge of maintaining the relationships – thinking about how to keep it going) – See NCCPE guide
- Building new relationships peer-to-peer learning and reciprocal relationships
- Exciting catalyst – other things happen because of a result of this project
- Everything about the projects has been new; new experiences, audiences, working
- Challenging but valuable – has been had to fit into the tangible output of the university, it is hard to do this work in the current university structure.
- Range of experiences is great, not all of the AOS had the same experience
- Miss match on time of project and logistics
- Opportunities as a way of learning
- Appreciation and genuine thanks.
- Exciting, new career paths, feeding down to the new early career researchers – they are able to do great research.