Universities engaging with society: the UK story
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Setting the scene: the policy context for public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>Research in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>Strategic leadership of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>Taking stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Setting the scene: the policy context
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Irrelevant and out of touch with society?

Secretive and untrustworthy?

Unaccountable & a waste of tax payers’ money?

Elitist and reinforcing inequality?
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Irrelevant and out of touch with society?

Secretive and untrustworthy?

Unaccountable & a waste of tax payers’ money?

Elitist and reinforcing inequality?
The NCCPE seeks to support a culture change in universities. Our vision is of a higher education sector making a vital, strategic and valued contribution to 21st-century society through its public engagement activity.
Manchester Beacon
connecting people, place & knowledge

The Beacons for Public Engagement are funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England and Research Councils UK in association with the Wellcome Trust, the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales and the Scottish Funding Council.
Irrelevant and out of touch with society?

Secretive and untrustworthy?

Unaccountable & a waste of tax payers’ money?

Elitist and reinforcing inequality?
Connected and relevant
Engaged and open

Partnersing for mutual benefit
Problem-solving with society
Do you recognise these pressures and opportunities?
What is similar and what is different in your context?
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PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WITH RESEARCH
Actively involving the public in the research activity of the institution

KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE & SHARING
Increasing the two-way flow of knowledge and insight between the university and wider society

ENGAGED TEACHING
Developing teaching activities which positively impact on the community, and enhance students’ engagement skills

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
Seeking to maximise the benefits that the institution can generate for the public

The engaged university
Funding research

Pathways to Impact
Public Engagement with Research: the RCUK perspective

Professor John Womersley
Chief Executive, STFC
and
RCUK Public Engagement with Research Champion
Research Councils UK (RCUK):

Our focus is on research excellence with impact
What is “Public Engagement with Research”?

**Definition:** “The myriad of ways in which the activity and benefits of research can be shared with the public”.

Engagement is a **two-way process**, involving interaction and listening, with the goal of generating **mutual benefit**.
The benefits of Public Engagement with Research: examples from the RCUK perspective

Public Engagement with Research

- Empowers
- Enriches attitudes
- Influence the direction of research
- Act as informed citizens
- Inspires the next generation of researchers
- Improve research (quality and impact)
- Support the future research base
- Benefit from fresh perspectives and insights
- Improved transferable skills
- Securing funding
- Networking opportunities
- Data collection
- Enjoyment
- Awareness of ethical impacts

Public

Researchers

Schools
The RCUK PER vision

Our vision is:

• to help society *value* research processes and outputs

• to *increase the societal and business impact of research* by creating a culture where:
  
  • researchers themselves value public engagement, and in turn are valued for the public engagement they deliver
  
  • an awareness of social and ethical issues is one of the factors routinely informing research development.

• for public engagement to be part of what *inspires young people* to become interested in research and research careers
Individual Councils’ Programmes

Example of STFC:

UK activities on CERN and the Higgs Boson reached 26 million people

2 million reached face-to-face including 300,000 school children and 17,500 teachers
Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research

A clear statement of support for Public Engagement

Ensures that researchers involved in PE are supported, recognised and valued
Embracing structural and cultural change:
Embedding and signposting PER across the sector

RCUK aim: Stimulating a reflexive and responsive research community that engages the public within the research process

  - Building capacity for PE through support, recognition and reward.

- The **Catalysts Initiative** (2012-2015);
  - Embed PER within policies, procedures and practices

- **Catalysts Seed Fund** (2015-2016); 10 “seed” Catalysts

- The **National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE)**
  - Managing and co-ordinating initiatives
  - PE training and resources
  - Annual Engage competition and conference
Capacity Building: School programmes, public dialogue and support for researchers

RCUK aim: “To secure and sustain a supply of future researchers and enable the next generation to act as informed and involved citizens”

• The **School-University Partnerships Initiative** (2013-2016): 12 HEIs
  • Schools programmes; Teacher CPD, online teaching resources, student research placements.

RCUK aim: “Enabling public views to inform policies and research strategies across Research Councils and the broader community”

• **Public Dialogue**
  • Ensures transparency and enables public views to shape policy and future research

RCUK aim: “Stimulating a reflexive and responsive research community that engages the public within the research process”

• **Supporting researchers and skills development**
  • The PE component of the [Vitae Research Development Framework](#)
Public Engagement in research proposals: Pathways to Impact

- Funding applications must include a statement on the potential economic and social impact of research, via a Pathway to Impact statement.

- Public Engagement activities can improve the quality and impact of research and so are a valued Pathway to Impact.

- Public Engagement can occur during, before or at the end of a grant.

- Researchers can also request resources to fund these public engagement activities.
To conclude:

- Public engagement is an integral part of research with benefits in terms of enhancing research quality and impact.

- Public engagement with research brings significant benefits to researchers, universities and to the public.

- RCUK is committed to engaging the public with research and supporting researchers and research organisations in this endeavour.
Thank you for listening
Did anything surprise you?

How do your research funders incentivise social engagement?
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PUBLİC ENGAGEMENT WITH RESEARCH
Actively involving the public in the research activity of the institution

KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE & SHARING
Increasing the two-way flow of knowledge and insight between the university and wider society

ENGAGED TEACHING
Developing teaching activities which positively impact on the community, and enhance students’ engagement skills

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
Seeking to maximise the benefits that the institution can generate for the public

The engaged university
Steven Hill
Head of Research Policy, HEFCE
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Public engagement and HEFCE

Dr Steven Hill
Head of Research Policy
UK Research Funding System
Apply for funding

RCUK Pathways to impact

‘consider potential beneficiaries and the future pathways towards impact from their research from inception’

Submit research for assessment

Research Excellence Framework

‘recognise universities achievements in terms of impacts from excellent research’
Overall quality

Outputs
- Maximum of 4 outputs per researcher
  - 65%

Impact
- Template and case studies
  - 20%

Environment
- Template and data
  - 15%
For the purposes of the REF, **research** is defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared.

**Impact** is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia.

- ‘**reach**’ (how widely the impact has been felt)
- ‘**significance**’ (how much difference was made to the beneficiaries)
# Indicators of Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts on society, culture and creativity</th>
<th>Economic impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Visitor or audience numbers and feedback.</td>
<td>• Jobs created or protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of public debate in the media or other fora.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of sustained and on-going engagement with a group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measures of increased attainment and/or measures of improved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts on practitioners and professional services</th>
<th>Impacts on the environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Traceable references by practitioners to research papers that describe their use and the impact of the research.</td>
<td>• Traceable impacts on particular projects or processes which bring environmental benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documented case-specific improvements to environment-related issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>policy and services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Documented evidence of policy debate (for example, in Parliament, the media, material produced by NGOs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Search REF Impact Case Studies

Browse the index below or search all Case Studies using keywords [e.g. “NHS”].

Learn about advanced search options [here](http://impact.ref.ac.uk/CaseStudies/).
6975 impact case studies

447 about public engagement
Public engagement case studies by panel
Impact related resources

The nature, scale and beneficiaries of research impact
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/analysisREFimpact/

Impact case studies database – download case studies and interrogate them
http://impact.ref.ac.uk/CaseStudies/

Preparing impact submissions for REF 2014: An evaluation (findings and observations)
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/Independentresearch/2015/
REF,impact,submissions/REF_impact_prep_process-findings.pdf

Assessing impact submissions for REF 2014: An evaluation
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/Independentresearch/2015/
REF,impact,submissions/REF_assessing_impact_submissions.pdf

REF2014 site – guidance documents, including sections on impact assessment
www.ref.ac.uk

REF 2014 Panel overview reports
http://www.ref.ac.uk/panels/paneloverviewreports/
2. Research in public: opening up research
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History and heritage

Caer heritage project

Know your Bristol

Postman’s Park

Art, design and culture

Prison reading groups

Interactive sensory objects

STEM

Deadinburgh

Marine Connections

Objects of invention
Health and wellbeing

Established projects

Sugar
Dance for Parkinson’s
Parasite infection

Danceroom spectroscopy
Conker tree science
Bright Club

Individual-led projects

Celestial sirens
Hospice volunteers
EcoCentrix
Collaboration

Focus on the positive  
Creating connections  
Parasites in Botswana

Engaging with young people

What if?  
Dreams of low carbon...  
Erica the Rhino
‘Health’ category finalists

You can view all of the competition finalists’ films here: http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/work-with-us/competition/competition-finalists
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Responsible research and innovation: opening up science

Funded by RCUK, The UK Higher Education funding councils and the Wellcome Trust
Richard Owen
University of Exeter
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Engaging with Science and Innovation: A Global Responsibility

Prof Richard Owen
University of Exeter Business School
Innovation creates futures...

in some times profound, complex and global ways.......
Want to mimic a volcano to combat global warming? Launch a Wembley-size balloon

Monster blimp would fire water into atmosphere
Scientists hope droplets can reflect the sun’s heat

John Vidal
Environment editor

It sounds barmy, audacious or sci-fi: a tethered balloon the size of Wembley stadium suspended 20km above Earth, linked to the ground by a giant garden hose pumping hundreds of tonnes of minute chemical particles a day into the thin stratospheric air to reflect sunlight and cool the planet.

But a team of British academics will later this month formally announce the first step towards creating an artificial volcano by going ahead with the world’s first major “geo-engineering” field test in the next few months. The ultimate aim is to mimic the cooling effect volcanoes have when they inject particles into the stratosphere that bounce some of the sun’s energy back into space, so preventing it from warming the Earth and diminishing the effects of man-made climate change.

Before the full-sized system can be deployed, the research team will test a scaled-down version of the balloon-and-hose design. Backed by a £1.6m government grant and the Royal Society, the team will send a balloon to a height of 10km over an undisclosed location. It will pump nothing more than water into the air, but it will allow climate scientists and engineers to gauge the feasibility of the plan. Ultimately, they aim to test the impact of sulphates and other aerosol particles sprayed directly into the stratosphere.

So imagine how big a helium balloon you need to hold several double-decker buses.
Stratosphere (15-50km)

Diagram: Balloon Supported Aramid Reinforced Pipe
- Design Pressure: 6000 Bar
- 6000 bar Design Pressure
- 125 m/s Jet Streams
- 55 m/s Design Windspeeds
- 16.5 cm od pipe, 5 cm id
- SO2 flow: 120 kg/s
- ~ 3 M Te/yr
Questions, dilemmas, uncertainties
Wider risks and distribution
Unanticipated consequences
Eternal experiment with nature
Political constitution
Motivation
Who has control
etc..etc.....
How can we collectively engage with, and shape, the futures science and innovation seek to create?

How do we empower social agency in technological choices?

What kind of future do we want science and Innovation to bring into the world?
Science, technologies and innovation are often socially, politically and culturally entangled…

Unintentionally… or by design
How can we collectively engage with the social, political and ethical dimensions of science and innovation?

In a way that is inclusive....

and responsive
Science and Innovation are unpredictable, uncertain and ambiguous....

They present questions and dilemmas as well as opportunities and solutions
Innovation of asset backed securities – collateralised debt obligations (ABS-CDO’s)
How should we proceed under conditions of uncertainty, ignorance and plurality?

Where good intentions can sometimes have unintended impacts… at global scales…
Innovation doesn't look like this.
How do we engage with these issues
Institutionally?
Politically?
Systematically?
FRAMEDWORK FOR RESPONSIBLE INNOVATION

EPSRC is committed to develop and promote Responsible Innovation. This site reaffirms our own commitment and sets out our expectations for the researchers we fund and their research organisations.

INTRODUCTION

Responsible Innovation is a process that seeks to promote creativity and opportunities for science and innovation that are socially desirable and undertaken in the public interest. Responsible Innovation acknowledges, that innovation can raise questions and dilemmas, is often ambiguous in terms of purposes and motivations and unpredictable in terms of impacts, beneficial or otherwise. Responsible Innovation creates spaces and processes to explore these aspects of innovation in an open, inclusive and timely way. This is a collective responsibility, where funders, researchers, stakeholders and the public all have an important role to play. It includes, but goes beyond, considerations of risk and regulation, important though these are.

As a public funder of research, we have a responsibility to ensure that our activities and the research we fund, are aligned with the principles of Responsible Innovation, creating value for society in an ethical and responsible way. EPSRC does not wish to be prescriptive about how Responsible Innovation is embedded in the research and innovation process. We recognise that some researchers are already well engaged with this agenda. We also recognise that different approaches might be required for different research areas. There may be instances where detailed consideration is premature or even unwarranted. In other areas of research, a responsible innovation approach may be highly recommended, or even required. As such we recommend that all researchers demonstrate awareness of and commitment to, the principles of Responsible Innovation. Taking an approach that encompasses the following steps, should provide a flexible framework for researchers to use.
A framework for responsible innovation

- Reflexive
- Anticipatory
- Responsive
- Deliberative
Responsible innovation is about embedding within the research and innovation process the capacity to be:

**Reflexive**

Is it safe?
What risks might it pose?
What regulations apply?
Why are we doing it?
What are our motivations?
Who could benefit, and who not?
Responsible innovation is about embedding within the research and innovation process the capacity to be:

**Anticipatory**

What are the intended impacts?
What other impacts could it have?
How else might it be used?
Responsible innovation is about embedding within the research and innovation process the capacity to be:

Inclusively deliberative

How do others frame what we are doing?
What questions do they ask?
Is it acceptable?
Is it desirable?
Responsible innovation is about embedding within the research and innovation process the capacity to be:

**Responsive**

How can we ensure the goals, purposes, directions and trajectories of innovation are responsive:

to emerging information

to emerging views

embedded and integrated into the innovation process
Some useful tools.....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicative techniques and approaches</th>
<th>Factors affecting implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation</td>
<td>Foresight</td>
<td>Engaging with existing imaginaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology assessment</td>
<td>Participation rather than prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizon scanning</td>
<td>Plausibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td>Investment in scenario-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision assessment</td>
<td>Scientific autonomy and reluctance to anticipate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-literary techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary collaboration and training</td>
<td>Rethinking moral division of labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embedded social scientists and ethicists in laboratories</td>
<td>Enlarging or redefining role responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td>Ethical technology assessment</td>
<td>Reflexive capacity among scientists and within institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codes of conduct</td>
<td>Connections made between research practice and governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus conferences</td>
<td>Questionable legitimacy of deliberative exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens’ juries and panels</td>
<td>Need for clarity about, purposes of and motivation for dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>Deliberation on framing assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science shops</td>
<td>Ability to consider power imbalances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Deliberative mapping</td>
<td>Ability to interrogate the social and ethical stakes associated with new science and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliberative polling</td>
<td>Quality of dialogue as a learning exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lay membership of expert bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User-centred design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constitution of grand challenges and thematic research programmes</td>
<td>Strategic policies and technology 'roadmaps'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Science-policy culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Institutional structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open access and other mechanisms of transparency</td>
<td>Prevailing policy discourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Niche management&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Institutional cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value-sensitive design</td>
<td>Institutional leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratoriums</td>
<td>Openness and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratoriums</td>
<td>Intellectual property regimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage-gates&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Technological standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative intellectual property regimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Simon Burall, Sciencewise
Richard Owen, University of Exeter
Jack Stilgoe, UCL
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Keri Facer, University of Bristol
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Co-produced Research in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences: Insights from ‘Connected Communities’

Professor Keri Facer
@ahrcconnect #ahrcccc
Arts & Humanities Research Council Leadership Fellow for Connected Communities,
Professor of Educational and Social Futures, University of Bristol
PANEL
Keri Facer
Richard Owen
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Lunch
1.00 – 1.45
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3. Strategic leadership of engagement
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Unaccountable & a waste of tax payers’ money?
Elitist and reinforcing inequality?
The NCCPE seeks to support a culture change in universities. Our vision is of a higher education sector making a vital, strategic and valued contribution to 21st-century society through its public engagement activity.
Consumer opposition: The public, and especially organisations such as Friends of the Earth, have not taken to the idea of genetically modified crops, or 'Frankenstein foods' as they are commonly known.
Sixty-four per cent said the need to spend more time on research was stopping them getting more engaged;

29% said that time taken away from research was the main drawback for engaging with the public;

20% agreed that scientists who engage are less well regarded by other scientists;
Beacons for Public Engagement
Catalysts for PE with research
School-University Partnership projects

Culture change in action
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WITH RESEARCH
Actively involving the public in the research activity of the institution

ENGAGED TEACHING
Developing teaching activities which positively impact on the community, and enhance students’ engagement skills

KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE & SHARING
Increasing the two-way flow of knowledge and insight between the university and wider society

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
Seeking to maximise the benefits that the institution can generate for the public
Simon Gaskell
Principal, Queen Mary, University of London
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Manchester Beacon
connecting people, place & knowledge

The Beacons for Public Engagement are funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England and Research Councils UK in association with the Wellcome Trust, the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales and the Scottish Funding Council.
PURPOSE
Embedding a commitment to public engagement in institutional mission and strategy, and championing that commitment at all levels

PEOPLE
Involving staff, students and representatives of the public and using their energy, expertise and feedback to shape the strategy and its delivery

PROCESS
Investing in systems and processes that facilitate involvement, maximise impact and help to ensure quality and value for money
### Focal points for embedding public engagement

**PURPOSE**

Embedding a commitment to public engagement in institutional mission and strategy, and championing that commitment at all levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION</th>
<th>Create a shared understanding of the purpose, value, meaning and role of public engagement to staff and students and embed this in your strategy and mission.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>Support champions across the organisation who embrace public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>Communicate consistent, clear messages to validate, support and celebrate it, and ensure open and two-way communication with members of the public and community organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five strategic goals are to:
- Enhance our research power
- Provide our students with a distinctive, high quality experience
- Sustain our financial strength and use it purposefully
- Enhance our performance and status as an ‘engaged university’
- Be the destination of choice amongst our peers

Enhance our performance and status as an engaged University

We will bring the University’s resources to bear on societal needs, through knowledge development and transfer, and strategic partnerships in the intellectual, commercial, cultural and policy spheres.
THE ENGAGED UNIVERSITY
A manifesto for public engagement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal points for embedding public engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| REWARD | Recognise and reward staff involvement within recruitment, promotion, workload plans and performance reviews, and celebrate success with awards or prizes. |
| SUPPORT | Co-ordinate the delivery of public engagement to maximise efficiency, target support, improve quality, foster innovation, join up thinking and monitor involvement and impact. |
| LEARNING | Provide opportunities for learning and reflection and provide support for continuing professional development and training. |

**PROCESS**

Investing in systems and processes that facilitate involvement, maximise impact and help to ensure quality and value for money.
Researcher Development Framework

Domain A: Knowledge and intellectual abilities
- The knowledge, intellectual abilities and techniques to do research.

Domain B: Personal effectiveness
- The personal qualities and approach to be an effective researcher.

Domain C: Research governance and organisation
- The knowledge of the standards, requirements and professionalism to do research.

Domain D: Engagement, influence and impact
- The knowledge and skills to work with others and ensure the wider impact of research.

Engagement, influence and impact
Knowledge and intellectual abilities
Research governance and organisation
Personal effectiveness
**Focal points for embedding public engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE</th>
<th>Involving staff, students and representatives of the public and using their energy, expertise and feedback to shape the strategy and its delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>Ensure that all staff – in academic and support roles – have opportunities to get involved in informal and formal ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Proactively include and involve students in shaping the mission and in the delivery of the strategy, and maximise opportunities for their involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>Invest in people, processes and infrastructure to support and nurture the involvement of individuals and organisations external to the HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>Embryonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table discussions:
Engagement stories
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Juliet Millican, University of Brighton
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The Cupp Story

Juliet Millican
Deputy Director (Academic)
2002: David Watson, then VC of Brighton and a champion of engaged practice, invite by a US Philanthropic trust to submit a business plan to trail engagement in the UK. Developed on the premise of mutual engagement,. Environment generally supportive, Paris conference prior to MDGs had already raised the issue of Social Responsibility in Higher Education.
The Cupp Team, 2003
2003: Cupp invited to ‘Define in the Doing’, started with a few small pilot projects, lots of discussion with local networks and the plan for a help desk or single point of entry into the University. Projects managed by a ‘Senior Researchers group’ and project managed by a steering group of university and community representatives. Talloires Network founded 2005.
2005: Teaching followed research by making connections with a ‘community engagement module’ already happening in the university and encouraging colleagues doing similar linked work to expand on this and offer credit for it, to ensure it was properly resourced. First Cupp conference 2006.
2004 – 2009 The HEFCE fund for Knowledge exchange opened up to include not for profit organisations. This enabled us to bid for a seed fund and work on a larger scale. Cupp taken into core university funding in 2006 with Social Commitment written into our corporate plan.
On Our Doorsteps Seed fund project
2009 After connecting with the Science Shop network Cupp provision extended to include students undertaking research for voluntary organisations as part of their Master’s programmes. This coincided with less availability/flexibility of Academics as budgets got tighter. Also piloted an international help desk offering support to universities in other parts of the world.
2011 Trebling of student fees in the UK alongside the global increase in demand for higher education contributed to the commodification of universities, danger of student engagement being connected with employability, students seen as customers, noticeable change in student attitudes and academic availability.
Student projects
2012 Research Excellence Framework, mechanism which contributes to university funding, adapted to attribute 25% of its criteria to ‘research impact’. Cupp’s relationship with many community partners over time made a significant contribution to impact and increased interest among academics in engaged work.
Community partner project
2013 Cupp becomes ten years old. ‘Learning to make a difference’ included in new strategic plan, Cupp works on a scenario exercise, ‘Futures’ envisaging what the university will look like in ten years. Increasingly using digital media to for teaching and communication, but also see a blurring of roles between university and community in the future.
Learning to make a difference: the University of Brighton and its local communities
2014 Setting up the ‘Hastings exchange’ on a different campus enabled us to explore the relationship between economic and social engagement. While in some ways the cultures are very different we are aware that there are overlaps, particularly in areas of social enterprise and small business.
The Hastings Exchange gives focus and shape to the University of Brighton’s external engagement work in the Hastings and Rother area, bringing together university-generated, community and local business knowledge.

The Exchange aims to encourage the development and exchange of knowledge between community residents, practitioners, university academics, students, graduates and local community organisations and industry.
2015 First Course in ‘Developing Community University Partnerships’ including a week’s intensive and six months on line. Enabled us to clarify our own practice while building on our international collaborations. Hope to continue this in 2016.
Sophie Duncan, NCCPE
Helen Featherstone, Bath
Rick Holliman, Open University
Juliet Millican, Brighton
Suzanne Spicer, Manchester
Charlotte Thorley, QMUL

Funded by RCUK, The UK Higher Education funding councils and the Wellcome Trust
4. Final reflections
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Some focal points for international collaboration

Culture and drivers of change

Innovation in engagement and institutional cultures that support it

Impact and evidence

Research and insight

Capacity building and skills development
What is the most significant challenge or opportunity still to be addressed?
Where is the greatest potential for international partnership activity?
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Thank you

www.publicengagement.ac.uk
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