



ChallengeCPD@Bath

End of project report, 2019

Helen Featherstone, PhD

University of Bath

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
Executive Summary.....	1
Background	1
Our approach	1
Our findings.....	1
Changes to our training and professional development offer.....	2
Recommendations to other universities	2
Introduction	3
The University of Bath.....	3
Pre-SEE-PER provision of professional development and training for PER	5
Changes in demands	5
Year one	8
Synopsis	8
Activities/outputs.....	8
Outcomes and impact.....	8
Sharing our learning.....	9
Year two	11
Synopsis	11
Activities/outputs.....	11
Outcomes and impact.....	12
Sharing our learning.....	16
ChallengeCPD@Bath Outcomes and impact	17
Summary of activities and outputs.....	18
Sustainability.....	19
Changes already made.....	19
(i) at our institution.....	19
(ii) for the sector as a whole	19
Anticipated changes for the future.....	20
(i) at our institution.....	20
(ii) for the sector as a whole	20
Final thoughts	21



Pastoral value of training	21
Recommendations	21
(i) other HEIs addressing similar challenges/ seeking to embed public engagement,	21
(ii) for funders/ policy makers of public engagement,	22
(iii) for the NCCPE.....	22
Reflections from senior leadership.....	23
Talking points	24
Reflections on the ChallengeCPD project structure	26
ChallengeCPD@Bath inputs.....	26
Assumptions we made at the start.....	27
Members of the Advisory Group	29
Information about the UKRI Strategic Support to Expedite Embedding Public Engagement with Research.....	30



Executive Summary

Background

This project investigated the provision, uptake and impact of training and professional development opportunities for researchers in public engagement.

Training and continuous professional development (CPD) in public engagement is one of nine core strands of work when embedding a positive culture of public engagement with research at universities. However, research has highlighted that these opportunities also act as a potential barrier to engagement through a perceived lack of availability or relevance of the training on offer¹.

ChallengeCPD@Bath (2017-2019) investigated the take-up and impact of training and CPD opportunities in public engagement and was funded by UK Research and Innovation as part of the Strategic Support to Expedite Embedding Public Engagement with Research call (Project budget: £78,271).

Our approach

Over the course of the two-year project, we critically examined our training and CPD for public engagement with research. We looked across the literature and worked with an Advisory Group of critical friends made up of academic and professional services staff from the University of Bath and external providers of public engagement training.

Our findings

Through our ChallengeCPD@Bath (2017-2019) work we identified four key learning points about training and professional development for public engagement:

1. **the issues associated with professional development for public engagement are not unique to public engagement training** – there is a wider culture of resistance to formal professional development within universities which disadvantages CPD for public engagement.
2. **professional development is more than just training** - people are less tuned into training opportunities in general and perhaps have a limited view of what counts as training as a result of the culture around CPD at universities. This means significant interventions may not be reported as ‘training’ in surveys such as Factors Affecting Public Engagement survey.
3. **it’s about the learner, not the intervention** - we need to put the learner first in our training interventions through involvement in developing activities, assessing and surfacing their existing skills, knowledge and behaviours from other non-public engagement work, and evaluating the impact of the intervention on their broader professional development and career aspirations.
4. **learning can take time to be realised** - evaluation of professional development should not primarily be about the intervention but about the benefits the learner has derived from the experience. We need to take a longer-term approach to evaluating an intervention to fully understand the impact of those opportunities.

¹ The State of Play: Public Engagement with Research in UK Universities



Changes to our training and professional development offer

The insight from the project has helped the Public Engagement Unit reshape the way we think about professional development for public engagement. We applied this analysis to: improve the quality of provision, develop guidance, and inform the development of new forms of training and CPD. This work has involved:

- framing all our activities, from our Engage Grants to our one-to-one help/advice/guidance, more overtly as opportunities for researchers to learn about public engagement
- developing an online learning tool, the Public Engagement Knowledge Hub (access for those external to the University of Bath available on email request)
- creating case studies of researchers' public engagement learning journeys featuring key learning moments and interventions
- developing self-assessment toolkits for public engagement
- piloting co-produced training, funding five co-produced training programmes and co-producing with doctoral students a module on public engagement with research
- producing workshops and guides for enablers of public engagement with research and external training providers
- evaluating the value of the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement's and University of Manchester's draft quality framework for public engagement
- sharing our findings with public engagement professionals from across the higher education sector through conference presentations and submitting a paper in the Research for All journal

Recommendations to other universities

Training for PER is important but will not cure all of Public Engagement's ills. Training for PER is doubly disadvantaged: PER is still a minority activity and training / professional development in HEIs is poorly developed. Do not be surprised when people do not sign up, or do not prioritise your training.

Put your learner first: think carefully about the broader professional development needs of the learners you are working with. Consider how your PER training can support those needs so that the training is more relevant and does more than enhance public engagement practice.

Training is more than what you devise and deliver, it's about the learning you help to foster. Think carefully about the opportunities for learning that you create – a chat over a cuppa, an internal news item, a small grant - you are probably doing a lot of training already. Can you reframe any of your activities to “count” as training?

Key learning from this work is available in Helen FEATHERSTONE & David OWEN – 'Rethinking professional development for public engagement with research: A way to improve uptake and impact of training?'

doi.org/10.18546/RFA.04.1.10



Introduction

The University of Bath

The University of Bath received its Royal Charter in 1966, celebrating its 50th anniversary in 2016, and is now firmly established as a top ten UK university with a reputation for research and teaching excellence. Our campus, overlooking the beautiful UNESCO World Heritage City of Bath, has a vibrant research culture driven by the enthusiasm and invention of our academic community. Students are attracted by our excellent academic reputation, our outstanding graduate employment record, our world-class sports facilities, and the wide array of other social, recreational and personal development opportunities we offer. Our ability to offer placement options across our discipline base, and with leading organisations, is unique among UK research-intensive universities. We are sector leaders in the commercial exploitation of intellectual property (IP) and the establishment of international links for exploitation of IP.

Our mission is to deliver world-class research and teaching, educating our students to become future leaders and innovators, and benefiting the wider population through our research, enterprise and influence.

The University of Bath has a current research portfolio of £150m¹. This includes £73m of Research Council grants, £15m in grants from the EU, £15m from industry and £8m from the charitable sector.

In the 2014 [Research Excellence Framework \(REF\)](#), 87% of our research activity was graded as 4*/3*, the highest classifications of world-leading and internationally excellent, placing us joint 12th in the UK (excluding specialist institutions). Research impact was strong, with 96% of our impact rated as 4*/3* and 6 of our 13 submissions in the top 10 by GPA for impact.

The University of Bath is part of 21 Doctoral Training Entities² and has a Doctoral College which was established in 2017.

The Public Engagement Unit at the University of Bath

The University of Bath has a small (2.5FTE) Public Engagement Unit which was formed as a result of RCUK Catalyst funding (2012-2015)³. The Public Engagement Unit works to support and foster a positive culture of public engagement with research. The University of Bath supports public engagement with research as a mechanism for enhancing research quality, increasing the likelihood of research making a difference to society, raising the visibility of the research and researcher, and developing the skills of the academics involved. Public engagement with research is embedded into the research strand of the work allocation model, and is not supported as a separate stand-alone programme of work.

¹ <https://www.bath.ac.uk/corporate-information/facts-and-figures/>

² <https://www.bath.ac.uk/corporate-information/doctoral-training-partnerships-and-centres-for-doctoral-training/>

³ <https://www.ukri.org/public-engagement/research-council-partners-and-public-engagement-with-research/embedding-public-engagement/public-engagement-with-research-catalysts-2012-2015/>



During ChallengeCPD the Public Engagement Unit moved from fixed-term funding to core funding in the July of 2018.

The Public Engagement Unit has four strategic strands of work which work to support and complement each other:

- Public Engagement in Practice
- Professional Development
- Reward and Recognition
- Leadership

Three of the four strands (Practice, Reward and Leadership) have evolved into robust, repeatable programmes of work. Yet the Professional Development strand continues to be different each year. While this could be seen to be a positive situation in that we are being responsive to the changing needs of our colleagues, the reality is that our professional development and training for public engagement is typical of the wider HE landscape:

- Training is offered and not taken up
- For those new to public engagement, training is seen as vital and is often requested at short notice before an event or activity
- For those with some practical experience, practice is seen as more useful than training
- Training and professional development can be invisible because it comes in different forms eg coaching conversations, seed funds and delivery
- The term training is not necessarily appealing

This situation is problematic for us in being able to identify where best to prioritise our limited time. Time spent on developing, delivering or adapting training feels disproportionate to its actual and perceived value. We are often called on for 'just in time' training to support events that we are unaware of. Adapting, or developing new, activities for this purpose takes time. However, because these are linked to practice, they are often very well received and valued.

There are times where we are unable to support these activities due to our limited capacity. This means that researchers are undertaking public engagement while feeling underprepared creating risks in terms of public and researcher experience. The latter can result in non-participation in public engagement in the future.

The workshops we put on as part of the PG Skills programme for post-graduate researchers are generally well attended and received favourably at the time. However, our end of project evaluation for the Engaged360@Bath (RCUK Catalyst) work, suggested that the long-term impact of these workshops was negligible with only one or two individuals making a demonstrable transition from workshop to practice.

Our professional development extends beyond workshops. The Public Engagement Unit offers coaching and mentoring on a one-to-one basis for anyone within the university and in particular for those we fund through our funding scheme. We know from the evaluation of this programme that these are true learning experiences for the researchers involved.



However, we don't know if this type of learning would be reported as 'training' in the surveys that capture this data nor in researchers' own portfolios for professional development.

The evaluation data from our training interventions is always extremely positive which suggests that quality of provision is not a key factor in participation. We readily acknowledge the complexity of the professional development challenge and anecdotally suggest that other factors at play could include the tone of the intervention, how much the intervention creates opportunities for self-reflection and forward planning, the seniority of the person delivering the training, the degree of expertise of the person / people delivering the training, the career stage of the academic, the facilitation / coaching skills of the person delivering the training, the format, time commitment, ability to share experiences and how embedded it is in the broader professional development of the participating academics.

Pre-SEE-PER provision of professional development and training for PER

To give an indication of the variety of our CPD and the numbers reached since the PEU formed in 2012 to the date of our application to SEE-PER:

- 111 workshops reaching 1730 researchers (including doctoral students)
- 280+ one-to-one conversations/advice sessions about PE
- 15 PE Conversations⁴ involving 337 staff (academic and professional services)
- 52 Seed funded projects
- 4 Showcases reaching 322 staff
- Cohort-based CPD (Pint of Science: run four times, reaching 37 PGR and 97 staff; and the PG Forum: run twice reaching 19 participants)
- Toolkits and guides eg Supervising a PER PhD, Case Studies, Top Ten Tips, Public Engagement at Bath

These figures do not include CPD which the PEU has not initiated or delivered, for example the cohort provision in the Sustainable Chemical Technologies Doctoral Training Centre, delivered by Graphic Science.

Changes in demands

In the year prior to ChallengeCPD we experienced two changes in the demands for CPD. We noticed an increase in requests to deliver training and CPD for other universities / research organisations; and more requests for departmental support for embedding PER (in contrast to the previous provisions of supporting PER for the individual).

As with delivering interventions in-house, when we deliver at other institutions we get very positive feedback (possibly even more positive). This gives us confidence that the quality of what we deliver is good, and transferrable. It also provides us with other factors to consider when understanding CPD uptake including how much the success is based on the trainer versus the materials / tools, the value of being an external provider, and the role of internal communications to mobilise participants.

⁴ Informal seminar series which focus on a particular aspect of PER



As part of our provision for external organisations, we are also beginning to build up expertise in developing *Train the Trainer* sessions and materials. In November 2015 HF co-developed and ran a one-day *Train the Trainer* workshop for members of BIG – the STEM Communicators Network. The evaluation of this demonstrated that people really valued the experience and left with lots of tools and techniques to use in their institutions. More recently, through a recent NERC public engagement pilot grant, we have developed pilot *Train the Trainer* materials for one of our most successful workshops: *Creative Public Engagement*. Early observations on this, and from the BIG workshop, have highlighted the importance of those delivering the training already having strong facilitation or group training skills.

A lot of our time is spent on fairly basic, entry-level advice: introducing colleagues to the concept of public engagement, why they may want to consider it and core concepts about how to do it well. This is very repetitive for us and provides us with less insight into more advanced practice. In response to this we decided to invest in developing online materials so that colleagues could use them independently or as a refresher having spoken to us or after participating in more formal forms of training. This provided a direct route for the findings from ChallengeCPD to be implemented.

a. The University of Bath – General CPD

Two relevant departments at the University of Bath (Doctoral College and the Centre for Learning and Teaching) were undergoing a period of change which created a timely opportunity to further embed PER CPD into the culture of the university and to understand the broader challenges of researcher professional development. We have positive relationships with the team members in the departments: some are long-standing colleagues with whom we have very productive relationships, others are new in post and our recent and ongoing discussions have revealed a lot of common ground and shared interests.

In September 2017 the University of Bath admitted its first cohort of postgraduate researchers into the Doctoral College. The Doctoral College has been formed in response to PRES survey results which identified a strong desire for ongoing professional development and community-building for doctoral students not located within an existing Doctoral Training Entity. The Public Engagement Unit has maintained a close relationship with senior managers during the realisation of the Doctoral College to ensure that public engagement features as part of the development of doctoral students located within the College. The Doctoral College team were appointed in June 2017. During Engaged360@Bath we had a strand of activity focusing on doctoral support. Evaluation of our work in this area demonstrated that participating in public engagement activities and professional development was excellent for bringing together researchers from diverse backgrounds and disciplines which was viewed very positively by the doctoral students.

In May 2017 the Centre for Learning and Teaching was launched. This department supports learning and teaching for academic staff and students. Its overall aim is to develop academic practice: both research and teaching. The department supports, amongst other things, curriculum development, teaching practice, and educational technology. The Centre has a variety of tools to do this including, but not limited to, grants, workshops, one-to-one advice etc. The Public Engagement Unit secured funding for two projects under the previous



Learning and Teaching Enhancement Office, through which we have good working relationships with staff in the new Centre. The centre lead wanted to work more closely with the Public Engagement Unit to explore the value of public engagement in teaching, as well as for researcher development and improving research quality.



Year one

Synopsis

In the first year of ChallengeCPD@Bath we wanted to use the opportunity to take a step back from the everyday working of the Public Engagement Unit and reflect on the basics of our assumptions. We commissioned an external consultant to provide us with broad, sector-level insight and established an Advisory Group to work with us on the project. We wanted the Advisory Group to challenge us and to bring alternative perspectives to our ideas as they developed. By the end of year one we had revised our assumptions, developed new ideas and made some easy changes to our work.

Activities/outputs

During ChallengeCPD@Bath year one we took a long hard look at our training. To do this we commissioned a literature review to explore what is collectively known about training in Higher Education Institutions (specifically for public engagement with research, where available) and iteratively tested out the ideas coming from this review with our Advisory Group. The Advisory Group comprised a range of internal and external stakeholders including academic staff developers, Doctoral College, Centre for Learning and Teaching, external providers of public engagement training who have delivered training for staff at the University of Bath, the NCCPE and academic staff at different career stages.

The literature and Advisory Group work helped us to unpack the complexity of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) and training culture meaning that our initial plans to codify and classify training interventions was fundamentally flawed. For example we had anticipated that challenges were linked to characteristics of the training such as who delivers it, if it has a linked opportunity to practice, if it linked to accreditation etc. However, it became clear that more fundamental to understanding our challenges was the need to put the learner at the heart of any professional development. So we spent time unpacking what this means in practice.

We touched on the frame of “leadership” but co-incidentally the university was developing a leadership programme. Rather than developing a specific leadership for PER piece of work, we started working with the HR team to incorporate PER into the new leadership programme.

Outcomes and impact

From the first year of ChallengeCPD@Bath we identified seven points about training and professional development for public engagement:

1. **When is continuing professional development recognised as CPD and by who?** In particular, giving consideration to how we support researchers to reflect on activities they have taken part in, not only to improve those activities, but also to look at their role in their professional development so that it can be captured as part of formal reward and recognition procedures.
2. **Learning can take time to be realised.** We need far greater time lags in our evaluation efforts. How often do people use the resources? How have activities improved over time?



3. **Surface existing skills and competencies.** Professional development is not necessarily about new knowledge or behaviours but helping people become conscious of what they already know.
4. **Involve participants in the development of CPD interventions.** This might include user-testing, train the trainer models, and overall design.
5. **Public Engagement CPD tends not to address quality.** Much of the CPD we found and deliver facilitates awareness raising and participation in PE, rather than making PE better.
6. **Language of CPD.** We still need to find more appropriate language. Training is sometimes the least offensive, other options include researcher development, academic development, personal and professional development, reflective practice.
7. **The role of external partners in supporting CPD is not acknowledged.** They often provide formative feedback and insights into audiences etc. There is professional development in organisations hosting researchers, buddying, acting as mentors or offering co-location working sites.

Sharing our learning

Throughout year one we shared our ideas widely by submitting proposals for, and presenting at, three events in 2018:

ECSITE (European Network of Science Centres and Museums) – June 2018.

The session looked at ‘professionalism’ in a broad sense, with training and CPD being one aspect of this. Four presenters (Professor Justin Dillon (University of Exeter), Dr Helen Featherstone (University of Bath), Margaret Glass (Association of Science-Technology Centres) and Andy Lloyd (Centre for Life)) each posed a question to the participants for further discussion in break-out groups. The question from ChallengeCPD@Bath addressed quality (following on from conclusion C) and whether it is appropriate to hold everyone in the sector to the same standards. This was framed as the questions: should scientists who communicate be held to the same standards as science communicators? The discussion was lively and the participants felt that this was inappropriate. The discussion also highlighted the lack of training available for scientists across the broader international context which may be an opportunity for the UK. The session was attended by 100 people.

BIG (STEM Communicators’ Network) – July 2018

In partnership with Wendy Sadler (science made simple), Andy McLeod (Association of Science and Discovery Centres) and Jon Wood (Birmingham University) we delivered a practical session framed by the key learning points. We shared the learning from ChallengeCPD before opening into table discussions which were suggested by the participants before finishing with an activity swap shop. The session was attended by 35 people.



Engage (NCCPE annual conference) – December 2018

With Heather Lusardi (National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement) we delivered a workshop which prompted discussions about three topics: Cohort Effect, Co-Production of CPD, and Learner Journeys. We wanted to consider the implications of delivering training with these three topics in mind. Participants were thoughtful and offered insightful suggestions which will feed into ChallengeCPD phase 2. The session was attended by 50 people.

Through the NCCPE Training Associates programme we have incorporated the learning from ChallengeCPD@Bath into the programme as it develops.



Year two

Synopsis

In year two, we looked to put our learning from year one into practice and sharing the findings from both years more widely. We experimented with co-produced CPD and have reflected on our experiences; we produced content for PER learning case studies which illustrate the range and influence of different learning interventions on those who participate in them; we explored how the draft quality framework⁵ could be used when developing and delivering CPD interventions; and shared our learning through existing channels (such as BIG and Engage, the Training Associates, the PEU Blog etc). We also produced practical outputs of our work eg our e-learning modules, self-assessment toolkits, call guidance for co-produced CPD, and the Doctoral Module. A commentary piece was written and accepted for publication for Research For All.

Activities/outputs

The work was undertaken under three strands of work with associated objectives:

1. Putting the learner at the centre of CPD
 - a. Co-produced Training – another open call for researchers to suggest topics and formats for CPD interventions they would like to pilot in partnership with PEU based on the learning from ChallengeCPD
 - b. Co-produced doctoral module – working with staff and doctoral students from three departments and the Doctoral College to produce a generic PER module which any group of doctoral students can use to develop their PER insight and practice
 - c. Self-assessment toolkit – building on the PE Lens on the RDF we produced a suite of self-assessment tools to help learners realise their existing skills and experiences that are relevant to PER

2. Quality PER

We used the draft framework to inform our CPD offer and how we talk about the skills needed for quality PER. We appreciate that this is a draft framework, so integrated the framework into our work in a reflective and evaluative manner. In order to do this, we worked with an external consultant to:

- a. Undertake light-touch research to explore the implications and responses (both positive and negative) of developing and implementing the framework. The research looked at the literature in this area and involved empirical research with some of our key stakeholders (for example, those who deliver CPD on our behalf; CPD providers at other institutions such as the Science Communication Unit, UWE; academics experienced in PER; and University of Bath Doctoral College staff)

⁵ During ChallengeCPD the NCCPE and the University of Manchester published a Draft Engage Framework (Good practice principles for public engagement involving universities) for consultation with the HEI community. We were the only university to explore its use in a training context.



- b. Evaluate the use of the framework in the development and delivery of our CPD offer, for example in our e-learning tools, with our Public Engagement Facilitators network, with our co-produced doctoral module and a light-touch programme we deliver for Advanced Research Dissertation Engineering students.
3. Long-term evaluation
 - a. To respond to both the lack of focus on the learner and the complexity of PER learning, we wanted to develop reflective narrative case studies with some of our key academics. Data and content for these have been collected and early prototypes have been developed, but the case studies are not complete yet. The case studies will illustrate notable learning interventions, points and epiphanies. These will be useful in future CPD interventions to help participants understand their place on a journey, and to help us inform CPD delivery and evaluation tools for future CPD interventions.

Outcomes and impact

At the end of year one we identified the seven points present in the previous. We used year two of ChallengeCPD to explore some of these ideas further through the activities described after each point. We outline the outcomes for these activities we implemented in this section and offer some thoughts on the two points that we chose not to do work on.

1. When is continuing professional development recognised as CPD and by who?

Activity: this has prompted a change in our thinking, rather than a specific set of activities. For example, we are being more overt about framing some of our general activities as learning interventions in the hope that they get reported as such more readily.

We promptly changed how we responded to ad hoc requests for training. Rather than say “yes” immediately (as had been our habit until this point) we took the time to work with the person making the request to understand the broader programme of professional development that our activity would be fitting into. This allowed us to understand how we could frame public engagement in the broader narrative of the programme we were contributing to. It also gave us permission to refuse to do stand-alone interventions that were not embedded into the professional development needs of those being targeted. For example, we worked with the Researcher Development Team and Research and Innovation Services to co-develop and deliver a workshop on engagement and impact for the Bath Course. The Bath Course is the compulsory course for all academic staff on probation. We also declined an invitation to deliver training for a Doctoral Training Centre because the workshop requested was not part of a broader programme of professional development for the doctoral students making it unclear how training on PER would benefit the students.

2. Learning can take time to be realised.

Activity: During year one it was apparent that researchers with a strength in PER had experienced several learning moments that emerged from several sources and over prolonged time periods. This emphasised the need to focus on the learner, rather than the



*intervention. We felt that it would be useful to capture some of these learning journeys as **case studies** to raise the profile of what “counts” as training but also to help us understand the ongoing professional development experiences of researchers developing skills and competencies in PER. This would allow us to tailor our offer more clearly.*

The case studies are currently with our external consultant. These have been delayed due to the consultant experiencing personal difficulties during November and December 2019. The core work has been completed and user-testing (as part of the Doctoral module) has informed the development of the case studies.

3. Surface existing skills and competencies.

*Activity: We created a **self-assessment toolkit** that we can use with colleagues in training settings, or can be used independently by a learner wishing to know more about their current skills and competencies to inform their longer-term professional development plans.*

The toolkit is currently with our graphic designers to enhance the usability of the toolkit and to produce hard copies that we can use in our training. We haven't been in a position to begin using the tool kit as part of our training and learning.

4. Involve participants in the development of CPD interventions.

*Activities: We develop all of our training with informal input from our participants. We wanted to take this concept to a maximum and explore if we could **co-produce training**. We did this in two ways: the development of a generic module for Doctoral researchers and through a funding call. The Doctoral module idea built on our generic undergraduate module which has been very successful. Three departments and the Doctoral College wanted some form of training for Doctoral students so we worked with them to experiment with involving Doctoral students in the development of a generic module which could be rolled out across other departments, or research centres.*

We have found having funding for PER to be a great mobiliser and also an excellent source of learning for the PEU. Anticipating that researchers may value some funding (and associated support from the PEU) to develop some bespoke training we tried two funding rounds to support co-produced training.

We found that co-produced training is not an appealing offer to academics at the University of Bath. We deliberately took our mantra of “putting the learner first” to an extreme. If we felt chastened by some our conclusions from year one that highlighted the sector tends to assume a deficit approach to training we wanted to see what would happen if we swung the pendulum to the other extreme.

What do we note:

- Low numbers of people responding suggest it is not appealing
- Traditional forms of training were suggested in terms of both format and content: video making, social media, data visualisation, workshop-based one-offs or programmes



- Professional services colleagues can identify training needs (perhaps more readily than our researcher colleagues), may have more capacity to hold a programme, and reach more people
- Making the programmes sustainable takes a lot of time on our part. The concept of developing something with a life beyond the funding is not readily grasped nor articulated. This applies to both our academic and professional services colleagues. Perhaps because the concept of devising and delivering training is not embedded in many roles or departments.

It is always hard to assess why something does not work. I think that we have to acknowledge that training / CPD is not an appealing thing to get involved with (we know the word puts people off) and that PER is a minoritized activity that can already feel risky to undertake. This creates two barriers to participating that exacerbate each other.

It is also possible that we (the PEU) hold more developed thinking on both training and public engagement (or are perceived to). This can mean that researchers are doubly unsure as to what to propose. Perhaps we should have heeded one of our researchers in an Advisory Group meeting who told us that we “are the experts and that researchers just need to be told what to do”. Clearly, it is not as simple as that. It’s not just knowing what people need to know, it’s about getting the format right. We listen carefully to our academic colleagues to inform everything we do and will continue to do so, particularly when there’s a deafening silence!

5. Public Engagement CPD tends not to address quality.

*Activity: during ChallengeCPD the NCCPE and the University of Manchester released a draft Quality Framework for PER. The framework was put out for consultation and we proposed **using the quality framework** in some of our training interventions to explore if it would improve the training, how it was perceived by researchers and by those who deliver training, and to see if may inadvertently raise barriers to participation in PER or training.*

We concluded:

The good practice principles were generally accepted by those we consulted as a reasonably robust and useful set of principles. But we couldn’t say they have been transformative from a CPD perspective. They are a useful resource, and we have successfully referenced them in our training and work with undergraduate students, however the need for tiering, and for translating into competencies, means there is still work to do for them to be really useful in a CPD setting.

Researchers suggested that the framework could benefit from further illustrations of each of the principles, and what they might mean in practice. External trainers suggested they could align their training with the principles, but they did not necessarily see them having an impact on CPD uptake. HR and other staff responsible for professional development of researchers suggested the framework needed to be graded in order to be useful for CPD and to be complemented with additional learning resource.

We’ve undertaken some initial work and further scoping to address these points and to apply the framework at University of Bath. However, our ability to fully progress this work has been



constrained by time and was beyond the scope of ChallengeCPD. It was evident that the Good Practice Principles for Public Engagement Involving Universities and the Researcher Development Framework provide a helpful framing for quality and progression respectively. However, CPD comes to life when it is located within the professional practices of the discipline itself, and there is more work needed to promote public engagement as a valid aspect of engaged research. As we tailor our support for researchers, we are learning to be mindful of the discourse of engagement that exists within the academic discipline. If the principles represent a set of agreed quality standards for PER, there is work needed to embed these principles within the Pathways to Impact processes, REF, and Researcher Development, so that they can inform the development of those disciplines.

6. Language of CPD.

No specific activity undertaken

At the end of year one we noted that there is a challenge in what we call our work. Training? Continuing Professional Development? Professional Learning? None of these terms are appealing. We have not been able to identify a more attractive name. Attending the Vitae Conference in 2019 as part of year two confirmed that this is a general problem across all training and development. The Vitae conference also confirmed our year one conclusions that the culture of training in universities is challenging.

Through our BIG Skills Day we devised an activity to surface the variety of interventions that participants were delivering. This helped participants realise that they were delivering more training interventions than they had previously thought (for example by realising that having a cup of tea and chat with someone can facilitate learning). As one participant put it *“This means that almost everything I do is training!”*

If those who are devising and delivering training do not always recognise that they are creating learning interventions, it is not surprising that the learners do not always report these as such. It does suggest that the challenge of training for PER may be, at least in part, a reporting issue.

7. The role of external partners in supporting CPD is not acknowledged.

No specific activity undertaken

We noted that a key part of learning about PER comes in the doing of it. However, we also noted that this is often done in live environments. At the University of Bath we have several entry-level opportunities where researchers can have a go at public engagement. These are events or activities organised by the PEU that researchers participate in (eg festivals, walking tours, lectures). This means that researchers do not need to get bogged down in the administration and logistics of doing PER and they can focus on their own contribution. We also offer small grants to allow researchers to undertake their own independent public engagement work with the support of the PEU.

We know from our evaluation work that these are key learning experiences for the researchers who participate. However, we also recognised that a key contributor to that learning experience are the visitors and community organisations who get involved. A visitor



attending a local festival does not invest much time, emotion or money to interact with one academic meaning the risks to the visitor are low, this changes when we start supporting researcher-led PER through the funding scheme. It is common for researchers to want to engage with vulnerable groups, small charities or voluntary organisations. The time and emotional commitment this takes is considerably greater than for a visitor to a festival and consequently is higher risk. We rightfully have to consider our duty of care to both our researchers and those they are engaging. This means we have to be clear to external organisations that they are contributing to a learning experience. We may not use that exact terminology but we should be able to articulate the degree of engagement expertise, in the way we would describe the degree of research expertise. This would allow external participants to make an informed decision as to whether to engage and on what terms. We should stop doing covert training using community organisations as uninformed trainers and guinea pigs.

Sharing our learning

Helen Featherstone has shared insight and outputs from both phases of ChallengeCPD through several mechanisms: BIG Event, BIG Skills Day, ECSITE, various NCCPE activities and through the regional GW4 collaboration.

Event feedback has shown that participants have found the “learner first” concept novel, in particular the idea that PER training can be framed in the context of broader professional development needs and activities of the learners.

Participants have also valued the clarity about what “counts” as training, giving confidence to participants to offer a range of interventions and to go beyond offering workshops.



ChallengeCPD@Bath Outcomes and impact

We have identified four key learning outcomes from the two years of ChallengeCPD. These summarise learning from years one and two however, there are interim steps in learning that have informed these final conclusions, these are detailed below.

ChallengeCPD learning outcomes:

1. The challenges of devising and delivering effective training and professional development for public engagement with research are not unique to PER. The culture of training and CPD in universities is not well developed so PER training falls victim to that culture. This culture means that people are less tuned into training and learning opportunities in general, and perhaps also have a limited view of what counts as training meaning that significant learning interventions may not be reported as training in surveys such as Factors Affecting Public Engagement.
2. A lot of the literature and discussions we have focus on the training intervention, rather than the learner who is participating in those interventions. We need to move our thinking from the training intervention to the individual learner: putting the learner first.
3. Putting the learner first means helping learners identify relevant existing skills and experience, understanding their longer-term career aspirations, and understanding the broader research culture the learner finds themselves in. In doing this we can begin to see how training for PER can be used to benefit the individuals more clearly, perhaps making it more appealing.
4. Evaluation of CPD should not primarily be about the intervention but about the benefits the learner has derived from the experience.



Summary of activities and outputs

Over the course of the two years of ChallengeCPD@Bath we have:

1. Commissioned research into researcher training in general and specifically for PER⁶
2. Held four Advisory Group workshops to make sense of the challenges related to uptake of professional development identified by the literature review and our own practice
3. Amended our approach to CPD in response to new insights – in particular in response to ad hoc requests for workshops, and in the development of our e-learning modules
4. Piloted new approaches to CPD – in particular the co-production of training
 - a. Using a funding call approach we have piloted (or started) five forms of researcher-led co-produced training and produced reflections on our learning
 - b. Worked with three departments to co-develop a Doctoral Module on public engagement with research
5. Developed content for self-assessment toolkits which allow learners to identify existing skills and experience that could be brought into public
6. Created content for case studies of researchers' learning journeys featuring key learning moments / interventions [these are still in development]
7. Explored the value of the draft quality framework for public engagement from the NCCPE and University of Manchester in live training interventions in the University of Bath and produced a report on our learning
8. Embedded learning from ChallengeCPD into our e-learning "Public Engagement Knowledge Hub"
9. Produced workshops and guides [see **Error! Reference source not found.**] for enablers of PER and external training providers – distributed through BIG Event and BIG Skills Day, NCCPE training associates, Engage conference, GW4
10. Included new ideas for training and PER into the university's submissions to the EPSRC CDT call
11. Had a paper accepted for Research For All
12. Attended Vitae conference 2019 to benchmark and sense-check our conclusions

⁶ <https://blogs.bath.ac.uk/publicengagement/2018/09/06/challengecpd-reports/>



Sustainability

Changes already made

(i) at our institution

As we have described earlier in this report, we have already taken the learning from year one and incorporated it into our work in year two and beyond. Examples of these changes include:

Ensuring that PER training is incorporated into existing programmes of professional development, rather than running a stand-alone programme of PER training. Linking our training offer to specific practice-based opportunities.

Incorporating the learning into our Public Engagement Knowledge Hub Moodle courses.

Developing activities that meet broader professional development needs of colleagues, using PER as the content and “lens” for the activities. For example, the leadership programme for the faculty of Humanities and Social Science.

Piloting co-produced training through a doctoral module and a funding call.

Developing tools to use in our ongoing CPD work that: help learners identify their existing skills and competencies that are relevant for PER; and help visualise the range of interventions and activities that are necessary to develop PER skills and confidence.

ChallengeCPD has provided a period of prolonged engagement and collaboration with colleagues in Researcher Development and the Doctoral College which has strengthened existing good relationships.

(ii) for the sector as a whole

We have disseminated our ideas through the following conferences and events:

BIG⁷ Event 2018 (n=45) and 2019 (n=30)

ECSITE⁸ 2018 (n=100)

UK Knowledge Mobilisation Forum⁹ (n=30)

BIG Skills Day (n=45)

Event feedback has shown that participants have found the “learner first” concept novel, in particular the idea that PER training can be framed in the context of broader professional development needs and activities of the learners.

⁷ BIG is the UK’s national STEM Communicators Network – the Event is the annual conference, Skills Days are day-long training workshops

⁸ European Network of Science and Technology Centres

⁹ National network and event for people (often health focused) who have an interest in mobilising knowledge from within and beyond universities



Participants have also valued the clarity about what “counts” as training, giving confidence to participants to offer a range of interventions and to go beyond offering workshops.

We have showcased the Public Engagement Knowledge Hub Moodle courses through these events and have had 22 people from other institutions access them using a guest log-in. The content has been made available for others so they can build their own Moodle courses in their institutions, although we recommend that create their own examples to make it more relevant for their learners.

Anticipated changes for the future

(i) at our institution

We will use the materials developed in year two in our ongoing training activities. We anticipate that these will help us to help learners create a more robust academic identity based on PER (in part or more completely).

(ii) for the sector as a whole

We will create a blog post reflecting on our experiences of piloting co-produced training and also share this learning through BIG 2020.

We will share our Knowledge Hub and the underpinning thinking about how it was developed to support others wishing to create their own e-learning tools.

The self-assessment tools will be made available through the PEU website and disseminated through eg the Training Associates, BIG, UK Knowledge Mobilisation Forum through 2020/21

Helen is a Training Associate for the NCCPE. Key ideas from ChallengeCPD will be incorporated into the ongoing development work of the courses run by the NCCPE.

We have an article accepted for publication in Research For All in February 2020.



Final thoughts

Pastoral value of training

It didn't emerge as a strong area of focus for ChallengeCPD, but it was noted in passing and has been noted in previous evaluations of the PEU's work, that learners place great value on the face-to-face and personalised nature of talking with a member of the PEU. We described earlier how a lot of our work is routine and entry level which feels repetitive and is time-consuming for us. While the people we work with may perceive our advice to be personalised, we feel it to be routine and generic.

The creation of our e-learning Public Engagement Knowledge Hub Moodle courses is an attempt to decrease the number of these routine and repetitive interactions. However, we were extremely mindful of the reported value of talking with us. We recognise that a Moodle course can never replace a nuanced conversation with a member of the PEU, but we have attempted to keep the Moodle courses personal and with the strong voice of the PEU. The courses are highly interactive, with small activities (based on the activities we use in face-to-face settings) to help users think more deeply about their own PER, they feature videos of the PEU and academics, and use real case studies to illustrate points. We hope that in doing this, users of the Knowledge Hub will come to the PEU with fewer basic questions and so increasing the efficiency of the PEU.

The Moodle courses went live in December 2019. User-testing during the development of the courses has suggested that they are appealing and easy to use. Longer term evaluation will tell us more about how effective they are in supporting learning.

Recommendations

Our recommendations for:

(i) other HEIs addressing similar challenges/ seeking to embed public engagement, Training for PER is important but is not a cure of Public Engagement's ills. Training for PER is doubly disadvantaged: PER is still a minority activity and training / professional development in HEIs is poorly developed. Inviting people to participate in PER training is inviting them to do two things that are culturally undervalued so it is not surprising that people do not sign up, or do not prioritise.

Put your learner first: think carefully about the broader professional development needs of the learners you are working with and consider how your PER training can support those needs so that the training does more than enhance PER. For example, can a small funding programme help develop grant writing skills (as well as help applicants develop and deliver PER)?

Training is more than what you devise and deliver, it's about the learning you help to foster. Think carefully about the opportunities for learning that you create – a chat over a cuppa, an internal news item, a small grant - you are probably doing a lot of training already. Can you reframe any of your activities to “count” as training?



(ii) for funders/ policy makers of public engagement,

The challenges we face in developing and delivering training for PER are not uniquely tied to public engagement with research but are more closely linked to the broader culture of university and research life. While we can continue to create better, more tailored, and more ambitious forms of training, the resultant improvement in uptake and subsequent improvement in quality PER will likely be minimal while we push against the grain of university and research culture.

Training is important, but the current training environment in HEIs works against anyone attempting to run high quality and effective training. What can you do to create change within the sector so that training and CPD is more highly valued and better understood?

One aspect of the challenge may be a reporting issue, directly related to the poorly developed culture of training and professional development in HEIs which means that people are not tuned into their own learning journeys.

A lot of training for PER is about raising awareness or encouraging people to get involved. That this primarily happens at doctoral level (and above) is problematic because this results in PER knowledge, skills and attitudes lagging far behind topic knowledge and disciplinary research skills. Knowledge and experience of PER should be happening earlier in researchers' training: at undergraduate or A Level. This will help ensure that PER is perceived as an integral part of being a researcher (rather than an optional add-on), reduce the ethical risks we identified, and mean that training at doctoral level and above can move beyond awareness raising.

(iii) for the NCCPE

How can we work together to disseminate these ideas? The BIG Skills Day was very well received but was quite conceptual. There is an opportunity to extend the ideas into a very practice-focused workshop where we can help people devise training interventions based on our new ideas.

The barriers and challenges we face in PER are not all unique to PER. Be careful of taking on a culture change remit that extends beyond PER. It is not your remit to try to change the training and learning culture of universities (using this challenge as one example). Where are your (potential) partners across the sector that you can work with where broader HE culture is a limiting factor in embedding PER?



Reflections from senior leadership

Professor Jonathan Knight (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research))

How has this SEE-PER funded work impacted your institution?

The outstanding institutional benefit of the project is that it has provided the context and the resources for us to think about what we do. This is essential across HE in the UK, and perhaps more than average at our own university. Across the UK, because the need to enhance broader public engagement with the research-led mission of universities has become much more apparent over the last few years. At Bath, because our “shared city” is small and constrained in many ways, necessitating alignment of the interests and activities of the University with those of the city and the region, and now under new leadership there is an opportunity to accelerate that alignment.

Have any of the project team’s initiatives or ways of working stood out to you, and if so what difference or contribution do you feel they have made?

One lesson that I have personally drawn from the project is the importance of a differentiated offer, depending on the level of researcher involved. This is true not just in content but in the use of language too. Indeed, “PER” as a concept carries significant baggage, and other relevant words (e.g. “researcher development”, “training”, “CPD”) are likewise fully-loaded. If we want to get the most from our PER activities in the future we may wish to consider leaving some of the words behind, to enable us to reach the broader internal audience. Another lesson is about the challenge posed by the need for scaling. The progress that we have previously made at Bath has been impressive, but I sense that it may be self-limiting. That is partly due to the strong identity that we now have for PER activities, but also because of the difficulty of moving beyond linear scaling.

What are your thoughts about the future for Public Engagement with Research at your institution, and its resourcing?

It’s apparent that we as a University need PER to be more mainstreamed. I do not consider that we can achieve that by increasing the size of our Public Engagement Unit, because of the scaling challenge. The activities that take place in our Doctoral Training Entities are a significant move in the right direction, but of course they only cover doctoral students (a small fraction of our research base) and they are also somewhat ephemeral. Better integration into researcher development programmes must be a part of it. One could start to make a case that the ethical obligation on publicly-funded researchers to engage publicly might imply that PER is a Research Integrity issue, and that this might ultimately provide a framework for broader implementation. The question of resourcing remains challenging, particularly in the current financial climate. That means that plans for change will require careful thought and likely gradual rollout. Unless we can identify a more suitable financial model, we will struggle to gain what we should from PER.



Talking points

1: ChallengeCPD has afforded us the opportunity to critically engage with our training and professional development offer. We have taken a step back, thought deeply about our work and been able to test our new thinking in a live environment.

Key new ideas include:

It's not about training for PER: The challenges of PER CPD are not unique to PER training and professional development. The culture of training and CPD in universities is not well developed so PER training falls victim to that culture. This means that people are less tuned into training and learning opportunities in general, and perhaps also have a limited view of what counts as training meaning that significant learning interventions are not reported as training in surveys such as Factors Affecting Public Engagement

Pay more attention to the learner rather than the intervention. Training is just one step on a journey and as a trainer we should consider ways to bring forth existing skills and experience, understand their longer-term career aspirations, and understand the broader research culture the learner finds themselves in so we can support learners after they have moved on from our intervention. Our role as trainers is to enable learning moments in others. The interventions are the means to this end and we should focus our attention to enabling those learning moments wherever they may happen.

PER training can do so much more than benefit PER practice, and attitudes to PER. Learners at different career stages have very diverse training needs. PER training can help to support those broader training needs. Thinking this way could help to overcome the double disadvantage that PER training faces.

2: The challenges we faced during ChallengeCPD were not related to public engagement or to training, but to do with broader work / life situations. Over the course of this two year project we experienced:

- Threat of redundancy while making the business case for core support for the PEU
- Team members leaving
- Team restructure (because of a team member leaving)
- Recruitment, induction and probation of new team members
- Absence due to ill health and family bereavements

These are to be expected over this time frame but it is worth noting that while some of our deliverables have been delayed, they have not been cancelled or dramatically changed. Our project structure – commissioning external consultants to deliver specific pieces of work provided us with continuity during periods of flux. However, it is worth noting that absence due to ill health and family bereavements happened both within the PEU and with our consultants. Indicating that this model of project structure does not make a project immune to broader life challenges. Very few of our deliverables have been time-critical. This flexibility has meant that we have been able to support quality outputs over working to a deadline and producing inferior deliverables.



3. We have been delighted by the positive response to our new ideas. Proposing and being accepted for conferences, journals and events shows us that our peers and colleagues across the broad PER and PE-STEM sector perceive the ideas as being novel and worthy of attention. The uptake and feedback from these events suggests that the new ideas resonate across the sector and have helped people think differently about the training activities they develop and deliver.



Reflections on the ChallengeCPD project structure

ChallengeCPD@Bath inputs

The project funding allowed us to undertake work that wouldn't have happened without the funding.

There are some aspects of how we structured the work that have been extremely beneficial. The funding covered: additional time for HF; external consultants to undertake specific pieces of work; administrative time; time, travel and subsistence for an Advisory Group.

ChallengeCPD@Bath was framed as an opportunity to examine our existing practice, reflect on it and make changes to our future practice. This approach meant that we could be responsive as our context changed. In particular, the PEU was undergoing a period of change during ChallengeCPD with team members leaving, new members being recruited and the case for ongoing funding for the PEU being made. Having external consultants working on specific pieces of work meant that they could remain focused on the work while the PEU navigated these more day-to-day tasks. Had we decided to buy out time within the PEU to deliver ChallengeCPD there is a strong likelihood that the day-to-day would have taken priority over the novel work that was less urgent meaning that project deliverables would have significantly delayed or cancelled due to the significant reduction in capacity.

However, it is worth noting that some of our consultants have experienced personal challenges during our time working with them. This has caused some delays in delivery which has not been problematic as the deliverables have not been time critical. The one output that had a hard deadline (Research for All paper) was delivered on time and was published in February 2020.

The inclusion of additional time for the HF and additional administration time was very useful. This time primarily covered the additional work that comes with holding a grant and running a project: setting up and maintaining budgets and cost-codes, reporting on the work, organising meetings, liaising with consultants and Advisory Group members, and travel to coordination meetings. This meant that the core work of the PEU could continue and the learning from the project was easily integrated into our practice due to the extra capacity being held by an existing member of the team.

As with Engage360@Bath, the status of UKRI funding was helpful in securing commitment from across the University. However, the considerably smaller scale and much tighter focus of ChallengeCPD@Bath meant that the influence across the University has been less high profile.

That the PEU is a well-established part of the professional services landscape at Bath has meant that the outcomes and impact of ChallengeCPD@Bath have been significant. The project has been about changing how we think and work, rather than about setting up new systems. We have been able to rapidly incorporate new ideas and practice into our robust programmes both internally and externally. These programmes have associated core funding so we have been able to allocate resource to try out new ideas and concepts. We were overly ambitious with our timescales and scheduled too many Advisory Group



meetings in year one. However, we were able to reallocate the budget and use it to pilot the Co-Produced funding call. This flexibility was really helpful as it allowed us to get ahead of ourselves for year two.

Assumptions we made at the start

Assumption	Conclusion
CPD for public engagement with research is a challenge area for embedding public engagement within the culture of a university.	The challenges of PER CPD are not unique to PER training and professional development – there is a complex and varied culture of professional development within HEIs.
The primary aim for CPD for public engagement with research is for improving participation in, and quality of, public engagement with research.	CPD for public engagement with research can contribute to broader academic professional development needs.
There is something about the training on offer that is part of the challenge. By mapping and analysing our offer we can identify changes we need to make to our programmes.	The broader culture of training in universities is the bigger barrier. Mapping and analysing our work (as was originally intended) was unlikely to be the most useful use of our time.
Putting the learner first will improve our training provision.	Yes, but what this means in practice is not straightforward as this means understanding their public engagement needs, their broader academic/career goals, their disciplinary/institutional cultures of training and their disciplinary/institutional cultures of public engagement. There is a spectrum between interventions that we devise / deliver and full co-production. Not all learners will want the same level of involvement.
The language of training and professional development is problematic.	The language of training and professional development is problematic. We were unable to develop a more acceptable term or phrase.
Case studies will be best delivered in video format.	The complex nature of the learning pathways has resulted in a more dynamic method for presenting the case studies.
Doing public engagement is a core aspect of learning about public engagement.	Doing public engagement is a key learning moment but the ethics of this are dubious particularly where vulnerable groups and individuals are involved. Should we be asking community organisations and individuals to give up their time to train researchers? Should we be more overt about when researchers are learning?



<p>Project structure (extra time for HF with Advisory Group and external contractors) would be sufficient to deliver the project.</p>	<p>The extra time for HF was essential, but was largely eaten up with administration, rather than creating additional thinking time.</p> <p>The Advisory Group model is a familiar process for the University of Bath so participants were comfortable being part of the group.</p> <p>The Advisory Group helped to sustain existing relationships and improved the embedding of public engagement into broader training programmes.</p> <p>We scheduled too many Advisory Group meetings for the pace of progress within the project meaning we had a small underspend. We were able to reallocate that funding.</p> <p>External contractors were essential to the delivery of many parts of our work. They offered stability and continuity while the Public Engagement Unit was going through a period of uncertainty.</p>
<p>That the Public Engagement Unit would secure core funding to sustain beyond July 2018 upon production of a robust business case.</p>	<p>The Public Engagement Unit secured core funding.</p>
<p>Outputs could be produced rapidly and within the timeframe of the project.</p>	<p>Several of our key outputs have been delivered behind schedule.</p> <p>This is a result of a combination of personal circumstances with our external contractors; the involvement of HF being constrained due to changes in personnel in the Public Engagement Unit and the broader university; and underestimation of how long these novel approaches would take.</p>



Members of the Advisory Group

- Andy Pitchford, Head of Learning and Teaching
- Fran Laughton, Director of Teaching and Resources (Physics)
- Ioannis Costas Battle, Lecturer in Education, doctoral researcher until 2017
- Jeanette Muller, Academic Staff Development Manager
- Neil Bannister, Graduate Development Manager, Doctoral College
- Sarah Bailey, Senior Lecturer
- Heather Lusardi / Sophie Duncan, NCCPE
- Shane McCracken, Director, Mangorolla
- Ed Drewitt, Freelance
- Matt Davidson, Professor of Inorganic Chemistry

We invited Shane McCracken to participate in our Advisory Group. Shane's company (Mangorolla¹⁰) runs an online engagement programme called *I'm a Scientist, Get Me Out Of Here*. Evaluation of *I'm a Scientist* has shown that participants develop skills and confidence and could be described as a form of experiential learning. It was for this reason that we asked Shane to be part of ChallengeCPD. Shane took the discussions and ideas developed during ChallengeCPD and applied them to the *I'm a Scientist* programme. Specifically, they created a more overtly educational experience that was facilitated by an academic in the Science Communication Unit, called *I'm a Scientist – Academy Zone*.

Through this pilot work¹¹, Mangorolla noted that:

- Researchers valued being given the space to reflect and think critically about different kinds of engagement
- Researchers gained knowledge of concepts and best practice that will inform future activities
- Researchers learnt from their peers

Showing that the Academy Zone enhanced and improved the learning gained through participating in *I'm a Scientist*.

¹⁰ Helen Featherstone is on the board of directors for Mangorolla

¹¹ <https://about.imascientist.org.uk/2019/reflecting-on-im-a-scientist-participation-academy-zone-pilot/>



Information about the UKRI Strategic Support to Expedite Embedding Public Engagement with Research

The UKRI Strategic Support to Expedite Embedding Public Engagement with Research (SEE-PER) call sought to help enrich and embed cultures within HEIs where excellent public engagement with research (PER) is supported, valued, rewarded and integrated within institutional policies and practices. The first year of this programme ran from October 2017 to October 2018. Two types of approach were funded:

‘Embedding change’ proposals that sought to enhance and embed an institution’s approach to supporting PER, building on the learning from the Beacons for Public Engagement, RCUK PER Catalyst and Catalyst Seed Fund programmes:

1. Birkbeck College, University of London, led by Professor Miriam Zukas
2. Heriot-Watt University, led by Professor Gareth Pender
3. Keele University, led by Professor David Amigoni
4. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, led by Professor Dame Anne Mills
5. NERC Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, led by Dr Nick Wells
6. University of Lincoln, led by Professor Carezza Lewis
7. University of St Andrews, led by Professor John Woollins

‘Challenge’ proposals which addressed a specific challenge in supporting PER effectively, and which expanded the existing knowledge base about ‘what works’ in effectively supporting PER:

1. University of Brighton: developing an incubator model for finding and fostering community-university knowledge partnerships, led by Professor Tara Dean
2. University College London: exploring how to make PER fundamental to the university's efforts to address global societal issues through cross-disciplinary research, led by Professor David Price
3. University of Bath: examining the challenges associated with training and professional development for public engagement, led by Professor Jonathan Knight
4. University of Southampton: tackling barriers to professional development in PER and developing a robust educational framework for such activity, led by Professor Simon Spearing
5. STFC – Laboratories: investigating the take up and provision of PER training, led by Dr Neil Geddes

In May 2018, the SEE-PER projects were given the opportunity to apply for a second year of funding to embed and expand upon work done in the first phase. Ten of the twelve projects received funding to extend for a further 12 months, and the programme concluded at the end of 2019.

UKRI appointed the NCCPE to co-ordinate this work, ensuring learning was shared across the projects, and that evaluation was used strategically to inform and assess the value of the SEE-PER initiative.

Further learning from the SEE-PER initiative can be found in the ‘Support Engagement’ section of the NCCPE website.

