

ParticipatoryResearch@Bath

End of phase two

(December 2022-July 2024)

Suzi Wright

October 2024

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Public Engagement Unit..... | 3 |
| ParticipatoryResearch@Bath..... | 3 |
| Phase one..... | 3 |
| Phase two (December 2022 to July 2024) | 3 |
| What have we learnt about public involvement and engagement in research at the University of Bath? | 4 |
| 1. Relationship building..... | 5 |
| Measuring and Evaluating Social Impact training..... | 5 |
| Minerva Lectures | 6 |
| Our learnings..... | 6 |
| 2. Participatory Research Ecosystem | 7 |
| Our learnings..... | 7 |
| 3. Participate Grants | 7 |
| Our learnings..... | 8 |
| 4. Payment Systems for Public Involvement..... | 9 |
| Our learnings..... | 10 |
| 5. Relational Practice and Welfare and Wellbeing | 10 |
| Commission..... | 10 |
| Engage 2024..... | 11 |
| Engage Academy | 11 |
| Roundtable..... | 12 |
| Our learnings..... | 13 |
| 6. Sharing Practice Get-togethers | 14 |
| Our learnings..... | 14 |
| Phase three (August 2024 to July 2025) | 14 |
| What next..... | 15 |

Public Engagement Unit

The Public Engagement Unit is a capacity and capability building unit which supports researchers to develop and advance their own practice engaging public groups with their research. Working in partnership with researchers and other professional services, including Research and Innovation Services, Communications and Press, and Human Resources, we aim to facilitate and create opportunities to meaningfully involve people and public groups outside of academia with all stages of the research cycle. We currently have four strands to our work: Practice, Learning, Rewarding, and Leading.

Since the Public Engagement Unit began in 2012, the landscape of Research and Innovation has changed significantly with an increased focus on improving the relationship and interactions between research and society. There are lots of different terms / practices being used but all point to a greater need to involve people from outside of academia in research processes and practices to build trust, improve research, create the conditions for societal impact, and to diversify the people who are involved in research as contributors and academic staff.

ParticipatoryResearch@Bath

ParticipatoryResearch@Bath is investigating what the culture of research with/by/for people looks like at the University of Bath in order to create and enhance the conditions for involving people in research in meaningful ways.

It is funded through the [Research England's Participatory Research funding allocation](#).

Phase one

During phase one of the project, we took an exploratory approach and worked to investigate the culture of participatory research at the University. Working with researchers and communities, we aimed to better understand the barriers and enablers of involving people in research. We discovered that participatory research as an approach or mindset, is not consistently defined and is not used equally across all disciplines.

As a result of this, we decided to take a broader approach to what we mean by participatory research. This ensured that we supported work across the spectrum of participation which enabled people to move along it, according to their current practices and their ambitions. Due to disciplinary differences and traditions, we have chosen to use a broad interpretation of the term participatory to accommodate a wide range of activities that cover involvement, engagement, participation, and co-production.

There was a desire for greater institutional support from researchers to enable them to meaningfully involve citizens in their work and for 'participatory-ready' systems, knowledge, and people within the University. Importantly, we also identified that people outside of the University require more support to feel ready and motivated to participate in research.

Phase two (December 2022 to July 2024)

During phase two of the project, we chose to focus on scoping and testing out ways of working and approaches using the knowledge we learnt from our phase one work.

The following were some of our expected outputs:

- A network of researchers who use participatory research approaches
- Funded participatory research projects
- A report on participatory approaches across the whole research system
- A report on initiatives piloting participatory approaches across two parts of the research system
- A report on 'emotional labour'
- Guidance on welfare and wellbeing of 'emotional labour'
- Streamlined payment systems and associated guidance
- Presentations at conferences and sector events
- Blogs sharing findings and learnings

To build the capacity to do this work, we recruited a Project Manager to lead on the coordination and delivery of the project and a Project Officer, with a focus on community engagement, to help us better understand how to establish and maintain connections with community groups.

We decided to trial a new approach when recruiting for these roles, ensuring it was an inclusive and accessible process throughout for candidates. We kept the person specifications for both roles to a maximum of 10 points, working hard to exclude any that weren't necessary for the role and tried to be clear and specific. We designed the interview with the applicant in mind, creating an interview pack detailing how the interview would be run and sharing the interview questions shortly before the interview. Being more accessible and inclusive in our recruitment process attracted a more diverse pool of candidates and led to richer conversations. Feedback from candidates commented on how supportive the approach had felt. Taking a more supportive and caring approach has provided us with a successful model to use for future recruitment.

What have we learnt about public involvement and engagement in research at the University of Bath?

During the last eighteen months, we have had lots of conversations about public involvement, and we have tried lots of interventions. We wanted to dig deeper into what public involvement looks like in Bath and Northeast Somerset (B&NES) and the wider region, considering both our communities and research at the University.

Our work in phase one revealed that for communities and public groups, there are limited access points to the University and their perceptions of the University are often limited by that experience. There is very little individual or collective understanding of research by those outside of academia. What research is, how it's funded, who does it, who benefits from it, and who regulates it are largely invisible. This work has emphasised the importance of cultivating 'research-ready' communities outside of the University and the need to move from a transactional approach to involving people in research to taking a relational

approach. A key priority of our work in phase two, has been to improve the connections between Bath researchers and the wider community.

1. Relationship building

We have prioritised carrying out more listening with community organisations across B&NES and our local region. Our Project Officer has been going out and meeting with a variety of local organisations including Bath City Farm, 3SG, Oasis Hub Bath, Active Way Radstock, Eco-wild and others. This focus on community listening continues to be ongoing as we take the time to build trusting and mutually beneficial relationships.

Several common themes have emerged out of these informal chats. Tackling the increase in loneliness and isolation that has occurred since the start of the COVID pandemic has become a priority for several organisations. It is also evident that there has been a rise in mental health issues reported across B&NES and this is leading to more referrals. Another concern that emerged is the lack of spaces for people to come together, especially for free. Despite a rise in demand for services, funding cuts across the charity and community sector are continuing to make a mark and stretch resources. The closing of Creativity Works in October 2023 has left a gap locally for supporting wellbeing through engaging people in creative activities. Green social prescribing, particularly for young people, emerged as an area in which more work could be done around supporting wellbeing through creativity and green spaces.

Going out into community spaces and having face to face contact has been really appreciated. It has provided the opportunity for us to clearly explain the purpose of our community engagement work, with a focus on trying to bridge the gap between the University and local communities, whilst acknowledging the perception of the University as elite and inaccessible. Local organisations are interested and keen to work with researchers but unsure of how they reach them. The concept of research has felt to be quite abstract by some community organisations. It has been beneficial to go out to community organisations to get to know them, their interests and motivations as well as explore and offer ways to connect with our researchers around areas of mutual interest. One of these offerings was a 'Connect' event, inspired by UCL's [Creating Connections](#), which took place in November 2024, serving as an informal opportunity for researchers and community organisations to get together and have creative conversations around health and wellbeing.

We have also built a strong relationship with the Twerton and Whiteway Community Research Network led by the Southside Family Project, Youth Connect South West, First Steps (Bath) and Bath City Farm. Working with the network, we organised community research skills training to enable members to explore how to do effective and ethical research within communities. We also continue to provide ongoing support to the network as critical friends.

Measuring and Evaluating Social Impact training

Our community listening, and interest in our Participate grant scheme, revealed a real need from those working in community organisations and researchers at the University to have support with impact measurement. There was a strong appetite for accessing support with

measuring and evaluating social impact and a desire to have a space to come together with other professionals to share practice and experiences.

Informed by these conversations, we approached Stacey Pottinger, founder of Octopus Impact and social impact guru, to develop [Social Impact training](#) focusing on measuring and evaluating social impact. A series of workshops were developed to discover the tools and strategies needed to measure, evaluate, and communicate the value of social initiatives or projects. The training was split up into three sessions; Theory of Change, Five Step Evaluation Framework, and Communicating Impact.

These workshops were well attended by researchers from the University as well as attendees from local organisations such as Bath Mind, Bath Welcomes Refugees, 3SG, Bath City Farm, Healthwatch, Homeshare, and more – all in different roles and stages of their projects and initiatives. The workshops demonstrated the power of bringing different voices into the room, making space for connections between researchers and community members, and bridging the gap between academics and the local B&NES community.

“As an academic, it’s been so valuable to be in a group of people who are not solely academics, it can feel like a bubble, and it’s been so useful to get candid feedback from community orgs about a funding bid I’m putting in that will involve community orgs”

[Minerva Lectures](#)

Since taking over responsibility for the University of Bath's Minerva Lecture series several years ago, we have taken the opportunity to play around with the format and test new ideas and approaches. We have created a programme of events that has acted as a platform for both researchers and the local community, fostering a dialogue between researcher and audience. With the right modifications and careful thinking, we have learnt that you can foster meaningful two-way engagement through a public lecture. We want to ensure our Minerva Lecture series reflects the interests of the local community.

From our community listening, loneliness emerged as a pressing issue, so we decided to bring in community voices to a Minerva lecture featuring academic Dr Sam Carr discussing his research, *All the Lonely People*. We invited a mix of community members and academics to join Sam as panellists. The panellists each brought fresh and relevant insights and felt they had something of value to say around loneliness. Taking this approach created a power balance of knowledge exchange and learning from each other. We recognise the value of the Minerva Lectures for creating partnerships with and giving a platform to community groups and third sector organisations. We want to continue to build on this success by involving different, non-academic voices, and value different forms of knowledge. We will be designating some of our Minerva budget to support our community engagement through the lecture series.

[Our learnings](#)

Through our community engagement work, we are continuing to explore how we can develop the capacity and capability of our community groups. We will take a flexible

approach to supporting community members, enabling them to engage with / interact with research in whatever way suits their needs.

During phase three, we will continue to build on our relationships with community organisations to better understand what our communities want and need. Based on the demand and positive feedback we received from the Social Impact workshops; we are delivering the training again during November 2024. Both community members and academics really enjoyed having the time and space to collaborate, share practice and learn from each other. Those who have attended the initial workshops continue to keep in touch and have now formed their own community of practice.

2. Participatory Research Ecosystem

During phase one, we mapped participatory research and public and patient involvement practice across the University and found that there are areas of the research ecosystem which appear to be under-developed in terms of participatory approaches. We wished to investigate how participatory approaches can be embedded across the whole research system. In May 2023, we commissioned David Owen (freelance Public Engagement consultant) to explore this further and draw out case studies of real and applied practice that illustrate how people and organisations have used participatory approaches.

The report highlighted that participatory approaches have been used across all parts of the research ecosystem and therefore we didn't particularly need to test any approaches as we had initially anticipated we might need to do. It has provided us with a useful bank of participatory methods to use including crowd wise, deliberative mapping and participatory grant making.

Our learnings

We are planning to take the suggested practice and learning from various case studies detailed in the report to create a catalogue of participatory approaches that our researchers can use. This resource will be shared with our colleagues across the University. We have successfully trialled the participatory grant making approach through developing our Participate grants.

3. Participate Grants

We decided to take a participatory approach with developing a new grant for ParticipatoryResearch@Bath and co-created a funding call with researchers at the University of Bath and community groups from B&NES.

In November and December 2023, we held three workshops to co-create a funding call with researchers Dr Dan Maskell (Architecture & Civil Engineering), Dr Alinka Gearon (Social & Policy Sciences), Dr Sarah Bailey (Life Sciences) and Professor Richie Gill (Mechanical Engineering) and Isobel Michael from Southside Family Centre and Lucy Gilbert from Quartet Community Foundation. Together, we co-created the [Participate grants](#), which we launched in January 2024. The call defined participatory research as an approach to

collaboratively generating new knowledge, insight or understanding between academics and people affected by the issues being explored.

As a group, we decided we wanted to fund parts of the research cycle to be more participatory rather than fund whole participatory research projects. We chose to take a portfolio approach to allocating the funding to ensure projects were represented from a variety of disciplines, of different scales and across the research cycle. This enabled us to be more inclusive as to where people were on their journey with taking a participatory approach.

The funding call was open to community groups from across Southwest England and researchers from the University of Bath. We wanted to fund people to work together on research activities that were collaborative and bring benefits to everyone involved. Where either a community partner or researcher/research team had not been identified by an applicant, we took on the role of matchmaking to ensure a successful collaboration. Recognising the limited and under-resourced time of many community organisations, we also provided a small number of honoraria to help support community organisations to be involved in developing an application.

There were three levels of funding available:

- Micro - for projects costing a few hundred pounds (we funded four projects in total)
- Medium - for projects costing a few thousand pounds (we funded five in total)
- Large - for projects costing approximately £10,000 (we funded five in total)

We were overwhelmed by the response to this funding opportunity, receiving 19 applications for a total value of £129, 863. Unfortunately, we were not able to fund every application, but we were able to invest over £74,000 in 14 collaborative research projects from right across the University. These projects included working with young people as peer researchers to investigate young people's experience of green spaces, hosting a series of dialogue events with parent carers and young people with special educational needs to better understand their needs and perspectives, co-developing a large-scale research bid addressing child exploitation prevention and working with people with brain injuries to co-design and prototype an exercise game for movement rehabilitation.

For those who were unsuccessful, we have offered our continued support to help them develop their ideas and consider other funding opportunities.

Our learnings

Through co-creating the funding call, we learnt that pre-work is essential, and we gave ourselves plenty of preparation time to develop and deliver the call. We learnt that we need to value and trust our own voices as part of the process of co-creation.

Once the call went live, we discovered through many conversations with researchers from all career stages, how difficult some people found it to talk about only a part of the research

cycle. We used the Participatory Spectrum¹ to guide us, with the aim of helping people take a step along the spectrum, and it quickly became apparent that some disciplines are further along the spectrum than others. We acknowledged this, respecting the different disciplinary conventions and norms. The value of taking a portfolio approach to the funding was also evident. We were able to fund projects from diverse disciplines and at various stages of the research cycle. We are continuing to take this approach and ensure that we fund a diverse portfolio of projects through our Engage and Involve grants.

The matchmaking process proved much more time consuming and challenging than we had anticipated. In some cases, researchers we approached simply did not have the time to commit despite an interest and passion for the research. This process was made more complicated by not having a senior academic lead to endorse the work (as we had done in a previous project), and researchers not being provided with any additional workload allocation to participate.

Over the next phase, we plan to work more closely with our colleagues in the Research and Innovation Services (RIS) to explore supporting and funding five research teams taking a participatory approach with their proposal development. This will provide us with the opportunity to fund researchers at an early stage and support them to involve patient and public contributors meaningfully in their research prioritisation and proposal.

4. Payment Systems for Public Involvement

During phase one we took the opportunity to chat widely with our peers and researchers about some of the barriers they faced when doing participatory research. It became evident that financial bureaucracy was a source of frustration and a significant barrier to participation. The payment process and policy within the University was seen as challenging to navigate, with the reimbursement process for public contributors complicated.

The relationship between researchers and public contributors is one of reciprocity, reimbursing public contributors supports a more equal and active partnership between academic colleagues and members of the public. As such, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to reimbursing public contributors to research. Public contributors may prefer to have their time and expertise recognised in ways such as:

- financial payment
- access to university facilities (e.g. library) and spaces
- access to university resources and services
- honorary appointments as research staff
- gifts
- vouchers
- access to training and professional development opportunities

Reimbursement of public contributors helps to support the inclusion of people who might not otherwise be able to get involved, whether for financial or other reasons relating to

¹ [International Association of Participation's Participation Spectrum Tool](#)

access. Within the University, there are currently no agreed principles and methods for a consistent and coordinated approach to the reimbursement of members of the public who are contributing to and being involved in public involvement in research activities. We have been working with the current finance process, making sure it is fit for purpose.

Our learnings

Moving forwards, we are now working with the Finance team to improve the process and trial some new guidance they have provided. The next steps are to work together to create a public contributor reimbursement policy and associated process based on good practice guidelines by the NIHR.

5. Relational Practice and Welfare and Wellbeing

One of the key findings from phase one revealed that there appears to be a high degree of 'emotional investment and labour' by those undertaking relational work in collaborative or participatory research projects. However, the support structures for all those involved in this work across the whole research lifecycle are underdeveloped. To meaningfully involve people in research requires a lot of time and capacity and raises issues around supporting the welfare and wellbeing of ourselves and those we work with.

In recent years, the importance of improving the connections between research and society has increased across the sector. Funders, such as the research councils under the umbrella of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), are placing increasing emphasis on ensuring the research they fund better meets the needs of society by enabling and empowering people to inform, shape, participate in, and use research.

Delivering research that involves and is in collaboration with diverse publics requires researchers and research enablers to adopt a more relational approach (often referred to as relationship-centred practice) to their work. The importance of this approach will only increase as funding calls reflect the strategic shift in focus by funders.

The term 'relationship' is broad and all-encompassing. We have drawn on the Relationships Project's work to define relationships²:

A good relationship is characterised as being fair, trusting, mutually beneficial and reliable. It's unscripted, organic and empathetic. It develops over time as value is created and carried forward from one interaction to the next.

When we talk about relationships, we are referring to relationships between people from civil society organisations and community groups, and researchers, and research enablers at universities highlighting the three-way nature of this work.

Commission

In the summer of 2023, we commissioned Dr Jude Fransman (The Open University), and Dr Tigist Grieve (University of Bristol) to design and implement an exploratory project on welfare and wellbeing in relational work. The project included a review of the existing

² <https://relationshipsproject.org/what-we-mean-by-good-relationships/>

literature and a participatory consultation involving webinar workshops with professional and support staff employed at thirteen UK-based higher education institutions and interviews with four key informants based in research-related organisations outside of the higher education sector. The report from the commissioned study outlined a series of five recommendations. These recommendations mostly relate to institutional and sector-level improvements that need to be implemented to recognise and support the roles of research enablers working relationally. These can be found in the study's full report on the [Relational Practice and Welfare and Wellbeing in Research Settings](#) publication page.

The report has prompted us to think more deeply about relational practice and welfare and wellbeing issues. Based on the recommendations from this work, we hope to generate an emerging community of practice, including partners such as the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) and the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE).

Engage 2024

We were invited by the [National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement \(NCCPE\)](#) to share our findings from the report with our sector and peers at the Engage Conference in May. We hosted a panel discussion, 'Looking after ourselves and others'. The panel discussion was attended by fifty-eight people, including Public Engagement Professionals (PEPs), academics and those in wider engagement and community roles. We shared the findings of our report, looking at why relational work has these particular issues. We discovered that using relational work as a term was useful as it enabled delegates to recognise their work in a new way and really resonated with many who attended the discussion. We asked delegates to share their thoughts and make recommendations for what the sector should do next.

Feedback from delegates included:

"Keep having these conversations. I will try to open these conversations with my colleagues, as a funder we have a lot of power in this space. This needs to be explicitly recognised and acted on."

"Why isn't it a priority to look after the people who are looking after all these relationships?"

"Support network/buddy systems/share ideas and strategies/best practice of what might work and how to help each other"

"Thank you for making us feel seen!"

"Thank you for vocalising what we are all experiencing"

Engage Academy

The NCCPE invited us to continue our conversation around welfare and wellbeing in June 2024 with academicians participating in the [Engage Academy](#). We delivered a webinar,

‘Looking after ourselves and others,’ to explore relationship-centred practice, the potential impact of working in this way and how we look after our own welfare and welfare and that of those we are working with.

The webinar was well received and attended, and we have been invited back to deliver the webinar for the Engage Academy’s 2025 cohort.

Feedback from the webinar participants:

“It made me think about how I underestimate the amount of energy that being a community connector takes. And how I don't have time to reflect on the impact of this very often”

“Resilience is an expectation especially in job descriptions. We're not taught it and it's very subjective and so different for everyone”

Roundtable

In July, we hosted a roundtable to explore relational practice in research and unpick some of the issues that emerged from our commission and talking to our peers. The importance of relational practice is increasing in our work as PEPs because research funders are placing an increasing emphasis on the importance of improving the connections between research and society. Relationships are at the heart of high-quality collaborative research. By bringing more people into the research - what impacts will this have on those who of us who build, hold, and sustain relationships? Due to the often-invisible nature of working to build and sustain relationships, the effort, benefits, and risks of this work are in danger of being overlooked.

We chose to host a roundtable to enable us to share our thinking and have a sense making discussion with our peers. We wanted to introduce relational practice as a concept and discuss and unpick what relational working means to us in our community. Understanding how to identify and advocate for relational work was a priority whilst considering what we need to do next as a sector. We invited along our peers working within HEIs as well as those working in small charities and the cultural sector as these are the types of partners we are likely to be building relationships with. This ensured we gained a perspective from the other side of the relationship.

The roundtable was delivered in a hybrid and inclusive format and enabled colleagues from across the country to attend. Twenty-three colleagues contributed to the discussion including colleagues from Unison as well as NCCPE, UKRI, The Ideas Fund, We The Curious, and Citizens UK.

The report highlighted a framework, Sarah White’s³ three dimensions of wellbeing, that we chose to frame the roundtable discussion. It outlines how creating a nurturing and

³ White, S. C. (2010). Analysing Wellbeing: A Framework for Development Policy and Practice. Development in Practice 20(2): 158–172.

supportive environment for relational work requires an interrelationship and balance between:

- Personal experiences – how you understand your personal values and motivations, your knowledge, skills and practice of relational work and how you perceive that work is valued and recognised,
- Material environments – this includes employment conditions, the presence or absence of support and resources, the timing, and spaces where relational work takes place, the resourcing of relational work, and attitudes towards relational practice,
- Social systems – such as institutional structures and processes that enable or obstruct relational work

We took these dimensions and created a series of questions for each to explore further with our colleagues. We invited three contributors along to speak about each of these dimensions including David Robinson ([The Relationships Project](#)) who introduced the concept of relationship-centred practice.

As part of the roundtable, we asked participants what the sector should do next:

“Move to democratising change around wellbeing and support, develop cross-sector networks and relationships, and think about hierarchies that exist in our decision-making systems”

“Hold leaders to account to bring vulnerability, slowness and kindness back to work that people are reenergised to do the work”

“Keep talking about relational work”

“What else UKRI can do: change of systems / processes? Convene sector to coordinate? Provide stronger messaging (even policies?) on this?”

Our learnings

We have only just begun the conversation around relational work and what this means for those in research enabler roles. It is clear from our discussions and our roundtable event that there are two strands to the work we are doing. One strand connects to welfare and wellbeing for PEPs and another strand connects to relational work. We have started a conversation with the NCCPE about what is unique to PEP roles and what is specific to the broader discussion around welfare and wellbeing within HEIs. We recognise that advocating for good welfare and wellbeing practices for PEPs sits within the wider remit of university services. We feel, however, that there is much more work to be done around raising awareness of the relational practice of PEPs. We are planning to work with the NCCPE to develop a language around relationship-centred practice and determine what resources our colleagues might want and need to support their practice. ARMA have also expressed an interest in supporting us with this work and keeping the conversation going.

We have also started thinking about how we support our community partners well when taking a relationship-centred approach. Our community partners will likely not have the

resources that we have access to in large HEIs such as access to a free counselling service. We recognise that we need to plan and make provisions for how we might help and support those that we are working with. This support might include providing resources or outputs that can be used by our partners as well as PEPs.

As a team we have decided to prioritise how we look after our welfare and wellbeing and share this process, whilst acknowledging our context as a small team with a secure starting point. We will build on the good practice we already have and will try out some new interventions. We plan to create a statement about the PEU's values and our culture of care that we will share on our website and ensure that these caring values are embedded throughout our work.

6. Sharing Practice Get-togethers

During phase one of the project, we delivered training on participatory research and received feedback from the participating researchers that they wanted opportunities to meet up and share practice with peers across the University. We listened to this feedback and have initiated a series of sharing practice get-togethers for researchers interested in developing participatory approaches to research.

Delivered as informal, lunchtime sessions, researchers have the option to join our sharing practice get-togethers in-person or remotely. The sessions are open to researchers from all disciplines and departments. They offer a safe space for researchers to reflect on their practice and feel part of a community of practice where they can share their stories, methodologies, and ethics approach. Responding to the needs and interests of the participating researchers, we have invited external speakers along to share their practice. Professor Sarah Banks, co-convenor of the [UK Participatory Research Network](#), delivered a popular session exploring ethical practice in participatory research.

Our learnings

Delivering the sharing practice get-togethers has provided us with the opportunity to have conversations with researchers from a range of disciplines and at various career stages. We have learnt a lot about the range of researcher motivations and readiness to involve people meaningfully in their research. It has taken time to reach researchers who are interested in taking a participatory approach and might benefit from participating in this network. Some of our most successful recruitment has happened through word of mouth and through advertising the sessions more widely on Eventbrite.

We are continuing to hold this space through coordinating and facilitating meetings, as this community of practice becomes more established.

Phase three (August 2024 to July 2025)

What next

We are now in phase three of *ParticipatoryResearch@Bath*, and we are embedding and sustaining all our learning about public involvement in research at the University and much of our work from phase two into our core programme. We are continuing to build on our learning from the last eighteen months to support and enhance research-society interactions. We have taken the time to explore what works by bringing out new learning and trialling novel approaches. Taking onboard our learning from phase two, has enabled us to start adapting what we do, strengthened our practice, and equipped us with a range of successful approaches to continue.

The Participatory Research Fund has been really valuable to the work of the PEU and has led to an important shift in our practice and way of working. It has been very timely, giving us the chance to interrogate what we are doing. It has strengthened the underlying principles of our work. We are more explicitly relational in what we do and much less transactional and we understand how to support this side of our work better. We now offer support across the research life cycle. We are upskilling ourselves to be more proficient at Public and Patient Involvement and Engagement (PPIE). This has included reviewing our previous grant scheme and relaunching it as the Engage and Involve grant to include involvement. We are also collaborating with digital engagement specialists [Mangorolla](#) (I'm a Scientist) to create a chat-based digital platform to try out a PPIE pilot. The platform will use a chat function to engage directly with patient and public contributors in text-only live chats between them and researchers. It has proved more challenging than anticipated to find a research team who are in the early stages of the research cycle and have the capacity to work with us to shape the PPIE, providing scope for us to test the platform. We have paused this project for now. We hope to further develop the pilot with Mangorolla as we increase our knowledge of researchers doing PPIE across the University and enhance our skills in supporting PPIE.

Due to the short-term nature of the funding, we have had to take a culture change approach so that we can continue some of the work after the funding runs out. We will not be able to do as much without the funding, but we will be able to support Participatory Research for those who wish to do it.

Moving forwards, we will make a case for continuing to resource this work to ensure the positive progress and impact that we have made in encouraging a culture of collaborative research with/by/for people at the University of Bath continues to grow and flourish.