

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement</b>
<b>Question 1: how should the outcomes framework currently in place for UIF evolve to ensure University KEIF is structured to deliver on its renewed purpose and has the right strategic drivers and incentives in place?</b>	<p>We are responding to the consultation on the basis of our experience supporting public, community and civic engagement across the UK HE sector. The NCCPE was established in 2008, and is funded by UKRI, the UK HE Funding Councils and Wellcome. We are also partners in the UK’s Civic University network, hosted at Sheffield Hallam University. We have been closely involved in supporting UK research funding policies, providing advice on how best to incentivise public engagement within the REF, the KEF and the KE Concordat. We strongly support the ambition of the review to support the drive for economic and social prosperity, and have identified areas where we feel considerations of public engagement could strengthen the proposed approaches laid out in the consultation.</p> <p>On reflection, we were struck by the absence of explicit incentives to prioritise engagement with publics and communities in the framing of the proposed approach. Diagram one does not foreground the importance of taking account of public and stakeholder needs and expectations of KE and innovation, in contrast with UKRI’s new strategy, published this month. UKRI's strategy identifies Engagement as one of four key strategic shifts required of the research and innovation system: For research and innovation to thrive, they must serve the society that funds them. Engagement is needed to build effective collaboration and genuine partnerships between the research and innovation system and its many stakeholders, including those who may not see themselves as part of the system. The removal of barriers across the research and innovation system must be matched by the removal of barriers between research and innovation and wider society.</p> <p>The UKRI strategy is informed by lessons learned about how to realise the enormous potential of research and innovation to transform our society and economy. When R&amp;I is out of step with society (e.g. GM crops) or misunderstood (e.g. vaccinations) the backlash, erosion of trust, and impact on behaviour can be profound, and have long lasting social and economic fallout.</p> <p>Done well, engaging the public can help develop research more attuned to society’s needs and sensitive to its concerns. It can inform research choices, build ownership of the outcomes of research, and enable it to be acted on to generate significant public benefit. We have seen a host of promising</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

developments in engaging the public with research and innovation in the last 20 years. We would like to see these lessons learned embedded in your new approach to investing in KE&I.

Key to achieving this will be valuing public engagement and supporting it effectively. There are a number of problems in how the KE&I and R&I system currently operates which inhibit high quality engagement. These include:

Research and innovation culture: there is evidence that the research/ KE system still operates with perverse incentives (e.g. de-valuing of external engagement and collaboration; and a toxic culture of “unhealthy competition, bullying and harassment” identified in the recent Wellcome Research Culture report).

Research and innovation purpose: by incentivising ‘outputs’ over outcomes, and in particular a publish or perish culture, at the expense of a broader range of activities to engage with users through the process.

Research process: engagement is often viewed as a secondary ‘bolt on’ activity; the expertise of engagement professionals undervalued; engagement with different users (e.g. business and publics) operating in separate silos; a lack of innovation in methods; a lack of deliberation and user engagement early in the process. There is a lack of investment in evaluation and learning about ‘what works’.

Things can be done differently, with many innovative approaches to engaging the public gaining traction across the R&D system, which could be scaled up. The embedding of patient and public involvement in health research, pioneered by NIHR is one example. Another is Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI). RRI emphasises the need to build trust in science; to take account of public views; and has developed a host of tools and approaches to build robust, socially sensitive scientific knowledge. UKRI’s Sciencewise programme is another example of a strategic approach to public engagement. AHRC’s Connected Communities programme was a 6 year £30M investment in community-focused research, which demonstrated the value and impact of engagement methods.

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>We would recommend that public engagement is included as a cross cutting enabler of your approach, as it is in UKRI's strategy, and that more explicit prompts and incentives to embed support for public engagement are built into your new approach.</p>
<p><b>Question 2: what are your views on the current UIF collaborative framework, how could this evolve and be sustained to support further good practice and purposeful collaboration? Is there a role for the Knowledge Exchange Concordat in this context or more generally?</b></p>	<p>We strongly support the use of the KE Concordat to support this process - it has proved itself to be a very well received and useful framework to encourage HEIs to develop their support for KE. It makes great sense to capitalise on this momentum.</p>
<p><b>Question 3: what are your views on how the impact and outcomes of University KEIF should be measured, including the role of metrics or other indicators in any future funding and allocation model? We would welcome views on current or potential good practice regarding measuring net-zero KE&amp;I activities and outcomes.</b></p>	<p>We have extensive experience in supporting the evaluation of impacts arising from engaging the public with research and KE. We published a review of the impact case studies and environment templates submitted to the REF in 2014, and have just completed a review of the Public and Community Engagement narratives submitted to the KEF in 2020. This provides a host of rich data about useful indicators to assess the KE/research environment and culture, as well as insights into how impacts arising from KE processes can be evaluated.</p> <p>One of our key insights from our review of the KEF is that:          'Publics' or citizens, have an important stake in and potential contribution to make to innovation across different domains, including the economic. This can helpfully be demonstrated using the perspectives in the Knowledge Exchange Framework.</p> <p>1: Working with business. The public can make a significant contribution to engagement with business, for instance through approaches to social innovation. This involves actively involving customers, consumers and audiences in the development of new products and services and in critique of existing products and processes</p> <p>2: Working with the public and third sector. By involving service users in the enhancement of public services (e.g. Patient and Public Involvement) public engagement can make a significant contribution to innovation in the public sphere</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>3: Skills, enterprise and entrepreneurship. By investing in community skills development and lifelong learning and in 'Engaged learning' to develop graduates awareness of and interaction with communities, public engagement has a major role to play in increasing human and social capital; and through the development of social enterprises and social entrepreneurship</p> <p>4: IP and commercialisation. Through encouraging open-source products and platforms, public engagement contributes to open innovation processes, and the wider diffusion of knowledge.</p> <p>5: Local growth and regeneration. By engaging with vulnerable or disadvantaged communities and by opening up facilities for community use, public engagement makes a significant contribution to place making and civic responsibility</p> <p>6: Research partnerships. By supporting the public to engage with and get involved in research, for a variety of purposes, public engagement contributes to valuable social outcomes, evidenced in the NCCPE's review of the 2014 REF case studies.</p> <p>This integrated approach is currently far from embedded, with public engagement often 'bolted on' or not even factored in to KE activities. We would recommend clearer guidance is developed on this topic to ensure that these opportunities aren't missed.</p>
<p><b>Question 4: how could the University KEIF, with Interface, help support collaboration with colleges, collectively supporting Scotland's SME base to be more innovative?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 5: how could core capacity funding (College KEIF) best support colleges to be effective agents of KE&amp;I? We would particularly like to learn from colleges directly on what KE&amp;I means to them and where capacity is needed to deliver this effectively, which could include building on current practice.</b></p>	

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

<p><b>Question 6: we would welcome views on what would be an appropriate period for SFC to run the first cycle of College KEIF before formally reviewing it and establishing a mature model for future years.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 7: we would welcome views on the potential value of using College KEIF to create frameworks for collaboration and sharing of good practice across the colleges, and with universities.</b></p>	<p>We have been very actively involved in the roll out of capacity building initiatives linked to both the KE Concordat and to Civic and Public Engagement with research, running a host of workshops, supporting various networks, and working alongside other agencies like Praxis Auril to develop a joined up approach to building KE capability. We have also developed a range of tools and frameworks to support collaboration and reflective practice in the KE/I space, including partnership building tools. Many of these are shared on our website (<a href="http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk">www.publicengagement.ac.uk</a>). We would be delighted to share our experience of developing such support and the key lessons learned. We have been very struck by the appetite for such support across the UK HE system, encouraged in particular by the KE Concordat.</p>
<p><b>Question 8: our review recommended that we co-design the Entrepreneurial Campus strategy with colleges and universities. We would welcome views on what is proposed in this consultation, including potential opportunities, weaknesses and gaps.</b></p>	<p>We would be keen to see that support for factoring public, community and civic engagement is built into the strategy. There are a number of existing models for this, developed by the NCCPE and the Civic University network which could easily be adapted for this purpose. We have spelt some of these out in other answers.</p> <p>Some of the key lessons we have learned about how to scale up effective strategic support for public and civic engagement include:</p> <p><b>Use a theory of change approach</b></p> <p>R&amp;D is a complex social intervention, with many uncertainties. We have found a ‘theory of change’ approach particularly valuable, both in considering how to frame new calls, and in supporting research teams to develop coherent plans for their work. The approach requires you to think through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the purpose of the approach?</li> <li>- What is the context (the existing knowledge base; the social need it is addressing; other interventions working in this space)</li> </ul>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the rationale for the proposed approach?</li> <li>- What activities will be put in place to pursue these goals?</li> <li>- What is its potential contribution to the knowledge base?</li> <li>- And how might it contribute to wider public benefit? What outcomes might we achieve?</li> </ul> <p>Such an approach also provides reviewers with useful intelligence with which to judge the planned approach to research and application. There is an urgent need to consider how the application and review process might be enhanced. We could usefully learn from how funders in the social sector invest to realise social outcomes.</p> <p><b>Develop impact and engagement capability</b></p> <p>The application of knowledge is a complex, social process. It is heavily dependent on skilful approaches to collaboration (engagement), and the effects (impact) are often subtle and difficult to evidence. We need to become much more skilful and reflective about ‘what works’; to provide training for researchers; and to invest in engagement and evaluation expertise. The NCCPE provides a range of training and development courses that build capacity in these different areas, and we are working increasingly closely with other agencies like Vitae, Praxis Auril, NCUB and ARMA to develop a more joined up approach. The Concordat for Knowledge Exchange is an important development, providing a clear articulation of the key principles and enablers of effective knowledge exchange.</p> <p><b>Fund development time and brokerage</b></p> <p>Impactful research typically depends upon the quality of relationships between researchers and research users. The Connected Communities programme modelled new approaches to funding, investing in ‘co-design’ projects for instance, funding both community organisations and researchers to work together to refine the focus of a research project to ensure it addressed a significant need. Scaling up new modes of ‘collaborative’ funding will be essential to enhance application.</p>
<p><b>Question 9: we would welcome evidence of current practice in Scotland (or elsewhere) to ensure we have an up-to-date picture of what is working well</b></p>	<p>The National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) is committed to increasing the involvement of the public in research and innovation, and to maximising the public benefit of innovation and entrepreneurship through purposeful public engagement. There are a number of</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**and upon which the Entrepreneurial Campus strategy could build on.**

lessons learned about how this can be achieved which should be factored into the development of the Entrepreneurial Campus strategy.

Knowledge Exchange and entrepreneurship offers enormous potential to transform our society and economy but involve very significant political choices about where and how to invest to realise this potential. When these choices are out of step with society (e.g. GM crops) or misunderstood (e.g. vaccinations) the backlash, erosion of trust, and impact on behaviour can be profound, and have long lasting social and economic fallout.

Done well, engaging the public can help develop innovation more attuned to society's needs and sensitive to its concerns. It can inform research choices, build ownership of the outcomes of research & innovation, and enable it to be acted on to generate significant public benefit. We have seen a host of promising developments in engaging the public with research and innovation in the last 20 years. These could usefully be applied to the new strategy.

Key to achieving this will be valuing public engagement and supporting it effectively. There are a number of problems in how the R&I system currently operates which inhibit high quality engagement which will need to be addressed to deliver on its aspirations. These include:

Research & Innovation culture: there is evidence that the research system still operates with perverse incentives (e.g. de-valuing of external engagement and collaboration; and a toxic culture of "unhealthy competition, bullying and harassment" identified in the recent Wellcome Research Culture report)

Research purpose: by incentivising 'outputs' over outcomes, and in particular a 'publish or perish' culture, at the expense of a broader range of activities to engage with users through the process

Research process: engagement is often viewed as a secondary 'bolt on' activity; the expertise of engagement professionals undervalued; engagement with different users (e.g. business and publics) operating in separate silos; a lack of innovation in methods; a lack of deliberation and user

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>engagement early in the process. There is a lack of investment in evaluation and learning about ‘what works.’</p> <p>Things can be done differently, with many innovative approaches to engaging the public gaining traction across the R&amp;D system, which could be scaled up by the new strategy. The embedding of patient and public involvement in health research, pioneered by NIHR is one example. Another is Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI). RRI emphasises the need to build trust in science; to take account of public views; and has developed a host of tools and approaches to build robust, socially sensitive scientific knowledge. UKRI’s Sciencewise programme is another example of a strategic approach to public engagement. AHRC’s Connected Communities programme was a 6 year £30M investment in community-focused research, which demonstrated the value and impact of engagement methods.</p>
<p><b>Question 10: the Review recommended that the university and college sectors join SFC in repositioning Innovation Centres (ICs) as stable long-term infrastructure investments. We would welcome views on the details of the proposed ‘repositioning’ as described in this consultation, including any opportunities, weaknesses and gaps.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 11: we would welcome views on how we could best strengthen the Innovation Centres’ relationship with universities and colleges, ensuring added value, sense of partnership and collaboration, avoiding duplication of effort etc. This would include opportunities for alignment and partnership with Interface, Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, South of Scotland Enterprise and other relevant agencies and organisations.</b></p>	<p>We would point to important lessons being learned about partnership and collaboration through the Civic University Network, which supports universities to drive positive social change in their local communities. Over 100 universities have joined the network, which is hosted by Sheffield Hallam University, in partnership with the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement and the Institute for Community Studies.</p> <p>Many members are developing Civic Agreements with local colleges, businesses and public sector partners (see for instance the recent Universities for Manchester agreement). The Agreements foreground the need for robust, systematic social and economic intelligence to inform planning,</p>



## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

similar to the approach taken with Science and Innovation Audits, building an evidence base and a shared narrative to mobilise collaboration.

This detailed planning then needs to translate into action. There are many examples of how programmes have emerged following a process of evidence gathering, citizen involvement, and co-design. Working in this way provides an opportunity to align R&D funding with other investment. UCLAN's £35m Engineering Innovation Centre reflects how universities can work with regional stakeholders to access devolved funding and respond to the challenges in the Roadmap. Kingston University worked with the LA, the BID and GLA to develop Re-imagining Kingston Town Centre's Spaces and Places, a public realm strategy to enable community groups to take projects forward.

Secondly, Civic universities take an inclusive view of how economic, health, cultural and environmental outcomes interact and are interdependent. Pursuing economic recovery in isolation mitigates against our goal of building thriving places which balance the different outcomes. Civic agreements are a means of driving demand-led R&D where commissioning and funding better connects with the local communities and institutions.

Foregrounding place-based outcomes and community involvement in funding can rapidly accelerate this. Network members have participated in UKRIs Enhancing Place-Based Public Engagement programme, which funded projects and partnerships driven by a community's need focused in the most deprived areas of the UK. This has pump primed innovative approaches and allowed for existing high-quality activity to be scaled up.

Finally, we need to reset our approach from supplying knowledge, to being increasingly demand-led, as the University of Winchester has through its Flourishing Communities research. Investing in more purposeful and robust evaluation is a vital part of this. Requiring evaluation and a stronger user voice in funding applications and providing the opportunity to cost-in resources would incentivise this. ICS's co-created Research Agenda for Communities is an example of a demand-led research agenda.

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>Research funders can accelerate this by valuing the involvement of civic leaders and citizens. Finally, it will be important to develop policies which encourage more collaboration. Many of the current incentives pit universities against each other and encourage them to develop projects in isolation. This makes it harder to achieve joined-up, strategic planning that puts societal benefit first. Despite this, there are many examples of our members working in partnership to realise place-based outcomes. One example is the Yorkshire &amp; Humber Academic Health Science Network, NHS Confederation and Yorkshire Universities partnership to tackle increasing socio-economic inequalities and boost health outcomes. Framing funding calls around local social challenges and building in incentives for collaboration not competition is a practical way to realise place-based outcomes.</p>
<p><b>Question 12: we would welcome views on potential areas of future opportunity where the Innovation Centre model could help deliver outcomes for Scotland.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 13: we would welcome views on strengthening Interface’s relationship with universities and colleges, ensuring added value, sense of partnership and collaboration, avoiding duplication of effort etc. This would include opportunities for alignment and partnership with Innovation Centres, Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, South of Scotland Enterprise and other relevant agencies and organisations.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 14: if you have direct experience of working with Interface, we would welcome suggestions for evolutions to its operating model to help it develop even more effective support for productive relationships between businesses and our universities and colleges.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 15: we would welcome general views, based on direct experience of the Innovation</b></p>	

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

<p><b>Voucher scheme, on how it could evolve and better support our system for KE&amp;I.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 16: we would welcome views on widening the scope of Innovation Vouchers to encompass wider KE activity but retaining the key objective of using them as a means to promote first time collaborations and encourage longer-term relationships.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 17: how could colleges and universities help SFC understand, or monitor longitudinally, how many Innovation Vouchers have led to ongoing relationships? Are there cross sectoral digital solutions to this which can help us better understand the outcome we hope to achieve?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 18: From experience of mission-led approaches elsewhere, how would you advise SFC to use its resources and investments to facilitate such activity in support of Scottish Government objectives for economic transformation?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 19: We would welcome views on the breadth of the role a KE&amp;I Advisory Board could play and what stakeholder membership would give us the most effective support for SFC's role in the ecosystem.</b></p>	
<p><b>We may publish a summary of the consultation responses and, in some cases, the responses themselves. Published responses may be attributed to an organisation where this information has been provided but will not contain personal data. When providing a response in an individual capacity,</b></p>	<p>Publish information and excerpts from this survey response INCLUDING the organisation name.</p>

**Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)**

<p><b>published responses will be anonymised. Please confirm whether or not you agree to your response being included in any potential publication.</b></p>	
---	--