

# Public Engagement in REF 2021

## NCCPE consultation response

### Background

[The consultation on REF 2021](#) is open until October 15<sup>th</sup> 2018. Two documents have been published by the REF team: **Draft Guidance** and **Draft Panel Criteria and Working Methods**.

We recently convened a workshop to share our draft response to the guidance about public engagement in the draft documents. The event provided very helpful feedback and advice from sector representatives, and the views and comments expressed at the event have informed the response we lay out here. The [briefing paper](#) and [write up](#) of the consultation event are available separately.

Our goal in this response is to make practical suggestions about what (if anything) could be changed or added to improve the guidance. By improve, we mean:

- Make it clearer
- Make it more coherent and consistent
- Make it more 'appropriate' (a term used consistently in the consultation. We are interpreting 'appropriate' to mean in accordance with good practice, and realistic within the constraints of the REF exercise)

In fact, there are very few explicit mentions of public engagement in the two documents, although what is included offers strong encouragement to universities to consider including impacts arising from public engagement in their submitted case studies. We include these references in Annex 1.

The purpose of this document is to share the key points we plan to make in our consultation response. The template for responses limits answers to just 300 words. This document also provides a more detailed rationale for our responses, and fleshes out some of our recommendations in more detail. For instance, we are suggesting some significant changes be made to Annex A of the Draft Criteria (Areas of Impact).

### The consultation questions

In total, the consultation asks 24 questions. We are only responding to 9 of these questions, pertinent to public engagement:

### **Questions about the Draft Guidance**

1. *Is the guidance clear in 'Part 1: Overview of the assessment framework'?*
2. *Is the guidance clear in 'Part 2: Submissions'?*
13. *Is the guidance in 'Part 3, Section 3: Impact' clear?*
15. *Is the guidance in 'Part 3, Section 5: Environment' clear?*
16. *Please provide any further comments on the 'Guidance on submissions', including Annexes A-M*

### **Questions about the Draft Criteria and working methods**

4. *Are the criteria clear and appropriate in 'Part 3, Section 3: Impact'?*
5. *Are the criteria clear and appropriate in 'Part 3, Section 5: Environment'?*
7. *Are the criteria clear and appropriate in 'Part 5: Panel working methods'?*
8. *Overall, the 'Panel criteria and working methods' achieves an appropriate balance between consistency and allowing for discipline-based differences between the panels*

### **Previous consultations and reviews of PE in the REF**

The NCCPE has provided input to inform the framing of public engagement in the REF, over a number of years. You can access [an overview and links](#) on the NCCPE website. Of particular note are:

- [The NCCPE's review of Public Engagement in the 2014 REF](#), which analysed the database of impact case studies and impact templates to examine how public engagement featured and to draw out lessons and recommendations to inform REF 2021
- [The NCCPE's response to the 2017 consultation](#) on the REF
- The [briefing paper](#) and [write up](#) of a workshop hosted by the REF team in February 2018 which explored how public engagement should feature in the guidance for REF 2021
- The [briefing paper](#) and [write up](#) of the consultation event we ran in September 2018, which has informed this response

### **Headlines of our response**

While broadly supportive of the guidance and the continuity achieved with REF 2014, we identify a small number of significant issues which we believe require attention. In particular:

- The guidance should highlight the importance of considering **Equality and Diversity** in relation to impact, not just internal HEI staffing policies. There should be a clear expectation set by the panels that equality and diversity be addressed in impact planning (in the 'environment'), and, where relevant, within impact case studies. We recommend that the [2010 Equality Act](#) and the [Public Duty regarding socio-economic inequalities](#) should be referenced to provide an appropriate framing of this expectation.

- While we are pleased to see that impacts arising from public engagement are encouraged, we suggest various ways in which this expectation could be made **more explicit and coherent**, to encourage a more strategic and comprehensive response from HEIs. We recommend changes to the framing of **the areas and indicators of impact** (Annex A of the Draft Criteria and Working Methods) to ensure that impacts arising from public engagement are considered more holistically (for instance in relation to influencing policy making and professional practice, not just in terms of individual learning outcomes).
- A greater emphasis on **evaluation** is vital if we want to see a step change in the quality of submissions and the robustness of evidence submitted in 2021. We recommend that this is signalled more explicitly.
- While recognising that the REF is focused on assessing the outcomes and impacts arising from research (not the engagement process itself) we recommend that more clarity is offered about how **'pathways' to impact** will be judged by panels as part of the assessment process. It is clear from talking to panellists that these do contribute contextual evidence to inform their judgements, and this should be explained more explicitly.
- Given that one of the core purposes of the REF is to 'create a strong performance incentive for HEIs and individual researchers' (Guidance on Submissions, p.9) we also recommend that the guidance encourages HEIs to consider **active user engagement** in the research process (for instance in relation to approaches to Open Access), in line with good practice.
- We argue for a minimum of **three assessors** (at least two research users) for each impact case study, and for more clarity on how the evidence from the Environment section will be used to inform the assessment of impact case studies.

The consultation limits responses to 300 words, which means very little rationale or detail can be included. Therefore, as well as including our consultation responses to key questions, we provide background notes to offer more context where we feel that will be helpful.

If you have comments on this response, please contact [paul.manners@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:paul.manners@uwe.ac.uk).

We would be delighted if you chose to reference our comments in your consultation response.

# CONSULTATION RESPONSE

## DRAFT GUIDANCE ON SUBMISSIONS

### Question 1a. Guidance on submissions: Part 1: Overview of the assessment framework: is the guidance clear?

*In our response to this question we argue two points: that the principles of equity and equality, laid out in paragraph 27, should be refined to clarify the panels' commitment to treating all types of impact equally, and to widen the treatment of Equality and Diversity beyond research careers.*

#### Question 1A

Equity (27a) is defined exclusively in terms of research outputs and the commitment to judging all types of outputs in an equitable way. This principle should be extended to the 'types of impact' as well. This will affirm the clear guidance elsewhere (e.g. 273, Draft Criteria: *The main panels wish to encourage the submission of a broad range of types of impact*). It also addresses the recommendation in the Stern review that impact be broadened and deepened (82-84). We suggest the following changes (new wording underlined):

**Equity:** *All types of research and all forms of research output and impact across all disciplines shall be assessed on a fair and equal basis. Panels [] recognise and treat on an equal footing excellence in research and impact across the spectrum... The REF aims to assess all types of research and impact...*

Equality (27b) is defined exclusively in terms of 'internal' codes of practice regarding processes of submitting staff. It is important that E&D issues are also addressed in relation to impact (which includes 'the reduction or prevention of harm, risk, cost of other negative effects'). Impact generating activities fall squarely under the 2010 Equality Act, and in particular the Public Sector Equality Duty which requires public bodies to take a proactive and anticipatory approach to promoting equality. We suggest these changes to the wording:

**Equality:** *HEIs are strongly encouraged to embed equality and diversity, and are expected to comply with equality legislation, regarding their processes for submitting staff and outputs and in their approach to achieving impact.*

In our response to consultation question 15a we suggest changes to the environment and impact case study templates to incorporate references to E&D.

We recommend that the section on E&D (51 – 55) is re-named 'E&D in Research Careers' to clarify its focus.

## Background notes to Q1a

While there are clear ethical reasons for considering equality and diversity in relation to impact (for instance, many researchers are committed to working with ‘underserved’ audiences, and to addressing inequalities), there are also legal requirements to take account of. The Equality Act 2010 includes a **Public sector duty regarding socio-economic inequalities**

*An authority to which this section applies must, when making decisions of a strategic nature about how to exercise its functions, have due regard to the desirability of exercising them in a way that is designed to reduce the inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage (P.1).*

It also requires that public bodies have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination
- advance equality of opportunity
- foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities

The Equality Duty applies across Great Britain to the public bodies [listed in Schedule 19 \(as amended\)](#), which includes HEIs and HEFCE, and to any other organisation when it is carrying out a public function.

It identifies the following ‘**protected characteristics**’:

*Age; disability; gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation (P.4)*

It spells out the expectations in more detail in section 149:

### **Public sector equality duty**

(1) *A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—*

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;*
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.*

(3) *Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—*

- (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;*
- (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;*
- (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.*

*(4) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.*

*(5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—*

- (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.*

*(6) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.*

There is additional Equalities legislation in the nations, including (for instance) [Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act \(1998\)](#) which places a statutory duty on public authorities to have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity between persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation; between men and women generally; and between persons with a disability and persons without.

## Question 2a. Guidance on submissions: Part 2: Submissions – is the guidance clear?

*In our response to this question we suggest a clarification to how Open Access is framed, to highlight the importance of considering user-needs.*

### Question 2a.

We are pleased to see the efforts made to encourage interdisciplinarity and collaboration, inside and outside academia (e.g. 106 d), and the guidance that this should be addressed within the Environment Template.

We were also encouraged by the commitment to encouraging Open Access.

However, we are concerned that the guidance, as it stands, suggests that simply making research outputs ‘open and accessible’ is sufficient. We would like to see the guidance reference the importance of considering ‘user needs’ when developing an open access strategy.

A focus on user needs is considered essential in the design of any intervention of this nature. The government’s **Digital Service Standard** provides a robust methodology to help inform how Open Access is approached (<https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/user-research/start-by-learning-user-needs>). The guidance pithily explains why this matters: ‘When designing a government service, always start by learning about the people who will use it. If you don’t understand who they are or what they need from your service, you can’t build the right thing’.

We advise that paragraph 108 is amended to emphasise the need for efforts to realise ‘openness’ are informed by a robust understanding of the needs of potential users and beneficiaries. We suggest the following change:

*‘The four UK HE funding bodies believe that the outputs of publicly funded research should be freely accessible and widely available, **and that consideration of user needs should inform how they are made available to potential beneficiaries**’*

The full potential of open access will not be realised without this encouragement: just making it ‘open’ does not mean that people will find research or choose to use it. Given that one of the core purposes of the REF is to ‘create a strong performance incentive for HEIs and individual researchers’ (p.9) we think that this clarification is important.

### Question 13a. Guidance on submissions: Part 3, Section 3: Impact (REF3)

*In our response to this question we focus attention on the definition of impact and suggest what we believe to be a more coherent and constructive definition. This differentiates between different types of indicators of impact (structure, process and outcome), in line with good practice in other sectors.*

#### Question 13a

There is some lack of consistency in how impact is defined in various parts of the guidance (139, 292) and draft criteria (277; Annex A). A variety of possible indicators are offered, but these lack coherence. Greater clarity could be achieved if these were organised more systematically using established approaches to evaluation, for instance in the health sector.

Here, useful distinctions are drawn between:

- 'Structure' indicators: e.g. policies, systems and infrastructure
- 'Process' indicators: e.g. performance, activity
- 'Outcome' indicators: e.g. skills, attitudes, understanding, behaviour, well-being

These are not currently clearly differentiated in the guidance documents. If taken up, this could also inform the definition of impact, as follows:

*Impact includes, but is not limited to, an effect on, change or benefit to:*

- *the activity, opportunity, performance, policy, practice or process (**structure and process indicators**)*
- *of an audience, beneficiary, community, constituency, organisation or individuals*
- *in any geographic location whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally*
- *affecting attitudes, awareness, behaviour, capacity or understanding (**outcome indicators**)*

There is also some lack of clarity about the extent to which 'pathways' to impact, when described in case studies, are considered by panels in making their judgements of the quality of case studies. We suggest that the following might be added to paragraph 318:

*Impact can happen serendipitously, but in many cases it is realised through well planned 'pathways' which maximise purposeful interaction between research users and researchers. Such pathways can involve users in the development and shaping of the research, and/or involve them actively in its application. While panels' primary focus will be on the outcomes realised by this kind of interaction, due consideration will be given to the contribution of 'pathway' activities when these are described.*

**Background note to Q 13a:** A useful overview of the use of structure, process and outcome indicators can be accessed here: <https://improvement.nhs.uk/documents/2135/measuring-quality-care-model.pdf>

**15a. The guidance in 'Part 3, Section 5: Environment' is clear:**

*Here we argue that a reference to Equality and Diversity is added to the prompts about impact strategy*

**Question 15a**

In line with our response to question 1a on the Draft Guidance, we recommend that paragraph 351 b is amended as follows, to include a prompt to consider equality and diversity in relation to impact strategy:

*Strategy: the institution's strategy for research and enabling impact (including integrity, open research, **considerations of equality and diversity** and structures to support interdisciplinary research) in the assessment period and for the next five year period.*

## Guidance on Submissions: further comments

### 16. Please provide any further comments on the 'Guidance on submissions', including Annexes A-M

*Here we make specific suggestions about how the impact case study and environment templates should be changed to foreground the importance of Equality and Diversity*

#### Question 16

In line with our response to Q1a we suggest changes to the case study and environment templates, to reflect equality and diversity (E&D) considerations. We suggest that a reference to E&D is added to Section 4 of the Case Study template (Annex G):

- *Details of the beneficiaries [] affected or impacted on. **If relevant, include details of how considerations of equality and diversity informed the engagement with beneficiaries.***

We suggest the following changes to the Unit-level Environment template (Annex I):

Section 2. People

- *This section should provide evidence about staffing strategy [] and evidence of how the submitting unit supports and promotes E&D **in research careers.***

Section 4. Collaboration and contribution to the research base, economy and society

- *This section should provide information about the submitted unit's research collaborations, networks and partnerships, including relationships with key research users, beneficiaries or audiences; the wider activities and contributions to the research base, economy and society; **and how the submitting unit supports and promotes equality and diversity through these collaborations and contributions.***

We suggest the following changes to the Institution-level Environment template (Annex H):

*Strategy: The institution's strategy for research and enabling impact (including integrity, **approach to equality and diversity,** open research, and structures to support interdisciplinary research).*

In line with our response to question 13a we suggest that section 4 of the case study template should be amended to emphasise the importance of user engagement:

*A clear explanation of the process or means through which the research led to, underpinned or made a contribution to the impact (for example, **how users were engaged in the research process,** how the research was disseminated, how it came to influence users or beneficiaries, or how it came to be exploited, taken up or applied).*

## **DRAFT PANEL CRITERIA AND WORKING METHODS**

### **Part 3, Section 3: Impact**

**4c. Please comment on the criteria in 'Part 3, Section 3: Impact', in particular on:**

- **where further clarification is required**
- **where refinements could be made**
- **whether there are areas where more consistency across panels could be achieved**
- **whether there are differences between the disciplines that justify further differentiation between the main panel criteria. (300 word limit)**

*Here the word limit restriction is particularly challenging. We flesh out our argument with more detailed suggestions in Annex 2, and provide more detail in our response to Q.8a*

### **Question 4c**

We are glad to see that submitting impacts arising from public engagement (PE) is encouraged but the guidance could be clearer. Firstly, PE is framed primarily as a route to realising individual understanding and learning. While this is significant, there are many other ways in which engaging the public in research can create impact, for instance in influencing policy and practice through public dialogue or co-production.

Secondly, the guidance (especially Annex A) limits public engagement to one of the areas of impact (understanding) and fails to make explicit its potential contribution to the others, for instance to health (through patient involvement) or to areas like policy or business. We have published a modified version of Annex A to illustrate how this could be realised, which includes examples of how impacts arising from public engagement can be evidenced. We provide more detail in our response to Q8a.

We recommend that the draft criteria makes more explicit reference to the role of evaluation as a mechanism for securing convincing evidence, and suggest the following wording be added to the guidance (paragraph 296):

*The use of robust evaluation methods and the provision of evidence arising from evaluation provides support for the impacts claimed. Assessors will bear this in mind when considering the evidence of impact that is cited in the case study.*

*Evidence might result from the researcher / team undertaking their own evaluation (which could be referenced in section 4 of the case study); or commissioning an external evaluation or drawing on evaluations conducted by one of their partners (which can be referenced in section 5 of the case study template.) A list of evaluation frameworks and tools, and the types of evidence they can provide, is available on the NCCPE website.*

### **Background notes to Q 4c**

*Annex 2 provides our rationale for amending **Annex A: Examples of Indicators and Impact***

**Panel criteria and working methods: Part 5: Panel working methods**

**7c. Please comment on the criteria in 'Part 5: Panel working methods', in particular on: - where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made. (300 word limit)**

*We have concerns about the proposed approach to assessing and moderating impact case studies. We suggest that a higher number of assessors for each case study is set (a minimum of three, with at least two research users), and that there is a clear process in place to ensure that those assessors are provided with the relevant information from the Environment template to inform their judgements.*

**Question 7c**

We have some concerns about the rigour of the assessment process as outlined for impact case studies:

*'Each impact case study will be allocated to at least one academic member and one user member or assessor, wherever practicable. User assessors will be allocated impact case studies, and may be allocated relevant parts of the environment template. User members may – in addition to impact case studies – be allocated whole environment templates and/or outputs in particular areas where they are willing and have appropriate expertise to assess them (369)'.*

We would like to see at least two research users assessing each impact case study, as a matter of course, alongside one academic.

More clarity on how the scores will be moderated within and across panels would be helpful, to build confidence in the process from HEI and user communities.

We consider it essential that all readers of impact case studies are provided with the relevant contextual information provided within the Environment templates, as this is a vital source of evidence which should inform their judgements. It is not clear from the draft guidance if and how this will be achieved, and we recommend that this is clarified. It would be helpful if the guidance explained more clearly how the evidence from the Environment section will be used to inform the assessment of case studies.

The NCCPE would be delighted to provide training or guidance to panel members on assessing impacts arising from public engagement. Having one academic and one research user from each panel attending such training (perhaps in Main Panel clusters) could help ensure consistency across the panels.

***8a. Overall, the 'Panel criteria and working methods' achieves an appropriate balance between consistency and allowing for discipline-based differences between the panels***

*We have used this final 'catch all' question to provide more detail of our proposed changes to Annex A.*

#### **Question 8a**

Annex A provides a helpful articulation of the panels' collective expectations. We suggest two ways in which the table could be made more consistent.

Firstly, we suggest that differentiating between 'structure', 'process' and 'outcome' indicators would help, and that examples might be given of each to frame the table, and then within each Area of Impact. For instance:

##### **Structure indicators:**

- Evidence of influence on policies, guidelines, standards or regulations
- Evidence of influence on decision making and accountability arrangements
- Evidence of influence on the strategic objectives of an organisation
- Evidence of adoption of regulations and routines to enhance social responsibility, ethical practice, equality and diversity and sustainability

##### **Process indicators:**

- Evidence adoption of new or changed methods, models, techniques and approaches (e.g. enhanced co-production; changes to resource-use)
- Evidence of influence on project activity and operations, product development and/or service delivery
- Evidence of challenge to 'received wisdom' or established paradigms and assumptions
- Evidence of influence on capacity building activity
- Evidence of widened participation and access (e.g. by marginalized, under-engaged and/or diverse audiences)

##### **Outcome indicators**

- Evidence of increased awareness and understanding
- Evidence of increased skills
- Evidence of increased empathy or tolerance
- Evidence of increased creativity
- Evidence of enhanced patient outcomes

The first 8 of the 'impact areas' in Annex A have a particular logic: each identifies a broad area of common purpose that motivates relatively discrete professional communities to realise impact. The final area (Understanding) doesn't follow the same logic, describing instead various individual outcomes, and not referencing the activity of any professional

communities. A more coherent framing of the areas of impact could be achieved if this ninth area of impact was revised. We suggest that it might be split into two broad areas:

- Impacts on education, lifelong learning and skills
- Impacts on citizenship and community engagement

## Annex 1: References to public engagement in the draft guidance

There are four explicit references to public engagement in the two documents:

### Draft Panel Guidance

318. There are many ways in which research may have underpinned impact, including but not limited to:

Impacts on, for example, public awareness, attitudes, understanding or behaviour that arose from engaging the public with research. In these cases, the submitting unit must show that the engagement activity was, at least in part, based on the submitted unit's research and drew materially and distinctly upon it. Further guidance and examples are set out in the 'Panel criteria', Annex A.

### Draft panel criteria

274. The panels also acknowledge that there are multiple and diverse pathways through which research achieves impact. Impact may be the result of individual or collective research (or a combination of these) within or between a range of organisations, within higher education and beyond, including collaboration beyond the UK. The associated impact may be achieved by a variety of possible models: from individuals, to inter-institutional groups, to groups including both academic and non-academic participants. The relationship between research and impact can be indirect or non-linear. The impact of research may be foreseen or unforeseen. It can emerge as an end product, but can also be demonstrated during the research process. Impact takes place through a wide variety of mechanisms. It may effect change or enrichment for local, national or international communities, groups or individuals. Consequently, public engagement may be an important feature of many case studies, as the mechanism by which the impact claimed has been achieved.

288. Engaging the public with the submitting unit's research (for example, through citizen science, patient and public involvement in health, or through public and community engagement), is an activity that may lead to impact. Sub-panels will welcome, and assess equitably, case studies describing impacts achieved through public engagement, either as the main impact described or as one facet of a wider range of impacts. Panels expect that case studies based on public engagement will demonstrate both reach (e.g. through audience or participant figures) and significance, and will take both into account when assessing the impacts. Examples of impacts arising from public engagement can be found as part of Table 1 (Annex A).

**Annex A:** Examples of impact achieved through public engagement are integrated into the different areas of impact in Table 1. More detailed advice on achieving and evidencing

impact through public engagement can be found on the website of the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement: <http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/>.

4. Examples are also provided of impact evaluation frameworks used outside higher education. Impact partners may also have their own evaluation frameworks that could be drawn upon to evidence impact.

## **Annex 2: reframing the Examples of Indicators and Impact (Annex A, Draft Panel Criteria)**

This annex 'walks through' our suggestions for how the table of indicators might be made more coherent and consistent, and how impacts arising from public engagement might be incorporated across the different impact domains

## Background notes to Q4c: structure, process and outcome indicators

We reviewed Annex A to establish whether a more consistent and coherent framing of the proposed indicators might be offered.

In doing so we identified how each provided, to a greater or lesser extent, examples of structure, process and outcome indicators. The table below lists examples, organised under the three headings. We suggest that the guidance might use this generic framing to provide a more coherent approach, and that each Impact Area could usefully provide examples of each pertinent to the area.

<b>Impact domain</b>	<b>Structure indicators</b>	<b>Process indicators</b>	<b>Outcome indicators</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creativity &amp; culture</li> <li>• Environment</li> <li>• Social welfare</li> <li>• Production</li> <li>• Commerce and the economy</li> <li>• Practitioners &amp; prof services</li> <li>• Public policy, law &amp; services</li> <li>• Health, wellbeing &amp; animal welfare</li> <li>• Understanding, learning and participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of influence on policies, guidelines, standards or regulations pertaining to each domain</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on decision making and accountability arrangements (e.g. governance arrangements)</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on the strategic objectives of an organisation</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on arrangements to support collaboration and partnership working (e.g. formal partnership arrangements)</li> <li>• Evidence of adoption of regulations and routines to enhance social responsibility, ethical practice, equality and diversity and sustainability</li> <li>• Evidence of positive environmental benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence adoption of new or changed methods, models, techniques and approaches (e.g. enhanced co-production; changes to resource-use)</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on project activity and operations, product development and/or service delivery</li> <li>• Evidence of challenge to 'received wisdom' or established paradigms and assumptions</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on capacity building activity (e.g. CPD; curricula; teaching methods)</li> <li>• Evidence of changes to working practices, e.g. through increased reflective practice</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on decision-making outcomes (e.g. planning decisions)</li> <li>• Evidence of changes to extent, quality and longevity of collaboration</li> <li>• Evidence of changes to management practices</li> <li>• Evidence of decision making processes being influenced</li> <li>• Evidence of changes to progression opportunities for individuals with protected characteristics</li> <li>• Evidence of improved access to resources or opportunities</li> <li>• Evidence of uptake of research in public debate and discourse</li> <li>• Evidence of the identification and mitigation of risks, and hazards</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on consideration of ethics and values</li> <li>• Evidence of reduced costs, greater profitability, enhanced efficiency or productivity</li> <li>• Evidence of improved accountability / monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of increased awareness and understanding</li> <li>• Evidence of increased skills</li> <li>• Evidence of increased empathy or tolerance</li> <li>• Evidence of increased creativity</li> <li>• Evidence of increased educational attainment</li> <li>• Evidence of increased confidence</li> <li>• Evidence of increased motivation</li> <li>• Evidence of increased trust</li> <li>• Evidence of enhanced health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Evidence of enhanced quality of life</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on social mobility</li> <li>• Evidence of improved equality and diversity outcomes</li> <li>• Evidence of strengthened or extended networks</li> <li>• Evidence of changed behaviours</li> <li>• Evidence of increased 'user' satisfaction with products or services</li> <li>• Evidence of enhanced patient outcomes</li> </ul>

## Background notes to Q4c: the impact areas

We reviewed the 9 'impact areas' in Annex A and identified that the first 8 had a particular logic: each identified a broad area of common purpose ('**motivation**') that mobilises relatively discrete **professional communities** to realise impact. This is represented in the table below. We noted that the final area (Understanding, Learning and Participation) didn't follow the same logic, describing instead various individual outcomes, and not referencing the activity of any professional communities. We argue that a more coherent framing of the 9 areas of impact could be achieved if this ninth area of impact was revised. We suggest that it might be split into two broad areas (shown on the next page):

- Impacts on Education, lifelong learning and skills
- Impacts on citizenship and community engagement

<b>Area of impact / domain</b>	<b>Motivation</b>	<b>Professional communities</b>
<b>Impacts on creativity, culture and society</b>	<i>To stimulate participation in the arts and culture; to support creative expression</i>	<i>People working in arts and cultural sector</i>
<b>Impacts on the environment</b>	<i>To enhance the environment, address climate change, stewardship, conservation</i>	<i>People working in all areas of society, committed to positive impacts on the environment</i>
<b>Impact on social welfare</b>	<i>To address poverty and inequality and other social challenges</i>	<i>People working in social care, and to address poverty social exclusion and social mobility</i>
<b>Impacts on production</b>	<i>To create new, or improve existing products and production processes</i>	<i>People working in manufacturing and on the production of new products</i>
<b>Impacts on commerce and the economy</b>	<i>To generate wealth, create efficiencies, improve financial regulation</i>	<i>People working in financial services and regulation, and in businesses with a 'bottom line'</i>
<b>Impacts on practitioners &amp; professional services</b>	<i>To enhance professional practice &amp; deliver high-quality services that meet 'users' needs</i>	<i>People working to deliver high quality services, in any sector</i>
<b>Impacts on public policy, law and services</b>	<i>To create effective, just and fair policies, regulations and laws</i>	<i>Government (national, devolved and local); regulators and law makers</i>
<b>Impacts on health, wellbeing &amp; animal welfare</b>	<i>To improve human and animal health and wellbeing</i>	<i>People working in &amp; allied to healthcare, social care or animal welfare to deliver services; companies supplying products &amp; services, carers &amp; community initiatives</i>
<b>Impacts on understanding, learning &amp; participation</b>	<i>To inspire individual learning and participation</i>	<b>We are suggesting that this area should be re-framed – see next page</b>

## Background notes to Q4c: Revised Impact Domains

<b>Area of impact / domain</b>	<b>Motivation</b>	<b>Professional communities</b>
<b><i>Impacts on creativity, culture and society</i></b>	<i>To stimulate participation in the arts and culture; to support creative expression</i>	<i>People working in arts and cultural sector</i>
<b><i>Impacts on the environment</i></b>	<i>To enhance the environment, address climate change, stewardship, conservation</i>	<i>People working in all areas of society, committed to positive impacts on the environment</i>
<b><i>Impact on social welfare</i></b>	<i>To address poverty and inequality and other social challenges</i>	<i>People working in social care, and to address poverty social exclusion and social mobility</i>
<b><i>Impacts on production</i></b>	<i>To create new, or improve existing products and production processes</i>	<i>People working in manufacturing and on the production of new products</i>
<b><i>Impacts on commerce and the economy</i></b>	<i>To generate wealth, create efficiencies, improve financial regulation</i>	<i>People working in financial services and regulation, and in businesses with a 'bottom line'</i>
<b><i>Impacts on practitioners &amp; professional services</i></b>	<i>To enhance professional practice &amp; deliver high-quality services that meet 'users' needs</i>	<i>People working to deliver high quality services, in any sector</i>
<b><i>Impacts on public policy, law and services</i></b>	<i>To create effective, just and fair policies, regulations and laws</i>	<i>Government (national, devolved and local); regulators and law makers</i>
<b><i>Impacts on health, wellbeing &amp; animal welfare</i></b>	<i>To improve human and animal health and wellbeing</i>	<i>People working in &amp; allied to healthcare, social care or animal welfare to deliver services; companies supplying products &amp; services, carers &amp; community initiatives</i>
<b><i>Impacts on education and lifelong learning</i></b>	<i>To stimulate lifelong learning and educational achievement</i>	<i>People working in formal and informal education</i>
<b><i>Impacts on citizenship &amp; community engagement</i></b>	<i>To increase participation in civil society, public engagement in decision-making and debate</i>	<i>People working in community development and citizenship</i>

*We then considered how best to frame the potential contribution of impacts arising from public engagement. Arising from our review of REF 2014 case studies, we wanted to demonstrate how engaging the public can contribute value in all areas of impact: from the environment to social welfare, policy making, health and the economy. We added examples of how the public can be engaged, with what kinds of results, to each of the 10 areas, as demonstrated on the next page*

## Background notes to Q4c: Updated table

*This table attempts to provide a more consistent and coherent framing of the areas of impact, and to model how PE contributes to each*

<b>Area of impact</b>	<b>Motivation</b>	<b>Professional communities</b>	<b>Public roles</b>	<b>Contribution of public engagement?</b>
<b>Impacts on creativity, culture and society</b>	<i>To stimulate participation in the arts and culture; to support creative expression</i>	<i>People working in arts and cultural sector</i>	<i>Audiences; participants; communities of place and interest; volunteers; supporters</i>	<i>Stimulate involvement in arts and culture; widen participation and representation; support development of services better tuned to users</i>
<b>Impacts on the environment</b>	<i>To enhance the environment, address climate change, stewardship, conservation</i>	<i>People working in all areas of society, committed to positive impacts on the environment</i>	<i>Citizen scientists; activists; volunteers; communities of place</i>	<i>Stimulate behaviour change; build understanding and awareness; contribute to public debate</i>
<b>Impact on social welfare</b>	<i>To address poverty and inequality and other social challenges</i>	<i>People working in social care, and to address poverty social exclusion and social mobility</i>	<i>Citizens; community members; carers</i>	<i>Contribute to public debate; support development of services better tuned to users; inform policy development; address behaviours</i>
<b>Impacts on production</b>	<i>To create new, or improve existing products and production processes</i>	<i>People working in manufacturing and on the production of new products</i>	<i>Consumers; employees; union members</i>	<i>Hold to account for business practices; contribute to shaping of new products so they better meet customer needs</i>
<b>Impacts on commerce and the economy</b>	<i>To generate wealth, create efficiencies, improve financial regulation</i>	<i>People working in financial services and regulation, and in businesses with a 'bottom line'</i>	<i>Consumers; customers; employees; communities of place; citizens</i>	<i>Hold to account for business practices; contribute to shaping of new products so they better meet customer needs; stimulate innovation</i>
<b>Impacts on practitioners &amp; professional services</b>	<i>To enhance professional practice &amp; deliver high-quality services that meet 'users' needs</i>	<i>People working to deliver high quality services, in any sector</i>	<i>Service users; customers; members; trustees and governors; clients</i>	<i>Hold to account for quality of service; contribute to shaping of new services so they better meet user needs; embed reflective practices</i>
<b>Impacts on public policy, law and services</b>	<i>To create effective, just and fair policies, regulations and laws</i>	<i>Government (national, devolved and local); regulators and law makers</i>	<i>Citizens; consumers; community members; voters</i>	<i>Contribute to public debate; support development of policies, governance and laws; inform policy development through dialogue</i>
<b>Impacts on health, wellbeing &amp; animal welfare</b>	<i>To improve human and animal health and wellbeing</i>	<i>People working in &amp; allied to healthcare, social care or animal welfare; companies supplying products &amp; services, carers &amp; community initiatives</i>	<i>Patients; carers; parents; pet owners</i>	<i>Stimulate awareness and understanding; address behaviours; enhance services through patient involvement; improved prevention, treatment and support</i>
<b>Impacts on education and lifelong learning</b>	<i>To stimulate lifelong learning and educational achievement</i>	<i>People working in formal and informal education</i>	<i>Learners; community members; pupils; parents</i>	<i>Stimulate take up of lifelong learning; encourage participation in civic life; enhance services through user engagement</i>
<b>Impacts on citizenship &amp; community engagement</b>	<i>To increase participation in civil society, public engagement in decision-making and debate</i>	<i>People working in community development and citizenship</i>	<i>Citizens; community members; communities of place</i>	<i>Improve participation in civil society, informal engagement in decision-making and involvement in public/online discussion</i>

## Background notes to Q4c: Structure, process and outcome indicators applied to impacts arising from public engagement

Finally, we revisited the indicators of impact listed in the different Areas of Impact, and proposed examples of indicators that might be utilised to capture impacts arising from public engagement

<b>Structure indicators</b>	<b>Process indicators</b>	<b>Outcome indicators</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of research process involving the public in the shaping of new policies, guidelines and regulations</li> <li>• Evidence of research process resulting in public involvement becoming embedded in governance and accountability arrangements</li> <li>• Evidence of research process ensuring public 'voice' holds organisations to account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of research process leading to enhanced public involvement in the shaping and delivery of services</li> <li>• Evidence of discussion and debate being stimulated in the public sphere</li> <li>• Evidence of individual / group decision making being influenced by research</li> <li>• Evidence of the increased uptake of lifelong learning</li> <li>• Evidence of increased public participation in the different domains</li> <li>• Evidence of widened participation and access (e.g. by marginalized, under-engaged and/or diverse audiences)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence of how specific individuals or groups have been directly affected in all indicator areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of increased awareness and understanding</li> <li>• Evidence of increased skills</li> <li>• Evidence of increased empathy or tolerance</li> <li>• Evidence of increased creativity</li> <li>• Evidence of increased educational attainment</li> <li>• Evidence of increased confidence</li> <li>• Evidence of increased motivation</li> <li>• Evidence of increased trust</li> <li>• Evidence of enhanced health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Evidence of enhanced quality of life</li> <li>• Evidence of influence on social mobility</li> <li>• Evidence of improved equality and diversity outcomes</li> <li>• Evidence of strengthened or extended networks</li> <li>• Evidence of changed behaviours</li> <li>• Evidence of increased 'user' satisfaction with products or services</li> <li>• Evidence of enhanced patient outcomes</li> </ul>



The National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) is internationally recognised for its work supporting and inspiring universities to engage with the public.

We work to change perspectives, promote innovation, and nurture and celebrate excellence. We also champion meaningful engagement that makes a real and valued difference to people's lives.

The NCCPE is supported by the UK Higher Education Councils, Research Councils UK and Wellcome, and has been hosted by the University of Bristol and the University of the West of England since it was established in 2008.

**National Co-ordinating Centre  
for Public Engagement**

2nd Floor, Arnolfini  
16 Narrow Quay  
Bristol, BS1 4QA

**Tel** 0117 328 7190

**Email** [nccpe.enquiries@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:nccpe.enquiries@uwe.ac.uk)

**Twitter** @NCCPE

[publicengagement.ac.uk](http://publicengagement.ac.uk)

