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Living Knowledge Network

Science Shops “And Similar Entities”

- Research intermediary for all disciplines
- Demand Driven (Upstream, Interactive)
- Research for/with Civil Society Organisations
- Often university-based and integrated in research-based learning (→ all 3 missions)
- No financial barriers: Curriculum Credits (if not possible: Grants needed)
- Open-up Research to civil society, complementary to curiosity or commercially driven research
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Issues

Application/Experience
EU Science-in-Society Call 2008

▷ Structuring Public Engagement in Research

▷ ...engagement that will make a difference to research strategies...

▷ ...broadest European coverage...

➔ PERARES: 26 partners, 17 countries, May 2010 – April 2014
EC-Grant FP7-SiS: 2.7 Million Euro
University of Groningen; Wageningen University (WU) and Research Centres (SDLO) (Netherlands),
Free University Brussels (Belgium),
Science Shop Bonn; WTT Science Shop Zittau (Germany),
Queens University Belfast; University of Cambridge; University of Glamorgan (→Univ of Newcastle) (UK),
University College Cork; Dublin Institute of Technology; Dublin City University (Ireland),
University Rovira I Virgili Tarragona (Spain),
Foundation Citizen Science; Foundation for the Development of an Active Citizen Research ÆDReCA; University of Lyon (France),
Swedish Research Council (Sweden),
Technical University Crete (Greece),
Politehnica University Bucharest (Romania),
ESSRG Science Shop (Hungary),
University of Stavanger (Norway),
University of Sassari (Italy),
European University (Cyprus),
Institute for Baltic Studies (Estonia),
Technical University of Denmark (→Aarhus Univ)(Denmark),
Heschel Centre (Israel).
Objective

› Strengthen interaction in formulating research agenda’s between researchers and CSOs.

› …engagement that will make a difference to research strategies...

› Structuring Public Engagement in Research
Connecting Two Worlds

> Debates / dialogues on science and research
  - At Science Festivals and other organised meetings
    - On-line dialogues
> Research for/with CSOs
  - Science Shops
  - Co-operative Projects funded by Research Funders
Setting research agenda’s in dialogue with CSOs:
- Continuous dialogue research labs-CSOs (France: Health Education; UK: Biodiversity)
- Local Human Rights: Roma/Traveller’s Communities Issues
- Domestic violence

International (on-line + local) dialogue to set research questions/agenda: Pilot Nanotechnology

10 more Science Shops!

Potential role of Higher Education and Research Funders
- HE Policy Review; Monitoring Post-doc project;
  Good practice overview & sharing by Research Funders

Evaluation packages

Conferences

EC Science in Society Program works!
New Shops: Steps to start

First 2 years (Seed Funded):
› Feasibility study / Preparation
› Advisory Board
› Pilot projects
› Business Plan

After second 2 years
› Report on implementation
Role of Mentors

› Making Visits:
  • Lectures, Talks, Speeches (ppt’s to share);
    different target groups (Lobby, PR, training)
  • Participate in discussions, meetings, workshops
  • Give on-the-job advice (eg curriculum inclusion)
  • Support pilots (/w students)
› Receiving visitor
  • Discussion / Introduction (but: language)
  • Introduction of operational procedures
› Summerschools + FAQs online Toolbox
TRAing and Mentoring of Science shops (TRAMS), EU 2005-2008

- Mentoring & Training (10 sites)
  - 37 days mentors
  - 5-10 days each mentored partner
  - Toolbox

- Cachan (F), TIMCED-Ploiesti (RO), National Network (RO), STEP-C (Crete), CREA (Barcelona), Science Shops Belgium, TU Iceland, TU Tallinn (EST), Hacettepe (Ankara), Baltic Inst. Soc. Sci. Sciences (LV)
PERARES, EU 2010-2014

- WP4: Mentoring & Training
  - 350 days mentors (10 sites)
  - 2-9 months each mentored partner
- Additional materials & approaches in other WPs
- Lyon, Grenoble, Cambridge, DIT Dublin, IBS (EST), Heschel (IL), EUC (Cyp), TUC (Crete), UNISS (Sardegna, IT), UiS (Stavanger, N).
- Non-PERARES members
  - Summer schools
  - Mini’s: Cork, Guelph, Portugal, Cape Town, ...
Pilot Project

› Civil society partner (preferably)
› Knowledge available, low risk
› Short
› Good publicity potential
› Involve students

Outcome as PR to start broader science shop
Mentoring

› Investment in people
  - Science Shop staff, students, professors
› Institutional learning?
Next

› Strong: science shop concept adaptable
› Additional needs?
   - (Advanced) Summer School
   - Toolbox materials (livingknowledge.org)
   - ....
› Paid mentoring and consultancy services?
PERARES:
Let’s Make Dialogues More Than Just Talk!

For more info on PERARES and Science Shops:
www.livingknowledge.org

The PERARES project including the LK Conference received funding from the European Commission in its 7th Framework Program for Research
Experiences and attitudes within research funding organisations towards Science Shops and research with or for civil society and its organisations

Public Engagement with Research & Research Engagement with Society: Science Shops, Civil Society Organizations & Universities from 16 European countries work together to advance the co-operation in setting research agendas among Community Organizations & Universities

Cuexpo 2013
June 14, 2013, Corner Brook, Canada

Norbert Steinhaus - Bonn Science Shop
Aim

to examine how research funders across Europe can support publicly engaged research and joint research projects with civil society organisations (CSOs).

- Survey among research councils
- Existing surveys and reports (STACS, MASIS)
- Research on existing funding programs (CURA, PICRI, European Commission)
- Questionnaires and Interviews leading into Country reports (UK, Ireland, the Netherlands, Germany)

STACS (Science Technology and Civil Society: Participation of Civil Society Organisations in Research)  
MASIS: Monitoring Policy and Research Activities on Science in Society in Europe  
PICRI: Partenariats institutions citoyens pour la recherche et l’innovation  
CURA: Community University Research Alliances
General Findings

MASIS

• lack of strong and well defined SiS research efforts.
• lack of or limited national funding schemes
• Funding for SIS research is primarily through **two main funding agencies**: national research councils and other governmental funding agencies (incl. ministries).
• In UK and Germany **non-profit private sector foundations support SIS research**.

How does your country support SiS research?
Findings

Spain

• Foundation for Science and Technology (FECYT) for popularising and communicating science and innovation.

• Spanish National Research Council (CSIC) sees itself as receiver of funds.

• NGOs may submit applications within the National Programme for the Culture of Science and Innovation.

• No major initiatives organized by civic organizations

• Some research could be conducted thanks to European projects
Interviews

Germany

- Science in Society (SiS) can be found at the federal level and the level of the individual states (Länder).
- CSOs watch scientific and technological progress
- 70 billion Euro are presently spent on research and development in Germany. 60% raised by the commercial sector
- There are almost 19,000 foundations in Germany.
- Private foundations in Germany have increasingly funded research programmes and projects
Findings

Germany

• CSOs acquire monies through contacts in science and politics. Some established their own foundations.

• Call for involvement is growing

• First beginnings at the Ministries to include citizens' participation into funding programmes.

• 39 contacted institutions - 24 replies - 15 fund providers

• The classic foundations for research funding barely know what to think of terms such as CBR. This also applies to the majority of scientists.
Findings

Germany

- Research projects including citizens' participation are initiated by science.
- No citizens' participation in the research process itself, civil societal groups do not co-design the research process.
- For smaller groups there are still only few possibilities to find fund providers for their scientific questions.
- One possibility lies with the community foundations.
Findings

United Kingdom (UK)

- UK governments have worked to provide incentives for wider engagement in research funding.
- The main research funding agencies have build a vision for a research culture that values, recognises and supports public engagement.
- Public engagement is written into research funding policy at all levels.
- A shared set of priorities and a shared language.
- Concordat for Public Engagement, and Manifesto for Public Engagement.
Findings

United Kingdom (UK)

• **Range of resources** to encourage and enable academics to participate in research which will have a social or economic impact.

• RCUK (Research Councils UK) developed **guidance for researchers**: *Pathways to Impact*.

• Funding of ‘**Beacons for Public Engagement**’ and the ‘**National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement**’

• Funding of **eight ‘Public Engagement with Research Catalysts’**
Findings

United Kingdom (UK)

• The **key research funders are encouraging research** which shows evidence of public engagement and public benefit.

• The **infrastructure** has been established **at a policy level**

• Good practice and **strong commitment to public engagement**.

• **CSOs can have their voices heard** and can potentially impact on research agendas at all levels

• **It now is important for UK CSOs to ensure that they take the opportunities** currently being offered.
Findings

• There are national and international commitments to research partnerships and an **interest in examining and spreading out models of good practice.**

• CBR often does not fit into structures of applied research

• Traditional funders need **information about terms such as CBR.** This also applies to the majority of scientists.

• Turning commitment into practice requires **strong leadership coupled with structures, support and funding to enable engagement.**

• It needs **institutional mechanisms** to help CBR activities more visible and accessible to the outside community.
Recommendations
For Funders

• Seek actively opportunities to exchange experiences on how to co-fund research with CSOs

• Explore where interests are shared and a formal model of engagement with CSOs can be considered

• Change the allocation criteria for calls for proposals and funding programmes. Citizens' participation should be made a condition

• Funds to support the longer term embedding of public engagement within HEIs should be established and maintained
**Recommendations**

**For Universities and HEIs**

- Public engagement with research should be embedded as a concept in research training within higher education at all levels.

- Set up contact points for citizens and civil-societal groups and thus enable CBR – and in return make an offer for CBR.

- CBR should be imposed as an own focus of funding and ought to be a scientific standard in all disciplines.
Recommendations
For CSOs

• Look out for small scale funding schemes (citizen foundations, crowd funding, companies ...)
• Participate in the evaluation of research programmes.
• Become more professional to extend possibilities to influence science.
• Attend meetings, talk to scientists, administration, policy makers. Write policy briefs
• Build up skills for commissioning and managing research

What good practice can you share how research funders can advance CBR?
Thank you for your attention

Norbert Steinhaus
norbert.steinhaus@wilabonn.de;
+.49.228.2016122

Henk Mulder (PERARES coordinator)
h.a.j.mulder@rug.nl ; +.31.50.363.4436

International Science Shop Network ‘Living Knowledge’
www.livingknowledge.org

Internat. Science Shop Contact Point
livingknowledge@wilabonn.de

Bonn Science Shop www.wilabonn.de
PERARES Online Dialogues

June 14, 2013, Corner Brook, Canada
CU Expo 2013

Michaela Shields
Bonn Science Shop
Living Knowledge Network
michaela.shields@wilabonn.de

www.livingknowledge.org/discussion/debate
Initiations of this web-tool

Living Knowledge members through PERARES project

Basic idea: „What do we agree that we do not yet know, but is important to know“.

www.livingknowledge.org/discussion/debate
Focus of Transnational Online Debates

Articulating research questions through a discussion among CSOs, researchers, policy-makers and others ("we")

Bringing the local to the international
Open to all and make debates accessible for further dissemination;

Show how dialogues can lead to real follow up
Submitting articulated requests to the collective research capacity of all Living Knowledge members and beyond, and to research funders.

Make dialogues more than just talk
→ Research requests fed back into research agendas.

www.livingknowledge.org/discussion/debate
From 2010  Design & access rights, format
Summer 2011  Start with an existing platform for online debates
Spring 2013  Relaunch based on the experience
PERARES Transnational Online Debates

Welcome to the Transnational Online Debate Website.

This Online Debate website – besides providing an opportunity for discussion – predominantly aims at supporting the articulation of research requests from civil society organisations (CSOs) and submitting these requests to the collective research capacity of all Living Knowledge members and beyond.

This tool has been initiated by members of a European consortium, Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society (PERARES) – which has been awarded financial support by the European Commission. The consortium’s members represent universities, civil society organisations and Science Sheds that carry out collaborative research with civil society organisations.

If you have any questions about this platform or even about the possibility to initiate a research question and how to discuss it with dedicated people, please don’t hesitate to contact us. We are looking forward to hearing from you:

Nicola Buckley (Coordinator PERARES Online Debate) Send email

Henk Mulder (Coordinator PERARES) Send email

Norbert Steinhaus (Interim Science Shop Contact Point) Send email

PERARES partners believe that if wider civil society has more of a say in setting research questions, then innovation is more likely to develop in ways that are responsive to societies’ needs. That’s our vision. Please take part and help us to promote research that directly addresses your hopes, concerns, and curiosity.

Open and recent debates
Debate topics

Nanotechnology Debates

Code of conduct for research with and for the Roma people ('Travelling Minorities)

Domestic violence

Promoting Local Economic Development

Big Tent Group III + IV (Communiqué)
Preparation of debates

Select theme (CSO and Research interest)

Develop in co-operation with Community Organisations (eg Environmental NGOs, Women’s Associations and Roma and Travellers Communities)

Moderators (with Editorial Board)

Wrap-up after 2-3 months

Questions to Q+A page

www.livingknowledge.org/discussion/debate
Steps taken by moderator

**Makes** start text for webpage, based on local dialogues between CSOs and researchers

**Invites** known members of LK network for first responses

**Actively promote** the debate to wider audience

**Extracts** potential research questions from debate

**Offers** theses questions to Science Shops or to research funders

www.livingknowledge.org/discussion/debate
Two challenges

In general: How to create and moderate online interactions?

More specific: On nanotechnology
What is Nanotechnology?

Umbrella term

Nanotechnology is still evolving (R&D phase)

Promises, expectations → uncertainty, indeterminacy

Lessons learned:

**Focus** on particular nano-domain

**Define** what is ‘at stake’ (issues are not given)

**Be clear** what the purpose is and what is offered in return

Ongoing process of learning and reflection
Process to set up the debate

Face to face interactions for issue articulation
Stakeholder workshops, interviews, science festivals, workshops conducting interviews and writing starting materials

Issues served as input and starting point for online dialogue
Consortium members with expertise on some social implications of nanotechnology identified 5 topics
– Renewable energy
– Food
– cancer
– Telemedicine
– Environment/life cycle analysis)
On-line interactions
Civil society actors articulated questions, concerns, dilemmas (varied level 5 topics). Some response from moderators, researchers.

Articulating research questions
based on online discussions

Distribution
among science shops, research groups & funders
Tentative conclusions

Difficult to get people engaged and create commitment (from all participants)

Various roles of moderator
Organizer
Facilitator
Mediator between R&D trajectories and civil society (nano is evolving)
Articulating / translating research questions

Moderation requires time, effort, knowledge

Nano: Started from a scientific discipline
In involve people and organisations in a structured online debate.

Science shops used to dealing with organised groups face to face. Now deal with ‘unorganised’, with written text only, and delays in response.

Online, more informal community: needs time by moderators to find interested audiences and interact with them. Need a mix of skills.

We needed offline events too for the process; needs time, effort

We can only facilitate English language at current

Research questions are taken up SS Cambridge and EU call for proposals
Your Feedback is welcome!

The approach?
Similar or differing (good) practices?
Ideas for new topics
– Local Economies (Current)
– Food, Gardening & the City
– Transboundary Pollution
– Synthetic Biology (?)
– .... Suggestions?....
Other use of the debate website
Thank you for your attention!

Michaela Shields
Michaela.shields@wilabon.n.de