



ENHANCING THE RESPONSIBLE AND SUSTAINABLE EXPANSION OF THE
SCIENCE SHOPS ECOSYSTEM IN EUROPE

Modules for Training of Science Shops Staff

Science Shops: Stakeholder Engagement



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No 741657.

Objectives

In the area of expanding knowledge, after this module, participants will:

- Have an overview of the main stakeholders of a Science Shop, and the benefits and challenges of stakeholder engagement
- Be familiar with the steps needed to engage stakeholders before, during and after Science Shop project
- Be conversant with the main methods of stakeholder involvement

In the area of skills and attitudes, they will:

- Be able to create and sustain relationships with Science Shop's stakeholders
- Be able to map stakeholders of concrete Science Shop projects
- Be encouraged to use new ways and methods of stakeholder engagement

Session outline

Methodology	Material required	Duration Total: 3hr 50 min
1. Welcome	Training agenda (printed)	5 min.
2. Personal introductions and initial evaluation	"Post-it notes" (different colours)	15 min.
3. Presentation	- PowerPoint projector & large screen - Key messages - PowerPoint presentation	90 min. (including Q&A and discussion)
4. Sharing experiences		60 min. (including Q&A and discussion)
5. Interactive exercise "Mapping stakeholders"		60 min.

Description of methodologies

Welcome

The trainer welcomes participants, presents the session's aims, distributes and comments briefly on the training agenda.

Personal introductions and initial evaluation

If there is a need (depending on the training programme), the trainer can ask participants to present themselves.

For the initial evaluation, attach 2-3 sheets of paper with questions for the participants on the wall. Questions could be:

- What do you think “to engage” means?
- Have you ever tried and engaged a public body in research? If yes, how?

Give sticky notes to the participants, ask them to write answers to every question (on a separate sticky note) and put them on the wall. At the end of this training invite all participants to the wall, and together go through all questions and comments to see if they were answered during the day.

PowerPoint presentation

Science Shops represents one model of public engagement in science. It is based on the involvement of stakeholders during the whole process of community based participatory research (CBPR). Science Shop projects might include different degrees of participation, as well as involve a different range of stakeholders and publics. Therefore, it is important to understand the rationale for the stakeholders' involvement as well as various modalities.

The aim of this presentation is to give participants information about the types of stakeholders, the concept and degrees of public engagement, discuss reasons behind stakeholder and public engagement, show benefits and challenges for stakeholder involvement, give an overview of the steps of stakeholder involvement during CBPR projects, and give a short review of changing methods in public engagement.

Key messages corresponding to the different slides

1. What is a stakeholder?

A stakeholder is “an individual, group, or organisation, who may affect, be affected by, or perceive itself to be affected by a decision, activity, or outcome of a project” (Project Management Institute, 2013).

In Science Shop projects, it is important to make a difference between publics and stakeholders. Stakeholders are defined as those who are affected or can affect a decision about the issue(s) that the project deals with. Publics are groups of people who are not affected by the issue(s) that the project deals with but who engage with the issues through discussions or otherwise (Reed et al 2018).

Another relevant difference for Science Shop projects is between internal and external stakeholders. **Internal stakeholders** are individuals and groups from within the organisation who are a part of the project implementation, such as project supervisors, researchers, students, interns or volunteers. Even if they are mainly from the same institution as the Science Shop staff, they still need to be identified and involved in the CBPR project.

External stakeholders are those groups from outside of the organisation that are affected by the project or are otherwise involved in project activities. External stakeholders can be grouped into **four broad groups**: stakeholders from civil society, the public sector, the business sector, and the general public.

Science Shops mostly work with civil society organisations – communities and NGOs – as “client organisations”, which submit requests for a research or other type of project and should be involved throughout the implementation of the project. Policy makers and other public agencies, for-profit businesses and social enterprises also can be Science Shops clients if they have a question of wider societal relevance and agree to publish the results openly. Nevertheless, these stakeholders are more frequently engaged as stakeholders that can discuss, support and sometimes help to implement project results. Involvement of these stakeholders at an early stage of the project increases the possibility of making a bigger impact in terms of project outcomes at local and even national levels.

The general public is less frequently involved in Science Shop projects; however, it can also participate in different engagement activities such as focus groups, discussion, world cafes, dissemination and education events.

Examples of different external stakeholders:

- **Civil society**: communities, voluntary organisations, NGOs
- **Public sector**: schools, colleges, universities, cultural, health agencies, national, regional and local authorities, financial institutions (funders)
- **Private sector**: business, social enterprises
- **General public**: public, individuals, citizen groups

More information: The National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement website, <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/about-engagement/who-are-public>

2. What is public engagement?

There are many definitions of public and stakeholder engagement. Nevertheless, all of them emphasise that it includes many different ways in which the general public or stakeholders are involved in various project activities (Reed et al. 2018).

Public and stakeholder engagement can take many different forms. Often they are classified by intensity of participation. For example, one classification distinguishes three broad approaches to stakeholder and public engagement (Ribeiro and Miller, 2015):

1. Education, where experts provide other individuals and organisations with information on a topic;
2. Dialogue, where some stakeholders consult and seek the views of other individuals and organisations;
3. Co-production of knowledge, based on cooperation between a range of experts, citizens and interest groups.

Other authors do not regard education as engagement, since in this case, public or stakeholders are only passive recipients of information, and also propose more refined schemes. For example, based on Jellema and Mulder (2016), stakeholder and public engagement falls along a continuum from discussing and consulting, to involving, collaborating, and supporting. In discussing and consulting activities, external stakeholders have only minimum input and the focus is primarily on gaining stakeholders' responses. Starting from the involving activity, stakeholders are more and more engaged in all aspects of the project, from the planning, development of tools and processes, through to data collection, data analysis, dissemination and action. In activities classified as supporting, Societal actors are in the lead in the research initiation and most of the execution, and are supported by researchers or institutions on their request.

Another characteristic of stakeholder involvement is its non-linearity. One project can simultaneously aim at different levels of public engagement during its implementation.

Several internal and external factors may create obstacles for performing public engagement in Science Shops activities. Internal factors are mainly related to the Science Shop's coordination and implementation staff's competencies and experience in doing public engagement. External factors are related to culture of participation in the society, as in some countries stakeholders are more willing to be more actively involved, whereas in others they are more passive (e.g. in countries with weak civil society).

The impact of engagement activities on society or decision-making not only depends on the approach taken, but also on other dimensions, including who participates, when the engagement takes place, what issues are considered or excluded, and power dynamics between participants.

More information: SciShops deliverable 4.2 "Practitioner roadmap and methodology toolkits" (Russo et al., 2018).

3. Why engage with stakeholders and citizens?

There are many reasons for stakeholder and public engagement in Science Shops, founded on several lines of argumentation.

From a normative view, engagement is seen as ‘a right thing to do’. Commitment to engagement rests on a commitment to empower citizens and is seen as a good thing in its own right, without the need for further justification. This view rests on a democratic political worldview that encourages participation in general (Datta 2011).

However, participation should not be an end in itself. **From a pragmatic perspective**, engagement is seen as a better way for researchers to achieve things. It helps to collect more knowledge, experience and expertise in addressing the complex nature of any kind of issues and problems. It is claimed that participatory approaches have the capacity to “reduce conflict, build trust, and facilitate learning among stakeholders and publics, who are then more likely to support project goals and implement decisions in the long term” (Reed et al. 2018). Thus, engagement is considered to improve quality of research by providing new insights and perspectives and to increase the likelihood of research impact.

In more general terms, participatory processes in science address problems such as a lack of trust in science and experts. By running Science Shops, research institutions and other host organisations demonstrate their commitment to responding to society’s concerns and participation in solving societal problems. For publicly funding research institutions, it is also a matter of accountability (The National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement). Science Shops are a form of public engagement as such, and by making their approaches even more participatory, they can add more to the transparency and trustworthiness of science.

From a societal perspective, engagement allows diverse groups to raise concerns of relevance to them which might otherwise be overlooked (Datta 2011). It also builds capacity among the public by creating networks and performing an educational function (Slocum 2003).

For individual citizens, participation in public engagement means the ability to contribute to shaping one’s environment, which might be related to political engagement or a need to self-expression. Furthermore, there is an educational function (Kelty et al. 2015), which applies to learners of all ages and from all walks of life with an interest in gaining knowledge of a particular area. Also, participation might be motivated by the possibility to share affective bonds with fellow citizens or community members without a need of further practical or instrumental reasons.

More information: SciShops deliverable 4.2 “Practitioner roadmap and methodology toolkits” (Russo et al., 2018).

4. Challenges for stakeholder engagement

A number of challenges and contingencies are specifically related to the engagement, development and maintenance of partnerships between community members and other external stakeholders on the one hand, and Science Shop’s staff and researchers on the other (based on Israel et al., 1998 and BIOSTEP, 2017):

- **Engagement is not always high on stakeholders' lists of priorities**, because engagement is seen to bring risks (e.g. doubts over others' willingness to engage constructively). Besides, some stakeholder organisations (e.g. NGOs) have very limited resources and may choose to focus their resources on certain issues more than others.
- **Lack of trust and respect**, particularly between researchers and community members. Community members may hesitate to get involved even if researchers are proposing a community based approach. Once established, trust cannot be taken for granted; researchers must continually prove their trustworthiness.
- **Additional administrative burden** and practical difficulties, as it can lead to slower and more complicated decision-making, and the need to take time to develop and co-create shared visions and goals. Also there is the possibility that agreement/consensus may not be reached, which in turn could lead to difficulties in developing or implementing new ideas or projects.
- **Inequitable distribution of power and control**. Within any community-based research partnership, the distribution of information, time, formal education, and income reflects broader social inequalities structured around race/ethnicity, class, and gender. These inequalities affect who attends, who participates, whose opinions are considered to be valid, and who has influence over decisions made.
- **Conflicts associated with differences in perspective, priorities, assumptions, values, beliefs, and language**. Conflicts within a community-based research partnership may occur between members within the same organisation (e.g. community-based organisation, university), as well as across organisational affiliation. They may be associated with differences in overall philosophy, decision-making styles, values, priorities, assumptions, beliefs, and use of language.
- **Engagement is a time-consuming process**. Numerous issues relate to the time involved in conducting community-based research, particularly the time required to establish and maintain trusting relationships. This issue is especially problematic if researchers view community-based research as just another project and are not committed to developing the necessary long-term relationships.
- **Obstacles for broader involvement**. Science Shops may prefer to continue to focus engagement on existing partners, rather than building broader engagement, e.g. because there may be strong strategic and engagement processes in specific sub-themes, so that they do not see the need to engage other stakeholders.

Main recommendations or facilitation factors to overcome these challenges are:

- **Show benefits and ensure effectiveness**. Discussing or organising training about public engagement will facilitate better understanding by all stakeholders of the benefits of engagement activities. All attempts should be made to organise engagement activities in the most constructive and productive way.
- **Jointly developed operating norms and procedures**, which foster attentive listening, openness, caring, inclusiveness, agreement to disagree, identifying and addressing conflicts, opportunity for all to participate, negotiation, compromise, mutual respect, confidentiality among participants and equality. These norms cannot be imposed on a partnership, but must be developed and agreed upon by its members.
- **Identification of common goals and objectives**, recognising that each organisation involved has its own mission, goals, and objectives. Here again, the extent to which these are informal or formal written arrangements should be decided by the group itself.

- **Democratic leadership.** The success of a collaborative partnership is determined in part by the extent to which the designated leader(s) fosters democratic processes and decision-making. Thus, effective leaders are supportive of, and facilitate, the implementation of the operating norms discussed above.
- **Presence of community organiser and support staff.** Critical to the success of the partnership is the involvement of representatives from the community, e.g. a community organiser who is able to bring together people in the community, who has a history of community involvement, and who is respected and perceived as a leader in the community. Responsibilities of support staff may include informal communication outside of meetings, providing minutes of meetings, gaining input on agenda items, circulating materials, establishing computer linkages, distributing grant-related and other information.
- **Researcher role, skills, and competencies.** Effective community-based researchers can be a facilitator, co-learner, and/or consultant. To further establish trust and show commitment, researchers need to spend time in the community on an ongoing basis. To carry out this role, a community-based researcher needs skills and competencies in addition to those required in research design and methods, for example: communication, group process, team development, negotiation, conflict resolution, understanding and competency to operate in multicultural contexts, the ability to be self-reflective and admit mistakes, the capacity to operate within different power structures, and humility.
- **Support for researchers in implementing stakeholder involvement.** Sometimes it is good to hire/involve additional staff in a Science Shop to help researchers with planning, developing and maintaining stakeholder engagement.
- **Prior history of positive working relationships.** Building upon prior positive working relationships is a viable strategy for conducting community-based research. Thus, identifying participants based on pre-existing trusting relationships is an important consideration for developing research partnerships. Such a history may be established through such mechanisms as previous collaborative research endeavours, consultations, student internship programs, conferences, and participation in community-wide coalitions.

5. Science Shops' work with stakeholders

The main external stakeholder that Science Shops deal with is civil society organisations (CSOs), or 'clients' that provide research requests for Science Shop projects. Working with this group of stakeholders includes several tasks.

Performance of stakeholder analysis. It is important to identify a pool of community/ not for-profit organisations, which may have research or other activity requests for a Science Shop. This can be done using desk research to compile a list of potential 'clients' from publicly available information that can be used later for contacting them. When starting a Science Shop or later, an advisable option is to perform a needs analysis, to identify potential research needs of CSOs. Some tools have been developed by existing Science Shops for undertaking a stakeholder analysis, e.g. The Living Knowledge Network provides an example of a survey to explore the interests of Civil Society Organisations, developed by the Science Shop Brussels, Belgium. This is a questionnaire that includes questions about the CSO's profile, its potential needs for requesting research from a Science Shop, and asks for contact information for future collaborations. The questionnaire is available here: http://www.livingknowledge.org/fileadmin/Dateien-Living-Knowledge/Dokumente Dateien/Toolbox/LK D Questionnaire_needssurvey2002_2003.pdf

Develop ways for collecting research requests. Science Shops can develop different ways to collect research requests: via the use of personal connections with NPOs and communities, spreading the word about research possibilities in mass media (local newspapers, news portals), presenting the work of a Science Shop at different events (conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.), developing an internet platform, conducting an active search of NPOs or communities that deal with pressing issues and encouraging them to submit a request research on the topic, etc.

From Science Shops studies conducted within the SciShops project, it became clear that all young Science Shops initially face difficulties collecting research questions, while mature and experienced ones often no longer need to advertise their services and receive more requests than they can deal with. The social and cultural context of a country can also have impact, as in countries with a less developed civil society, passive forms of collecting research requests are less likely to be fruitful. In this case, a more proactive approach is needed; strong personal contacts need to be nurtured and specific events for target audiences organised (e.g. co-creation events with researchers and community members) to increase success.

Collect and evaluate research requests. When collecting and evaluating research requests, it is important to consider that requests often need to be reformulated into research questions, taking into account the timing and availability of material and human resources, because not all research needs by CSOs may be suitable for a research project, particularly if to be performed by students. Consultants and an Advisory Board can be very valuable in deciding which received requests are suitable for developing into Science Shop CBPR projects.

Some examples from Deliverable 2.2. “Existing RRI tools and successful participatory community-based research case studies report” (Garrison et al. 2018) demonstrate how Science Shops work with finding and selecting research requests.

Example 1**The Research Shop at the University of Guelph (Canada)**

Having more than 10 years experience, The Research Shop does not need to advertise itself but receives research requests directly from community organisations, including NGOs and social service providers as well as other grassroots organisations. In some cases, this involves a group of community organisations coming together with a shared and identified need. However, relationships with community organisations are still often developed via personal contacts. For example, many of the students and Community Engaged Scholarship Institute (CESI) staff members sit on the boards of various community initiatives, task forces and community health centres, giving them in-depth insights into community needs.

CESI also organises an annual engagement event aimed at bringing together representatives of community organisations to explore ways of enhancing their community-university partnerships as well as showcasing existing research projects. Held in public spaces, such as shopping centres, they provide an opportunity to raise awareness of their activities. This process has previously resulted in new enquiries.

Example 2**The Science Shop Language, Culture and Communication at University of Groningen, Netherlands.**

This Science Shop was set up in 1986 and has no problems receiving research questions. Usually around 25-30 questions are received a year, some of which can be answered without the need for a research project. However, because the Science Shop is small, it can only manage a maximum of ten projects a year. Although they receive a sufficient number of research questions, sometimes the coordinators themselves proactively identify organisations with interesting problems to research.

Not all requests are transformed into research projects as sometimes it is not possible to do this because the Science Shop doesn't have the expertise or students available to undertake the project, or the question is too big or too complicated for a student to answer.

Example 3**Institute of Social Innovations Science Shop, Lithuania**

This Science Shop has only been run for five years and is thus still struggling with collecting research requests. When the Science Shop was first set up, they sent letters inviting research requests to over 1,000 NGOs and received just one response. This is partly due to civil society being relatively underdeveloped in Lithuania. In addition, the public is not particularly interested in research and NGOs do not understand its use in their own work and activities. At the government level, knowledge-based decision-making is acknowledged in declarations but there is a lack of understanding on the ground about what this means in practice.

The identification of research requests relies on the enthusiasm and persistence of the Science Shop's staff in following up potential avenues. Research requests are generated by ongoing conversations and direct contact with NGOs, through which they are made aware about the work of the Science Shop. Information campaigns have proven unsuccessful in the past but the Science Shop does raise awareness of its work and the benefits of undertaking this type of research through articles and interviews in the media.

Develop long term relationships with stakeholders. Best practices of Science Shops show the importance of maintaining relationships with stakeholders after the end of a project. This task usually is performed by the coordinator of the Science Shop as project implementation staff (students, interns, volunteers, researchers and supervisors) are not so much involved in the running of the Science Shop. This is known as sustainable relationship management; when Science Shops try to keep contact with all stakeholders, particularly with community organisations after completion of a project. Lots of Science Shops report that they get a lot of repeat business due to the good relationships that are established through the projects and this can also lead to other collaborations in the future. Some of these relationships also develop into long-lasting partnerships, with Science Shops providing ongoing help and consultations to former clients, organising joint events and developing g new CBPR projects together etc.

6. Advisory Board

One way to maintain relationships with stakeholders, both external and internal, is through an Advisory Board. To have one is not universal practice among the Science Shops, but some of them do have such a body. Advisory Boards act as an advisory and sometimes supervisory body; however, they are also helpful in developing partnership networks of Science Shops, as its members' contacts can be used by Science Shops to solicit research requests and result in the involvement of other stakeholders.

Some examples from Deliverable 2.2. "Existing RRI tools and successful participatory community-based research case studies report" (Garrison et al. 2018) demonstrate how Science Shops work with advisory boards.

Example 1

European University Cyprus Science Shop

The management structure of the Science Shop consists of a Director and an Administrator (contact officer) based within the Business School, an Advisory Board, and a Scientific Committee. The Advisory Board represents all stakeholders and includes the Science Shop's Director, Vice Director for research at the university, Deans of six of the university's schools, three representatives of community organisations, and one representative of the Science Shop's Scientific Committee. The Advisory Board has an advisory role, but the networks of its members are also utilised for finding research requests.

Example 2

Interchange Liverpool, UK

Interchange has a Management Committee consisting of academics from the University of Liverpool and Liverpool John Moores University, representatives from community organisations, as well as student alumni. The Management Committee acts as a legal and advisory board.

7. Stakeholder involvement in project implementation

Involvement of civil society organisations (CSOs). The main external stakeholder during implementation of the project is the ‘client’ organisation(s) – one organisation or a group of organisations that submitted the request for the project. They can, and should be, involved into all steps of the project’s design and implementation, although the actual degree of involvement will depend on the context and their willingness, as well as capabilities of the CSO itself.

Involvement of other external stakeholders. The project can also involve other relevant external stakeholders, e.g. professional organisations in the field, local authorities, etc. The process of stakeholder identification, or ‘mapping’ of stakeholders, will be addressed in the interactive exercise performed at the end of this module. Other stakeholders can be contacted and invited to take part in discussions or other one-off events, or become members of a project’s advisory committee.

Involvement of internal stakeholders. After a request for CBPR is received from a client, the first task is to analyse what internal stakeholders (supervisors, researchers, students, etc.) can conduct the requested research. If there are no such interested and competent persons for the requested research topic, and if there is no possibility to invite them from outside (this is especially important for Science Shops based at NPOs and business), then the research cannot be conducted. The possibility of using a multidisciplinary research team should be also considered, as some requests can be better answered by involving researchers from different scientific disciplines, e.g., a decrease in the bee population can be investigated with the help of both chemists (e.g. to examine the impact of pesticides) and biologists (to examine parasites and other killers of bees).

Advisory committee. Some Science Shop projects, particularly larger ones, may rely on an advisory committee that includes relevant stakeholders and has a supplementary project supervision role. Such a committee might include representatives of clients, local authorities, relevant citizen or professional associations, and other stakeholders. Below is one example.

Example

Many of the projects run by **Wageningen University & Research Science Shop** (the Netherlands) are supervised by a coordinator and an advisory committee. As an example, the advisory committee of a project that aimed to propose a plan for reconstructing an allotment complex in Ede, Netherlands, besides the supervisors of the master student who did the main research, also included a representative of the client, chairman of the steering group for renovation of the garden complex, a consultant from a private consultancy firm, a representative of a national organisation for hobby gardeners, a coordinator of the district where the complex was located, a representative of the “Green Office” at Utrecht University, and two coordinators of the Science Shop.

More information: Alix, L. and H. Eppink (2012) *Welkom op Tuinenpark De Koekelt*. Science Shop project report. Available at: <http://edepot.wur.nl/210766>

Stakeholder involvement in project implementation is addressed in more detail in Module 3 “CBPR project management” and described in the “Practitioner roadmap and methodology toolkits”, developed by SciShops project partners (Russo et al., 2018).

8. Stakeholder involvement in the dissemination and evaluation of project results

Stakeholders' part in project dissemination. As Science Shops projects mainly involve answering the requests of community organisations, communication and dissemination activities will depend on a community organisation's preferences and will be carried out with its involvement or solely on its initiative, especially if the project is implemented by students.

Relevant stakeholders for dissemination. It is important that the results are disseminated to relevant stakeholders, e.g. the broader research community via conferences and publications, policy-makers (if relevant), the general public (e.g. via the media / public engagement activities), and other organisations working in the field of research (e.g. environment, etc.) to whom the results could be of interest.

New stakeholders, who didn't participate in previous phases of project implementation, can be involved in a project's dissemination and evaluation. This can result in better exploitation of the research results and a bigger impact.

9. Organising engagement activities

There are several issues to consider when organising stakeholder and public engagement activities.

Aims of involvement. It should be remembered that stakeholder and public participation is not a goal in itself. In some projects/issues, the participation of outside actors might be not necessary or not appropriate to reach the goals – the definition of goals must bear in mind the benefits and limits of participation. Moreover, participation might even bring unintended results if it is not carefully aligned with project goals and the organisation/project is not able or ready to incorporate public input. Thus the project team should have a clear picture of why they want to involve stakeholders or the public, what the expected results of the activity are, and how they will be used.

Finding relevant external stakeholders. If a Science Shop has already appointed a team of internal stakeholders, it must try to identify and engage relevant external stakeholders. Relevance may take different forms: providers of access to the research object (e.g. if the object is bees, then individual beekeepers, or even better their associations, farmers who would allow samples to be taken from their fields for the examination of pesticides), NPOs interested in the topic (e.g. environmental groups and organisations), providers of valuable contacts (e.g. most large environmental organisations have good contacts with environment related government departments), decision makers (e.g. the national agency responsible for pesticide control etc.).

Decision on the form of engagement. There are many tools and approaches, ranging from conventional social science methods such as qualitative interviews and focus groups, to more specific tools such as scenario workshops or citizen panels. For example, the Action Catalogue (<http://actioncatalogue.eu/>) includes 57 methods focusing on research driven by involvement and inclusion. Decisions about which method(s) to employ must take into account at least the following criteria: objectives (reasons for involvement and expected outcomes), topic (e.g. the nature and scope of the issue), contextual situation (e.g. available time), the available resources (e.g. funding and

available facilitation competencies), and the number and nature of participants (e.g. their knowledge on the topic or interest in the issue).

Importance of planning. A key feature of successful engagement is the effective design of engagement activities, which in turn implies the need to take time in the planning stage, and for careful consideration of the timing of engagement, the contextual conditions that are necessary, and the representativeness of participants in terms of both planned participants, and who actually participates in practice.

More information: SciShops deliverable 4.2. “Practitioner roadmap and methodology toolkits”(Russo et al., 2018).

10. Engagement methods/techniques

Engagement may take less structured forms of discussion, and not being ‘labelled’ with a specific method or title, does not make them any the less valuable. However, structured and tested forms of engagement are beneficial as they help to ensure that all participants are equally involved and heard. We will not mention all the possible techniques, only the most popular and more innovative ways of engagement.

To discuss concrete methods of stakeholder engagement, the trainer is advised to use the handout presented in the Appendix.

Sharing experiences

Participants are asked to share their experiences of involving stakeholders in running CBPR projects. Alternatively, if there are no participants with such experience, cases can be presented in the form of written stories/ or a video or by inviting a speaker to share their experiences (physically present or online).

Instead of using participants and external speakers, some examples of CBPR with a strong component of stakeholder involvement could be presented. These examples can be chosen by the trainer and based on his/her experience, or can be used from deliverables: 2.2. “Existing RRI tools and successful participatory community-based research case studies report” (Garrison et al. 2018) and 2.5 “Existing Science Shops assessment” (Stanescu et al. 2018).

We propose using the following cases from health, environment and social CBPR:

Case 1

Science Shop “The Living Lab for Health” at the IrsiCaixa AIDS Research Institute in Spain

The Healthy Minds (Sana Ment) project (2015 – 2016) was the Living Lab for Health’s first implementation project on the topic of mental health, run as part of the EU EnRRICH project. Its aim was to design and implement health interventions for, and with students, involving them in research and innovation projects. The project was run as a pilot involving 15 schools and was a collaboration between educators, pupils, researchers, patients’ associations and policy makers.

Stages of the project included:

- Selection of the theme from a list of health topics – the pupils chose stress and depression.
- Collective needs agenda – pupils prioritised their needs and interest in the subject.
- Co-design and implementation of community research projects together with researchers, NGOs, pupils and teachers.
- Final recommendations on promoting emotional well-being developed with public health experts and patient associations.
- Presentation of results through dissemination activities, such as the Caixa Congress.

More information: Sana Ment project. <http://www.irsicaixa.es/en/living-lab-health/sana-ment-project>

Case 2

Science Shop Wageningen University & Research, The Netherland

A good example of urban development research (2006) in the Netherlands was the Ons Buiten project to demonstrate the benefits of gardens to the community. The research question was submitted by the Board of the Ons Buiten, which designed and developed community gardens containing small plots that were rented to citizens. The Ons Buiten community garden was on a list of community gardens designated to be transformed into a housing area. In this context, the Science Shop conducted a research project together with senior staff from the Department of Rural Sociology and the Education and Competence Studies Group, as well as two BSc students from the Van Hall Larenstein University for Professional Education (part of Wageningen University & Research, WUR).

A number of working groups were set up at Ons Buiten. Members of the community discussed and drew up a project plan in which they outlined the objectives of the community gardens and planned activities. The project developed a brochure that was considered “a welcome support and a source of inspiration for all those garden parks that face threats time after time” (Van der Hoeven and Stobbelaar, 2006). The project had a clear social impact on the community, involving its members and other stakeholders from the beginning in the change process and listening to their wishes and interests. The findings of the study highlighted the fact that the garden was bringing a lot of value to the community and, furthermore, made recommendations to secure the future sustainability of the garden.

More information: Van der Hoeven, N., Stobbelaar D., J. (2006) De meerwaarde van tuinparken De betekenis van tuinparken in een stedelijke omgeving. Science Shop project report. Available at: <http://edepot.wur.nl/44891>

Case 3*Science Shop at Environmental Social Science Research Group, Hungary*

One part of the project “Forgotten citizens of Europe: Participatory Action Research for Local Human Rights” conducted by the Science Shop at Environmental Social Science Research Group (ESSRG), Hungary, was aimed at exploring local human rights problems and the experiences of the Roma communities in Szeged in Southern Hungary. The project used action research methods: participatory research that involved inviting Roma communities and local experts from Szeged to discussion groups; debates on local human rights issues; engaging and network building of local stakeholders, professionals, activists, schools, and the municipality. The engagement of the municipality was of crucial importance to the implementation of the final result of the project – to establish an alternative school for Roma children in the local community.

More information: Málovics, G. (2012) Forgotten Citizens of Europe: Participatory Action Research for Local Human Rights. Available at:

http://www.livingknowledge.org/fileadmin/Dateien-Living-Knowledge/Library/Project_reports/PERARES_Structuring_PER_in_Social_Sciences_Research_and_forgotten_citizens_of_Europe_D6.1.pdf

The presentation(s) is followed by a Q&A session or a plenary discussion. Questions for discussion could be:

- What are the benefits of stakeholder involvement?
- What might be the challenges of stakeholder involvement?

Interactive exercise**“Mapping stakeholders”¹**

Aim: To develop the skills of stakeholder analysis by mapping the stakeholders of projects and drafting a stakeholder engagement strategy.

Number of Participants: not limited; participants should be divided into groups of 4-5 people.

Duration: 30 min. to 60 min., depending on the depth of the analysis

Process: There are a number of variations in mapping out stakeholders. The most common way to map is by power and interest:

- **Power:** describes a stakeholder’s level of influence – how much it can direct or coerce a project and other stakeholders.
- **Interest:** describes the degree to which a stakeholder will be affected by the project.

¹ Based on: Gamestorming: A toolkit for innovators, rule-breakers and changemakers. Stakeholder Analysis. Available at: <http://gamestorming.com/stakeholder-analysis/>

Different groups are given different examples of projects to work with. Some examples of project research requests that they can work with (the same examples from previous modules can be used):

- **Water quality.** Members of the local community are concerned about the drinking/tap water quality and approach a research group to help them with this issue.
- **Multilingual training for children.** Parents in the local community are concerned about the language teaching methods for their multilingual children and approach a research group to help them with this issue.
- **Child obesity.** Members of the local community are concerned about the rise of child obesity in the community and approach a research group to help them with this issue.
- **Wildfires.** Members of the local community are concerned about the increase of wildfires in the community and approach a research group to help them with this issue.
- **Roma minority integration.** Researchers approach a local community to study the causes of the poor situation of the Roma minority in that community. Researchers (among them, two are of Roma origin) are also interested in the potential solution of problem.
- **Biodiversity.** A local beekeeping community approaches researchers to study the decline of bees in the community. They are also interested in potential mitigation actions.

The groups are given large sheets of papers, post-it notes, and pens. They have to complete three tasks:

- 1) To create a list of stakeholder groups by answering these questions:
 - Who will implement the results of the project?
 - Who will be impacted by the project?
 - Who can support the project?
 - Who can obstruct the project?
- 2) To map the list onto a matrix, based on their relative power and interest. If the stakeholders have been captured on sticky notes, the group should be able to place them directly on the matrix.
- 3) To draft a strategy for stakeholder involvement. After each stakeholder has been placed on the matrix, the group should discuss specific strategies for engaging their stakeholders. They may ask:
 - Who needs to be involved in the Project Advisory Board?
 - Who needs to be informed of what, and when?
 - Who needs to be consulted about what, and when?
 - Who should be responsible for engaging each stakeholder, and when and how will they do it?

After the group work is finished, group representatives are asked to present the findings to the whole group.

Wrapping up. The exercise is finished with a short discussion on the benefit of such an exercise and its applicability to running projects at Science Shops.

References and further reading

Literature

- Alix, L. and H. Eppink (2012) *Welkom op Tuinenpark De Koekelt*. Science Shop project report. Available at: <http://edepot.wur.nl/210766>
- Bertini, P. (2014) *Co-creation: methods & approaches*. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/20140530181242-144684-co-creation-methods-approaches>
- BIOSTEP (2017) *Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in Bioeconomy Strategies: Guidelines for Practitioners*. Available at: http://www.bio-step.eu/fileadmin/BioSTEP/Bio_documents/BioSTEP_Guidelines_for_Practitioners.pdf
- Datta, A. (2011) *Lessons from deliberative public engagement work: A scoping study*. Overseas Development Institute. Working Paper 338. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7489.pdf>
- Garrison, H., Gečienė, I., Nevinskaitė, L. and J. Kleibrink (2018). ENHANCING THE RESPONSIBLE AND SUSTAINABLE EXPANSION OF THE SCIENCE SHOPS ECOSYSTEM IN EUROPE. D2.2 *Existing RRI tools and successful participatory community-based research case studies report*. Available at: https://project.scishops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/SciShops.eu_D2.2-Existing-RRI-Tools-and-Successful-Participatory-Community-Based-Research-Case-Studies-Report.pdf
- Gordon, E. (2016) *Accelerating Public Engagement a Roadmap for Local Government*. Available at: <https://elabhome.blob.core.windows.net/city-accelerator/Accelerating%20Public%20Engagement-A%20Roadmap%20for%20Local%20Government%20By%20Eric%20Gordon%20Engagement%20Lab%20At%20Emerson%20College.pdf>
- Jellema, J. and A. J. Mulder (2016) Public Engagement in Energy Research. *Energies* 9 (125).
- Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A. and A. B. Becker (1998) Review of community-based research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health. *Annual Review of Public Health* 19, pp. 173–202.
- Kelty, C., Panofsky, A., Currie, M., Crooks, R., Erickson, S., Garcia, P., Wartenbe, M. and S. Wood (2015) Seven dimensions of contemporary participation disentangled. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(3), pp. 474-488.
- Málovics, G. (2012) FORGOTTEN CITIZENS OF EUROPE Participatory Action Research for Local Human Rights. Available at: http://www.livingknowledge.org/fileadmin/Dateien-Living-Knowledge/Library/Project_reports/PERARES_Structuring_PER_in_Social_Sciences_Research_and_forgotten_citizens_of_Europe_D6.1.pdf
- O’Haire, C., McPheeters, M., Nakamoto, E., et al. (2011) *Methods Future Research Needs Reports*, No. 4. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US). Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK62556/>

Project Management Institute (2013) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge*. Available at: <https://www.safaribooksonline.com/library/view/a-guide-to/9781935589679/>

Reed, M.S. et al. (2018) A theory of participation: what makes stakeholder and public engagement in environmental management work? *Restoration Ecology*, 26(1), pp. S7–S17.

Ribeiro B. and K. Millar (2015) *Public engagement in the bioeconomy: outlining an analytical framework for BioSTEP*, BioSTEP Working Paper. Available at: http://www.bio-step.eu/fileadmin/BioSTEP/Bio_documents/BioSTEP_Working_Paper_Ribeiro_and_Millar_2015.pdf

Russo, P., Gečienė, I., Nevinskaitė, L., Grossi, G., Barisani, F. and R. Schroeder (2018) ENHANCING THE RESPONSIBLE AND SUSTAINABLE EXPANSION OF THE SCIENCE SHOPS ECOSYSTEM IN EUROPE. D 4.2 *Practitioner roadmap and methodology toolkits*. Available at: https://project.scishops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/SciShops.eu_D4.2_Practitioner_roadmap_and_methodology_toolkits.pdf

Slocum, N. (2003). *Participatory Methods Toolkit. A practitioner's manual*. Brussels: King Baudouin Foundation & Flemish Institute for Science and Technology Assessment. Available at: <http://cris.unu.edu/participatory-methods-toolkit-practitioners-manual>

Stanescu, R., Ionescu, C. S., Garrison, H., Kleibrink, J., Jung, S., Gečienė, I. and L. Nevinskaitė (2018). ENHANCING THE RESPONSIBLE AND SUSTAINABLE EXPANSION OF THE SCIENCE SHOPS ECOSYSTEM IN EUROPE. D2.5 *Existing Science Shops Assessment*. Available at: https://project.scishops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/SciShops.eu_D2.5-Existing-Science-Shops-assessment.pdf

Websites

Sana Ment project, <http://www.irsicaixa.es/en/living-lab-health/sana-ment-project>, retrieved on 31.08.2018

Questionnaire: Needs survey among Civil Society Organizations, http://www.livingknowledge.org/fileadmin/Dateien-Living-Knowledge/Dokumente_Dateien/Toolbox/LK_D_Questionnaire_needssurvey2002_2003.pdf, retrieved on 31.08.2018

The National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE), <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/about-engagement/who-are-public>, retrieved on 31.08.2018