The 8th Living Knowledge conference has been supported by the European Union and Hungary and co-financed by the European Social Fund through the project EFOP-3.6.3-VEKOP-16-2017-00007, titled "Young researchers from talented students – Fostering scientific careers in higher education".
Co-creating solutions to food insecurity: A conversation about deliberative engagement processes for knowledge AND policy creation

Andree, Peter¹; Wilson, Amanda²; Steinhaus, Norbert³

¹Carleton University, Political Science, Ottawa, Canada; ²Food Secure Canada, Montreal, Canada; ³Wissenschaftsladen Bonn - Bonn Science Shop, Bonn, Germany

This workshop will discuss new arrangements and governance models for promoting public engagement and cross-sectoral dialogue to bridge knowledge gaps between the public, policy-makers, food industry, civil society, and researchers around local and global food security issues. Examples will come in the form of a dialogue between a Canadian initiative (the Food Secure Canada/CFICE partnership, and related effort to build a multi-stakeholder National Food Policy Council) and Europe (the Big Picnic project and Food 2030 Strategy of the European Commission).

Questions speakers (and our discussion with participants) will seek to address: What are the food insecurity challenges we seek to address? What does community engagement and the 'co-creation' of solutions mean in the context of this work? What new arrangements and governance models are being introduced to try to fill knowledge gaps, and what is the role of deliberative engagement in them? What is (or should be) the relationship between deliberative engagement in knowledge co-creation and policy co-creation?

Norbert Steinhaus from Wissenschaftsladen Bonn - Bonn Science Shop will speak about efforts at knowledge co-creation associated with the Big Picnic project (led by Botanic gardens). This project involved applied methodologies of co-creation and team based inquiry (involving national and local communities of practice) to identify key food security key issues. The project's collaborative approach gives a voice to adults and young people, and aims to communicate their views to policy-makers, share ideas, encourage debate on the future of our food and move towards Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI). This work is also linked to efforts at co-creation associated with the Food2030 strategy of the European Commission.

Amanda Wilson from Food Secure Canada, and Prof. Peter Andrée from Carleton University (Ottawa) will speak to a community-university research project that seeks to actively engage the public and civil society organizations, in partnership with academics, in food policy making processes in Canada. This work has contributed to the co-creation (and co-promotion) of a proposal to Canada’s federal government to develop a cross-sectoral National Food Policy Council that would involve industry, academic, civil society representation as an important component of building a systems-wide, integrated food policy. This National Food Policy Council proposal has emerged out of efforts to bring systems-
thinking and to include more diverse voices in policy development (and in the creation of the evidence-base for policy development).
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PISA: A Permanent Partnership Instrument to tackle SDGs through Public Engagement
Antongiovanni, Francesca; Congiu, Marta; Ghibellini, Valentina; Merler, Alberto; Vargiu, Andrea
1Association of Social Promotion IntHum - Laboratorio Interculturale di Ricerca e di Promozione della Condizione (H)umana, Sassari, Italy; 2Università degli studi di Sassari FOIST Laboratory, Sassari, Italy

The poster will present the PISA platform. PISA is an acronym which in Italian stands for Participated Platform for Social Innovation and Integration through Active citizenship. It is one of the outcomes of a two and a half year collaborative work with citizens from a disadvantaged community. Participatory activities like community walks, mapping, assessment and planning have been carried out by the FOIST Laboratory for Social Policies and Learning Processes of the University of Sassari, jointly with the IntHum Association mainly within two projects: EnRRICH – Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (funded by the EU under Horizon 2020, c.n. 665759) and CapacitAzione (funded by Fondazione di Sardegna).
PISA has been developed jointly by those two organizations along with community members who shared their precious time and energies, their valuable knowledge, ideas and creativity to conceive something that could bring together a large number of actors to work for a common cause through a shared view of the future and for a long time. In fact, the idea of the platform originates from the common experience of community development projects being all too often limited in time and operated in relative isolation, with no organic connections among each other nor with an overarching strategic view of a general common interest.
To overcome such shortcomings, citizens have worked out a comprehensive future community development scenario which rests on five connected pillars that serve as guidelines for action planning and implementation: 1) health and wellbeing; 2) work, environment and circular economy; 3) identity and promotion; 4) knowledge democracy and continuous learning; 5) active citizenship and social accountability. Those pillars are strongly interconnected and are clearly related to specific Sustainable
Development Goals so to provide for direct connection between local action and the wider global context.

In this perspective, PISA will ensure connections with such international projects as K4C – Knowledge for Change, led by the UNESCO Chair for CBR and Social Responsibility of Higher Education: the upcoming training mentorship programs will be locally based on field work that is currently being developed in close collaboration with community members involved in PISA. Yet, further local, national and international projects will possibly rely on the PISA Platform which will ensure early citizens involvement in any CBPR activity, way before the project idea is conceived.

Thus, PISA lays down the basis for the setting up of a Living Community Laboratory. Furthermore, its intrinsic interest rests on Civil Society Organizations as well as institutional partners like local Municipality progressively joining PISA which will therefore serve as the overarching strategic horizon to different yet organically connected projects and actions. Conceptually, such a collaborative platform can be conceived as a PPI – Permanent Partnership Instrument which is intended to provide coherence, sustainability and continuity to public engagement activities which, otherwise, all too often suffer from being limited in time and isolated from a wider context.
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Inspire your world! Open Innovation in the Living Knowledge Network
Pap, Henrik¹; Gresle, Anne-Sophie²; Balázs, Bálint³

¹Be-novative, Open Innovation Specialist / Education partnerships, Budapest, Hungary; ²Barcelona Institute for Global Health, University of Barcelona, Department of Innovation, Barcelona, Spain; ³ESSRG Ltd, Budapest, Hungary

InSPIRES (H2020-SwafS-2016-1) is about Ingenious Science shops to promote Participatory Innovation, Research and Equity in Science (inspiresproject.com). ESSRG is leading the work on the state-of-the-art analysis of science shops and community-based participatory research. The project brings together practitioners and experts from across and beyond Europe to co-design, jointly pilot, refine and implement innovative models for Science Shops (SS). The main ambition is to help the expansion of the Science Shop movement and create new units around responsible research and innovation (RRI) in Europe and abroad.
The proposed workshop will carry out a participatory evaluation which comprises of a deliberative exercise and a visioning exercise for Science Shops. Our partner, Be-novative provides an on-demand Innovation platform that unleashes collective creativity to leverage breakthrough ideas from the SWAFS community. It will bring novelty to LK conferences by introducing Be-novative’s award-winning, unique methodology that fuses open innovation with gamification, crowdsourcing, and design thinking principles.

The proposed session will comprise of two phases.

During the pre-conference phase (March-May 2018, 7 to 30 days) we will invite LK and SWAFS communities to participate in an (Open) Innovation Challenge on the Be-novative online platform and support it with a co-branded communication campaign.

The Open Innovation Challenge will possibly offer the following questions:

- What are the most inspiring examples you know of community engagement?
- What kind of training would you need to develop as a science shop?
- How can we further develop the concept of Living Knowledge Network?

Questions will be tailor-made by InSPIRES and Be-novative teams, based on the state-of-the-art research carried out in the project.

During the conference the proposed workshop session will present and discuss or reflect on the results in two phases:

- Facilitated Ideation/brainstorming of 1.5 hours as an on-site creative, interactive event for all the conference participant to take part through their mobiles in different innovation challenges supported by 2 Be-novative facilitators.
- Facilitated Workshop of 1.5 hours as a closing event for the top ideators to further elaborate on their ideas using Design Thinking methods. The workshop is organised and supported by 2 Be-novative facilitators. Optionally we let participants use Be-novative in their own local communities/teams.
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Finding Inspiration in the Science Shop Movement: results from the InSPIRES baseline study

Balázs, Bálint1; Bajmócy, Zoltán1,2; Gresle, Anne-Sophie3
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InSPIRES (H2020-SwafS-2016-1) is about Ingenious Science shops to promote Participatory Innovation, Research and Equity in Science. ESSRG is leading the work on the state-of-the-art analysis of science shops and community-based participatory research. The project brings together practitioners and experts from across and beyond Europe to co-design, jointly pilot, refine and implement innovative models for Science Shops. The main ambition is to help the expansion of the Science Shop movement and create new units around responsible research and innovation (RRI) in Europe and abroad.

This workshop will present the results of the InSPIRES baseline study and make propositions on the history of Science Shops from a transformative social innovation point of view to identify their strengths and limitations in nurturing transformative social innovation. It will also show how science shops can build and capitalise on public engagement activities to contribute to capacity building in social innovation.

Specifically, the presentation on the results of our key informant interviewing with more than 80 well-established and promising science shops and similar institutions will extend to the analysis of various institutional profiles and framework conditions, as well as pathways for development. We analysed the most valued aspects of science shop activities: gathered success stories and qualities for the future.

Next, we present the results of a systematic literature review on the impacts and primary outcomes of science shops. The main lines of analysis will look at normative expectations, strengths, limitations and weaknesses, societal needs, empowerment of stakeholders, alignment with RRI and Open Science dimensions, impact assessment methodologies used and a comparative assessment identifying the type of impacts in education, research, and sensitisation and participation of CSOs in research activities.

The proposed workshop will introduce the objectives, methods and research questions of the state of the art analysis. Then we present our (preliminary) results based on the literature and the interview analysis. Finally, the audience will be invited to critically reflect on the outcome and help us to develop recommendations for creating new Science Shops.

20 min: Introduction to the project, methods and aims of the baseline study

25 min: discussion with the participants in groups around the most valued aspects of the baseline study
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Possible learning and development barriers of students in an MA course – RRI as Tool for Research, Reflection and Curricula Innovation
Beck-Bíró, Kata¹; Fazekas, Nóra¹
¹Corvinus University of Budapest, Organization Behaviour Department, Budapest, Hungary

The purpose of the research presented in the paper is to discover students possible cognitive and emotional experiences throughout our Organization Development MA course (at CUB), and to find out what are the barriers we, as instructors of the course unconsciously raise in them which hinders the purposes of the course and/or their learning and development process. Findings of the RRI allow the teachers to redefine the curricula of the course, its teaching methodology and messages, as well as the performance appraisal system in order to have a deeper and/or a wider impact on students – that is a conscious aim of the instructors.

Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in Higher Education (HE) Practice, having in the spotlight RRI as Tool for Research, Reflection and Curricula Innovation enables to understand the intended and unintended effects on students of the 1) multi-level structure concerning cooperation, knowledge transfer and performance appraisal; 2) intensity of the course; and the 3) multi-channelled performance appraisal system. The course requires a deep involvement from the students’ and teachers’ sides as well, in order to transmit the foundations, theory and practice of the OD profession, and helping them through a professional and personal development. This way it is essential for teacher to find the right way to formulate the course, to interact and teach.

The research will be conducted in the spring semester of 2018, when the next course is available. The sample of the RRI research will be selected using 1) inclusion, as present and former students, present consultants (quasi teachers who have ever been students) and present teachers will form it; 2) transparency as the aim and scientific research process will be presented to the sample. Concerning the data collection process, the research aims to use transparency, inclusion and 3) public engagement when opening the circle of the data collectors to the sample itself, thus enabling the governance of the research to peers and producing knowledge in collaboration and dialogue. The methodology of the research will also be based on the three aspects of RRI presented above by organising focus group discussions throughout the semester. This will also enable 4) reflexivity through e.g story telling, reading
each others’ personal learning report (part of the of the course) by letting the researchers - all data “possessors” and “collectors” - reflect on the possible cognitive and emotional barriers of their own, and others’ learning and development process. In order to be real-time reflective during the process, all researchers will have to share their own presumptions about the process and content of the research as well as their present cognitive and emotional state within the research processes – thus it will be possible to discover the interaction between person and system in real time. Scheduling the RRI research will be transparent to the participants of the research, however it will only partly use inclusion: the start and the end of the research will be defined by the head of the research team, taking into consideration the pacing of the spring semester and the course, as well as the Living Knowledge conference, where the results will be presented.

As results of this research we hope to gain information about learning and development barriers that originate from the individual, the course itself and the higher education system (embeddedness), thus drawing up multi-
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Do the Co-Creation!

Becker, Frank¹

¹TU Berlin, Science Shop kubus, Berlin, Germany

Frank Becker with Martine Legris Revel, Université Lille 2, France
Co-author: Heike Müller-Seckin, Learning Online Teaching Team, TU Berlin, Germany

Training / Workshop 90 minutes

We provide experiential learning and practical experiences in co-creational work. Participants go through and reflect the individual subjective dimension of participatory work. Co-creational work is done by human beings with different “realities”. The workshop is grounding the discussion on relevant topics of the conference. Exercise, experiences and reflection need time so that we apply for 90 min. Less time might be possible but with shorter program and less benefit for the participants.

The format is well suited to meet our aims. It offers the opportunity to learn on a true, precise and sensorial level what interactions are needed to develop co-creation. Participants will perform exercises in small groups, exchange experiences and reflect on it. We work action-oriented, focused on the participants’ knowledge / experience. The work will contribute to a continuing education workshop at TU
Berlin. Participants might also organise this education program in their own organisation. This workshop will enable access to the personal dimension of co-creational work and open up a more impactful use of existing guidelines, tools and strategies.

How can I enable / craft real participation (involvement and co-organizing)? Transdisciplinarity, participation and co-creation of research start with the interaction of people and their capacity to communicate in a reflexive way. The question “HOW do I understand my counterpart?” is fundamental for this kind of work. Problems emerge because people (researchers) believe they already know how something works; how a problem has to be solved. But that is not the purpose, knowing how something works. Otherwise it may end up in “bringing an old lady across the street who does not want to cross”.

The task is to understand my interlocutor to actively create the space for a co-creation process on eye-level. Therefore some uncertainty is necessary to disturb the respective self-assurance. With an adjusted portion of uncertainty, the “eggshell” of scientific views will be shakened. In different exercises we address consciousness and reflexivity which we regard substantial for a successful transdisciplinary and participatory work.

- Introduction / objectives: People split in small groups and define their views of participation and co creation. They also give examples of tips and tools they use.
  - How do we fulfil our promises of community engagement?
  - Why has it become relevant in funding schemes and research calls?
  - What is the point for me? What benefit do I have?
  - What do I expect from that workshop?

- Self-awareness Guided meditation

- “Community and engagement”: Play with a ball to create interaction and situate myself in a group.

- „My counterpart is not myself“ I: Non-verbal communication in Citizen Science dialogue on eye-level / Eye contact

- „My counterpart is not myself“ II: Non-verbal communication in Citizen Science dialogue – closeness and distance / Exercise on distance

- „My counterpart is not myself“ III: Non-verbal communication in Citizen Science – dialogue with all senses / Dance exercise

- „My counterpart is not myself“ IV: Walking forwards backward (backward walking person led by eye-contact with forward walking person) Empathy and awareness are developed.

- Reflection / closing the loop: Participants in small groups
Since the revolution in 2011, Tunisia witnessed the rise of a very active civil society involved in the decision-making processes. Institut Pasteur de Tunis (IPT) is more century public health and research institution who is committed to answering to public health needs. Consequently, for IPT community, adopting RRI principles in their activities has become a must.

Several workshops on Open Science, Ethics, and Research Integrity were proposed to the national scientific community. In addition, a Colloquium of young researchers was organized by and for the post-graduate students.

Since 2015 Tunisia has become a country associated to H2020. This drove a new dynamic in international cooperation activities. Science shops are among the best tools to increase the engagement of civil society in R&I activities. This is the aim of a recent Swafs H2020 project “Ingenious Science shops to promote Participatory Innovation, Research, and Equity in Science”. (InSPIRES)

As part of InSPIRES, the Science Shop at the Institut Pasteur de Tunis will be mainly focused on Health, Environment and Vulnerable groups.

In order to ensure real involvement of all the stakeholders, we adopted a co-creation process conducted by representative research centers, CSO’s and universities.
We have launched a call to collect needs from the civil society. 36 projects were submitted by different CSO’s. The selection committee included CSO representatives as well as local experts. For the first year, we decided to perform one pilot project. This pilot project was born from a demand formulated by a local CSO: the Tunisian Association for Information and Orientation on HIV/AIDS and Toxicomania (ATIOST) who proposed to work on the “Genetic characterization of circulating Hepatitis C (HCV) virus strains among injecting drug users in Tunisia”. The selection committee was particularly interested in this project, as HCV infection is a major public health problem in Tunisia. In fact, HCV prevalence is estimated at 0.9% (30,000 people) in the general population. People who inject drugs (10,000) are a key population highly affected by hepatitis C virus (33%). The project will begin in February and will be conducted by a student in Master degree selected out of 33 candidates. The final goal of this project is to give scientific evidence to decision-makers in order to give access to this vulnerable group to the free treatment program.
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Establishing a Science Shop in Francophone Africa: Common Challenges and Visions for the Future
Bensaoud, Chayma¹; ABDELHAK, Sonia¹; MAATOUG, Sonia¹; HADHRI, Najet¹; BENHASSINE, Hichem¹
¹Institut Pasteur de Tunis, InSPIRES-IPT, Tunis, Tunisia

Title: The First Tunisian Science Shop: Between Research Requirements and Service to Civil Society. Since the revolution in 2011, Tunisia witnessed the rise of a very active civil society involved in many decision-making processes. This context brings very interesting perspectives to the creation of a new kind of collaboration between Research institutions, universities, students, decision-makers and CSO’s. A science shop could be a very effective tool in this country to help tackling societal challenges, develop citizenship and provide students with new skills. Indeed, a science shop is presently being created in Tunis through the contribution of the Institut Pasteur de Tunis (IPT) to a European H2020 project (InSPIRES). We are members of the team behind this endeavor.
However many obstacles to the sustainability of our Tunisian science shop are already in view. For instance, our first project is about “circulating hepatitis C virus strains among injecting drug users in Tunisia”. This important project is born from a demand formulated by a local CSO and will also involve several stakeholders from the public health sector. It will be driven by a funded Master student. Even if this project is very stimulating, it is the only one on which we will work for now, because of our circumstances, whereas our call for projects gathered more than 30 demands. We also noticed that those demands were less of a scientific nature and more of a practical nature. Should the Tunis science shop keep its scientific dimension at the expense of the practical demands from CSOs? Or should we enlarge the mission of our science shop? In that case, how could we find funding? We hope that by discussing this challenge with other Global South science shops, solutions will emerge in service to the common interest of the Tunisian citizens.
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First steps of science shop process in Bolivia. A challenge for the Inspire’s project team in a rural context
Billot, Claire Y.B.; Lozano Beltran, Daniel Franz1; Torrico, Faustino1
1CEADES, RESEARCH INSTITUTE, COCHABAMBA, Bolivia

We shortly present the first experience of science shop in rural context (Punata-Bolivia), leaded by a private health research institute called CEADES, in coordination with the Faculty of Medicine of the UMSS (Major University of San Simon), in Cochabamba, Bolivia. The video resumes this process since October 2017 to January 2018, includes the first workshop we made with civil participants and meeting of academic members. We choose a health topic on which the institution has worked for more than 10 years, this is CHAGAS disease, caused by an intra-cell parasite transmitted by an insect that lives in the region since pre-Inca times. Access to diagnosis and treatment remains difficult for most of the infected people, who represent around 20% of the total population of Bolivia. We organized a workshop with civil society, that means directly affected people with this disease, and we collected all their demands around their uncovered needs, that we classified later in categories.
The CEADES's scientific committee formulated research questions related to all the expressed demands and then prioritized some of them (7) that are able to be taken in charge by master’s students of Public Health’s course, inside the University. Actually 3 students elaborated their protocols to be submitted to the CEADES’s Scientific Committee, early in 2018.

The civil society will be involved in the process of implementation of this protocols, they will be asked to support the process and they will share the results with the students and their mentors.

Later, all results will be shared with a larger public, inside academic and non-academic interested people.

The video in annex the link, it is in draft, original version in Spanish & Quecgua (we translate to English in 3 weeks), the final duration is about 8 minutes.
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Case study of a co-building scientific question

Legris-Revel, Martine; Lefebvre, Bénédicte; Ienna, Florence; Havez, Mireille; Bocquet, Bertrand

1Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR8026 - CERAPS - Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Administratives, Politiques et Sociales, Lille, France; 2Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 8019 - CLERSE- Centre Lillois d’Études et de Recherches sociologiques et Économiques, Lille, France; 3COMUE LNF - Communauté d'Universités et d'Etablissements Lille Nord de France, Villeneuve d'Ascq, France; 4MRES - Maison Régionale de l’Environnement et des Solidarités, Lille, France; 5University of Lille - CNAM, Villeneuve d'Ascq, France

The development of relationships between science and society is a reality today, but more frequently fulfilled by industrial and commercial developments. The exchange with the general public is mainly based on the “public understanding of science”. Nevertheless, the development of a “third scientific sector” based on non-profit Civil Society Organizations (CSO) is hindered by very limited access to scientific research, in spite of the emergence of science-society services within universities and higher education institutions[1].

A research group, which works on analysis and experiments on science-society interfaces has developed the Science Shop -North of France located in Lille. The science shop is supported by a scientific committee gathering together an interdisciplinary academic team (physics, sociology,
engineering, management) and multi-actor members (researchers, students, CSOs and scientific and cultural institution representatives). The science shop is an experimental platform where CSO members can meet researchers and graduate students. This type of structure could bring direct benefits to organizations which do not have sufficient means and/or time to conduct research projects to improve their practices.

The main activity and objective of our science shop is the support of grants and researches in co-building processes, from the social research demand to the public dissemination of results. Note that during the prefiguration study, the team already made the choice to undertake a co-creation process engaging all stakeholders of a science shop from the beginning by using a scenario-workshop [2]. Today, we begin to use methodologies of Participatory Action Research (PAR) [3]. This approach offers all variations in the three characteristic dimensions: knowledge production through Research, concrete issue problem solving through Action, and citizen implication through their Participation at each step.

Nevertheless co-building research with actors who have no practice in working together is not so easy. Most of the time, CSO let the researchers do most of the job, sometimes by lack of time or resources or because they feel incompetent, and researchers often do not change their own professional habits. We believe that those issues are common to many participatory research experiments. So, in order to identify blocking points and to improve the process of such research involving civil society actors, we would like to organize a game in which participants - placed in a situation of co-building research oriented towards CSO’s questions - will play the roles of the different partners.

We propose during the conference to manage a workshop with people interested in working out together an academic research question from a demand formulated by a CSO. People would take a role they usually do not practice (academics playing CSOs’ members, etc). We could form several groups. At the end of the workshop, we could get out not only some ways to succeed in co-building researches but also the difficulties met in such a process. Finally, we could compare the results.

1 Legris-Revel M., Main Findings Report, Projet CONSIDER, 7ème PCRD, 2014.
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Engaged Research for Greater Impact

Bowman, Sarah1; Adshead, Maura2; Morris, Kate3

1Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland; 2University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland; 3Irish Universities Association, Campus Engage, Dublin, Ireland

In recent years, following the transition of the EU Framework 7 research programme to H2020 (valued at almost €80 billion (European Commission, 2016)), there has been an implicit shift in the emphasis of current EU funding streams from research to research and innovation. As a result, HEI researchers are now required to make more explicit the connections between their research and its capacity to generate new products, processes, services to address societal challenges, and impact issues of public concern. The Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation includes the Science with and for Society programme, which will be instrumental in addressing European societal challenges. Science with and for Society seeks to build capacity and develop innovative ways of connecting science to society across all disciplines. Its aim is to allow all societal actors including researchers, citizens, policy makers, business, civic and civil society organisations to work together during the whole research and innovation process in order to better align both the process and its outcomes with the values, needs and expectations of European society.

It is within this changing and challenging context that collaboration between researchers and a range of public research stakeholders - including civic and civil society organisations, state and semi-state agencies, industry and professionals - has begun to move from the margins to the mainstream of research design and execution. This change is also reflected by an increasing application and demand for new pedagogies and research methods, promoting more collaborative interactions between students and the organisations they will one day work in.

The Campus Engage Engaged Research Team associates propose to deliver a bespoke presentation, developed for the EU H2020 National Contact Points Academy (NCP Academy), on engaged research for better impact. The workshop content is tailored to a pan-European audience, and complemented by bespoke slides, case studies, logic modelling for impact planning. The content is based on the 2017 expert report by Campus Engage and the Irish Research Council Engaged Research, Society and Higher Education, Addressing Grand Social Challenges Together. The presentation will cover:

- Principals of Engaged Research
- Engaged Research Framework
- Challenges, Enablers for Engaged Research
- Engaged Research Impact, Framework and Categories.

By attending this presentation, attendees at the conference will
• Deepen their understanding of principles of Engaged Research (ER) in relation to H2020 funding calls;
• Gain greater knowledge of how to decide and articulate agreed impact categories and indicators of successful engaged research activities;
• Deepen understanding about why Engaged Research is important for EU, society, and the individual researcher.

This session will build attendees capacity and competency in understanding how to consider engaged research impact targets, in partnership with research stakeholders.

This presentation provides a stakeholder-informed and actionable Framework for professional researchers to engage with civic and civil society organisations, state and semi-state agencies, industry and professionals in research at higher education institutions; ensuring high quality and impactful research and encouraging efficient collaboration, knowledge exchange. This session will be run by Campus Engage report authors
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A whole institutional approach to RRI: the experience of the UOC
Gmelch, Nadja1; Cambra, Inés1
1Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC), Globalization and Cooperation, Barcelona, Spain

The Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) framework is gaining momentum across Europe as a strategy to align scientific and technological progress with socially desirable and acceptable ends. New frameworks bring along new concepts and new needs for adaptation.

In this context universities are one of the principal institutions which can effectively enhance the possibilities of RRI dissemination and implementation, mainly through offering training for researchers. But universities themselves also need new strategies that allow accomplishing their commitment by creating the environment and conditions that allow RRI being fully unfold.

The Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC), committed to fostering a better integration of science, research and innovation within society and to reinventing universities with the aim of connecting them more and in a better way with society, has developed and implemented an internal policy for open and responsible research and innovation (2018-2020). This strategy focuses on updating the transversal competences of the UOC’s staff, taking strongly into consideration the new social demands.
One of the main components of this strategy is the online training course “Responsible Research & Innovation for Researchers” which the UOC offers to PhD students and research professionals, both as well as from within UOC as from other institutions as well as to funding agencies, government or the third sector representatives who want to understand RRI and how to relate to it in their own practice.

Bridging the gap between RRI theory and practice is crucial to accomplish a real implementation of the framework. Therefore this course, developed by interdisciplinary experts both from theory and practice (UOC, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, University of Bristol) and based on the outcomes of different European projects (PERFORM, HEIRRI, Genport), offers an introduction to the theory and practice, gives practical guidelines to harmonise your whole research and innovation process with and for society and widens your critical reflections on your role as a researcher in society

*We are submitting our contribution as a 5 minute exposé but we would be happy to participate in any other format (full session or workshop) and present our experience. Feel free to ask.
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Joining Quantitative Environmental Data and Qualitative Local Knowledge to Better Understand Complex Issues

Collier-Oxandale, Ashley M1; Wong, Nicole2; Navarro, Sandy3; Johnston, Jill4; Hannigan, Michael P.5

1University of Colorado, Boulder, Environmental Engineering, Denver, United States; 2Redeemer Community Partnership, Los Angeles, United States; 3Esperanza Community Housing, Los Angeles, United States; 4University of Southern California, Los Angeles, United States; 5University of Colorado, Boulder, Boulder, United States

Advances in environmental monitoring technologies, such as low-cost and portable air quality sensors, have made it possible to collect data at new temporal and spatial scales. Existing monitoring networks while very important for understanding regional air quality and for regulatory purposes, cannot provide an idea of what’s happening with air quality at the neighborhood or facility-level. The availability of continuous, high resolution data from this new technology has the potential to provide both researchers and communities with more detailed information regarding local pollution sources and personal exposure. Given their lower cost, these technologies may be particularly useful in supporting community-based work with environmental justice communities (typically lacking in resources). However, as these technologies are being used in community-based studies there is an opportunity to
also collect local knowledge and expertise to help make sense of this sensor data. I believe that the inclusion of community observations (e.g., odors, activity at emissions sites, visible emissions, etc.) has the potential to support the understanding of sensor data, which in turn could help to provide a more complete picture of emissions in an area. Furthermore, community members may recognize patterns in the data or features that researchers miss, because of their daily experience. Leveraging these two types of data can not only result in more participatory and inclusive studies, but also may enhance data interpretation that can lead to more locally relevant and actionable results for a community.

For my 5-minute expose, I will briefly present results from a community-based study in Los Angeles, where sensor data was used to collect continuous methane and non-methane hydrocarbon data around an active oil extraction site. These results will include what we learned from the quantitative sensor data and how community observations enhanced our understanding and interpretation of the data. Following this example, I will share my own ideas on how we can better record qualitative, local knowledge as well as how these two data types can be better integrated in future studies. My presentation will end with a call to attendees to share their own examples of joining these data types, or any ideas they may have on how we can incorporate local expertise into research for the benefit of both researchers and participating communities. I am interested in collecting these examples and ideas as models for future research, and would be particularly interested in comparing examples from different disciplines.

Note, if this topic sounds like it might benefit from more time and discussion, or it would complement a planned session, I would be happy to expand it to a 15-minute research presentation (of which 8 minutes could be the presentation and 7 minutes could be reserved for discussion).

Keywords
community-based research, environmental justice, inclusion

Comfort with discomfort: Celebrating the imperfections of community-based research.

Stevens, Ed¹; Blackwood, Leda¹; Costas Batlle, Ioannis¹

¹University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom

We aim to contribute to the enrichment of community engagement through critical reflection that acknowledges and celebrates the imperfections of community-based research. Specifically, we will focus on the process (rather than outcomes) of community engagement, paying close attention to the relationships between academics and the community. To do this, we will (interactively) tell a story about a year-long community-based research project conducted at the University of Bath (United Kingdom).
This project, funded by the University of Bath’s Public Engagement Unit, brought together five local community groups and 15 academic researchers from across the university. Working together, academics and practitioners collaborated as co-researchers to explore issues such as how young people from a supplementary school impact on their community, or how creative arts-based peer-led support groups can impact on mental health.

Drawing on data from this year-long project, we will invite the audience to celebrate the complexities and imperfections of engagement in community-based research through three interactive stories. The first – told from the perspective of the project evaluator – will focus on the ‘ideal’ (how we hoped the academic-community partnerships would operate). The second story, narrated by one of the participating academics, addresses the ‘reality’ of how their partnership fell short of this ‘ideal’. Finally, the third story is the project manager’s reflections on the lessons learned from the clash between the ‘ideal’ and ‘reality’.

The focus of our collaborative presentation is to reflect on our experiences of the process and the relationships between academics and practitioners; hence, our reflections are imbued with emotion. The power of storytelling as a means of dissemination is that it welcomes and celebrates emotion and that it can captivate an audience, and enable them to connect with the experience of the speaker. We hope our stories will resonate with community members and academics alike. We also hope our stories will stimulate discussion about and critical reflection on the emotional journey entailed in community engagement.

Our principal hope here is that together, with the audience, we can shine a light on the experiences of vulnerability and imperfection as a fundamental aspect of the community engagement process. In our view, these experiences are too often ignored and treated as a source of shame; yet, when acknowledged and brought into the open they have the potential to enrich and transform our understanding and practice. To ensure our stories leave an impression on our audience, we will incorporate provocations that can help bridge the gap between our experience and that of the audiences’. For instance, for community-based research to flourish, is it important that we have friendships, or should we maintain our professional boundaries? In doing this, our interactive presentations will be infused with emotion that can encourage the audience “to care, to feel, to empathise” (Ellis & Bochner, 2006, p. 433).

Keywords
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Art and Science - Rules of Engagement
Cutajar, Simone\textsuperscript{1}; Duca, Edward\textsuperscript{2}
\textsuperscript{1}Greenhouse Malta (VO/0296) and University of Malta, Msida, Malta; \textsuperscript{2}University of Malta, Msida, Malta

One of the most innate needs of humans is to understand the world around us and then share that understanding. Both science and art have been described as a human attempt to do so. However for a long time, the disciplines of science and art have been separated as ‘two cultures’ between which there was no communication.

Presently, this (artificial) divide is crumbling as the arts are slowly emerging as a favoured approach for science communication with a growing list of collaborative artistic exhibits, performances and installations that aim to make science more engaging in an attempt to reach new and diverse audiences. However, even though there is solid evidence backing the benefits of integrating arts with science to reach the different parts of society, there are are limited number of researchers that work with artists or consider the role of narrative in their work.

During this Pecha Kucha, Simone Cutajar and Dr Edward Duca, will explore the multivariate reasons as to why it is jointly beneficial for both artists and scientists to work collaboratively. They will introduce the topic based on their respective experiences. Simone Cutajar - researcher at the University of Malta (UoM) and director at Greenhouse Malta (research and community based non-profit organisation) - will reflect on her experiences in designing and managing projects that focus on both using community generated artwork as a means to communicate science but also as a tool to collect and generate more ecological data. Edward Duca - Science and Innovation Communication lecturer at UoM and manager of Science in the City Malta (European Researchers’ Night) - will reflect on his focus on how science festivals can be used to make science and research more engaging by reflecting on his experiences in managing Science in the City, which, amongst others, uses art installations, music, performing arts, theatre, and dance to communicate science.

The themes that will be brought forward during this Pecha Kucha touch on the speakers’ experience and are aligned to the conference aims:

- How art effectively engages different publics and communities with complex scientific principles, in the spirit of RRI.
- How artists’ role in science does not have to be simply limited to a tool to communicate research but can also be involved in the methodology to generate new data and collectively come up with novel research questions.
- How we can motivate and incentivise both artists and scientists to collaborate.
• How engagement between artists and scientists can lead to better science, better art and more holistic research projects.

• How we can effectively evaluate art and science projects.

• To allow for active and instant audience involvement, we will use an interactive presentation software, which will allow audiences to react live to the presentation.

To facilitate engagement, we will pose open-ended and yes/no questions throughout the Pecha Kucha. The software will show results live while participants are voting with the web based mobile polling app directly in their browser, this will make sure that everyone is part of the presentation.
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In Citizen Science data we trust
Cutajar, Simone¹; Duca, Edward²

¹Greenhouse Malta (VO/0296) and University of Malta, Msida, Malta; ²University of Malta, Msida, Malta

Research needs to be relevant for societal needs. Citizen Science (CS) provides an opportunity for the co-production of knowledge between citizens and scientists. Its public participatory approach is vital to generate and communicate knowledge as well as to encourage dialogue. CS projects can democratise data, help the analysis of ideas and capitalise on the diversity of ideas generated by large numbers of people. However there are obstacles that hamper the use of CS by scientific professionals some of which we will discuss in the workshop.

Simone Cutajar, University of Malta researcher (UM) and director at Greenhouse Malta (research and community based non-profit organisation) and Dr Edward Duca (Science and Innovation Communication lecturer, UM and Science in the City Malta project manager) will introduce and facilitate the workshop. Topics will be presented as a Gallery Walk. The group will be split up into smaller groups which rotate to different parts of the room themed around a different topic put up as a poster paper (‘exhibits’). Exhibits will present a topic and a point for discussion though images and questions. Groups will walk around the room, visiting each exhibit. ‘Curators’ will prompt groups to discuss and add their thoughts to each exhibit. By the end, each group will have viewed and discussed each exhibit and their peer’s comments to them. This workshop format allows cross-pollination of ideas between all groups. The quick turn around between exhibits is aimed to instigate creative thinking within the groups.

Exhibits (open to input from conference team):
• CS to achieve broader impacts - curator, Edward Duca.
• How can we turn scientific research into science communication and what is the best way of having researchers and citizens working together to produce community-generated research.
• Sustainability of CS projects - curator, Gaia Agnello (European Citizen Science Association)
• What are the motivations of the participants to take part in a CS programme and what incentives or volunteering management structures must be in place to ensure long term engagement of citizens?
• Trust in CS data quality and transparency - curator, Simone Cutajar
• What are the existing standards for data quality assurance and how can these be adopted? Should we develop new ones? Discussing current practices versus best/ideal practices.
• The balance between public engagement and scientific outputs - curator, Matt Postles (Bristol Natural History Consortium)

How best to define aims of different CS activities? How do you find a compromise between collection of rigorous scientific data and public engagement? How does this affect different stakeholders including participating researchers, science communicators and different publics.

At the end of the gallery tour, the curators will summarise the main points of each topic and there will be a few minutes to allow for group reflections. The facilitators will commit to sum up the outcomes and conclusions from this workshop and will disseminate post-conference.

By proposal submission, Cutajar and Duca have confirmed attendance to the conference, who will handle to facilitation of the full workshop should the others not make it.

If it is possible to contact the participants prior to the conference, we will send out a few short questions to gauge their ideas and understanding of the topics. Keywords will be extracted from their answers and added to the exhibits.
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Freshwater Life: preventing extinctions by eradicating freshwater invasive species
Bedolfe, Sarah¹; Ree, Karin²; de Boer, M. Karin²
¹University of Groningen, Marine Biology, Groningen, Netherlands; ²University of Groningen, Beta Science Shop, Groningen, Netherlands
Invasive species policy and practice is currently a patchwork of strategies across state and national boundaries. Management is hindered by lack of funding, inadequate communication and collaboration, and low awareness. An important precedent is set by Island Conservation, a non-profit, non-governmental organization. While there is currently no international group specializing in freshwater invasive species, a new NGO can build on the successful Island model to complete more effective eradictions in freshwater habitats. During her internship Science Business and Policy (University of Groningen; supervised by Beta Science Shop) MSc student Marine Biology, Sarah Bedolfe, examined the possibilities to develop a new organization on behalf of NGO Island Conservation.

Freshwater systems are a top conservation priority. They compose just 1% of earth’s surface, yet harbor >30% of vertebrate species, and provides water, food and employment to billions of people around the world. Yet, 28% of extinctions and 29% of Critically Endangered species are from freshwater systems. Invasive species are one of the top drivers of extinction and endangerment in freshwater systems. We can protect endangered freshwater species by eradicating those invasive species that threaten them. In fact, after prevention, eradication is by far the most cost-effective solution. By identifying, prioritizing, and carrying out eradictions, we will not only protect freshwater habitats but also preserve their ability to feed and sustain the millions of people that depend upon them.

In this study a plan is presented for an international non-governmental organization dedicated to eradicate freshwater invasive species that threaten endangered species: Freshwater Life. To facilitate successful eradictions, we will assemble two databases on freshwater: past eradictions and threatened species. These will guide prioritization of low-hanging fruit eradictions. We will facilitate low-cost, high impact eradictions by bringing together stakeholders, experts, policymakers, and funders. Implementing and promoting successful eradictions will stimulate development of eradication techniques, leading to further improvements, and increased awareness and funding.

Keywords
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A participative Science Shop with Bolivian citizens to facilitate access to Chagas disease diagnosis and treatment in Zaragoza, Spain

dela Torre Ávila, Leonardo¹; Jimeno, Irene¹; Pinazo, María-Jesús²; Gresle, Anne-Sophie²; Villanueva, Sergio²; Unknown to be Invited, Unknown to be Invited³

¹InSPIRES, Barcelona, Spain; ²InSPIRES - ISGlobal, Barcelona, Spain; ³Raíces Andinas de Bolivia, Science Shop CSO, Zaragoza, Spain

We have a story to tell. Is an open-end story about people’s real needs related with Chagas, a neglected disease that affects between 6 and 7 million people in the world and kills 7.000 each year, mainly through cardiac and digestive implications. Due to current migrations flows, it is estimated that between 48.000 and 87.000 people live with Chagas parasite in a non-endemic country as Spain. In Europe, Bolivian migrants have the highest prevalence (18,1%), and the total prevalence among Latin American migrants is 4,2%. Although there are two medications against Chagas, less than 1% of affected people reach diagnosis and treatment worldwide. In our story, an specific Bolivian association asked support to access a first medical visit in Chagas in Zaragoza, Spain. Would a participative Science Shop project, in line with RRI principles, really help ensuring an answer to this demand?

A year and a half ago, the president of “Raíces Andinas”, Bolivian Cultural Association established in Zaragoza, asked the Barcelona Institute for Global Health (ISglobal) how could the association members know if they were affected with Chagas and, if so, receive treatment. It was not until the beginning of InSPIRES project (Ingenious Science shops to promote Participatory Innovation, Research and Equity in Science), that our team envisioned the possibility of a Science Shop to respond to this demand.

Our methodology embraces a model in which the participation and decision of the members allows a better connection to their expectations and needs. To date, we have achieved a joint definition of the research question. Participation was ensured through technics in which actors could spotlight the main health problem or health-related problem “Raíces Andinas” partners face in common. The demands were recruited, prioritized and reformulated together with the association members. The research questions were analyzed by a Scientific Committee and later validated by the association. The process is still underway as a community-based participatory research process.

In our Story-telling Session we will be able to share the outcomes of the collective research we are currently performing around these questions: How can the partners of “Raíces Andinas” effectively access diagnosis and treatment in Chagas Disease? What communication processes can reinforce this access? What should we know about the lack of health services demand by “Raíces Andinas” partners.
in order to cooperate in the activation of this demand related with real access to diagnosis and treatment in Chagas?

We believe the collectively-built knowledge that could emerge from this Science Shop experience could improve future strategies for the integral management of Chagas disease that directly respond to people’s demands. The project is being faced with a transdisciplinary and transnational perspective because Chagas moves throughout different geographies and fields of concern.

Methodologically, the session aims to join the debate on the possible applicability of Science Shops in health, specially to work on hidden diseases with special global importance due to migratory movements. In addition, we will discuss on the potentials of engaging key population and scaling research results to involve different actors in the generation of social change.

Convennor: Maria Jesús Pinazo. Speakers: Leonardo de la Torre, Irene Jimeno, Anne-Sophie Gresle, Sergio Villanueva
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Ingenious Science shops to promote Participatory Innovation, Research and Equity in Science (InSPIRES)
de la Torre Ávila, Leonardo 1; Balázs, Bálint 2; Malagrida, Rosina 3; Belaen, Florence 4; Zweekhorst, Marjolein 5; Bagnoli, Franco 6; Ben Hassine, Hichem 7; Lozano, Daniel 8; Pinazo, María-Jesús 1

1 InSPIRES - ISGlobal, Barcelona, Spain; 2 ESSRG, Budapest, Hungary; 3 Living Lab for Health at IrsiCaixa, Barcelona, Spain; 4 Université de Lyon (UdL), Lyon, France; 5 Institute for Research on Innovation and Communication in the Health and Life Sciences (VU), Amsterdam, Netherlands; 6 Universita degli Studi di Firenze (UNIFI), Firenze, Italy; 7 Institut Pasteur Tunis, Tunis, Tunisia; 8 Ciencia y Estudios Aplicados para el Desarrollo en Salud y Medio Ambiente (CEADES), Cochabamba, Bolivia

(Submitted in behalf of InSPIRES consortium)

We want to introduce InSPIRES project with a Pecha Kucha chat. Some of the images that will be used in this ultra-short communicational format are already displayed at www.inspiresproject.eu With these photographs, we aim to remember that great research could start when regular people inspire science, when somebody—as explained by Norbert Steinhaus—reformulates, translates society’s questions into a language that scientists understand.
Using each image’s potential, we will present the declaration of principles of InSPIRES, a project that brings together practitioners and experts from across and beyond Europe to co-design, jointly pilot, implement and roll out innovative models for Science Shops.

The InSPIRES models integrate Responsible Research and Innovation, Open Science and Impact Evaluation as part of their DNA in order to open the research process up in a more strategic way to civil society and other stakeholders. The inputs from systematic impact evaluation studies will be continuously integrated in order to make InSPIRES Science Shops 2.0 models more accurate and responsive to civil society needs and concerns.

Concentrating most of its efforts on Research & Innovation in the health and environmental sectors, giving special attention to gender parity and vulnerable groups (women, the elderly, adolescents, migrants and refugees), InSPIRES brings Science Cafés and other public engagement initiatives into its models together with a “glocal” international focus, for more inclusive, context relevant and culturally adapted community-based participatory research and innovation.

In our Pecha Kucha chat we want show an example of our comprehensive communication plan. We want to express how we envision InSPIRES outcomes, which will:

a) give evidence and support political bodies and decision-makers, in order to propose changes in local, regional, national and international policies;

b) nurture the debate about the place and role of society in science, encouraging the systematic and ethical involvement of civil society actors and their societal concerns in the research and innovation processes, and

c) support the development of new Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) and Open Science (OSc) strategies and guidelines, in the context of safe spaces to involve and engage civil society in the whole science process.

People attending our Pecha Kucha chat will get to know InSPIRES project and have a hint on its most important particularities. We want to communicate what our consortium believes in: that Science Shops are powerful encounter opportunities to trigger bottom-up, demand-driven research. Images can tell better about the Science Shops InSPIRES partners and advisors are developing in Italy, Spain, France, Hungary, Netherlands, Tunisia, Bolivia, Japan and India, extracting the best of past practices and experimenting with more participative methodologies.
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**EnRRICHing curricula, academics, CSOs & students through Science Shop work**

De Marrée, Jozefien A.¹

¹Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

Full Session Title: Embedding Responsible Research and Innovation in the higher education curricula – learnings from developing and implementing RRI pilots with community partners and the supporting role of Science Shops.

Today's students require an educational system that equips them to be 'whole persons' (Tassone and Eppink 2016). HEIs must provide students with an educational experience which not only emphasises 'job-ready' qualities but also prepares students to optimally engage with stakeholders and work towards solutions to complex challenges.

Drawing on the experiences of EnRRICH (Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education, H2020), this informal session will provide insight into developing curricula that is socially responsive and how to support educators in its adoption. Participants will learn about RRI pilots, relationships formed with community partners, and the role played by Science Shops. Participants will explore essential elements for designing effective university-community partnerships, including stimulating RRI exercises to illustrate the value of multi-stakeholder approaches for investigating and addressing pertinent challenges.

Other presenters: Ruth Hally & Valentina Tassone

EnRRICHing curricula, academics, CSOs & students through Science Shop work

RRI values collective and distributed notions of responsibility to steer scientific and innovation endeavours towards more socially desirable outcomes. The Science Shop model has been successful in doing this; bringing students, researchers and civil society together to tackle real issues at local and regional levels (European Commission, 2015). But most Science Shops are small and continuously need to re-invent themselves. EnRRICH established a Community of Practice (CoP) for new and experienced Science Shops within the project. This CoP created an incubation-like environment for Science Shops where they can learn important factors for demonstrating their relevance, securing their sustainability, and embedding RRI in HE. We'll open up this CoP and share tips for impactful Science Shops.

Keywords
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At first glance, it is most unlikely, that people agree to collaborate in campus-community-partnerships: Cooperating is demanding, exhausting, sometimes tiring. Cooperating and collaborating across functions, areas and disciplines doesn’t necessarily promote your career progression as different sectors, disciplines and (scientific) communities are all characterized by different values, target agreements and reward systems. You get your things done in a shorter time and with less effort, if you do not let yourself get entangled in expectations, ideas and obligations of others. Why is it that people nevertheless voluntarily cooperate with individuals from other sectors/fields of interest? Why is it that people stay engaged in collaborative networks, continuously dedicating time and passion against all odds? Why is it that people even convince others to do so as well? Answering these questions by providing the story of two stakeholders of a long-term campus-community-partnership, one from local community, the other from academia, this contribution reflects on motives and driving forces of people collaborating in cooperation projects. In addition, it takes into account related dimensions of cooperation and collaboration like finding meaning, compromising and trust. The aim is to describe the power of motivating forces as well as the conflict potential that may arise from them and identify resulting basic patterns. Reflection with the participants: By debating the "boon and bane" of individual motivating forces in long-term campus-community-partnerships with the participants and benefitting from their (international) expertise and assessment we hope to engage all participants in a lively discussion on how to value individual motives of different stakeholders and - where appropriate - on ways to reconcile them. The discussion will be opened by central questions that refer to basic patterns, using the card game service learning in higher education developed by the University of Duisburg-Essen that identifies and records success patterns of Campus-Community-Partnerships. (Let’s play!)
Suggestions, ideas and impulses that the participants contribute to the discussion will be saved during the session and subsequently documented.

Keywords
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Development of partnerships between community-based organisations and UCD in the Community

Dignam, Holly¹; O’Leary, Theresa¹
¹University College Dublin, UCD in the Community, Dublin, Ireland

In September 2016, University College Dublin (UCD) launched a campus wide initiative, UCD in the Community, which seeks to promote greater civic engagement through its core activities. This initiative supports and complements UCD’s involvement in the Irish Universities Association Campus Engage programme.

UCD in the Community strives to strengthen its relationships with the community and work together in a collaborative and mutually beneficial way, contributing to positive and sustainable social outcomes. It is about working together, bringing our skills and expertise to support community-based organisations, and in exchange empowering our students and staff as socially aware citizens.

Community engagement is one of the core values of UCD and the university’s strategic plan commits to build engagement at local, national and international levels.

UCD in the Community wishes to support and promote community engagement in all forms, shapes and sizes, examples of this include:

- Student volunteering
- Staff placements with community based organisations (CBOs)
- Capacity building
- Outreach programmes targeting marginalised groups and communities - Widening participation and access to higher education
- Promoting and stimulating social innovations with community partners - Community based research projects
- Events and activities that promote awareness of civic engagement
This presentation will seek to demonstrate how UCD in the Community develops partnerships with community-based (or civil society) organisations (CBOs). UCD in the Community has established 61 partnerships with CBOs since its establishment.

UCD in the Community operates as a collaborative team, with requests from CBOs debated, discussed, reviewed and implemented by various staff and students, across multiple disciplines. Our aim is to work collaboratively with individuals and groups from across the 11 colleges in UCD, to engage as many of our staff and students as possible with the wider community, whether that be at a local, national or international level.

Working with Campus Engage, our goal is to ensure community engagement becomes an integral part of university life. By demonstrating the success of multidisciplinary projects with CBOs, we hope to influence more HEIs to follow suite, whether that be at a national or international level.

This joint presentation would outline the process of developing partnerships with these organisations, the successes and the challenges associated with this, and provide insight to staff of other Higher Education Institutes or community groups on how one might establish and ensure the progression and sustainability of these partnerships with community-based organisations.
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Technology and Science in a Diverse Society The Unique Case of the Technion Social Hub
Donag, Ruti

1Technion, Social Hub, Haifa, Israel

The Social Hub of the Technion was established in 2011 with the aim of catalyzing social change within the academe and beyond, by encouraging students, teachers and researchers to break out of the Ivory Tower and to deal with real questions "on the ground". Within this science and technology-oriented university, the Social Hub is a unique platform. It creates a campus-community partnership that links academic activity with local communities and their needs. The Hub encourages faculty to develop academic courses and research that relate directly to social issues and needs. It helps in implementing new methodologies and pedagogies required to support this kind of collaborative work and follows the participants through the process by monitoring the activity and assuring it aligns with the goals of the local community and does not succumb to academic goals alone.
Beyond individual projects, The Social Hub invests in long-term development by supporting field work with students and researchers in order to develop social awareness of students in the early stages of academic training, in order to impact the future generation of scientists, engineers, architects and planners.

The Social Hub's vision brings spirit and promise to the Technion: Its students are intelligent, creative, innovative, and they are quick learners. They bring new approaches to diverse local communities, seek to empower them, open new horizons and encourage innovation. Both students and community members report meaningful interactions and (for the students) a life-changing experience.

Despite its promise and initial successes, operating such a social hub in a technological research university presents numerous distinct challenges. For example, introducing a socially-conscious perspective within a technological university requires bottom-up work with students and teachers (e.g. training and values-development) and top-down investment (creating sensitivity and sense of importance for the Hub and its goals among Technion administration, community decision-makers, etc.).

Dealing with social issues brings to this institution controversial opinions for which there is no intellectual or professional infrastructure to facilitate dialogue; the methodology and pedagogy required for actualizing is practically non-existent, and therefore must be developed as part of the training and project implementation.

A second challenge is that The Social Hub must bridge the gap between "academic-time" (e.g. the semester of the student or the research grant of the faculty) and "community-time". The Social Hub must maintain the long term commitment to community partners, even as students and faculty change. Logistics thus becomes a major responsibility of the Social Hub, redirecting limited resources from other more substantive objectives.

Keywords
co-creation, community-based research, diversity

Reflections on the emergence & development of Living Knowledge and other networks, and how they can develop further to empower local initiatives in their agency to transform societies
Dorland, Jens\textsuperscript{1}; Jorgensen, Michael Sogaard\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{1}Aalborg University Copenhagen, Centre for Design, Innovation and Sustainable Transition, Copenhagen, Denmark
This session builds on our research in TRANSIT (Transformative social innovation theory) and is a direct continuation of the 45-min workshop we held at LK7 in Dublin 2 years ago on critical turning points in the emergence and development of science shops. We here suggest making another full session with an interactive workshop and presentation on the emergence and development over time of social innovation networks that can empower local initiatives and enable them through co-production to have a societal impact that they could never have individually, with the Living Knowledge network as a case.

The focus in this session is on how international networks like living knowledge empower their members, with a purpose to help practitioners in Living Knowledge or like-minded networks to be reflexive about the potential of their networks and how to consciously develop them depending on their context and needs.

Although the focus here is on the Living Knowledge network, we will play up against 19 other social innovations networks studied in TRANSIT. The focus is thus not on the social innovation itself, which for Science Shops is novel relations and interactions between universities and communities leading to empowerment, but on how and why networks of local initiatives emerge and develop over time. The research question that led to this session is:

How has the Living Knowledge network formed and how can it develop further as an actor that can empower local science shops in their social innovation activities?

From the research question three sub-questions emerged:

- What is the nature of the Living Knowledge network and social innovation networks in general? I.e. are they formal organisation not unlike NGOs or commercial businesses, or more like informal social network with no formal boundaries like a social movement. This is crucial to understand the phenomenon as well as for the applicability of research from other fields. One of the crucial finding here, is that different social innovation networks have different organisational types, and consequently empower the local members differently.

- How has the Living Knowledge network and the science shops emerged and formed over their lifetime? This brings focus on the temporal aspect of the development, important to understand to discuss with practitioners how and why to develop in certain directions.

- How and what kind of empowerment does the formation of a social innovation network like Living Knowledge facilitate for the local initiatives? Together with the previous question on the temporal aspect this should enable us to knit together an understanding of how a global actor that can empower local initiatives can emerge and be constructed.
How an actor can be constructed, here Living Knowledge, that can interact with and affect other global actors that are beyond the influence of local initiatives individually is the most important finding, and what we aim to engage participants in a discussion about.

Sidenote: this research is based on Science, Technology and Society studies and especially Actor-Network theory inspired by recent developments in organisational studies and cognitive science.
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Scientists, Artists & Citizens working together
Duca, Edward

1University of Malta, Centre for Entrepreneurship and Business Incubation, Msida, Malta

10 min introduction
30–75 min discussion
5 min reflection

The fusion of science and art in research and science communication is a phenomenon that spread worldwide. Concepts like SciArt, BioArt and others have seen scientists and artists working together to create groundbreaking research, innovative exhibition spaces, new methods of expressing scientific ideas to engage citizens and attracting new audiences to science events and festivals. This has been coupled to a rise in citizen science (CS) and participatory science. This discussion panel will give examples and deliberate how scientists, artists and citizens have worked together highlighting the management barriers that exist to running successful events.

The structure of the discussion panel will be four short introductions followed by a discussion panel. A reflection on the key points will be performed five minutes before the session closes.

Introductory talks:
- science and theatre & art installations — Dr Edward Duca (science and innovation communication lecturer) is the manager of the Science and Art festival Science in the City in Malta which attracts over 6% of the Maltese population to the capital city. It uses different forms of arts and interactive activities to involve citizens with research.
- science and community art — Simone Cutajar (researcher, University of Malta) is the director of a Malta based non-profit organisation working with local communities with the aim of both
producing reliable scientific outputs, communicating research to different publics and engaging both scientists and artists in the production of community art pieces based on research.

- science and opera — Oded Ben-Horin (Associate Professor at the Western Norway University of Applied Sciences) is the chair at the Center of Creativities in the Arts and Science in Education. He coordinates the Global Science Opera, which sees dozens of school children and professionals collaborate to create an online science opera.

- science and theatre — Menelaos Sotiriou is a science writer and communicator who’s main research focus is on the communication of scientific research to citizens, in particular through science education projects. He started a nation-wide programme called “Learning Science Through Theater” that involves over 80 schools and hundreds of school children throughout Greece.

The talks will be followed by a panel discussion exploring the complex relationship between citizens, research and arts. The panel and participants could discuss the following themes:

- Aligning RRI values with public engagement projects, platforms, CS and science-arts projects
- Embedding RRI in institutions to enable more scientists, citizens and artists to work together. What barriers exist and how can they be overcome?
- Evaluating CS / science-arts projects.
- Rewarding and incentivising stakeholders for their participation and work.
- How do science and art projects involve communities? Using community space to direct involvement of citizens.

The themes touch on the experts’ experience and are aligned to the conference aims (these questions are open to input by the conference team). Discussion with participants will be encouraged through many means including sending in tweets during the session. The organisers will sum up the outcomes from this workshop and will disseminate post-conference.

Keywords
co-creation, civil society, RRI

A Nuclei of Citizen Science
Duca, Edward¹

¹University of Malta, Centre for Entrepreneurship and Business Incubation, Msida, Malta
5 min introductions
4x10min presentations
40 min discussion
5 min reflections

NUCLEUS is a four-year, Horizon 2020 project investigating how to make Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) a reality in universities and research institutions. It has studied best practice examples of how universities interact with other actors including civil society. The consortium is built by academic institutions, national science and technology associations, public policy organisations, national public engagement networks, and non-governmental organisations, which give a unique collaboration between 14 countries over 3 continents. One of its foci is identifying the barriers and opportunities that exist between universities and research institutions, and civil society. This session will give brief examples of civil society partnerships with universities followed by opening up a discussion on the RRI agenda within this context, how science shops can connect to communities, the development of mutual trust & related topics.

The key focus of NUCLEUS is to identify what institutional barriers prevent universities and research institutions from engaging with their stakeholders to align research with society’s needs. And, how can these obstacles be overcome. NUCLEUS is implementing new policies and programming in 30 international test sites to understand the DNA of RRI.

The following talks will start off the session followed by an open discussion on the mentioned topics:

**Prof. Alexander Gerber (Chair, Science Communication, Rhine-Waal University, Germany)** will talk about CS Map: Mapping and Measuring the Inclusiveness of Citizen Science. The “CS MAP” research project at the Science Communication department of Rhine-Waal University, aligned with the Horizon 2020 project “NUCLEUS” which it coordinates, has led to an improved, quantitative understanding of where Citizen Science stands today. These empirical results provide an evidence-base for analysing and reflecting the present and future directions for Citizen involvement.

**Dr Edward Duca** (festival manager and lecturer, University of Malta) will talk about NUCLEUS lessons from Malta for Europe? His talk will discuss the results of a study launched by the NUCLEUS project that is identifying the barriers and opportunities to overcome them in relation to how the university engages with societal actors. Additionally, it is identifying key Citizen Science projects as best practice examples for the country.

**Dr Florence BELAËN (Directrice Manager Culture, Sciences et Société, France) & Amalia Verzola (Chargée du projet InSPIRES, Direction Culture, Sciences et Société, France)** will talk about RRI and Civil Society, Rethinking the Image of Researchers. Lyon’s Science Shop was launched in 2013. Since then, many projects have been running, with the aim of bringing research closer to society and exploring...
their mutual responsiveness. Their talk will discuss the outcomes of their research projects and the implementation of a Social Innovation Lab.

Jon Rea (Engagement and Participation Lead, Nottingham City Council, UK) will talk about: 'Smart Because of You’ – Co-creating cities of the future using RRI principles. This engagement strategy, led by the local authority and involving citizens as well as local university and business stakeholders is underpinned by RRI principles.

The organisers will commit to sum up the outcomes and conclusions from this workshop and will disseminate post-conference.

Keywords
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Assessing a course's impact on the students views. A reflection exercise

Dudás, Levente¹

¹Corvinus University of Budapest, Budapest, Hungary

Research Question: Does the semester long project work in the Decision Techniques class foster a deeper level thinking in public engagement and social inclusion?

The aim of the research is to measure at the beginning and at the end of the semester, how undergraduate students view the role of public engagement and social inclusion in a topic of their choice. During the semester, related to the Decision Techniques class, the students are expected to understand, analyze and offer solution on a local scale in a topic of their choice. The focus of the project can relate to an event, a practice or a phenomenon the students personally perceive as a 'problem'. During the whole semester, groups of 4-6 students work on each project using exercises to understand, brainstorm and analyse. Through this process, one of the intended learning outcomes, is to realize the depth of the social embeddedness of these problems, and that a stable, well-rounded solution can only come through including a wide spectrum of stakeholders in the decision making process.

Method of the research: a deductive content analysis of the students responses given at the beginning and the end of the semester and pairwise comparison the the differences in language and thoughts. As a conWith this reflection exercise we aim to understand how this project work shapes the students view on the ideal form of public engagement and social inclusion.
Supporting collaborative working

Duncan, Sophie¹; Todd, Stephanie¹; Aumann, Kim²

¹NCCPE, Bristol, United Kingdom; ²UK Community Partner Network, Brighton, United Kingdom

The NCCPE has developed resources to support effective university-society collaboration. Over the last four years we have facilitated a range of different projects which have brought together schools, museums, community groups and community businesses with university staff and students. Each project has developed a range of practical resources to support high quality collaboration, including:

- Formats for networking
- Top tips guides
- A partnership card game to help participants workout the kind of partnership they want to enter into
- Innovative approaches to funding collaboration

These tools provide a great focal point for discussion, sharing experiences, and building partnerships. In this workshop delegates will have the opportunity to experience some of the methods we have developed. It will be highly interactive and practical – with delegates invited to take away and utilise the resources they find helpful.

The workshop will close with a short reflection on the collective lessons learned about how to nurture and support powerful collaborative working.

Link to the conference themes

The workshop will particularly address the following conference themes

- How can science shops better connect with civil society?
- How do researchers lower the barriers to participation or build trust among participants with different worldviews?
- What new arrangements, governance models exist or can be created/practised addressing the instrumentalisation of these practices at the personal, organisational, and funding levels?
Keywords
co-creation, community-based research, public engagement

A typology of engagement

Duncan, Sophie; Manners, Paul

1NCCPE, Bristol, United Kingdom

There are a diversity of practices, philosophies and rationales for engagement and collaboration. Navigating the landscape can be bewildering. The NCCPE are developing a typology of engagement to help see the wood for the trees. We hope that this will provide a useful tool to help people plan, manage and evaluate projects. Join us in this session to explore how the different purposes, audiences, methods and outcomes can be mapped into a coherent framework. Our goal is to develop a simple, practical tool which also resonates with the theoretical literature. Come to share your responses and help us generate a tool that really helps to support high quality engagement.

Delegates will be invited to use the typology to map one of their own projects, and road test our current approach. They will have the opportunity to contribute their ideas in shaping the next version.

Link to the conference themes

The workshop will particularly address the following conference themes

- What is the epistemological importance of science and community engagement activities?
- How can researchers live up to the societal expectations in community engagement settings?
  - What are the long-term and real benefits?

Keywords
research with impact, public engagement, co-creation

The diary of becoming responsive: A 4-month leap from life with multiple sclerosis to the Life of Things

Endaltseva, Aleksandra

1École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales; Linköping University, European framework PHOENIX Erasmus +: Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctoral Program on Dynamics of Health and Welfare, Paris, France
May 2017. Second week of fieldwork. Second year of PhD program. I am sitting in the middle of a long table in the regional center for social provision “Butirsky” in the North-East of Moscow. Right of me – Sergei, a social entrepreneur developing a legal aid online platform for people with multiple sclerosis. Left of me – Anna, co-living with multiple sclerosis for 11 years. Across the table – Armen, hiding his MS behind the wide shoulders of Sveta, his wife and care-taker. The table is full with cheeses, fruits, sweets, cups of tea and coffee, candies and colorful napkins. The sounds of camera shutters occasionally interfere into the murmur of catching-up people in their 30-s, 40-s, 50-s... It is a national MS day in Russia. It is a community celebration that evokes flashbacks of those long tables in the middle of the neighborhood street when I was a child... It’s the day of my initiation as an ethnographer.

June 2017. I am sitting at the kitchen table in my friends’ apartment. I retell what is STS and RRI; what are my uncertainties about the significance of my research for the people that...I really care about. We try to reconcile theory and practice. To build a map of scarce resources and abundant aspirations; to look for support structures that don’t take years of paperwork. It’s the day of my initiation as a maintainer and repairer.

August 2017. I am sitting in a guest chair in the management office of ZIL cultural center in the South-West of Moscow. Right of me – proposal for a collaborative art&research project Life of Things, with highlighted in bold collaborators: “Moscow MS Society; Bionic prosthesis designers “Motorica”, Charity Fund “Podary Lubov Miru”...” In front of me – the person whom I should convince to give us free space for a photo-exhibition and a public discussion. It’s the day of my initiation as a community and STS activist in Russia.

September 2017. I am standing with the microphone announcing the opening of the public discussion Life of Things. In from of me – a volunteering videographer. On my left side – speakers that supported this bold idea. Inside of me – a feeling of bonding with those who were next to me in May 2017. It’s the day of my initiation as a responsive researcher.

This piece tells the story of proactive engagement of an emergent researcher into the emotional community life of people, ill and affected by multiple sclerosis in Russia. It’s a track of my involvement in Russian MS community life; my failure to establish a living lab; and my experiment of merging a category from my coded data with communal emotions, which gave birth to the anti-disciplinary collaboration project Life of Things. This story reflects on the challenge of reconciling European scholarship with Russian activism; institutional support of community-based scholarship and the absence of co-doers when it comes to immediate expectations from the community. The format of storytelling permits to trace the birth of the project, the obstacles that paused it, and the context that frames it. It includes emotions, uncertainties, and messy experiences and allows to seek feedback, brainstorm ideas, and find future collaborators. Finally, with this presentation I expect to bring the
concept of engaged scholarship down to the world of play and responsible emotional engagement; to question the boundaries of research institution/community members authority; and to engage interested participants into the Life of Things project.

Keywords
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Science-community partnership between researchers and educators: towards a RRI holistic approach

Escarrabill, Mar¹; de Lecuona, Itziar²
¹Bioethics and Law Observatory (University of Barcelona), Transference of Knowledge, Barcelona, Spain; ²Bioethics and Law Observatory, Barcelona, Spain

Democracy needs citizens that participate in R&I processes and in R&I decision making. For this purpose, it is crucial to encourage critical, creative and caring thinking at class to empower today’s and tomorrow’s younger citizens. RRI holistic approach brings a new paradigm for a transdisciplinary education by raising the interest in STEAM careers and fostering the collaboration between the educational community and other stakeholders.

Our story is mainly focused in practical experiences carried out by the Bioethics and Law Observatory of the University of Barcelona during the program “Youth, Science and Ethics”. The first goal of this program was to improve community access to technical information by promoting a science-community partnership between researchers and educators. The second one was to promote social implication of students as active citizens in front of environmental problems produced by anthropogenic causes. These were achieved by developing workshops and debates at high schools guided by researchers regarding the effects of climate change and fostering decision-making of students to tackle climate change challenges. “Youth, Science and Ethics” successfully brought together 400 students of five Catalan high schools and twelve scientists from four research centres specialized in different fields (bioethics, marine sciences, terrestrial ecology and technology of food and agriculture). After the workshops, participants prepared a set of recommendations to tackle climate change that were further presented to an audience conformed by students, educators, researchers and policymakers at CosmoCaixa (the biggest Science Museum of Catalonia). During the session all assistants had the opportunity to learnt from each other.
With this experience we aim at contributing to the 8th Living Knowledge Conference by sharing educational initiatives that promote a culture of responsibility and democratic participation in science starting in primary and high schools. Through our story we will analyse the opportunities and difficulties of developing programs in which researchers, educators and students are involved. Moreover, we will highlight the importance of the creation of spaces for mutual learning in which youth can be involved to tackle climate change challenges.

Keywords
RRI, youth, science education

How experiences and knowledge from the past will guide us into the future - studies from the SciShops project

Garrison, Helen¹; Bergman, Martin¹; Jung, Sven²; Nevinskaitė, Laima³
¹VA (Public & Science), Stockholm, Sweden; ²Handelsblatt Research Institute, Düsseldorf, Germany; ³Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

This session will present a number of different findings from the newly started Horizon2020 SciShops project. SciShops aims at building on and expanding the capacity of the science shop ecosystem in Europe and beyond. We will present results from four different studies done during the first year of the SciShops project. The overall focus of the session will be on the following question: what can be learned about the successes and weaknesses of community-based participatory research and science shops for the future of public engagement with science?

The first part will be to provide an overview of the existing studies, reports, and initiatives in the field of community-based participatory research. What can be learned from the previous literature about general strengths and shortcomings of science shops, including their role in society? This will be presented by Professor Branko Kontić, Department of Environmental Sciences, Institute Jožef Stefan, Slovenia, also a partner in the SciShops project.

The second part will be on findings from case studies of organisations conducting community-based participatory research with a focus on success factors and challenges and the lessons that can be elicited from them. The case studies investigate a number of aspects about the organisations themselves, such as their business models, how they are funded and managed, their relationships with community organisations and other stakeholders, how work and impact is evaluated, as well as Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) practices. This will be presented by Helen Garrison, Project
and Communications Manager at the civil society organisation VA (Public & Science), a partner in the SciShops project.

The third part will be about the outcome of an European-wide online survey on awareness, experience and impact of community-based participatory research. 600 respondents within the three main stakeholder groups researchers, community organisations and policy makers gives useful insights into the awareness and experience of community-based participatory research projects. This will be presented by Martin Bergman, Researcher at the civil society organisation VA (Public & Science), Sweden, also a partner in the SciShops project.

The fourth part will focus on the results of an analysis of the impacts that existing science shops have had on their communities and the quality of knowledge transfer they conduct. This will be presented by Rodica Stanescu, Director of the science shop InterMEDIU Bucharest, University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania, also a partner in the SciShops project.

The presentations will be interspersed by comments from two guest commentators who will comment on the findings. The session will then be opened up into a plenary discussion involving the whole panel with invited comments from the audience in order to stimulate a broad debate on the topic. We welcome suggestions from the LK8 organising committee on suitable guest commentators.

Draft Agenda

1. Welcome: Purpose and structure of the session. (5 min)
2. Two research presentations of 10 minutes each (20 minutes)
3. Observations and comments from two external experts (e.g. from science shop/CBPR world or with an even broader RRI perspective?) (5 minutes)
4. Two research presentations of 10 minutes each (20 minutes)
5. Observations and comments from 2 external experts (5 minutes)
6. Plenary discussion: (30 min)
7. Closing remarks (5 mins)

Keywords

community-based research, science shop, RRI

What can make or break a citizen observatory?

Gharesifard, Mohammad\textsuperscript{1,2}; Wehn, Uta\textsuperscript{1}; van der Zaag, Pieter\textsuperscript{1,2}; Masa, Alberto\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1}IHE Delft Institute for Water Education, Delft, Netherlands; \textsuperscript{2}Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands; \textsuperscript{3}Altran, Barcelona, Spain
Citizen observatories (COs) are a form of citizen science initiatives that, on the one hand, have the potential to help enhance the spatial and temporal resolution of shared environmental data, and, on the other hand, to inform environmental decision making by providing accessible, reliable and timely environmental data and subsequently help shape environmental policies. Much attention is being paid to the design and implementation of COs and how to attract more citizen scientists to participate in such initiatives. Although mass participation in collecting and sharing environmental data and good project design and implementation are key factors for the success of COs, these initiatives do not operate in a void. There are always contextual factors such as existing institutions, policies, financial means and technological settings in which COs are embedded and with which they interact. These factors are often forgotten or only considered after initiation of a project. Therefore this session aims to create an opportunity to exchange ideas, experiences, and lessons learned from different projects on how to soundly embed citizen observatories in their existing institutional and technological settings.

This interactive event will be held in World Café style. The session will begin with a ‘welcome and introduction’ part, where an introduction will be given to citizen observatories and to the World Café process, and the context of the session (10 minutes). Next, the process will begin with the first of the three 20 minute rounds of conversation for the small groups seated around a table (60 minutes in total). At this stage, the participants will choose one of the three available stations where they can discuss the institutional, technological, and financial contextual aspects that can influence the design, implementation, and outcome of COs and Citizen Science projects. The institutional context station focuses on the importance of understanding the formal and informal institutions (rules of the game) governing the environmental issue that the CO initiatives try to address; for example what are the current inputs for the decision making processes? Is there any interest in or demand for the type of knowledge produced by the CO from decision makers or policy makers? Is there a legal basis for public participation in environmental management? The technological context station focuses on issues such as appropriateness and effectiveness of the choice and delivery of technological means for the given geographic and demographic context of the CO projects. The financial context station aims to discuss the challenges of making initiatives sustainable beyond the lifetime of the projects. Each station will be facilitated by a co-convener who will manage the time and draft a summary of the discussions. At the end of each twenty minute, the member of the three groups moves to a different new table. A final plenary discussion (20 minutes) will provide the participants with a summary of the discussions at the three tables, and will also accommodate the feedback from the participants on their ‘station visits’.
Could university be a “service of social utility”? The contemporary science shop experience in Europe

Ghibellini, Valentina¹
¹Associazione Inthum, Sassari, Italy

Objective:
The paper is based on a PhD work and introduces the main results of a research upon contemporary Science Shops’ network experience in Europe. In order to do so, it will describe some of the main features of their action within and with universities. The research considers the effects that Science shops produce on the three missions of university and on people involved, and how they link them in the different national contexts.

Method:
The research was based on a multi-method approach (standard and non standard) which combined a mixed-instrument strategy using and questionnaire, focus group and participant observation.

Results:
The main focus will be based on showing how Science shops’ method to link CSO’s needs and academia world lead to consider that their action, as social service action, is based on three lenses (persons, community and institutions) to be engaged in the society. The paper will present a several description of data obtained. It will than discuss main empirical results with particular emphasis on Science shops’ engagement with society at three different focus: personal, community and institutional upon - which a social utility service can be conceived, observe and effected.

Keywords
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Knowledge for Change (K4C): reflections on a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers

Ghibellini, Valentina¹; Antongiovanni, Francesca¹
¹Associazione Inthum, Sassari, Italy
This presentation is conceived as a contribution to the proposed session titled “Knowledge for Change (K4C): a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers”.

Within the session, Francesca and Valentina will present and discuss their experience within the K4C project as mentors who are just about to finish the Training Mentorship Programme.

K4C is a project coordinated by the UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research & Social Responsibility in Higher Education, based on an agreement between University of Victoria (Canada) and PRIA - Participatory Research in Asia (Delhi, India).

It is an international partnered training initiative between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) & Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) from several countries (Canada, India, Brazil, Uganda, Indonesia, Ghana, South Africa and Europe) aimed at the co-creation of knowledge through collective action by academics and community groups working together in various training hubs around the world. Community-based research and training in the different hubs is focused on the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in order to systematically ensure the connection between local issues and global challenges, along with the necessary multidisciplinary approach.

Keywords

community-based research, civil society, participatory action research

How to Implement Student Based Service Learning at University Level - Project Laboratories & tu projects at Technische Universität Berlin

Haas, Anna¹; Clausnitzer, Catherina¹

¹TU Berlin, ZEWK / Science Shop kubus, Berlin, Germany

Presenters: Anna Haas, Catherina Clausnitzer, Patrice Römholdt

In our workshop we want to present and discuss best practice examples and lessons learned from student self-organized service learning projects. The aim is to inspire living knowledge participants to join forces, find allies and develop a guideline to establish similar projects all over the world. We will work with guided group discussions and brainstorming and present an experimental set up to demonstrate complex scientific topics in a simple way.

What are Project Laboratories & tu projects?

At the Technische Universität (TU) of Berlin students have the possibility to design their own research and teaching in so called Project Laboratories (Projektwerkstätten) and tu projects. The Project
Laboratories have been established at TU Berlin in consequence of a student’s strike to improve study conditions in 1985. Based on this idea, tu projects have been additionally funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research since 2012. Until today, more than 150 of these self-organized project-courses have been conducted. Currently there are more than 25 projects running in parallel.

The courses are independently initiated, designed and led by students. The practical orientation of the program facilitates the accessibility for students with varying backgrounds and activates their inquiring mind while teaching important key competencies. The projects are scientifically supported by specialist areas and by TU Berlin’s science shop kubus concerning all other issues.

The interdisciplinary projects deal with issues and apply methods which are insufficiently represented in the official teaching standards. The participating students test innovative teaching, learning and research concepts. Approved good practice courses or successful elements can be subsequently transferred into the official standard of teaching at TU Berlin.

The overall topic of the program is to foster sustainability issues and to activate socially useful and environmentally friendly thinking and acting. Service learning is especially suitable to combine education and social interaction with society. It fosters interpersonal learning, academic learning through practical application and cognitive development, challenging critical thinking and problem solving in complex situations. Students and community partners can benefit from working together.

Student project example “creative biogas lab”

The tu project „creative biogas lab“ is a vivid example for the described Service Learning approach. The students who are participating in that tu project visit an existing small-scaled biogas digester at a nature conservation station in Berlin, Germany, in order to set it up for the operation period in summer term and to support during the operation period including maintenance and reparation if necessary. Additionally the students can perform different tests at the biogas digester with focus on certain research questions and with regard to optimizing the operation of the digester and increasing the biogas yield. At the end of the operation period the students dismantle the biogas digester for storing it during the winter term. This way they support the nature conservation station in a continuous and sustainable use of the small-scale biogas digester which is used there for children’s teaching purposes.

Keywords
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Today’s students require an educational system that equips them to be ‘whole persons’ (Tassone and Eppink 2016). HEIs must provide students with an educational experience which not only emphasises ‘job-ready’ qualities but also prepares students to optimally engage with stakeholders and work towards solutions to complex challenges.

Drawing on the experiences of EnRRICH (Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education, H2020), this interactive session will provide insight into how to develop curricula that is socially responsive and how to support educators in its adoption. Participants will discuss essential elements for designing effective university-community partnerships, including hand-on experience of using RRI exercises to illustrate the value of multi-stakeholder approaches for investigating and addressing pertinent challenges.

Valentina Tassone
Curricula design with an RRI orientation
How to best equip students, through higher education curricula design and pedagogy, to be and to become responsible researchers and innovators in a complex world? In the past couple of years, EnRRICH partners have addressed this question. Through an iterative and collaborative journey of reflection and action, through piloting activities, data collection and analysis, EnRRICH has developed a set of principles that can revitalize education and pedagogies from a RRI standpoint. During the presentation we will reveal those principles and highlight a few key lessons learned through the EnRRICH pilots. The first presentation of this session is especially targeted to educators interested in fostering a culture of responsibility in their higher educational practices.

Ruth Hally, Catherine O’Mahony and Kenneth Burns
Prompts for Engaging Students with Societal Challenges and RRI Pilots
Key prompts to explore societal issues with students, adopted by educators within EnRRICH, will be presented along with some surprises and realities experienced. We will draw on teaching strategies used to capture students’ imaginations and impress the importance of RRI components such as diversity, inclusion, anticipation and reflection. We will highlight exemplary pilots (many of which were co-created with community partners), including essential factors and contextual conditions that made these pilots possible. Educators, researchers and civic society organisations will have the opportunity to
learn about, how to design and implement a community-based participatory research module, and will be encouraged to reflect on their own approach to participatory research.

Jozefien DeMaree

EnRRICHttpcurricula, academics, CSOs & students through Science Shop work

RRI values collective and distributed notions of responsibility to steer scientific and innovation endeavours towards more socially desirable outcomes. The Science Shop model has been successful in doing this; bringing students, researchers and civil society together to tackle real issues at local and regional levels (European Commission, 2015). But most Science Shops are small and continuously need to re-invent themselves. EnRRICH established a Community of Practice (CoP) for new and experienced Science Shops within the project. This CoP created an incubation-like environment for Science Shops where they can learn important factors for demonstrating their relevance, securing their sustainability, and embedding RRI in HE. We'll open up this CoP and share tips for impactful Science Shops.
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Creating Strong and Sustainable Partnerships between Universities and Community Groups

Ruth, Hally¹; Connolly, Bernie¹; Burns, Kenneth¹; O'Mahony, Catherine¹; Galvin, Martin¹

¹University College Cork, Applied Social Studies, Cork, Ireland

Forging strong, synergistic and sustainable partnerships between universities and community groups is a challenging task. An essential element in any partnership, but particularly in community-higher education partnerships is creating and maintaining trust between and across parties. This poster will illustrate the partnership- and trust-building approach applied in a community-based participatory research (CBPR) module for cross-discipline PhD students. The participants involved in University College Cork's CBPR module will take you through the phases involved from initial introductory meetings, to identifying key themes to explore, and to generate mutually beneficial partnership outcomes. The poster will share key tools used to build trust in new collaborations and how these tools helped to identify important discursive themes.

Keywords
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Public engagement in research practices: the role of civil society organisations in European research networks

Hametner, Markus¹; Martinuzzi, André¹

¹Vienna University of Economics and Business, Institute for Managing Sustainability, Vienna, Austria

Collaboration between different actors in research and innovation (R&I) activities has been a cornerstone of EU research policy, especially in the context of the research framework programmes (FP). In previous FPs, this collaboration aspect has mainly focused on universities, research organisations and companies. Recent approaches, such as by Horizon 2020, call for also involving other societal actors, in particular civil society.

However, while the participation of universities, research organisations and companies in European R&I activities has already been well researched, the role of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) is largely unexplored. Against this background, our study aimed at answering the questions “To what extent did CSOs participate in FP6 and FP7?”, “In which roles, positions and thematic areas did they participate?”, and “How did they contribute to research and network performance?”. The methods applied comprise case studies, social network analysis and analysis of publication output and media presence. The main data source for the study was the European Commission’s E-CORDA database.

CSOs constitute a heterogeneous group of organisations concerning size, strategic orientation, business model or funding streams, which makes it challenging to clearly identify them in the FP6 and FP7 research networks. We therefore developed a typology distinguishing between different types of CSOs based on their target groups and funding sources.

The findings of our study reveal that CSOs have so far only played a marginal role: although they accounted for 6% of all participating organisations in FP7, they received only about 1% of the funding. Business-oriented CSOs made up a large proportion of these shares, while society-oriented CSOs accounted for less than 3% of organisations and received less than 0.5% of the funding.

CSO participation was not evenly spread across FP7. While they mainly participated in the “Capacities” programme, Health- and ICT-related research also constituted important funding sources for CSOs, due to the large budget allocated to these themes. In contrast, CSOs were practically absent from the more excellence- and technology-oriented parts of FP7, such as the ERC or nanotechnology research.

CSOs were largely characterised by nonrecurring participations, and showed the highest drop-out rate between FP6 and FP7. CSOs consequently did not occupy central positions in the FP networks. They were mainly located in the periphery and semi-periphery, did not build sub-clusters or bridge gaps, and did not have an important brokerage function. Removing CSOs from the FPs would have virtually no
effect on network morphology. Similarly, CSOs did not contribute to research performance; on the contrary, we found a significant negative correlation between CSO participation and publication output. This pattern of marginal CSO contribution to FP-funded projects can be explained by fundamentally different logics: while FPs are shaped by researchers, focusing on scientific excellence, and the business sector, focusing on profits and competiveness, CSOs follow a logic of societal impacts. They therefore find it difficult to link up with the highly competitive and excellence-driven logic of R&I. In addition, since CSOs usually act on a local or regional scale, they hardly gain added value from participating in EU-wide projects.
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Public engagement as a driver of responsible innovation in smart future living businesses?
Auer, Alexander1; Hametner, Markus1; Martinuzzi, André1; Stahl, Bernd C.2
1Vienna University of Economics and Business, Institute for Managing Sustainability, Vienna, Austria; 2De Montfort University, Centre for Computing and Social Responsibility, Leicester, United Kingdom

Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) aims to introduce the notion of “responsibility” into research and innovation practices, both in academia and in businesses. As such, it addresses corporate innovation management processes, with the aim to align innovation outcomes with “the values, needs and expectations of society”. Smart future living (e.g. smart homes and smart health) is a key application area in this regard, as it directly impacts the lives of citizens but also constitutes a major emerging market (business opportunity).

Since responsible innovation management practices are considered inclusive, anticipatory, reflective and responsive in nature, businesses are expected to benefit from “including a wider group of stakeholders” and in particular from engaging knowledgeable citizens during the whole research and innovation process. Under this perspective, RRI could be seen as a competing institutional logic to current corporate innovation practices, as it may challenge existing rules, belief systems and organisational strategies.

RRI is a relatively new concept, in particular in terms of its relevance in the business context. Being driven by policy and academia, the scientific debate has to date largely revolved around questions on how to define and frame RRI. As evidence on its implementation in businesses is still scarce, scholars
dealing with corporate RRI practices have mainly referred to studies that investigate the relationship
between CSR and innovation, or to literature about social and sustainable innovation in the business
context. Those studies that have investigated the implementation of RRI in businesses have been
limited to incentives, motives and drivers for employing RRI in companies.

Our study contributes to and expands this debate by considering RRI as competing institutional logic to
extant corporate innovation practices. To this end, our study is guided by the questions “How do
businesses perceive the value of RRI for corporate innovation management?”, “To what extent does
RRI compete with existing corporate logics and innovation practices (in which areas and why)?” and
“How does public engagement contribute to corporate innovation processes?”

The methods applied in our study comprise semi-structured interviews and an online survey with
managers of European companies in the area of smart future living, comprising businesses from the
ICT, telecommunications and related sectors. We will analyse the collected data be means of qualitative
content analysis, using the Atlas.ti software package.

Preliminary findings of our research suggest that some RRI principles indeed resonate well with current
innovation practices. As a necessary condition for open innovation, public engagement and corporate-
citizen collaboration have become increasingly important in the area of smart future living. Other RRI
aspects seem to be less compatible, in particular when they stand in the way of a firm’s desire to make
profits or gain a competitive advantage. Such impeding aspects include ethical or social intentions for
starting new innovation processes as well as attempts to design those processes in a fully transparent
way towards all involved stakeholders. In line with Blok and Lemmens, it seems reasonable to conclude
that RRI is more than a simple add-on to extant innovation processes, but, in its entirety, needs to be
understood as emergent institutional logic that calls for a new understanding of the concept of
innovation.
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How Does Open Science Benefit Researchers? ORION Project Training on Understanding the
Challenges and Benefits of Open Science
Harris, Emma A1; Bengtsson, Luiza1

1Max-Delbrück-Centre for Molecular Medicine, Communications, Berlin, Germany
As with previous culture changes and shifts within the academic world, Open Science provokes differing opinions and perspectives. On one extreme, some maintain that open publishing, data, and engagement fundamentally alter and damage the rigor of research. On the other extreme, some proponents argue that openness is an absolute good, and that all research should be open regardless of any potential problems this may cause. It is necessary to understand these conflicting ideas and address them in order to elicit a genuine and long-lasting culture change in science.

The EU-funded ORION project takes on the challenge of triggering evidence-based institutional, cultural, and behavioural changes towards Open Science. The project seeks to enhance awareness, understanding, and skills in relation to Open Science and RRI approaches, in particular public engagement. Through benchmarking and co-creation experiments, drivers and the obstacles for Open Science will be identified and subsequently tackled by training designed for early-career researchers and funders in the field of Life Sciences.

However, the training offered would be flawed and impractical if it was based on an evangelising perspective of Open Science. The ORION training aims to support researchers and those involved in science communication and engagement by allowing them to discuss challenges honestly and find the best approaches to including Open Science in day-to-day practices.

Consequently, we propose a workshop which will help explore how Open Science and Community Engagement benefits researchers and institutions, and how best to communicate these advantages to both scientists and the community. In addition, there will be the opportunity to raise questions and concerns about the challenges of Open Science, exchange ideas about successful strategies, and get practical, personalised support from the trainers.

This session will be based on the training developed by ORION. ORION's interactive training program involves a learner-led approach allowing participants to creatively find solutions and discuss issues. The training combines various innovative methods such as future search methods and team-based learning.

For LK8, we will offer a condensed and streamlined version of these training workshops. We will have groups work on professional dilemma scenarios in order to consider the broad issue of how Open Science, in particular public engagement, helps benefit the research community: researchers, funders, policy makers, and citizens. Specific focus will be put on the practicalities of Open Science and how the science community is adapting to the cultural change the Open Science movement has inspired.
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Make every voice matter: Can peer feedback bring about change?

Hazelhoff, Vincent

1University of Groningen, Science Shop Language, Culture & Communication, Groningen, Netherlands

Community based research has the potential to change people, organisations, communities and even entire societies. The challenge often is how to continue from successful small project to a sustainable change for a broader group. To achieve this, collaborating partners often have to overcome a lack of financial support, organisation, time, skills or priority, which can turn up unexpectedly. All partners can be disappointed and ask themselves how could we have done things differently. As Science Shops, we wonder: Where does the role of (student)researchers and knowledge brokers like science shops end in this process? When and how do we pass on the responsibility for implementation and change to other organisations or groups? And how can we help these organisations to really implement sustainable change?

A recent Science Shop project on peer feedback in a language learning environment evoked an enormous shift in learning culture for the partners involved and has managed to spread to others. This project has led to a simple idea: Could peer feedback be a tool to help organisations use their full potential and bring about change?

In this Living Lab we would like to take all participants on a journey into pro-active learning environments through the use of effective peer feedback. Traditionally mainly experts provide feedback to students or junior colleagues, but feedback given by peers has proven to be able to play an important role in improving skills and reaching the goal you have set for yourself (or for your community). Provided the feedback is given in the right way. Tips and tricks for effective peer feedback will be shared and experienced.

Through an interactive and playful method participants will learn in this participatory classroom how to apply feedback effectively without being an authority. Furthermore we would like to add a discussion on how peer feedback could be applied in different situations, what participants view as the main benefits and limitations of this tool and which alternatives do they have to really bring about change and make every voice matter.

- The contribution to the conference: The Living Lab addresses how to enrich the public engagement in research practices, how to achieve successful ‘engagement’ and create a motivating change for everyone.
- The choice of format: Peer feedback is something that should be experienced and participants bring their own experiences to the table to expand and criticize the idea. A living lab is the best format to make this happen.
The collaborative features of our submission: Peer feedback in action is fully collaborative.
The expected impact of the presented work: Participants can use knowledge of effective peer feedback in working with students or with (in) organization that want to bring about change.

Timing: 45 minutes.
Technical requirements: room with presenting facilities (computer/beamer or digiboard), WiFi and a few tables to discuss.
Presenters: Vincent Hazelhoff, Saskia Visser, Karin de Boer and Jolanda Tuinstra (Science Shops, University of Groningen)
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Project-Social - Combining 'Problem Based Learning' with Community Engaged Research
Hickey, Adrian 1; Mulrone, Claire 2
1 Ulster University, Communication and Media, Coleraine, United Kingdom; 2 Ulster University, Centre for Flexible Education, Coleraine, United Kingdom

Project-Social - Combining 'Problem Based Learning' with Community Engaged Research
In this presentation Hickey and Mulrone will showcase Project Social. (www.project-social.co.uk)
Project-Social is the name of a collective of community engaged research and learning projects Hickey and Mulrone have undertaken with their students during the last eight years. Project Social is, at its core, underpinned by the pedagogies of 'Work Based Learning' (Kolb, Lucas, Boud, etc) and contemporary pedagogies of 'Students as Partners' (Healey). The students produce most of the work independently, using weekly sessions to pitch ideas, critique work in progress, set goals and resolve issues. These scenarios can be loosely described as problem based learning. "Problem-based learning (PBL) is a pedagogical approach that suggests that learning is effective when the learner is empowered to undertake research into real problems or challenges applying both theory and practice to develop solutions." (Lucas, 2010) Hickey and Mulrone will reflect on how they have evolved Project Social to link 'Problem Based Learning' with Community Engaged Research resulting in improved community partnerships and excellent student experiences.

Keohane argues that Universities should be "intergenerational partnerships in learning and discovery, with compelling moral purposes that include not only teaching and research but also service to society…we are not just collections of loosely affiliated persons with convergent or conflicting interests,"
but institutions that make a difference in the world...I emphasise the fellowship here among students as well as faculty members" (Keohane, 2006) In this presentation we will outline how we deliver an impactful learning experience which not only engages the students in subject relevant research activities, but which also has a real and meaningful impact in the communities in which we exist.

In her paper on Community Based Research and Civic Pedagogy Paul argues, "such research is increasingly necessary for their (non-profit organisations) economic survival, not to mention for developing maximally effective programs and services". (Paul 2006) For Ulster University Project Social showcases the knowledge and expertise of both staff and students and our willingness to participate with community partners ensuring Ulster's contribution to the development of a stronger social economy.
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How to select the research questions of your Science Shop through participatory research agenda setting?
Horváth, Janka

ESSRG Ltd., Budapest, Hungary

Other speakers: VU University of Amsterdam, Living Lab for Health of IrsiCaixa

In 2018 at ESSRG we attempt to map those Hungarian initiatives, organizations and experts who apply alternative, green care services to people who struggle with mental health challenges. In Northern and Western Europe those supplementary services which integrate the healing power of nature are quite popular and well-researched. Our pilot programme concentrates on generating research questions involving as many actors as we can. At the first stage of the process, we are conducting semi-structured interviews with knowledge holders and organizing Science Cafés in order to identify the relevant stakeholders and formulate research questions in a participatory way. At the second stage, we aim to prioritize the research questions with the representatives of civil society organizations, users, health care providers, research and education community and policy makers. Our overwhelming objective is to generate dialogue among the relevant sectors and prepare research proposals related to the field of green care services.
Keywords
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Stop-motion and co-creation as methods for public engagement
Humm, Antonia

Freie Universität Berlin, Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin, Educational Departement, Berlin, Germany

At the Botanical Garden & Botanical Museum Berlin (BGBM) a co-creation team of volunteers developed a stop-motion workshop as an interactive format for young people. The aim was to motivate the audience to address the question of how we can deal responsibly with food in the future and to gather their opinions on this topic.

The workshop was created as part of the EU project BigPicnic, in which the BGBM has been participating since 2016. The project deals with food security and focuses on participation and public engagement. All of the project’s cooperation partners - 15 botanical gardens in 13 countries - are developing their own events to raise public awareness of food security, address hard-to-reach audiences and document public opinion on this topic. The project promotes a dialogue between the public, science and political decision-makers. In this respect, the project and the results achieved in Berlin fit very well with the theme of the LK 8 conference "Enriching Science and Community Engagement".

In our Pecha Kucha presentation we would like to show that public engagement and interest in a topic can be effectively promoted with target group-oriented participatory methods.

First we will talk about the participatory approach which is linked to a creative and interactive process in which new perspectives and ideas from outside will be integrated from the outset. The co-creation team of volunteers at the BGBM met regularly for seven months to define a key topic in the field of food security and find suitable ways of communicating it. As the members of this heterogeneous group did not know each other before, it was more challenging than expected to agree on a topic and a suitable format. The team decided on the topic of food waste, which is particularly relevant for our society, and a stop-motion workshop to reach young people in particular.

In a second step, we report on our experiences with the Stop-Motion-Workshops for young people, in which the participants in small groups shot animated short films with tablets and a simple app. It turned out that it was very easy to inspire the target group for the stop-motion technique and that they seriously dealt with the topic of food waste in their films. The results of the workshops were published on the
Lessons on empowerment – sharing experiences from community-based research and citizen science

Joergensen, Michael S

1Aalborg University, Copenhagen SV, Denmark

This proposal is submitted by Michael Søgaard Jørgensen, Aalborg University and ECSA (European Citizen Science Association), Claudia Göbel, ECSA and Jens Dorland, Aalborg University.

Empowerment is an issue which needs to be addressed in order to realize the potentials for civil society of both Citizen Science and Community-based research.

We think that community-based research - as it is practiced in Science Shops and other initiatives in the Living Knowledge network - has many valuable lessons to share with the Citizen Science community – and vice versa. This session is meant to stimulate exchange between these two communities of practice and identify joint questions of interest for future collaboration.

Central questions include:

- How do citizen science initiatives and community-based research address equity between scientists and civil society in their activities?
- What parts of the research process are civil society actors involved in and how? What is the role of co-creation of knowledge between researchers and civil society?
- How can civil society be empowered by applying results from citizen science they have contributed to?
- How can civil society be empowered by community-based research they are involved in?
What type of physical and/or organizational space is created as a framework for cooperation between university and other institutions for research and education and civil society?

Members of the Living Knowledge Network from science shops and the Citizen Science community will share successes and failures on empowerment of civil society and citizens from their work with civil society organisations and communities. After short introductions to the concepts and some experiences, the participants in the session break into circles for a more in-depth exchange of experiences and discussions.
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The Jisr Project: Technology with the Community
Kallus, Rachel1; Shilon, Mor1

1Social Hub Technion, Haifa, Israel

Jisr az-Zarqa is a marginalized Arab town on Israel's northern Mediterranean coast. It has the lowest monthly wage and the highest high school dropout rates in the country, with 80% of its residents living below the poverty line. Collaboration between the Social Hub at the Technion and the HCI group at Cornell-Tech is designed to deploy an innovative computational intervention that provides Jisr's residents with economic and social opportunities with positive impact on their lives.

The Jisr project involves interdisciplinary residents and students' teams – supervised by faculty – working on projects identified by Jisr inhabitants in need of technological tools for implementation: 1. Development of a website and an interactive map of the village; 2. Promoting heritage sites and stories; 3. Advancing small business entrepreneurships. The teams draw on participatory methods to work with instead of for the community, engaging in an iterative design model of co-planning – co-action – co-evaluation.

The project involves theoretical, methodological and empirical considerations to be applied in the ongoing working process with the community. It develops, updates and refines theoretical tools and methods for reciprocal research and field work with communities. Furthermore, it develops a set of participatory design processes to guide the teams as they build and deploy new technologies with the inhabitants of Jisr.

By strengthening academic-community partnerships, the project brings advanced technologies to a marginalized community through participatory processes that engage and empower local residents to
play a role in strengthening their own community. However, it also raises important queries regarding the possibility to implement academic-community collaborations for advancing underserved communities in an egalitarian and inclusive process that will bring to sustainable outcomes for long-term horizons.
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Technology WITH Communities
Kallus, Rachel
1Social Hub Technion, Haifa, Israel

How can technological tools be accessible for communities in need? How can technology-inclined professions operate effectively with communities? How can training in these fields be adjusted to the learning of shared processes “on the ground”?

In an attempt to answer these questions, our project is based on a set of participatory design processes to guide and deploy new technologies with under-served communities. Our project develops theoretical tools and methods for reciprocal research and field work with communities. It draws on participatory methods to work with instead of for the community, engaging in an iterative design model of co-planning – co-action – co-evaluation.

Our project aims to bring advanced technologies to marginalized and under-served communities in diverse locations and contexts. It stresses participatory processes that engage and empower local communities to play a role in strengthening their own circumstances. Thus, it seeks to implement collaborative processes for advancing partner communities in an egalitarian and inclusive process that promote sustainable and long-term outcomes.
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Team entrepreneurship education
Katonane Kovacs, Judit
1Local Entrepreneurs Supporting Community association, Debrecen, Hungary
Collaborative and entrepreneurial culture is important in the 21st century. The story will present the Igen Debrecen program of a civil organisation, where individuals, idea bringers and teams can develop their projects. The organisers and the participants of the program coming from different sectors of the quadruple helix model, will be presented. Having experience of entrepreneurship education at university as well, topics, such as institutions for entrepreneurship education, flexibility, learning community are addressed.
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A community-university partnership to improve implementation and evaluation of an early childhood education program: Implications for practice and policy
Kilmer, Ryan P.1,2; Cook, James R.1,2; Messinger, Lindsay3; Gadaire, Andrew2; Larson, Jacqueline1; Babb, Julie4; Simmons, Caitlin2; Thiery, Tracy4; Day, Peggy4; Salim, Khalil2

1University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Department of Psychological Science, Charlotte, United States; 2University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Community Psychology Training Program, Charlotte, United States; 3Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Office of Accountability, Charlotte, United States; 4Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Pre-Kindergarten Program, Charlotte, United States

This presentation focuses on a multi-year community-university partnership centered on evaluating and enhancing a publicly-funded early childhood education program in a large, urban school system in the United States. The program's target population, four-year-olds identified via screening as at-risk for not being ready for kindergarten, includes many children from marginalized (low income, minority, English as a Second Language) groups, and this partnership has sought to strengthen the program's implementation across sites and classrooms to benefit all children. Using a community-based participatory research approach, this partnership (including university faculty, school system program administrators and staff, school system researchers, and university graduate students) has been characterized by shared governance, dual decision-making, direct communication, and mutual learning. These qualities have contributed to an effective partnership, improving the quality of the science and maximizing its applicability to program practices and the school system at-large; the work clearly aligns with the overall conference theme. Following a brief overview about the community needs that catalyzed this effort, the presenters, university faculty members (in a training program that has received national
recognition for its promotion of community-engaged research and action, including strength in enhancing competencies necessary for community-engaged scholarship and practice), will describe the partnership’s evolution over time, with emphasis on the impact it has had on program practices and local policy work. Supported by a grant from the Institute of Education Sciences within the U.S. Dept. of Education (with university- and school system lead investigators), the current project seeks to increase the capacity of the school system to collect, manage, and use student data, to improve teacher instruction to meet individual child needs, enhance coaching of teachers, and build research capacity within the system. Key project foci include: (a) conducting a randomized controlled trial testing whether providing teachers with feedback about student performance on a teacher-completed measure of social-emotional skills (and information regarding how to use results to guide instruction) will lead to individualized instruction and improved student social-emotional skills; and (b) helping develop and test a data-guided enhanced coaching model to support teachers’ use of data to inform instruction and increase fidelity of implementation of pre-kindergarten curricula. Over the years, the partnership has yielded short- and long-term benefits across levels and stakeholders (program leaders and staff, university students, faculty, school system researchers, the university, the community). This presentation will describe partnership strategies and selected findings from the evaluation, highlighting how the partners have used data to guide capacity building, modify practice, and contribute to local efforts to expand early childhood programs; the present partnership’s connection of research to real-world programming and practice is a particular asset. The presentation will conclude by describing actionable strategies for facilitating mutually beneficial partnerships that may generalize to other contexts.
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Integrate RRI in teaching and research practices: sustainability and inclusion in a business school course
Kiss, Gabriella

1Corvinus University of Budapest, Department of Decesion Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

The aim of my presentation is to provide insights of my research into my course on Decision Technics involving a CSO. In line with the full session proposal on Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in Higher Education (HE) Practice: RRI as Tool for Research, Reflection and Curricula Innovation by Judit
GÁSPÁR, Réka MATOLAY and Andrea TOARNICZKY, I am conducting a research inspired by RRI keys to investigate how knowledge on sustainability issues can be deepened by a business course involving a CSO.

In the concept of Science Shops universities can conduct courses that lead to socially relevant teaching and research activities. Throughout these co-learning processes students, CSOs and teachers can share their knowledge. These socially embedded learning processes can lead to more responsible students and teachers and could serve the aims of CSOs as well. It is important for me, that these courses can integrate more RRI keys into teaching activities that are in my research interest as well. Especially two important keys from RRI: sustainability and inclusion.

My research topic is public participation in environmental issues such as waste management decisions. From time to time I tried to integrate my research interest into teaching activities for example creating case studies on research results etc. I felt that students are not able to get deeper in the topic or are not involved into the question. The reason could be that I teach business students in bachelor level and the course is not about sustainability or environmental economics as such. That is the reason why we started a Science Shop project in 2018 and invited a CSO specialized to waste management into Decision Technics course and we started a research on that course.

The course that I am teaching is Decision Technics in Corvinus Business School at bachelor level. The course is built on a “problem-solving process” where students should define a “problem” to work with for 12 weeks. At the course they learn tools (technics) that help them to get through this process. At the end of the course students should take an action as a problem-solving step. As a side effect students improve knowledge on the issue that they bring to the course as a “problem”.

The aim of this Science Shop project is twofold; I can define it as a teacher and as a researcher. As a teacher I would like the students to work on socially and environmentally relevant problems involving a real stakeholder and improve the knowledge on the chosen topic. As a researcher I questioned that the knowledge on sustainability issues has improved throughout the project by all three actors (students, CSO members, and teacher). As a researcher I would like to involve the actors into the research process. To fulfill these aims we are conducting a qualitative research on this Decision Technics course in 2018 making interviews with all three actors. The researchers are the students, the CSO members, and the teacher as well. The inclusion of these actors realized in these research processes: formulating the research question, collecting data and interpret and publish the results together.

Keywords
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Present paper intends to highlight the social utilization of contemporary research results on multi-ethnic traditions in Slovakia. Multi-ethnic traditions can be regarded as an umbrella conception for all the patterns and attitudes of inter-ethnic coexistence and multilingualism in the past. These traditions can not be narrowed down to a particular historical epoch, but can have strict spatial focus (local, regional, national, or transnational).

In the course of the 20th century, this interdisciplinary field of research had become increasingly popular on the academic scene, but not in Slovakia, where research had to serve nation-building narrative and prioritize the presentation of the Slavic legacy. But after the fall of Communism, and parallel with the EU accession process and democratization, general questions of inter-ethnic coexistence came into the limelight. As the part of this process, academic mainstream begun to regard history of Slovakia as the history of a geographical region and not just of Slovaks. Besides, local communities launched their own development strategies and started their own place-branding activities, supplemented with historical narratives. As a result, locality and regionality overwrote nationality, the earlier dominant driving force of historical narratives.

The main social stakeholders of (re)inventing multi-ethnic traditions have proved to be NGOs, local governments and the business sphere: this latter is also involved in this co-creation process through tourism and heritage industry. The primary aim of this paper is to scrutinize the confluence and interactions between the academic sphere and these stakeholders, all of them being interested in unveiling multi-ethnic traditions, mainly on local level.

In some cases, the ties are so institutionalized among them that a kind of ecosystem is formed by them. Hotel owners who reconstructed castles and ruins (e.g. in Oponice, Hermanovce, Halic or in Viglas) try to create unique and authentic atmosphere with evoking local noblemen (not typical archetypes of Slovak ethnic narrative) based on research in archives. Bratislava has already two Coronation festivities, and a bunch of NGOs issue and organize events highlighting the coexistence of Germans, Jews, Hungarians and Slovaks in the city. Synagogues throughout the country have gained new public functions, backed by local governments, NGOs and even MNCs who have found it a suitable CSR activity. Scouts and schools participate in fortress renovation initiatives lead by archeologists. Local governments have erected statues for city founders (typically kings), instructed by local museums. The subject of these participative research projects are such historical symbols who have been generally regarded as non-Slovaks and since their new cult embraces a multi-ethnic character.
These few examples try to uncover the science-society interactions during reinventing multi-ethnic traditions. This paper - beside mapping the public, civic and business engagement in research processes – intends to answer a main question, whether can we speak about a bottom-up model of transnationalization of identity, questioning the dominance of the top-down nation-building structures of Slovakia? In addition, the presentation tackles the dilemma, whether the participatory feature of research means the decline of research quality and results in the commodification of the past in a standardized form ideally for consumers and not for academics.
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Widening horizons through RRI in International Business education
Kozma, Miklos
1
1Corvinus University of Budapest, Department of Business Studies, Budapest, Hungary

Title of the session where the presentation is intended to be made:
Gáspár-Matolay-Toarniczky: Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in Higher Education (HE) Practice: RRI as Tool for Research, Reflection and Curricula Innovation

My proposal for presentation:
I have introduced the concept of business in an international environment to BSc students just starting their studies at the university using the RRI framework. It was interesting to observe what they understood from the key aspects of RRI about business and how this developed over the course of their studies in the semester.

A key outcome for my teaching was the renewal of my approach according to contemporary challenges and opportunities as inspired by the RRI framework.

A key outcome for the students was going beyond their existing understanding of the business world and sensing the delicate links between science, business and society.

I am willing to continue applying the RRI framework in my other courses with more experienced BSc students, as well as in MSc and MBA courses.

The conference may provide a platform to share ideas on how to progress in teaching by making the most of the opportunities inspired by RRI.
Knowledge production and its appreciation (claiming the truth) is changing and diversifying. The authority of scientific knowledge as we know it is being questioned. Science is becoming no more an opinion as any other opinion. At the same time science is still under the influence of very dominant traditions and discourse of producing scientific knowledge.

Is there a need for strategies aiming at a more inclusive knowledge production? We believe science shops, with (practical) experience on working on the edge of science and society, could be of great value. The aim of the Science Shop of Wageningen University and Research (WUR) is to support non-profit organizations by implementing research projects with a potential societal impact in the fields of among others nutrition and health, environmental quality and processes of social change. Over the past 30 years we have a long track record of projects. We merge and combine, as many science shops do, our education and research activities where we can. We work with community driven research questions on community aimed consultancy. But is this really enough to bridge the gap between science and society? But does this really make knowledge production inclusive? Do we really serve those in society who need it most?

How can we reach out to those in society that now do not show up on our radar? And is this outreaching really a key issue? Is our current approach helping us to do so? Or should we change our way of working?

We think that we need to unravel the complexities in society, the forces that shape the things as they are. However, is it possible to enforce change beyond the micro level of consultancy in the science shop project? Should we perhaps re-aim and facilitate more normative research? Or should we instead be absolutely normless in what we take on? Is true understanding of the context of the question crucial to articulate the value to be added. One of our ideas is that science shops should be like experimental laboratories that make explicit created value for different stakeholders.
We will organize a dialogue as part of the 8th Living Knowledge Conference in Boedapest on this subject with our fellow Living Knowledge colleagues. Key is how do to make an impact in society with our research strategy. We will facilitate discussion with practice-based examples of The WUR Science Shop. Do you recognize your own struggle in above mentioned issues? What is your experience in this matter? What can we learn from each other? How can we build upon our experience to make a difference?
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A New and Innovative Governance Model to Instrumentalize Community-University Engagement: A Case Study of an Indian University
Lahiri, Amit

1O.P. Jindal Global University, International Institute of Higher Education and Capacity Building, Delhi, India

The higher education system in India is in a state of peril. At one level, the staggering number of higher education institutions estimated to be more than 50,000 and growing, seem to be exacerbating the inequitable access to higher education in the youngest demographic in the world. At another level, the publicly-funded institutions face increasingly dwindling budgetary support from the government agencies which is allocating progressively higher budgets to supporting economic growth and increased spending on defence. Yet the impressive figures of India’s economic growth much hyped by the international media itself leads to a growing inequality causing a massive under-performance in the global rankings of its human development indicators (HDI) as well as inclusive development indicators (IDIs). With every year of increase in economic growth accompanied by increased consumer demand and industrial production, there is rampant environmental degradation and rampant growth of marginalised and poor sections in the population. Compounding this scenario is the incredible levels of youth unemployment in the country with a very high proportion of even the technically educated youth unable to demonstrate adequate skills to get decent jobs. The dwindling budgets for the public higher education institutions is propelling an exponential demand for privately funded education with one of the highest growth of private universities in the world. Many of these private higher education institutions fail to meet acceptable standards of academic quality while the public institutions facing budget cuts fail to fill up the teaching vacancies and improve and innovate their curriculum design and delivery to produce socially
and economically relevant education for vast numbers of the young students who can ill afford the high fees demanded by private universities.

In this scenario of rampant social, economic and environmental degradation amidst impressive economic growth figures coupled with the exponential demand for higher education in the world’s second most populous nation and the youngest demographic, higher education reform is imperative to climb out of the spectre of lack of innovation, job less growth and massive youth unemployment. The story telling session is one such narrative of a novel innovation at an Indian university fostering community-university engagement to produce transdisciplinary public engagement practices via community based research or participatory research resulting in engaged scholarship amongst faculty and action learning amongst students while at the same time incorporating an inclusive participation of community members in addressing common developmental challenges. This novel approach combines strategic institutional partnerships with a wide variety of stakeholders like UNESCO, industry, civil society organizations, international and national think tanks and a diverse range of international academic partnerships under one institutional umbrella at this university. This novel governance model is poised to attract public-private partnerships, contributions from various funding agencies and feeding back to improved curriculum design and innovation to result in socially relevant and inclusive education. It combines students from a variety of disciplines to utilize their capacities with faculty mentorship to produce engaged global citizens while engaging with real world community development problems by exploring practical solutions.
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Ethical Concerns of Collaboration and Co-creation in Action Research
Lajos, Veronika¹; Nemes, Gusztáv²

¹University of Miskolc, Department of Cultural and Visual Anthropology, Miskolc, Hungary; ²Budapest Corvinus University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Budapest, Hungary

Well-known basic elements of the action research cycle are doing research and planning changes, action and observation, reflection and the participation as well as collaboration of the stakeholders. However, in this context, the content and type of investigation, examination and scholarly work are generally quite diversified as well as the ethical challenges one is to encounter.
The workshop aims to initiate a critical, reflective and “thick” conversation focusing on the participants’ interests around the following questions, for instance, in a collaborative learning process: What kinds of ethical dilemmas one is to encounter in the framework of action research? What signifies as an ethical problem on different stakeholders’ side when jointly working in an action research project? What are the ethical challenges and consequences of initiating social change in a local site/community as well as in the business or civil sector? In what ways and for whom the action research is inclusive or exclusive? What about gender equality and, in general, how to do an ethically reflective and conscious research when working with variously underprivileged people? What kinds of ethical issues are embedded in the typically inevitable moment of exiting the social scene of the local site/community or business/civil sector when the action research project ends? What types of ethical concerns are embedded into the textualization processes of action research (e.g. talk and write about co-researchers or with them)?

We plan to have two consecutive workshops having a strong focus, the 1st on the methodological and the 2nd on the ethical issues of collaboration and participation in action research – the ethical one following the methodological. The duration of each session is 45 minutes and the participants are invited to attend either both of the workshops or only one of them. Depending on the number of people attending the sessions, we will work in one group or break up into subgroups for some of the time. We apply participatory techniques to discuss the field of ethics occurring in different types of action research (PAR, CBPR, cooperative research etc.).

The outline of the workshop on ethical concerns of action research:

- Introduction of the workshop scheme and of the participants (its time frame depending on the numbers of participants –circa 5-10 minutes)

- During the first 20 minutes participants are asked to write a short message containing 3-3 do’s and don’ts in small groups (2-3 people) concerning their most memorable lessons (each of the members of the group) of a bad mistake in the field of ethical problems when collaborating with various stakeholders in the course of action research. (Do not worry, we have all done mistakes, I will be the first one telling you some of ours.)

- During the second 15-20 minutes there is a brainstorm session about the most typical ethical problems and the ways of solving or ameliorating them, about the means of ethically conscious participation and the ethical challenges of collaboration in the course of different kinds of action research.

We hope to have a friendly, honest and reflective conversation on ethical issues in action research that could become the start of many other ones to come in the future.
Exploring innovative solutions to involve citizens and civil society: the case of the Framework Programme 9
Lappranda, Aude¹; Gorre, Fleur¹; Pigeon, Martin²
¹Sciences Citoyennes, PARIS, France; ²CEO, Brussels, Belgium

The next Research Framework Programme (FP9) gives a real opportunity to adopt a new way forward and to rethink the role of citizens and civil society organisations.

While Europe’s next budget for research-funding could reach €120-billion, key objectives of FP9 are still mainly focused on technological solutions, science and innovation. There is also a concern that the societal impact will not be taken into account in all types of missions. In this context, Sciences Citoyennes and Global Health Advocates took the lead of a coalition of European non-governmental organisations (NGOs). A call has been addressed to the Commission in order to promote the involvement of citizens in the co-designing of the missions.

Effective and meaningful engagement of European citizens and civil society may be reached through two dedicated mechanisms: the Citizen Conventions and Civil Society High Level Group.

In the current political context, it is increasingly important to inform citizens and to involve them in defining research and innovation (R&I) priorities. Citizens Conventions are an innovative process of decision-making to co-create FP9’s missions. Citizens are trusted to discuss and to define missions that respond to the future needs of society.

The second mechanism relies on a EU Civil Society High Level Group, which aims at maximising the societal impact of R&I. Members includes NGOs, community groups, faith-based organisations, foundations and advocacy groups. Following the FP9 negotiation process, the EU Civil Society High Level Group would be transformed into an Advisory Group of Experts whose mission is to monitor the implementation of PF9.

Global Health Advocates, Sciences Citoyennes and Corporate Europe Observatory suggest holding a round-table conference about the involvement of civil society, associations and NGOs in the development of FP9.

The discussion could be structured as follows:

- description and challenges for FP9;
- proposals advocated by the coalition;
• responses from European institutions.

Speakers:
Fanny Voitzwinkler for Global Health Advocates
Martin Pigeon for CEO
Fleur Gorre for Sciences Citoyennes.
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Connecting stories of real-life, Authentic cases in Education- how to capture and share impact?
Leenders-Pellis, Saskia J.1; Vergoossen, Nina1
1Education Project Services Wageningen University & Research, Education Support Centre, Wageningen, Netherlands

Workshop - Connecting stories of real-life, Authentic cases in Education- how to capture and share impact for dialogue?
Presented by Saskia Leenders and Nina Vergoossen
In this workshop we would like to share our dilemma of how to capture the impact and added value for society and university that is created by using real-life cases in education. And once captured, how to share the stories and create dialogue?
This workshop is connected to a problem we see: there are so many very valuable projects done, and we could have so much more impact if we could somehow capture the impact and share knowledge in a systematic way. To make projects more visible, within society and university.
We would therefore like to collaboratively learn more about what (facilitative) role the education project services (or science shops, etc) could have in capturing the stories and making the impact visible. By doing this, we would like to share knowledge and get inspired on how to make continuation possible for more impact in society and university;
• What impact and added value do you see now working with real-life projects in educational settings? What makes these projects unique in comparison to monetary based research projects?
• How to share these stories in a systematic and inspiring way? And for whom?
• How could a systematic way of collecting stories change the impact and added value?
In what way could these stories stimulate dialogue between university (or other knowledge institutes) and society?

What role would we as facilitators have?

We would like to present 5-10 executed cases in the course ‘Academic Consultancy Training’ of Wageningen University in the form of a portrait as a starting point: a picture with a story. Within the Academic Consultancy Training (ACT), teams of students are contributing to addressing real-life challenges experienced by organizations in society. As a result of their work, ACT teams deliver to those organizations an academic consultancy advice about how to tackle the challenge at hand.

After presenting those portraits, we would like to start a workshop session in smaller groups guided by the above questions. Our aim is to inspire and to generate dialogue among participants of how to tackle this dilemma.

We hope to generate awareness and creativity among the participants on the value and importance of capturing stories from real life projects, and making a start in developing a way how to do this. So ‘science for impact’ is also assessed on the level of those smaller projects; creating even more dialogue between society and the university, and within the university as well.

**Keywords**
co-creation, science shop, learning & education

**How to facilitate real-life, authentic projects in education? Sharing experiences and tools**

Leenders-Pellis, Saskia J.; Vergoossen, Nina

*Education Project Services Wageningen University & Research, Education Support Centre, Wageningen, Netherlands*

In real-life, authentic situations students will learn to apply scientific and practical knowledge to tackle complex and interdisciplinary issues. This is instrumental for developing a critical and responsible attitude, cooperation skills and the ability to deal with diverse societal stakeholders and influences. By using real-life cases in education, there will be an interaction between science and society, and this opens the door for the possibility to enrich science and community engagement, and science for impact. Implementing a real-life case in education is much more complex in comparison to using theoretical cases, and do need much more organisation and planning. As Educational Project Services of Wageningen University and Research we have gained quite some experiences in this facilitation...
process, and we would like to share these. Next to this, we hope to learn more about real life cases in other educational settings and what is needed to facilitate/support in these cases.

First, we will explain more about how we as Education Project Services facilitate real-life cases in education and share our experiences and insights of defining clear conditions and expectations. Next to this, we will share an example of how we keep track on progress and project planning to give the participants an insight of what it takes to facilitate this, and how this could differ between courses.

Second, we would like to start an interactive session on what different stakeholders (commissioner, teacher, coordinator, student) need to know in what stage of the project to be able to communicate and managed expectations well. For this we would like to invite one of the participants to tell his/her specific case, and work this out together on flap overs with post-its.

Question raised: What do you need to facilitate, develop and think of and when implementing real life cases in your educational settings?

This way we, hope to help and stimulate participants to implement real-life cases in their education, to create rich learning environments for the students, and connect society and university more closely.

Keywords
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The Long and Winding Road of the Cameroon Science Shop

Leka Essomba, Armand1; Mboa Nkoudou, Thomas Hervé2; Dibounje, Marie Sophie3
1 University of Yaoundé I, Yaoundé, Cameroon; 2 Université Laval, Yaoundé, Cameroon; 3 OHADA (ORGANISATION POUR L’HARMONISATION EN AFRIQUE DU DROIT DES AFFAIRES), Yaoundé, Cameroon

In 2015 the SOHA Project introduced Cameroonian students and teachers to Science shops. Seemingly this powerful space of mediation could allow research oriented by citizens and drive sustainable local development. Seduced by this idea, we wanted to reproduce it in our context, by adapting it to our Cameroonian realities. But that was not without difficulties. From the onset, we faced a dilemma: where to locate the Science shop: inside or outside the university? Since in our context the university is considered as almost sacred by the general population (because it is only for those who have studied), a Science Shop located inside a university may not be helpful to local associations. However, institutional anchoring is necessary for the smooth running of a Science Shop, in particular to ensure access to courses, teachers and students. To overcome this difficulty, we have designed a Science
Shop model that includes a central Science Shop located within the university, with satellites points attached to it and located in different neighborhoods. The biggest challenge is now to integrate the idea of a Science Shop in academic practices. From a pedagogical point of view, one major question deals with how to recognize as valid research projects ran by students, while the current system does not allow the pedagogical approach by project. Even if a teacher agrees to include a Science Shop project in their practice, would he have the approval of the authorities of the university? Because of those difficulties, the Cameroon Science Shop was still struggling to get the approval of the university authorities. It is only recently, thanks to the will and dynamism of the Head of Academic Affairs of the Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences of Yaounde 1 University, that the Science Shop of Cameroon really took off. We will discuss in more detail this difficult course, as part of the panel entitled “Establishing a science shop in Africa: Common Challenges and Visions for the Future” moderated by Florence Piron.

Keywords
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**Humanizing the Evidence**

Levesque, Peter Norman

1Institute for Knowledge Mobilization, Ottawa, Canada

We are not machines. We do not process like a computer. We are human. We live in a time of abundance. In one year, we create more data than most of our human history. We have educated more of the global population than at any other moment in time. We create marvels from discovery and research. Yet, most of the data and associated information products we produce go to waste. We create great dumping grounds of databases, repositories, and resources that never inform our decisions. In turn, we continue to make decisions that ignore the best scientific and practice evidence. The result is reliably poor results and avoidable mistakes. The tension between the abundance of data & information and the very real human constraints of time, focus, and processing capacity means that we need to “humanize” the processes used to create knowledge. Knowledge Management is the human side of the Information Management and Information Technology systems that we have built and use almost every day.
This short presentation is an open invitation to work with the Canadian Centre for Excellence in Knowledge Management in building systems that help move research from laptop to tabletop.

Keywords
research with impact, social innovation, open access and open data

**Applied research: How does academia become an instrument for the community**

_Liebenberg, Linda_¹; _Dyck, Marilyn_²; _Hutt-MacLeod, Daphne_³

¹_Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada; ²_The Doorway, Calgary, Canada; ³_Eskasoni Mental Health Services, Eskasoni, Canada_

Community-based service organisations are funding dependent. Funding decisions are however often driven by requirements of evidence-based frameworks, that in-turn are powerfully shaped by quantitative, experiment style evaluation and research. While such approaches to knowledge development and evaluation of programme effectiveness have a valuable place in social and health sciences, continued emphasis of these designs to the exclusion of others, stands to powerfully misalign programming by promoting only a small group of “gold standard” programs. Specifically, the concern is that traditional quantitative experimental designs implemented by so-called “scientific experts”, can fail to identify meaningful ways in which many programmes are highly effective and relevant to communities. Despite recognition of the blind spot created through the continuing dominance of a particular approach to generating knowledge, the profound shift in philosophical frameworks necessary to acknowledge and even prioritise alternative approaches to understanding service effectiveness has yet to take place.

Additionally, community-based service providers are often concerned that the implementation of traditional quantitative experimental designs are at odds with their particular service provision models and ethos. Relatedly, organisations question if experimental research and evaluation designs will produce findings that are relevant to community-based organisations; findings that extend beyond an assessment of service impact and provide nuanced information on the extent to which needs are being addressed, and relatedly why needs are or are not being addressed.

Aligning with the conference questions “How could action research and participatory methods contribute to the shaping of responsible research and innovation agendas?” and “How can researchers live up to the societal expectations in community engagement settings? What are the long-term and real benefits?” this presentation will draw on the experiences of two community-based organisations and
their experiences with research and evaluation pertaining to their service delivery. Drawing on their experiences we will establish a framework of responsive research and evaluation characteristics in response to the aforementioned concerns. We will then present an example of the ways in which one community organisation has developed a collaborative research relationship with an academic researcher that has allowed the organisation to draw on the researcher as an instrument for community-based research that facilitates citizen science to both demonstrate and drive social innovation. This collaboration has ensured that the organisation obtains helpful feedback on its service provision in terms of needs, effectiveness, and program design. We will conclude by posing two core questions to the audience: 1) how more researchers can be encouraged to adopt collaborative approaches that may be at odds with their institutional frameworks; and 2) how a greater paradigm shift can be encouraged that sees greater recognition of these approaches to knowledge development.

A problem-solving session will allow for engaged and critical group discussion of these two final questions. In exploring these questions we aim to contribute to greater use of community-based research that is able to promote citizen science of social innovations pertaining to service provision for especially marginalised groups such as youth within our communities.
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“Out of the box – participatory research with people from the region”
Ludwig, Daniel¹; Bokop, Karin P.²; Rieckmann, Marco³

¹University of Vechta, Research development and knowledge transfer, Vechta, Germany; ²University of Vechta, Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg, Sevelten, Germany; ³University of Vechta, Vechta, Germany

This poster-presentation is designed to show how RRI is included into the curricula of University of Vechta by Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg through a pilot course on participatory research with regional CSOs as partners. The course “Out of the box – Participatory research with people from the region” is an interdisciplinary optional course open for all BA and MA students and focusses on participatory student group projects with regional actors. In this course, transdisciplinary research regarding RRI-approaches and participatory research in different action fields take place. The subjects of participation and citizen science are processed in a way relevant to practice, since the students research on a question developed with the regional partners.
Students work in interdisciplinary groups, since each group consists of 4-5 students with different disciplinary backgrounds (e.g. social sciences, social work, business & ethics, geographies of rural spaces and much more), on research topics, problems and conflict areas introduced by the CSOs. They have to collaboratively develop their own research project (research question, research design, data collection and evaluation). Groups work on a different project with individual partners from practice for one semester.

Aim of the course is to show benefits of RRI for both sides – science (represented by the students) and society (represented by the partners). The participatory research project with regional partners helps students to get in touch with civil society and real societal issues. Researching for a real societal problem with a partner interested in results is very motivating for the students, who really appreciate the freedom in designing the research process and group work. Additionally they take part in a service learning activity. On the flipside, the partners from practice also benefit, since their questions are answered and research is responsible in the sense of practicing science for society. The students work on the partner’s research need and try to find answers to real societal challenges and problems.

Examples for student research projects are: food supply in everyday life for seniors, openness of rural and urban residents to new foods, attitudes on working hours of part-time workers in nursing professions, wants and needs for e-government, buying behavior on regional products, “assisted living”-institutions and their orientation on the DIN standard 77880, what do adolescents associate with the term home (“Heimat”), exercise offers for seniors in rural areas, “homeland” feelings of refugees, media reproduction of regional environmental problems and more. Some groups did qualitative research e.g. via questionnaires, others followed a qualitative approach (focus groups) or even a media analysis.

The course shows how science can tackle societal challenges even at an undergraduate level. It was developed as a part of the EnRRICH project and tries to include responsible research in the curricula of the University of Vechta by working with the Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg. The poster presentation aims to stimulate dialogue on service learning and RRI at HEIs.

The poster-presentation aims to stimulate dialogue with CSOs as well as academics on how to implement regional societal research needs into science combined with service learning. Benefits for both sides will be pointed out and illustrated by the examples already run in the scope of the pilot.

Keywords
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Space to Place- Supporting and Co-Designing Innovation, Infrastructure and Incentives for CBR and CCE in the EU and Canada

Lydon, Maeve¹; Andree, Peter¹; Levesque, Peter²; Graham, Catherine³; Rankin, Jennifer³; Quillinan, Bernie⁴; Soorgard Jorgensen, Michael⁵; Duncan, Sophie⁶

¹Carleton University, Canadian Community Campus Engagement Roundtable- CFICE, Victoria, Canada; ²Institute for KM, Ottawa, Canada; ³National Association of Friendship Centres, Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network, Ottawa, Canada; ⁴Campus Engage Ireland / University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland; ⁵Aalborg University, Planning, Copenhagen, Denmark; ⁶National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, Bristol, United Kingdom

What processes, infrastructure or systems do we have or need to build for nationally based and regionally-globally connected responsible and transformative research and social innovation? Specifically, how best do we incentivize collaboration and address the capacity and funders-funding gap between communities and academia? What are emergent and transformative frameworks for scaling up and connecting our efforts from KM and public engagement practitioners, indigenous knowledge leaders, and community-engaged researchers embedded in national movements?

For all of us supporting networks such as the LKN, what do we, as individuals and participants and leaders, want to stop doing, keep doing and start doing in this CCE space?

This inter-national group of researchers, practitioners, students and national-level network leaders from Ireland, Canada, Denmark, England and the Ojibway First Nations in Canada will share their experience and perspectives on what systems and infrastructure we need to focus on and will identify competing, aligned and unique incentives and opportunities in the local and national locations they are part of.

The team will each share for 5 minutes and address the key questions: Bernie Quillinan from Campus Engage Ireland and the University of Limerick, Sophie Duncan from the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement in the UK, Peter Andree from Carleton University and PI of Community First : Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE) CBR Project and Canadian Community Campus Engagement Roundtable (CCCER), Peter Norman Levesque from the Institute for KM in Canada, Michael Sogaard Jorgensen from Aalborg University Denmark and the Transition Social Innovation (EU) project, Jennifer Rankin from the Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network (Canada) and the National Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centres (NAFC-) and Catherine Graham, Research Director with the NAFC. The session is convened by Maeve Lydon, community co-lead with CFICE and coordinator with the (CCCER).

Jennifer Rankin and Catherine Graham bring the context and work of the UAKN and NAFC, building the first indigenous community-based urban research network in Canada.
Bernie Quillinan will speak on the growing need to focus on the systems and culture change deficit in HE which struggles to meet the demands from RRI and engaged researchers.

Sophie Duncan will share lessons learned building diverse public engagement with HE and current infrastructure and opportunities including the growing role and relevance of international collaboration.

Peter Andree will draw from his perspective in his role as a researcher and facilitator of Canada’s CCE movement with community- CSO, indigenous, academic, funder, HE and CCE policy innovators/ networks.

Peter Norman Levesque, who helped bring together Canadian academic funders to the EU to learn about the science shop movement, helped renew Canada’s own community-university alliances movement. He will focus on framing our work, how do we ‘exploit’ research (and not each other) and what we need to do as fellow citizens committed to co-creating societal well being in the CCE space.

Michael Sogaard Jorgensen, combining his research and SI design work, will share a “critical turning point” approach, assess the strategic and navigational capacity of CBR and ways to unleash the potential of universities as places and spaces for SI.

After a Q and A, participants will be given a team handout.
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Growing Common Ground and Meeting the UN Sustainable Development Goals: A Green and Community Mapping Workshop

Lydon, Maeve¹; Brawer, Wendy²

¹Carleton University/ University of Victoria Community Mapping Collaboratory, Canadian Community Campus Engagement Roundtable- CFICE (Carleton), Victoria, Canada; ²Green Map System, New York, United States

Community-based mapping is a powerful participatory design, research and social innovation method used increasingly in and between community and campus spaces and places to create wholistic pictures and enable interdisciplinary solutions to complex issues and global sustainability challenges. This hand-on tool sharing and skills building workshop will provide participants with an overview of the theory and practice of community-based mapping and placemaking and methods and tools available to start your own community, classroom, planning or community-based research project. The workshop co-facilitators are Maeve Lydon from the UVic Community Mapping Collaboratory/Common Ground
Network based in Victoria, Canada and Wendy Brawer, Designer, Director and Founder of Green Map, based in New York City. Wendy recently completed a residency with Ted Talks. (see link on greenmap.org)

The LKN workshop includes a brief overview of the on-line open source new edition of Mapping our Common Ground book, co-produced with colleague and cartographer-designer Ken Josephson. Maeve will share a few stories of how she uses personal and community asset and 'gift' mapping in her community development and public engagement work with diverse groups (e.g. Citizen science projects, youth and students, indigenous communities, people with diverse/dis-abilities) and Wendy will focus on recent work with aligning Green Map with the United Nations' SDGs. Green Map System, a locally-led global NGO and sustainability mapping movement now impacting 65 countries, is built on a universal iconography. Over 1000 print and online maps have been made throughout the world using this shared language, many in the EU.

All over the world, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) are starting to take root as a unifying linkage that helps everyone progress toward the UN’s 2030 goals, clarifying the complexities of these carefully-established sustainable development goals.


Keywords
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Indigenous and Community ‘First’ Campus Engagement (CCE) in Canada: Navigating Landscapes of Reconciliation and Sustainability through a CCE Community of Practice

Lydon, Maeve¹; Andree, Peter²; Rankin, Jennifer³; Graham, Catherine³; DeVito Wilson, Amanda⁴

¹Carleton University, Canadian Community Campus Engagement Roundtable- CFICE, Victoria, Canada; ²Carleton University, Professor, Political Science, PI of CFICE Project, Ottawa, Canada; ³National Association of Friendship Centres, Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network, Ottawa, Canada; ⁴Food Secure Canada and CFICE-Carleton University, COORDINATOR: COMMUNITY-ACADEMIC COLLABORATIVE, NEW FARMERS INITIATIVE AND NORTHERN FOOD NETWORK, Ottawa, Canada

This workshop features the experience of NGO/ CSO, student, indigenous and academic CCE practitioners who are co-creating the Canadian Community Campus Engagement Roundtable (CCCER) and engages participants in reflection on power, privilege and transformation in the contested community-campus engagement (CCE) space.

The workshop will begin with a reflective group exercise for 10 minutes followed by the presenter stories for 25 minutes and ends with participants identifying action they can take in their own lives and contexts. Reflective topics include identifying our own individual and collective values, behaviour and cultures(s). Presenter stories and action topics focus on increasing social, research and financial infrastructure for CCE which privileges community, indigenous and marginalized / excluded voices, de-centers academia within a broader context of societal well being and democratization, incentivizes community centered and engaged research, and increases community-based/governed and CSO-driven graduate research and student experiential learning.

CCE in Canada Presenters: Jennifer Rankin, indigenous Ojibway with family roots from the Batchewana First Nation and a research officer with the Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network (UAKN); Catherine Graham, Research Director with the National Assn. of Friendship Centres and Ph.D student at Carleton University; Peter Andree, Professor of Political Science at Carleton U and PI on the Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE), and Amanda DeVito Wilson, post-doc with Carleton and CFICE – supported staff-student with Food Secure Canada. Convenor, Maeve Lydon, a community co-lead with CFICE and coordinator of the Canadian Community-Campus Engagement Roundtable. Both CFICE (2012-2019) and the UAKN (2012-2018) received core SSHRC Partnership Grant funding from the Canadian government.

Background: CFICE www.cfice.org studies how community and campus players work together to positively impact their communities. The goal of CFICE’s research is to strengthen Canadian communities by answering the question: How can community campus partnerships be designed and
implemented to maximize the value created for non-profit, community-based organizations? For CFICE, being community first means engaging in equitable partnerships to co-create knowledge and action plans for addressing pressing community issues. The UAKN www.uakn.org is a community driven research network (hosted by the National Association of Friendship Centres and Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada) focused on urban aboriginal concerns. UAKN’s goal is to contribute to a better quality of life for Aboriginal people living in cities and towns by filling the current knowledge gap in research, programming and policy. UAKN has established a national interdisciplinary network for research, scholarship and KM.

Context: Canada, has 36 million people and is the world’s second largest country. The EU, 1.2 times larger, has 745 million and 50 countries. There are 1.4 million Indigenous peoples in Canada (First Nations, Inuit and Metis.) with the pop. growing at 4 times the national avg. and 60% living in urban areas. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's 2015 Report and Call to Action recognizes the cultural genocide and destructive land-use practices by European settlers. Today indigenous peoples and Canadian allies are working together for a better future including in the CCE space.
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How to select the research questions of your Science Shop through participatory research agenda setting?

Malagrida, Rosina\(^1\); Zweekhorst, Marjolein\(^2\); Balazs, Balint\(^3\); Floor, Vogels\(^2\); Janka, Horvath\(^3\); Carreras, Josep\(^1\)

\(^1\)IrsiCaixa, Living Lab for Health, Badalona, Spain; \(^2\)VU University of Amsterdam, Athena, Amsterdam, Netherlands; \(^3\)ESSRG, Budapest, Hungary

During the last decade, different initiatives in Europe have been exploring methodologies to open the process of deciding the priority research questions to the participation of different stakeholders. This is a quality criteria within Responsible Research and Innovation, as facilitates the process to become open and inclusive upstream to better respond to the needs and expectations of the stakeholders that are somehow affected by the research.

Pilots have been launched at European level, i.e. VOICES or CIMULACT, and there are also other initiatives happening at national level, such as the James Lind Alliance in the UK.
As stated in the RRI Tools website, “implementing participatory research agenda setting has multiple advantages: apart from helping to identify stakeholders’ unmet needs and what matters to end users, it also helps researchers include new perspectives in research, prepare stakeholders for the research process, structure the process for broader collaboration between stakeholder groups, and enable and empower stakeholders to develop their own voice”.

Can Science Shops incorporate these methodologies in their processes?

The EC funded project InSPIRES, which aims to explore new models of Science Shops inspired by Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI), Open Science and Impact Evaluation, and the EnRRICH project, are currently piloting different projects in this direction.

During this workshop, the Science Shops located at the VU University of Amsterdam, the Living Lab for Health of IrsiCaixa, in Barcelona, and the Environmental social science research group (ESSRG), in Budapest, will share their experiences in this field.

Pilot project Co-ResponHIVility, Rosina Malagrida & Josep Carreras from Living Lab for Health at IrsiCaixa

Pilot project STIs and HIV/AIDS Needs Assessment, Marjolein Zweekhorst & Floor Vogels from VU University of Amsterdam

Pilot project Green care services in Hungary, Balint Balazs & Janka Horvath from ESSRG

Draft programme:
- Welcome and presentation of the session
- Presentation of the 3 pilot experiences
- Table discussions on obstacles and opportunities to implement those methods in your Science Shop
- Closing remarks

Keywords
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Pilot project on: setting up a participatory research agenda with the Co-ResponHIVility project

Malagrida, Rosina; Carreras, Josep

1IrsiCaixa, Living Lab for Health, Badalona, Spain

Co-ResponsHIVility is a pilot programme of governance of R&I, which is focused on participatory R&I agenda setting on the prevention of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs). It is being developed through the creation of a platform or ecosystem where different interested stakeholders come together through an open, reflexive and inclusive process to explore R&I priorities. The project has an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach and comprises a wide range of academic disciplines and non-academic knowledge based on experience. The ecosystem gathers more than 670 social actors interested in the issue who represent different stakeholders: the research community, healthcare providers, civil society organizations, patients, policy makers and the education community (including master students and secondary school students and lecturers). To respond to the priorities identified with an RRI approach, the Lab offers RRI training to the master students and supervisors that are willing to work in the priorities together with other actors. The RRI training workshops have also been implemented through the projects RRI Tools and EnRRICH in different universities and RPO.
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Dilemmas concerning researchers’ responsibilities in working with segregated communities – the case of an urban desegregation process

Méreiné Berki, Boglárka; Málovics, György; Juhász, Judit; Bajmócy, Zoltán; Gébert, Judit

1University of Szeged, Domaszék, Hungary

The focus of present workshop has grown out of the experiences of a participatory action research (PAR) process. Within this process, local researcher-activists cooperate with mostly extremely poor local Roma (Gypsy) residents living in one of the two Roma segregates (gipsy ghettos) of the city (see Méreiné et al. 2017).

In 2017, the city council started to desegregate the larger local Roma segregate. Desegregation clearly appears here as applying mixing policy (Bolt et al. 2010; Kearns et al. 2013, Mugnano - Palvarini 2013) for the segregated area and its residents. Although desegregation is still in process, the preliminary results of our analysis show that it is a rather contradictory process, for at least two reasons:
The community is divided whether desegregation is desirable or not. Most legal residents, who are compensated, are happy to be able to leave the segregate. Others, mostly illegal inhabitants ("squatters"), do not get any compensation and thus have nowhere to go. For them the segregate means a final refuge.

While certain people, who already have left the segregate, seem to be able to fit in to their new environments successfully, others do not seem to be able to do so for various reasons (including enhanced living costs, missing social relations and related material and emotional support, stigmatization by the majority society etc.)

From a “conventional” social scientific point of view, having such a desegregation process at hand might seem as an “enormous luck for a young researcher” (as noted by one of the seniors of the doctoral school where the lead author carries out her doctoral research). However, from the perspective of PAR and our personal moral judgements, carrying out research in such a context is an extremely contradictory issue. Emerging questions include e.g.:

- What is the role and responsibility of the researcher in case she benefits from producing knowledge (publishing) about marginalized and stigmatized social groups?
- What to do in case the researcher aims to work (cooperate) with and for a certain marginalized community providing also benefits for the community (e.g. in the framework of PAR) but the community is affected diversely and divided over a policy issue?

Present workshop is a reflection on these issues – thus its subject is researcher’s roles and responsibilities in carrying out research on (with and for) marginalized and social groups on one hand, and processes of de-segregation and mixing policy on the other. Within our workshop we use group discussion and reflection (as methods) concerning the identified moral and practical dilemmas after a short initial presentation of the “case”.

This way our workshop contributes to the conference by (1) introducing the approach of PAR; and (2) reflecting on the role and responsibilities of researchers when producing knowledge about/working with marginalized communities.

The aim of the contribution is supporting reflection within the scientific community concerning researchers’ responsibilities when working with (making research on) marginalized communities – the selected format (workshop) provides room for group discussion and reflection – as collaborative features of our submission.

As the expected impact of the presented work, we hope that our workshop motivates and supports participants to reflect on their role and responsibilities as researchers when producing knowledge on/working with marginalized communities.
Keywords
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Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in Higher Education (HE) Practice: RRI as Tool for Research, Reflection and Curricula Innovation
Gáspár, Judit¹; Matolay, Réka¹; Toarniczky, Andrea¹
¹Corvinus University of Budapest, Budapest, Hungary

The aim of the session is to provide presentation and interaction space for those educators, who are ready to reflect on their teaching and learning activities from an RRI point of view. Educators of Corvinus Business School (CBS) have developed their cases and stories, where not only the researched teaching practices involve RRI aspects but also the research is designed with RRI keys in mind. The session aims at an interactive sharing of the cases, where contributors (presenters) and participants of the session are discussing and working together in formats similar to that of the RRI faculty development process at CBS in 2016-2018. Thus, insights not only into the lived-through and personal research results of teaching practices with RRI but also to a customized, RRI-driven higher educations development programmes can be gained in the session.

In the RRI faculty development process at CBS, faculty members have been provided with the opportunity of working with their own assumptions, course(s), research and that of their colleagues from selected aspects of RRI, i.e. social inclusion; open science and others. Contributors to the session have reflected and innovated their teaching within the framework of RRI and/or are researching their teaching during the spring semester of 2018 with RRI also embedded in their research process. The session thus has a double RRI-relationship: both in the researched teaching practice and the research itself:

- The teaching practice may integrate RRI reflections in the course design, evaluation system, content/topics, role and expected involvement of students, the tutor-student relationship and collaboration. The teaching practice may integrate the various RRI elements in one or multiple aspects of the course, or be concentrated on one RRI with every aspect of the teaching practice (e.g. how the course reflected on the embeddedness in and responsibility for the society, active citizenship, etc.).

- Considering the RRI framework for the research, one can experiment with it for each step of the process: consider it in the research design, in the decisions regarding the research field and sample, the engagement of research actors, the data gathering, and analysis, the participation
of the relevant stakeholders. Through e.g. open science and inclusion, the involvement of students, community members, and - being a business school - corporate managers can take place in the research.

For the cases to be presented here we have invited colleagues to consider various research methods, let them be quantitative or qualitative; to reflect on the content, processes of the course and/or themselves as educators and researchers. This also raises questions such as how a lecturer can be a researcher of his or her own teaching practices? What new thoughts and learnings are generated when utilizing RRI aspects in research, especially in the research of teaching practices?

There are several contributors from CBS to the session, submissions from:
Katalin ÁSVÁNYI
Levente DUDÁS
Katalin BÍRÓ - Nóra FAZEKAS
Zsófia KENESEI
Gabriella KISS
Miklós KOZMA
Ágnes NEULINGER
Ágnes ROBOZ
Ágnes ZSÓKA
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Science Shops in Central and Eastern Europe: Common Features and Shared Characteristics?
Martoni, András¹; Matolay, Réka¹; Schmidt Fiedler, Anna²; Morawska Jancelewicz, Joanna²; Stanescu, Rodica³
¹Corvinus University of Budapest, Budapest, Hungary; ²A. Mickiewicz University, Science Shop, Poznan, Poland; ³University Politehnica of Bucharest, Science Shop InterMEDIU, Bucharest, Romania

Rationale
Through several exchanges, knowledge transfer exercises and projects within the Living Knowledge Network community, an insight has emerged that historical and socio-political geographies may contribute to a certain degree as influential factors in the formation, development and actual operation of science shops. This session aims to explore such commonalities and specialties in opportunities and
challenges among science shops (and alike initiatives) from Central and Eastern Europe and to provide a discussion forum for an exchange of locally-regionally relevant experiences.

Background
Whenever we – the representatives of a science shop from Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) – talk with colleagues engaged with science shop type activities in our region, there is immediately a shared understanding of several features of how our science shops operate, what type of barriers we face, and potential leverages we may count on.

These features relate to several layers. One of them is current geopolitics demonstrating clear regional differences in how civil society organisations (CSOs) and autonomous bottom-up initiatives are regarded, funded and acknowledged as necessary and significant actors of a democratic society. Another feature is how the third mission of higher education is understood and perceived in e.g. Eastern and Western Europe. Further ones are connected to the organizational culture and structure of higher education institutions, etc. All this has urged us to explore and discuss

- What are the regional characteristics of science shops? In what respects regional differences play a significant role in explaining how science shops gain legitimacy and operate?
- How do commonalities and specificities shape the everyday operation of our science shops?
- What are those local experiences and responses to specific challenges that are important to share?
- To what extent, or in what sense, the immediate socio-political context of higher education, research and science explain regional characteristics of science shop like initiatives?

The Living Knowledge conference in 2018 being taken place in a Central and Eastern European country provides an opportunity to explore the regional and geopolitical specificities of science shop operation. We welcome participants to this session

Science-society partnerships, including science shops and other initiatives from CEE as realising some commonalities, may help to progress their agenda,

Science shops and similar initiatives from all other geographical locations that may challenge, or comment upon, the CEE-specificities while also reflecting on their own situation and positioning.

Format
After a brief introduction by some CEE science shops (panel members), an interactive workshop will take place based on a structured discussion and sharing of experiences and dilemmas. Participants of the discussion panel are introducing the operation and organization of their science shops according to a pre-set template in order to have a quick and structured overview. Other CEE sciences shops visiting the session are invited to join this format and, consequently, develop a CEE database and/or brochure of science shops.
Confirmed Science Shops as Members of the Discussion Panel:
Anna Fiedler, Joanna Morawska-Jancelewicz, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland
Rodica Stanescu, InterMEDIUBucuresti Science Shop, Romania
György Pataki, Environmental Social Science Research Group, Budapest, Hungary

Keywords
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Engaging 1st year Interior Design students in RRI/CBR projects
McCann, Sinead1; Bates, Dr Catherine Bates1; Dalton, Ms Tracey1
1Dublin Institute of Technology, Access and Civic Engagement, Dublin 7, Ireland

This collaborative proposal will share experiences and insights from engaging 1st year Interior Design students in Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI)/Community Based Research (CBR) projects over a number of years with a range of community partners including; Crosscare; Saint Michaels Youth Project, and The Salvation Army. It will focus on two perspectives inclusive of staff members who coordinate and deliver CBR/RRI projects through the Students Learning with Communities programme at the Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland. It will share experiences on:

• how to collaboratively write a design brief suitable for 1st year students with the
• partner while managing expectations
• Pre project planning activities in order to prepare 1st year students to work on the
• collaborative project; cultural induction to the organization, site visits,
• communication skills, time management skills, & working to a budget.
• Interim design meetings and presentations to incorporate feedback from the
• partner staff & participants.
• Agreeing project milestones upfront.
• Agreeing format of final designs upfront.
• Reflections on doing the RRI/CBR project

This presentation will use the RRI process requirements to reflect upon the RRI/CBR project to focus on the challenges faced and steps they took to overcome them, what worked well and what didn’t, what could be done differently in the future to enhance the project, and what has been the impact. Our
learning from the RRI/CBR projects will be related to the wider context of enriching research experiences for students and communities.

The presentation will be very visual and will showcase example of the student's interior design collaborative projects.

We think the Pecha Kucha style presentation will focus our thinking to share only the important aspects - for others who may be considering under taking their own project. We are open to comments and questions in the interactive Q & A session afterwards.

Keywords
community-based research, RRI, youth

Moving forward from EnRRICH: Building Policy to Help European Higher Education Institutions Develop Engaged Curricula

McKenna, Emma A\(^1\); Vargiu, Andrea\(^2\); Bates, Catherine\(^3\)

\(^1\)Queen's University Belfast, Science Shop, Belfast, United Kingdom; \(^2\)Università degli Studi di Sassari, Sassari, Italy; \(^3\)Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland

Emma McKenna, Queen's University Belfast
Andrea Vargiu, University of Sassari
Catherine Bates, Dublin Institute of Technology

This proposal addresses the question of how new arrangements exist or can be created/practiced at a policy level to address the unnoticed and unacknowledged nature of much engagement practice. It will be of interest to people working in the field of policy development, either at the level of higher education institutions or at regional, national and international levels. The area of engaged research/ Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) through academic curricula is relatively unexplored at a policy level. Whilst there are many strong grassroots examples of projects and practices, it is barely recognised at a policy level and individuals who do this work are often unsupported and not appropriately rewarded for it. This results in a failure to embed projects and practices, which often disappear when those who support them move on.

This workshop will consider how to move forward from the policy work in the Enhancing Responsible Research through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) project. One of the major outcomes of EnRRICH has been kick starting a global discussion on the importance of developing policy to support engagement and RRI in academic curricula. Experiences in both EnRRICH and in previous European
Commission funded projects is that people who want to make curriculum level changes also need to make sure that they explain how these changes can contribute to the goals of their policymakers. For example in EnRRICH, policymakers were interested in improving interdisciplinarity and connecting students with the ‘real world’ and employment opportunities, so it was helpful if people implementing curriculum pilots could explain how their pilots contributed to these outcomes.

Policy is not necessarily an automatically engaging subject. We have made the decision to make the policy focus in this workshop really clear so that the people attracted to the session will be those who have an interest in exploring and developing policy in this area. The purpose of the session is to put ideas in front of people and ask for their feedback and expertise. We will also adapt the session in light of asking what people want from it.

We will invite other RRI projects and policymakers interested in both RRI and higher education curricula to attend and bring their own perspectives. Participants will be encouraged to come up with one policy action they can implement.

Session plan
The session will begin with asking what people know about RRI. We will briefly outline what RRI is (if necessary), what EnRRICH is and highlight some findings and resources from the EnRRICH project.(10mins)
Introductions (10mins)
Situate ourselves – How close do you feel to policy making in your own work environment/working reference group. Purpose is to get a sense of who is in the room and et people to stand up and move about.(10 minutes)
Group people mixing them up according to the above scale to ensure a mix of experience (5mins)
Current policy context – key drivers and their impact on teaching on learning? How can we best harness this to embed our work (20mins)
Policy – how does policy reward or constrain us in our work? What are the enabling and constraining factors? (Exercise 20mins)
Back together – action, what can we change? Post-it commitments (20 minutes)
Convenors conclusions/feedback (5mins)

Keywords
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Types of learning/knowledge acquired by partner organisations engaged in coproduced research with social science students

Metcalf, Lindsey¹; Hardwick, Louise²

¹Liverpool John Moores University, Humanities and Social Science, LIVERPOOL, United Kingdom;
²University of Liverpool, School of Law and Social Justice, Liverpool, United Kingdom

Co-presenters: Lindsey Metcalf, LJMU and Louise Hardwick, University of Liverpool

The aim of this presentation is to report on initial findings from a study exploring the kinds of learning/knowledge Voluntary Community Organisations (VCOs) gain through engaging in research with social science students. These community – university collaborations are brokered through Interchange, a charity partnered with the University of Liverpool and based in the Department of Sociology, Social Policy & Criminology. Interchange creates opportunities for student researchers to produce new knowledge by transforming tacit understanding held by the organisation into evidenced and useful knowledge for the organisation.

Many of the VCOs that approach Interchange have been badly affected by recent funding cuts and are struggling to remain sustainable (Hastings et al., 2016). In the context of austerity, the study sought to understand the kind of learning/knowledge generated and its potential to support VCOs, as well as constraints faced from the policy and organisational context, and curricula design.

The research questions for the 2 focus groups each (n=16) and interviews [n=6] were:

- Instrumental purposes (generating new knowledge)?
- Capacity building purposes (increased skills, confidence and experience of research)?
- Knowledge that has the potential to reveal commonalities of experience across the sector?

To provide a balanced sample, VCOs representatives who had taken an Interchange student for the first time during the year (2016/17), or who had previously had one project, or who had had more than one project over the past five years, were invited to participate. The sample for the interviews were taken from focus group participants who had had a student in 2016/17, whether this was their first or not because of it being a recent experience.

What emerges from this study is that nearly all the VCOs had sought instrumental knowledge for evidencing the value and effectiveness of specific interventions or social programs. The study also revealed a number of perceived barriers to undertaking cross-organisational work that addresses social problems experienced across the voluntary sector. We understand this instrumentalism by using McGovern’s (2017:5) application of a Bourdieuan (1994) concept of neoliberal orthodoxy.

Our paper raises questions about values and approaches to coproduction in light of these neoliberal pressures. This connects with the conference themes by asking how can fulfill our promises of
community engagement and we hope to open this up for discussion and engagement during the session.

Keywords
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Impact Evaluation (IE) of Science Shops Structures and Projects: what has been done until now and what could be necessary for the future?
Millot, Glen¹; Rojas, David²; Straver, Gerard³
¹Sciences Citoyennes, Paris, France; ²IS Global, Barcelona, Spain; ³Wageningen Science Shop, Wageningen, Netherlands

Three parallel sessions organized in three languages (English, French and Spanish) will be proposed. Evaluation of science shops, raises beforehand the question of impacts to be analysed. Whether it is a matter of increasing the competence of the stakeholders, increasing their legitimacy to intervene in the various forums for consultation, to reaffirm the relevance of projects that are not exclusively connected to the production of technological innovations and to value lecturers and researchers who engage in this path or more generally the evolution of the relationship between science and society, the choice of the impacts to be taken into account pre-determines the way we consider the role of Science Shops in the scientific landscape.

Following a world-cafés format, these sessions will allow identified the issues of the impact study, and the desirable evolutions of the evaluation systems.

Impacts aspects will be proposed for discussion are (amongst others):
- societal impacts, impacts for civil society organizations and political impacts
- impacts for students and higher education workers
- impacts for researchers and research practices
- impacts on research governance

Draft Agenda (180 min in total)
1) Welcome: Purpose of the session. (5 min)
2) Allocation of participants in the 3 different rooms (5 min)
3) World Cafés with XX tables: (120 min)
   3.1) What type of methodologies have you used to evaluate your Science Shops projects?
   3.2) What type of methodologies have you used to evaluate your Science Shops structure?
3.3) What do you think were the barriers and opportunities to implement IE methodologies, and how we could overcome them?

4) Preparation of summary of each session (15 min)

5) Restitution of the discussion in each of the session (5 min each + 20 min for final debate)

Conveners:
David Rojas (IS Global) for the Spanish session
Glen Millot (Sciences Citoyennes) for the French one
Gerard Straver (Wageningen Science Shop) for the English one

Keywords
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Co-creating evaluation practice: A partnership between the university and community sectors

Moore, Gemma E; Pitts, Georgia; Crisp, Anne; Rouse, Caroline

1UCL, UCL Culture, London, United Kingdom; 2Aston-Mansfield, Community Involvement Unit, London, United Kingdom

The conference theme invites us to reflect on how different perspectives influence how knowledge is generated, interpreted and used. In this session, we tell the story of a university-voluntary/community sector partnership focussed on evaluation practice. Voluntary and community organisations in the UK want, and are under pressure to, improve their skills, tools and capacity to evaluate, whilst universities have corresponding research, skills and expertise. We look at a university response to this community need, drawing on the experience of the Evaluation Exchange. The Evaluation Exchange is a partnership between London-based umbrella organisation Aston-Mansfield and the UCL Public Engagement Unit. Working together, we are supporting 6 teams made up of 23 cross-disciplinary UCL researchers and staff from 6 voluntary sector organisations by providing training and guidance to tackle evaluation challenges within the voluntary sector. The overall aim is to “connect the know-how to the how-to” giving organisations a chance to build capacity for effective evaluation, and researchers a valuable opportunity to extend their training outside of a traditional university environment, applying and developing research skills in a real world situation and gaining ‘hands-on’ experience. University researchers have been carefully matched to the organisations, taking into account research interests and skills. These multi- and transdisciplinary teams have deliberately set out to co-construct knowledge on evaluation, in a democratic space where expertise from the community, science and arts/humanities disciplines are
brought together and valued. In our role as programme manager/supporter/brokerage we will reflect on this process. We will provide an honest account of engagement with researchers and community and voluntary organisations, recognising successes and failures, to share our experience and generate ideas for future work. We are framed by our separate organisations and areas of expertise, but despite these differences we recognised commonalities in our experiences and motivations. So far what has emerged are conflicts and contradictions as much as conversations and collaborations; and a new knowledge and practice of evaluation.

In keeping with the ethos of the conference we propose a story-telling session. However, we would like to attempt a unique technique for stimulating discussion within our session. We will send out a call to all those involved in the Evaluation Exchange (university researchers, staff from voluntary and community organisations, beneficiaries) asking for those working in these trans-disciplinary groups to send us the questions, queries and insights about working within such groups that they found interesting, stimulating, challenging, motivating and/or difficult. This should capture experiences from different perspectives involved in the Evaluation Exchange. Our story will be framed around the themes that derive from this exercise. We anticipate that our story will create a lively discussion with maximum opportunities for interaction and feedback between those involved in the session. We hope to encourage consideration on how such engagement projects help researchers and voluntary and community organisations understand complex phenomena, whilst acknowledging that some of the more complicated occurrences in public engagement are not the objects of study but the relationships that such activities emerge and reveal.

Keywords
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Universities and engagement- challenges in CEE countries
Morawska Jancelewicz, Joanna¹

¹Adam Mickiewicz University, Rector's Cabinet, Poznan, Poland

Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) with its post-communistic history and burdens is said to have its own specific character, also in a field of civil society, public engagement, the quality of dialogue that is held among various stakeholder. This heritage also applies to the ways universities function as dialogue partners.
The road of democratic transition has not been an easy one, and although one could have thought that the CEE countries have established a strong democratic structures, at present time young democracies are facing many challenges.

In which extend does the CEE’s characteristics influence the quality of this dialogue between universities and its environment and process of implementing the RRI and ideas of engagement at universities of the CEE region?

Going deeper – what are the key challenges for Science Shops in CEE and how to overcome potential barriers and constrains? Which of them are shared with western countries, which are unique for the region? What areas seem to have natural potential to be included in Science Shop and which demand more support and effort?

What is the best model to attain the efficient cooperation between the university and CSO ? Which elements of these cooperation can enhance the quality of civil society? What is the role of the science and scientists in this process?

Which trends and developments can be expected in the coming years?

Let’s meet and talk about it within the panel ……, you are very welcome.

Keywords
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Cultural heritage and rural development - what social enterprise can achieve

Nemes, Gusztav

1Budapest Cotvinus University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Budapest, Hungary

This presentation explores interactions between cultural heritage, social cohesion and place attachment in a rural development context focusing on:

- how the practical and sustainable usage of cultural heritage can mutually enhance the betterment of rural communities and the maintenance of built and immaterial heritage;
- what are the main factors, problems and solutions in such processes both concerning the local socio-economic context and the wider institutional environment.

We present an action research project aimed at developing a social enterprise, based on cultural heritage protection, sustainable tourism and local co-operation. Economic opportunities for the Nivegyvölgy (800 people in 5 villages, Balaton-uplands, Hungary) are in sustainable tourism, quality
products, services, wine, unique landscape and nature. Weak culture in co-operation, strategic marketing and social learning, however, are locking these resources. The opportunity for change arose through a pilot project, supported by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism, aimed at capacity building and knowledge creation. An old priest house was refurbished and turned into a community centre, in parallel with an intensive community and business model development process. According to the plans an initial investment into physical space, community and capacity building was to provide for the development of a non-profit community based enterprise that, through elevating the local tourism industry can ensure long term sustainability of the project.

This presentation will explore:

- some of the sources of systemic conflicts throughout the project (tensions between protection and management, institutional uncertainty and the objectives of the local and the central stakeholders, etc.);
- and how the social enterprise is functioning and what are the challenges for the sustainable management of the project.

During the project mainly qualitative methodology was used, ranging from interviews and participant observation, through workshops, community analysis, participatory video and a continuous reflection on the processes both within the local community, the institutional environment and the interaction between them. The whole project was organised in an action research setting, where a real life experiment, involving an actual building and a living community provided the context for the exploration through different disciplines (heritage experts, sociologist, environmental phycologist, gender, communication and community development experts). The results of the project apart from traditional publications have been communicated through films, methodological guidelines and through social media and social networks.

Films about the project: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCny5Q7eps20NOGzb8xJmxMg ; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qioQ8fPCyXo
https://oroksegkalauz.seed.hu/
Homepage: http://nivegyhaz.hu/
And social network/media pages of the project: https://www.facebook.com/csicsoiplebania/?ref=bookmarks; http://balatoncsico.reblog.hu/

Keywords
co-creation, participatory action research, community-based research
Generating ‘real life action’ and engaging in it as an action researcher; seeing collaborative learning processes and tangible results of our work is an exciting and satisfying way of doing research for the more active kind of academics. However, compared to more conventional research practices, action research brings up a range of new ethical, methodological and practical problems. It is easy to make bad mistakes and it is often difficult to establish fruitful and long-lasting relationships with stakeholders, and to maintain a meaningful and committed participation generated by processes of co-creation on each parties’ side. The workshop intends to be a critical, reflective and „thick” conversation about the practice of collaboration between different stakeholders (researchers in the academia and co-researchers such as members of local communities, NGO’s or entrepreneurs etc.) of the process of action research, in the form of a participatory learning process. Researchers already using action research methodology and other stakeholders simply interested in it are both welcome.

We plan to have two consecutive workshops having a strong focus 1st on the methodological and 2nd on the ethical issues of collaboration and participation in action research. The duration of each session is 45 minutes and the participants are invited to attend either both of the workshops or only one of them. Depending on the number of people attending the sessions, we will work in one group or break up into subgroups for some of the time.

The outline of the workshop concerning methodological problems

- Introduction of the workshop scheme and of the participants (Its time frame depending on the numbers of participants –circa 5-10 minutes)

- During the first 20 minutes participants are asked to write a short message containing 3-3 do’s and dont’s in small groups (2-3 people) concerning their most memorable lessons (each of the members of the group) of a bad mistake or a methodological problem that proved to be difficult or highly impossible to solve concerning collaboration between various stakeholders in the course of action research. (Do not worry, we have all done mistakes, I will be the first one telling you some of ours.)

- During the second 15-20 minutes there is a brainstorm session about the most typical methodological problems and the ways of solving or ameliorating them, about the means of
engaged participation as well as the ups and downs of collaboration in processes of co-creation in the course of participatory action research.

We hope to have a friendly, honest and fruitful conversation that could become the start of many other ones to come in the future. We hope to establish contacts, ideas for future co-operation in this field.

Keywords
participatory action research, co-creation, engaged scholarship

Curriculum development with the help of RRI: The case of the Theory of Consumption and Consumer Behaviour course
Neulinger, Agnes1
1Corvinus University of Budapest, Marketing and Media Institute, Budapest, Hungary

Session:
Gáspár-Matolay-Toarniczky: Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in Higher Education (HE)
Practice: RRI as Tool for Research, Reflection and Curricula Innovation

The aim of this proposal is to introduce a curriculum development project inspired by the RRI agenda. The Theory of Consumption and Consumer Behaviour course (master level) was an easy choice for this project as skills improvement on critical thinking and reflexivity relates to the course learning objectives. Some of the RRI dimensions have already been included in the course such as sustainability and gender issues, however diversion & inclusion agendas offered room for further improvement.

In order to enhance public engagement and further include ethics and diversity the following new practices have been introduced to the course:

- the main topic of the group project focuses on perceived well-being and involves civil society organisations
- more emphasis have been put on ethics in consumption (interactive class debate)
- assessment methods have been adjusted to consider the various needs of students (e.g. the acknowledgment of different learning styles and personality to offer different platforms for class activities, consideration of unique life situations like pregnancy)

The final stage of the development project is the measurement of the perception of the new practices amongst students. The research study aims to understand the attitudes towards these practices in order to further improve them.
The sample of the data collection includes those students who study the course in Spring Semester 2018 (N= app. 120). The participation will be rewarded with extra points in the course evaluation (anonymity will be guaranteed). Data will be collected with the help of an online survey in early May, 2018. In order to ensure transparency, results will be shared with the respondents. The research will foster students’ engagement in the evaluation process and invite them to co-create the research (discussion of deadlines, evaluation criteria etc.) Results of the quantitative study will be presented along with the details of the whole development process at the conference.
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Philosophy meets Real World Problems
Nieuwenhuijsen, Nick1; Pauly, Marc1

1University of Groningen, Science Shop Philosophy (Kenniscentrum Filosofie), Groningen, Netherlands

Although philosophers are mainly known for problematizing and complicating a wide range of issues, they are also very much able to reveal perspectives otherwise hidden. Apart from doing so in an academic sense, the Knowledge Centre Philosophy aims to connect philosophers of the Faculty of Philosophy on the University of Groningen to partners interested in philosophical issues and simultaneously show society in an appealing way which findings are done within the Faculty.

In this Poster Presentation we will get in on the core tasks and projects of the Knowledge Centre Philosophy (in Dutch: Kenniscentrum Filosofie). Which questions arrive on our doorstep? What (kind of) organizations are looking for other perspectives? And to what kind of projects do we contribute in order to further connect society and (professional) philosophy?

Four projects will be explained in more detail during this presentation:

1) Democratic Deliberation - setting up a theoretical framework for various experiments meant to improve involvement and citizenship in a vivid, deliberative democracy;

2) ‘Tussenweg’ - the creating of a method enabling high schoolers to debate and discuss difficult and sensitive issues;

3) Reading guides - coordinating the writing by students, PhD’ers and co-workers of reading guides of philosophical books for reading clubs consisting of seniors;
4) Events - a short notion on which events the Knowledge Centre Philosophy helps organizing, like the 'Night of Philosophy' in Groningen.
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Development of partnerships between community-based organisations and UCD in the Community
O'Leary, Theresa¹; Dignam, Holly¹
¹University College Dublin, UCD in the Community, Dublin, Ireland

8th Living Knowledge Conference: Enriching Science and Community Engagement
Joint Presentation Submission
Title: Development of partnerships between community-based organisations and UCD in the Community
Presenters: Holly Dignam, UCD in the Community. holly.dignam@ucd.ie
Theresa O'Leary, UCD in the Community. theresa.oleary@ucd.ie
Keywords: Service learning, civil society, community
Proposal:
In September 2016, University College Dublin (UCD) launched a campus wide initiative, UCD in the Community, which seeks to promote greater civic engagement through its core activities. This initiative supports and complements UCD’s involvement in the Irish Universities Association Campus Engage programme.
UCD in the Community strives to strengthen its relationships with the community and work together in a collaborative and mutually beneficial way, contributing to positive and sustainable social outcomes. It is about working together, bringing our skills and expertise to support community-based organisations, and in exchange empowering our students and staff as socially aware citizens.
Community engagement is one of the core values of UCD and the university’s strategic plan commits to build engagement at local, national and international levels.
UCD in the Community wishes to support and promote community engagement in all forms, shapes and sizes, examples of this include:
- Student volunteering
- Staff placements with community based organisations (CBOs)
- Capacity building
- Outreach programmes targeting marginalised groups and communities - Widening participation and access to higher education
- Promoting and stimulating social innovations with community partners - Community based research projects
- Events and activities that promote awareness of civic engagement.

This presentation will seek to demonstrate how UCD in the Community develops partnerships with community-based (or civil society) organisations (CBOs). UCD in the Community has established 61 partnerships with CBOs since its establishment.

UCD in the Community operates as a collaborative team, with requests from CBOs debated, discussed, reviewed and implemented by various staff and students, across multiple disciplines. Our aim is to work collaboratively with individuals and groups from across the 11 colleges in UCD, to engage as many of our staff and students as possible with the wider community, whether that be at a local, national or international level.

Working with Campus Engage, our goal is to ensure community engagement becomes an integral part of university life. By demonstrating the success of multidisciplinary projects with CBOs, we hope to influence more HEIs to follow suite, whether that be at a national or international level.

This joint presentation would outline the process of developing partnerships with these organisations, the successes and the challenges associated with this, and provide insight to staff of other Higher Education Institutes or community groups on how one might establish and ensure the progression and sustainability of these partnerships with community-based organisations.
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Teaching physics through magic
Bagnoli, Franco¹; pacini, giovanna¹
¹University of Florence, Florence, Italy

Physics is a difficult subject! This is the most common declaration by students and common people about this topic. Indeed, it is true! The main problem about physics does not rely in what should be learnt, but in what has to be forgotten. Our body, and therefore our brain, has been selected to successfully deal with everyday experiences, and in order to comply with them we are born with a hard-
wired general knowledge of "real-life physics", which is essentially Aristotelian. This innate knowledge is common also to other animals. Unfortunately, the world works following other rules, and therefore the main goal of a teacher is that of inducing pupils to follow a different reasoning path with respect to the innate one. One technique that can be used is that of "surprising" the audience by means of nearly-magic experiences, followed by a discussion, with an analysis of the physics principles involved and the illustration of possible extension, fields of application, etc. With respect to standard "science fair" experiments, we mainly focus on the magic in everyday life.

In the last years, we have developed a set of simple experiments that can be repeated at home using a cheap equipment and scrap materials. We have tested this show (that lately brought to the publication of a book) in several contexts, from school of various level to universities, elder people, public exhibitions, with promising results for what concerns the participation and the engagement of attendees. We propose to organise a short version (20/30 min) of our show for the 8th Living Knowledge Conference.
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The Cooperative Council in Groningen: An Experiment in Democracy
Pauly, Marc¹; van de Wetering, Liesbeth²

¹University of Groningen, Faculty of Philosophy, Groningen, Netherlands; ²City of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands

The Cooperative Council in Groningen: An Experiment in Democracy
In this presentation, we want to describe an experiment in democracy that currently takes place in the city of Groningen, the Netherlands. First we want to describe what this experiment entails. Second, we want to point out how some key features of this experiment are related to philosophical thinking about what democracy is or could mean. Hence, our presentation will be a combination of research presentation and practice sharing, as the experiment will be underway at the time of the conference.

In Oosterparkwijk, a gentrified former working-class neighbourhood with 11.700 inhabitants, the city of Groningen has set up a cooperative council. The cooperative council consists of 11 randomly selected residents of the neighbourhood together with 6 members of the city council. Associated with this core council of 17 is a panel of 400 randomly selected residents who serve as an advisory board for the core council. The cooperative council decides on (parts of) the neighbourhood agenda and its budgets.
Beforehand, topics will be chosen by the cooperative council itself. Decisions about these topics won’t be made at city hall, but in the neighbourhood. The hope is that this will create more dialogue between residents in this neighbourhood, and between residents and the city council. City councillors will work together with residents on an equal footing. With consultations, meetings, brainstorm-sessions, panels and polls – offline and online – the cooperative council will involve as many residents as possible. Particular attention will be payed to the turnout of vulnerable and infrequently heard residents.

The experiment officially starts at the beginning of 2018, and the city has convened a group of researchers from the University of Groningen to accompany the unfolding of this experiment. These researchers cover different disciplines, but in our presentation, we will focus on the philosophical questions that are related to this experiment, philosophical questions that are related to the nature of democracy. These philosophical questions can be summarized under the keywords of sortition, deliberation and representation.

The first key feature of the cooperative council is that it works with sortition: Members of the council are randomly selected. The use of sortition in democracy has a long history dating back to the first democracy in Athens. What are the (dis)advantages of sortition over election? Second, one of the aims of the cooperative council is to create a dialogue among citizens and between citizens and elected politicians. Within philosophy, the theory of deliberative democracy has thought about the desiderata for such a political dialogue and the difficulties that are involved in creating such a dialogue. How can we create political deliberation that gives people equal voice, that is conscious of power inequalities, and that creates mutual understanding? Third, the cooperative council embodies a view of political representation that differs from the standard view in representative democracies. Representation here means obtaining a decision making body that is statistically approximately representative of the neighbourhood as a whole. What are the (dis)advantages of this notion of representation with respect to other forms of representation? In our presentation, we want to describe some of the philosophical thinking relevant to answering these questions.

Keywords
participatory governance, science shop, civil society

Society in responsive Science: The willingness to learn!
Pfeiffer, Lèneke¹; Straver, Gerard¹

¹Wageningen University & Research, Science Shop, Wageningen, Netherlands
Workshop exploring everyday science shop practices

Abstract

Society in responsive Science: The willingness to learn!

How to involve society?

It is a challenge to include civil society in a science shop research project. It is even a bigger challenge to keep society actively involved and connected during the whole process of this research project. We would like to discuss some experiences of both the WUR-science shop and the workshop participants in order to improve different approaches and methods. This is especially important in the context of RRI and for science shops willing to change.

Responsiveness of research is divided in three aspects of governance by Morten Velsing Nielsen: defining objectives, setting process requirements and understanding drivers. Link: https://academic.oup.com/spp/article/43/6/831/2525458

Following this line of thought, developing co-creative and scientific research projects, is overseeing a broad scope on the topic by involving different perspectives, including the field of view of friends and enemies. This can contribute to the ability to reflect and respond on changing circumstances in society. The involvement of stakeholders with every aspect of governance is required, in order to create relevant outcomes and more important relevant output.

It is essential to develop different ways and methods to include society in research projects. The objective of this workshop is to exchange and to inspire!
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Establishing a Science Shop in Francophone Africa: Common Challenges and Visions for the Future

Piron, Florence

1 Université Laval, Quebec, Canada

Born from the action research SOHA project (2015-2017) in Haiti and Africa, several science shop projects are underway in various Sub-Saharan Francophone African countries (Benin, Niger, Cameroon, Burkina Faso, Mali, among others) and in Haiti; a Tunisian science shop is also in the way of being created at the Institut Pasteur of Tunis through the INSPIRES European project. These Global South science shops face very specific challenges compared to the ones situated in the North. For instance,
the Francophone Sub-saharan universities have very few financial, human and material resources while facing an ever growing number of students: this situation greatly hampers their ability to develop original educational initiatives or even their third mission (service to the community). Moreover, their research mission is only rarely active because they lack research infrastructures at the regional or national level. The Tunisian situation is better, albeit far from the European situation. Yet the potential contribution of science shops or action research to sustainable local development, as shown in the North, makes it a tool that could be of a great benefit for these countries.

This is why, in addition to INSPIRES, a new 5-year action research project funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada aims at monitoring and supporting these new initiatives from the Francophone Global South. One of its objectives is to identify the main obstacles to the flourishing of these science shops as well as possible solutions. Many financial and managerial difficulties are obviously in view and should find local solutions. But one hypothesis is that the concept itself of science shop needs to be enlarged to fit with local needs. For instance, some African participants imagined that an African science shop could include transversal methodological training for students of all disciplines (documentary research, grant proposal writing, etc.), an open computer lab welcoming students as well as the general population aspiring to greater digital literacy, fablab-type and life-long training activities, but also the preservation of local traditional and scientific knowledge (in Haiti especially). Can this new concept help African science shop promoters to overcome their difficulties?

During the session, which will be moderated and introduced by Florence Piron, Université Laval and PI of the Canadian project, several actors of the nascent African science shops will share their experiences, analyses, hopes, difficulties and visions. The objective of the session is to build a common knowledge base which will be subsequently disseminated to all the science shop promoters in Francophone Africa.

Djossé Roméo Tessy, Judicael Alladatin and Wenceslas Mahoussi: « Alavotodji (« Knowledge citizens »), the science shop from Benin: Results from the first year »
Armand Leka, Sophie Dibounje Madiba and Thomas Hervé Mboa Nkoudou: « The Long and Winding Road of the Cameroon Science Shop »
Ben Saoud, Chayma, S. Abdelhak, S. Maatoug, N. Hadhri and H. Ben Hassine: « The Institut Pasteur Science Shop: between Research Requirements and Service to the Civil Society ».
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Why publishing in open access books and journals is a priority for action research practitioners
Piron, Florence

1Université Laval, Quebec, Canada

During previous LK conferences, I noticed that several presented books on action research, including handbooks for practitioners, were published by for-profit publishers (Sage, Springer, etc.) at a very high price. Therefore, these books were not accessible to civil society organizations, non-university workers or activists, even non-funded academics - which is a sad paradox for people hoping to co-construct knowledge or do it in a participatory way. How to raise awareness about the benefits of open access books and papers among action research practitioners and authors? The fact that many open access journals now charge huge sums of money to authors for “publication charges” does not help the cause of open science. However, these journals are still a minority (30-40%). Many journals and more and more publishing houses now advocate a “radical” open access practice, publishing in open access under Creative Commons licences. These licences allow the re-use and re-mix of all knowledge thus published, therefore allowing to disseminate it under many different formats to different audiences. In this presentation, I will describe the benefits of open access for action research and explain how to practice it in order to build together the commons of knowledge, against the commodification and privatization of knowledge.

I will also present a recent open access book about science shops.
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Alavotodji (« University in the City »), the science shop from Benin: Results from the first year
Piron, Florence; Tessy, Djossè Romeo; Alladatin, Judicael; Mahoussi, Wenceslas

1Université Laval, Quebec, Canada; 2Université de Parakou, Parakou, Benin; 3Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Calavi, Benin

The training and research missions of Beninese universities, like that of their counterparts in West Africa, face many challenges : student massification, weak quality of training, geographical distances, unexisting research and development infrastructures, difficult access to and use of information and communication technologies. For a long time, these universities have been places dedicated to reproducing the national elites. Even if they are culturally considered as the highest place of knowledge...
(alavo in Fon language), it is also obvious that they could also have considerable impacts on Benin society. How to remove the sealed wall between universities and society in order to promote the social responsibility of universities, while contributing to the transformation of educational models? Science shops seemed to us a very promising solution when we discovered it through the SOHA project

We (a PhD student and 2 lecturers) have founded the Benin science shop (named alavotodji, which is translated literally by « the university in the city ») in 2016, covering 2 universities. Our activities have been numerous. First, a science club opened at the University of Parakou and developed various activities, including training courses and lectures on open science and the various uses of information and communication technologies. Several projects have been started with contributions from students, teachers and community organizations. At the University of Abomey-Calavi, some courses have integrated local knowledge, for example national languages which had beforehand never been considered as a language adequate to get or or disseminate university knowledge. Projects have been set up to enable learners to apply their knowledge by organising public and community libraries in urban and rural settings. The science shop also organized a conference for media professionals on open access to scientific and technical information. However, Alavotodji remains very fragile since it rests mainly on the work on volunteers, without any infrastructure nor budget. Two of the volunteers are half time in the North, where technology allows them to advance some projects, but their absence could also slow other projects. Is it possible to administer an African science shop from the North? Could digital technologies enlarge the scope of a science shop? Could a science shop specialize in web projects so as to fight digital illiteracy? These are the questions that we hope to discuss with other African science shops in the discussion panel “Establishing a science shop in Africa: shared challenges and possible solutions” organised by Florence Piron.
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„Seas thereof – Why Berlin lies at the North Sea“ - Manner of science-society communication

Bokop, Karin J.¹; Huwe, Björn²; Shields, Michaela³; Prystav, Gisela M.⁴; von der Heiden, Kirsten⁵

¹University of Vechta, Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg, Sevelten, Germany; ²machbar Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany; ³Bonn Science Shop, Bonn, Germany; ⁴Technische Universität Berlin, ZEWK/Science Shop kubus, Berlin, Germany; ⁵Science Shop WTT e.V., Zittau, Germany
The project “Seas thereof – Why Berlin lies at the North Sea” engaged citizens in various formats on topics related to seas and oceans across Germany. Questions around seas and oceans were developed in cooperation with local civil society and answered by different kind of experts in a variety of formats. The one-year-project was funded by German BMBF during the Science Year 2016*17 “Seas and Oceans”, aimed to communicate science to the public and support science and society dialogue. Manifold project partners from the german speaking science shop network “wissnet” worked together: basis.wissen.schafft e.V.(Berlin), kubus TU Berlin, Science Shop Bonn, machbar Potsdam, Science Shop Nürnberg, WTT e.V. Saxony and Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg. Local events and activities took place across Germany. The approaches of communication varied from giving theoretical input up to practical workshops, in order to get as much of civil society involved as possible. Formats varied between public-opinion poll, Science Espressi, workshops on i.e. plastic waste or the construction of aquaponic facilities, a photo marathon, DIY sensor technology, water quality measurements, school workshops and more. Individual approaches depended on local or regional needs and circumstances (e.g. interests of stakeholders, CSOs, public and involved scientists).

As the partners offered a variety, it makes only sense to have different speakers/partners explaining individual work and story. The storytelling team is multi-disciplinary (academics, CBPR-experts, Science Shop experts).

Agenda:

- Vechta/Cloppenburg (project coordinator): “Wissnet - Science Shop Collaboration”. Overview and scope of project; activities of absent partners (online-discussions, evaluation of research needs in rural areas, photomarathon) illustrated by a photo-show
- Sc. Shop Potsdam: Experience with DIY-workshops on aquaponic systems and water quality measurements; Building a new network of qualitative partners.
- kubus, TUB: Hands-on workshops with school students on water and nutrient; regional measurements of water quality
- Science Shop Bonn: Simulation game on sustainable school canteen, Science Espressi during lunch break
- WTT e.V.: Customizable approach for IT-based multi-stakeholder debates on innovative knowledge. Learning aspects of run combined face-to-face + online debates; Kaizen-process-innovation of feature-matching by IT-management; participatory approach of topic setting by means of public-opinion poll
Reflection with plenum: Could formats become adapted to their context? What was the particular added value of the collaboration of science shops? Advantages and disadvantages of project-online-communication

Personal, institutional and civic expectations and contributions regarding science communication projects will be reflected by drawing out how different regions and target groups influenced events/topics. Obstacles like how to get schools involved for simulation games or scenario-workshops and how to work in a joint project with different sub projects will be elaborated upon. Lessons learned could lead as reference frame for others on how to plan/organise events with science & society and work in a collaborative and co-creative scheme of several Science Shops.
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Framing Multiple Research Partnerships in Probing Structural Inequities

Rahi, Khan1; Richmond, Al2

1Loka Institute & Canadian Community-Based Research Network, Toronto, Canada; 2Community Campus Partnership for Health (CCPH), North Carolina, United States

Convener, Khan Rahi

Framing Multiple Research Partnerships in Probing Structural Inequities

The session is a convened, thematically focused and collaborative presentation of two current research projects in a 90 minutes full session format.

The session addresses critical issues of structural inequities affecting socioeconomically marginalized neighborhood enclaves and racialized communities in two urban landscapes in Canada and the US.

The presentations use CBPR as a method to gather data, to apply community strengths and assets and to articulate the depth of the issues deeply rooted in the community. Twofold Aims: To discuss the interface between science and society and to probe the development of strategic partnerships to enhance understanding of structural inequities and, to foster understanding of collaborative research between the civil society actors and universities and multiple institutes interested in community engaged scholarship.

Why Full Session: The format allows for an in-depth interactive exchange and small group discussions, creating space for all participants to reflect and share their work. The presentations begin with an overview of the research questions, a multi-layered local context and the CBPR framework applied,
followed by questions. The attendees will be divided into two facilitated discussion groups. Handouts provide participants Guiding Questions and the RRI Keys to ask capacity building questions, identify methodological and research impact issues and pathways for building strategic collaborative partnerships. The session ends with a jointly convened plenary of the outcomes from small groups. This provides all participants the space to brainstorm innovative research models and to engage in networking for future collaborations beyond the session.

Guiding Question: What strategies should CBPR use to develop common tools to engage universities and other institutions in collaborative partnerships and would this impact science and society interaction?

1

Khan Rahi

Interface between Structural Inequities and Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies: A Toronto Study

The presentation focuses on lessons learned from the application of CBPR and RRI Keys in a multi-racial neighborhood study of multiple partnerships in Canada.

Local governments in North America and elsewhere are engaged in revitalization strategies, applying the principles of racial equity, economic opportunity and actions designed to sustain social cohesion in mixed ethno-racial neighborhoods. They aim to maintain a balance between economic growth and higher level of poverty in these communities. Our research on a community housing development project in Toronto, however, indicates competing realities and the dynamics of “Social Mix” on the ground, which unfold structural inequities along historic patterns within new boundaries. The project informs about mix income local government community housing policies in addressing structural inequities through revitalization planning and social cohesion goals.

2

Al Richmond

Dismantling Structural Inequality through Community-Academic Partners

A US based presentation by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. The study will compliment and inform about the role of partnerships in addressing the historic and contemporary manifestations of structural inequities and how to address them using CBPR and Community Action Strategies. The findings are from a conference held in 2017. Abstract is submitted.
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An Investigation of the Relationship between Student Engagement in Service Learning/CBL Curricular Modules and Student Wellbeing

Randles, Edel1; Bogle, Dania M.2; Beades, Dr. Mary2

1Institute of Technology Tralee, UNESCO Chair - Strand Leader Community Civic Engagement, Tralee, Ireland; 2Institute of Technology Tralee, Dept. of Health & Leisure Studies, Tralee, Ireland

One of the main purposes of education, according to the Council of Europe, is the preparation of students for life, as active citizens of democratic societies. Community based learning (CBL) and Service learning (SL) have grown as pedagogical tools for the inculcation of student mores of civic and social responsibility, across the International Higher Education (HE) landscape.

The world now ‘flat’, has resulted in a global levelling of opportunities given the way people ‘plug, play, compete, connect & collaborate 24/7’; the electronic umbilical computer and cell phone ‘connections’ paradoxically are producing psychological and emotional ‘disconnect’. In response it is imperative that HE provides a ‘well rounded’ education for this flat world, where we need to educate students to belong, to be active citizens, to have a resilient sense of self, & emotional competence with others and the world.

There exists a large body of research evidence which indicates that student civic engagement leads to an increase in academic success, career direction & self-esteem, it provides a positive connection with others and serves as an important factor in social identity development (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda & Yee 2000; Galura, Pasque, Schoem & Howard 2004). Furthermore, attributes that are positively influenced by participation in SL initiatives include critical thinking & leadership skills (Astin & Sax, 1998). Many researchers recognise SL as a unique opportunity to foster civic responsibility & personal growth (Colby et al, 2008; Washburn et al, 2004) where students construct their understanding of what it means to be a citizen in a democratic society. However is there also a link to student wellbeing?

This research investigates SL student citizen attributes, while also analysing reflective journals, utilising the PERMA model of human flourishing, as a theoretical construct for data analysis (Seligman, 2011). Human flourishing is described as optimum positive well-being, physically, mentally and socially, in the absence of ill being. Seligman (2011) describes his multidimensional theoretical construct as comprising of five key elements: Positive emotions; Engagement; Relationships; Meaning; Accomplishment

Specific Research Questions Posed:

Does SL provide opportunities for students to:

1. feel a sense of belonging?
2. Have a greater connectivity to community (college & society) and demonstrate heightened civic responsibility?
3. experience positive emotions?
4. become absorbed & experience flow?
5. have good relationships?
6. experience meaning & purpose in their activities?
7. feel accomplished

The societal impact is likely to be enhanced knowledge on student wellbeing in HE, with a window into enhancing the student experience, Research outcomes will provide a justification for continued and increased SL/CBL programming, across HE sectors, in a multi-disciplinary fashion, engaging academics across faculties and disciplines to enable learners to ‘see’ the connectedness and value of their learning.

At the conference this work aspires to stimulate delegates to reflect on their own practice and to consider utilisation of Seligman’s PERMA model of human flourishing across their own CBL/CR. Can such findings be evidenced to enable data on student wellbeing to grow, in support of this labour intensive, time consuming pedagogy? Can same be utilised to influence HE decision makers, to allocate funding/time/recognition/tenure to follow this pedagogy?

Keywords
service learning, health, learning & education

Building an Inclusive Flourishing Community through Sport

Randles, Edel¹; Suganthy Selvaraj, Jerrome¹; Gallagher, Dr. Jackie²

¹Institute of Technology Tralee, UNESCO Chair - Strand Leader Community Civic Engagement, Tralee, Ireland; ²Institute of Technology Tralee, UNESCO Chair/Dept. of Health & Leisure Studies, Tralee, Ireland

The UNESCO Chair (Institute of Technology Tralee) in collaboration with the Els Foundation Florida, LD Golf Ltd., the Dept. of Health & Leisure Studies and Castlegregory Golf Club, collaborated to introduce the Ernie Els #GameON Autism ™ Golf programme to Ireland, the first location outside of the US, whilst also embarking on an evaluation of the programme. This golf inclusion programme for people with autism, incorporates therapeutic elements to address behaviours specific to autism spectrum disorder (Wong, C. et al., 2013). The programme consists of group lessons with specially designed golf instruction incorporating 4 key autism learning concepts: communication skills, regulatory skills, motor skills and social skills.
The aim of this research study was to explore participants’ lived experiences of the Ernie Els #GameON Autism™ Golf programme. Specific objectives included, to:

1. Analyse the impact of the #GameON AutismTM Golf Program on the social/communication, motor and golf skills of individuals with ASD.
2. Assess the potential for the #GameON AutismTM Golf intervention program to impart flourishing among the stakeholders (participants, coaches, volunteers).
3. Assess the changes in the attitude towards individuals with autism among the coach and the volunteers vis-à-vis pre and post participation in the #GameON AutismTM Golf Program.

A mixed methods approach was utilised, embracing Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) as the underpinning research philosophy, which strove to understand the subjective meaning of the lived experiences of the participants, their families, PGA coaches and volunteers.

Els for Autism foundation protocol was used to collect quantitative data in social/communication, athletic and golf skills, with pre and post-test evaluations completed. This was followed by qualitative interviews with the participants, their parents, golf coach and volunteers, which was augmented by researcher reflective diary.

Seligman’s (2011) theory of human flourishing (PERMA Model) was utilised to examine and analyse the qualitative interview data and field researcher notes, (supported by photo images).

This multidimensional theoretical construct is comprised of five key elements: Positive Emotions; Engagement; Relationships; Meaning and Accomplishment.

This presentation serves to convey how Higher Education Institutes can lead the way in community sport inclusive practices, collaborating with identified agents of change, whilst ensuring also that students can gain from the experience through service learning programmes.

On conclusion of the research participants were keen to continue golf. The research team and collaborative partners felt ethically bound to create a pathway to enable this to happen. Everybody gained from their involvement in this initiative. The presence of the entire facets of PERMA model were evidenced and as reported by Croom (2015), it indicated the presence of an archetypical cognitive well-being/flourishing.

The programme legacy has realised a transformational Golf/Higher Education/International partnership, establishing a ‘blue print’ for a successful golf/sport inclusive initiative for young people with autism, while also delivering a new generation of student advocates for the therapeutic benefits of golf for young people with ASD.
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Cultural Adaptation Strategies for RRI: The Case of Finland

Rask, Mikko T.¹; Kahma, Nina¹; d'Andrea, Luciano²

¹University of Helsinki, Consumer Society Research Centre, Helsinki, Finland; ²Knowledge and Innovation, Rome, Italy

Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) is usually understood as both a strategic framework and a set of practical instruments and knowledge, overall oriented to better align the process and outcomes of R&I with the values, needs and expectations of society. In this perspective, RRI is seen as an approach allowing researchers and research institutions to anticipate impacts and risks of their own research, to favour citizens’ participation in research and research policies and to promote closer relations between science and industry for accelerating innovation. The European Commission has identified six key components of RRI: public and societal engagement; open access; gender equality; ethics; science education and governance. In different national contexts, however, the adoption of RRI has largely differed due to different political systems, established research funding institutions and conventions as well as ‘civic epistemologies’ that characterize what is counted as legitimate knowledge or policy.

In this paper we will closely examine national strategies in adopting RRI in Finland, which is a country with a tradition of strong research and innovation policy and a country where RRI does not represent the local way of conceptualizing research policy. We will study the perception of and attitudes towards RRI, feasible conditions for RRI, and barriers to the diffusion of RRI by presenting and discussing the findings of a ‘context tailoring workshop’ that was organized in Finland, in early 2018, and comparing the experiences to countries were similar workshops were organized (Italy, the Netherlands, Greece). Each workshop involved 10-15 highly experienced research policy actors in the national context. In addition to the workshops, we build on recent research on RRI in the European research context, such as the FIT4RRI project, where the key factors contributing to the adaptation of RRI in Europe have been studied, as well as a study of key policy documents and media publicity regarding RRI in Finland.
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Hackathon for Public Engagement Performance Indicators

Rask, Mikko T.¹

¹University of Helsinki, Consumer Society Research Centre, Helsinki, Finland
As public engagement (PE) activities have increased in number and volume, it has become more and more important to evaluate the success of such processes. Actually, there are many types of evaluations which have reflected PE processes from different angles. However, evaluations have often tended focus on the evaluation of singular events and participant feedback, at the expense of elaborating more systemic views of the contribution of PE, acknowledging also institutional impacts and indirect impacts, such as creation of spin offs, new conceptualizations and institutional renewal. As more systematic evaluation approaches have been called for by both academics and practitioners of PE, this exposé proposes the idea of organizing an international hackathon for identifying viable indicators for the systemic evaluation of PE activity in research and innovation. Among the foundations for this work will be a recent synthetic model of PE evaluation that was developed under the PE2020 project and recently published in Rask et al. (2018). The synthetic model was built by closely examining recent evaluation literature and empirically studying 38 PE innovations in Europe and the U.S. The synthetic model identified and consolidated 40 evaluation criteria in nine categories of impact under three classic evaluation dimensions (appropriateness, efficiency, impact). While this and similar evaluation studies have identified criteria, understanding of viable indicators, particularly for the evaluation of systemic effects, remains scattered.

Reference:
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‘Smart Because of You’ – Co-creating cities of the future using RRI principles
REA, JON

1NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL, STRATEGY & INSIGHT, NOTTINGHAM, United Kingdom

Nottingham, UK is a Smart City with a developing culture of citizen co-creation of smart technologies across transport, energy and health. The city’s ‘Smart Because of You’ engagement strategy, led by the local authority and involving citizens as well as local university and business stakeholders, informs various smart technology development projects and is underpinned by an understanding and application
of RRI principles. This submission will provide examples of projects involving older citizens, young people and community-based groups; explore the innovative engagement processes that lead to meaningful citizen participation in research; and demonstrate the impact of co-creative work on research outcomes.

This presentation forms part of the Full Session proposal 'A Nuclei of Citizen Science', for the Horizon 2020 funded project called NUCLEUS, submitted by Dr Edward Duca, University of Malta
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Dismantling Structural Inequality through Community-Academic Partners

Richmond, Alan¹; Khan, Rahi²

¹Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Administration, Raleigh, United States; ²University of Montreal, Montreal, Canada

American history is resplendent with historic and contemporary manifestations of institutional and systemic inequities. Not one aspect of our society is unscathed of the atrocities of injustice. As systems are built, they too can be dismantled. Cast systems of ethnical and racial social and cultural control is in the fabric of the formation and legacy of America. From the work of early American abolitionists, to the 1960s civil rights movement, to contemporary activist, the value and necessity of efforts to not merely address, but also dismantle deeply entrenched societal systems has become evident and deemed paramount to promoting equity.

Session Goals:

1. Understand the historic and contemporary manifestations of inequity in the US
2. Discuss the role of community-academic partnerships in addressing longstanding systems of inequity.
3. Present case studies of community-campus partnerships engaged in exploring inequity in local communities and action steps to dismantle inequity.

It is important to define the clear nature of this work. It is about dismantling those laws and practices that support inequity. Single system efforts to reduce and eliminate racial gaps and inequities have been ineffective and unsustainable. The realities that have resulted from decades of human and economic resources focusing on individuals rather than institutions. Structural inequities require multi-systems approaches that will improve and enhance system services for everyone.
As an international leader in social justice and health equity, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health is engaged in addressing such inequities through a series of intentional activities designed to deepen our collective understanding of the role of community-academic partnerships to create transformation in local communities.

The critical affirmative step to addressing these inequities is that of launching the inaugural intensive, Structural Inequalities: An On The Ground View - A Two-Day Summer Intensive in Summer’17. This highly engaging and experiential session was designed to 1) To explore the roots of structural inequality, and 2) To discuss real life examples of how to address structural inequalities using both tools of the Community-Based Participatory Research /Approach (CBPR/A) and Community Action Strategies.

The intensive included presentations by the Racial Equity Institute which examined characteristics of the historic and contemporary manifestations of institutional and systemic inequities. A tour of Historic Stagville, one of the largest plantation of the pre US Civil War South provided participants with an opportunity to reflect on the enslavement of people in the US. Additionally, participants were engaged in a session that discussed CBPR/A and how it offers a beneficial approach to support collaborative efforts. Lastly, participants explored Communities in Partnership, and how this organization is strategically addressing systemic problems through an anti-racism lens. Analysis of evaluation data determined a significant increase in understanding racism and its impact on institutions and systems. Additionally, participants reported a strengthening of skills, confidence, and ability to engage in efforts addressing the impact of structural inequalities.
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Responsible Research and Innovation on the attitude and/or behavior changes of students through a Higher Educational course
Roboz, Ágnes

1Corvinus University of Budapest, Decision Sciences Deparatment, Budapest, Hungary

The present proposal is a research design for the session of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in Higher Education (HE) practice – RRI as a tool for Research, Reflection and Curricula Innovation. Which aims that thinking about that how, or to what extent we can effect on the change of the attitude and/or behavior habits of students through our Decision Making Techniques courses. During
this classes, the students should bring their own social, environmental or business-oriented problems to the classroom and work with them for one semester. Present research design looking for the answer of the question that what are those pivotal patterns that influence the students to be able to change their attitude and/or behavior habits from the point of view of social, environmental or economic sensitiveness. The main question is that these changes in what extent depend on our (the teachers) personal attitudes, the language we use, the way that we move or gesticulate, in one word ourselves. Or more dominates are those case studies and syllabus that we bring to the classroom. Or the result generated perhaps from the trade-offs all of these together. Are these elements are relevant from this point of view? Or if not what are those ones?

One way to investigate this issue could be a close cooperation with the students. When the first step obviously will be to inform the students that they will be a ‘subject’ of the research. This is one of the key aspects of the RRI policy agenda, the ethics. Since hundreds of students interested in this course, the sampling process should be very wary. Thus it is worth to choose some prominent groups (approx. 5-6 people) from each seminar who are working with a sensitive, taboo or somehow valuable topic from social, economic or environmental aspects.

The data collection could be a critical point in this research as well. Qualitative methods clearly more appropriate to investigate attitude and behavior change. Thus in the light of this research conduct, interviews or organizing focus groups methods could help us to dig deeper into the sensitiveness of the students. Data collection should start only after the first sight of seeing some change in the mind and/or after the first „aha” experience. For this process research time, planning must be one whole semester. Less than this time won’t be enough for this complex and close cooperation work with the students. The continuous reflection for the common work will be necessary from the teacher and from students to themselves and to each other as well.

A lot of dilemmas are emerging about present research which is the followings: Do the students accept the research process without compensation? (E.g.: for fun, for experience, for to learn something new, etc.). It is important to share with the students that what I experience, learn, feel during this research? When we become equal partners in this process is it necessary to keep some power in it?

The aim of present research through RRI is to apply mainly the aspects of ethics, social justice, sustainability, gender equality, public engagement and strengthen the competence of openness, anticipation and reflectivity, responsiveness, etc. in the students.
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Youth Driven Knowledge Mobilization: a graphic novel on transitions from custody

Roche, Tricia T¹; Marshall, Anne²

¹University of Victoria, Centre for Youth and Society, Victoria, Canada; ²University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada

Research on both sides of the campus-community hyphen have led to a proliferation of new entities and functions designed to, on the one hand, facilitate research impact and on the other, to ensure community knowledge is leveraged in the design of research initiatives (“upstream Knowledge Mobilization”). In this Pecha Kucha presentation we present strategies used by the University of Victoria, Canada, to mobilize research findings in youth created vehicles.

When youth are partners in the research process, benefits accrue to both the quality of the research and to the youth themselves (Tolan, 2014). Partnerships with youth have the potential to change the role that youth play in research -- from passive objects to empowered participants, social agents and rightful citizens (kerström & Brunnberg, 2013; Chen, et al., 2007; Hughes, 2014; Westwood, et al., 2014). Youth participation in research has also been linked with improved psychological health, rights enhancement, gains in self-efficacy, revaluing their intellectual activities, self-esteem, confidence, meaningful knowledge and social skills (Ardoin, et al., 2013; Rodrigues Coser et al., 2014). Involving youth allows researchers to look at insider views and sidestep power inequalities to get at data that might not otherwise be accessible (Tarapdar & Kellett, 2013). Partnerships with youth help bridge, on one hand, intergenerational gaps inside the community, and the university-community relationship, on the other (Ardoin et al, 2013; Marshall & Guenette, 2011).

We discuss a qualitative research study on successful transitions from youth custody. The project led to an engagement initiative whereby the youth in prison created the knowledge mobilization vehicle for the project: a brief graphic novel containing accessible information that their peers need to understand to help them transition successfully from custody. Using a strengths-based approach, the project harnessed youth knowledge of transition challenges as well as their creative and artistic skills. The project suggests that reach and research impact are strengthened through the facilitation of youth knowledge and involvement in KM design. Lessons are shared from the strategy used of attending to the process through which knowledge is made available. Implications for future knowledge mobilization practices are discussed including integrating upstream KM into the fabric of research projects, thicker notions of partnership and the value of youth-led KM products for research communications targeting both youth and general audiences. Lessons learned from this project have implications for higher quality
youth engagement that will strengthen research alliances between youth led and youth serving organizations and the academy.
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Active multidisciplinary research to face new social challenges
Romanin, Valentina

1Ca’Foscari University of Venice, Venice, Italy

The present proposal aims to focus on the importance of multidisciplinary research on facing nowadays social challenges. The cooperation between different kind of knowledges and skills is a successful way to foster innovation and to generate a positive impact in the society. This work wants to foster the discussion starting from the experience of the Active Learning Lab (ALL) – Urban Innovation, an action learning program in which I am involved. It is promoted by Ca’Foscari University of Venice since 2015. ALL-Urban Innovation has born from an analysis of the main challenging issues negatively affecting the local communities, such as social exclusion, the increasing poverty, the lack of job opportunities – especially for the youth -, the decreasing level of citizen participation to the city decisions. “How can the scientific knowledge to contribute to the society improvement? How can the University foster the dialogue between public and private sector in order to share resources and develop new city governance models?” ALL – Urban Innovation is both an educational and practical program. It is based on two main objectives: i) to promote the entrepreneurial culture between University’s students and to transfer them innovative methods to co-design new urban solutions; ii) to cooperate with the local territory in order to generate social, economic and environment changes. In this way, participants – university students and graduate people coming from different fields of study - work in multidisciplinary team in order to develop some innovative and entrepreneurial solutions to concrete issues coming from the local communities. ALL – Urban Innovation is a space where youth have the opportunity to share and apply different competences and soft skills, learning from each other and from experts. At the same time, the territorial stakeholders can experiment new kinds of cooperation among public and private sectors driven by scientific and multidisciplinary knowledge. The program combines methodologies based on a human centered approach and aimed to plan sustainable solutions, such as Service Design and Social Business Model Canvas. ALL-Urban Innovation is not a consolidated program yet. Due to its
strongly connection with the society, it is an open laboratory where experiment new methodologies and new approaches.

My submission can offer a contribution on how to encourage the systematic and ethical involvement of civil society actors and their societal concerns in research and innovation processes. Moreover, it wants to foster the discussion on methodologies able to connect research with innovative sustainable solutions to social challenges. Starting from the ALL-Urban Innovation program, I would like to learn from other experiences of active learning and research coming from the participants in order to stimulate the design of new cooperation models.

On the base of these aims, I have chosen the ultrashort format in order to discuss with participants about the challenges that the community engagement generate, starting from my personal experience. I can offer an experience of an active learning program aimed to enrich the public engagement in research practices through open innovation methods. From this work, I both expected to foster the arising of new knowledge around these themes. Personally, I hope to have the opportunity to create a network with other participants coming from from different countries and involved in a similar process.
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Trends in scientific activity regarding citizen science: a bibliometric study

Bautista, Nuria1; De Filippo, Daniela1; Mauleón, Elba1; Sanz, Elías1

1University Carlos III of Madrid (Spain), Getafe, Spain

Citizen science is related to the general public engagement in the scientific research process in which the citizens participates actively in different ways, with their intellectual or knowledge, tools or resources. The main aim is to co-create a scientific culture and an exchange of understanding (Socientize Consortium, 2013). As a result of this open process the interactions between society-science-policies are improved, facilitating an investigation based on evidence and informed decision making (Serrano et al., 2016). This movement is linked with so many benefits such as democratize science, scientific literacy, social capital, citizen inclusion in local issues, benefits to government, and benefits to ecosystems being monitored or educational role (Conrad and Hilchey, 2011).

This new movement has gained wider political, institutional and public attention increasingly broad. An example of it is in the framework programmes of the European Union, in which several citizen projects have been financed such as Socientize or Citi-sense, among others. Even in the last H2020 programme
several calls are focused on that issues and the call 'Science with and for society' is one example of the interest on this new focus.

One of the traditional ways of analysing the development of scientific research in a thematic field is through the study of scientific publications and bibliometry has become a consolidated tool for this purpose. Among its most frequent uses is the analysis of scientific productivity (of researchers, groups, institutions, disciplines or countries) and the study of its impact. However, it has other more innovative applications such as the detection of new research fronts and emerging fields, the study of the formation of collaboration networks and the identification of research niches (Callon et al, 1995).

In this sense, the focus of the study would be to analyse the trends in scientific research on citizen science by applying bibliometric tools with the following objectives:

- To detect the main actors involved in scientific production
- Identify the topics of interest
- To analyse the social impact of research in this field through social media.

In order to carry out the study from a bibliometric perspective, we have used the international database Web of Science, which gathers references from the main multidisciplinary scientific publications since 1945.

Publications on Citizen Science have been identified through a search strategy in the title of documents based on terms such as: ‘community science’, ‘citizen science’, ‘community-based research’ or ‘participatory research’.

After obtaining the documents, the following indicators have been obtained:

- Research activity patterns: nº documents and evolution over time, production by countries, institutions.
- Thematic specialization and interdisciplinary approach: journals, disciplines and keywords
- Impact
  - Citations
  - Open acces habits
  - Social impact: altmetrics indicators
- Collaboration practices: international collaboration, network of countries and institutions.

Preliminary results show the growing interest in these issues in the scientific community. USA, UK, Canada and Australia concentrate the largest number of documents with North American universities being the main producers. The subjects most related to Citizen Science are related to Public Health and Environment and 22% of the documents are published in Open Access journals.
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Science shops in Central and Eastern Europe
Schmidt Fiedler, Anna¹; Morawska Jancelewicz, Joanna¹
¹A. Mickiewicz University, Science Shop, Poznan, Poland

Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) with its post-communistic history and burdens is said to have its own specific character, also in a field of civil society, public engagement, the quality of dialogue that is held among various stakeholder. This heritage also applies to the ways universities function as dialogue partners.

The road of democratic transition has not been an easy one, and although one could have thought that the CEE countries have established a strong democratic structures, at present time young democracies are facing many challenges.

In which extend does the CEE’s characteristics influence the quality of this dialogue between universities and its environment and process of implementing the RRI and ideas of engagement at universities of the CEE region?

Going deeper – what are the key challenges for Science Shops in CEE and how to overcome potential barriers and constrains? Which of them are shared with western countries, which are unique for the region? What areas seem to have natural potential to be included in Science Shop and which demand more support and effort?

What is the best model to attain the efficient cooperation between the university and CSO ? Which elements of these cooperation can enhance the quality of civil society? What is the role of the science and scientists in this process?

Which trends and developments can be expected in the coming years?

Let’s meet and talk about it within the panel, you are very welcome.

Keywords
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Understanding, Working with, and Responding to the Needs of Water Resource Managers and Planners in the Face of a Changing Climate

Simms, Nancy Beller¹; Houston, Tamara G.¹

¹US Federal Government, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, United States

In response to studies and requests from decision and policy makers from the water resource management and city planning communities, U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) Climate Program Office and the National Centers for Environmental Information and several NGOs (1) worked together to develop the Water Resources Dashboard (Dashboard) to provide a one-stop location for many of the extreme precipitation (flooding and drought) data set needs of this community. (https://toolkit.climate.gov/topics/water/water-resources-dashboard). Over the course of a year and a half, these organizations worked with their constituents to determine the data sets most needed. Several NOAA line office staff worked together to secure the use of these data sets and designed the Dashboard for the community. Released in March 2016 as part of the U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit, the Dashboard features relevant datasets and background information.

During the course of the development of the Dashboard, decision makers voiced concern of not understanding the purpose and science behind some of the datasets on the Dashboard. The next effort jointly developed by this same group was to develop a series of ½ hour webinars which included brief descriptions by a scientist of the dataset being discussed, followed by an explanation by a water resource manager describing how they incorporate that specific data set in their work. The remaining webinar time included questions and answers between the audience and speakers. The next joint effort will be to develop a series of “learning progressions” for users of all expertise. This project is currently underway and includes representatives from other Federal and NGOs.

To date, there have been approximately 9,000 visits to this website and 1,000 attendees at our webinars or visits through YouTube. Continued collaboration and user analytics help to keep content in the Dashboard relevant to the water resource management and city planning communities.

(1) These have included:: the American Planning Association, American Water Works Association, Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies, Water Environment Federation, Water Environment Research Foundation, Water Research Foundation, and the US Environmental Protection Agency.
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SciShops.eu - synergy processes with European projects and initiatives

Stanescu, Rodica¹; Ionescu, Cristina Sorana¹

¹University Politehnica of Bucharest, Science Shop InterMEDIU, Bucharest, Romania

SciShops.eu project develops a strong strategy for growing and building capacity in the European Science Shops ecosystem. The strategy of maximising the added value and impact of current or past projects consists of identifying and leveraging the resources and creating new sources of value that form the base for building synergies. One of the aims of SciShops.eu is to establish synergy processes with similar H2020/ FP7 projects and international initiatives and to enhance pan-European and international knowledge exchange in the participatory and community-based research field across Europe and worldwide. The winning H2020 and FP7 participatory and community based research projects are identified and potential strong synergies and links with the SciShops.eu activities are established. The potential connections and partnerships that could be developed by the SciShops.eu consortium with previous or ongoing projects in the field of participatory and community based research are presented. The synergies will help in spreading the project’s results to a broader audience but also to learn from other projects’ findings. A Strategic Plan sets the vision, goals and main objectives of the SciShops.eu Synergy Process for the project length (2018 – 2020).
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SciShops – Enhancing the Responsible and Sustainable Expansion of the Science Shop Ecosystem in Europe

Steiner, Christoph M.¹

¹SYNYO GmbH, Wien, Austria

This poster session will summarize and present the concepts and goals of newly established science shops within the H2020 funded SciShops (project.scishops.eu) project. The diverse and international consortium will start and run 10 new science shops in the duration of the project. This newly established science shop ecosystem will cover fields like astronomy, environmental science, big and open data, climate change, radicalization as well as cover a broad spatial distribution by setting them up in
countries like Austria, Cyprus, United Kingdom, Belgium, Spain, Italy, The Netherlands, Slovenia, Germany and Hungary.

The poster session will visualize and represent this vast diversity and will inform about the different concepts and approaches of each science shop. The success of those science shops will be down to finding a topic that is of particular interest to a peculiar group of people because they need to engage throughout the science shop research process. The poster session itself aims to take up this approach by establishing a dialogue with the audience and stimulating discussions on the spot. In this sense, the poster session will serve as an access point to the SciShops ecosystem, giving opportunity to drop any question or staggering idea which may be redirected to inform the most relevant science shop. The presenters, on the other hand, will share interesting and practical insights from the according fields combined with interesting facts from the SciShops ecosystem in order to give a better grasp of the general idea behind the science shop concept.

The contribution will be directed towards an audience within science as well as within the broader society, supporting the idea of a collaboration between those two domains. By allowing to question and challenge the science shop concept, the poster session itself will serve as a “Meta – Science Shop”. By taking up a dialogical approach, the contribution will not only present, but also create knowledge, following the mindset of American novelist Thomas Berger who once stated that “The art and science of asking questions is the source of all knowledge”.
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Succes Stories of SPARKS
Steinhaus, Laura¹
¹Science Shop Bonn, Bonn, Germany

Sparks is a project to familiarize and engage European citizens with the concept and practice of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) through the topic of technology shifts in health and medicine. Sparks promotes RRI by inviting key stakeholders to actively question, experiment and play with science in a way that makes it relevant to today’s society. Over almost three years four clones of an especially designed exhibition were touring to 29 different countries all over Europe. At each exhibition location, interactive, participative events were held to communicate more effectively on the topic.
Sparks is now in its last months and has had mentionable success in its local context. In order to grasp and present the success it had, a poster was designed that introduces to several different cases. It tells stories where Sparks has mobilized something, inspired someone, or turned into a meaningful experience over the course of the project and its exhibition and activities. Questions like “Has SPARKS opened doors to new opportunities for you? Has it inspired the people attending your events to continue the discussion? Has it made new project opportunities? Has it encouraged someone to make a change on their own?” have been asked and the results are presented on the poster.

Keywords
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Daring to swim in unknown waters: Pop-up Science Shops in SPARKS
Steinhaus, Laura; Gečienė, I.; Efstathiades, A.; Björk, F.

Sparks is a project to familiarize and engage European citizens with the concept and practice of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) through the topic of technology shifts in health and medicine. Sparks promotes RRI by inviting key stakeholders to actively question, experiment and play with science in a way that makes it relevant to today’s society.

Over the course of the project local partners from all over Europe hosted a touring exhibition and organized participatory events. Besides organizing a “Reversed Science Café” and several smaller versions of the latter called “Science Espressos” the partners also had the possibility to choose a third format of activities. One option was to organize a Pop-up Science shop. Due to fact that most partners were museums themselves or were connected to such, they were new to participatory activities and the idea of Science Shops. This makes the experiences they made while they hosted the exhibition and activities especially interesting.

Science Shops, in the broader sense, mediate between citizens, citizen groups and research institutions. In other words, Science Shops can be seen as valuable and experienced actors to bridge the gap between research and society and mediate mutual learning and cooperation processes ‘The Pop-up Science Shop’ refers to the way civil society’s requests and problems can be transferred into a research setup. This activity format can be connected to a specific event, runs for a given period of time
and in Sparks was connected to the exhibition period. In Sweden this format was connected to lectures at the Malmö University.

In this session, the local Sparks partners from Lithuania and Cyprus will share their experience of running a Pop-up Science Shop and discuss the effects it had on their work. In addition, Frederik Björk who ran a Pop-up Science Shop for Malmö University will also share his experience and join the discussion. All conference participants are invited to join and take part in the discussion as well. The overall focus will lay on opening up to and enhancing science communication.

Schedule for session:

5 min - Welcome and introduction to the topic
3 x 10 min - Partners present and share their experience of organizing a Pop-up Science Shop
10 min - Discussion between partners and participants of the session

Speakers:

Ingrida Gečienė – “Running a Pop-up Science Shop by nongovernmental organization in Lithuania”
Andreas Efstathiades – “Working with students and citizens – A Cyprian Pop-up Science Shop”
Frederik Björk – “Doing a Pop-up Science Shop the Swedish way” or “The city’s green nutrition”
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BigPicnic - Engaging the Public with Responsible Research and Innovation on Food Security

Steinhaus, Norbert¹

¹Bonn Science Shop / Living Knowledge Network, Responsible Research and Innovation, Bonn, Germany

The H2020 project 'BigPicnic' brings together the public, scientists, policy-makers and industry. Botanic gardens, with help from other partners including a Science Shop, co-created a range of exhibitions and participatory events to generate dialogue and build greater understanding of food security.

BigPicnic engages with a wide range of audiences with people from all walks of life across the EU on the topic of food security, a topic of major concern for the future and one that will have far reaching impact on personal expenditure, health and lifestyle. Food security is a concern not only at policy level but also for the general public. Building on the experiences of the co-created exhibitions, a suite of science cafés will be co-ordinated by each partner garden, either on site or in accessible local sites to further debate and discuss RRI for food security. Visionary and pragmatic public opinion,
recommendations and ideas on RRI related to food security will be captured and fed into a report for policy makers and key stakeholders.

The project’s collaborative approach gives a voice to adults and young people, and aims to communicate their views to policy-makers, share ideas, encourage debate on the future of our food and moving towards Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI).

The poster (or Pecha Kucha if preferred by the conference organisation team) will give an overview on objectives and mid-term project results on applied methodologies of co-creation and team-based inquiry as well as identified food security key issues and foci identified by the national and local communities of practice.
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The role of Science Shops in processes to support the social commitment and the cooperation of various groups of actors

Steinhaus, Norbert1; Mulder, Henk A.J.2; Gresle, Anne-Sophie3; Munteanu, Carmen4

1Bonn Science Shop / Living Knowledge Network, Responsible Research and Innovation, Bonn, Germany; 2University of Groningen, Science Shop, Groningen, Netherlands; 3ISGlobal, InSPIRES project, Barcelona, Spain; 4SYNYO GmbH, SciShop.eu project, Vienna, Austria

Science Shops have gained a huge recognition and earned a huge respect during the last years. But we have to have an eye if new activities address the credibility of Science Shops – because once the term is synonymous with arbitrariness, it’s probably nothing worth anymore!

A discussion already started among several Science Shops about the relationship of Science Shops and business. The demands made on research and development by commerce and industry are one ‘face’ of research, whilst ‘civil society’ organisations have their own research needs. Anyway, the boundaries between business and civil society are becoming increasingly fluid.

Two European projects, SciShops.eu and InSPIRES, have started last year to develop new Science Shops. The InSPIRES model integrates RRI, Open Science and Impact Evaluation to open the research process up in a more strategic way. SciShops.eu aims at building on and expanding the capacity of the Science Shops ecosystem in Europe and beyond and wants to demonstrate the benefits of starting a
Science Shop for various kinds of organization. Both projects try to gain from existing Science Shops expertise.

So, something is starting to move. There’s the basic idea of a Science Shop, applying its methodology in more and more HEIs through rephrasing requests from civil society organisations (and other stakeholders) to scientific research topics. And there are Science Shops as organizational units focusing more on the role of a Civil Society (Stakeholder) Contact Point to lead tasks in mediating society-science interactions through various methodologies, or developing training and education for specific topics and needs. They all pursue the idea of stakeholder participation at all levels of R&I processes with the Living Knowledge Network to be the European contact for institutions and organisations that wish to act in that field.

The discussion panel intends to stimulate the exchange about the self-understanding of Science Shops and their future place and role in the civil society – research - education – business - policy interaction.

Panelists:
Dr Henk Mulder, Science Shop, University of Groningen
Anne-Sophie Gresle,, ISGlobal, InSPIRES project
Carmen Munteanu, MSc, SYNYO GmbH, SciShop.eu project
Norbert Steinhaus, Bonn Science Shop, Living Knowledge

Guiding questions:
- What are the critiques and expectations from institutions aiming at community engagement?
- What are strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of existing models and latest developments, in the context of an international Science Shop network
- What should be the next steps to strengthen Science Shops in a broadened European / global / stakeholder based recognition and understanding of their - values?
- How to encourage the systematic and ethical sound involvement of CSOs and their societal concerns in R&I processes at all levels?

Draft Agenda
1. Welcome: Purpose and structure of the session. (5 min)
2. 4 presentations on experiences and expectations à 5 min. (Inspires, SciShops.eu, university based Science Shop, non-university based Science Shop. (20 minutes)
3. Table discussions. 4 Tables hosted by presenters. 2x15 min (1x change of table). SWAT discussion of existing models and latest developments
4. Plenary discussion: Summary and Outlook. What should be the next steps to strengthen Science Shops in a broadened European / global / stakeholder based recognition and understanding of values. (30 min)

5. Closing remarks (5 min)
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Knowledge Exchange for Resource Management and International Trust (KERMIT) - Aleppo case study

Stevens, Rodney L.; Wallin, Peter; Alkridi, Mohamed; Kouro, Michael

1University of Gothenburg, Dept. Earth Sciences, Gotohenburg, Sweden

The KERMIT project deals with research and capacity-building targeted at two, related groups with academic backgrounds: 1) refugees in Europe and 2) local populations in the stressed regions from which people are fleeing. Although the long-term focus is aimed at raising the competence and capacity for sustainable resource management in stressed regions, the refugees with academic backgrounds involve both new challenges and opportunities with related objectives. These refugees need complementary study to adapt their educational background to European conditions, and at the same time they can provide valuable expertise and knowledge of specific regions and general conditions where resource conflicts and management have increased migration. Utilizing the connections to the local academic community and the existing infrastructure, project activities explore the dual and complementary goals to increase human capacity, thereby strengthening the hope for positive, short-term and long-term developments for both groups.

Cooperative projects and educational activities with partner institutes in stressed regions are the distinctive profile of the KERMIT project. These activities build upon our international networks and the multidisciplinary research from the cooperative projects, utilizing earlier results and emphasizing the exchange activities for knowledge transfer in all directions. One on-going case study deals with water-management strategies for Aleppo, Syria, and considers the increased pollution loading on agricultural areas along the river due to continued irrigation during the war while the water-treatment plant has not functioned. In addition, urban pollution sources, transport pathways, and recipients are modeled using system structural analysis and relative risk ranking methods.
To improve legitimacy of science policy, policy makers increasingly refer to public engagement and stakeholder involvement. They organise stakeholder dialogues, public consultations, scenario workshops and focus groups, just to name a few, to develop research programmes, set research priorities and assess social impacts of emerging technologies. Obviously there is a „participatory turn“ (Sheila Jasanoff) in science policy. Technology assessment introduced public engagement into its methodologies and becomes participatory technology assessment (pTA). Public engagement, formerly much endorsed by STS, has become a kind of industry offering a toolbox of engagement methods seemingly becoming larger and larger. It aims at opening up policy making by informing it with a broad range of interests and concerns and by backing up decision-making in science policy with societal input, but criticism of it is increasing, too: from political scientists, STS scholars and civil society organisations. Especially CSOs see a lack of transparency, arbitrary recruitment if not handpicking of participants recruitment biased towards those who are already powerful, such as Big Business. Some Member States witness a participation fatigue, so it becomes more and more difficult to attract participants, which shows that the trust in participation of citizens might be more limited than presumed. This is also a problem for Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) and political decision-making in science policy, which aims at enhancing public engagement, respectively stakeholder engagement.

This criticism can also affect Science Shops and their credibility as intermediaries between civil society and academia. On a positive note, it creates a tremendous opportunity for Science Shops to become honest brokers between civil society, academia, SMEs and their business associations, and political authorities.

The World Café will be guided by the following question: „What is transparent and credible public engagement in science policy?“

In this World Café we will discuss

• Experiences with organised public engagement in science policy
• How to move beyond existing practices to engage with publics and stakeholders in RTD projects and science policy
• How to increase the legitimacy of public engagement and stakeholder involvement in political decision-making

• The roles Science Shops could play in creating and conducting credible public participation in science policy

In the World Café, all session participants are contributors: as presenters, and discussants. It is a structured conversation setting, in which groups of people discuss given topics at so called „topic tables“, with participants periodically switching tables so they can contribute to several or even all topics. Discussions are facilitated by „table hosts“. Participants are encouraged to write or draw their contributions on poster sheets serving as table cloths.

The World Café will start with a presentation by the session convenors of present practices of engaging with publics and stakeholders.

The session convenors intend to publish the complete documentation of the World Café, including all written input of session participants – photographs and transcripts of the posters –, open access in SocArXiv and disseminated to civil society organisations.

Duration: 90 – 180 minutes

The topic addresses specifically Q1 of LK8. This format has been chosen to collect a broad input from conference participants.
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Developing more transparent and inclusive stakeholder involvement in the governance of science and innovation

Strähle, Michael¹; Urban, Christine¹

¹Wissenschaftsladen Wien - Science Shop Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Policy makers and researchers engage with stakeholders to increase legitimacy of research and innovation governance and to address societal challenges. It is expected that involving stakeholders, end-users, consumers or citizens at large makes research and innovation governance more democratic by making it more inclusive. It is hoped that such procedures improve the probability of arriving at more “real” solutions to societal problems. There are open questions as to whether stakeholder involvement lives up to its promise, either in a policy or research context, because the engagement processes could – and, deliberately or not, sometimes do - result in serving particular interests.
The authors coordinated an international stakeholder involvement on research programming on food and health in connection with environmental and social sustainability. In 13 countries stakeholder consultations targeted mainly public authorities, civil society organisations, business organisations, and research funding and research performing organisations. At the time of these consultations they were the largest coordinated stakeholder involvement process in science policy by scenario workshops so far. Still there are no widely accepted and sufficiently legitimated formats for stakeholder involvement in science policy. It was one of the objectives to address some weaknesses of stakeholder involvement at all stages, from the setting up to the implementation through to documentation as much transparency as possible was maintained. The authors will present lessons learned and show what has been done to make stakeholder involvement more transparent, initiatives that have worked out well and others that failed. The presentation will conclude with suggestions for improving such engagement activities, naming research needs on stakeholder involvement, and reflections on how the status quo of stakeholder involvement influences democratic European research and innovation governance.

This presentation is linked to the session proposal “World Café: Public engagement in science policy: Present situation and opportunities” by providing a theoretical background based on a working paper by the authors of this presentation proposal, but is a distinct contribution of its own.

The topic of this session addresses specifically Q1 of LK8: How to build on and enrich the public engagement in research practices (through RRI, Open Science, Open Innovation, Science Shops, citizen science, participatory governance, community-based research, inclusion of community members in advisory boards, etc.)?
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Society in responsive Science: The willingness to learn!
Straver, Gerard¹; Pfeiffer, Lèneke¹

¹Wageningen University & Research, Science Shop, Wageningen, Netherlands

Workshop exploring everyday science shop practises

Abstract
Society in responsive Science: The willingness to learn!
How to involve society?
It is a challenge to include civil society in a science shop research project. It is even a bigger challenge to keep society actively involved and connected during the whole process of this research project. We would like to discuss some experiences of both the WUR-science shop and the workshop participants in order to improve different approaches and methods. This is especially important in the context of RRI and for science shops willing to change.

Responsiveness of research is divided in three aspects of governance by Morten Velsing Nielsen: defining objectives, setting process requirements and understanding drivers. Link: https://academic.oup.com/spp/article/43/6/831/2525458

Following this line of thought, developing co-creative and scientific research projects, is overseeing a broad scope on the topic by involving different perspectives, including the field of view of friends and enemies. This can contribute to the ability to reflect and respond on changing circumstances in society. The involvement of stakeholders with every aspect of governance is required, in order to create relevant outcomes and more important relevant output.

It is essential to develop different ways and methods to include society in research projects. The objective of this workshop is to exchange and to inspire!

Keywords
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The stories of DIY Science Lab

Szász, Levente¹; Fuchs, Péter¹

¹DIY Science Lab, Budapest, Hungary

DIY Science Lab is a newly established grass root social innovation initiative to supports collaborative DIY/DIWO (do-it-yourself /do-it-with-others) research and RRI with and for local society in Hungary. It connects enterprises/organizations/citizen groups that have a specific problem with potential problem-solvers such as researchers or innovators. The Lab provides well-defined collaboration, co-design process of RRI research and innovation. Local communities, citizens, individual researchers and social SMEs do not have the competence or resources to drive the collaboration and innovation process themselves.

DIY Science Lab use and develop a wide range of methods and tools to stimulate creativity, facilitate co-creation, develop prototypes and solutions. It brings together academic researchers and community
practitioners to engage in experiments and in action design and prototyping. We provide experientially, the hands-on learning opportunity and meaningful experiences for participants to improve their skills and knowledge (technological knowledge, research literacy, business and community development skills and learning about social entrepreneurship) and they will understand how to make the innovation processes more responsible.

DIY Science Lab generates multiple layers of value and impacts. These impacts are coming from both by the activities of the Lab itself, such as new connections between participants and improved skills and knowledge on methods, but also by the participants as they form teams and start to research and reframe the systemic roots of problems. It enhances capacities of citizens to take part in the environmental and health monitoring and enable them the democratisation of innovation and data collection.

During the story telling session of LK8 we will give the real story of how DIY Science Lab is developing. We will share truthful experiences of covering the challenges we faced and our failures, as much as our successes.
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Attractive and Meaningful student involvement for NGO/Social Business projects
Szilas, Roland Ferenc¹
¹Corvinus Business School, Institute of Management, Budapest, Hungary

Attractive and Meaningful student involvement for NGO/Social Business projects
Background:
During the last five years in various courses at Corvinus University Budapest, Institute of Management, students have been regularly offered opportunities to participate in business projects with NGOs or Social Businesses. Our business degree students are especially concerned about gaining up-to-date and “marketable” competencies and knowledge during their studies and are often concerned about courses being too theoretical or difficult to apply in real business situations. For this reason, business projects are generally popular among university students, however, a few difficult challenges emerge in the development of attractive and meaningful NGO/Social Business projects. In this Problem Solving Session two challenges would be addressed: 1) Competitiveness of NGO/Social Business projects 2) Meaningfulness of NGO/Social Business projects
1. Competitiveness of NGO/Social Business projects against for-profit corporate projects

Business students are happy to get involved in business projects, at the same time most of them in Hungary are planning to start their careers in for-profit organizations and also find these corporations more professional and better places for acquiring up-to-date competencies and know-how. Projects offered by for-profit organizations are usually more attractive and preferred by our students compared to NGO/Social Business projects, that are often perceived as „nice to have” activities. The challenge is around developing NGO/Social Business projects for our students in which they also recognize a great opportunity for their professional development.

2. Meaningful NGO/Social Business projects for students

NGO/Social Business projects are usually very strong in their positive community impact, and students easily recognize the good purpose they are contributing to. At the same time, the project experience can turn out to be problematic mainly because of some common problems NGOs/Social Business are facing in Hungary:

- Some NGOs and Social Businesses are very organic and spontaneous organizations with less hierarchy and experience with rigorous project management, this makes it difficult to achieve in a student project a well-defined project outcome within 2-3 months.

- Other NGOs/Social Business have stronger competencies in project management, however, their resources are often very scarce and strictly connected to various EU and other government funds. The student contribution in these projects can turn out to be very bureaucratic and administrative, often just moderately meaningful because of the high uncertainty of the survival of project outcomes after EU/government funds run out.

The challenge is around developing NGO/Social Business projects that have a more professional project management structure and also successfully aim positive community impact beyond the period of EU/government funds.
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Knowledge for Change (K4C): reflections on a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers

Tremblay, Crystal

1University of Victoria, Department of Geography, Victoria, Canada
Knowledge for Change (K4C): reflections on a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers

Presentation by
Crystal Tremblay, University of Victoria

This presentation is conceived as a contribution to the proposed session titled “Knowledge for Change (K4C): a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers”.

Within the session, Crystal will present an overview of the K4C global initiative on behalf of the UNESCO Chair in Community-based Research. Crystal is a research director and Co-PI on this global initiative.

K4C is a project coordinated by the UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research & Social Responsibility in Higher Education, based on an agreement between University of Victoria (Canada) and PRIA - Participatory Research in Asia (Delhi, India).

It is an international partnered training initiative between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) & Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) from several countries (Canada, India, Brazil, Uganda, Indonesia, Ghana, South Africa and Europe) aimed at the co-creation of knowledge through collective action by academics and community groups working together in various training hubs around the world. Community-based research and training in the different hubs is focused on the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in order to systematically ensure the connection between local issues and global challenges, along with the necessary multidisciplinary approach.
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An institutional assessment of community engaged research and the UN Sustainable Development Goals

Tremblay, Crystal

1University of Victoria, Department of Geography, Victoria, Canada

The University of Victoria has a strong institutional commitment and support for Community-engaged Scholarship. Over the years there has been some mapping of these activities, however there has been no systematic analysis of the impacts of community-engaged research and learning or a comprehensive picture of the spectrum of community engaged activities across the campus. Of the hundreds of projects
and possibly thousands of community engagement activities, few have been the subjects of detailed examination. This presentation will report on a comprehensive impact assessment of community-engaged research activities across the campus between 2009-2015 using five indicators of impact. These indicators were chosen as they provide specific data of the impact of centrally funded structures, an overview of each academic unit using an Enhanced Planning Tool (EPT), and narratives of impact through case studies from community and academic partners using the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG) framework. The results point to a wide range and diversity of impact to society in almost all the UN goals, also documented at various levels (i.e. individual, community, systems). This work has informed peer-review criteria and an impact rubric to assess engaged research in reviewing grant applications, partnership proposals, and faculty merit, tenure and promotion. A similar methodological approach using the UNSDG’s has been used to assess the impact of the charitable non-profit sector in the Capital Regional District (CRD) and will also be discussed within a regional context.

Keywords
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Strategies and Challenges of Organizing Regional Engagement Networks

This convened roundtable discussion will address key questions of organizing regional multi-institution associations for community engagement, improved research governance, knowledge transfer, and community-based research: How can these smaller networks, while affordable and nimble with members sharing proximity, be most effective, with staff already overloaded in full time jobs and extra efforts unrecognized? How can they thrive given limited funding, and overcome logistical challenges of connecting across regional geographic boundaries? How can we problem-solve and collaborate, and facilitate exchange between network members? How can we make the most out of each network’s information to encourage global exchange? The roundtable will highlight what works and what challenges persist in building and maintaining regional associations/networks in brief presentations.
about our conveners’ successful strategies, followed by open discussion to learn from participants and problem-solve together.

The presenters’ representative networks offer a wide variety of models:

wissnet, an independent network of German speaking science shops, as well as another German State-organized network of university knowledge transfer units in Lower Saxony, both have regular meetings and joint projects on participatory research and knowledge exchange, and wissnet uses an online conferencing system.

- Sciences Citoyennes provides international spaces for sharing experiences and developing advocacy tools & co-constructed projects to strengthen interactions between science and society. These multi-stakeholder platforms bring together academics, CSOs, institutions and practitioners from many sectors to share views and pool resources.
- The U.S. Midwest Knowledge Mobilization Network (MKMN) hosts free annual workshops connected to existing regional conferences, webinar series to pare travel expenses, and shares model at national conferences.
- Canadian Community-Based Research Network is a grassroots; project-based association of researchers & CBR practitioners, works in association with Loka Institute (USA) and organizes international seminars.
- Linking us together globally, a very robust model for funding and cooperation strategies is the International Living Knowledge Network started in 2000 as part of the 5th Framework Programme of the European Commission, that led to seven reports and a scientific conference. EC-funded projects ISSNET, TRAMS, PERARES and EnRRICH followed, as well as 7 more LK conferences organized by network partners.

By sharing strategies and barriers of our collective networks, highlighting the nurturing aspects of banding together for encouragement in challenging political climates, and brainstorming in small groups with the knowledge of workshop participants, we seek to further our common goal of making mobilizing knowledge more efficient and impactful. Representatives of other formal or informal networks are especially invited to participate in this session to share and discuss and help outline what is needed in the future to further our collective work. The conveners will capture the discussion, collecting issues and key points. Through the Living Knowledge Network, conveners will make public the results of the discussion and next steps for collaborating to support our respective networks and potentially a global network of networks. Conveners: Beth Tryon, Howard Rosing, Norbert Steinhaus, Daniel Ludwig, Glen Millot, Khan Rahi.
During this presentation, we present the results of a community based project ‘Eigen regie en participatie’ (Self-management and participation). We will do this from two perspectives: (1) a project member will talk about the content and organisation of the project and (2) a researcher will present the (interim) results and the impact of the project.

What is the project about?

The multicultural women's centre Jasmijn in Groningen (NLD) observed that a large number of women living in Groningen are stressed, have physical complaints and that only a few of these women participate in community activities. Together with two independent trainers, a training is designed for these women aiming to enhance their self-management and participation. The design of the training allows for a train-the-trainer method, whereby the trained women will give the training to women in their own neighborhood. The project consist of three phases.

In phase 1, the group of women will attend a weekly (10 weeks) training focusing on mindfulness, body awareness and personal organizing skills. Women who want to be trained in a short version to train women themselves, continue the training in phase 2. Phase 2 lasts for 10 months, in which there is a monthly meeting where a topic from phase 1 is deepened. Also, women are taught to give some specific components of the training themselves. Interim they do homework assignments. In phase 3, the newly trained women will give the short version of the training to a group of women in their own neighborhood in pairs during 5 meetings in 5 weeks.

In May 2017, phase 1 started with a group of 21 women. There was a lot of enthusiasm for the training and therefor a waiting list was created. In total, 12 women continued to phase 2, which started in September 2017.
At the start of the training, all women have been asked to talk about their experiences at different times and ways during the project. 15 women gave their consent. Around the start of phase 1, the participating women have been interviewed about their motivation, about different domains of health and about their daily living situation. A similar interview is also done at the end of phase 1, where the women are asked if they could indicate changes in their health and daily life. First analyses show positive results. Especially in the area of ‘daily functioning’, the women indicate progress.

In phase 2, the participating women are also interviewed. These results will be presented at the Living Knowledge Conference.

Finally, halfway through phase 1, the women were given a probekit in which they could indicate in a creative way what made them feel good in their daily life. Working with the probekit was a successful addition to the content of the training and was greatly appreciated by the participating women.

The presentation will also include two perspectives on aspects that made the collaboration successful and the way in which the impact of the project has increased.
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Curricula design with an RRI orientation
Vargiu, Andrea¹; Tassone, Valentina²; Eppink, Hansje²

¹Università degli Studi di Sassari, Foist Laboratory for Social Policies and Learning Processes, Sassari, Italy; ²Wageningen University, Wageningen, Netherlands

How to best equip students, through higher education curricula design and pedagogy, to be and to become responsible researchers and innovators in a complex world? In the past couple of years, EnRRICH partners have addressed this question. Through an iterative and collaborative journey of reflection and action, through piloting activities, data collection and analysis, EnRRICH has developed a set of principles that can revitalize education and pedagogies from a RRI standpoint. During the presentation we will reveal those principles and highlight a few key lessons learned through the EnRRICH pilots. The first presentation of this session is especially targeted to educators interested in fostering a culture of responsibility in their higher educational practices.

Keywords
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Knowledge for Change (K4C): a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers

Tremblay, Crystal¹; Vargiu, Andrea²

¹University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada; ²Università degli Studi di Sassari, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sassari, Italy

Session conveners
Crystal Tremblay, University of Victoria (Canada)
Andrea Vargiu, Università di Sassari (Italy)

The session will introduce participants to an international project aimed at the training the next generations of Community-based researcher across the world, named Knowledge for Change: K4C.

K4C is a project coordinated by the UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research & Social Responsibility in Higher Education, based on an agreement between University of Victoria (Canada) and PRIA - Participatory Research in Asia (Delhi, India).

It is a training initiative between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) & Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) from several countries (Canada, India, Brazil, Uganda, Indonesia, Ghana, South Africa and Europe) aimed at the co-creation of knowledge through collective action by academics and community groups working together in various training hubs around the world. Community-based research (CBR) and training in the different hubs is focused on the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in order to systematically ensure the connection between local issues and global challenges, along with the necessary multidisciplinary approach.

K4C was developed on the basis of previous research led by the UNESCO Chair which showed that, despite high demand, formal, structured training opportunities are scarce; university training in CBR generally offers little practical exposure; and community training is often weak on reflection and theory.

The K4C Consortium is conceptualised to seek new ways of learning and creating conditions needed for innovative models of research and research training programs in CBR to flourish. It offers a variety of means to enhance individual and institutional research training capacities and support the transition of K4C trainees to the workplace in academic and non-academic settings.

It does so by means of a Mentorship Training Program (MTP) which is intended to support the creation of training hubs in various parts of the global South and the excluded North by developing research capacity in local languages using local learning materials. Training hubs thus develop local training based on common pedagogical principles, as well as a shared learning approach and practices.
K4C is based on five pedagogical principles grounded in theories of knowledge that recognize the value of linking community-based knowledge with academic knowledge, and relate to various practical aspects and dimensions involved in training community-based researchers within and outside academia. The principles are: orientation towards research ethics and values; deep understanding of power and partnerships; incorporation of multiple modes of enquiry; ensuring a balance between classroom and field; developing critical and reflexive researchers.

The session is conceived to allow for the different actors of the K4C "value chain" (Unesco Chair, Hub Coordinator, Supervisors and Mentors) to share their experience with participants also through comparisons with other collaborative teaching and learning experiences.

Presenters
Crystal Tremblay, University of Victoria (Canada). Research Director for the UNESCO Chair in CBR and Social Responsibility in Higher Education.
Andrea Vargiu and Mariantonietta Cocco, Università di Sassari (Italy). K4C Hub Coordinator and Mentors' Supervisors
Francesca Antongiovanni and Valentina Ghibellini, IntHum and Foist Laboratory for Social Policies and Learning Processes (Italy), K4C Mentors
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Knowledge for Change (K4C): reflections on a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers
Cocco, Mariantonietta¹; Vargiu, Andrea¹
¹Università degli Studi di Sassari, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sassari, Italy

This presentation is conceived as a contribution to the proposed session titled "Knowledge for Change (K4C): a global project to train the next generations of community-based researchers".

Within the session, Mariantonietta and Andrea will present and discuss their experience within the K4C project respectively as mentor's supervisors and training hub coordinator.

K4C is a project coordinated by the UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research & Social Responsibility in Higher Education, based on an agreement between University of Victoria (Canada) and PRIA - Participatory Research in Asia (Delhi, India).
It is an international partnered training initiative between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) & Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) from several countries (Canada, India, Brazil, Uganda, Indonesia, Ghana, South Africa and Europe) aimed at the co-creation of knowledge through collective action by academics and community groups working together in various training hubs around the world. Community-based research and training in the different hubs is focused on the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in order to systematically ensure the connection between local issues and global challenges, along with the necessary multidiciplinary approach.
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Loneliness and social network among elderly people living in an area of population decline in the Netherlands
Veldman, Karin¹

¹University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Health Sciences, Groningen, Netherlands

During the presentation we will present the results of a study among elderly people living in a small village in the Netherlands. The research question came from the foundation You & Co. You & Co organizes projects for people who want to improve their living environment. You & Co learned that more and more elderly people experience feelings of loneliness and become inactive (i.e., they hardly participate in society), especially in areas of population decline. Previous research has shown that older adults keep living in areas of population decline in the province of Groningen, while young people leave the region. Many residential care homes have to close, as policies stimulate living at home as long as possible, and more older adults age in their own homes. For some elderly people, this results in feelings of loneliness.

Although several initiatives have been established to improve the liveability of areas of population decline for older adults, there are older adults who refrain from participating in these initiatives. Therefore, You & Co wanted to pair ‘invisible’ older adults with ‘active’ older adults. When older adults support each other, the ultimate goal can be achieved of a society in which all older adults participate and are visible. In order to reach this goal, You & Co wanted to obtain more knowledge on the target group of older adults in areas of population decline in the province of Groningen. In collaboration with the Science Shop Medicine & Public Health, a mixed-method research was performed to examine the
concept of loneliness and to describe the need and content of the social network of elderly people living in a small village, named Garmerwolde.

In total, 52 elderly residents of Garmerwolde filled out a questionnaire about loneliness and their social network. Next, in-depth interviews were held with four participants who had a high score on the loneliness scale. The interviews covered the daily activities and social networks, living situation in Garmerwolde and the perception of loneliness.

The findings of the present study showed that loneliness is experienced when there is a lack of meaningful relations with the social or natural environment. To build these meaningful relations, three conditions should be complied to: the actors involved should all be motivated to have contact, have some joint interests, and be equal to each other.

For You & Co the results were very valuable, as it improved the understanding of the concept of loneliness. The study showed that there is still a taboo around loneliness. Approaching inactive elderly must be done carefully, as people do not want to be stigmatized as lonely. Furthermore, the results showed that active elderly can also experience feelings of loneliness, even though they are socially active.
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New forms of value creation and the transformational dynamism of civil society organizations

Veress, József

Corvinus University, Information systems, Budapest, Hungary

The civil society and its organizations possess transformational dynamism which - somewhat paradoxically - provides the capacity to facilitate social sustainability in long term by facilitating to reshape the interplay among the societal macro-sectors. The civil society and its organizations are frequently seen as domains of twofold social innovation. Namely, these are private organizations which nevertheless serve public aims through the members’ voluntary interactions (Salamon et al. 2003; Anheier 2004). Additionally, they bring about cooperation into competitive environments (Benkler 2011; Nowak 2006). The current working paper argues that these innovative features are linked with the civil society organizations’ transformational dynamism that feeds back with specific characteristics and growing effectiveness of collective resourcing. Such enhanced effectiveness of resource enactment
interplays with evolutionary changes driven by “natural cooperation” (Nowak, 2006) that enables to unleash “cooperation trap” (Csányi 1989).

By contrast the market sector generates competition interlinked with colliding, conflicting and confrontational relational dynamism. It also creates increasing institutional isomorphic pressures (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) that feedback with robust marketization trends which affect both the civil society and the public sphere. The civil society exhibits two well distinguishable approaches as response to such pressures. Part of its organizations due to growing dependence on funding through private and public funds and grants “…arguably offers a mirror image to the for-profit mode of operating” (Bauwens and Kostakis, 2017c). However, the civil society organizations can and do exhibit conscious and effective opposition to such market-driven isomorphic institutional pressures. Moreover, since their dynamism has transformational character and capacity the civil society entities can generate association-prone isomorphic tendencies, promote cooperation and sharing even in environments characterized by competitive tendencies - as empirical data indicates (Veress 2016). The current work uses Responsible Research and Innovation to explore sources, mechanisms, and outcomes of the civil society organizations’ cooperative transformational dynamism and analyses how it creates their capability to generate change - carry out social agency. It also aims to facilitate the transformation of the findings into curricula.
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Participative research, ethics and students’ training, what’s on the menu at the University of Lyon?

Verzola, Amalia¹

¹University of Lyon, Lyon, France

University of Lyon would like to present a poster focusing on the relevance of students’ training in the context of our Science Shop.

More specifically, we will present in a catchy and synthetic manner the main features of the training that we propose every year to students who take part in our Science Shops’ projects. The purpose of our training is sensitize students and prepare them to the challenges of participatory research. In this respect, we would like to present to the public the features of our training sessions but at the same time explain how this training is going to be changed to become more ethics-sensitive.
We will try to raise awareness on the fact that answering to social demand in the context of a Science Shop needs to take into account in a more targeted way the issues that students could encounter all along their traineeship. Conducting research which is driven by social demand means that we need to problematize also ethical approach. A training conceived specifically for PhD students and shedding light on ethics has already been developed from University of Lyon (moreover, now this type of training is compulsory by law). At present we are also working on a MOOC on this topic, and we are thinking about developing a mini-MOOC for M2 students as well. In fact, during their traineeships, students could be confronted with ethics-centred issues. It is thus important for them to acknowledge that responding to societal questions implies at the same time being conscious that ethical questions could arise. The student needs to be attentive to this specific perspective, and our mission is to make them aware of this concrete possibility.

Regarding the form of our proposal, we would like to work on a poster, because it represents a way to shed light on a topic in a clear and concise manner. The public can decide when to have a look at the poster and at the same time share impressions and suggestions with us.

With respect to the collaborative features of our submission, we would like to underline that Science Shop’s team as a whole will participate to the drafting of the content of the poster as well as to its overall layout design and implementation. Moreover, another form of interaction should be considered, which relies especially on the possibility of soliciting the public and engaging with participants. Our mail address will be marked on the poster, in order to share expertise, collect ideas and nurture the discussion also outside of the framework of the LK Conference. Furthermore, it would be interesting to make our poster available to participants on a collaborative platform which could for instance collect all the posters proposed, and in different sections according to the themes (this could permit to continue exchanging on the topic).

The expected impact of the proposal is on the one hand raising awareness on the topic of ethics within students’ training and providing ideas, on the other hand nurturing the discussion and enriching our practices, which are not crystallized but of course open to solicitations. In this respect the poster is not a point of arrival but instead a starting point for further discussions. We would also like to underline that the Sciences and Society department of University of Lyon is involved in three EU projects (NUCLEUS, EnRRICH, InSPIRES).
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RRI and civil society, rethinking the image of researcher

Verzola, Amalia

1University of Lyon, Lyon, France

Lyon’s Science Shop was launched in 2013. Since then, many projects have been running, with the aim of bringing research closer to society and exploring their mutual responsiveness. As a corollary, a constellation of initiatives boosting the involvement of civil society in our actions has been implemented. Amongst them, the digital platform Pop’ Sciences and its online magazine, as well as a series of events targeting local actors and boosting strategic partnerships. Some of these are itinerant, such as for instance our Science Shop exhibition, whose purpose is presenting the outcomes of our research projects while melting with society, and nurturing the discussion about the responsibility of researcher as well.

Moreover, the University of Lyon is at present engaged in the implementation of a Social Innovation Lab, whose objective is catalyzing ongoing debates on research, innovation and civil society.

IMPORTANT:
This proposal is part of the Full Proposal called ‘A Nuclei of Citizen Science’, for the Horizon 2020 funded project called NUCLEUS.
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Refugees and students: partners in study

Visser, Saskia J.; Post, Alies; Berghuis, Stephanie

1University of Groningen, Science Shop Language, Culture and Communication, Groningen, Netherlands

Combining language learning and research

In all our Science Shop projects we start with a question from a community in which research can help to provide an answer. In this case, a group of refugees with a medical profession and their voluntary mentor from the Welfare Organisation Humanitas asked for help on how to learn Dutch as effectively as possible. Three Ma-students of Applied Linguistics and the University Language Center were keen to participate.
In this 10 week project mutual benefits were ensured by explicitly discussing the needs, experience and knowledge of everyone involved. From the start it was clear that everyone played several roles and was learning themselves (refugees learning Dutch, students learning to teach and researching aspects of the process of language learning) and assisting others to learn (refugees by sharing their knowledge and experiences, students by setting up lessons). Through this form expectations were managed, it built trust and enhanced the level of participation. All questions and needs could be freely expressed and favors could be returned easily.

The mutual learning also took place with the voluntary mentors. In a discussion session they learned about to the role of motivation, feedback and language anxiety in effective language learning as a response to their questions. But they also contributed to the research by sharing their experiences and critically shaping the research agenda e.g. by advocating the needs of refugees with low-literacy in language learning.

In the poster we will share our experience with the process, but also our practical results on how to learn a language effectively by overcoming language anxiety, keeping up the motivation to learn and making good use of feedback.

(Poster might be presented by involved students: Stephanie Berghuis, Alies Post, Kristy Kuik)
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Delphi Study on New Science Shop Models involving RRI, CBPR (Community Based Participatory Research) and Open Science - Join the fourth Live and interactive Delphi round
Vogels, Floor1; Muftugil-Yalcin, Seda1; Zweekhorst, Marjolein1; Muniz Pereira Urias, Eduardo1
1VU Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

InSPIRES is an EU project that brings together practitioners and experts from across and beyond Europe to co-design, jointly pilot, refine and implement innovative models for Science Shops. The main goal of the 4-year InSPIRES project is to build effective cooperation between science and society by supporting the growth of Science Shops and enabling the expansion of responsible research and innovation (RRI) in Europe and abroad, in order to tackle key societal challenges that affect the world population. As an InSPIRES partner, the team of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam is leading the process of co-developing process (elements) and methodologies to co-create the new Science Shop model.
Using principles of RRI, OSc and CBPR in relation to Science Shops is a challenging endeavor, since these concepts are in themselves open to inquiry and deliberation. There is not one clear vision on how the principles of RRI, OSc and CBPR could be utilized in the Science Shop context. To be able to have a common conceptualization of these terms and their possible contribution to (the development of) the new model, we have carried out a Delphi study.

The aim of this Delphi study was to assess what each partner thought the elements and components of the new Science Shop model should be and to what extent this will have effect on the three Science Shop conditions (Organization, Educational & Training needs and Execution of (research) projects). Up to January 2018 we have carried out the first round of Delphi study with our project partners from 6 institutes in 5 countries. In the second and third round of the Delphi we will use the results of the previous rounds and go one step deeper at the time, by adapting the statements with the partners ideas and suggestions. Again we will ask the partners to indicate to what extent they agree or not. The aim is to reach a step-by-step and deliberative consensus on which elements should or should not be part of the new Science Shop model.

During the LK18 conference we would like to benefit from the expertise of the conference visitors (Science Shop experts of the Living Knowledge Network) by conducting the fourth Delphi round in a live and interactive session. In the proposed workshop we plan to first explain the method and the aim of the Delphi and then present our (preliminary) results. After this 15 minute presentation we would like to invite the audience to join our live and interactive fourth Delphi round. We plan to divide the audience over three tables which represent the frameworks of RRI, CBPR and OSc. The audience can pick a table of preference to discuss the (preliminary) conceptualization of the new Science Shop model based on the chosen framework. The aim of this fourth Delphi round is to get feedback on the elements which should or should not be encompassed in our final conceptualization of the new Science Shop model. We would like to hear and learn from other (expert) perspectives on the new model, which will be taken into account while refining the new Science Shop model.

In addition, during the Delphi process we learned from our partners that the Delphi in itself is already an interesting, inspiring and rich exercise which gives a solid basis for more fruitful discussions among all involved partners and (social) actors. We would like to share this experience with our audience and hopefully inspire more conference visitors to share their visions and ideas with us and each other.
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Exploring a new approach in integrating society in research and innovation: A CSO recommendations case analysis

Wakunuma, Kutoma¹

¹DeMontfort University, Centre for Computing and Social Responsibility, Leicester, United Kingdom

For a long time, scientists have been in the forefront in shaping and determining the course of scientific research and innovation. By so doing they have influenced how science should be received and used by society. This has meant that society has had little to no say in determining how scientific research and innovation impacts society as a whole. As a result, research and innovation meant for the public good has been left unchecked and unchallenged by most of society because the research agendas along with research processes and outcomes have been the preserve of scientific experts. However, the status quo is changing as demand for scientific transparency and accountability is growing. For instance, the European Commission’s (EU) initiative on Horizon 2020 with specific focus on RRI as well as its recent call for citizen science and openness is one such example where there is a push for the integration of society as a whole to play an integral part in science (European Commission, 2017). This then eliminates questions of the legitimacy of experts as working together creates a level of transparency and accountability between society and scientists. Despite calls for societal integration such as demonstrated by the EU’s RRI or open science initiatives, such calls are not a new thing as vast amounts of literature show us that there has in the past been similar frameworks in the form of public engagement (Rask, 2012; Hennen & Pfersdorf, 2014), other frameworks such as participatory action research (Whyte, 1991), Social Inclusion (Warschauer, 2004) among others calling for much similar things. However, one particular area that fits well with the current call for societal integration in science and with science is that of Civil Society Organisation (CSOs) participation in research and innovation (European Commission, 2017). CSOs are seen to represent public interest in areas such as climate change (Council of the European Union, 2010); disseminators of research (revel) or are able to help with transparency and accountability (Tsipouri, 2012). It however remains unclear how CSOs can be effectively integrated in research and innovation. One crucial hindrance is the fact that there are no clear methodologies on how this might work. This is where this proposal aims to make an important contribution. The proposal will focus on analysing recommendations from funders, policy makers, researchers and CSOs themselves as a starting point in developing a methodology for the effective participation of CSOs in research and innovation. The recommendations were collected during the running of an EU funded project called CONSIDER (Civil Society Organisations in Designing Research Governance) which involved data collection from the four stakeholder groups. Although CSOs are seen as an important player in research and innovation, their role is not as clearly defined as the other three
stakeholder groups. For instance, funders often lead the way in the funding of innovative projects and therefore set the research agenda while policy-makers are often involved in outlining policies for areas of research and innovation in addition to funding. Researchers on the other hand take the role of research scientific experts. Therefore, recommendations from the four stakeholders will prove valuable in understanding where the stakeholders see the role of CSOs in research and innovation.
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Research as social innovation – exploring and mapping alternative modes of research

Wittmayer, Julia

Erasmus University Rotterdam, DRIFT, Rotterdam, Netherlands

This workshop takes a social innovation perspective on research. This means, it starts from the assumption that the alternative modes of research that are at the heart of this Living Knowledge Conference (such as science shops, participatory action research, transdisciplinary research or citizen science) are social innovations. They are thus understood as innovations that change social relations. The aim of the workshop is to share experiences with different research approaches and to reflect on their societal impact. It does so by mapping the diversity of these different approaches and critically interrogate them along a number of questions, such as:

- Which social relations do these research approaches change? In which ways?
- What are the different roles in these research approaches? To which extent are they different from the roles in ‘usual’ research settings?
- In how far are these alternative research approaches transformative? Thus in how far are these challenging, altering or replacing ‘traditional’ or ‘usual’ ways of doing research and science?
- Is it desirable to upscale or mainstream these research approaches?

These are big questions and in order to allow for meaningful discussions, the workshop will take the following format. We start with a short round of taking stock of the research approaches that are known to participants (specifically those they have experience with). Depending on the size of the audience, either work in a plenary setting or make smaller groups. Using a questionnaire to structure, large flipovers/post-its/markers for visualization and based on their actual experience with these approaches, workshop participants discuss how the research approach in question did challenge the dominant
understanding of the ‘science-society-interface’, how it changed/changes (or not) the relation between ‘researcher’ and ‘practitioner’, and if it let to the invention of new roles. We take time to share our results and discuss the transformative potential of these different approaches while critically reflecting on their position vis-à-vis other forms of scientific activity. The outcome should be a visual overview of different approaches for research and their transformative potential.

After the conference, this outcome will be shared via the website of the Social Innovation Community (siceurope.eu) to show the diversity of academia-led innovation.
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Climate Justice: What Strategies Can Improve Its Practical Impact?
Worthington, Rick¹
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This research presentation makes an argument and identifies a challenge. The argument is that in addition to addressing fairness, climate justice matters because it will be impossible to respond effectively to climate change in the absence of equitable and inclusive policies and processes. The challenge is that existing and envisioned climate policies rely increasingly on social innovation and cooperation, yet innovations in equitable and inclusive policies and processes have had little effect to date. The research supporting this presentation includes review of primary documents, grey literature and research literature on the history and policies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and of sub-national climate policies (focused on California); interviews of policy makers, experts and advocates in the climate policy arena; participation in the organization and evaluation of three global citizen deliberations on climate change and biodiversity; cooperative research with environmental justice organizations; and a case study of an innovative climate justice project. The goal of the presentation is to generate a discussion that refines our understanding of innovations in climate change governance, and that identifies next steps for research and strategies that can address the climate justice challenge.
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A NATIONAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT METRICS FRAMEWORK: CAMPUS ENGAGE IRELAND
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Campus Engage is an Irish Network promoting civic and community engagement in higher education. Similar networks exist around the world: Campus Compact (USA), National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (UK), Service Learning Network South America, and Engagement Australia. While there are variations in the focus and scope of these networks, they have a common interest in promoting connections between higher education institutions and their communities for mutual and reciprocal benefit.

Through Campus Engage, the seven universities of the Irish Republic and Dublin Institute of Technology, collaborate to work on four main strands of activity: community based learning, engaged research for societal impact, student volunteering, and metrics and evaluation.

This presentation will focus on the work of the Campus Engage Metrics and Evaluation National Working Group which has developed a National Framework for measuring community engagement activities across campuses. Campus Engage recognises that to give greater visibility to community engagement, and infuse an ethos of societal engagement across institutions, this work needs to be defined, recognised, and celebrated.

As institutions grappled with how to map, measure and report on the expanding variety of community and public engagement activities, the Irish national working group carried out a review of international research and looked to other measurement frameworks (e.g., National Co-ordination Centre for Public Engagement (UK) EDGE Tool, and Carnegie Community Engagement Classification) to inform discussions. The work of the group has been collaborative and iterative, with materials proposed, discussed, revised, edited, and reviewed to produce a nationally consulted upon and informed ‘Metrics Framework’ that fits with the Irish community engagement context and narrative, but which also has application for other institutions and higher education systems globally.

To develop the Metrics Framework, certain philosophical, definitional, procedural, and methodological issues and challenges had to be addressed. Debating these issues through the Campus Engage national community of practice was key to developing a consensus around how a metrics system could contribute to moving community engagement from a peripheral activity to a core university function. As the Framework was developed through an extended consultative process, Campus Engage can leverage this consensus to liaise with policy makers, representative governmental institutions, including the Higher Education Authority, Irish Research Council, and Science Foundation Ireland, where it has
been able to influence debates and persuade for the value of engaged scholarship, community partnerships for greater societal impact.

This joint presentation will outline the process of collaboration at Campus Engage and present the Metrics Framework.
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A Critical Examination of ABCD in Community – University Partnership Building
Zeigler, John1; Standberry-Wallace, Miranda2; Rosing, Howard B.3
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This workshop will discuss Asset-based Community Development (ABCD) as an approach to community engagement within the context of community-university partnerships. Established during the 1980s by two Northwestern University faculty, ABCD considers local assets as the primary building blocks of sustainable community development. In particular, practitioners build on skills of local residents, the power of local associations, and the supportive functions of local institutions in community development processes. Since the 1990s, DePaul University in Chicago has employed ABCD as a central approach in numerous research, capacity-building and curriculum-based community engagement efforts. In 2016, the ABCD Institute, relocated from Northwestern to DePaul further extending ABCD as an approach in community-university partnerships.

The presenters are both directors at DePaul’s primary community engagement unit, the Steans Center, which also houses the ABCD Institute. The Center focuses on engaging faculty and students with communities through service learning, community-based research, training, evaluation, and capacity-building projects. The workshop will begin by employing the use of storytelling to provide an overview of ABCD as an approach to forging community partnerships. Presenters will offer stories of past projects that illustrate the challenges of working with faculty and students who are accustom to more deficit-based approaches to community engagement, how ABCD has been adopted by community partners in Chicago, and ways in which community residents and other local groups have engaged in ABCD training and research to assist in achieving community-defined goals.
Subsequently, presenters will provide examples of funded capacity-building, service learning, and research projects that have integrated ABCD verses more conventional university engagement approaches that promotes research on what is wrong with/missing within communities. These examples explore how universities can utilize resources (financial, curricular, knowledge-producing) to organize community residents to build long-term relationships with one another and local associations and institutions, including schools, parks and the police, and to work on projects that solve neighborhood challenges. Examples include ways in which community members utilize students—through curriculum—to engage in service learning projects that support both the illumination and building of neighborhood and community assets. Specific attention is paid to how ABCD can be complicated by the complexities of community histories and racial segregation and economic distress.

The final segment presents examples of how ABCD has been used for decades across a variety of international spaces, illustrating the malleability of the approach within differing political, economic and cultural contexts. And at the end of the segment, presenters will engage with attendees to solicit whether or how ABCD has been employed by others in diverse contexts.

The workshop will conclude with dissemination of a list of ABCD resources including community-building workbooks, published scholarly articles, books, and training curricula. These includes materials that offer community stories where ABCD has been effectively utilized to create positive neighborhood change as well examples of asset-mapping tools that community groups and universities can use to engage others in asset-based community development work.
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Experience of a Pro Bono Project, integrated into a CSR course
Zsóka, Ágnes

Corvinus University of Budapest, Department of Marketing, Budapest, Hungary

The proposal is based on the story of engaging business students into a project which is focusing on cooperation with the civil society. The Pro Bono project was run during the winter semester of 2017, at Corvinus University of Budapest, integrated into the master course „Corporate sustainability and CSR“. The main contribution of the submission to the conference lies in its feature to provide a real case as well as evaluation criteria to the assessment of impacts in science-community partnerships, specifically
focused on collaboration, knowledge-sharing and helping the civil society with business approach for higher efficiency of operation.

The selected format of storytelling serves my aim of contribution, as I would like to share with the conference audience my experience as teacher and academic supervisor of the Pro Bono project participants. In the project, business students played the role of consultants – continuously supported by a consultancy company (PWC) – where their task was to evaluate the overall situation, current challenges and future opportunities, related to the operation of the civil organisation called Symbiosis Foundation. Students worked in two teams, on different operational areas of the Foundation – including a Restaurant and a Farm, run partly by people with disabilities.

Within the course, students had to elaborate an assignment, consisting of a team presentation and a reflection paper. The presentation included following aspects:

- Presenting the analysis they carried out (financial and non-financial criteria, benchmarking, performance analysis, potential ways of improvement, marketing plan, cost-benefit analysis, etc.) and the outcome of the project.
- Evaluating the results by providing a SWOT analysis regarding the implementation of their suggested solution to the problem statement.
- Setting up KPIs for performance evaluation of the activities of the Restaurant and the Farm, including KPIs which are related to responsibility and sustainability.
- Exploring the perception of the society regarding the “business model” and “value creation” of the Foundation. Suggestions to increase visibility and acceptance.
- Discussing the expected impacts of a successful implementation of the project, from business and social points of view. Considering possible trade-offs between economic and social goals as well as outcomes, related to the project.
- Formulating suggestions for the civil organisation to demolish possible barriers to long-term success and proposing ways of future collaboration between such organisations like the Symbiosis Foundation and the society (including consultancy companies, the local community, individuals, students, scholars etc.).

The detailed reflection paper (5-6 pages) reported to the problem statement, target setting, the process itself, communication with the civil organisation (Symbiosis Foundation) and the consultancy company (PWC), the different roles (with your role in focus), features of the workflow (how did you approach the issue and the whole project), main lessons, success factors and suggestions for future Pro Bono Projects, and takeaway.
The expected impact of the presented work is to gain better understanding of the inspiring features and the difficulties, resulting from an intensive collaboration between business students and civil organisations.
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STIs and HIV/AIDS Needs Assessment, VU University of Amsterdam
Zweekhorst, Marjolein¹; Vogels, Floor¹
¹Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Co-ResponsHiVility is a pilot programme of governance of R&I, which is focused on participatory R&I agenda setting on the prevention of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs). It is being developed through the creation of a platform or ecosystem where different interested stakeholders come together through an open, reflexive and inclusive process to explore R&I priorities. The project has an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach and comprises a wide range of academic disciplines and non-academic knowledge based on experience. The ecosystem gathers more than 670 social actors interested in the issue who represent different stakeholders: the research community, healthcare providers, civil society organizations, patients, policy makers and the education community (including master students and secondary school students and lecturers). To respond to the priorities identified with an RRI approach, the Lab offers RRI training to the master students and supervisors that are willing to work in the priorities together with other actors. The RRI training workshops have also been implemented through the projects RRI Tools and EnRRICH in different universities and RPO.
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