Welcome

Professor Lisa Roberts, Deputy Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation

- Focused on the breadth and depth of social sciences research and to highlight the impact of the Research University of Leeds does.
- Interdisciplinarity is the core strength of our research.
- Local and international challenges need interdisciplinarity research.
- Bringing different people together with different expertise is very much needed.
- There is a need to explore new ideas for the benefit of society.
- We prefer complex and challenging issues.
- Partnership, interdisciplinarity, and impact are key to our research.
- The budget is produced through open competition.
- Knowledge exchange, postgraduate research placements are done.
- Congratulations to all the achievements.

Introduction

Professor Jeremy Higham, Executive Dean for Education

- Knowledge is my favourite word as it does not distinguish between teaching and research, between a PhD student and a research team.
- Social sciences institute is all for the researchers and collaborate all the researchers across the university and connect communities.
- You build a bridge as much of the social sciences.
- What you can do is that you can do partnership among ideas, partnership among practice, and partnership among policy.
- It is also a time of celebration of ideas of working together between university and ESRC.
- There is a need to develop further partnerships with business and society.
- It’s time not only to celebrate us, our potential, but also new partnerships, new opportunities, and new ways forward with international collaborators.

Impact Showcase

Showcase I: Leeds Climate Commission

Professor Andy Gouldson, University of Leeds
Dr Tom Knowland, Leeds City Council
• The biggest themes in the social sciences is reuniting the relationship between government, business, and society.
• There is a recognition in the Council that climate change is a big issue.
• We are blessed to have experts from two big universities of Leeds.
• Informed by the work of the UK Committee on Climate Change, the Leeds Climate Commission is an independent voice in the city, bringing together key actors from across the city to guide and track transition towards a low carbon, climate resilient future to inform policies and shape the actions of local stakeholders and decision makers.
• 24 Commissioners and 40+ members drawn from across the public, private and third sectors.
• The aims are ambitious
  a. Create shared ownership, build a can-do culture, celebrate success
  b. Support robust decision-making
  c. Monitor progress towards carbon reduction targets
  d. Recommend actions to keep city on track.
  e. Monitor progress towards climate resilience
  f. Advise on climate-related risks and adaptation opportunities
  g. Foster collaboration, build shared capacities
  h. Act as a forum for the exchange of ideas, research findings, information and best practice
  i. Promote best practice in public engagement
• The structure is based on four working groups
  a. Low Carbon
  b. Climate Resilience
  c. Project Development and Finance (this is the most important group)
  d. Engagement and Communications
• We have also set up Leeds Climate Forum
• The whole process links back to the council’s democratic process.
• It’s also time to celebrate success, Leeds is a big city and there are interesting examples across the city that we have load on the website (www.candocities.org).
• Our international agenda has pace with international projects.

Conclusions
• Leeds Climate Commission can identify priority areas
• We need to start to deliver on some of the easier options
• But we also need to learn lessons and build capacities to do the harder things.
• Critically, it needs to develop real plans for funding and delivery.
• It can be the place where we learn from success stories to help to spread good practice and a ‘can-do’ spirit through the city.
• Significant potential for the approach to spread to other issues within Leeds (Infrastructure, Transport, Food, Culture) and to other cities.
Questions and Comments

Q. What are the practical issues about the partnership and also the challenges?
A. We spent few months developing ideas then we formally launched it in last September and we had lots of applications. Addressing climate change is difficult but if everyone comes to it by taking it a genuine challenge, as Leeds is a big city, then difference can be made. Within council, use us as a research opportunity to do something in Leeds. Council wants to be a good research partner for something if it makes a real change.

Q. What kind of changes you would like to bring about as climate change is a big idea?
A. About two hundred million of economically viable investment is possible in Leeds, we want collaboration with commercial sector. Climate change communication is what we want with third sector. For the city to be more confident, we want more on housing, energy efficiency than Brexit, globalisation and similar other matters.

Showcase II: Creating Impact through Animations with Safeguarding Messages for Children

Dr Hayley Davies, University of Leeds

- I have interest in children research especially with families and relationships
- Today I am going to discuss three projects namely
  1. Keeping Each Other Safe (London) 2010-2011
  3. Collaboration with Families Feeling Safe: Protective Behaviours Services

The second project was funded by Leeds Social Sciences Institute (LSSI).

Keeping Each Other Safe (1st Project)

Questions
- Children’s strategies in situations of bullying, domestic abuse, sexual abuse.
- Who do they think they can ask for help?
- What stops children asking for help?

Methods/sample
- Sensitive subject matter
- Vignettes (third party stories) and hypothetical questions.
- 20 children 8-10 years old interviewed in pairs

The Problems Identified
- Children are reluctant to disclose abuse (Davies, 2015; NSPCC, 2013; London et al., 2005).
- Limited strategies for abusive situations, particularly if perpetrators are known to or live in family homes (see also Goodman-Brown et al. 2003).
- Concern about not being believed/helped especially if abuse occurs at home (as in Butler and Williamson, 1994).
• Not sure who else to tell outside of the family in these situations.

These findings inspired me so we were interested in developing animations to teach children. The purpose of these animations was to improve upon, make struggle, and encourage children to talk about sensitive issues like domestic abuse (DA), child sexual abuse (CSA), and bullying.

Families Feeling Safe (FFS): Protective Behaviours Services
• Based in Hertfordshire
• Train 2000 safeguarding professionals each year (will be using animations in training).
• Work with large numbers of vulnerable families and children.
• http://familiesfeelingsafe.co.uk

UsingAnimations in Keeping Children Safe (Funded by LSSI)
• improve upon children’s understandings of their right to be, and feel safe;
• encourage children to consider a wide network of people (including professionals) who they could tell about a problem;
• Make suggestions for the words children could use to tell an adult about a problem.

The Award
• Hired a professional animator (Limehouse & Fettle) and produce three professional animations.
• Supported collaboration on script writing, and face-to-face meetings at various stages of animation development.
• Production of Creating Impact Through Animations, a guide for researchers using animations in disseminating research (Davies, 2017).
• Piloting of animations in Leeds schools and children found the animations really helpful.
• These animations are available freely and widely on youtube covering DA, CSA, and bullying.

Piloting with Children
• Two groups of children in two Leeds schools, aged 7-13
• Forty safeguarding professionals –Hertfordshire, FFS workshops.
• The videos focused on vocabulary for seeking help, Clear and memorable message, what to do and who to tell, Style and accessibility.

Piloting with professionals
• Engaging resources for children on DA and CSA
• Need for scaffolding supportive materials
• Materials would allow us to consider diversity issues - range of victims (boys too) & perpetrators (include older children as well as adults, women and men etc.)

Collaborating with external organisations:
• Shared philosophy (how we work with children; children as people with voice but also who are marginalised; children as rights holders).
• **Shared values** (that children should receive support/help, non-blaming approach).
• **Commitment to tackling abuse**

**Challenges in doing the Project**
• No prior experience of doing animation
• Worked with families feeling safe (familiesfeelingsafe.org.uk) but no idea whose intellectual property are the animations.

Many people would benefit from this in Leeds and across.

**Final Thoughts: Collaboration has offered**
• Insights into real life application of research.
• FFS additional evidence-base for professional practice
• Contribution to the development of safeguarding practice – with the use of engaging digital resources.

**Questions and Comments**
**Q.** How much impact it has created?
**A.** Knowing something is the first step. The videos are to give awareness. We can work with professionals to make it more valuable.

**Showcase III: The Petitions Committee: Developing a new style of public engagement**

**Professor Cristina Leston Bandeira**, University of Leeds
**Kate Anderson**, Petitions Committee, Houses of Parliament

• A Petition committee was setup in 2015
• There are many petition systems but this system has a committee with parliament.
• IAA Knowledge Exchange Fellowship: the purpose was to explore the issue that whether public engagement has an impact?
• One day a week, Oct 2016 – May 2017
• Shared a day with the Petitions Committee
• 55 Observations of private and public meetings, debates
• 16 interviews (staff, MPs and petitioners)
• e-petitions actual data
• Twitter data of 28 petitions debates
• The output was a report “An Evaluation of the UK Parliament’s E-Petitions System”. We had proposed thirty-nine recommendations in the report that committee had to discuss at the end of session.
• However, after one week, there was no committee as the Prime Minister announced elections. The report never discussed.
• Now, after election, there were new MPs, new committees, new people.
• However, staff was working through.
• There were issues with **ethics and trust**. We were quite careful and protective of data and petitioners.
• Working on this project also provided the opportunity to the staff to have an **outsider, expert perspective** that could give a different opinion of how to improve the system.
• A catalyst for change.
• Say the things that staff cannot say because of institutional politics.
• Credibility and influence.
• All 39 recommendations were fruitful.

**Impact Workshops**

**Workshop A: International Collaborations**

**Facilitators: Dr Ghazala Mir, Professor Mark Priestley, Professor Anna Lawson**

• GCRF funded project bringing together four countries from lower income group to assess how public services like health, education, police, and local government can become more inclusive from minority ethnic and religious background.
• The reason behind selection of this group is that in terms of economic growth, these communities are often left out.
• Despite rapid growth, there are widening inequalities in those contexts.
• Started looking out on these issues in Leeds with IAA funding. We set series of workshops with local authorities, police, educational and health practitioners, and NGOs just to know what they thought we should address in terms of research that could help address exclusion.
• For this particular project, we focused on UK, India, Kenya, Vietnam, and Nigeria as contexts to look out evidence of what has been tried, how impactful it has been, and what are the future research gaps.
• The main aim of this study is the future research of Gender that would influence future GCRF funding.
• **GCRF is Grand Challenges Research Fund** that UK government provides to lower middle-income countries through Research Council.
• We had multisector kind of meetings in Leeds to develop some ideas to be replicated in those countries.
• We held 24 workshops to find out what has been produced and also to explore future research strategies.
• We tried to find out drivers of exclusion at macro, meso (institutional), and micro (individual) level and found out that there are very few strategies used at three levels.
• We proposed strategies for inclusion at all three levels including financial assistance, participatory decision making, system reform at Macro level. Revise policies, managed care protocols at meso level and behaviour change training, health promotion, skill development at micro level.
• With international projects there is a particular challenge with the impact. As Impact translate easily into local and national contexts but it is harder internationally to specify the impact or changes.
• The purpose of this project is also to inform GCRF funding if we would be able to find that impact.
- The working is across different disciplines and also with academic and non-academic partners. Doing that internationally means three sets of different partners.
- Another project is disability
- When we start work on disability internationally, people are from quite different disciplines who are working on disability.
- We have worked in 35 countries but all in Europe.
- We were trying to construct an international network of partners to work in a unified way to look at assessment protocols that exists in public policy to decide who was disabled and who was not.
- There are differences at academic level that are actually problems at disciplinary base and also to know how it evolve in different countries is also part of the problem ontologically.
- We have worked under European Commission and had to mobilise all the countries so we had to look for experts that were not always available in academic institutions
- We engaged people from NGOs who were involved for translation into impacts.
- It took us almost 7 years to have a meeting to discuss the possibility of a shared European degree on disability.
- Mobilising the partners to set the agenda is really important.
- Impact translation is crucial as sometimes NGOs use our material for lobbying.
- European Union had to present its report to the United Nations on its progress on disability equality, we prepared the report.
- We used LSSI funding to bring partners together like Microsoft, Nokia, Samsung.
- We brought together academia, civil society, and industry together.
- There are excellent partnerships going on but the problem is that these are personally driven partnerships.
- There should be a core team so that if the leading person leave, it should not affect the project.
- Another project was done with NGOs working for disabled people. We provide them trainings on research proposals, research skills, methodology. It was a sort of capacity building.
- Many NGOs share that academics do not share the results of data that they collect. As NGOs had to go to governments with some statistics.

Workshop B: Coproduction and Partnership Working

**Facilitators: Professor Paul Chatterton, Professor Gary Dymski, Dr Gabriella Alberti**

**Introduction**

- Facilitators will be framing the discussion around coproduction and partnership working in order to stimulate a discussion.
- **Paul Chatterton**: what is the relationship between coproduction and impact? In our own disciplines and institutions, we are not leveraging the kinds of impacts we would like to see. The term coproduction – a popular one right now – is becoming overused, just like sustainability. But it is essentially about breaking down boundaries and looking for durable outcomes by sharing/creating knowledge together.
• Paul’s own experiences of coproduction have been around creating institutional thickness – he is interested in boundaries → there are four sectors to think about, which are academy/private/public/community + voluntary. There is an imbalance between those 4 and they are not working together in a balanced way. But they are all important for ensuring places can flourish. Questions to consider:
  o How do we bring the immense knowledge of the academy into place leadership and innovation?
  o Coproduction is a way to enable those voices to deliberate and communicate – to actively listen and generate different sorts of outputs. A way to tackle persistent wicked problems.
  o How do we unlock the potential of coproduction as both an approach and a set of tools, for identifying and working on those problems and the potential solutions?

• Gary Dymski: there is a need to emphasise why coproduction is important. We are in a post-crisis austerity environment – every sector is being squeezed and so no sector is able to achieve what it might have set out to do. Honesty and trust has to replace the inadequacy of resources. We need to talk to each other!

• We need to envisage a revolution in the way we live, the engineering/ecological solutions, entrepreneurship etc. We are looking at systems of systems; systemic innovation – a defining characteristic of University of Leeds. But that creates huge challenges of organisation. So to get started we need to learn how to exchange with each other and to make what is at stake real.

• Gabriella Alberti: how to bring people around the table in the context of austerity. Migrant Access Project is a good example of the need for coproduction. Its purpose is to alleviate the pressure of new migrants in Leeds and to support these migrants. There are ‘migrant community networkers’ who spread positive messages to communities. It’s about helping people to help themselves within the community. The role involves a lot of advocacy and signposting. This is something that statutory services haven’t been able to do but this sector has begun to fill the gap – it is important to continue building those relationships and to showcase the work they do. So far about 87 migrant community networkers have been trained in Leeds. The aim is for Leeds to be a welcoming and compassionate place – what does this actually mean? Event in Leeds Civic Hall showcased the work being done and was a way for senior leaders at the Council to understand its importance.

• Gabriella Alberti notes the impact that Brexit is likely to have on communities, on racial tensions, tensions over common resources etc. ‘Listening Laboratories Method’ is an approach to co-production that focuses on creating an understanding of different research agendas and most importantly of different concerns that people had about various issues. Topics were chosen to talk about in the listening laboratories – breaking the boundaries between different groups and services but also a way to produce knowledge together. Different people are experts of things like welfare reform, legal issues – from policy/institutional work but also from lived experience. It was important to organise the event with the migrant community – there were small but significant things to think about, like how do you decide what food to provide when bringing together different communities?
o **Synergy and flexibility**: if you want to do coproduction, this is fundamental for actually listening to each other.

o **Ethical use of resources**: it is difficult to liberate resources from the impact acceleration fund to actually pay for people – people end up working for free. Academics have a responsibility to ensure people are being rewarded for the work they are doing in these sorts of coproduction projects. This is necessary for building and maintaining trust.

Discussion

- **Alice Owen**: talked about a project which engaged with further education, building contractors and developers, to co-create the idea of what skills and curriculum we need for a particular industry in the city, with a view to being sensitive to the specifics of the city.
  - **What does Leeds need to become the physical embodiment of its aspirations? What’s the physical place we are trying to operate within?**

- Important to be clear about that shared idea – whether it’s about the sustainable city, compassionate city, learning city. Getting back to this core shared goal is important for beginning to cross those bridges. Impacts and outputs are a big part of what makes us successful as academics – there needs to be thought around how we value different ways of working and of producing knowledge.

- **Cristina Bandeira**: Doing good research: coproduction is about talking to the people affected by a particular issue – impact is a way of badging it but it should, at its core, be about doing good research and asking the right questions.

- **Building trust** – once it is established, the amount you can do is huge. Similarly, being flexible and adaptable is key. It’s about listening, having different session formats. It is useful to use different platforms that already exist (e.g. ESRC festival of social science) to organise something exciting, to enable community groups to think about how they can do what they want to do through that channel.

- **Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTPs)** – how can they be used to pay for someone, to support them in developing an organisation? Another example of platforms/shells that can be used for sharing ideas, asking questions.

- **Stephen Curry (Calder Valley Renaissance Project)**: Example of successful coproduction. There was a need/desire to understand the economic situation post-flooding in the Calder Valley. Emailed LUBS to ask for help, to help create an economic impact report to take to local authority/government. Had a response and struck up a partnership with Leeds University – it was valuable for the eventual outcome of a report that went to central government, which was praised.

*Where do ideas come from*

- **Question**: how is coproduction usually driven? Do universities go out seeking partnerships or do people come to them?

- **Answer** (Jo Cutter, Work and Employment Relations at Leeds University)
  - both – there are several ways that it has been done in Leeds – there is a need for the university to draw activities together in a more coherent way. To build trust and be flexible, there needs to be a better / more strategic / less serendipitous way for successful partnerships to be forged.
 Nick Plant: the university really wants people to come to them with a ‘real world problem’ but it is not always obvious who you might ask / whose door you should knock on. It’s about creating spaces people know they can go to, to talk to the right people to create these partnerships/coproduction projects. We need to communicate the success of projects, which justifies the university finding other sources of income for future coproduction.

- Different communities work in very different ways – there is a need for better cultural understanding between organisations.
- ‘True’ coproduction is a continuum.
- Poverty alleviation programme: the way people are working in decision making is random – sometimes it is better to start from ‘what do you want’ and then think about service provision areas. That way you can identify the people that make the decision in e.g. councils. Tracking local authority decision making processes – there has to be a process of linking up people involved with different stages – there has to be flexibility but we have to learn about effective collaboration through people’s experiences.
- Local authority perspective: difficulties with building relationships between external partners and the university – there is a clear need for better channels of communication and ways in to finding out who you should talk to. There are cultures that operate, a need for realism about what academics want (data for a research project etc.) all within the context of austerity and slashed budgets.
- Upskilling: supporting partners in thinking about ways to do things and enabling people to get skills in the process. Builds confidence and skills going forwards and eliminates the need for external support/financial resources in the future.
- Need to think about the differences between co-creation and co-production – thinking about what the questions are, versus the production of actual outcomes through collaborative practices.
- How do you evidence co-production? When working with very different organisations it can be challenging. Need to find useful metrics, a model or ways of understanding/capturing effectiveness of a process. The sustaining of a project is one thing, but the evidencing at the end is another – there are different demands, different needs, a diversity of voices. This has the potential to make a place that works – from a university to city scale. This idea of how to evidence is an important research gap.

Concluding Statements / Recommendations

- Coproduction with e.g. Parliament would be very different than working with a community organisation. Different sets of challenges, but it’s still about understanding the different cultures.
- Coproduction is an important tool for communicating with each other in the context of a rapidly changing planet.
- We all have to work together because it’s not going to work any other way!
- Mechanisms are being set up clearly – including the cities theme driven by Gary Dymski etc.
Workshop C: Sharing best practice of developing impactful research collaborations

Facilitators: Dr Helen Graham, DR Julia Martin-Ortega

Helen Graham suggests going around the table to introduce why each participant is interested in impact and use each person’s experience to see of what made each case impactful.

Introductions

Mark Crowe – works for DISC as a research and evaluation officer on a lottery-funded project. Works with excluded people who are likely to experience offending, homelessness. The project is heavily evaluated. Part of the reason he is interested in impact is measuring it while carrying out the project to make sure that it is in fact influential. A challenge is to influence a world where things are constantly influenced by a number of factors.

James Simpson – part of the School of Education. Most of his work focusses on language education. A lot of his work has been done in language learning contexts and he is chair of an organisation called MESH (Migrant English Support Hub) whose main activity is to organise a website to connect providers of opportunities to learn English for new arrivals in the city. He is hoping to get new ideas on impact during this workshop. He has never had Leeds funding for MESH but hoping to embed an IAA activity. He also works on the TLang project, focussing on urban multilingualism. He is in the late stages of developing a bid to ESRC to work with partners in Yorkshire and rural areas. Impact is written into the project.

Richard Sherburn – works for Leeds and York Partnership NHS Foundation Trust

Catherine Dillon – works at Upper Calder Valley Renaissance. Collaborator in heritage science project.

Colin Webster – works at Leeds Beckett University on criminality and drugs in Bradford. He is also a coordinator of impact case studies for REF

Helen Pickard – she is a research development manager in environment and social sciences. She helps support academics in terms of strategic direction and ESRC funding. She is interested in impact because research councils are interested in impact and in her personal experience, applications are more likely to be funded if they do embed research impact from the very start. She wishes to find out more about how to help academics write about impact

Richard Norton – works at Voluntary Action Leeds. In his organisation, they have contacts with organisations in the city working in very different activities, different fields

Fiona Phillip – works as impact support officer in the School of Philosophy.

Sarah Howson – works at the University of Sheffield as IAA account manager.
Julia Martin Ortega – is an environmental economist in water systems, focussed on trying to see how environmental changes have economic consequences. Impact is very natural to the very nature of her work. Excited about interest and funding

Jill – works as Senior Lecturer in Law and Lead for Law Apprenticeships at Sheffield Hallam.

Alyson Brody – is a freelance gender consultant on programmes aimed to achieve gender-sensitive practices. She has been part of an organising team for online discussion that received IAA funding.

Julia Martin Ortega: my project is about the benefits of peatlands restoration. There has recently been much interest in terms of policy on restoring them so my research was trying to understand whether there was public support on this restoration that no one traditionally cared about. It was mainly focussed on Scotland with the Scottish Natural Heritage. Impact for us consists of the fact that they are now using our results to support restoration and managed to secure funding from government. The manager of the restoration says that research has changed the way they look at public support, so we need to either get the support or do what people support. I have also recently been contacted by the government of Iceland to translate our report for them. There are the ramifications to our work: other organisations have taken and used our results. Reason why we managed to get impact: we genuinely responded to a real policy need. We went to events and realised it was only conservation and environment experts there, we were the only environmental economists. We engaged from the beginning with the Scottish Natural Heritage and asked them what they needed. It was almost impossible to produce something useless. We designed our own research process so that it was part of the outcome we were looking for. The methodology was not oriented to get us papers. In journals, they want methodological sophistication, but we made an effort to write the paper but also an accessible report. IAA helped so much because it gave us flexibility to do that. We could hire a research assistant.

Helen Graham: my background is in museums. I work with participatory action research approaches. The IAA grant paid for our collaboration with the York council. In my research, we had people working in different fields collaborating to design the research with people who had a stake in it. Different perspectives are part of the work. There should be links to a theorisation of what makes impact: when paradigm changes. We use action and do things together so it’s experimental. Impact is living, dynamic and social. It means working across boundaries including people working in communities. We tried to be transparent about research process and used open tagging, Flicker tags. Change is unfolding through research. Now, shall we see if we have questions to each other and develop our agenda based on this?

Alyson Brody: what do we mean by impact? We are reluctant to attribute what we’ve done to ever-lasting or huge change, but that is the way it is commonly used as

Helen Pickard: things academics struggle with: 1) how they connect with the right people, how to find the right people to work with because they don’t know they exist; 2) scaling up of impact and 3) how you measure it. In bids, academics should describe how to measure it
Mark Crowe: it is hard to measure because we work on a population base of about 750 people. Everyone has an individual journey and we can measure that but how can you aggregate that?

Julia Martin Ortega: it’s not only hard to measure, it can also be damaging to obsess with it. I see impact naturally in my work and that is where I get my satisfaction.

Helen Graham: how we conceptualise it

Alyson Brody: the problem in my field is that funding is only subject to the achievement of results.

Julia Martin Ortega: an element of it is good because they make us think, but without going too far

Helen Graham: (briefly explains REF)

Mark Crowe: these things are outside the pursuit of knowledge. Impact is compromised in that perspective. Working with drug users, offenders etc., the system they’re in is covered by the criminal code and welfare system failures in social services and so on. So trying to measure the impact on people is not that effective in this sense. So getting a theory of that in a complex world is what I am interested in

Helen Pickard: REF puts pressure on academics to think about it. I read applications for funding that say the project will have impact and they will give a workshop at the end of the project. It is not enough, and I see a barrier because academics who work in local community groups want to have impact on relevant issues to them, but to get the funding, you need generalisable impact

Mark Crowe: I take issue with best practice because something works contingently, not because you can generalise it

Alyson Brody: we should also be brave enough to share what didn’t work, and when we talk about vulnerable people, this is even more important.

Julia Martin Ortega: also, as much as they say that we as academics should leave our ivory towers, it is interesting to notice how some non-academics sometimes do not want to work with academics. They don’t have time and they’re under pressure, when we talk about public bodies

Mark Crowe: We’ve had a couple of cases with impact with 2\textsuperscript{nd} year social science students. Reasonably easy to manage and supported by people based in the city council. PG research placement: good work was done there. We have to procure an external evaluation partner for our 6-year project but we only got one academic applicant. It has also become harder than it was to have access to academics and to academic papers. You struggle to find out who in which university is doing what.
Helen Graham: I think it’s harder to find people like you. We have individual profiles on the website and our publications are indexed.

Helen Pickard: however, staff profiles are outdated, especially those of senior staff. Also, they tend to be written in inaccessible academic language. Especially in the social sciences, the language used is difficult for non-academics.

Julia Martin Ortega: the themes in the university can help. I am part of Water@leeds and it works really well. Anyone who needs a water person can find me. Maybe developing themes can help.

Colin Webster: another issue: in smaller countries, in Scotland...

Julia Martin Ortega: I worked 5 years in Scotland and here in English it’s so big. I was one of the main authors there, every workshop was done by the same people. I replicate the Scottish element in Yorkshire with local agencies.

Helen Pickard: I am jealous of Cardiff University because they are always in contact with the Welsh parliament.

Julia Martin Ortega: transparency is important but puts researchers at risk because they can get feedback from people about things which are out of scope of the project because of lack of money.

Helen Pickard: Funders recognise that we are regularly given more money now than ever before. I think there’s more money out than there ever was. We get given money that needs to be used in little time with specific purposes, which is very difficult to manage although it may sound great.

Alyson Brody: it is cheaper to have an online discussion but it requires management. If people are in different areas it can be useful.

Workshop D: Creating impact through PGR placements

Facilitators: Mr Sherif Youssef, Mr Jeroen Bastiaanssen

Sherif Youssef, Sociology and LUBS
Working in sociology and business school on a PhD on entrepreneurship, Youssef initially wanted to explore the city council and entrepreneurship in Leeds, particularly the mechanisms for support for entrepreneurship. Found a key contact – Simon Brereton who gave Youssef access to a dataset about start-ups in the Yorkshire 2008-16. Youssef started to analyse the data of highly deprived areas in Leeds. Looking at questions such as – how do you define ‘start up’? The PGR placement has allowed Youssef to understand what is behind the policy and how to negotiate, and also how to get stakeholders involved in relevant practice. Initial outputs are a report to be produced at the end of this month and he has now secured funding for a conference related to the placement.
Jereon Bastiaanssen, ITS
Looking at the impact of lack of transport, specifically on young people in Yorkshire compared to Rotterdam, Netherlands. Jereon is working with policy makers and placed in the research team at West Yorkshire Combined Authority which maps unemployment levels but are unsure about the impact of lack of transport on employment levels. Helping the team to understand how to interpret the data.

- How does Youssef’s work tie in with looking at the changes in employment benefits?
  - Being self-employed in deprived areas doesn’t make people poor – it’s therefore important to understand the demographics.
  - How do you define a start-up? Initially 1month – 2 years early stage entrepreneurs. However, UBER drivers can be entrepreneurs.
  - There is a lot of work to be done around whether start-ups in deprived areas are positive or not.
  - The importance of contextual and qualitative research to establish the drivers behind entrepreneurship.
  - Many common businesses in Leeds are hospitality, food, accommodation and others.

- What sort of areas would we like to collaborate on for PGR placements? What is the role of PGR placements?

- How can you get from problematizing an issue to a solution in a project?
  - Problematizing issues in social science, the presentations earlier were based on solution-based action.
  - Crisinta Bendeira looked at the problems in the inside of an organisation and then looking at a local partner who agrees on the problem and is looking at solving the problem with you. What is the problem? How can we work with organisations to solve the problem?
  - What data is available to assess the situation? How can the situation be improved upon? In this process we come across new data sets which we can then look at how to interpret.
  - The question you ask is very important. What is the potential solution? It’s not just the academic looking at what is the problem but thinking creatively about what the solution could be for the policy makers. Important to think in that way. Opportunity to work in a collaborative way to become an impactful researcher by design. Sometimes the answer is beyond the capability of the collaborators. However, by working together we can find solutions. How can we engage people in practical ways?
  - Are there any questions which don’t have an answer?
  - It’s also very important to consider the differences between the disciplines, there are many advantages of cross-disciplinary working.

- How aligned is your PGR placement to your PhD?
- Youssef’s placement is not related to his PhD, but there are common themes, for example entrepreneurship and looking at vulnerable communities.
- Jeroen’s research was proposed by his funder and there was a need to use Leeds as a case study. His own interests brought in a comparison with Rotterdam, this would create more impact due to the comparative method.

- Is it possible to work across different sectors with the findings from the placements? These PGR placements allow us to look at ways in which this can happen.

- These PGR placements are one of the few opportunities available to PhD students to explore possibilities outside their research. Many less powerful groups who can provide an alternative voice are very often overlooked. The benefits of PGR placements are obvious to prevent piecemeal research. What’s the best way to coordinate more? Can we create a forum for PGR placement students to come together to discuss their placements? Knowledge transfer partnerships (RIS) organises placements where companies and academics supervise students. There are problems with matching funding, companies/organisations still have to put up funds, therefore short placements, like the PGR placements, are positive because 3-4 years in policy terms is a long time for short term action/results.

- Access to funding is problematic, however we need to think creatively about ways to get funding which can be useful for PGR students. Currently there’s not a coordinated approach to PGR placements at the University level, especially those which build longer term relationships which develop trust.

- RECOMMENDATION: It would be useful for the University to have more coordination and interaction with RIS about how to develop placement ideas and possibilities.

- Within the PGR community we need to encourage connections and practical real-world action which is relevant in our region. Thinking about the social impact of PhD related research is very important.

- Do PhD students have the awareness of interacting with LSSI? Or of interdisciplinary opportunities in the University? No, it is often up to the students to look for these themselves. RECOMMENDATION: LSSI could be more proactive in different parts of the University in encouraging such interdiscipinarities to PGR students.

- Social prescribing – reducing illness by providing social support in Leeds. E.g. gardening groups in the community. Inequalities research network is starting to address these issues. How can the University PGR placement system reach out to those most vulnerable people?

Panel Discussion

Professor Anthea Hucklesby, Professor of Criminal Justice and Pro-Dean for Research, Law – Chair
Ruth Redfern, Project Director – Inclusive Growth & Social Justice, West Yorkshire Combined Authority
Paul Hayes, Senior Policy Officer, Wakefield Council & Policy Coordinator, Key Cities Group
Professor Andy Brown, Leeds University Business School
Professor Paul Chatterton, School of Geography

Ruth Redfern
What is inclusive growth? And why do we care about it?

- Inequalities and poverty in Leeds City region are vast – half a million people.

What does poverty mean?

- Hunger, cold, lack of employment. 25% of jobs in Leeds pay less than the living wage. If you are male and work part time 50% pay less than the living wage per hour.
- About 20% of nurses are ‘sofa hopping’.
- In work poverty has decreased slightly but we still have more of it than ever before.

We decided to develop an inclusive growth programme which is collaborative to share good ideas, information, intelligence where we replicate and upscale. Each of the authorities are good at something, at ensuring everyone gets benefits. E.g. Wakefield is looking at poverty and homelessness. In Bradford a project working with 50 Asian women in Keighley and taken women good at textiles and matched them with textiles companies desperate to employ people. Local authorities are worse than universities at collaboration. Encouraging collaboration is hard because to do it you have to confess what has failed. A hiccup occurred with the project in Bradford was that the Asian women were not used to using buses, learning and adaptation changed this.

Public sector reform is very important especially with the dire effects of austerity. Austerity can make us more obsessive and send collaboration to the bottom of the pile. Collaboration with local government needs hard work on collaborators part as they are skint, and they feel it.
Inclusive growth begins at home. What are the cleaners at Leeds University paid?

Paul Hayes
How can academics engage with place?

Key cities unlocking potential – looks at the emerging industrial strategy from the government

Local Industrial strategies – understanding the needs and differences of a place are vital. How will ‘events’ and Brexit shape industrial strategy? Local enterprise partnerships will be having a great influence on policy formation, but this is political – it’s important to understand the political contexts in the places you are working.

How can alienation be tackled by greater cohesion? How do smaller places fit into policy? You have an opportunity to shape the world, Paul looks forward to us doing that.
Andy Brown, comments on the presentations

- Thanked presenters for excellent presentations. Andy was involved in LUBS work on key cities. There is now a real opportunity for universities to work in the public interest. The problem is how to create structures where we can work together. The fundamental issue is that academics need long term research projects and work on different timescales to local authorities. Important to build up structures of interaction to build a strategy to access research in the areas which local authorities need. We need to keep working at establishing relationships.

Paul Chatterton, comments on the presentations

- Trickle down isn’t working; how do we improve it and tackle inequality?
- For example, land, how do we change how it is used here? How do we get community working together? How do we take on massive changes in work ahead of us?
- We need to be practical with what we build. We have nineteenth century problems and 21st century solutions. We need civic renewal and solutions. Some problems are Westminster problems which need to be solved there.
- What does this mean for the impact agenda? We need to unlock the potential of celebrating alternatives and locking down power houses of ecological and sociological damage.

Questions to the panel

How can we use social prescribing to solve problems? Using community assets.

Social prescribing allows people to think outside their community. We have to do something about the number of people who are unemployed. What makes well-being and happiness around a community?

Do local authorities have a responsibility to think more carefully about what they’re purchasing? And purchasing what’s needed at the end user point? This could be a driver to bring back inclusive growth.

There has been some success in evaluating the spending, however local authorities are not paid to do many things, e.g. involvement in policy or strategy. However R&D is desperately needed in local government.

At Kirklees they undertook a systems led approach to nudge into a better way about thinking about spending. Procurement e.g. work in Preston has been effective – the anchor programme (the university will hopefully be a large institution anchoring communities to support them) procuring locally. There is a lot more which can be done in procurement collectively.

Renaissance project – a community project to collaborate with local authorities. Why has this project met with objections and challenges for implementation? Local authorities are collaborating now more through choice. Co-production is vital.
How can we make collaboration between the third sector, public sector and research/university sector work more effectively? In the wake of austerity and the university’s agenda for more impact? In addition to the climate commission.

Timescales and different paces/agendas need to be tackled. Public brokerage is a skill people need to learn. System thinking in social care is great to introduce people into new ideas, it’s asking the customer/front line worker what would be the better system? It brought solutions and got front line staff genuinely listened to and cut through old systems to find new solutions.

Summary

Professor Karen Lucas, Chair in Transport and Social Analysis, ITS & Deputy Director, LSSI
- Seeing things from the external partners’ perspective is very useful and we could take forward working towards joint key agendas to offer a more systematic approach to the ways we’re delivering impact.
- Why do research if you don’t intend to make a difference?
- Can we create new models for funding these impact exercises?
- Accommodating long term and consistent collaboration is particularly important
- Social sciences should be at the forefront of this change but also need to engage higher up in the university to see this as a cohesive programme across the university.
- Don’t think about the impact of your research but think about building impact through design in your research.
- Thank you all for coming and participating.