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Forward

In 2018, we, the School of Life Sciences Public Engagement team, worked with Evaluation Support Scotland to create an evaluation strategy aligned to our then recently developed Public Engagement with Research Strategy. The result was ‘Our Evaluation Story’ - an evaluation framework.

Over the past 5 years, we used the framework to evaluate public engagement work. Starting in 2018, we produced an annual report to look in detail at what we were doing and if it helped the School of Life Sciences community achieve our ‘indicators of success’. Five years on, we have a strong collection of evidence to show how we have achieved some of our aims and objectives and where more work is needed.

We revisited the evaluation strategy, with three key questions in mind:

- What changes need to be made following its use and review?
- Do the outcomes reflect the revised Public Engagement with Research and Scholarship Strategy?
- Is the evaluation strategy the best it can be to help measure the impact of the Public Engagement with Research and Scholarship Strategy?

This document contains our new evaluation framework and recording forms.

Logic Model for 2023-2028

We separated out the three groups for whom there were outcomes. These are:

- the public, including teachers and pupils
- our staff and students
- the School of Life Sciences public engagement team

Each group has different priorities for taking part in engagement. We updated the outputs and outcomes along with the assumptions we made for each group. This made it easier to see the contributions of each group to the evaluation framework.

Each group’s individual outcomes then fed into our long-term outcomes that align with the five main aims of our School of Life Sciences Public Engagement with Research and Scholarship Strategy. The revised logic model is provided in Appendix 1.

New outcomes and indicators

As stated, some of our existing outcomes and indicators no longer aligned with our updated aims, and so they were updated.
Outcomes for public
We wanted to reflect our growing focus on public and patient involvement, so added a new outcome, ‘Greater involvement in science’, and several indicators. This includes ‘I feel this activity reflects my needs/the needs of my community’ and ‘I feel my voice has been heard’. This will help us remember to work with our audiences in the development and delivery of our activities and to ensure that we are listening to them throughout.

We removed the outcomes around new skills and pupil attainment which, while worthy aims, require more resources and staffing than we are likely to be able to provide going forward. This doesn’t mean we won’t be contributing to activities that up-skill teachers and students, helping them with their science learning, but it means we can use what resources we have more effectively.

Outcomes for staff and students
We added an outcome around increased embedding within career pathways. This has always been an important part of our work and we realised we had been collecting this information for years, but it wasn’t reflected in our evaluation strategy. Indicators placed under this outcome include the number of staff and students getting nominations and awards for their public engagement work, and the number of public engagement grants our researchers apply for and achieve in the course of their work.

We updated the outcome ‘New perspective on topic in question’ to capture the mutual benefits of public engagement by including the publics’ impact on our staff and students. We changed the outcome to ‘Impact of the public upon research’ to reflect this and added an indicator ‘The public have influenced my research process’ which also considers our expanding public and patient involvement work.

We removed the outcome about increased access to useful resources, as we realised this is more appropriate in the public engagement team section of the evaluation strategy. We will still be measuring it, but the focus will be on what we as a team are providing for our life sciences community. For the same reason, we also moved an indicator, ‘Number of people accessing training and resources’ from the wider participation in PE activities outcome within the PE team section to the more appropriate ‘our staff and students have increased PE skills’ outcome.

Outcomes for the School of Life Sciences public engagement team
We added a section around the internal audiences we want to reach and the increased embedding of public engagement in research culture. We included indicators around the demographics of staff and students doing public engagement, the number of requests for our expertise, and the appropriate inclusion of public engagement in operational processes. This gives us a push to monitor how we are feeding into research culture and to assess our effectiveness in supporting researchers and students in their development.

We also specified what our aims for external audiences were, removing some indicators that were not fit for purpose and adding ‘I have reflected on the best way of reaching my desired audience’ to reinforce that our audience needs come first. The revised list is provided in Appendix 2.

Methods of measuring
We revised our methods of measuring to reflect our increased online engagement work. These include and are not restricted to:
• Questionnaires
• Observation
• Interactive Feedback
• Interview
• Internal Records
• External Endorsement
• Online Analytics

Collecting Evaluation
We updated the evaluation report template to reflect the changes to our outcomes and indicators. We also added additional points such as adding entries for public engagement events and research outputs into Discovery, the University of Dundee’s online research repository, and photo file links to ensure these aspects are completed as part of the evaluation report process. The revised report template is provided in Appendix 3.

Conclusion
Our revised evaluation strategy is clearly aligned with our new Public Engagement with Scholarship and Research Strategy. This will ensure we can measure both the work we currently are doing and the work we want to do over the next five years. This will also help us document and assess our progress effectively, ensuring the aims of our Public Engagement with Scholarship and Research Strategy are met while continuing to embed public engagement within the School of Life Sciences and the wider university for years to come.
Appendix 1: Logic Model for 2023-2028

Assumptions
- Sharing implies impact
- High science capital is positive for individuals & society *
- Public engagement is a two-way process
- Public engagement benefits our staff and students’ careers
- Scientists engaging with public is a good thing
- Gaining the public’s input benefits the research
- Benefits the University
- Having dedicated staff adds value
- Broadening embedding is the right thing to do

Outputs
- Art/Science Collaborations
- Opening our doors
- School engagement
- Community outreach
- Public & Patient Involvement
- Training
- Activities
- Public Engagement in funding bids

Outcomes
- Greater understanding of science
- Greater enthusiasm for science
- Greater involvement in science
- Increased employability skills
- Greater empowerment in engagement
- Impact of public on research
- Increased embedding of public engagement into research culture

Long-term outcomes
- Public engagement embedded into research culture
- Mutual benefit from public engagement
- More sustainable working
- Science is for everyone

Appendix 2: New Outcomes and Indicators

Outcomes for public

Greater understanding of science
- Number of aims and objectives adequately achieved
- “I can explain [activity]”
- “I understand the world of science”
- “I understand the methodology of science”

Greater enthusiasm for science
- “I feel enthusiastic about science”
- Number of events that individuals come to
- “I share what I have learned”

Greater involvement in science
- “I felt involved in the development of [activity]”
- “I feel this activity reflects my needs/the needs of my community”
- “I feel my voice has been heard”
- Involvement in science activities/pathways

Outcomes for staff and students

Staff and students have increased public engagement skills
- “I can run a public engagement event safely”
- Number of post-event evaluations and reflections
- Number of people accessing training and resources
- “I can explain my ideas in simple language”

Staff and students have greater enthusiasm for public engagement
- “I feel confident to do more of this”
- Number of staff participating/repeat participation
- Variety of activities and novel approaches

Impact of the public upon research
- “I understand the public perspective on my topic”
- “The public have influenced my research process”
- Number of new collaborations

Increased embedding within career pathways
- Number of staff and students getting nominations and awards
- Number of grants applied for/achieved
- “Doing public engagement is part of my responsibilities as a member of the School of Life Sciences”
Outcomes for School of Life Sciences public engagement team

**More meaningful public engagement activities**
- “I feel this activity reflects the research taking place within the University"
- Activities have explicit aims and objectives
- Number of uses of each resource, idea, or activity
- Consultation and development with audience or partner groups

**More productive partnerships**
- Length of time for partnership and number of projects/activities produced
- Partnership agreement exists
- “I feel all partner goals are being worked towards and there is good communication in place”
- Instances of sharing outcomes externally

**External audiences reached**
- Demographics of public engaged with
- “I can see myself reflected in those participating”
- “I have reflected on the best way of reaching my desired audience”

**Internal audiences and university culture**
- Demographics of staff and students doing public engagement
- Number of requests for public engagement expertise
- Staff aware of support and resources available
- Appropriate inclusion of public engagement in university operational processes
Appendix 3: Evaluation Report Template

[Project name and date] Evaluation Report

Summary sentence: [a single sentence about the project]

Number of public participants/demographics: [Who took part? Could include ages, gender balance, where they’re from, etc]

Number of staff/demographics: [Departments, numbers, career stages – as much detail as possible]

Type of activity:

List of partners involved:

Planned Outcomes:

These can include things like learning, behavioural, and attitudinal outcomes. They should also reference whether they are outcomes for public (inc. teachers and pupils), our staff & students, and/or the PE team. They should be clearly defined as they will be what’s used to set up the feedback system. There are lots of ways of defining these; Bloom’s taxonomy is one useful tool for thinking about what you really want people to do – learn, consider, list, state, etc.

Evaluation methods used: Questionnaires, observations, post-its – list all

Links to Discovery entry:

- Activity:
- Research Outputs:

Link to images folder:

- Photo consents stored:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Learning/Action Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For public (including teachers &amp; pupils)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater understanding of science</td>
<td>Number of aims and objectives adequately achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I can explain [activity]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I understand the world of science”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I understand the methodology of science”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater enthusiasm for science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I feel enthusiastic about science”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No. of events that individuals come to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I share what I have learned”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater involvement in science</td>
<td>“I felt involved in the development of [activity]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I feel this activity reflects my needs/the needs of my community”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I feel my voice has been heard”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involvement in science activities/pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Learning/Action Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For staff and students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and students have increased public engagement skills</td>
<td>• “I can run a public engagement event safely”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of post-event evaluations and reflections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of people accessing training and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I can explain my ideas in simple language”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and students have greater enthusiasm for PE</td>
<td>• “I feel confident to do more of this”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of staff participating/repeat participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variety of activities and novel approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New perspective on topic in question</td>
<td>• “I understand the public perspective on my topic”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No. of new collaborations/partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased embedding within career pathways</td>
<td>• Number of staff and students getting nominations and awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of grants applied for/achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Doing PE is part of my responsibilities as a member of SLS”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Learning/Action Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For PE team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More meaningful PE activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I feel this activity reflects the research taking place within the University”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activities have explicit learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of uses of each resource, idea or activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation and development with audience or partner groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More productive partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Length of time for partnership and number of projects/activities produced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnership agreement exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I feel all partner goals are being worked towards and there is good communication in place”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instances of sharing outcomes externally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External audiences reached</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographics of public engaged with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I can see myself reflected in those participating”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of events individuals attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I have reflected on the best way of reaching my desired audience”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal audiences and university culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographics of staff and students doing PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of requests for PE expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff aware of support and resources available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriate inclusion of PE in university operation processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further Information**
[Capture any other evidence, add here: e.g., social media links, articles]
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