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Turning research into action | De la recherche à l’action
1. What do we do
2. Why do we do it
3. How it happened
4. Leadership and strategy for sharing the joy of research impact
WHAT?
RESEARCHER ↔ PARTNER

- Public policies
- Funding: research, operations
- Institutional policy/plans
- Services
- Infrastructure
- Funding
- Collaboration
- Students
- Dissemination
- End user perspective
An institutional priority: York U

Knowledge for the Future: From Creation to Application
• expanding the influence of our work through broadening and deepening our external partnerships and engagement in the generation and sharing of knowledge and creative works
• maximizing our impact by building on the success of Innovation York to expand student, faculty, and community access to entrepreneurial programming and to increase our innovation activities

Working in Partnership
• developing with partners in Vaughan an integrated, interdisciplinary health precinct that will serve the needs of a growing region, while creating synergies for health-related research, teaching, and innovation
• establishing a UN-sponsored CIFAL1 centre to provide cross-sectoral training and development programs that will advance the UN SDGs
• connecting our entrepreneurship and innovation activities to the broader innovation ecosystem of Ontario

Living Well Together
• continue our actions to support reconciliation through our Indigenous Framework, including additional Indigenous spaces and art works
• Entrepreneurship, start up companies: hot desks, shared meeting rooms
• School/community outreach
• Maker space
• Community engagement
• Community based research
• Legal aid, practicum placements, experiential education

• Knowledge mobilization, research partnerships
• Grant support
• Graduate student research/engagement

• 4 universities, 3 colleges, City of Toronto
• Academic ↔ City research partnerships
• First research summit November 2021
K Mb Services Offered at York

Connecting  Partnering  Collaborating

(Events, Social Media)  (Brokering Relationships/Projects)  (Grant/Project Support)

Impact

(Impact Assessment, Mentoring, Success Stories)

- 2 full time staff
- 2 student assistants
- $300K/year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Brokering Projects</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Engaged</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners Engaged</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Engaged</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Applications Submitted</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Applications*</td>
<td>$24,759,000</td>
<td>$9,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Attended</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Supported or Led</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total external research income from KMb Unit supported applications (2006-2019) =$99M
WHY?
Article 27

1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.
Transformation stream grants will support projects that tackle a **well-defined** problem or challenge.

**SSHRC PG Cross-sector co-creation of knowledge and understanding:** Partnerships that use ongoing collaboration and mutual learning to foster innovative research, training and the co-creation of new knowledge on **critical issues of intellectual, social, economic and cultural significance.**

**SPG-N:** The goal of NSERC’s Strategic Partnership Grants is to increase research and training in targeted areas that could **strongly enhance Canada’s economy, society and/or environment within the next 10 years.**
MISSION DRIVEN = HOW

ASSESSMENT DRIVEN = WHAT

SYSTEMS OF RESEARCH IMPACT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUN</th>
<th>MON</th>
<th>TUE</th>
<th>WED</th>
<th>THU</th>
<th>FRI</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR
CHALLENGE
$450K \times 4.5 \text{ years}
2006: York U & U. Victoria

- Institutional membership
- Primarily non-academic staff
- Focus on institutional practices
- Respond to unique contexts including but not limited to policy
- Support units emerging
- Common: engagement (students, teaching/learning, research), dissemination, events, grant support (research office)
- Qualities: reciprocity, meaningful partner, trust, sharing, multiplier effect, central coordination (central and local delivery)
1. Commitment
   a) Is the organization committed to impact: strategy, systems, staff?
2. Clarity
   a) Do (non)academic staff understand impact, expectations, roles?
3. Connectivity
   a) Do the organizational units work together, connect to strategy, cohesive?
4. Competencies
   a) Is there advice, training, support to develop skills for impact?
5. Co-production
   a) What is the extent and quality of engagement with non-academic stakeholders?

We want to start

But we want to start

Leadership but who is going to write the Strategy?

What are the drivers to move forward

We rock (but don’t get complacent)

What are the barriers to moving forward

Somebody wrote a strategy but who is going to lead implementation?

What actions can you take to move forward
It's Your Turn!
Igor Campillo Santos

Executive Director, Euskampus Foundation, Basque Country
SESSION: Development and implementation of institutional strategies that integrate societal impact, and overcoming current and possible obstacles and challenges

The case of ENLIGHT, moving towards an impact-driven European University Alliance
Igor Campillo (Euskampus Director & ENLIGHT Impact Task Force Leader)
Gloria Nunes & Iñigo Puertas (Euskampus & ENLIGHT Task Force)
• ENLIGHT European University Alliance
• ENLIGHT Impact Strategy
• Diagnosis of Impact Awareness/Literacy in ENLIGHT
• Moving towards an impact driven university
• ENLIGHT European University Alliance
  • ENLIGHT Impact Strategy
  • Diagnosis of Impact Awareness/Literacy in ENLIGHT
  • Moving towards an impact driven university
• 9 comprehensive, research-intensive universities
• Sharing a deep commitment to their social responsibility:

University of the Basque Country
University of Bordeaux
Comenius University Bratislava
National University Ireland Galway
Ghent University
University of Göttingen
University of Groningen
University of Tartu
Uppsala University
ENLIGHT aims to undertake a fundamental transformation of European Higher Education by empowering learners as globally engaged citizens with state-of-the-art knowledge, skills, and innovation potential to tackle the major societal transition and to promote equitable quality of life and sustainability.

ENLIGHT RISE will deploy a comprehensive joint transformation agenda in R&I, in synergy with the educational component. We aim to jointly promote a greener, healthier, more equitable and sustainable Europe.
ONE ALLIANCE, TWO INSTITUTIONAL-WIDE PROJECTS, MANY DIFFERENT WORKING GROUPS AND PACKAGES

Long-term Outcome: an open integrated space (ENLIGHT European University System) with free movement of students and staff and sharing of resources that gradually integrates quality assurance, international outreach and global engagement, talent recruitment and investment in large research infrastructure

- Major joint **structuring impact on all partner universities**
- **Systemic impact** on local socio-economic environments
- Successful **model for institutional transformation** to maximize the societal impact of HEIs in Europe
- Novel framework for addressing complex local and global challenges via **partnerships between HEIs and other relevant stakeholders**
• ENLIGHT European University Alliance
• ENLIGHT Impact Strategy
• Diagnosis of Impact Awareness/Literacy in ENLIGHT
• Moving towards an impact driven university
ENLIGHT IS AN IMPACT-ORIENTED ALLIANCE
TWO IMPACT-FOCUSED WORK PACKAGES ADDRESS TWO MAIN OBJECTIVES

To create a comprehensive methodology and tools for measuring the long-term impact of ENLIGHT on people, communities, institutions, and systems at large in such a way that the addressed and accomplished transformations may be monitored, measured and communicated transparently.

To explore the frontiers of a common impact-driven R&I agenda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What we mobilise</td>
<td>Case Study Selection &amp; Analysis (6)</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>SHIFTING our way of THINKING</td>
<td>SHIFTING our way of BEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLIGHT Action lines</td>
<td>Methodology &amp; Toolkit Development</td>
<td>Toolkit</td>
<td>Raise Impact Awareness (understanding and internalising the importance of impact)</td>
<td>Promoting and institutionalizing a culture of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Methods &amp; Tools</td>
<td>Surveying &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Repository of good practices</td>
<td>Acquire Impact literacy (background concepts, methods, skills)</td>
<td>Becoming a role model of an impact-driven alliance, co-creating value with our local stakeholders and global partners for equitable well-being and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLIGHT Universities’ examples</td>
<td>Training &amp; mentoring</td>
<td>Impact Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange, dissemination and reporting</td>
<td>Papers &amp; Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHIFTING our way of ACTING.</td>
<td>Extending the impact culture to HEIs and transforming the European Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Impact Readiness (being able to take action and direct our activities through pathways towards maximizing the value generated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Focusing on Impact Awareness and Impact Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inputs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Activities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outputs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What we mobilise</td>
<td>What we do</td>
<td>What we achieve</td>
<td>What we aim for</td>
<td>What we hope for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force</td>
<td>Case Study Selection &amp; Analysis (6)</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>SHIFTING our way of THINKING</td>
<td>SHIFTING our way of BEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLIGHT Action lines</td>
<td>Methodology &amp; Toolkit Development</td>
<td>Toolkit</td>
<td>Raise Impact Awareness (understanding and internalising the importance of impact)</td>
<td>Promoting and institutionalizing a culture of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Methods &amp; Tools</td>
<td>Surveying &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Repository of good practices</td>
<td>Acquire Impact literacy (background concepts, methods, skills)</td>
<td>Becoming a role model of an impact-driven alliance, co-creating value with our local stakeholders and global partners for equitable well-being and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLIGHT Universities’ examples</td>
<td>Training &amp; mentoring</td>
<td>Impact Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extending the impact culture to HEIs and transforming the European Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange, dissemination and reporting</td>
<td>Papers &amp; Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Study
- Selection & Analysis (6)
- Methodology & Toolkit Development
- Surveying & Analysis
- Training & mentoring
- Exchange, dissemination and reporting

### Methodology
- Toolkit
- Repository of good practices
- Impact Conference
- Papers & Communications
- New proposals

### Impact Awareness
- Raise Impact Awareness (understanding and internalising the importance of impact)

### Impact Literacy
- Acquire Impact literacy (background concepts, methods, skills)

### Impact Readiness
- Develop Impact Readiness (able to direct our activities through pathways towards maximizing the value generated)
• ENLIGHT European University Alliance
• ENLIGHT Impact Strategy
• Diagnosis of Impact Awareness/Literacy in ENLIGHT
• Moving towards an impact driven university
DIAGNOSIS OF IMPACT AWARENESS AND IMPACT LITERACY

WHY?

➔ **Baseline of Impact awareness** and literacy across the different ENLIGHT universities

➔ Help assessing progress in the medium/long-term, paving the way for Impact readiness, as well as our own impact in the promotion of a culture of impact

➔ Help identifying (common) **barriers and challenges**, as well as areas where action would be needed to implement a common impact-driven R&I agenda
DIAGNOSIS OF IMPACT AWARENESS AND IMPACT LITERACY

HOW?
STEP by STEP APPROACH

Overview of the ENLIGHT Universities’ Research Impact Landscape

PILOT (NUIGalway, UGENT, UPV/EHU)

Universities’ Institutional Survey
- 1 response per University
- From the Senior Management Team (e.g. Vice-rectorate/Support Service/ Specialised Committee)

Academics/Researchers & Research Support Staff Survey
- Multiple responses are possible (and welcome)
- Researchers (PhD students, early career, senior researchers, PIs, etc.)
- Research Support Staff (e.g. Research administrators, advisors, research project managers…)

Survey to all ENLIGHT Universities
Main conclusions

1. R&I Impact definition:
   - 4 out of 8 Universities do not have a thought-out definition of R&I impact
   - Different interpretations of R&I impact: academic vs economic vs societal impact
   - In few cases impact is clearly associated with “economic valorisation” of R&I via business agreements, commercialisation
   - The interpretation of R&I Impact is conditioning the identification of “good practices”

2. R&I Impact policy/ implementation plan:
   - Only 1 University has a stand-alone R&I Impact policy with strategic priorities and actions planned
   - 4 out of the 8 Universities tackle Impact as an embedded part of a wider strategic policy framework, but with different grades of depth and detail.
   - 2 out of these 4 Universities identify a concrete set of actions for promoting R&I Impact

3. Identification of good R&I Impact practices:
   - Different interpretations of good R&I Impact practices: 3 responses are focused on the institutional practices to promote a culture of Impact; others identify impactful R&I projects; and others focus on knowledge transfer/ innovation / entrepreneurship support practices; and one identifies a methodological approach.
ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

MAIN SOURCES
ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

MAIN SOURCES
ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

MAIN CHANGES

- **Reduction on the number of questions** to approx. 20 questions in total
- **Inclusion of free text optional questions**
- **Understanding the CONTEXT** in which HEIs operate and the external drivers for Research Impact. A new dimension with 2 additional questions on:
  1. national/ regional research quality assessment, policy or frameworks
  2. If research impact is incorporated into the research proposal templates of national /regional funding agencies
- **Understanding the METHODOLOGICAL approaches** used for measuring/assessing Research Impact
- **Understanding the CO-CREATION process** with additional questions on type of collaboration and main type of societal stakeholder
- **Reformulation of questions** (e.g. “your role” in contributing to research impact; is there [sufficient] funding to support Research Impact delivery; consideration if researchers/ RSO are prepared for playing their role in Research impact delivery)
- **Internal discussion on the possibly/partly responses options**: a scientific study or a information gathering tool?
ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

Structure

1. CLARITY
   • Knowledge, understanding and valorisation of research impact

2. CONTEXT: looking at the external research impact drivers
   • Regional/ national policy, frameworks, research quality assessment processes, funding criteria

3. COMMITMENT
   • Institutional Impact Strategies/ Plans/ Policies (stand-alone vs. embedded) and links to regional, European and global (UN SDGs) policy priorities
   • Institutional leadership of R&I impact

4. CAPACITIES
   • Dedicated support and advice services
   • Funding and staff resources for impact delivery
   • Recognition and investment in the development of impact-related skills (staff training & education)

5. CONNECTIVITY
   • How the organisational units work together and connect to the overall strategy

6. CO-CREATION
   • Engagement with non-academics to generate impactful research
ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

**RESPONDERS PROFILES**

9 responses to the Institutional Survey & 518 responses to the researchers/RSO survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY 1</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 2</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 3</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 4</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 5</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 6</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 7</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 8</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCIPLINE FOCUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 1</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 2</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 3</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 4</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 5</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 6</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 7</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 8</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life sciences</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical humanities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

MAIN CONCLUSIONS (I)

1. CLARITY
The majority of respondents state they do know what RI is. However, there are multiple interpretations of RI (in/beyond academia; science communication; KT and innovation (spin-offs, patents)).

2. CONTEXT
The majority of respondents state RI plays a role within national/ regional research quality assessment, policy or frameworks; however, in the majority of the cases, RI is ”only” used as a criterion for funding grant proposals.

3. COMMITMENT
- The majority of Universities do not have a RI policy/ implementation plan; whilst RI is seen as a strategic priority by the majority of researchers/RSO responders.
- 4/9 of Institutional survey responders say that the University will “Greatly prioritise” around RI in the coming 5 years. Academics/ RSO responders are more reluctant. The majority stating that it will “Possibly prioritise”.
- 4/9 of Institutional survey responders say there IS Institutional leadership in RI.
- Only 1 University states there are “incentive& reward structures for RI”.

ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

MAIN CONCLUSIONS (II)

4. CAPACITIES & RESOURCES
- Limited number of Universities (2) with Support & Advice for RI. The majority of Universities do not have dedicated systems for RI.
- The majority of researchers/RSO respondents state NOT following a methodology for RI.
- The majority of Universities state not having dedicated staff & funding for RI.
- The provision of training for RI competences is limited to a few number of Universities. The majority of researchers/RSO of each University state NEVER having participated in RI training.

5. CONNECTIVITY
The majority of researchers/RSO respondents state they DO WORK with other teams to support RI and that RI activities are only “possibly/partly” aligned with University’s strategy.

6. CO-CREATION
- The majority of researchers/RSO respondents state they do work with societal stakeholders in the framework of their RI activities.
- The main type of collaboration is “collaboration as potential end users of the project results”.
- The main type of stakeholder is “Not-for profit organisations” and “business”.
ENLIGHT Impact Awareness/Literacy Survey

LESSONS LEARNT

Positive elements
- 1st landscaping exercise
- Pilot exercise with 3 different Universities
- Co-creation within the impact taskforce team

Challenges
- Confusion between ”healthcheck” and evaluation/assessment exercises
- Fear of comparison
- Exhaustion of surveys
- What is ENLIGHT? What is impact? “Don’t know... No answer”
- Incomplete responses
- Data protection and ethic concerns
- Responses depend on the understanding people have of Research Impact

For improvement
- Involvement of Universities’ management teams in the launch of the survey
- More details on the incentives and reward structures for Research Impa
• ENLIGHT European University Alliance
• ENLIGHT Impact Strategy
• Diagnosis of Impact Awareness/Literacy in ENLIGHT
• Moving towards an impact driven university
Moving towards an impact-driven university

**READINESS**
Preparedness & Willingness
Internal support mechanisms
Connectivity & Co-creation

**LITERACY**
Knowledge, Competencies & Skills

**AWARENESS**
Understanding and internalising the importance of Research Impact,
External Context & Institutional Commitment

Needs capacity building + Engagement strategy

Operational

Educational

Inspirational

Necessary conditions for Readiness

Strategy

Leadership
Thank-you for your attention
Eskerrik asko zure arretagatik
Bedankt voor uw aandacht
Tänan teid tähelepanu eest
Merci pour votre attention
Vielen Dank für Ihre Aufmerksamkeit
Go raibh maith agat as do aird
Đakujem za pozornos
Gracias por su atención
Tack för din uppmärksamhet
Esther de Smet

Senior Research Policy Advisor,
Ghent University, Belgium
✓ Factors associated with “high quality research”

• Focus
• Group composition and climate
• Group size
• **Leadership**
  • Active role in daily research activities
  • Careful recruitment of new members
  • Build bridges to other knowledge domains
  • Support junior researchers

Research Quality and the Role of the University Leadership (2014), Håkan Carlsson, Åsa Kettis, Anders Söderholm
LEADERSHIP AND RESEARCH

✓ Factors associated with “high quality research”
  • Focus
  • Group composition and climate
  • Group size
  • Leadership

Ghent University, Career Progression Model for Professors (2019)
Does the same apply to “impact”?

And what about?

The possibility to govern universities strategically should not be overemphasized. Detailed strategies at a university-wide level on research content are bound to fail (in most cases). The idea is, however, that there is a level in each research-focused organization where strategic discussions are appropriate and productive. A strategic agenda may be vague and have a simplified structure. It is more important to demonstrate a long-term interest in discussing the future of the research, and it is a management responsibility to emphasize and re-emphasize the requirement for such discussions and agendas.
LEVEL OF PTB

✓ Institutional health check


• Commitment: strategy, incentives & rewards, funding & support
• Connectivity: connected teams, co-ordinated activities
• Co-production: support for partnerships & engagement, knowledge on co-creation
• Competencies: available expertise, training
• Clarity: transparent strategy, transparent support, responsibilities, transparent evaluation

What kind of leadership is there from the top?
What is organisational DNA?
LEVEL OF PTB

✓ Are they “walking the talk”?
  • Are they open to all pathways to impact, to all types of impact?
  • Are they stimulating joint efforts and responsibilities on other levels?
  • Has PR and communication changed?
  • Have they invested (funds, staff, infrastructure)?
  • Are they having the difficult conversations?

✓ Are they influencing or engaging with national/local policy on impact?

✓ Are they part of impact initiatives such as networks and/or projects?
What can, and should, be done by the leadership within the scope of the available opportunities after taking external restrictions and the academic freedom of individual researchers into account?
✓ University as a whole

• Role in society?
• Insightful and deliberate analysis of expectations, stakeholder positions and the long-term position of the role of the university > if not done by the sector, this position will be carved out by stakeholders outside the sector (?)

“It’s not a question of whether the claims are legitimate or not, it is a question of the asymmetry in how well different claims are articulated and communicated.”
LEVEL OF POLICY & SUPPORT SERVICES

✓ More than implementation > need for showing leadership
✓ Building impact literacy > need for collaboration between services
✓ Have all little pieces of the puzzle been adapted (implicit and explicit incentives)?
✓ Added value towards research community > need for clear roles
GROUP LEVEL

✓ Research and research impact as a group effort
✓ Symbiosis between levels of researchers
✓ Group leaders play an important role in fostering a creative environment
✓ Consider using knowledge brokers (with link to level of policy & support services)
INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

✓ Leadership towards your peers (mentoring, realism)
✓ Leadership towards your stakeholders (trust & authenticity)
THE STORY SO FAR

✓ Ambiguous (relationship with) leadership in all stages of the strategy
✓ A lot of individual leadership but also efforts on group level (decentralised knowledge brokers)
✓ Trial and error approach to networking and lobbying efforts
Esther De Smet
Sr. Research Policy Advisor

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

E   esther.desmet@ugent.be
T   +32 9 264 30 23

www.ugent.be/en/research
Twitter: @ResearchUGent
(personal: @sterretje8)
Recommendation

Institutional Strategy & Leadership

“Leadership and strategy requires a participatory approach within and outside of the academy”