

Public Engagement Strategy: Evaluation Framework

An evaluation framework has been developed for the evaluation of the Wellcome/EPSRC Centre for Medical Engineering (i.e. “the Centre”) Public Engagement Strategy 2019-2022 programme. The framework aims to:

- provide an overarching structure for the evaluation of the public engagement programme and projects funded, linked to the overall goal and four specific aims of the Centre;
- break down what the strategic aims mean and how they might be achieved;
- identify indicators (the things that will be measured to determine if the outputs and outcomes outlined in the public engagement strategy are achieved);
- be a framework to undertake and oversee specific evaluations of projects, activities and events – and a way to integrate these evaluations to consider the broad impacts the public engagement programme has.

This is an overarching framework which sets out both output and outcome indicators for the Centre, measured against each aim:

- Aim 1: Enabling publics and patients to inform our research and learning ensuring impact
- Aim 2: Engaging public and patients about the Centre’s research to empower them so that they feel more confident to access, use and respond to health research
- Aim 3: Working with children and young people in London, to enthuse and inspire young people about science and supports a future diverse research sector
- Aim 4: Building collaborative, inclusive and equitable relationships with marginalized communities in Lambeth and Southwark, to enable the community to iteratively influence research practice and research priorities, co-producing mutual benefits in the local areas and broadening the impact of the Centre.

Table 1 sets out indicators to capture change linked to the aims, which include:

- output indicators i.e. specific, observable and measurable characteristics that captures what services/activities that are delivered as part of the public engagement strategy;
- outcome indicator i.e. specific and assessable characteristics that captures the changes that happen as a result of the PE strategy.

The indicators combine both subjective and objective measures, suggesting the collection of numbers (quantitative data) and descriptions or narrative (qualitative data). In many cases with public engagement activities, there are ‘soft’ outcomes – changes to the way people feel or think - that are difficult to measure. For example: increase in confidence and/or changes in attitude. However, despite this, indicators have been proposed which can be observed and subjectively assessed. We will develop specific evaluation plans linked to programme activities (i.e. funding, training, support and advice) and a bank of resources to go with this framework which will specifically outline how the information and evidence will be collected, throughout the life of the programme.

Table 1: Evaluation Framework

	Aim 1	Aim 2	Aim 3	Aim 4
Output indicators	<p>1.1 Number of patients involved in PPI group</p> <p>1.2 Number of, and percentage of, researchers who participate in PPI group (including dept, career level), breakdown of level of participation (i.e. presentation, facilitator)</p> <p>1.3 Number of patients (and/or community groups) collaborating with research through our programmes</p>	<p>2.1 Number of public events run by the Centre</p> <p>2.2 Number of participants at public events run by the Centre (divided by onsite/offsite)</p> <p>2.3 Number of external partners involved in public engagement activities/projects, details of types of partner (i.e. funder, community group, school) and nature of partnership</p> <p>2.4 Number of connections brokered through the Centre's programmes and activities</p>	<p>3.1 Number of children booked into public engagement activities arranged by the Centre (divided by age and onsite/offsite)</p>	<p>4.1 Number and detail of partnerships between the Centre and external communities (in Lambeth and Southwark) established through our programmes</p> <p>4.2 Classification of how projects/activities are generated (e.g. does the initial idea come from a community partner or a researcher?)</p> <p>4.3 Number of times external communities have been signposted to wider engagement opportunities or Kings services (i.e. volunteering)</p> <p>4.4 Number of projects and research based activities created through the relationships</p> <p>4.5 Number of connections made between Centre researchers and external partners/communities</p>
Outcomes	<p>1.4 Positive learning outcomes patients involved in PPI e.g. increased understanding of health research</p> <p>1.5 Researchers report an understanding of patients' priorities for research</p>	<p>2.5 Participants involved in our events/activities state they feel informed about our research</p> <p>2.6 Positive learning outcomes for those involved in our events e.g. increased understanding of our health research</p> <p>2.7 Project partners feel: that there are benefits from working with the Centre; that there was benefit for them in undertaking the PE project/activity</p>	<p>3.2 Participating students state that they are interested in and aware of jobs in STEM, research and in hospitals</p>	<p>4.6 External partners see the Centre as open and supportive, and an organisation that can respond to its needs or requests</p> <p>4.7 The Centre is seen as a key resource in the boroughs (i.e. for space, knowledge etc) and external partners are comfortable in contacting the Centre</p> <p>4.8 External partners gain insights, knowledge and expertise from working with the Centre, which informs their practice</p> <p>4.9 Collaborative projects put forward by external partners, and where appropriate joint programmes developed</p> <p>4.10 Our core engagement values¹ (equitable, inclusive, transparent, flexible, change focused, respectful), which underpin our ways are working, are reflected and recognised in our projects and programmes by all those involved</p>

Overarching goal	To develop a supportive culture of public engagement within the Centre
Output indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of, and percentage of, researchers who participate in public engagement programme activities (including dept, career level; and breakdown of level of participation) led by the Centre • Number of, and percentage of, researchers (including dept, career level) who have taken part in public engagement training and development • Value of successful grants for public engagement (where indirect support has been provided) • Number of public engagement projects and initiatives supported across the Centre • Number, and value of, public engagement projects funded within the Centre
Outcome indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers know about our team, our resources, what we can offer and how to contact us. Researchers comment upon now being able to access funding and support, and feedback of usefulness • Statements from researchers relating to a deeper understanding of public engagement, and awareness of opportunities available • Participating researchers report impacts on their research from public engagement, including new perspectives, directions, collaborations • Increase in researchers proposing and delivering engagement activities, independent of the team, with examples throughout the research lifecycle, and with diversity of groups • Participating researchers state that they have developed or gained certain skills (e.g. subject-specific, practical skills, communication skills, intellectual skills, social skills) or learnt something new as a result of being involved • Researchers (staff and PhD students) state that they feel supported and recognised in undertaking PE – and the experience is rewarding

Table 2: Our Engagement Values

This table outlines the values which underpin our engagement work. The values are useful in thinking what meaningful, successful community engagement looks like.

Values	What this means to us
Inclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who we are working with reflects the communities in which we operate (Lambeth and Southwark)• There are a range of opportunities for all people to participate• The public engagement opportunities enable diverse voices to be heard and respected
Equitable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is an understanding of inequity, and this is used to create more equitable processes and opportunities
Transparent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If appropriate, the engagement process reflects everyone's voice• The engagement process is transparent• There are opportunities to put views across and these are considered
Flexible/adaptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The activities are generated a range of ways (e.g. from a community partner or researcher)• Our participants and stakeholders have opportunities to tell us what we should change about our work
Change focused	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our activities should lead to change for all those involved• The intended changes from projects are thought about at the start, and reflected upon at the end
Respectful	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The decisions or actions incorporate the needs and interests of others• We accept and respect diverse perspectives• Our relationships are built on sense of trust