## No. 68-B WORKING WITH SCHOLARS TO INCREASE IMPACT AND GLOBAL REACH

**Author**
K. Jane Burpee
University of Guelph, Canada

Changes are underway regarding how scholarly information is produced and communicated. There is a growing understanding in the library community that it possess stewardship responsibilities and expertise towards open access and the materials that are generated on campus —particularly those of researchers, including community engaged researchers. Community engaged scholars are benefiting when they seek the support systems that are being offered in their academic libraries. The presentation will focus on how researchers seeking to deepen their effectiveness, global impact and reach are being supported by librarians at the University of Guelph in Canada. The Research Enterprise and Scholarly Communication Team was established at the beginning of 2010. From the time a researcher conceives of a research project until after the research is complete, the RE&SC team will work with scholars in the areas of information management, data curation, dissemination, publication, collaboration and long-term preservation. For those involved in community research our team will provide:

- Consultations to discuss in-depth information needs related to research projects.
- Assistance with the data management needs of research teams by identifying secure storage, recommending appropriate metadata practices, and consulting about data repositories. We assist research teams in developing a full data management strategy for a research project.
- Consultations on issues researchers may have as authors, educators, and researchers with respect to copyright law, rights as an author, and the various options available to publishing work (both traditional academic publishing and alternative formats.
- Support by offering an online presence designed specifically for multi institutional research teams enabling better communications between team members and a place to store data with security and backup mechanisms in place.
- Assistance in using our institutional repository. We accept scholarly resources, in virtually all formats and media, that are created by, published by, or sponsored by the University of Guelph, its faculty, its staff, its students and selected other affiliated scholars. Priority is given to fully open access collections. Items in repositories are retrievable by web search engines like Google. This significantly increases the visibility of an author's work.
- An open access platform for the publishing of academic, peer-reviewed journals and an online platform for conference hosting.

## No. 69-B LEARNING FROM UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP: UK RESEARCH FINDINGS

**Author**
Zoraida Mendiwelso-Bendek,
University of Lincoln, UK.

This paper presents findings from a Research Cluster in UK in line with other researchers understanding concepts and practices of the partnership learning between University and civil society. It reflects upon programmes to promote community-based learning for active citizenship in UK (2004-2011) and the lessons emerging from researching these at the Cluster. The previous New Labour government launched two consecutive initiatives first: 'Active Learning for Active Citizenship' (2004-2006) Learning programmes delivered via Third Sector organisations based in seven regional hubs working in partnership with voluntary and community sector organisations and with academic partners with relevant experience of community-based learning in their regions. Second: Take Part Programe consisted of two components, the 'Pathfinders', which were to take the learning from ALAC forward more widely improving knowledge, skills and confidence of citizens and Take Part Champions supported by 'National Support' programme which was to engage organisations beyond the Pathfinders and Champions, and to enable them to run Take Part activities too. There were eighteen Pathfinders and nine Champions bringing in several local authorities as well as Third Sector organisations and universities. Learning Partnership to support learning to take part in civil society as an active citizen has been a topical policy commitment. And Community-based learning is a key issue to enable a transformative space for citizenship engagement in democratic processes for active citizenship(Mayo and Annette, 2010).Education for more fully empowering forms of civic activism would include learning how to challenge unequal power relations working collectively to promote agendas of social justice (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004, Mayo and Rooke, 2006). The emphases of these programmes were upon learning collectively, as well as individually, and learning experientially through engaging as volunteers and participants in structures of governance. Through increasing their knowledge and their critical understanding, learners could in addition be empowered to take collective action, it was argued, in the pursuit of the values of equalities and social justice (Mayo, 2010) How effective have community based approaches been in engaging people as active citizens, including the most excluded people? And to what extent University – Community Learning Partnership have actually been prepared to facilitate this learning for active citizenship is question civil society are part of this paper. It also presents research finding of some of the current challenges and dilemmas that third sector organisations are facing, in particular we illustrate manifestations of their resilience to survive and develop strategically for the future (Buzzanell, P. 2010)





## No. 70-E CO-CREATION OF SOLUTIONS BY GENERATING PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS AND KNOWLEDGE INSTITUTIONS. EXAMPLES FROM THE WAGENINGEN UR SCIENCE SHOP

**Authors**
Stobbelaar, D. J.
University of Applied Science Van Hall Larenstein (part of Wageningen University and Research Centre)

Hugo Hoofwijk
De Groene Link, bureau for civic participation,
The Netherlands

### 1. Introduction: working in a governance situation

In the last 20 years policy has shifted from a government situation – more or less top down – into a governance situation where policy is made in coalitions in society (e.g. Ayre & Callway, 2005). This is also effecting the problem statements; many visions on cause and effect co-exist, which make the decision-making process difficult (Bressers & Kuks, 2011; Vreke et al., 2009). However, making use of the potentials of the different stakeholders, their money, knowledge, power and labour, also increases the problem solving capacity of the region. Unleashing this potential requires a transdiciplinary method, that takes into account not only new sources of knowledge (as transdisciplinary normally is defined, Tress et al., 2005) but also other resources: successful participation in governance situations is an equal exchange of money, power, time, consent and support (Stobbelaar, 2012). The legitimacy of claims is also at stake here. This of course also holds true for green claims: is this purely self-interest, or do other parties also gain from the green project (Leistra, in prep.)?

All these issues lead us to the main question of this paper: how can a broad range of different stakeholders work together on civil society issues? We will discuss this matter in two ways. Firstly, we give three models of cooperation we use when running projects for the Science Shop of Wageningen University. Secondly, we describe the roles that the stakeholders can play in the different stages of the Science Shop projects.

### 2. Models of cooperation

When a Science Shop project starts, it intervenes in an existing stakeholder arena. Depending on the situation different approaches can be taken. Here we highlight three models, namely the interactive model, the representation model and the 'taking the lead' model, on basis of three cases.

#### 2.1 The interactive model: the case of designing a new future for empty sand pits

In the case Spaubeek (province of Limburg, the Netherlands), the interactive model was chosen. Here, sand mining in two quarries had come to an end and the local environmental group asked the Science Shop to prove that an ecological redevelopment of the exhausted sand pits would be better than just the standard lay out that is required legally (Stobbelaar&Hoofwijk, 2009). The Science Shop rephrased this question into: which lay-out would fit best the needs of the region. A survey among the stakeholders learnt that landscape, ecology, environment, economy, recreation, liveability and cultural historical elements all had to be taken into account. Hence, the scale of the solution could no longer be the sand pits only, but also the surrounding areas had to be included.

In several rounds, alternatives for the redevelopment of the sandpits plus the surroundings were discussed with the local and regional stakeholders. In every round the most suitable directions of development could be detected, which were used to improve our plans – more in line with the wishes of the stakeholders – in the next round (using students and planners). In the end, the local environmental group could present a broadly supported plan for integrated redevelopment of the pits plus their surroundings. This, in combination with the interactive procedure followed, changed the status of the environmental group from 'always opposing against' into taking the lead in finding solutions. The environmental group became an equal partner in regional discussions, which – as it seems now – are also more integral than before.

#### 2.2 The representation model: the case of designing an integral solution for mountain bike annoyance

National Park Utrechtse Heuvelrug (NPUH) is an important area for Dutch mountain bikers. Local terrain bikers, but also large groups from other parts of the country, come to the vicinity of Am-

erongen, Leersum to Veenendaal to ride the trails (Hoofwijk&Stobbelaar, 2012). However, the current four mountain bike trails fail because they are too busy, too short and not challenging enough. Moreover, there are no trails in the western part of the NPUH. Therefore, some mountain bikers choose to ride (partly) their own routes. Most land owners do not like this unregulated presence of mountain bikers on their property at all. They are afraid of disturbance of nature (mainly game and birds), of violation of privacy and property rights and of additional conflicts with other recreationists. Over the last years the number of mountain bikers has been growing very quickly and still continues to do so - as do the subsequent conflicts between land owners, recreationists and nature on one side and mountain bikers on the other side.

With this in mind the researchers of the Science shop worked with representatives of organisations for nature conservation, private landowners, mountain bike clubs and municipalities on an integrated solution of the problem. Core of the proposed solution was the creation of a consistent network of mountain bike tracks, complemented by a correct managerial, financial and legal integration. This consistent network of mountain bike trails was to cover the entire National Park (and to be expanded to the entire Utrechtse Heuvelrug region in a later stage). After all: a continuous and challenging route structure will ensure that the terrain bikers less often leave the tracks.

The advantage of the model used was that all types of stakeholders were equally present. Also, always the same persons were available to discuss the new proposals. This meant that these people could really attach to the process and deepen their understanding of it. In several interactive sessions, solutions were formulated that – according to the representatives - would stand the chance of being accepted by the organisations they were representing and their respective grass root level. Another expected advantage was that these representatives could more easily reach these organisations than we could. However nice in theory, practise showed that knowledge and insights did not always flow neatly from the representatives to the represented organisations nor further on to the grass roots: although our plans were supported by the representatives, this did not mean that they were automatically supported by the represented organisations or by their grass roots. And without consent of those grass roots (e.g. the landowners) the proposed solutions cannot be put into practice Yet another disadvantage is that the process was not visible for the stakeholders on grass root level, so they were wondering what was happening and some were overwhelmed and even felt betrayed when we presented our solutions.

### 2.3 The 'taking the lead' model: the case of finding solutions for local traffic problems

The village of Erp, a small village in the municipality of Veghel (North Brabant, the Netherlands), suffered from high traffic intensity in its village centre. The construction of a ring road was propagated for many years already. However, this proposal divided the community already for a very long time. Half of the village wanted the ring road, the other half absolutely not. The situation was very polarised: organisations pro and contra the ring road were not on speaking terms. Due to these circumstances, it was not possible to start an interactive model or representation model. A local pressure group 'Erp Alert' asked the science shop to prove that the ring road was a bad solution for the traffic problems in Erp. The science shop rephrased this question into: what is the best solution to the traffic problem taking into account the wishes of all stakeholders in the area. A stakeholder analysis showed that, notwithstanding the differences, there was a great deal of consensus: everybody wanted a safe situation, no traffic nuisance, fast traffic flow, and no decline of landscape and nature qualities. The researchers used these criteria to test eleven traffic options which they collected from the stakeholders themselves, and found out that one of the solutions – which was not the ring road - was by far the best. This option consisted of guiding the through-traffic away from the village onto the main roads, combined with a dead-end access road to the industrial area. This option was later on incorporated in municipal policy.

This solution could only be found by looking at a higher spatial level and a higher social level, the latter meaning not discussing the different solutions per se, but first the criteria on which a solution should be based.

The advantage of the 'taking the lead' model was that progress could still be made, despite of the strong polarisation. We did so by matching the criteria for solutions that the stakeholders brought up with their proposed solutions. By using scientific techniques it was possible to define the solution that matched best. Disadvantage of this way of working was that stakeholders were only used as a source of reference, they were not involved in co-creating knowledge. This made the outcomes for some of them being a bit of a surprise. Although this caused new roaring in the village, at the end it proved to be helpful.

## 3. Choosing a model of cooperation

In the projects of the Science Shop of Wageningen UR, the following stakeholders usually are included: client organisation, project leader, researcher, students, project steering committee, and other stakeholders. Each group has its own share and its own role. In the representation model, the representatives of the stakeholders are included in the steering committee. In the 'taking the lead' model, the 'external' stakeholders are only asked for information, not for feedback on research or design.

When it comes to the stakeholders' ownership of the process, and to the co-creation of knowledge, the interactive model is the scenario of choice. The active involvement of the stakeholders enables checking and adjusting the proposed solutions. Moreover, it also gives exposure to the client organisation. This exposure has an empowering effect; the client organisation will be seen as leader in the process and discussion instead of a 'mere'follower.

Not every situation, however, allows for the interactive model to be employed. This is the case, for example, when there are too many stakeholders to take into account or when the situation is too tense for interaction. Then the representation model or 'taking the lead' model are second best.

## 4. Stages in the process

In this section, we will elaborate on the four different phases of a typical Science Shop project: start-up, research, design, and dissemination.

In the start-up phase, the client organisation obviously has its own perception of the problem at hand. However, it is the researcher's responsibility to check whether this problem definition is broad enough to be recognised by the other stakeholders involved (see the case of the ring road, or the case of the sand pits, for example). The project steering committee can be instrumental by putting forward valuable information from other, similar, cases.

In the subsequent research phase, the client organisation can be of value in mapping the stakeholders and the local experts. Sometimes, the client organisation can even be of help in the actual research. In the case of the ring road, the client organisation conducted a survey to find out which subareas were highly valued by the inhabitants of the region (in terms of landscape) and which were less valued. Of course, this survey was conducted under strict supervision of the researchers.

In the design phase, it is the client organisation that should take the lead in critically reviewing the researchers' plans – and in stimulating other stake-

| | PRODUCTS | ROLES | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Client organisation | Researchers/ Students | Other stakeholders | Steering committee |
| **Start-up phase** | Project proposal | Phrasing the problem | Rephrasing the problem | Local input for rephrasing the problem | External input for rephrasing the problem |
| **Research phase** | Network analyses (interests) Geographical values, political boundaries | Defining the network (+surveys) Local knowledge | Researching the network | Being the network Local knowledge | Providing feedback |
| **Design phase** | Vision Detailed designs | Organising critics on the vision<br>Checking feasibility | Producing the vision Bringing the problem to a higher (geographical) level<br>Clarifying the effect of the vision | Criticising the vision<br>Checking feasibility | Criticising the vision |
| **Dissemination phase** | New networks, new knowledge | Taking the lead, using the product as an entrance in regional processes | Informing the scientific community and society by writing papers | New coalitions | Informing peersc |

*Table 1: roles of the project participants in the Science shop project phases.*

holders to do so as well. This will fortify the client organisation's role in the upcoming developments, thus empowering the client organisation. As an added bonus, this process can already bring along approximation between the stakeholders involved.

The latter is fortified still further in the dissemination phase, during which the client once again can show it is able to critically review the products developed. And since a locally defined problem hardly ever is truly unique, the researchers on their part should endeavour to disseminate their findings – both those related to content as well as those related to the process. In table 1 the roles of the different project participants are detailed out.

**5. Conclusions**

Several models can be used to involve stakeholders in research projects. A truly interactive model is to be preferred, since it allows all stakeholders to contribute - thus maximising the stakeholders' potential in coming to the best solution. The choice of which model to use, however, depends on several factors such as the number of stakeholders, the degree of polarisation and the number of possible solutions that have been explored at an earlier stage. The cases also make clear that – as written in the introduction – different perceptions of reality are present, which makes it necessary to design a suitable process with the proper role for every stakeholder. The roles the different stakeholders can play in the project, depend on the phase the project is in and on the position of the stakeholder. Understanding the different roles the stakeholders can play is a crucial success factor for Science Shop projects, as is shown (albeit negatively) by the case of the mountain bikers: the insufficient flow of information in the representation model seriously hampered the acceptance of the final outcome. Legitimacy for the solutions of the Science shop client was gained by improving the dialog during the science shop process, by making use of the strongpoints of the different stakeholders (see table 1) and structuring the process in the best possible way, as shown in section 2.

**References**

**Ayre, G., R. Callway** (2005). Governance for sustainable development: a foundation for the future. Earthscan, London.

**Bressers, H., S. Kuks** (2011). Governance patronen als verbreding van het beleidsbegrip. Beleidswetenschap, vol. 15 (1), 76-103.

**Hoofwijk, H., D .J. Stobbelaar** (2012). Mountainbikers op de Utrechtse Heuvelrug. Een voorstel voor een uitdagende en financieel haalbare routestructuur waarbij beheer en aansprakelijkheid geregeld zijn. Wetenschapswinkel Wageningen UR, 84 pg.

**Leistra, G. in prep.** Different shades of green. Reflections on the legitimacy of Dutch nature conservation. Dissertation Wageningen University, Wageningen.

**Stobbelaar, D. J.** (2012). Bewoners maken het groen. Uitgeverij Landwerk, Wageningen.

**Stobbelaar, D. J., G. Leistra** (2010). Upscaling local environmental problems to create governance solutions. In: B. Kolijn e.a. (eds). Book of abstracts Scaling and Governance conference 2010. "Towards a new knowledge for Scale Sensitive Governance of Complex Systems". Pp 34-35.

**Stobbelaar, D. J., H. Hoofwijk** (2009). Integraal plannen. Voorbeeld Zuid-Limburgse groeven. Ruimtelijke Ordening Magazine 2009-12, 32-34.

**Stobbelaar, D.J., R. Jaarsma, H. Hoofwijk, R. Simons** (2008). Verkeer is als water. Verkeersoverlast te lijf met opschaling. RO Magazine, januari/februari 2008.

**Tress, B., G. Tress, G. Fry** (2003). Potential and limitations of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary landscape studies. In: Tress, B., G. Tress, A. Van der Valk (eds). Interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity in landscape studies: potential and limitations. Delta Program, Wageningen, 182-192. Delta Series no. 2.

**Vreke, J., A.L. Gerritsen, R.P. Kranendonk, M. Pleijte, P.H. Kersten, F.J.P. van den Bosch** (2009). Maatlat government – governance. Wettelijke onderzoekstaken Natuur en Milieu, werkdocument 142, Alterra Wageningen.





## ENGAGING STAKEHOLDERS IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: ADAPTED EUROPEAN AWARENESS SCENARIO WORKSHOPS IN THE INPROFOOD PROJECT

**No. 72-E**

**Authors**
Christine Urban,
Michael Strähle,
Science Shop Vienna,
Austria

The authors present a concept for adapted and refined European Awareness Scenario Workshops (EASW), a method they apply in the FP7 project INPROFOOD. Since about 20 years EASW have been conducted in many countries. Usually this method is applied in urban planning in local contexts to create balanced participation of stakeholders in developing sustainable solutions. In general EASW are geared at reaching a shared vision on a given topic among different actors and to gather their knowledge about barriers, experiences, and needs. Furthermore, EASW participants propose steps to make these visions come true. It is a precondition for EASW that they are on topics where decisions still can be made. That way, they aim at promoting debate and democratic participation in decision making and form a basis for further discussions and assessments among policy makers, and, with outcomes being communicated widely, a broad range of stakeholders and society at large. In INPROFOOD the EASW approach is applied on national and European levels for developing shared visions of how to reconcile health concerns and innovations in food technology. In this project 39 EASW – three series of 13 workshops each – are conducted in 13 European countries. Among others, participants include policy makers, health and food professionals, representatives of consumer associations, trade unions, industrialist associations, organisations in public health, and self-help groups, and, of course, scientists. Connecting food technology with health is a constant task, irrespective of different views, because there are many varying needs in populations, and conflicts are inevitable. In such a conflict area, stakeholder involvement has to be as credible as possible and methods have to be optimised for and tailored to sensitive issues. The authors present the set of rules of EASW, the adaptations and refinements they made for making it more effective on national and European levels, their efforts to make this approach credible and transparent, the pitfalls to avoid in organising such participative processes, how the workshops fit into the framework of the INPROFOOD project and relate to other project activities, and discuss the limits of this method and what can be expected from the workshops.

## KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION THROUGH A COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY BROKER MODEL

**No. 73-C**

**Authors**
Krista Jensen,
Jane Wedlock,
York University,
Canada

York University's Knowledge Mobilization (KMb) Unit has worked to connect faculty members and graduate students with external community members since 2006. Using a knowledge broker model, the Unit supports community-university research partnerships so that research can inform public policy and professional practice. In June 2011, the KMb Unit and their community partner, United Way York Region, were awarded a CDN $93,000 grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) to develop research initiatives looking at the social determinants of health. Established in 1976, United Way York Region is a registered charity uniting people and resources to improve quality of life in York Region, a regional municipality north of Toronto, Ontario which is experiencing one of the fastest rates of population growth in Canada. A large percentage of this growth comes from immigration and settlement (Regional Municipality of York, 2009). United Way identifies community priorities and works with partners to take action, supporting a network of 100 critical programs across the region's nine municipalities. As part of this funded initiative, the United Way York Region now employs a community knowledge broker who works to make university research and researchers more accessible to the community. In this storytelling session, York University and United Way York Region Knowledge Mobilization Officers Krista Jensen and Jane Wedlock will discuss civil society engagement through research partnership building using a community-university knowledge broker model. This session will focus on the development of knowledge mobilization activities at York University and the United Way York Region; the development of the York University-United Way York Region relationship; our community-university knowledge broker model; benefits and challenges of this model and next steps for our work together.