6

Embedding community–university partnerships: science shops and policy development

Eileen Martin, Emma McKenna, Henk Mulder and Norbert Steinhaus

Science shops originated in the Netherlands in the 1970s as part of the wider democratization-of-science movement. The gap between civil society and traditional knowledge providers was recognized by Dutch students, who established relationships with civil society organizations (CSOs) to bring their research needs into universities where they could be addressed by students as part of their academic course of study. The basic model of opening up knowledge resources within universities to the wider society has been adapted and used in countries across the world to help ensure that community-based organizations have access to knowledge within universities which they can then use to effect change in their local communities. Partnerships both within and across nation states have been vital to the spread of the model and its continuing success. One major challenge, however, as with many community–university partnership projects, has been sustainability, particularly in situations where resources are limited. From the outset, therefore, the wider science shop movement has recognized the importance of policy development and has had a focus on ensuring that science shops are embedded both within individual universities and within public policy more generally at regional, national and international levels.

As science shops spread across Europe and beyond, there is a growing acceptance that they can be an efficient and effective mechanism by which HEIs address a range of strategic priorities such as research, teaching and reputational enhancement.[1] This chapter will consider the role of science shops in helping to develop policy to support community engagement within universities, both at the European level and at the country level. It will also discuss lessons learned by science shops in embedding community–university partnerships in policy, with a view to enhancing their sustainability.

A science shop provides independent, participatory research support in response to concerns experienced by civil society (Living Knowledge Network, 2012). In practical terms, most science shops work with CSOs to help them develop their information and problem-solving needs into research projects which can then be carried out by university students as part of their academic curriculum – meaning CSOs do not pay to access this resource. However, there are variations on this model – some non-university-based science shops carry out their own research in response to requests from citizen groups. And in some countries where the

CSO sector is less well developed, science shops work with schools or with local government to meet community needs.

Science shops have been most successful in the Netherlands where they are an integral part of many Dutch universities and a more specialist system has been established. For example, the University of Groningen has five different science shops covering each of their major faculties (University of Groningen, 2011). The model began to spread from the Netherlands fairly rapidly after its initial development.

Leydesdorff and Ward (2009) characterize four waves in the development of science shops. The first wave reached across the Netherlands and originated within academia itself. The second in the 1980s originated within civil society in countries such as Germany as part of a wider institutionalization of extra-parliamentary opposition. The third wave focused on the need to build social capital; the concept was taken up by social scientists in countries such as the UK and the USA. The fourth saw the spread of the movement into Eastern European countries and South Africa. Since then there has been a further wave of interest from Asian countries. Science shops have been established: thirteen new science shops in China and emerging science shops in Malaysia and South Korea. While the models used vary enormously according to the prevailing structures within the society, the core values of democratizing knowledge and opening up knowledge resources to wider civil society remain at the heart of the science shop concept.

However, the importance of individual science shops in creating the energy for this wave of development has not necessarily been acknowledged. The initial Dutch science shops could see the importance of becoming embedded in public policy and worked to influence the Ministry of Research in the Netherlands, who recognized the value of science shops as a means to reach out to communities around scientific issues, and sought to support the concept. Simultaneously, Dutch science shops were also reaching out internationally. For example, a Dutch academic brought the concept to Northern Ireland in the late 1980s and made a successful application for funding under the Nuffield Foundation's Public Understanding of Science stream to establish a science shop, now one of the longest-running outside of the Netherlands. Between 1998 and 2005, Dutch science shops utilized key policy drivers, around renewal of higher education and capacity building on environmental issues, to make the case to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs to fund a network of science shops focused on environmental issues in Romania. The resulting InterMEDIU centres at universities were seen as important steps in the renewal of higher education, and instrumental in capacity building to tackle environmental issues with domestic resources. As science shops gained momentum through international networking and national-level lobbying, the movement also sought to bring the concept to the European Commission (EC) where policymakers within the Research Directorate made conceptual links with the *citizen science* and *science in society* agendas. A fruitful two-way relationship was gradually established which will be explored in more detail in this chapter.

However, while the model has spread across the world and there are science shops or science shop-type structures on every continent, as with other community–university partnership projects, sustainability has remained a key challenge.

Leydesdorff's use of wave imagery is apposite since the tide can also go out as well as come in and some science-shop-type initiatives have failed to flourish (Mulder *et al.*, 2001). This may increasingly be the case in the current global economic crisis where the roles of both CSOs and universities are being redefined. The need for science shops is greater than ever, both in terms of servicing the needs of the CSO sector struggling with a reduction in resource allocation, and in terms of demonstrating the value of universities at a time where evidencing return on public sector investment is vital. However, the fact that science shops are bridging mechanisms can make them more vulnerable to changing societal mores since they can be viewed as not fully embedded in either sector.

These issues are currently being addressed by the Living Knowledge Network as part of the EC-funded PERARES – Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society project.[2] This project developed from science shop practice and is focused on helping CSOs influence research at a more strategic level within research institutes (including universities) and within public policy. One element of this work is focused on how science shops themselves have linked into and shaped public policy both within their own university context and within public policy more widely. This chapter draws on the report produced from this work (Martin *et al.* 2011).

Science shops and the European Commission

> The European Union is not just about institution building and bringing Member States closer together, it is also about bringing Europe closer to its citizens. Consequently, its research programmes are keen to promote partnerships and knowledge for living. (Gerold, 2001, p. 3)

From the beginning, Dutch science shop participants who believed in the value of the work, to both CSOs and universities, wanted to share the development of this new practice. Initially, they established a formal network within the Netherlands. As the model spread internationally, the value of sharing support and experiences across different countries in service of this shared goal became clear. From the outset, science shop practitioners recognized the potential links between their work, which aimed to democratize science with the wider European Commission Science and Society agenda. Dutch science shops in particular took every chance to lobby public policymakers at national and international levels. Early stage discussions provided the foundation for a successful EC-funded project known as SCIPAS (Study and Conference on Improving Public Access to Science through Science Shops). A project officer at the Commission who had read about science shops contacted Dutch staff to make an application and strongly encouraged and helped to guide the process (Sclove, 1995). This project was funded under the Fifth Framework Programme of the European Community for Research, Technological Development (RTD) and Demonstration Activities (1998–2002). Nine countries took part in this project and it provided the foundation for the idea of the Living Knowledge International Science Shop Network.

SCIPAS sought not only to create a suite of resources to support science shops,

but also explicitly established an international contact point which provided information on relevant policy developments, both to participants in the project and to the wider science shop community (Steinhaus, 2003). Science shops involved in the SCIPAS project used it to reach out internationally and to promote the model in different countries, both responding to and stimulating interest and helping to build a groundswell of support among CSO partners, universities and public policymakers. The role of the EC in promoting science shops was used as leverage to support people interested in developing the concept in many countries across the world. This burgeoning international interest also demonstrated to the EC the value of their investment. The development of a website and newsletter as part of the project was also very useful in enabling people in different parts of the world to see how the concept might apply in their particular region. Another major output from SCIPAS was a conference in 2001 which offered an opportunity for existing science shops to come together, for the first time, with policymakers and discuss current practice and future priorities.

This project addressed the need identified in SCIPAS for a more formal international science shop network to support access to knowledge for disadvantaged communities, and focused on how to build and maintain a science shop network through the exchange of information and research cooperation.

The INTERACTS project (Improving Interaction between Non-Governmental Organizations – NGOs, Universities, and Science Shops: Experiences and Expectations) was a pioneer cross-national study which aimed to identify necessary changes in structures and routines in the RTD system for improving the future interaction between NGOs, researchers and intermediaries such as science shops. It was funded by the European Commission/DG12 under the Fifth RTD Framework Programme. INTERACTS contributed to the strengthening of the interaction between research institutions and society and provided more in-depth understanding of processes and effects of knowledge production.

This project indicated a growing demand for tools and support for starting science shop activities in many regions of Europe. The next step for the Living Knowledge Network was to seek funding to offer direct support to some new and emerging science shops, and to develop online resources which would be of use to people across the world trying to bring CSO demands on to university research agendas. The TRAMS project (Training and Mentoring of Science Shops) aimed to fulfil this need by supporting the ongoing professional development of existing science shops and encouraging emerging science shops through training and mentoring support. Previous EC-funded projects had enabled participants to do this in an informal way but it was clear that a more formalized structure for supporting and mentoring new science shops was needed. The TRAMS project not only helped established science shops to develop their practice further, and supported new and emerging science shops, it also supported the development of a database which brought together a range of existing training resources. It was funded within the Sixth Framework Programme of the EC. It resulted in science shops being established in France, Spain and Turkey and strengthened emerging networks in Belgium and Romania.

In November 2004, the EC invited participants for a workshop on science shops – Thinking the Future and Twinning Old/ New Shops. The debate focused on the role of universities, partnerships with CSOs and the promotion of new science shops in Europe. Ongoing and new projects were presented and a possible partnership with FP6 projects (networks of excellence and integrated projects) was also discussed (European Commission, 2005). Dutch science shops were able to point to the successful growth of the model elsewhere, particularly in Canada where the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) was funding Community–University Research Alliances (CURAs), which drew heavily on science shop experiences.[3] The outcome of this lobbying was that, in November 2005, the EC published a science shop call for proposals as part of the Science and Society Program. This was an important achievement for the Living Knowledge Network as it made science shops more visible and was a clear acknowledgement of the value of their work. The general objective of the call was to contribute to the universities' aim of sharing knowledge with society – in particular in the context of regional and local development – by supporting the development and strengthening of science shops (and similar organizations) based in, or cooperating with universities. The call aimed to support science shops in addressing the specific needs identified by local civil society, while at the same time optimizing the use of existing research results and expertise.

Emphasizing the local dimension of the research while simultaneously fostering international cooperation with organizations dealing with the same kind of local research questions (such as, for example, the issue of local air quality) were the key elements of this EC call. The call was widely publicized by the network and a total of twenty-seven eligible applications were received, indicating the strength and diversity of the science shop movement, with four projects eventually being funded. These dealt with health effects of noise from wind turbines; cycling and air pollution; optimizing public transport for the elderly; and mental health care for immigrant communities. Even where these applications were unsuccessful, productive networks were established, and ideas for interesting research proposals were worked up which has contributed to the development of science-shop-type structures.

This success of this call led to the establishment of a general funding mechanism that can be used in any DG Research call, 'research for the benefit of specific groups/CSOs' (European Commission, 2012). This funding mechanism already existed for small and medium enterprises. By attaching this funding mechanism to calls for proposals in all fields, CSOs and research institutes are able to submit joint proposals, although this mechanism has been little used to date.

A Science in Society consultation seminar was held in January 2006 in order to give relevant stakeholders the opportunity to express their opinion on the Science in Society programme, published by the EC in September 2005. Representations made by Living Knowledge Network members helped to ensure that framework programmes and work plans had enough scope to enable science shops to apply for funding. Living Knowledge Network was also invited to advise the EC's Forum on University based Research which in 2006 advised universities to 'promote the

creation and the advancement of science shops at Universities' (Living Knowledge Network, 2005).

It was also the explicit aim of the Science in Society Call of 2008 to have public engagement activities that would make a difference to research strategies. The EC-funded science shop project PERARES began in 2010 and has supported the production of the policy report from which much of this chapter has been drawn. It also offers cross-national demonstration projects examining domestic violence in pregnancy across England, Belgium and Norway, and examining human rights issues among Roma and Travellers across Ireland, Spain and Hungary. These projects involve CSO organizations in carrying out research which is of direct relevance to their own work in supporting vulnerable people across Europe. The fact that the Living Knowledge Network has grown to be able to submit and obtain a grant of €2.7 million shows how policy development and capacity building of those active in the Science in Society field go hand in hand.[4]

Negotiations on the PERARES project also made it clear that the EC sees science shops as a way to implement policy targets for more equitable access to science and technology, and increasing response from science and technology to civil society, both of which are needed to achieve the ideal of the knowledge society, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. The Ljubljana process in Slovenia calls for improved governance of the European Research Area (ERA) which should involve universities and research organizations, and civil society. A genuine engagement can make civil society a partner in identifying and responding to the *grand challenges* of our time to which European research should respond, according to the EC's Lund Declaration.

Science shops have therefore had a high degree of success in working with the EC. Commission support has allowed networking and capacity building to respond to policy opportunities, thus creating synergy between policy and implementation. The fact that the EC's Science and Society Action Plan of 2001 mentions that 'the networking of science shops in the regions of the Union and the candidate countries will be encouraged' (European Commission, 2002, p. 15) was a direct consequence of the SCIPAS project. The establishing of a Science and Society Directorate at the EC's DG Research in 2000 has helped to provide continuity to policy development; the concept of public understanding has moved beyond unidirectional science communication towards two-way public engagement. This shift clearly favours the interactive, upstream engagement performed by science shops.

In some cases, the outcomes of lobbying by Living Knowledge members are clear – for example, the specific science shop call which led to several projects which directly benefited CSOs. In the Netherlands, science shops are invited to comment on draft Science in Society work plans and have some success in making representations. In others, as with all policy development work, it is less clear to what degree particular interventions are responsible for positive outcomes. Continued funding of successful science shop projects indicates a level of both successful policy intervention and successful international networking.

Science shops in national and institutional policy

Attempts have been made by science shops in different countries to either capitalize on current public and institutional policy where it exists or to create a policy context where it does not exist. EC support has also enabled some science shops to make stronger arguments for support at national and local levels. This section will focus on science shops within the UK and Ireland which have been less well covered in previous reports and where there have been recent significant policy gains.

United Kingdom

Over the last fifteen years, active citizenship has become a key policy driver within the UK. Under the 1997–2010 Labour government, there was a focus on third-sector organizations and on volunteering, which left space for citizen engagement initiatives. Elements of this have been rebranded in policy terms as 'Big Society' by the current coalition government. In terms of higher education, there have been attempts to open universities up to the needs of society, resulting in the development of a funding stream in 2001 known as Higher Education Innovation Funding (HEIF). This funding stream sought to develop capacity in universities to engage outside the academy, with a goal of making economic and social impacts in society. While the focus for such policy and funding has been overwhelmingly in the direction of economic development, community engagement practitioners within universities, including science shops, have argued that the needs of civil society must also be reflected. This has helped to support some small-scale knowledge exchange initiatives; for example, the Department for Employment and Learning Northern Ireland has funded science shops in Northern Ireland through this stream since 2004 (Martin *et al.*, 2011).

As part of this policy of opening up universities to the public, UK government has also been encouraging UK research funders towards public engagement. When the Research Councils United Kingdom (RCUK) and Wellcome Trust opened a funding call for Beacons for Public Engagement, and a National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) in 2007, community engagement practitioners worked to ensure that initiatives focused on community engagement also found a place alongside more traditional public engagement activities such as public lectures and partnerships with museums and broadcasters. The NCCPE has a goal of 'support[ing] universities to increase the quantity and quality of their public engagement activity' (NCCPE, 2012). Initiatives such as the Concordat on Public Engagement[5] and NCCPE Manifesto on Public Engagement[6] create spaces where community engagement can find a home, although a lot of public engagement activity still falls in the area of 'inspiring interest' rather than direct engagement with civil society. The NCCPE has been successful in linking public engagement to the traditional university priorities of teaching and research. More recently, in discussions on the future direction of academic research in the UK, the NCCPE's lobbying contributed directly to the inclusion of impact and environment as elements of the proposed Research Excellence Framework (REF), the

main government mechanism for funding academic research in UK universities. So, while academic excellence is still at the heart of research, the funding stream now acknowledges the importance of research that reaches out beyond the HEI. And at least one UK-based science shop is hoping to use REF to gain visibility and profile within their HEIs (Martin *et al.*, 2011).

Several UK science shops have also recognized the importance of having community engagement written into policy within their own universities. In some cases this was relatively easy to achieve, where a science shop was established in an HEI which already had engagement strongly written in at strategic level. Within this context, a science shop offered an additional means by which to carry out one of the core missions of HEIs. In a few cases, community service work was also written into the promotions criteria of HEIs so that academics who support students working on science shop projects can have this recognized as contributing to a core mission.

In other cases, there were no policies or strategies in place that directly supported community engagement; science shop practitioners worked to develop this agenda within universities. For example, one science shop used the appointment of a senior staff member with responsibility for the area of outreach and worked with him to develop an outreach strategy to the community. They also used this to write community engagement via student projects into the education strategy and to ensure there were small references to community-engaged research in the research policy. This ensured that engagement with the community was viewed as part of the university's core work.

However, some science shops have not prioritized policy development to the same degree. One science shop, established in 2006 under a strategic development fund, was very successful in establishing links with NGOs and in lobbying policymakers, who extended this regional funding for a second round. However, this successful lobbying work was not replicated within the HEIs involved and the lack of embedding within the universities contributed significantly to the demise of the project, since the value of the work was not clear to senior managers who made budget allocations. While some attempts were made latterly to address this, it was not enough to make a case for continuing funding, particularly in a time of economic cutbacks across the public sector in the UK.

Ireland

One UK science shop was instrumental in bringing the concept to HEIs in the Republic of Ireland, both through direct contact and through involvement in a master's programme in science communication. There are currently four science-shop-type organizations in the Republic of Ireland at different stages of development. In the Irish example, difficult circumstances have helped to provide the catalyst for positive change. In spite of financial pressures in Irish Higher Education, the Higher Education Authority (HEA) policy of supporting strategic innovation enabled three years' funding for two full-time staff for one HEI-based Knowledge Exchange programme, incorporating both community-based learning and research. The HEA has used the current economic situation to re-evaluate

the key purposes of higher education. The National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030, which emerged from this process, emphasizes the significance of HEIs engaging with society in several sections and has been instrumental in supporting the development of science-shop-type programmes. The strategy notes: 'Greater engagement and partnership between higher education institutions and community and voluntary groups offers significant potential to progress equality and community development and to further social innovation' (Hunt, 2011, p. 76). Partnerships with community groups 'can contribute to the creation of an academic community engagement model that builds academic community partnerships to create long-term cultural and social change (*ibid.*, p. 77).

In addition, the National Access Strategy in Ireland, with its focus on widening participation in Higher Education, has helped focus on the benefits of building bridges between disadvantaged communities and higher education. Regarding curriculum development, the National Strategy for Higher Education in Ireland Report states that 'Engagement with the wider community must become more firmly embedded in the mission of higher education institutions', and this could be achieved by recognizing the 'civic engagement of their students through programme accreditation', and by putting in place 'structures and procedures that welcome and encourage the involvement of the wider community in a range of activities' (*ibid.*, p. 23). Irish science shops are already using this policy paper to make arguments to support science shop work both within their own universities and in public policy (Martin *et al.*, 2011).

In addition to its focus on community engagement, the National Strategy for Higher Education in Ireland has identified the need for students 'to spend some time in a work or service situation, and formally acknowledge such work through accreditation or inclusion in the student's Diploma Supplement' (Hunt, 2011, p. 19). Such a policy supports the development of new courses or curricula redesign to include community-based learning and research activities. But there is also no mention of community-engaged research or CBR in the National Strategy, despite there being a whole chapter on research. 'However, the experience of Irish science shops has been that, while there may have been policy gains at the national level, very little policy exists at the level of individual HEIs that explicitly supports or even names science shops; it is more that we they have been using the policy goals in these documents to match the science shop process and rationale' (*ibid.*, p. 20).

Embedding science shops in policy – lessons learned

The experience of science shops has been that contributing to the development of policy at all levels – from institutional to national and international – is helpful to embedding their work, especially in terms of fostering a culture supportive of community university alliances. The work of individual Living Knowledge Network representatives in raising the profile of science shops with key policymakers at the EC, particularly in the Research directorate, has led to a number of projects being initiated, including the current PERARES project. This networking, lobbying and linking to other core agendas has brought science shops to a point

where there is a broad awareness of the concept and practice of science-shop-type activities in higher education across the world and, in some countries, there is a real momentum behind the movement to make universities more accessible to community interests: 'EC-funded projects such as PERARES are also useful in examining opportunities for development and lobbying and in encouraging networking. Often it only takes one contact to make a difference' (*ibid*., p. 22).

For most science shops, lobbying is fundamental to survival. However, not all understood lobbying in the same way. For some, lobbying was a formal activity undertaken largely by making policy representations, for example, to the EC during a formal consultation. For others, lobbying was an ongoing exercise, involving both formal and less formal routes. One community engagement manager commented, 'we don't really lobby, but we do go to places where we know people with influence will be and we make presentations and talk to them afterwards' (*ibid*., p. 21). In discussions, it was clear that both types of lobbying have a role to play in successful policy development.

It should also be noted that many science shops did not engage in lobbying activities. As one commented, 'It is not easy to play chess simultaneously on different boards. Many science shops are understaffed and … do not know how to give more priority to their strategic development within international, national, regional or university policies' (*ibid*.).

Finding the right supporter to champion science shops both within government and within the HEI also emerged as important in embedding science shops. In some cases, this might not be the person with direct responsibility for this area of work but rather someone with either a personal or a research interest in it. Often they are at a senior level within the organization; however, some people also have influence beyond their job title – for example, those who write policy drafts. Consequently, it is also important to ensure that the good work done by science shops is clearly communicated, both within and outside the university at different levels. Successful science shops pointed to the importance of making sure that their work is visible, both within the HEI and externally (*ibid*.). This in turn may impact both institutional and regional support for science shops. It is also important to build a skills base in the network of people who are able to effectively market the work they do at a range of different levels.

The process of writing into sub-policies is often easier if it is written in at the highest level within the HEI – for example, in the mission statement, operational plan or corporate plan. However, the distinctive thing about science shops is that they meet the needs of HEIs, curriculum development, student skills, and employability, research impact, science communication, and societal needs in a cost-effective way. This reinforces the importance for science shops of building links both formally and informally across institutions and reflects the different agendas which science shops can respond to within HEI. The location of a science shop within the institution is not critical; the degree of connectivity is.

It was clear from the research that one individual can have a significant effect on policy within both their own HEI and at a broader level in their region or country. Policies do not exist in isolation but can be influenced and developed by

individuals. This can happen on a formal basis via submitting responses to consultations. However, it can also happen informally and it is important to ensure that science shop agendas are represented in as many different areas as possible. Indeed, Living Knowledge Network as a network has some notable successes with building relationships with influential individuals. This also works both ways – science shops are often small and one person can have a lot of influence for good or bad.

The results of informal lobbying are not easily identified and may not take effect immediately. It can be difficult to identify whether or where influence has been felt. However, those science shops fully embedded in policy tended to undertake informal lobbying on a regular basis, which would suggest this is an effective tactic. It is also the case that such informal lobbying can help to ensure that, when outside threats do present themselves, there is a strong defensive position in place.

In some countries such as the Netherlands and Ireland, lobbying has been very effective and has led to a strong policy outcomes. But for some institutions, this is not necessarily seen as a successful outcome – in some institutions the requirement to establish a science shop is itself seen as an impediment. Generally speaking though, it would seem that commitment from HEIs is necessary as well as a broader government agenda; imposed policy without prior discussion and agreement may cause as many problems as it solves.

Conclusions

Embedding community university engagement is a key challenge for many community engagement practitioners and this chapter has sought to give some examples of where science shops have been active in both influencing and utilizing policy to enable communities to access the knowledge resources of universities.

While there is an international drive towards opening up universities to the needs of outside society, and the science shop movement continues to grow and develop both within Europe and across the world, in the current climate of economic uncertainty it is more important than ever that science shops and community university partnerships be firmly embedded within a policy context. As drastic cuts to HEI budgets are implemented in many countries, activities regarded as *add-on* are being reduced or removed and only core activities remain. In some cases this has already affected science shops and consequently has blocked a key route where communities can access the knowledge resources of universities. Linking to appropriate international agendas, such as those developed by the European Union, and using these agendas to help develop a critical mass, has been crucial to the success of the science shop movement across Europe and in influencing national policies both within the EU and further afield.

The contribution science shops can make to core HEI agendas in both research and education is apparent; indeed, the prevailing view is that, in order for science shops to maintain their position in HEIs they must ensure that these links are made clear to the institutions, both internally and externally. Embedding science shops within HEI policies and within HEI curricula can only help to strengthen

their sustainability. However, science shops can also help HEIs make the argument for their relevance in times of austerity since they help demonstrate the value of universities to society more broadly, rather than primarily commercial and industrial interests. In many cases, science shops are fully embedded in both public policy and in institutional policy. However, policy gains need to be monitored and evaluated, and policy influence needs to be constantly refreshed. In some cases, while policy battles have been won at a national level, this gain has not been reflected at an operational level and is therefore unlikely to have any real impact.

Policies are created when individuals understand the vision for an activity or area of work and can see the links with other key priorities. Policy change is therefore something that everyone can contribute to. Lobbying at all levels is a critical part of this process as strategic thinkers and influencers need to understand the vision for science shops and community university engagement more broadly. In order to ensure sustainability, science shops need to understand what the policy drivers are across a range of areas and this can be both time-consuming and challenging. While it is indeed difficult to play chess on several boards at once, it is important for both science shops and community–university partnerships to be aware that it may be vital to the future of their work.

Notes

1 For more information on how science shops operate, see Mulder and DeBok (2006).
2 This chapter draws heavily on work carried out as part of the Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society – PERARES – project which received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013, under grant agreement no. 244264). This project aims to strengthen the interaction in formulating research agendas between researchers and CSOs and citizens in Europe: made up of twenty-six partners from seventeen countries. Partners include science shops, social organizations, HEIs; a research funder participated in the first phase. The partners actively involve researchers and CSOs, and help both CSOs and the general public in dialogues to articulate research questions. These will then be put on the research agendas of the partnering research bodies such as HEIs and science shops.
3 Currently, a number of French regional councils apply the same funding scheme, as does the Romanian National Partnerships Program.
4 Previous projects had budgets from €200,000 to €450,000.
5 www.publicengagement.ac.uk/why-does-it-matter/concordat (accessed 12/01/2012).
6 www.publicengagement.ac.uk/why-does-it-matter/manifesto (accessed 12/01/2012).