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Overview

Convenors: Tim Boon (Head of Research & Public History, the Science Museum, London) and Keri Facer (University of Bristol and AHRC Connected Communities Leadership Fellow).

This workshop was convened to provide space for critical reflection on the role of Independent Research Organisations (IROs) within the Research Councils’ Connected Communities programme. Connected Communities is now well established – as of February 2015, it has funded 314 projects, which have supported 400 academics and 650 collaborating organisations. Its goals are to produce research by and into communities; to conduct interdisciplinary research with a strong arts and humanities component; and to connect research, stakeholders and communities. IROs – mainly heritage organisations, empowered to lead on RCUK-funded research projects – have played a comparatively small part in the programme thus far, but have a unique potential in the realisation of its ambitions. This event brought together staff from IROs, project participants and other interested parties to share experiences of working within the programme, to promote more intensive involvement, and to exchange their perspectives on the scheme’s future and legacy. For reference, the participants at the workshop are listed at the end of the report.

From a day of conversation, elicited using ‘open space’ technique, several key themes emerged. The goals, resources, networks and structures of IROs are more diverse than those of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), producing both exciting possibilities and some challenges. Funding from the programme has enabled certain IROs to produce innovative research methods, extend their networks, and collaborate with a broader range of communities. However, it became clear that the very funding pressures that should make Connected Communities awards attractive to IROs may also be making IROs conservative in their expectations of research funding. Awareness of the potential of the scheme had been lower than might be expected; for IROs to seize these opportunities more widely it may well be necessary to build bridges internally, especially between curators and learning department staff. On the RCUK side, there is the potential to consider modifying and developing funding mechanisms to better adapt the programme to the pressures and obligations felt by IROs, and in turn fully benefit from the rich research outcomes they can offer.

There was also discussion of the wide range of changes that a Connected Communities project might effect on participating IROs themselves. Through these conversations the workshop participants began to identify examples of good practice, impediments to success, and to make concrete suggestions for ways that Connected Communities funding might inspire and enable a culture of participatory research within an even larger number of organisations.

The workshop itself was organised on collaborative principles, and the opinions expressed here were certainly not held by all. The report is intended to give a sense of the discussions, which we expect to be continued in other forums. The recommendations developed through the day’s debates are collated on pages 11-12.
Experiencing Connected Communities: Presentations

Enfield Exchange / Helen Peavitt / Science Museum

This project saw a 1920s manual telephone exchange from the museum’s collection return to Enfield where it had been in use until five decades before. The exchange was placed on display in a local cultural centre, and became the focus of events and the collection of oral histories. The project succeeded in reuniting the community of former telephonists at the exchange, who were largely retired women, not usually a key audience for the Science Museum. A good working relationship between the local and national partners meant that the project could be delivered fast and efficiently. The reminiscences of the telephonists’ working lives now form part of the displays in the new Information Age gallery. Yet the original intention had been to work closely with local history societies to gain insights into how ‘serious amateurs’ think about the past of science and technology, and this proved not to be possible. The project showed the pitfalls of a mismatch between the timescales of the funder and those of amateur practitioners, who are often organised far into the future. It was fortunate that the funding allowed the researchers the flexibility to ‘follow the contours’ of what was found ‘on the ground’, and re-orientate the project towards the telephonists rather than amateur historians.

Whose Remembrance? / Suzanne Bardgett / Imperial War Museum

This project investigated the role of the museum in the narratives of colonial participation in the First World War. It did this through several interconnected strands (1) Through a series of advisory groups and workshops in which academics and community leaders discussed the current state of public and specialist historical understanding (2) An investigation of how IWM archives and displays could contribute to increasing public awareness. This resulted in (3) improved structures for access and interpretation, and a more informed acquisition policy. It was regretted that the community leaders and academics had not been brought together within the project. However, both groups contributed to (and featured in), a film produced by the museum that addressed the lacuna in public awareness of colonial contribution to the British military past. Overall the project identified future research directions and brought new perspectives to the displays, as well as new audiences to the museum.

All our Stories / Kayte McSweeney / Science Museum

The Science Museum All Our Stories project was a scheme linked to the HLF small grants scheme of the same name, through which the Museum could facilitate research and the use of the collections by community groups. They used the funding to work with groups that had a non-expert, non-enthusiast interests in the history of science and technology. This involved ‘hacking’ and breaking down barriers with groups who wanted to do this. At moments it also involved negotiating with the groups’ ‘uninstitutionalised’ visions for how they’d like to use the collections, including enthusiasm desire to get ‘hands on’. The community groups took part in workshops, co-developed research programmes, a film and events. Groups such as Gendered Intelligence gave the museum new insights into the scope of the collections, access and interpretation. In return the museum offered the groups a platform for previously untold, (or rarely told) stories.

“There’s no stable ‘co’ in co-designed research. Personalities and motivations, these are all evolving entities”
Linking Communities to Historic Environments / Alex Hale / Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland

RCAHMS has participated in five Connected Communities projects. These have been diverse in their scale and aims. The Commission has brought several key benefits to the HEIs it has worked with, notably skill sets and pre-existing contacts within communities. The Connected Communities funded projects have generated rich research content. Collaborating with climbers at Dumbarton Rock in the ACCORD project, and working on Mr Seele’s Garden in Liverpool, had demonstrated diverse ways in which ‘lay’ experts could contribute to defining the history and heritage of their community’s sites of interest. These collaborations also revealed the ways in which working with young designers and coders could open up new avenues. The contribution of these freelance specialists was much more than glossy output, if invited at an early stage they could bring new direction and ambition to the projects. However, the researchers had also found that multidisciplinary, multi-party working required more time than conventional research.

Heritage Decisions / Helen Graham / University of Leeds

‘How should decisions about heritage be made?: Co-designing a research project brought together universities, two IROs, HLF and a wider group of people (community conservation officers, digital culture entrepreneurs, and activists) to explore heritage conceived as a system. It was also a pilot project for collaborative research design. The members of the team took part in workshops, experienced days in the working lives of their co-investigators, and sought to identify the common factors in decision-making across different areas of heritage. Emphasis was placed on social and dynamic learning within the team. The open-ended ‘emergent’ style of the research occasionally caused difficulties in the research process, but was vindicated in the final analysis, as it produced a new framework for heritage activity based around four themes: Act / Connect / Reflect / Situate. After a first co-design phase, a rich variety of sub-projects was pursued in phase two, including DIY heritage initiatives in York, and a music co-collecting strand at the Science Museum.

Pararchive / Simon Popple / University of Leeds

Pararchive was begun with the intention of creating a digital resource for communities to use for story-telling, campaigning, creative expression, and communication. The resource was designed by the project team (including the university, Science Museum Group, BBC, and an SME) in collaboration with four communities in Manchester, Bute, and Stoke-on-Trent. Bringing these diverse perspectives into a framework for designing software tools was a challenge, but it is expected that this diversity will make it useful for a wider range of users of the end product. The final result is the website Yarn (see: http://yarncommunity.com/) which is built around the principle that users can build stories by creating personal archives from digitised artefacts. These artefacts can be ‘collected’ by the user from the resources of institutional contributors (for example the BBC archives, and Science Museum image library), or from the users’ own uploaded content.
With the presentations in mind, all workshop participants were invited to propose points for discussion on the IROs’ experience of Connected Communities thus far. These proposals were worked into five themes that were then used to frame the first Open Space session: ‘Looking Back’. The discussion is summarised below and the notes from the discussion can be found in the appendix.

**Theme 1:** The “Mess of the Present”: methods/non-methods

**Theme 2:** Access: objects and sensitivities

**Theme 3:** Unwilling Collaborators

**Theme 4:** Control, silence, copyright and ownership

**Theme 5:** What do we know about heritage that we didn’t know before?

Process in research: skewed expectations, animated collections, and dynamic relationships

For successful collaborative research each party needs to recognise the others’ expectations. This means coping with the evolution of project objectives, a process that can often happen asymmetrically. Feeling comfortable with compromise and change during collaborations requires understanding and trust. These discussions need to be sustained throughout the projects.

An IRO can support mutual understanding with its community partners by setting out clear guidelines and contexts for projects. For example, in short collaborations it has proved easier to satisfy the interests of community participants through outward-faced engagement, and the production of events, rather than through carrying out research that focuses on issues such as classification, provenance, or display. In cases where less publicly visible research outcomes are desired, it may be necessary to give community participants a more thorough explanation of institutional processes and functions.

However, in many cases IROs might want to find ways to adapt their procedures and goals to ‘meet’ their community partners. This can be seen clearly through the lens of access policies. Community members might be confused or put off by restrictions on how they can use IRO collections in research. IROs might respond to that by changing their attitude. Traditionally museum policy focuses on protecting objects from decay caused by handling, transport, or display. However, we might also consider balancing physical preservation with the need to protect those objects from the fate of ‘irrelevance’, when they aren’t made active or productive. Individual institutions could consider developing more sensitive and differential access policies that demonstrate a wider view of the different sites from which the public might access collections (galleries, stores, online). This would be easier if supported by more discussion of access policy, both between IROs and at a national level.

“The bicycle enthusiasts soon got bored because couldn’t touch the objects. They wanted to engage with them on their terms, so what did getting ‘access’ mean for them in the end?”
Risk

Within the straitened budgets of the museum/gallery/heritage sector, **Connected Communities** has made space for organisations to take risks in exploring what might otherwise be ‘off-limits’. The presentations proved that taking those risks could produce extraordinary outcomes, but the process can also create anxiety for IRO project representatives in a number of ways. Firstly, their home institution might not give credit to projects that have produced interesting or valid failure. Secondly, there is the fear that relinquishing full control over collections and narratives might damage institutional integrity (and collections, see above). Risk and the feeling of risk, might be mitigated by developing better internal communication, new frameworks for assessing the value of projects, increased peer support, and more forums for the discussion of good and interesting practice.

Identity, expertise and ownership in collaborative research

The roles of different parties in collaborative research are not always clear. Who sets the agendas? How do research outcomes reflect multiple identities that are hidden within apparently coherent communities and institutions? Where community research agendas are developed by the ‘gatekeepers’ of a group, those agendas won’t always reflect the position of the wider membership. However, this is also the case within IROs. Collaborative research might not be a familiar practice for the majority of an IRO’s staff so it may be difficult to communicate benefits and outcomes to other parts of the institution. These issues might be complicated further if the dissemination of research outcomes is restricted by IRO ‘ownership’ of the cultural goods in question, due to the practical role of copyright and IP in IRO income streams.

Defining Communities

The question of identity in research output described above reflects the fact that communities and their ‘commons’ are not straightforward or homogeneous. There was concern amongst the workshop participants that unreflexive attitudes might lead to ‘community’ becoming a fetishised term. This was reflected in discussion of the practical processes through which potential collaborators were identified, and encountered. However, answering the research questions that an IRO has identified may also sometimes require the involvement of groups that are not initially inclined to join in. It is important to go beyond ‘the articulate and willing’ when developing **Connected Communities** initiatives, but reaching the ‘unwilling’ requires time and technique, in addition to raising political questions. New funding initiatives will need to respond to these necessities if the full promise of research collaboration with communities is to be realised. Three particular points were raised:

Working with demographically defined ‘communities’ is likely to be an unsatisfying way of approaching answering research questions (particularly since groups rarely self-identify with those categories). Where the recruitment of collaborators feels more organic, the process is still often inadvertently ‘curated’ in ways that favour communities who self-organise in particular ways.

It makes a difference where you recruit your communities. Experimental methods for ‘real world’ engagement with a more diverse range of community partners have included town hall meetings and ‘mixing moments’. IROs have seen success in recruiting communities via their online presence but this opens new questions. For example, remote access alters individual engagements with group narratives. and it is even possible that digital culture could be seen to be creating ‘communities of one’.

Finally, heritage also **produces** communities. The question was posed whether innovation in research is leading to the creation of new heritage(s)? Or new stories from old heritage? Collaborative research of this kind might be reinforcing particular communal identities (possibly at the expense of others).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community project participants</th>
<th>Wave 2 / RIO project participants</th>
<th>Wider RIO</th>
<th>Positive Outcomes</th>
<th>Queries</th>
<th>Potential problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refined interpretation of collections from ‘lay expert’ knowledge</td>
<td>Refined collection policy</td>
<td>New audiences/networks</td>
<td>What gains from a CC project?</td>
<td>What organisation policy changes result from a CC project?</td>
<td>Tension between institutional responsibilities e.g. education/curation and handling/use of collection items?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrable ‘successes’ contribute to likely continued support for RIOs</td>
<td>Demonstrable ‘successes’ contribute to likely continued support for RIOs</td>
<td>New skills</td>
<td>Who learns from a CC project?</td>
<td>What forms of project review are most appropriate?</td>
<td>Endangering the integrity of the collection/objects? Sacrificing collection items to unskilled handling/use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New knowledge</td>
<td>New knowledge</td>
<td>More freedom from institutional constraints</td>
<td>How best to build relationships?</td>
<td>Can these new relationships been maintained?</td>
<td>Dealing with ‘failed’ experimental practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New skills</td>
<td>New skills</td>
<td>Diversified perspective</td>
<td>Can the project fail? What happens then?</td>
<td>Asymmetrical (and shifting) expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New tools</td>
<td>New tools</td>
<td>Innovative research</td>
<td>Can the RIOs resources be made available? Can access be tailored to fit?</td>
<td>Productive ‘messiness’ not recognised by existing accounting and reward systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More agency in the production of their history</td>
<td>More agency in the production of their history</td>
<td>Events and learning</td>
<td>What modes of participation are available?</td>
<td>How are communities identified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New platforms</td>
<td>New platforms</td>
<td>New narratives and perspectives</td>
<td>Have gatekeepers ‘represented’ their community?</td>
<td>What unites this community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better representation</td>
<td>Better representation</td>
<td>Increased desire to participate in history/heritage</td>
<td>What role does the CC play in their future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the second round of Open Space discussions, workshop participants were invited to discuss how the Connected Communities programme might better serve the goals of IROs, and better draw on their assets, in the future. The participants, once again, proposed points for discussion, which were organised into four themes:

Theme 1: Setting up collaborative projects

Theme 2: Mainstreaming the radical potential in Connected Communities

Theme 3: Sustainability and legacy

Theme 4: Spaces for review and reflection

These were considered through the lens of pragmatically focused questions:

1. If you had another £30m to spend what sort of projects would you fund?
2. If you were to put an agenda forward to the AHRC, what would it be?
3. How might these proposals be achieved without funding?

The notes from the discussions can be found in the appendix.

Funding and timing determine outcomes

The funding structure for Connected Communities projects strongly determines the scale, and timescale of the award holders' projects. Currently it imposes brief application design periods, a long lead up, a rapid start, and a short project duration. This structure isn’t beneficial to building effective community relationships and doesn’t reflect the great complexity of the processes involved in carrying out collaborative research. This problem could be addressed through changes in the funding process such as:

Increased ‘run-in’ time for grant applications, or a two-stage process.

Funding sabbaticals, and exchanges (as exemplified by the arrangement between the V&A and the University of Sussex) that would lay the ground for collaboration on grant applications over a longer period of time.

Providing seed-corn funding/coffee money to support the development of a wider range of partners, and for producing more intimate relationships prior to writing a proposal.

Spreading funding over longer periods of time. This would relieve some of the pressure on the complex and sensitive relationships produced in the course of participatory research, and be likely to make relationships more durable and productive. This could be reinforced by a reconceived follow-on funding scheme that would enable relationships between IROs and community groups to be sustained in the medium term.

Whilst it wouldn’t be possible for the AHRC to manage smaller grants such as ‘seed funds’, the distribution of these could be devolved to another institution. IROs could potentially be responsible for that process. This might take a similar form to the ‘block grants’ of Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships, although the risk of this centralising resources in London and in existing national organisations would need to be mitigated.

The IROs could independently develop on-going programmes to build relationships, using museum spaces to run meetings, ‘speed-dating,’ or ‘town hall’ events. It was suggested that IROs might also benefit from drawing more from the experience and networks of their own learning departments.
Scale and the sites of collaborative research

Scale is a key issue. Projects could be better adapted to the resources and goals of Community Partners. Simple alterations might be effective, such as allowing funding to be spent on either equipment, or on the production of longer-term ‘Community Research Plans’. There was much discussion about potential collaboration with volunteer-led or very small local museums (the example was given of the William Morris Gallery in Walthamstow). The question arose as to whether these smaller institutions could act as community partners, or participate in applications in collaboration with larger IROs. Although they wouldn’t have the available staffing for team members to spend time writing bids, etc. they might be involved if it were possible to arrange funding to cover sabbaticals, or if they could write bids/carry out projects with the assistance of ‘roaming’ experts in community research that were shared across multiple sites, or sent ‘out’ from larger IROs.

The culture of collaboration

The principles of Connected Communities are not yet part of mainstream heritage culture. The fact that few IROs have taken advantage of the funding suggests that it might not suit what they want to do. Or does it lie in the museum sector’s lack of vision?

More value could be gained from these projects if the benefits of participatory working were better recognised across the sector. Ideally participatory methods should be included as a standard element of professional development training for directors, interpreters, and curators. Participatory methods should also have a more central place in higher education curricula for heritage education. Grantees should take advantage of the leverage they gain in their own institution when they succeed in bringing external funding for a participatory project to raise awareness. Could more resources be made available to support training and development within institutions? Is this a role for the AHRC?

The existing outcomes from the Connected Communities programme provide a body of empirical material for the increased study of participatory research methods. The programme has already enabled experiment in research methods that open up new possibilities, and it could form the foundations of future work. Access to an overview of the programme would allow potential applicants to identify patterns, and in particular to address gaps/overlaps in the communities that are participating. (This is now available on the Connected Communities website www.connected-communities.org - where keyword searches will allow potential applicants to determine the level of existing activity in a given area.)

Outcomes and legacy

The legacy of Connected Communities thus far could be made more valuable in a number of ways. Firstly, a wider range of research outcomes needs to be considered valid by the whole research community, including funders, HEIs, IROs and, indeed, community researchers. All parties might proactively encourage a more diverse view of what research ‘looks like’, by supporting co-writing, emergent project design, and other non-traditional outputs. Secondly, more time and funding needs to be focused on supporting the reflective assessment of collaborative research projects. Finally, it is important that all parties, including community partners should have the opportunity to disseminate their findings. These processes need financing and could be encouraged through adaptations to the grant requirements.

“How much knowledge should sit in the IROs? Is it okay if it mostly ends up outside?”
Recommendations for IROs

(1) The IROs’ Heads of Research Group should take the lead in promoting the value of *Connected Communities* research across their organisations, developing a common approach that would link the different professional groups who might take advantage of the funding. (At present, most of the everyday practice in participation is pursued in Learning Departments remote from the research-question driven culture of research departments; each could learn from the other’s approach).

(2) Expansion of participatory practice within IROs beyond small advocacy experiments for specific demographic groups, exploring the benefits of engagement with ‘communities’ of many kinds in all aspects of their work. This might include taking more imaginative approaches to identifying communities (beyond demographic clusters).

(3) IROs could seek to develop community relationships on a more continuous basis (and in anticipation of organising project bids) through town hall meetings or ‘mixing moments’ with potential partners. IROs usually have the physical space available to host these, and so they could possibly find low cost solutions to establishing relationships prior to funding calls.

(4) More substantial recognition of the need for *Connected Communities* award holders to promote the value of their projects within their home institutions. *Connected Communities* grantees should take full advantage of the opportunity to use their project funding as leverage and to promote collaborative work in general, by clearly setting their project outcomes within the framework of their particular institutional goals and mission statements.

(5) Greater recognition within home institutions would allow the *Connected Communities* award holders to influence internal policy in ways that would facilitate further collaborative work. This might be particularly welcome with regards to:

   (a) Conservative conservation policies and collection presentation formats, with the suggestion of innovating to allow for more differentiated forms of access.

   (b) Developing the visibility and approachability of IROs to external groups that might have research agendas and suggestions

   (c) Innovating IP restrictions to allow for more diverse strategies for capitalising on collections

(6) Consideration of developing reflexive practices further, through the collection of in-depth evidence and feedback from collaborators. The Scottish Community Heritage Conference is an excellent model for sustained conversation between community partners about their past experiences and future goals in their work with IROs.

(7) Construction of peer review and support networks, including the use of heritage sector events and journals for sharing advice and developing reflexive practices as above, and campaigning for a national discussion of more diverse and stratified conservation and access policies.
Recommendations for RCUK

(1) The Research Councils should consider the timetables of their research funding opportunities to include:

   a. Short term, or seed grants that can be used to establish and test-out relationships with community partners, and encourage greater levels of collaboration at the design stage of projects. This might allow, for example, the development of ‘community research plans’. These could be organised through established IROs, as with Combined Doctoral Partnerships.

   b. Longer-term research funding opportunities that would enable sustained relationships between ROs and community groups of many kinds.

   c. Intervals in funding that reflect the experimental nature of the relationships and the projects, and might allow for unsuccessful projects to be put aside and the allotted funds to be reinvested elsewhere.

(2) The Research Councils should consider how they reward particular outcomes. This includes recognition and championing of a wider range of projects and more integrating greater diversity into the Research Excellence Framework criteria.

(3) This might, in particular include funding to support more learning from the projects. Many of the completed IRO Connected Communities funded projects beg a higher level of synthesis and theoretical engagement than the stream has been able to fund up to this point. The IROs would benefit from a ‘Reverse Follow on Funding’ scheme that would enable the theoretical and policy implications of their community engagement projects to be investigated.

(4) The Research Councils would be able to harness a wider set of existing organisations and skills if they offered increased support for the development of expertise. This might include supporting partnership or mentorship groups between IROs and smaller (local, volunteer run) heritage institutions. Alternatively it might include funding sabbatical or exchange projects. Finally, it might mean allowing funds to be spent on improving the technological or organisational capital of community partners.

(5) The support of the Research Councils in developing criteria and infrastructure for the assessment for a more diverse range of research outcomes, would give credence and weight to the achievements of participatory projects, both amongst researchers’ peers and within their institutions.
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