

**UKRI Funding Assurance**

**Self-assessment questionnaire**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research Organisation:** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Signed on behalf of the Research Organisation:** |  |
| **Print name:** |  |
| **Position:** |  |
| **Date:** |  |

Contents

[Research Grant Administration 2](#_Toc131164413)

[Doctoral Training 3](#_Toc131164414)

[Research Charge-Out Rates 4](#_Toc131164415)

[Research Integrity and Ethics 5](#_Toc131164416)

[Third Party Research Providers & Trusted Research 7](#_Toc131164417)

[Annex 1 - Policies 9](#_Toc131164418)

[Annex 2b: Research Charge-Out Rates (Own Method) 13](#_Toc131164419)

[Annex 3 - Public Engagement with Research 15](#_Toc131164420)

[**Reward and Recognition** 17](#_Toc131164421)

[**Training Support and Opportunities** 17](#_Toc131164422)

[**Good Practice** 19](#_Toc131164423)

**Research Grant Administration**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** |
|  | How is pre and post award research grant administration managed? Which responsibilities, if any, are devolved to faculties?  Briefly outline the key responsibilities for those involved in research grant administration at both the pre and post award stage and confirm who has overall responsibility for the management of research grants and fellowships.  ***Please provide any relevant organisation charts.*** |  |
|  | What financial accounting system is used by the research organisation and have any recent changes to systems affected research grant management? |  |
|  | What procedures are in place to prevent ineligible costs being charged to research grants and fellowships?  Please outline who is responsible for managing these processes and at what stage(s) of the grant / how frequently you check for, and remove, ineligible expenditure.  ***Please supply any process or guidance documents or flow charts that detail these processes.*** |  |
|  | Are reconciliations of income against expenditure on UKRI funded projects undertaken?  If yes, please outline the following:   * How often reconciliations are performed? * Who is responsible for performing the reconciliations? * How do you define ‘material’ variances (please note that variances greater than £100k will require follow-up action as part of this review)? * When a ‘material’ variance is identified how it is addressed? |  |
|  | What is the process for completing the Final Expenditure Statement and how do you ensure that the data recorded is complete and accurate?  Are there any approval processes in place prior to submitting the Final Expenditure Statement? If yes, please provide details. |  |
|  | Please confirm that you maintain timesheets for DI staff (who spend less than 100% of their contracted time on one UKRI project) in line with UKRI T&C’s.  How are timesheets recorded/authorised?  For DI staff who spend less than 100% of their contracted time on one UKRI project, please provide the calculation used to determine the portion of their employment costs which is charged to the UKRI project.  For example, productive hours etc. |  |
|  | What controls are in place to ensure that any material changes (e.g., a change in Grant Holder) are submitted for approval via Je-S in a timely manner? |  |
|  | What controls are in place to ensure that equipment purchases in excess of £138k (£115k VAT exclusive) are registered on the “[Equipment.data](https://equipment.data.ac.uk/)” national database? |  |
|  | Have there been any formal cases of fraud or suspected fraud reported, involving Research Funding bodies in the last five years from the date of your response?  ***If yes, please provide details separately including how these were investigated; when and to whom they were reported and whether there was any financial loss (including how much).*** |  |
|  | Have you had any declared conflicts of Interest on any UKRI funded projects? If so, please tell us how these have been managed?  Do you have a declaration/conflicts of Interest register? if so, how and who is responsible for managing this? |  |

**Doctoral Training**

***Note - If you are part of a consortium on a training grant, either as lead RO or partner RO, please include this aspect of management and operations when answering the following questions.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** |
|  | How is corporate (strategic decision making regarding Doctoral Training schemes) managed by the organisation? Where these are awarded on an institution-wide basis, is there a clear central body responsible, and how is the distribution of funding between departments decided? |  |
|  | What functions of training grant management are devolved to departments for internal students and consortium organisations for students based at consortium member organisations (where applicable i.e., DTP’s)? |  |
|  | All Training Grant activity must comply with the standard terms and conditions as set out in the grant offer letter. How do you ensure that all parties, such as students, supervisors and administrators are aware of the conditions? |  |
|  | What controls are in place to ensure that only costs related to students selected for funding from a training grant are recorded on the final expenditure statement? |  |
|  | How are terminations and replacements identified and managed? If payments are made in advance, what processes are in place to recover overpayment of stipend and fees? |  |
|  | How are changes in student circumstance linked to the level of stipend e.g., suspension, moving to part-time etc.? |  |
|  | How do you ensure that all studentship records are updated in Je-S within one month of changes being formally agreed and who is responsible for updating the Je-S student Portal for both your own and consortium member organisations? |  |

# Research Charge-Out Rates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** | |
|  | Please state which of the following methodologies you are using to calculate your research charge-out rates (indirect, estates, technicians, facilities).  • TRAC – calculation of own rates in compliance with [TRAC](https://www.trac.ac.uk/tracguidance/) requirements. • Organisational own methodology for calculating research charge-out rates per FTE. • Using [dispensation](https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-standards-and-data/funding-assurance-programme/) rates.  ***Note:*** *Overseas organisations (or UK organisations not using any of the methods listed above) should specify their costing methodology for research, the governance arrangements and whether the methodology is independently reviewed/ audited.* |  | |
|  | Please provide the research charge-out rates being applied to UKRI project applications as of the date of SAQ completion and indicate when the rates applied from. | *Indirect rate (per FTE)*  *Laboratory Estates Rate (per FTE)*  *Non-Laboratory rate (per FTE)*  *Infrastructure Technician rate (per FTE)*  *\* Other (please specify)*  *Date that rates were adopted*  *\*Please add more lines to report other research rates.* | £(TBC)  £(TBC)  £(TBC)  £(TBC)  £(TBC)  (DATE) |
|  | Please provide details of who within your organisation (name, role and function) is/ are responsible for:  • Maintaining the costing system and calculating the research charge-out rates (indirect, estates, technicians and facilities)?  • Updating the research charge-out rates (indirect, estates, technicians and facilities) in the costing tool? |  | |
|  | How is the costing model maintained, e.g., through Microsoft Access/ Excel/ specialist software? |  | |
|  | Please provide details of who within your organisation (name, role and function) is/ are responsible for approving / signing off the research charge-out rates?  ***Please provide:  • A copy of the paper presented to the accountable officer/ committee that approved the charge-out rates quoted at question 20, and a copy of the notes/ minutes from the meeting to evidence approval.*** |  | |
| ***UK Higher Education Providers and Research Organisations required to submit annual TRAC returns should also complete the questions set out at Annex 2a.***  ***Research Organisations using their own methodology should complete the questions set out at Annex 2b.*** | | | |

# Research Integrity and Ethics

***Research Organisations are required to meet the requirements set out in the*** [***Concordat to Support Research Integrity (2019***](https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2019/the-concordat-to-support-research-integrity.pdf)***), hereafter, ‘Concordat’) the*** [***UKRI fEC grant terms and conditions***](https://ukriwebsite-ukri.msappproxy.net/apply-for-funding/before-you-apply/your-responsibilities-if-you-get-funding/meeting-ukri-terms-and-conditions-for-funding/#contents-list)***, and the*** [***UKRI’s Policy on the Governance of Good Research Conduct***](https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-policy-on-the-governance-of-good-research-practice/) ***(published March 2022) and any subsequent amendments. The reasons for collecting the following information are: -***

* ***Primarily to provide assurance to the RCs that research organisations (ROs) are complying with our T&Cs and Policy on the Governance of Good Research Practice:***
* ***But also:***
* ***to inform the development of UKRI policies and procedures, to make sure we are doing what we can to help ROs provide a good environment for research integrity and ethics, and to help us identify and share best practice across the sector;***
* ***to feed in to UKRI’s narrative statement in meeting the requirements of the Concordat; and***
* ***to allow UKRI to compare the data received from ROs as part of the Funding Assurance programme with any information about research misconduct received from other sources;***

***UKRI plans to make public annually, anonymised data relating to:***

* ***Numbers of ROs where the Funding Assurance programme has examined compliance with the above guidelines.***
* ***Numbers of formal investigations of research misconduct that have been undertaken in the past financial year which relate to researchers funded by, or engaged with UKRI (including supervisors, postgraduate students, or those engaged with peer review activities).***
* ***Trend data on the above.***
* ***Qualitative data, such as examples of best practice and external initiatives undertaken to promote research integrity***

***No RO will be named. It is recognised that numbers will need careful explanation as increases may reflect better reporting.***

**Research misconduct**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** |
|  | Complete the table below by detailing any formal investigations into allegations of research misconduct that have been conducted in the past three calendar years which relate to Research Councils.  ***Where there are none, please clearly state "Nil Return"***  *NB: The UKRI’s Policy on the Governance of Good Research Practice requires Research Organisations to keep the relevant Research Council(s) informed of all allegations of research misconduct – at the stage that it is decided to undertake a formal investigation as defined in the UKRI policy – where it relates to an individual(s) associated with:*  *• a UKRI grant application under consideration*  *• any directly or indirectly funded UKRI research activity*  *• UKRI activity such as acting as an expert reviewer or strategic advisor (e.g., panel, committee, council member).* |  |
|  | Please provide brief details of further action taken in cases where allegations were partially or fully upheld (e.g., remedial action for respondent; sanctions on respondent; outputs retracted; disciplinary process initiated). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | | | | | | | F | | | | | |
| **Case Ref** | **Date first reported to UKRI** | **Date of decision to hold formal investigation** | **Outcome of formal investigation**  **(Allegation upheld;**  **allegation partially upheld;**  **allegation not upheld)** | **UKRI Council** | | | | | | | **Type of Research Misconduct** | | | | | |
| **AHRC** | **BBSRC** | **ESRC** | **EPSRC** | **MRC** | **NERC** | **STFC** | **Fabrication** | **Falsification** | **Plagiarism** | **Failure to meet legal, ethical and professional obligations** | **Misrepresentation** | **Other (give brief description)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Instructions***

*Complete the table for all cases of alleged research misconduct at your organisation* ***which have resulted in a formal investigation*** *within the last three financial years.*

*Add extra rows if necessary; give all dates in format dd/mm/yyyy; leave blank any dates still to be determined.*

*If any allegations were (or are being) investigated by any other organisation(s), give the case ref and names of the other organisation(s) involved on a separate sheet.*

***A*** *- Provide a unique reference for the case so it may be distinguished from others.*

***B*** *–**Give the date on which it was first reported to one or more parts of UKRI*

***C*** *– The date the formal investigation was initiated*

***D*** *- If completed, state the outcome of the formal investigation (select one of three options)*

***E*** *- Indicate the UKRI Council(s) with which the respondent has (or has had) formal interactions as a reviewer/panellist/advisor/funded researcher/student supervisor (tick all that apply)*

***F*** *- Indicate the type(s) of alleged misconduct (tick all that apply; if 'other' give a brief description)*

# Third Party Research Providers & Trusted Research

***This section relates to funding received from UKRI, with elements subsequently sub-contracted inside or outside of the UK. These are referred to as “Collaborators or Sub-Contractors” in the questions below. Newton Fund awards should be included below where relevant***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** |
|  | What due diligence do you perform on potential collaborators/subcontractors? Is this process documented anywhere?  **If yes, please provide a copy of any relevant policies/ process notes.** |  |
|  | Please describe how your organisation manages payments to sub-contractors/collaborators? Do you pay in advance of need to any sub-contractor/collaborator?  ***If yes, please describe how this is managed.*** |  |
|  | Are there any sub-contractors, partners or collaborators that you would not use a collaboration agreement for?  ***If yes, what document do you use which sets out the terms of the agreement?*** |  |
|  | Where relevant, how do you ensure that projects continue to be ODA compliant? |  |
|  | Is expenditure claimed fully supported by receipts?  What controls do you have in place to monitor expenditure incurred by third parties to ensure it complies with UKRI T&C’s? |  |
|  | [Trusted Research and Innovation](https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-standards-and-data/good-research-resource-hub/trusted-research-and-innovation/) guidance is available on the UKRI website. Please provide a short statement outlining how these Principles are reflected within your grant management processes. |  |

**Annex 1 - Policies**

**Please complete the table below and provide either hard copies or external links for the documents listed:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Date of last review** | **How is this policy disseminated to staff?**  Please indicate if any special provision is made for new employees (including post-graduate students) and also how staff awareness is maintained. | **External link (where applicable)** |
| Any relevant policies/procedural documentation relating to Research Grant Administration |  |  |  |
| Bullying and Harassment policy |  |  |  |
| Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy |  |  |  |
| Risk Management policy/strategy |  |  |  |
| Policy covering Anti-Fraud, Corruption and Bribery |  |  |  |
| Conflicts/Declaration of Interest policy |  |  |  |
| Whistleblowing policy |  |  |  |
| Procurement policy/relevant procedural documentation |  |  |  |
| Travel and Subsistence policy |  |  |  |
| Financial Regulations |  |  |  |
| Modern Slavery Statement  **Only applicable if your research organisation has a turnover of greater than £36m**  **Please provide a link to the Statement on your organisational website.** |  |  |  |

**Annex 2a: Research Charge-Out Rates (TRAC Method)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Please only complete this annex if you are a UK Higher Education Provider or Research Organisation required to submit Annual TRAC returns.***  ***All questions must be completed if you are using TRAC to calculate your own rates. If you are using dispensation rates, please only complete questions 1 to 3.*** | | |
|  | Are you eligible for and using dispensation rates?  ***If yes, please provide:***  ***A summary of your last five years research income from public sources (as defined in*** [***Annex 1.2b***](https://www.trac.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Annex-1.2b-Dispensation-v2.5.pdf) ***of the TRAC Guidance). Please also indicate when you forecast that you will no longer be eligible to use dispensation rates?*** |  |
|  | How frequently does your TRAC Oversight Group meet?  ***Please provide:  • Terms of Reference and membership information.   • Oversight Group agenda and minutes for all meetings related to the most recent Annual TRAC submission.*** |  |
|  | How frequently is a self-assessment against the TRAC Statement of Requirements (SoR) and/ or TRAC Assurance Reminders Checklist completed? Who is this completed by and is it presented to the Oversight group?  ***Please provide:  • A copy of the most recently completed SoR self-assessment / assurance reminders checklist. Where you have noted that you are not in full compliance with TRAC requirements, please explain how you plan to address the data or system weaknesses.  • Details of any high-level adjustments that have been made to TRAC data as a result of reasonableness checking and whether they have been repeated for more than one submission cycle.***  ***• A copy of the TRAC materiality log (TRAC guidance Annex 1.2a).*** |  |
|  | Is your TRAC model and approach compliant with TRAC requirements?  ***If no, please provide:***  ***• A copy of your TRAC action plan setting out steps to be taken to achieve compliance with TRAC requirements.*** |  |
|  | Please specify which space weighting factors you use in your TRAC model (how many categories of space and the weighting factors used).  Please confirm that library and information services cost drivers have been informed by the relevant director of these areas.  ***Please provide:  • The Oversight Group agenda and minutes for the most recent meeting when space weighting factors were reviewed.***  ***• The Oversight Group agenda and minutes for the most recent meeting when library and information services cost drivers were reviewed.*** |  |
|  | What method(s) did you use to collect academic staff time data for the most recent Annual TRAC submission? If more than one method was used, please indicate how many departments use each approach.  • Statistical approach • In-year retrospective • Workload planning • Other (please specify)  Please also specify whether the collection is carried out annually, or if not, when the most recent collection was carried out.  ***Please provide:  • A summary of the time allocation survey data at department and institution level (unweighted and weighted for salaries). The data provided must include a reconciliation to Table D and Table F2 of the Annual TRAC return.  • A breakdown of time allocation data return/ confirmation rates at department and institution level.*** |  |
|  | Please specify how many TRAC research facilities were calculated at the time of the most recent Annual TRAC submission?  ***Please provide:  • A list of all research facilities excluded from the estates cost pool.***  ***• A copy of the costing template for the first facility listed at section E(a) of the Annual TRAC return together with a copy of the indexation rate calculation applied.*** |  |

**Annex 2b: Research Charge-Out Rates (Own Method)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Please only complete this annex if you are not required to submit annual TRAC returns.***  ***All questions must be completed if you are calculating your own research charge-out rates. If you are using dispensation rates, please only complete questions 1 and 2.*** | | |
|  | When did you last complete an [FEC questionnaire](https://www.ukri.org/apply-for-funding/before-you-apply/check-if-you-are-eligible-for-research-and-innovation-funding/apply-to-become-an-eligible-organisation/#contents-list)? Has the methodology described in the most recently submitted FEC questionnaire changed since submission?  ***Please provide:  • The most recently submitted FEC questionnaire.*** |  |
|  | Are you eligible for and using dispensation charge-out rates?  ***If yes, please provide:***  ***• A summary of your last five years research income from public sources (as defined in*** [***Annex 1.2b***](https://www.trac.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Annex-1.2b-Dispensation-v2.5.pdf) ***of the TRAC Guidance). Please also indicate when you forecast that you will no longer be eligible to use dispensation rates?*** |  |
|  | You provided current/ most recently calculated research charge-out rates at question 20 of the SAQ document.  ***Please provide:***  *•* ***A copy of your two most recently approved research charge-out rate calculations.***  *•* ***Process notes documenting how the research staff FTE used as the denominator for the research charge-out rates is calculated.*** |  |
|  | Do you calculate charge-out rates for research facilities that are applied to UKRI applications?  ***Please provide:  • A list of all research facilities applied to UKRI applications using a charge-out rate.***  ***• An example costing template for a research facility charged to a live UKRI contract.*** |  |
|  | How frequently does the committee/ group that oversees your research costing system meet?  ***Please provide:  • Terms of Reference and membership information.   • Committee/ Group agenda and minutes for all meetings related to the most recently calculated research charge-out rates.*** |  |

**Annex 3 - Public Engagement with Research**

[*The Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research*](https://www.ukri.org/files/legacy/scisoc/concordatforengagingthepublicwithresearch-pdf/) *articulates the expectations research funders place on institutions in receipt of their funding to support and enable effective public engagement with research. This section of the questionnaire seeks to ascertain the measures your institution has in place to implement the expectations of the Concordat.*

***To ensure that we receive a suitably comprehensive perspective from your institution, we ask that the questions in this section are completed by an appropriate senior leader within your organisation and draw on the knowledge of any public engagement professionals that you may employ.*** ***Please answer the questions to the best of your ability, using the text boxes to explain your responses and context. If you have any queries which are specific to this section, please contact*** [*PublicEngagement@ukri.org*](mailto:PublicEngagement@ukri.org)*.* ***If your organisation is not a university, or is based oversees, we recognise that some of the questions may not map as well to your organisational structures and activities as they do for UK HEIs.***

*Please evidence your responses as much as possible. Evidence might include:*

* *Embedding public engagement with research within strategic goals, planning cycles, formal governance, academic workload planning or within the responsibilities of senior managers.*
* *An institutional public engagement with research strategy or mission.*
* *Strategic funding to support public engagement with research.*
* *Recognising public engagement with research in awards, recruitment criteria, promotion criteria and providing examples of staff who have been rewarded.*
* *Self-assessment of your organisations support for public engagement using the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement’s EDGE tool.*
* *Building capacity for public engagement with research through creating champions, networks, professional development, partnership working and creation of resources.*
* *Signing up to the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement’s Manifesto for Public Engagement or participating in their Watermark scheme.*
* *Practical support for public engagement with research e.g., central support and an indication of number of staff working in these roles.*
* *Training provision for public engagement with research including embedding within Postgraduate training.*
* *Breadth and depth of participation in activities.*
* *Evaluation of quality and impact of activities and policies to inform practice.*
* *Strategic relationships and collaborations with external stakeholders such as community partners.*
* *Data on awareness, support and capacity for public engagement from assessment, evaluation and national surveys (e.g., Vitae CEDARS and/or institutional surveys)*
* *Input prepared for the Research Excellence Framework, Knowledge Exchange Framework or within the Higher Education Innovation Fund, Innovation and Engagement Fund, or Knowledge Transfer Grants.*
* *Submission of public engagement with research activities within ResearchFish.*
* *Inclusion of public engagement within UKRI grant applications.*
* *Other available and pertinent management information or case studies.*

**Strategic Commitment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** | |
|  | Is there an organisational public engagement with research strategy? | Yes | No |
|  | If no, is public engagement with research included within other strategies and/or operational plans? | Yes | No |
|  | Are there any formal governance processes for public engagement with research? | Yes | No |
|  | Is public engagement with research included within the responsibilities of:   * Senior academic managers (e.g., PVC, Deans, Heads of Department)? | Yes | No |
|  | * Senior professional services managers? | Yes | No |
|  | Has your organisation signed up to the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement’s Manifesto for Public Engagement? | Yes | No |
|  | Please use this box to explain your answers to Questions 34 to 38  **Provide evidence or examples of your organisation’s strategic commitment to public engagement with research. Please provide publicly available web links if relevant** |  | |
|  | Please explain how staff are made aware of the institution’s commitment to and staff’s responsibilities for public engagement. |  | |

**Reward and Recognition**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** | |
|  | Is public engagement with research included within:           Academic workload planning? | Yes | No |
|  |          Recruitment criteria? | Yes | No |
|  |          Promotion criteria? | Yes | No |
|  | Does your organisation have any awards for recognising public engagement with research? | Yes | No |
|  | Please use this box to build on your answers to Questions 41 and 42 (e.g., the extent to which public engagement is included in workload planning and assessed in recruitment and promotion criteria). Please outline any other activities you have undertaken to ensure that researchers are recognised and valued for their involvement with public engagement with research.  **Please provide publicly available web links if relevant.** |  | |

**Training Support and Opportunities**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** |
|  | What training do you provide in public engagement? | ***Please complete the table below detailing any internal training and other development opportunities provided for researchers*** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Is training provided through formal course(s)? Please indicate if this course is part of an institutional professional development programme** | **What is the content of the course(s) (e.g., introduction to PE, PE as a route to Impact, partnership working, community engagement, communication skills)?** | **What is the frequency of the course(s) e.g., annually/on request/once per term?** |
| **PhD students** |  |  |  |
| **Early-Career Research Staff** |  |  |  |
| **Mid-Career Research Staff** |  |  |  |
| **Senior Research Staff** |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** | |
|  | Does your institution provide practical support for public engagement with research (including networks, resources and communications with staff)? | Yes | No |
|  | Do you employ staff with dedicated responsibility for supporting researchers to engage with the public? (This might include professional service or researchers who have a supporting role in public engagement). | Yes | No |
|  | If yes, please give an indication of the number of staff (FTE) working in these roles: (if these roles are not dedicated purely to public engagement support, please estimate the equivalent FTE spent supporting public engagement, if possible). | Centrally  Within faculties, departments and institutes | |
|  | Is funding available for:   * Institution-led public engagement with research activities, such as university festivals or partnerships with local schools? | Yes | No |
|  | * Researchers to develop and lead their own, individual public engagement with research activities? * Researchers to access external training and development opportunities in public engagement? | Yes  Yes | No  No |
|  | Please use this box to explain the answers to Questions 45 - 48 and describe any other evidence of how researchers are enabled to participate in public engagement with research activities.  **This could include:**  **• a list of job titles and/or an organogram of staff supporting public engagement**  **• data on awareness, support and capacity for public engagement from assessment, evaluation and national surveys (e.g., Knowledge Exchange Framework, Vitae CEDARS survey).**  **Please provide publicly available web links if relevant.** |  |  |

**Good Practice**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION** | **RO’s Response**  ***Please complete this column*** |
|  | Please highlight any examples of best practice in public engagement with research within your research organisation. Please provide examples of:  a) Public engagement with research undertaken by staff  Where possible, please be clear about the purpose and nature of the engagement work, for example:  • To inspire others  • To use knowledge and experience of others to inform researcher conclusions  • To collaborate and build consensus  **These examples may include collaborative approaches between departments, institutions and external organisations.**  b) How institutional mechanisms of support for public engagement with research have enabled this activity  **Where possible please refer to support evidenced in Question 49**  c) The impact of this activity, how the quality and impact of this activity was evaluated, and how this may have informed future activity.  **In answering this question, you may wish to draw on the following evidence:**  **• Input prepared for the Research Excellence Framework, the Knowledge Exchange Framework or within the Higher Education Innovation Fund, Innovation and Engagement Fund, or Knowledge Transfer Grants**  **• Submission of public engagement with research activities within ResearchFish**  **• Inclusion of public engagement within UKRI grant applications.** |  |