Impact template (REF3a)

Institution: University of St Andrews

Unit of Assessment: 19 - Business and Management

a. Context

The main non-academic beneficiaries of, and audiences for, research from the School of Management can broadly be categorised as: policy makers at international, national, regional and local levels; public, private and third sector organisations; individual practitioners working in these organisations; and community groupings. Within each of these categories the School's research is particularly relevant for and is targeted at those concerned with the following spheres of policy and practice:

- Cultural and creative industries - the focus of the Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) Thematic Group and the Institute for Capitalising on Creativity (ICC)

- Environmental sustainability - a core concern of the Ethics, Sustainability and Accountability (ESA) Thematic Group, the Centre for Social and Environmental Accounting Research (CSEAR) and the St Andrews Sustainability Institute (SASI)

- Financial institutions and markets - the focus of the Financial Institutions and Markets (FIM) Thematic Group and the Centre for Responsible Banking and Finance (CRBF)

- Research impact and knowledge mobilisation – a core concern for the Knowledge and Practice (KP) Thematic Group and the Research Unit for Research Utilisation (RURU)

- Human resource management – a research stream within the Organisations and Society (OS) Thematic Group.

- Ethical investment – a research stream involving staff from both the ESA and FIM groups

- The organisation of, and accountability for, service delivery, especially in public services – a research theme that runs across the CCI, KP and OS thematic groups

- The social dimensions of health – a research stream for some staff within the KP group, particularly through their involvement with the Social Dimensions of Health Institute (SDHI - a joint interdisciplinary institute of the Universities of St Andrews and Dundee).

The nature of impact in these spheres is wide-ranging and the examples cited in the case studies include changes in: awareness, attitude, understanding, behaviour, organisational activity, policy making and professional practice. Sometimes the impact is direct and tangible (as in our impact case study on *Capitalising on Creativity in the Film and Screen Industry*). However, more often impacts are indirect, non-linear, multi-faceted and less easy to evidence directly, especially as one the School's aims is to hold public and private bodies to account and subject proposed changes to policy and business practice to public scrutiny. In such circumstances the assessment of impact is often based on our contribution to critical public debate around policy, social or business issues (e.g. Roscoe's work on unrealistic representations of the entrepreneur; Davies' work outlining the challenges of cultural change in healthcare).

b. Approach to impact

The School has long been concerned to promote active engagement with potential users of our research and the 2008 RAE feedback suggested that our activities in that regard were seen as 'world class' by the panel. Over the current REF period the School has sought to build on its strengths, and our approach to enabling and supporting impact has benefited from RURU's work on the need for a differentiated approach to engagement which recognises the interactive, social and interpretive nature of research use and impact (www.ruru.ac.uk). In particular, our approach addresses four features of the multiple and sometime serendipitous pathways through which research impact occurs:

- Research needs to be translated for policy, practice and public audiences;

- Face-to-face engagement with specific audiences and active engagement with wider networks are more likely to result in impact than just relying on the written word;

- Knowledge that is co-produced by researchers and practitioners working together is likely to enhance both the quality of the research and its impact, especially if this is part of an ongoing, iterative cycle of knowledge and practice development;

- Activities aimed at promoting impact take time and energy, and they often require the development of new skills and access to additional resources.

With these features in mind the School has sought: (1) to produce research-based reports and other outputs that are specifically aimed at policy makers, practitioners or corporate bodies; (2) to engage with policy and practice audiences by sitting on influential committees, providing expert advice and hosting events to discuss research ideas with practitioners; (3) to support the co-production of knowledge; and (4) to recognise and support impact activities by incorporating these into the workload assessments, performance reviews, personal development plans and resource allocations. Examples of each of these areas of activity are provided below.

1. Producing reports and other outputs for policy makers, practitioners or corporate bodies
Often such reports have been published in conjunction with key audiences at which they are targeted. For example, Wilson's research findings on Credit Unions in Scotland were published by Scottish Government in 2008. Hoepner was a key contributor to a number of reports produced by the United Nations on the principles for responsible investment (from 2009-2013). Davies has produced commissioned research reports for a variety of national and international healthcare agencies. As part of his success in the AHRC/BBC 'New Generation Thinkers' competition, Roscoe developed a radio essay from his research on the entrepreneur (broadcast on Radio 3 on 16/1/12). Timming has translated the findings from his research on trade union administration and produced a handbook for these administrators (2013).

2. Sitting on influential committees, providing expert advice and hosting practitioner events
There are many examples where content-area experts from the School have had direct influence and impact. Bebbington was the Vice-Chair (Scotland) of the UK's Sustainable Development Commission, the Government's formal advisor on sustainable development (2006-11). Davies was appointed Director of Knowledge Mobilisation for the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Service Delivery & Organisation (SDO) R&D Programme, the largest funder of health management research in the UK (2008-10). In addition, Davies sat on the original funding panel (in 2008) for the NIHR Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRCs), and chaired the panel (in 2013) for the second competition (total NIHR funding allocated across these two panels was around £200 million). Nutley is a member of the ESRC's Evaluation Committee (from 2012), which is drawing on her research on the assessment of research impact. Wilson served as a full member of the Irish Government's Credit Union Commission (2011-12). Beech hosted a number of events (2009-11) on music and organisation with the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) and the Association of British Orchestras. These drew on his Advanced Institute of Management (AIM) Fellowship research. Davies has hosted over a dozen workshops, seminars & conferences (2008-2013) involving practitioners in various *fora* across the UK, exploring aspects of healthcare management, patient safety and evidence use.

3.Supporting the ongoing co-production of knowledge with practitioner groups
Townley has directly supervised twelve CASE studentships and knowledge transfer partnership projects (2008-2013), in which researchers have worked collaboratively with creative and cultural organisations to co-produce and apply research-based knowledge. Nutley (in collaboration with colleagues at Cardiff University) had an ESRC knowledge exchange grant (2012-2013) to enable the co-production of a future research agenda on benchmarking public services with policy makers and practitioners in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Russell is working with the Scottish water industry on issues relating to water governance and accountability (ongoing from 2012). Davies, in his research on healthcare management, quality and safety, engaged in the co-creation of knowledge with various agencies in the NHS (e.g. NHS Education for Scotland; Quality Improvement Scotland; and several NIHR Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research & Care (CLAHRCs)). Hibbert has collaborated with both the Scottish Police and the Theological Institute to co-produce knowledge on leadership and learning respectively (2012-13).

4. Supporting and rewarding impact activities
The School has a transparent but flexible workload model, which enables it to recognise a wide range of impact activities and incorporate these (sometimes at short notice) into judgements about workload allocation. The School implements the University's annual mentoring and development process ('Q6'), ensuring that engagement and impact activities are recognised and discussed alongside research, teaching and administrative activities. Achievements in this arena are

recognised in the School's reward systems and the University's promotion criteria. The School draws on both the University's in-house courses and external training opportunities to support impact skills development (e.g. writing for external audiences, media training and public engagement). As part of staff mentoring (outlined in REF5), senior staff support skills development of more junior staff and help them to gain access to specific user networks, organisations and individuals. The School also funds staff to travel to or host impact events and meetings.

c. Strategy and plans

The School aspires to be a community of scholars that researches and contributes to responsible enterprise (see REF5 for more details on how this is defined and operationalised). One part of this commitment is a strong focus on the praxis of engagement within each of the School's thematic research groups. Success is measured both by the diversity and extent of engagement, and by the identification of non-academic influence and impacts that can be attributed, at least in part, to the research undertaken by members of the School. Narratives of success (rather than quantitative indicators) are used iteratively to build support within the School for the praxis of engagement.

The School will build on its current approach, focusing on the following priorities:

• Ensure critical mass and engagement expertise around a specific set of (evolving) research interests within each thematic group and the research centres and institutes to which they contribute. This priority recognises that while individuals working on their own can and do have an impact, this is enriched and enhanced when those individuals are situated in centres of expertise. Plans for achieving this will target recruitment and retention activities, personal development plans and mentoring arrangements.

• Maintain a differentiated approach to engagement that may range from the broadly consensual (working with the grain of current orthodoxies) to critical and contentious ('keeping the system honest') and sometimes subversive (seeking significant paradigm change). Our plans, activities and reward systems will not therefore assume that one size fits all.

• Celebrate and publicise successes, such as Nutley's 2011 Campbell Collaboration Award for research that informs public policy, Gray's 2012 Emerald Impact of Research Award, and Orr's 2013 Public Administration Review Award for best article written with a practitioner.

• Encourage grant applications that support a wide range of engagement activities, and ensure that an element of co-production is built into most of our research projects.

• Further develop an infrastructure to support engagement and impact activities at both School and University levels. The School has already begun to collaborate with other units within the University to identify the infrastructure needed to support future engagement and impact activities (these include staff development opportunities, promotion procedures, support for event organisation, and the contractual arrangements associated with collaborative ventures).

d. Relationship to case studies

The case studies were chosen to reflect the way in which engagement and impact are a central feature of our thematic groups. The cases are drawn from the work of three of the thematic groups (CCI, FIM and KP). They exemplify many aspects of the School's current impact approach and they have in turn informed the development of that approach.

• All the case studies were underpinned by targeted reports and other publications which translated the main findings from research for policy and practice audiences.

• The case studies exemplify the importance of face-to-face engagement with potential user groups, and the opportunities and influence that flow from sitting on key committees and offering expert advice.

• At least some elements of the underpinning research were developed in collaboration with potential user groups in all cases.

• In several cases, sustained engagement with both the research topic and a range of user groups led to an ongoing refinement of both theory and practice. It also enabled the research impacts to reach across sector and country boundaries.

• In all cases, workload allocations were adjusted to enable researchers to work intensively on engagement activities for specific periods of time.