



NHSF Impact
Working Group
Update 11.10.21

- Jack Ridge
- Bronwyn Ormsby
- Caroline Peach
- WG members



Members

[MEMBERS](#) [WHAT'S ON](#) [MEMBERS' MEETINGS](#) [JOIN US](#)

Developing an impact toolkit for heritage science

The April Members' Meeting brought members together to discuss how to develop a toolkit to measure the impact of heritage science.

The workshop on 26th April provided an overview of activity by the NHSF Impact Working Group to address the 'Demonstrable Social and Economic Impact' theme of the [Strategic Framework for Heritage Science in the UK](#). The group has looked at different ways of defining impact as well as the different types of value generated by heritage science activity (e.g. research or application of research) and the range of beneficiaries or audiences.

The presentation by the group's co-convenors, Jacqueline Ridge (National Galleries of Scotland) and Bronwyn Ormsby (Tate) captured the relationship between the Research working group's focus on identifying *what* societal challenges heritage science connects to, and the Impact working group's challenge of *how* to demonstrate and measure those connections. It built on previous work on why demonstrating benefit is important and then drew attention a number of different methods of defining and measuring impact from government, the academic sector, heritage sector and others.

Presentation: [Initial recommendations on how to develop a framework for assessing impact](#)

Recommendation 1: Defining what we are trying to capture when we talk about assessing the impact of heritage science

Capturing the impact of heritage science involves demonstrating the contribution that the application of science and technology to understanding heritage, the management of heritage and engagement with heritage makes to: society, the economy and new knowledge.

Recommendation 2: Clarifying how we should approach the development of a toolkit

An impact toolkit should be developed by NHSF, in consultation with and for the benefit of the wider heritage science community, that adapts and re-uses existing methods of assessing impact as far as possible.

Recommendation 3: Which existing methodologies offer the best potential for adaptation and re-use

The following three methods could be adapted to form part of the heritage science impact toolkit

- *ODI REF impact toolkit (for planning)*
- *Science Foundation Ireland matrix (to map activity/projects to a range of values e.g. societal challenges)*
- *DCMS Culture and Heritage Capital Framework (emerging methodology for assessing economic value)*

Recommendation 4: How to involve the wider sector in the development process

NHSF convenes a series of workshops or roundtables to consult the heritage science community on the development of an impact framework (identification of indicators and metrics) to form part of the toolkit.



Recommendation 1

Recommendation 1 - updated the definition of what we are trying to capture when we discuss impact - <https://www.heritagescienceforum.org.uk/members/developing-an-impact-toolkit-for-heritage-science>


‘Capturing the impact of heritage science involves demonstrating the contribution that the application of science and technology to understanding heritage, the management of heritage and engagement with heritage makes to: society, the economy and new knowledge.’



Recommendation 3

Expanded our methods in *Recommendation 3* to 4 including:

- *ODI REF impact toolkit (for planning)* - <https://odi.org/en/publications/research-excellence-framework-ref-impact-toolkit/>
- *Science Foundation Ireland matrix (to map activity/projects to a range of values e.g. societal challenges)*- <https://www.sfi.ie/funding/award-management/research-impact/Impact-graphic.png>
- *DCMS Culture and Heritage Capital Framework (emerging methodology for assessing economic value)* - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/valuing-culture-and-heritage-capital-a-framework-towards-decision-making>
- *Europeana Impact Playbook* - <https://pro.europeana.eu/page/europeana-impact-playbook>



NHSF - IWG –
Priorities for 21-22 and
22-23



Engage with AHRC

- Engage with AHRC on its development of a monitoring and evaluation framework (e.g. for CapCo investment)



Recommendations 2 and 3

- Raise funds for an analysis of these methodologies to assess methods and mapping of heritage science impact case studies, gaps and *how/whether NHSF can use these models or alternatively provide guidance on useful adaptations of these models for Heritage Science impact.*
- Dependencies: funding (costs to be determined).
- Timing: possible in 21-22 with funds secured.
- Funding sources need to be identified.




Recommendations 2 and 4

- Member/sector survey - designed within NHSF to capture information on audiences, beneficiaries, priorities, categories for impact data collection – what do we need to collect? What else?
- Align with other WGs.
- Timing: possible within 21-22.
- Within NHSF capacity.



Recommendation 4

- Model + infrastructure for information collection across members + sector - to **support data gathering** as a starting point (e.g. papers, datasets, funding awards, dissemination events etc) - this needs consideration and could form the focus of a working group meeting. *Hosted on NHSF website (e.g. via member login area?); via ResearchFish? Other WGs?*
- This would need to be aligned with gathering information around softer benefits (AHRC impact streams include: new knowledge, society, downstream benefits).
- Dependencies - co-ordination time, possible cost re expanding website, alignment with collation requirements re AHRC funds, reminders for members/others to collate, resource re compiling and publishing yearly (quarterly?) reports for use.
- Timing: possible IWG Nov/Feb meeting focus, proposal by end 21-22, consultation.
- Costs identified and implementation 2022-3.



Notes from meeting 11.10.21

Public value, cultural value.

Case studies that show value added by Heritage Science.

Virtual resources, databases hidden.

Wide range of stakeholders, diverse, appetite, vision, passion.

Poor connectivity re resource sharing.

CapCo engagement – BBC podcasts

Impact across other WGs – time to collate ideas/initiatives across the 3 working groups.

Publications log – overlap with Research WG.

Notes from meeting 11.10.21

REF – questions – what does REF report on.

ResearchFish – what do they ask for?

Also consider time horizons, beyond 2-3 years, looking towards 10 years+

Defining audiences – nub of the survey.