

<p>Name of your approach to assess societal impact</p>	<p>Impact (Reflection) Workshop Martina Schäfer, Josefa Kny (ZTG, Technische Universität Berlin)</p>
<p>Approach description</p> <p>Please summarize your approach and its application context/options in a few sentences or bullet points.</p>	<p>Thus far, few manageable tools have been developed to enable transdisciplinary research projects to systematically and in a manageable way reflect on and describe their societal effects – whether independently or with external support. We invite projects teams to reflect – guided by the method – on the societal effects they are aiming for or have achieved repeatedly in different project phases. The half-day discussions bring together project partners from academia and practice; we support processes of reflection with external facilitation and evaluation. During the discussions, the participants become aware of the different perspectives on the intended or achieved effects and of implicit assumptions about impact pathways within the team. The workshops contribute to a joint understanding and a prioritization of effects aimed for and can be applied in different project phases (ex-ante, in itinere, ex-post). Working with the “Theory of Change” (ToC) is at the core of the method set.</p>
<p>Concepts used in the approach</p> <p>Please insert definitions for key concepts and components.</p>	<p>- effect orders: 1st order = changes that occur within the duration and/or spatial scope of the project; 2nd order = changes that occur within the close temporal and/or spatial context of the project; 3rd order = changes beyond the temporal and/or spatial context of the project (e.g. institutional consolidation or imitation) (see figure at the end; after Lux et al. 2019)</p> <p>- forms of effects: 1st order: learning and capacity building, network formation, improving the situation, increase in reputation; 2nd order: continuation of activities with the project context, transfer to other spatial contexts, 3rd order: influence on public discourse, new concepts, influence on law and regulation, further structural effects (after Schäfer et al. forthcoming; derived from Wiek et al. 2014, Nutley et al. 2007, Mitchell et al. 2015 and elaborated empirically)</p>
<p>Key challenges</p> <p>Please write down what you are struggling with concerning the application of your approach.</p>	<p>Conceptual challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - differentiation between results, objectives and effects; differentiation between 1st, 2nd and 3rd order effects - use of terms and concepts in the workshops that everyone can easily follow and work with (scientists vs. practitioners; e.g. ‘theory of change’) <p>Procedural challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tension between manageable workshop format and sufficient time to initiate reflection and understanding processes (overview vs. ‘complete’ picture) - convincing key practitioners (with limited resources) to take part in the joint reflection of effects and explaining/realizing the benefits of their participation
<p>Visualization and narratives</p> <p>Please add short information on whether and how you use visualization, narratives or other boundary objects in your approach.</p>	<p>We use several visualizations (in an online collaboration tool) in the course of our workshop format with research project teams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a table of movers/floater/blockers (after Eguren 2011) - a table of activities/interactions/outputs (after Krainer/Winiwarter 2016) - a figure combining the activities/interactions/outputs table with a modified version of the spheres ToC template (by Belcher et al.) - a figure of impact paths and underlying assumptions (after Mayne 2015) <p>As an overall guiding narrative, we use the metaphor of ‘building impact paths’ (‘at the end of the path’, ‘collecting building materials’,</p>

	<p>'testing the paths for their stability') that leads the participants throughout the workshop.</p> <p>So far, we have tested our workshop format in a digital version only. As an output of our workshop, we provide the corresponding project team with a short 'impact story' (narrative of app. 2 pages) including the understanding of the (assumed) impact pathways that were discussed during the workshop. The team is asked to specify it.</p>
<p>Strengths and weaknesses From your own perspective: What would you consider as strengths and weakness of your approach?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + In the workshops, a starting point (boundary object, i.e. visualization + narrative) is created that can be referred to regularly during the course of the project (iterative adaptation, monitoring). + tentative result: method useful for effect reflection with 'beginners' and small to medium-sized projects (about 8 people), especially at the beginning of the project (ex-ante); bigger projects with several sub-projects need a more modular approach (not tested empirically yet) - Half-day workshop cannot deepen every aspect/effect, but remains rather superficial. Question of ownership: Deepening is up to the project teams; it can be encouraged but not controlled (without the proper resources). + tentative result: method less useful for effect reflection of 'professionals' and large projects (more than 8 people and diverse sub-projects)
<p>Learn more If possible, please insert a link to a website, paper etc. where details of your approach and its application can be found.</p>	<p>No materials or publications yet.</p>