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Workshop goals:

- Establish a shared understanding of the state of the research and practice on measuring impact and rewarding scholarship, where impact refers to engaged, actionable, solutions-oriented work that advances sustainability in a diverse and changing world.
- Identify persistent barriers and challenges related to measuring and rewarding impact and co-develop a roadmap for addressing these barriers.
- Define high-impact products (research, essays, training modules, curricula, convenings, etc.) that will individually and collectively enhance efforts to reform the academy across all network institutions.

About Beyond the Academy:
We are a network of research institutions united in a commitment to identify and overcome institutional barriers to tackling urgent societal challenges related to sustainability. We take aim at three barriers:

1. Metrics and rewards: Conventional systems reward individual work over collaboration and conformity over risk taking, dis-incentivizing engagement with “real world” problems.
2. Co-development: Research that is co-developed with external partners is both more credible, and more likely to translate to action. How can we promote the practice of co-development in academia?
3. Training leaders: Sustainability challenges require innovative solutions, creative thinking, interdisciplinary collaboration, and an understanding of how to translate knowledge to impact. Our network seeks to advance graduate education and training for future sustainability leaders in any sector.

University investments in institutes, graduate programs, and other cross-cutting mechanisms are signs of progress, but they remain uncoordinated experiments with limited contribution to systemic change. Beyond the Academy seeks to do collectively what single institutions cannot do alone - transform the culture of reward, collaboration, and education to promote solutions-oriented sustainability scholarship.
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Welcome & Opening

Welcome to Cambridge by Bhaskar Vira and Hawa Sydique
Introductions and ice breaker led by Bonnie Keeler

Present: Bonnie Keeler, Mike Rands, Glen Whitehead – Cambridge development office, Peter Kareiva, Anne Marie Spataru, Holly Buck, Carolyn Finney, Kirsten Rowell, Nate Sanders, Lydia Olander, Jessica Hellmann, Taylor Ricketts, Alex Spataru, Ed Balleisen, Klara Winkler, Molly Grace, April Snyder, Carissa Slotterback, Tamara Ticktin, Gen Meredith, Yan Zhang – Cambridge early career researcher, Josh Tewksbury, Bhaskar Vira, Hawa Sydique, Yuan Pan – Cambridge early career researcher, Nate Nibbelink, Jason Neff, Ellie Tew – Cambridge early career researcher

Icebreaker: Line up from strongly agree to strongly disagree with the following statements:
1) Doing work that has external impacts is important to me.
2) Advancing the common good is a core mission of the academy.
3) I am rewarded personally for work that has external impacts.

Background for NAKFI grant
Two focuses:
- Metrics
- Incentive structures, specifically tenure policies
This is the start of a conversation. Up to the group to determine what success looks like – what do we want to produce?

Hope that these conversations feed into change at individual institutions

Activity:
- Write down one sentence that describes the mission statement of the academy
- Brainstorm a list of factors that may prevent achieving the mission statement 10-20 years into the future
- Make two axes using two of the factors. Plot scenarios in each of the four quadrants (low/low, low/high, high/low, high/high)

Discussion
Questions: 1) Who is in the academy? 2) If we are solving the world’s problems, what’s the place of a Classics Department?
- The legitimacy of disciplines that are not solution oriented but enhance cultural value is a public purpose in its own right.
- The definition of “Classics” or “language” can evolve.
- To the first question, community and tech colleges oriented towards job preparation. That’s all part of the academy, not just R1 (research) universities.
- Mission statements may cluster based on land grant status, public oriented mission. Community colleges all about access.
- We can think more broadly to include PhDs that end up working in the private sector, NGOs, etc.
- 1 in 10 students will get a tenure track position. The PhD path is much more diverse than it used to be. And that’s a positive - students should be aware of all the possibilities.

Is the definition of “academy” up for debate within this group?
- It’s up to the group. We have just a narrow slice of the academy represented here. 50% of the students are in community colleges, so we are leaving out half of college students. For our purposes we’ve narrowly defined students to graduate students and research to sustainability research.

Session 1: Ambitions & Progress
Facilitators: Peter Kareiva and Jessica Hellmann

Part I: Stories

Oxford: UK gov’t research fellowship program. Department does a good job at highlighting work: seminar series, seed funds. Modeled off of Research Excellence Framework (REF), currently developing a KEF – Knowledge Exchange Framework. Active process of consultation happening regarding which metrics to use. Currently focused on the wrong things – number of contracts, etc.

University of Vermont: Gund Institute, cross-cutting interdisciplinary institute. Carrots: seed grants for projects with potential for real world impact, grant writing help for winners to write their next big grant, hiring a director to connect researchers with policy spheres, 2x/year graduate seminars focused on real world impact (overseas development, policy issue in Vermont, etc.)

Nate Sanders: Rubenstein School of the Environment and Natural Resources, incoming dean. In charge of revising tenure policies. Nothing about impact currently. First rule at UVT is: Never do anything for the first time. How to get researchers to think about impact?


Part of program that pairs students with outside organization. Fosters co-production of research. Results apply directly to industry.
Future Earth: Future Earth is a boundary organization. 1000s of researchers around the globe. Focus is to interact researchers and societal structures. Workshop series on reimagining sustainability (funded by National Academies). Systems orienting. Structures we need to foster interdisciplinarity in professional societies. Produce integrative knowledge and visibility for work being done between disciplines. We need a “well trodden path” as you see in professional societies. Future Earth can be liaison for us to learn about other organizations’ methods. Leopold Leadership Program – internationalize this training program.

Duke: Seed grants as catalysts. 66 research teams next year. We have done a lot of work on how to make them work well. Types of support, not just funding, larger scale. How to do team science well.
Example: Instead of having one director, we have a suite of directors in different topic areas. One foot in different policy conversations that create a bridge to the university. Use seed grants to link to new ideas from faculty and staff. Boot camp for students and faculty.

McGill: Sustainability chosen as the area of focus for the next 100 years. Multiple small initiatives: match fund for students. University pays 50 cents for every student credit hour – money goes to many areas including operations and research. Tenure and evaluation of faculty – env science uses a point system. New director added new lines to the form – taking the train, outreach, videoconferencing, etc.

Cornell: Master of Public Health program trains public health practitioners – sustainability at the focus. Program came to be because of two initiatives: Atkinson Center for Sustainable Future – seed grants for big-picture interdisciplinary projects. Tenure project “Engaged Cornell” to incentivize engaged learning and transform all faculty work toward engaged work. Trying to adopt core tenets: students are immersed in engaged practice, students articulate impacts as they engage with community partners. Funding and incentives are behind these initiatives.

University of Georgia: Experiential learning program. Vice president for research establishing groups. Integrative Conservation (ICON) PhD program has 100% placement. Program is interdisciplinary. Students address wicked problems, and have a big role determining what works and what doesn’t. Reach into arts and humanities. Using art pedagogy to examine watershed sustainability.

Colorado Boulder: Culture change in an interdisciplinary program. Completely decentralized, completely apart from university structure. Traditional metrics – publication, authorship – not a conversation anymore. Stage 2 was thinking about how to evaluate different types of work: humanities model vs social science vs natural science. Stage 3 will be engaged scholarship. How do you give credit for engaged work? Hard at the nuts and bolts level. Office incentivizes engaged work, but has no sway on tenure policies. Cohort program for pre-tenure faculty to develop research leadership skills.
Hawaii: part of a bottom-up initiative for interdisciplinary faculty. Organize seminars, symposiums, get funding for students interested in co-development. Departments vary wildly in their culture around engaged research. One example: Pacific Island Studies professors teach less, they do service learning, have a community outreach director. Not formalized in tenure documents – next step. Diversity a big issue at Hawaii – boards need to represent native Hawaiians.

No affiliation: Looking at this issue from the outside in. Previously on committee meant to support faculty doing engaged work. Provide incentives for junior faculty. What do we gain from learning from the arts? Middlebury college provides residencies – can take a chance for several years on someone without offering tenure. At Berkeley, National Park Service provided fellowships to PhD students. Arts program that partnered faculty with student from different department to do engaged work.

Holly Buck: NatureNet program for fellows co-funded by Nature Conservancy and UCLA. Fellows receive communications and facilitation training. Institutional support from TNC. Co-teaching in institute across disciplines, e.g. environmental justice.

Minnesota: Institute on the Environment is a cross-campus program created 12 years ago during a time when disciplines were fighting over being the environmental center on campus. Increasingly trying to become mission oriented and develop a theory of impact. Tools: seed funding, programming, access.
Associate Dean of the Humphrey School for Public Affairs. Approach to cross-disciplinary research: 1) make engaged work of faculty more visible to administrators, 2) find ways to make it easier for faculty to do this work (support), 3) do more to demonstrate impact.
Inter-governmental organization meeting to discuss opportunities for collaboration, research opportunities. Seed grant to support collaborative projects that cross disciplines. Significant effort to support faculty through seed grants to be part of the organization. Made a case for administrators that showed the benefits for faculty: soft skills, communication, making process easier, valuing people and centers that do this work.

Part II: Visionary Ideas. And how will we know if we are successful?

- First thing I would do is create an advisory board. You don't need an institution to have a board. Be inclusive, work with activist groups, business, etc. Second, develop environmental projects that represent cross-institutional efforts. Get funding ($1-2 million). Prove by doing. This is a structure to support the network, including graduate students. Measure success by board and money.
- Wasted potential when PhDs can’t find jobs. Many brilliant colleagues who don’t have a place. Lack of programming tailored for doing work that students are interested in. Series of webinars? Can gather data from students.
• This room grows and includes a lot more people at the discipline and sector level, and represents voices that are seldom heard. Cross institutions and sustained. Not a flash in the pan. 5-10 year, $5 million community. Incorporate in the network the skills to do transdisciplinary research, stakeholders, community leaders.
• Avoid doing what academics do: form a committee, talk more, write a paper. Avoid low-hanging fruit (seed grants). How often do seed grants lead to bigger initiatives? As ecologists, lets do an experiment and see how it turns out.
• Let’s be more specific about the problem(s) we are trying to solve. Then figure out how to address. We don’t need to discover new models – we are already doing this work – but we need to scale up models that work. We should focus on pre-competitive space (industry term). Industry groups come together to discuss mutually beneficial interests (e.g. develop a new drug). In our group, we can achieve shared goals, if we determine our shared goals.
• Model dissemination and adoption off of ALEC. For example, tenure policies. If UCLA, etc. are doing something it helps make the case at home institution to follow suit.
• To persist, credibility is essential. Come up with things that people respect and want to follow. Be careful in picking projects – something that will work and resonate.
• Aligning incentives – most of the discussion so far has been individual tenure. What about for units? New international campuses, including at least one with no departments. Learn from examples. Tenure can be added to research: what can be learned from adoption and implementation? This is a collective action problem. Model instructions to letter writers or how to pick letter writers to get at the feedback you want.
• Best practices or cookbook. Different examples – how to do top-down vs bottom-up initiatives. Could be an online platform. Look at other countries.
• Knowledge Exchange Framework requires metrics. Output of this network could inform what metrics.
• From an admin standpoint, how to operationally and tactfully get things done. Shadow network of “inconspicuously rogue” administrators to advance these aspirations. Success achieved when barriers are diminished. Help to create a pipeline within institutional structures.
• Move away from some of the language that reinforces elitism. We often say we want to solve challenges, which positions us as having the answers to other peoples’ problems. All sectors and communities have expertise we need to value. We often say we “communicate to” and translate, “consult with.” Alternatives: “dialogue with”, co-produce, work together.
• Co-producers get slammed by external evaluators. We can develop model guidelines but can we do something big like get people to sign on. Most of my PhD students don’t want to go into academia.
• Measuring impacts. Building trust if we can highlight collective impacts and speak from a bigger stage.
• No follow-up support for early career researchers doing interdisciplinary work. Very difficult to secure collaboration. Knowledge exchange with developing countries, we should involve.
- Academic operations often work in a black box (tenure decisions, e.g.) Push for greater transparency.
- This is a social impact network. What is it we are trying to create? What is our role and what should we push to others? Partnership idea. Use a platform to share standardized information. Innovations within a space. Administrative support.
- Success: noticeable shift toward support for engaged work. Form a good practice charter to bring back to institution to sign. Virtual community for early career researchers to learn from network members.
- Very disciplinary undergraduate experience, very different from situation working with Bhaskar. We can learn from case studies.
- Let’s learn from our interdisciplinary departments. Establishing a specific role from graduate students. Non-institution specific program for graduate students. Fund students who are doing the kind of work we say we want to do. The quest for tenure constrains creativity – how to overcome that?
- “If we build it they will come” true for education, but maybe not the solution environment. Skeptical that if we fix these things, we will still be slow, expensive, ineffective. We need to pull in different people to help us grapple with how to be effective in problem solving in today’s world.
- We should ask who we work with what they aspire to. Reciprocity rather than outreach. Diversity of thought as well as background – who isn’t at the table? Why, really, are we interested in “beyond the academy?” Real change within the academia – what’s in that that will motivate us for the longterm. Success: public trust in the academy, they seek out the academy for help.
- Going beyond tenure. Thinking ahead to the next workshop on engagement.

**Session 2: Measuring Progress**

Presentation on 1) traditional metrics used in academia and the status of current literature on the topic, and 2) examples on innovative frameworks that could be adapted to academic contexts.

Group discussion:

*Are these models potentially useful at your institution?*
- With modification models can be useful. Extension already uses logic model.
- Giving some formalized ways of representing impact could be useful.
- REF debate about quantitative vs qualitative. People are unhappy with the qualitative part of the assessment driving funding.

*Examples of non-traditional metrics in use:*
- Recommendations recognizing other forms of scholarship besides publication: patents, web-based publication, etc. Not implemented yet. Journal quality still salient.
Promotion and Tenure at the institute – boards you sit on, city commissions, film and media credits, major media coverage. Institute emphasizes collaboration and evaluations.

Are these applied to everyone? Penalizing those who don’t do it?

**What can we do as a group or individual institutions to be better on this front?**

- Group 5: We could adopt frameworks. Get grants for experimenting with indicators. Real impact is long term.
- Group 4: Like the idea of self and external evaluation based on something like the impact compass. Should the dossier rely on narrative? Favors good writers. Look retrospectively and ask how established National Academies members would score if their first six years were measured on these metrics frameworks.
- Group 3: We don’t value what’s hard; we value what gets published. Impact outside one’s field is not necessarily something we credit. Get at the degree of difficulty with different types of research. The +/- statistic: how do we credit people who make other people better? Faculty could have a dialog with their unit to articulate aspirations.
- Group 2: Indicators will only be successful if weighted so as not to add more work. Letters from external partners. All these metric systems have biases, but we can correct for them if we understand their direction.
- Group 1: We should place more emphasis on articulating impacts. Rewarding good narrative writers is actually a good thing.
  - Feedback: Letters from former students have not been useful.

**Session 3: Learning from Success in Collaboration & Co-location**

Panel discussion: How do organizations structure incentives to encourage collaboration? How do cross-institutional collaborations work for individuals?

- **Bhaskar Vira** (Moderator)
- **Sherry Coutu**, Entrepreneur & Investor, Member of Finance Committee, University of Cambridge

Researched academic collaborations 30 years ago. Has since been a practitioner. Collaborations: academic and business and civil society coming together. Use different languages (e.g. the various meanings of ROI). 86% of alliances don’t work. In the ones that do work, people understand what their roles are and their limitations - where partners can fit in. Collaborations are more expensive upfront, but when they work the impact is 90x greater than working alone. Peer influence, shared vision allows for working together effectively.

- **Andy Neely**, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Enterprise and Business Relations, University of Cambridge

Works on the boundaries of policy and the university and industry and the university. Building and sustaining relationships: based on trust. Governance: As you start to build the relationship,
the governance structure needs to be defined. Think how you spread your tentacles as an organization is key to building partnerships and not getting stuck in one area. Contributing to society and having impact at scale, we need to partner with people who have reach outside of the university. If universities are going to have impacts, we’ve got to think about building the right relationships with the right people.

- **Mike Rands**, Executive Director, Cambridge Conservation Initiative

Ten biodiversity organizations operating individually. It took ten years to partner (not merge) organizations and the university to bridge research, policy and practice. Developed shared governance, theory of change, co-designed the building for collaboration. Comprehensive assessment of barriers to collaboration: lack of trust, lack of money, lack of opportunity to interact. Established seed grants ($100k) that require including an academic and a practioner. Some have gone on to larger initiatives. Challenges: rewards and incentives for academics are very different than those for practitioners. Reconciling those is a constant challenge. Government also moves slowly, can’t quickly respond to emerging issues. It’s expensive to collaborate. Risk: doing things by consensus leads to settling for the lowest common denominator. People get excited about collaborating, but academics still have to publish and practitioners still have to raise money.

- **Katie Smith**, Director of Operations and Deputy Executive Director, [Campaign for Female Education (CAMFED)](http://www.campaignfederated.org)

Majority funded by nat’l funding agency in UK, funding tied to specific outcomes and impacts. Donors require vigorous documentation, requires collecting lots of data. Data collected at the level of individual girl. Partner with the university, only partway toward institutionalizing this relationship. How do we replicate this relationship with other partners?

- **Alex Spataru**, CEO, [The Adept Group, Inc.](http://www.adeptgroupinc.com)

Runs an engineering company that operates sustainably. Previously worked for the oil and gas industry, decided to work on green energy. Partner with university students to solve practical problems: solar powered irrigation, sensor technology for sulfur content of ship fuel, etc. Practicum program at the UCLA Institute of the Environment and the Sustainability allows students to get credit for partnerships. Partnerships could not occur if they did not cross disciplinary lines.

**Discussion**

- We don’t have the name recognition, 800 years of history, or smallscale atmosphere that Cambridge does. How do we bring these ideas for collaboration home when we don’t have these things?
  - limit the scope by geography.
○ It doesn’t have to be based on geography, but can be based on ideas. If you are in an isolated community, build bridges to those with like or complementary interests, even if they are in other countries.
○ 800 years of history can also work against you.
○ It will look different for each institution. Where can we allocate resources?
○ There is an array of organizations that can help with the bridge building. Academic institutions often think they have to do all the work themselves, but they don’t.
● The infrastructure is heavily biased toward institutions that already have a lot of capital. These same structures alienate underrepresented communities.
○ We bring together community, university, NGOs. Some relationships work really well with online meetings, etc. Others are not based on digital connections.
○ Many of our international conservation orgs are comprised of local orgs that work with local communities. Provides clusters of local community groups. Some of these collaborations are scalable.
○ We still have institutional barriers like tenure processes. If we don’t think institutionally, we will just create frustrations for people. Being deliberate in recruiting people with complementary strengths.
● Any examples of collaborations that didn’t work?
○ People moving on to new organizations. Some orgs have developed rules that you need at least 5 contacts so if one person leaves you have 4 others and you don’t lose the connection
○ Important to know when you are going to disagree.

Session 4: Rewards & Incentives

Presentation on Institutional incentives for engaged scholarship, with a focus on tenure and promotion policies. Results from an analysis of mission statements and tenure policies from participating institutions and departments, as well as results from a survey of Beyond the Academy network members. Main conclusions: There is a disconnect between what institutions say they want (engaged scholarship) and what tenure policies reward, at least on paper. Survey results indicated departmental culture often not encapsulated in policy documents. Lack of time and recognition identified as the primary barriers to embarking on engaged work.

Post-talk discussion
● Debate as to whether the production of a template document that outlines aims is a worthwhile target, given variability in uptake and use
  ○ But, example of including impact on REF guidelines – this has changed the culture at UK universities universally
● What signals are role models giving to early career researchers? People in this room are positive role models who have taken risks and succeeded, but probably the majority of successful researchers with tenure have followed the traditional route.
● What are the criteria for acceleration? Could exceptional engagement be one? Used to be just based on scholarship.
But most places outside of the University of California system don’t have formal route of steps and acceleration that you can influence.

Panel
- Should think clearly about what incentives are. Most important incentive seems to be time.
- What if academia did away with tenure? Just have a creative workforce instead.
- Often easier to clear away disincentives than provide new incentives.
- If you focus only on extrinsic incentives at the expense of intrinsic incentives then you have people focusing on false things.
- There are aspects of the system where you have to keep marching through gates and you are being watched, not doing things that you really want to do. Need to incentivise taking risks, trying things and failing.
- P&T standards isn’t a big motivation for our work. So what is and what are these levers?
- How can we evolve dossier to effectively tell story of what our work is. Rather than having to split it into artificial baskets?
- Academic CV consists of lists of achievements. How might we evolve this to make connections and articulate stories of what we’re doing.
- A focus on metrics is artificial. Developing self-evaluation of own targets could be more effective.
- Change mentoring system to include non-academic mentors and contacts to put in contact with outside people who are doing work related to your research.
- There’s a lack of capacity at understanding diversity. There’s a culture that it’s optional to try to increase diversity.
- Mentors go through same problems but then put you through the same thing

Discussion
- How do we overcome bias/snobbery against social science from traditionally natural science departments?
- Different departments work differently. Some are equipped for flexibility but some (e.g. more traditional natural sciences departments) are not equipped at all for interdisciplinarity, and have no training etc.
- Why are we doing this? We’re making a big fuss when the rest of the world have ways of dealing with this. Shouldn’t we do performance evaluations and work out whether we’re achieving what we’re hoping to do. Are we over-complicating things (adding to outside perceptions of what people think academics do)?
- What if research were to be ranked by contribution to society?
- Academics need to be protected so that they can take risks and speak their true mind in stakeholder environments, otherwise end up being consultants.
- There are examples of universities (Antioch University) that don’t have tenure and focus more on individual evaluations.

Session 5: Great Ideas to Action

Co-production of science
- Proposed focus is for the co-production of solutions
● This should be the whole focus for this group. Engaged scholarship needs to be co-produced.
● Larger community to explore what the skills are that younger faculty/early career researchers need.
● Learn from other communities that are doing this.
● Would be useful to scope out the current theory of best practice in co-production, alongside examples of small- to large-scale solution development.
● Need to invest in leadership development if looking at co-production.
● Good idea to bring in people from outside academia who are on the other side.
● Don’t want to re-invent the wheel here about what co-production is.

Session 6: Advancing short-term and long-term goals

Broke into groups to address “top aspirations” for our network that we listed on Day 1:

1. Boilerplate “bills”
2. Identify skills and needed training modules
3. Pick three projects and find funding
4. Develop and populate a platform and create a stronger collective voice via stories or charter
5. Decolonize methods and academic culture, challenge elitism, eject terminology
6. Create and support “community” for early career researchers
7. Grow the network
8. Network of creative admins
9. Articulate a problem we are trying to address

Group 1. Boilerplate “bills.” Model structure for broader impact statements. Recognition and facilitation of engaged sustainability science. Analysis of broader impacts for engaged sustainability science/research @NSF @USAID. A structure for a USAID for the US? Put together with job ads, CV, guidelines for annual reports, annual reviews (mentor, team-based internal and external), tenure standards, principles around committee formation, solicitation of letter writers, rubrics/advice for letter writers, rubrics for defining excellence in community engaged, self studies for units (collective activity of the unit).

Group 2. Identify skills and training modules. What: Needs analysis, survey our community and look for other syntheses, training in soft skills. Co-production training (collect case studies - there is a global curriculum to build off of), conflict, systems thinking, root cause analysis, cultural competence (diversity and inclusion). How: Divide the needs assessment into 2 tiers: all need this training, bring in expert with this training. Connect to education experts who understand different forms of learning. Think about training for “sustainable action” rather than just knowledge. Model: The Nature Conservancy Science Impact Project (3 yr curriculum) - trainings, exercises.
Engaged scholarship actually happens quite a lot, so let’s make this well known. Dispute the ivory tower narrative.

Group 3. Pick 3 projects and find funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future proofing</td>
<td>Radical Resilience $100 million innovation fund</td>
<td>Beyond academia</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally facing (w/ side benefit internal)</td>
<td>Creating new narrative visibility campaign (for engaged culture) Pledge could join. “I'm a naturalist” campaign.</td>
<td>Online w/ video and audio.</td>
<td>Neep workshop to plan &gt;12 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRT grant, e.g. non-institutional program or “anti-disciplinarity”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 4A: Themes of “Beyond the Academy.” So much is about addressing complexity - we can use stories to do this. What is the prompt so people can engage? What is the platform (dropbox?) Who is this for? Just us? We need to be clear on that. That will drive the format.

Group 4B: People want a mechanism to share things: slides, shared literature, Group 1’s draft bills. This is easy; we can do this. Use “case” model from the Leopold Scholar network? Webinar series to watch network members give talks, invite students, etc. Pledge for universities to sign (like DORA) or campus compact (ASHOKA network). Stronger collective voices. Better tools to demonstrate and show impact (ripple effect mapping).

Group 5: Decolonize methodology, terminology, structures of privilege. First, define decolonization. How to embed this in all we do? Being inclusive is key. Need to include diverse voices and be sensitive to issues of power. Glossary idea: defining terms of power, etc. Why are some terms problematic and what are the alternatives? Examples of existing good practice, e.g. Center for Whole Communities in Vermont. Not just about good practice but also about structural constraints. Empower those in power to enable change. Need for role models across the academy. Call out inappropriate behavior and actions. Emerging toward 3 things: value of network voice to communicate best practices, support existing activities, permeate up through the academic hierarchy.
Group 6. Create and support “community” for early career researchers. Types of engagement for early career networks: information on conferences, networks, mentors, etc. Best practices, webinars, a more engaged network. Who is this for? Our institutions? Different contexts: scales, disciplines, sectors. One way to collect stories: a blog. Stories of cul de sacs as well as successes.

Keynote Address (Q&A with Vice Chancellor)

University of Cambridge Vice Chancellor Stephen Toope addressed the network. Covered topics of supporting interdisciplinary research, interdisciplinary initiatives at Cambridge, addressing complex societal issues within academic structures. Asked the group for feedback on how the university can address our needs.

- Idea that interdisciplinarity is superficial – how can we tackle this? We need to stop the negative mentoring that give people outdated advice that you need to be strictly disciplinary in order to progress.
- Being interdisciplinary doesn’t mean that you need to know everything about the other disciplines; it means that you can engage actively with different fields. This is often misunderstood.
- Graduate training: how do we speak the different languages of different disciplines to encourage students to branch out? Part of it is cultural. American academic system recognizes that mentor roles include helping students get jobs through networking. Less true of the UK system.
- Graduates are often pushed into narrow fields. Network building is fundamental. Part of supervisors’ jobs should be to help students network and secure jobs.
- Undergraduate initiatives: call for more interdisciplinary Tripos (teaching structures) - these are traditionally very discipline oriented.
- Foster student excitement for communicating with other students with like interests.
- How do we scale up from pilot projects?
- More cross-disciplinary programmes. More seamless transitions between academia and elsewhere. When connections are made you find areas outside academia that your intellectual passion links to.
- What leverage do we have as a group? Seeing the difference you can make and students that are attracted to other institutions are powerful motivators, particularly at the department level. You are forcing people to be more competitive.
- Change agency initiatives are hard; just getting together with others with the same passions is psychologically important. How do we share this excitement more broadly within our institutions? We have not been a good enough job of this.
- Stories about impactful work have attracted younger staff members and students.

We followed this discussion by going around the room and sharing thoughts with the Vice Chancellor.