

LUT University: Research and Impact Assessment 2019

Societal impact case study template and guidance

Each Unit of Assessment (UoA) should provide approximately one case study per five professors. Each completed case study template will be **limited to three pages** in length. Each case study should include sufficiently clear and detailed information to enable the panel to make judgements based on the information it contains. Impact must be achieved during the Assessment period (2013-2018), regardless of its stage or maturity. No account will be taken of anticipated or future potential impact. The assessment criteria are presented in the RIA Terms of Reference document. The individual case studies will not be rated.

TEMPLATE and guidance

Unit of Assessment (UoA): Title of case study:

1. Short summary of the impact

2. Underpinning research

Outline the key research insights or findings that underpinned the societal impact, and provide details of what research was undertaken, when, and by whom. This research may be a body of work produced over a number of years or may be the output(s) of a particular project. References to specific research outputs that embody the research described in this section, and evidence of its quality, should be provided in the next section.

Details of the following should be provided in this section:

- The nature of the research insights or findings which relate to the impact claimed in the case study.
- An outline of what the underpinning research produced by the submitted unit was (this may relate to one or more research outputs, projects or programmes). Dates of when it was carried out.
- Names of the key researchers and what positions they held at the institution at the time of the research.
- Any relevant key contextual information about this area of research.

3. References to the research (maximum of six references)

Provide max six key outputs from the research described in the previous section, and evidence about the quality of the research. Include the following details for each cited output: Authors, Title, Journal or other, Year of publication.

4. Details of the societal impact

Provide *a narrative, with supporting evidence*, to explain:

- How the research underpinned (made a distinct and material contribution to) the societal impact
- The nature and extent of the societal impact

The following should be provided:

- A clear explanation of the process or channels through which the research led to, underpinned or made a contribution to the societal impact (for example, how it was disseminated, how it came to influence users or beneficiaries, or how it came to be exploited, taken up or applied).
- Where the submitted unit's research was part of a wider body of research that contributed to the impact (for example, where there has been research collaboration with other institutions), the case study should specify the particular contribution of the submitted unit's research and acknowledge other key research contributions.
- Details of the beneficiaries who or what community, constituency or organisation has benefitted, been affected or impacted on.
- Details of the nature of the impact how they have benefitted, been affected or impacted on.
- Evidence or indicators of the extent of the impact described, as appropriate to the case being made.
- Time of when these impacts occurred.

5. Sources to corroborate the societal impact (maximum of ten references)

List sources external to LUT University that could, if requested by the panel, provide corroboration of specific claims made in the case study. These could include, as appropriate to the case study, the following external sources of corroboration (stating which claim each source provides corroboration for):

- Reports, reviews, web links or other documented sources of information in the public domain
- Individual users/beneficiaries who could be contacted by the panel to corroborate claims. Maximum of five individuals (Name, Organisation) may be entered for each case study.
- Factual statements already provided to the LUT University by key users/beneficiaries, that corroborate specific claims made in the case study.