1. Executive Summary

In September 2015 the University of Oxford became a member of *The Conversation*, an online source of articles written by academics, researchers and research students across all disciplines for the wider public in the UK and globally. At that time, three key objectives were agreed by the cross-University team responsible for *The Conversation* (the Divisions; Public Engagement with Research, Research Services and the Public Affairs Directorate, PAD). This report was compiled in Trinity Term, 2016–17 and presents evaluation data and evidence that objectives 1 and 2 have been achieved and that progress has been made towards objective 3.

**Objective 1** – Increase public and media awareness of the excellent research and innovation undertaken by Oxford’s researchers. After joining *The Conversation* as a member:

- Readership numbers almost doubled
- The number of Oxford’s authors increased by ≈ 45%
- The number of articles published increased by ≈ 45%

**Objective 2** – Provide opportunities and training for researchers and academics at all levels, including those early in their career, to write for public audiences. As a result of Oxford’s membership:

- 25 training sessions were organised between September 2015 and January 2017
- 216 academics, researchers and DPhil students attended the sessions
- Positive feedback was received
Objective 3 – Demonstrate that Oxford is committed to facilitating knowledge exchange and engaging with the public:

A qualitative analysis of the interviews shows a commitment towards promoting good practice in public engagement through *The Conversation* at both the Divisional and Departmental levels.

2. Introduction

Launched in Australia in 2011 and in the UK in 2013, *The Conversation* is an online source of articles written by researchers and academics for public audiences in the UK and globally. A team of professional editors work with researchers to create an engaging short article that will appeal to a wide public readership.

It aims to provide a platform for researchers to raise the profile of their research and engage the wider world, with the freedom to discuss topical issues in a more nuanced way than is typically offered by traditional media outlets.

*The Conversation* is free-to-read and free-to-share and articles can be republished under Creative Commons licensing. At the time of completing this report (May 2017), 409 Oxford researchers and academics had published 640 articles attracting over 17 million reads from across the world.

With backing from the four academic Divisions and funding from the University’s Higher Education & Innovation Funding (HEIF) allocation, Oxford became a member of *The Conversation* in September 2015–16 and as such receives regular opportunities for researchers and academics across the University to contribute articles and to take part in hands-on training to enhance writing and engagement skills.

In addition to financial support, Oxford staff resources are also invested into *The Conversation*. Each Division has at least one staff member (typically the Impact or Public Engagement with Research Facilitator or Communications Manager) responsible for encouraging academics, researchers and DPhil students to contribute articles and to co-ordinate and facilitate the training courses that are offered, which are delivered jointly by the Divisions (MSD and MPLS; HUMs and SSD1). The Senior Facilitator, Public Engagement with Research (PER), Research Services has an overall co-ordination role – convening cross-Divisional meetings to share updates, learning and enable joint-working; coordinating activities such as the launch event, communications, and the evaluation of *The Conversation*. Some colleagues from PAD also engage with *The Conversation*, exploring how its offer can complement those of the University’s press office.

3. Objectives

At the time that the University of Oxford became a member in September 2015, three main objectives were articulated, and we agreed that an evaluation would be conducted to measure progress against the objectives.

---

1 MSD = Medical Sciences Division; MPLS = Mathematics, Physical & Life Sciences Division, HUMs – Humanities Division and SSD = Social Sciences Division.
- Increase public and media awareness of the excellent research and innovation undertaken by Oxford’s researchers.
- Provide opportunities and training for researchers and academics at all levels, including those early in their career, to write for public audiences.
- Demonstrate that Oxford is committed to facilitating knowledge exchange and engaging with the public.

This evaluation aims to explore if the objectives have been met; to better understand the costs-benefits of Oxford’s membership and engagement with *The Conversation*; and what can be improved to increase effectiveness.

4. Overview of metrics

Membership to *The Conversation* gives access to institutional dashboards and metrics that includes numbers and names of the authors, number of articles, social media interactions, readership and replications. The dashboards also includes metrics from other HEIs to allow for comparison.

4.1 Readership

The readership includes online users’ reads of all published and republished articles through *The Conversation’s* Creative Commons policy. Articles are regularly republished in the *Guardian* and the *Washington Post* and on online platforms like *IFLS* and *Quartz*.

Figure 1 shows readership numbers from *The Conversation* dashboard over an equivalent period of time before and after Oxford became a member. Other universities’ metrics are also included for comparison. The University of Cambridge was selected due to its similarity to Oxford and it became a member of *The Conversation* at the same time, while the universities of Edinburgh and Manchester were selected as they are both part of the Russell Group but had not become members of *The Conversation* at the time of this evaluation. As Figure 1 shows, the readership almost doubled since Oxford became a member (more than doubled for Cambridge), while non-member universities experienced a drop in readership:

![Figure 1: Readership numbers from The Conversation dashboard before (blue) and after (red) the University of Oxford become a member.](image-url)
4.2 Authors

In a similar way, Figure 2 illustrates the number of authors that wrote for *The Conversation* over the same periods of time before and after membership. The number of researchers that actively engaged with *The Conversation* increased for both Oxford and Cambridge after the membership, while it diminished for non-member universities.

![Figure 2: Number of authors that wrote for *The Conversation* over the same periods of time before (blue) and after (red) membership with comparison with other universities.](image)

4.3 Articles

Similarly, Figure 3 compares the number of articles published over the same two periods showing an increase of published articles for both member universities and a substantial drop for the non-members.

![Figure 3: Number of articles published on *The Conversation* over the same periods of time before (blue) and after (red) membership with comparison with other universities.](image)
4.4 Pitches

*The Conversation* also encourages academics to pitch ideas for articles focused on their research. Figure 4 shows an increase in the number of pitches received by *The Conversation* before and after the membership periods.

![Number of Pitches](image)

*Figure 4: Number of Pitches sent to The Conversation by University of Oxford researchers over the same periods of time before (blue) and after membership (red).*

4.5 Overall

*The Conversation* produce a monthly report on the highlights, overall metrics and the top ten Universities by readership and number of articles published.

The most recent monthly report that had been published at the start of writing this report was for April 2017 at which time *The Conversation* had over 60 HEI members. The University of Oxford was ranked fifth for the top universities by readership and first for the number of articles published for the 2016-17 academic year to date.

5. Survey – Authors

To better understand the benefits and challenges of working with *The Conversation* as a platform to engage wider audiences, two online surveys took place in August 2016 (one year after Oxford became a member) and in March 2017 (18 months after Oxford became a member) with researchers at Oxford who had authored at least one published article for *The Conversation*. The findings of the two surveys are similar and so only results from the 2017 survey are presented here.

**Sampling method** – we sampled authors who had published at least one article for *The Conversation* in the period between September 2015 – January 2017; and had not taken part in the 2016 survey.
A list of 116 names were identified with such criteria; of which we found 96 emails (others having moved on from Oxford etc). We sent out an email to the selected 96 authors inviting them to complete the online survey.

**Demographics** – A total of 29 (30% of the total) responses were collected. In terms of career level, there was a reasonable representation at all levels:

![Career Level Chart](image)

Figure 5: Authors survey respondents: career level; X-axis = number of researchers.

**Rating of the experience** – We asked respondents to rate and comment on their experience with *The Conversation*. Figure 6 shows that about 80% of respondents rated the experience on each item positively (answering either “Good” or “Very Good”):

![Rating Chart](image)

Figure 6: Authors’ survey results re: writing for *The Conversation* (percentages)
A selection of comments received include:

- The writing and editing process

  "Smooth and efficient"

  "My editor got back to me quickly, but I did find the deadlines quite tight, given my other term-time commitments."

  "I found the process to be very streamlined in terms of collaborative writing. The online editing system makes edits and communication very easy (much easier than sending revised documents back and forth)."

  "I really enjoyed working with the editing platform!"

  "Very easy thanks to the excellent editing template. Readability ‘meter’ and tips are especially useful."

  "The process was very efficient."

- The final published article

  "Always very punchy"

- The number reached (either via the article or through republication)

  "Varied a bit from article to article."

  "I have reached over 300,000, which was very exciting."

  "Impressive."

  "It generated a lot of Twitter interest."

  "Not so many for my 2nd article directly on The Conversation but the piece was picked up by The New Statesmen where it seems to have been widely read."

- The overall experience

  "Very straightforward and worthwhile."

  "A useful discipline (as a writing exercise) and generally very satisfying."

- There were also some frustrating aspects that could be improved:

  "Fairly pain free, but there were issues over the title and the use of illustrations."

  "I was not sure why there was a need for such speed."
“My editor introduced spelling mistakes into my piece, which I thought was quite poor.”

“Not much follow-up on a pitch. Better to reject clearly than leave one hanging on.”

“Slow and unpredictable.”

“They got back to me with a 24 hour or less turnaround because they wanted the article to be linked to a specific day.”

Value – We asked authors to identify what, if anything, they found valuable.

- 90% (26 out of 29) of respondents noted that The Conversation is a valuable platform to engage the wider public;
- 55% (16 out of 29) that The Conversation enabled them to share their research/opinion;
- 38% (11 out of 29) feel more confident about writing for a public audience.

“This is a very useful exercise for me (as a humanities scholar) in writing in a more accessible register and for a broader audience”

- 17% (5 out of 29) questioned whether there were better ways of engaging the public:

“I feel my time would have been better spent in a face-to-face activity, or in writing a piece for a curated academic blog.”

Which of the following statements best represents your point of view? [You can select more than one]

- The Conversation is a valuable platform to engage the wider public: 26
- The Conversation enabled me to share my research/opinion: 16
- I feel more confident in writing for public audiences: 11
- There are better ways to engage the public with my research than writing for The Conversation: 5
- I don’t feel I gained anything from writing for The Conversation: 1
- The Conversation was not a good use of my time: 0
- No opinion: 0
- Other comments (optional): 3

Figure 7: Authors survey results of the value of The Conversation
Additional outcomes and impacts – We also explored if there were any other outcomes or impacts that arose as a consequence of the published article. Figure 8 shows that two-thirds of respondents received additional benefits including social media interest, further press coverage and being contacted by other researchers; and around a third of respondents were not aware of any additional outcomes.

Are you aware of any outcome(s) and impact(s) that have arisen as a result of your article(s) in The Conversation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I am not aware of any outcome/impact</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were some negative outcomes/impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received good publicity on social media</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generated additional press coverage</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was interviewed on radio/TV</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was contacted by other academics or researchers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested in my work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was invited to collaborate on a project</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked to give a talk at a conference/meeting/workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify in the box below)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three respondents with negative outcomes and impacts noted that:

“I received a critical email from another researcher who disagreed with me – but I was able to respond respectfully, and it did not bother me very much.”

“Publication of one piece led to some quite negative personal comments on social media, and Twitter in particular – focused on me, not my research/argument. This is obviously part of the nature of online debate, and The Conversation is not to blame for it, but I would caution researchers – especially female researchers in the early stages of their career – to think carefully before writing for it.”

Would you recommend it? – Four in five researchers would recommend writing for The Conversation to others; with one in five unsure:
Additional comments include:

“I’m really pleased and proud to have published an article with them.”

“Overall, my feelings about The Conversation are quite ambivalent. I’m not entirely sure how well it fulfills its ‘engagement’ brief, nor how it functions as a ‘conversation’.”

“It’s great!”

6. Training

As a member of The Conversation, Oxford receives regular opportunities for researchers, academics and DPhil students across the University to take part in hands-on training to enhance writing and engagement skills.

6.1 Introduction

Organised by the Divisions and led by editors of The Conversation, training opportunities range from introductory sessions and short writing workshops to drop-in clinics and in-depth masterclasses. The material covered during the training include: an introduction to The Conversation and how it works; writing for non-specialist public audiences; what makes a good story/opinion article. The more in-depth courses include feedback sessions, suggestions on pitching stories; and guidance on how to respond to comments once the article is published.

The Divisions partnered together in the organisation and delivery of the training: MPLS together with MSD; SSD together with HUMs. Table 1 summarises The Conversation training sessions organised at Oxford in the period September 2015 till February 2017. A total of 25 training sessions were organised by the four Divisions. More than 297 researchers and academics registered, with at least 216 attending the sessions.
Table 1: Training sessions organised at University of Oxford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainings</th>
<th>MPLS &amp; MSD</th>
<th>SSD &amp; HUMs</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of training sessions between Sep 2015 and Feb 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of registered participants</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>297*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of attending participants</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>216*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To note: data on the registered and attending participants for 4 of the sessions was not available, so the actual number of participants is higher than what is reported.

6.2 Training evaluation surveys

Evaluation of the training was led by the Divisions. The questions and format of the data received varied between the Divisions making it difficult to analyse the data gathered as a whole – as it was difficult to compare ‘like-with-like’. However, a qualitative analysis of the responses shows positive responses and appreciation for the training courses:

“ [...] a clear and engaging introduction to The Conversation. The information provided and case study presented would certainly encourage researcher participation”.

“Useful introduction to The Conversation, worth attending if one is considering pitching an article or simply interested in learning more.”

“This presentation was a great and interesting introduction to The Conversation, aimed at people who might be interested in writing for it.”

“This session gives academics an overview of different ways they can use media to communicate with an engaged and educated audience, covering topics from describing their own research outputs to providing their expert opinions on pieces about current news topics.”

Other findings extracted from the evaluations include:

- In both cases (MPLS & MSD and HUM & SSD) the training survey response rate = 20%.
- The quantitative evaluation data for the training courses organised by SSD & HUMs shows that participants enjoyed the course. A large majority of respondents stated that they found the course useful and 73% would recommend the course to a colleague.
- The full quantitative data set for MPLS-MSD training was not available at the time of writing this report, however findings from partial data set indicate that a large majority of respondents rated the course highly and the majority would recommend it to another researcher.
6.3 Outcomes of the training

When asked how they might use their training in the future or whether they will change some aspects of their practice as a result of attending the training:

- 28 (out of 52) of respondents’ comments stated that they felt more confident about pitching a story to The Conversation in the future and/or expressed interest in writing for The Conversation;
  
  “I hope to be able to write a bit more in the future and be more confident about submitting articles, or at least pitching stories.”

  “I would feel more confident to pitch an idea to The Conversation, having a better feel for what type of article they would be interested in.”

  “I will have a better idea when writing a science article for the public on how to do it best. I will probably also use some techniques in other outreach events that I attend.”

- 10 (out of 52) stated that they would think more about the audience and felt more confident in writing for a public audience;
  
  “Motivated me and increased my confidence for writing articles for the public about my field of science.”

  “Ways to simplify texts to move away from an academic writing style to a more journalistic one.”

  “Aim to engage more and in a broader spectrum than I had initially realised was possible.”

- 9 (out of 52) would support The Conversation further by raising awareness with colleagues and within their department.
  
  “I will be following The Conversation on social media and promoting relevant stories through our own publicity channels”

  “It was new to me that publications like The Conversation would be interested in my view as a researcher on OTHERS’ work, not just my own”

6.4 What was found to be useful

The majority of comments were positive and highlight different features of the course:

- Understanding the process of publication and the timescales involved – 15 comments (out of 58)
- Clarity of the speakers – 8 comments (out of 58)

”Brilliant platform, really well presented, the [editors] were great, very engaging, just perfect!”
Examples and case studies offered, hands-on experience and feedback in writing – 7 comments (out of 58)
Understanding how The Conversation is structured and funded – 6 comments (out of 58)
Possibility to talk to a published researcher – 4 comments (out of 58)
How to structure a journalistic article – 4 comments (out of 58)
Practical guide to using the The Conversation online tools – 3 comments (out of 58)

"The benefits of writing to the public includes improving my visibility to other researchers and the public and improving the impacts of my research."

6.5 What to improve

Although shorter, the list of aspects that respondents found least useful is also important to note. Feedback from the respondents recommends that the training sessions could be improved in the following ways:

- Some training sessions are too generalised – need more targeted sessions
- Include examples, case studies and editorial support that are relevant for all Divisions

"It seems to be only for science and current affairs topics in a serious way."

- Give more time and guidance to prepare for the session, especially for longer workshops
- More hand-outs required
- More guidance needed on finding links between research and the news
- More step-by-step guidance including more practical examples

7. Academic case studies

A number of phone interviews were conducted with authors and other stakeholders. Two of the interviews are presented here to provide further insight on the perspective of researchers that have engaged with The Conversation:

7.1 Nikita Sud – Social Sciences Division
Associate Professor of Development Studies, Oxford Department of International Development

Tell me about your involvement with The Conversation:

I have written 4 articles in 15 months, the first of which was in December 2015. I pitched three of these articles to The Conversation, while one was suggested by editors of The Conversation as a follow up to another article. The two most read articles had a connection with the current news at that time (i.e. one is on Brexit).

I first heard about The Conversation from email messages shared by Divisional contacts when the University of Oxford decided to become a member. It is a very good way of showcasing my research. I have written in the past for other in-country and international media and news sources in India, Australia, the UK, and have been interviewed by a range of media providers
including Al Jazeera, BBC Radio 4, Radio France, Bloomberg News, Bloomberg Business, etc. I decided to write for *The Conversation* as an additional avenue for publicising my research. The articles I wrote for ended up being picked up by many media sources, ranging from Yahoo News and Quartz to the Financial Times, the LSE Politics and Policy Blog and even The Daily Mail. This significantly increased the reach of my pieces, with one article in particular being read over 129,000 times. Nothing I have written so far in an academic or more popular publication has had this kind of readership.

**What are the benefits of writing for *The Conversation***?

Visibility and being able to reach a wide range of audiences are the main benefits. Following my publications in *The Conversation*, I have been asked for interviews for radio and print media; my articles have been tweeted and widely shared on social media.

Writing for *The Conversation* is very different than publishing in specialist academic journals, both in terms of accessibility and in terms of numbers reached. Academic journals often have a paywall, thus restricting access by readers. *The Conversation* is free to anyone with an internet connection. Over the last year I have received approximately 20 requests from students and researchers around the world to send them additional work I have published in journals, and/or inquiries about doing a DPhil with me.

My recent article on the new superpowers in the global land grab was unexpectedly republished worldwide reaching Latin America and Africa. Traditional media would not allow for that. I am currently working on a book on land grab, in part as a result of the wide interest that my non-academic writing has received internationally.

The outreach work I have been doing through *The Conversation* and other media has made me a better writer. I now write in a more accessible way, and keep in mind a wider public. Five years ago I would not have thought along these lines.

**What are the challenges of writing for *The Conversation***?

Academics have a finite amount of time that needs to be divided between research, teaching, administration, and other activities. Therefore, whenever I decide to write for *The Conversation*, I have to sacrifice time spent on research or teaching making it difficult to do it as often as one would wish.

7.2 Harriet Dempsey–Jones – Medical Science Division

Postdoctoral Research Assistant, Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences

**Tell me about your involvement with *The Conversation***:

I have written several pieces for *The Conversation* – eight for the UK site and one for the French site.

The articles vary in terms of content. The first article I wrote was the result of an expert request; for the other articles I was contacted by *The Conversation* editors directly. I had different experiences with each articles, but all positive. It was good to interact directly with an editor and keep on working with the same person. In this way I have never sent a pitch to another general call, but always pitched directly to my contact editor.
What are the benefits of writing for The Conversation?

Writing for The Conversation gave me some good experience in publishing for a journal. The articles I wrote were also picked up by other publishers (e.g. newspapers online and in print) and re-published.

Writing for a public audience has also turned out to be very useful at improving my academic writing, making my research more accessible. For example I now write abstracts of my papers in a headline style. It has also improved my academic communication. I do pay more attention to small writing details that make my work better understood.

It has benefited my research career as well as it helped me link up people from my department and get to know some of my colleagues better. The article I wrote with my group helped publicise the research we do to a larger audience. I also started doing some work with a new group as a result of some of the conversations I had while I was writing an article.

After writing my first article I also went to one of the training sessions with The Conversation editors. It was good to have a one to one session with the editor to get direct targeted suggestions. It also made it easier later on to have a good collaboration with that same editor.

Finally, it is enjoyable. It is nice to have something to show to my family and friends!

What are the challenges of writing for The Conversation?

The one challenge comes from the collaborative enterprise approach and the common consequences of collaborations. It happened few times that there was a slight disagreement with the editor – usually wanting to make the writing more accessible and easier to read at the cost of the scientific correctness. I however always managed to find the compromise with the editor and I am happy about my articles.

Another challenge would be adapting to the fast pace of writing for The Conversation (else the news hook can be lost) that is the opposite of the slow academic writing.

When you publish an article, the author’s email address goes public and readers can comment. Interacting with the public audience and respond to comments can be challenging for some.

The Conversation encourages authors to respond to all comments. It can be difficult to manage negative comments and it is not always straightforward how to deal with them. The Conversation does not, to my knowledge, really offer help on it.

All in all, it really helps researchers seeking more opportunities to get them. I would like to see the University work more actively towards getting more academics to write for The Conversation and publicising it more.

8. Conclusions and recommendations

When joining The Conversation as a member, the University of Oxford set three main objectives that have been evaluated in this report. We have approached the evaluation in multiple ways: we analysed the data available through The Conversation online metrics; we have conducted
two consecutive surveys to gather insights from authors; we have collected and analysed the evaluation of training sessions; and we have interviewed key stakeholders and authors.

We conclude that the first two objectives have been met, with progress towards the third objective, specifically:

**Objective 1** – Increase public and media awareness of the excellent research and innovation undertaken by Oxford’s researchers.

After becoming a member, the number of readers, of authors, of articles published increased significantly.

**Objective 2** – Provide opportunities and training for researchers and academics at all levels, including those early in their career, to write for public audiences.

25 training sessions were organised between September 2015 and January 2017 with more than 216 people attending.

**Objective 3** – Demonstrate that Oxford is committed to facilitating knowledge exchange and engaging with the public:

A qualitative analysis of the interviews shows a commitment towards promoting good practice of public engagement through *The Conversation*.

We have also identified a number of benefits for researchers:

- Improves writing skills, not just for a wider public audience and for the media but also for research publications and presentations
- Enables Early Career Researchers to showcase their research and to give them an ‘edge’ over others
- Increases the visibility of researchers’ profile and their research
- Opens up the potential for new opportunities and collaborations
- Improved communications and relationships with other media outlets

And benefits for the University, Divisions and Departments:

- Increases public and media awareness of the excellent research and innovation undertaken by Oxford’s researchers
- Facilitates access to a wider audience
- Improves the quality of communications from academia to wider society, increasing openness and transparency
- Demonstrates Oxford’s commitment to foster knowledge exchange and public engagement

**8.1 Recommendations for the Divisions re: training sessions**

- Targeted – take a more targeted approach; either by providing training at the departmental level or via specific research themes and topics
- Evaluation – to enable us to compare feedback from the training, data collection needs to happen in a more systematic and homogeneous way
8.2 Recommendations for staff involved in securing authors

- Prioritise a targeted and planned pitching approach over expert requests
  - Gives more time for researchers to plan and draft their articles
  - It can be coordinated at multiple levels (a press release or other media coverage can be arranged)
  - It frees up resource time trying to secure authors for the expert requests
    (most of the authors are secured directly by The Conversation editors)

8.3 Recommendations for The Conversation

- A clearer and more inclusive author policy that does not list the most senior researcher as the first author by default; the first author should be the researcher that contributed to the majority of the article
- Provide much more training and support on how to deal with comments
- Provide a way for institutions to know about up and coming articles authored by their researchers (so key staff are aware and can help promote the articles)
- Change the communications and key messages from this is ‘better’ than working with the traditional media to this complements the work of the mainstream media and an institution’s press office.

8.4 Further information

- [https://theconversation.com/uk](https://theconversation.com/uk)
- [Po.st/TheConversation](http://Po.st/TheConversation) (on www.ox.ac.uk) which includes Divisional contact details
- Enquiries about this evaluation report – contact: [publicengagement@admin.ox.ac.uk](mailto:publicengagement@admin.ox.ac.uk)