

ENGAGING SCIENCE: END OF GRANT REPORT

Background

Engaging Science grantholders are required to submit this report within three months of the end of the Grant. This report is an opportunity for you to share achievements, difficulties, impacts, outputs and learning from your project. This information will be used by the Trust to assess and report on our portfolio of funded projects and is a vital input to future planning and strategy setting.

Completing the form

Please complete this form electronically in Word, save it and return it as an e-mail attachment to: endofgrantforms@wellcome.ac.uk, copying in your project contact.

Grant Outputs

In addition to this form please also send copies of any materials created as a result of the project and any supporting documentation about your project. This can take a variety of forms, please consider what would most appropriately reflect your project. It might include:

- Evaluation reports
- Education resources
- DVDs
- Photographs of the project
- Copies of artistic work
- Copies of publicity materials/press releases

Please send any digital outputs to engagingscienceoutputs@wellcome.ac.uk and any hard copy outputs to Engaging Science, Wellcome Trust, 215 Euston Road, London, NW1 2BE. Please see the final page of 'Grant Expectations' for a list of the types of output we would like to receive and the format we would prefer them to be sent in.

In addition to using grant outputs in our assessment of, and reporting on, your project they will also be placed into the Engaging Science Archive in the Wellcome Library. They will be available to view by library visitors. We would also like to make them viewable to library users electronically, where possible. Please complete the archive clearance information at the end of this document to specify how you would like your project outputs to be made available.

Contact us

If you have any general questions or comments about the completion of this form, please get in touch with your project contact, or pegrants@wellcome.ac.uk.

ENGAGING SCIENCE: END OF GRANT REPORT

Name of Grantholder	Full Name	<input type="text" value="Henry Scowcroft"/>	Title	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>
Project Title	<input type="text" value="Cancer Research UK, Wikipedian in Residence"/>			
Grant Scheme	<input type="text" value="Public Engagement, People Award"/>			
Grant Number	<input type="text" value="28248?"/>			
Amount of award	<input type="text" value="£25,469, then extra £ ???"/>			
Total project cost	<input type="text"/>			
Source and amount of additional funding	<input type="text"/>			

OVERVIEW & EVALUATION

<p>Please provide a short description of the project supported by this Award (approx. 150 words)</p> <p>To fund a Wikipedian in Residence based at CRUK's London headquarters. The project was extended with additional funding to last 9.5 months at 4 days per week, from May 2014 to February 2015. Aims included: to foster collaboration across the charity, the Wikimedia community and the UK cancer research community, with the aim of improving Wikipedia's cancer-related content for the benefit of all, establishing a robust case study for other organisations, and producing research on how the general public uses cancer information on the internet</p>

<p>Please provide a summary of your original objectives (approx. 150 words).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content: in particular to target the main Wikipedia articles on the four cancers identified as having special unmet needs in the CRUK research strategy: pancreas, lung, oesophagus and brain. Get them to a state where they can be nominated for Featured articles on Wikipedia. Training: deliver training on editing Wikipedia to CRUK & CRUK-supported researchers. Open licenses for CRUK media, where possible. Upload them to 	<p>Please outline whether each objective was achieved, exceeded or not. Please also tell us of any unexpected outcomes. (approx. 500 words)</p> <p>Content: Pancreatic cancer and Endometrial cancer greatly improved and newly made Featured Articles (FA). Lung cancer heavily revised and remains an FA. Oesophageal cancer greatly improved, by 424 edits over the WiR period, vs 40 in all 2013, but not yet FA. Less progress made on Brain tumour, a knotty topic with so many types and so few general characteristics.</p> <p>Many other cancer-related topics improved, including general ones on risk factors. In particular the CRUK Statistics team have added key UK statistics to all 30+ cancers they cover, and have made continuing to do so part of their work routine.</p> <p>Training: The number of sessions and trainees was slightly exceeded, but continuing editing by those trained has been less than hoped, though in line with similar projects.</p> <p>Media released: 532 media objects have been uploaded to Wikimedia Commons on open licenses. Most of these are</p>
--	--

<p>Wikimedia Commons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research: two pieces, one qualitative and the other quantitative. See Protocols attached.	<p>diagrams, but there are also photographs, informatics and animation. They can be seen here.</p> <p>Research: The qualitative research was expanded, and has produced results that exceed expectations, although analysis and writing-up remains ongoing. The quantitative research went according to the plan by the start date, and has produced good results, in terms of showing different ratings for the sites tested.</p> <p>The nature of the research shifted away from the focus groups in the original grant application to a combination of a qualitative online survey of 1,000 and 30 qualitative interviews. These have almost certainly produced more interesting material than the original plan would have done.</p>
---	---

Please give a brief description of the evaluation methodology used (approx. 200 words)

(Including how you have gathered information and reflections about your project)

Content: There were large numbers of comments by other Wikipedia medical editors at the [WikiProject Medicine talk page](#), the talk pages for individual articles, and the review process for FAs (for example the Pancreatic cancer [Featured article candidates page](#) had [331 comments by 22 editors](#), totalling 131,334 bytes.

In addition to reviews by internal CRUK specialists, external reviews were received from leading clinicians and researchers for the target articles approaching FA status.

The qualitative research involved getting 2 groups of c. 333 online respondees (via YouGov) to rate “before” and “after” versions of one WP article.

Training: evaluation forms were handed out for most long training session workshops, though not all were completed.

Media released: Mainly by usage statistics, and comments made by users.

Research: The research was planned and carried out in consultation with Dr Henry Potts, Senior Lecturer in health Informatics at UCL (Farr Institute).

Please give details of the key findings from your evaluation in terms of project development and delivery (approx. 200 words)

(Please provide details of both aspects that worked and those that didn't work so well, including the quality of the outputs)

Content: Not as many articles as hoped were taken to FA; it was always a challenging target. The ones that were developed can be regarded as a success, though the input from CRUK itself varied by department. Not as many as hoped of the people trained have continued to edit Wikipedia subsequently.

Considerable effort was put into involving the existing medical editing community, with some success, but many editors became involved at the review stages rather than in compiling the content. This resulted in a very stringent review process, and further improvement to the article, but forced the WiR to spend more time than anticipated doing the spadework improving the articles. This was undoubtedly the main reason for the target articles not all being taken as far as hoped. There were competing demands on the medical editing community, not least the Ebola outbreak.

Training: Feedback was generally good but few trained have continued to edit. This is a very common problem in Wikipedia training for new editors. There are other benefits in terms of increasing understanding and raising awareness, and some may later edit, often using different accounts, or without logging on.

Specific training to individuals who will, it is planned, continue to upload newly-released media was effective, and by the end of the project some media were being uploaded by CRUK staff, with the WiR just being informed about it afterwards.

Media released: Received enthusiastically by other medical editors. Some 220 images are now used in English Wikipedia articles, and the great majority were added to them by other editors, rather than the WiR and those at CRUK. The page view figures achieved are larger than anticipated. As a result of the project CRUK has made a very wide commitment to releasing its material on open licenses. The standard CRUK model release forms have been changed to allow models/subjects to opt into this in future. Few images containing individuals could be released during the project's life, as this had not been in place earlier.

Research: The research is still in the process of being written up, but the results seem perhaps more rich and interesting than anticipated. The qualitative piece of research changed and grew in concept during the period, ending as 30 qualitative interviews with members of the public, watching and recording them research pancreatic cancer on the web, and then interviewing them about the choices they made and how they rated the sites they saw (which always included Wikipedia).

Please give details of the key findings from your evaluation in terms of impact on, or response from, audiences (approx. 200 words)

(For R&D Arts projects we realise you may have had a more limited audience, here we are interested in how the audience response has helped to develop the work itself)

Content: The quantitative research assessed this. Improvement in Wikipedia articles does not typically produce a great improvement in views in the short term. Many favourable comments were received, many from other editors some acting as readers for the articles in question, others as reviewers or editors.

Training: Ratings and comments generally improved over the period, as CRUK-specific material was developed and practised.

Please give details of the key findings from your evaluation in terms of impact on project team members including the researchers/scientific experts involved in the area of scientific research (approx. 200 words)

(Please provide details of both your achievements and the challenges you faced)

There has been incorporation of helping and releasing to WP into the normal working routine of some CRUK departments but not others. Whether a regular and efficient route of communication between Wikipedia medical ...editors

Are there any other findings you would share with others undertaking similar projects?

(approx. 250 words)

Please give details of how you have informed your peers of your project and any learning that has come from it (approx. 200 words)

The project was publicised internally on Wikipedia, and on blogs by CRUK and the Wikimedia Foundation. There was a CRUK podcast, and newsletters for those involved. There was an interview on MEDSCAPE.com, and mentions in news stories on the *The Independent* and the BBC website. There were presentations to two international Wikipedia conferences, and at SPOTON. More conference talks are planned; one proposal has been accepted.

If your project has resulted in any findings of relevance to policy makers please provide details about how they have been presented to them (approx. 150 words)

If your project has resulted in any publications, please list them below

It is hoped to publish 1 or 2 papers in the future, with the results of the search, with the help of UCL Health Informatics people (Senior Lecturer and MSc students)

AUDIENCE DETAILS

We would like to know more about the audiences/participants who have been reached via the activity. Please provide information about the **primary audiences**, i.e. those who were reached directly by the project outputs (e.g. attended performances, participated in workshops, viewed film etc.), and the **secondary audiences**, i.e. those indirectly reached (e.g. via press coverage of activity or via primary audiences). We recognise that details of these may not always be possible to measure accurately!

Primary Audiences			
Age Range <i>Please select all that apply</i>	Collected	Actual Number (if known)	Estimated Number
Early Years (under 5s)	Y/N		
Children (5-11)	Y/N		
Youth (12-15)	Y/N		
Older Youth (16-19)	Y/N		
Young Adults (20-34)	Y/N		
Adults (35-64)	Y/N		
Adults (65+)	Y/N		
Unknown age distribution	Y/N		
TOTAL			
Gender <i>Please include numbers where available</i>	Collected	Actual Number (if known)	Estimated Number
Male	Y/N		

Female	Y/N		
TOTAL			
Ethnicity (for UK-based projects) <i>Please select all that apply</i>	Collected	Actual Number (if known)	Estimated Number
Asian or Asian British	Y/N		
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Y/N		
Mixed / Multiple Ethnic Groups	Y/N		
White	Y/N		
Other Ethnic Group	Y/N		
TOTAL			

Geographical Location <i>Please select all that apply</i>	Collected	Actual Number (if known)	Estimated Number
UK			
East Midlands	Y/N		
East of England	Y/N		
London	Y/N		
North East	Y/N		
North West	Y/N		
Northern Ireland	Y/N		
Scotland	Y/N		
South East	Y/N		
South West	Y/N		
Wales	Y/N		
West Midlands	Y/N		
Yorkshire and the Humber	Y/N		
Republic of Ireland	Y/N		
Other Countries <i>Please list and expand table as necessary</i>	Y/N		
TOTAL			
Audience category <i>Please select all that apply</i>	Collected	Actual Number (if known)	Estimated Number
School	Y/N		
Families	Y/N		
Non-specialist adult	Y/N		
Academics/Researchers	Y/N		
Health Professionals	Y/N		
Policy makers/Politicians	Y/N		
Patient/Special interest groups	Y/N		
Teachers/Educators	Y/N		
Online	Y/N		
TOTAL			

Audience Profile	Collected	
Have you collected additional data on the audience profile of your project? <i>If yes, please add a summary and appendix with a further breakdown</i>	Y/N	Further Details: The primary audiences were employees of CRUK or researchers funded by them, and no data was collected for them. The CRUK audiences were over 50% female, and mostly aged 20-34. The researchers varied a bit more.
Have you engaged 'under-represented audiences' during your project? <i>For example, this may include individuals with low socio-economic status, please refer to Grant Expectations for guidance. If yes, please add a summary</i>	Y/N	Further Details: No

Secondary Audiences

Where possible please provide details of secondary audiences reached by your project, and any evidence for having reached these audiences. Please include metrics (e.g. web hits, media impressions) and anecdotal reports as appropriate. (approx. 250 words)

These "secondary" audiences were really the "primary" ones for this project. The easiest figures to collect are the hits to articles that contain CRUK images released under this project: these are running at about 1.35 million per month (desktop only, uplift by c. 30% for tablet and mobile views), and are likely to slowly increase both by adding to new articles, and organic growth in views. [Views to April 2014](#) total 13.25 million (before uplift). The vast majority so far are to the English Wikipedia, but altogether 22 different language versions of Wikipedia use some of these images. The image files are in svg format, making it easy to translate the captions in new file versions. Much the most-used images are diagrams showing anatomic details, stages of cancer, and features of cells; these are also the majority of the uploads.

The English Wikipedia is accessed by English-speakers globally, including large numbers from countries where English is not an official language (something known but confirmed by our research), especially for medical topics, where the English Wikipedia is more trusted than the local language version by, for example, Poles and Ukrainians.

The Wikipedian in residence (as [User:Wiki_CRUK_John](#)) made [a total of 2868 edits](#), but more edits were made by other editors involved in the project. These are hard to quantify, but for example [Pancreatic cancer](#) was edited 1367 times ([bottom of the page here](#)) in the WiR's period, against 116 edits in all of 2013.

The page views received by articles whose text was edited and improved by the project are likely to exceed 1 million per month, but this is hard to quantify. The most common cancer types each get 200-600K views per month, on the English Wikipedia, from where content tends to flow to other languages.

OTHER

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

If your project has an educational component have you deposited any resources produced by the project, either physical and/or virtual with the National STEM Centre in York?

Yes		Comments: Usual Wikipedia training materials used. Special slides developed, which have been shared with CRUK & other Wikipedia trainers.
No		
N/A	N/A	

PRIZES

Has your project, or any element of your project been nominated for or won any prizes? If so please give details including dates.

No (or not yet)

RESEARCH PAPERS

Has your project resulted in any academic publications? If yes:

a) Please provide details

b) Please confirm that the publication is in line with our open access policy:

<http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/about-us/policy/spotlight-issues/Open-access/index.htm>

Yes: 1 or 2 papers are planned, but not yet published. They will be in line with Wellcome's open access policy

ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK

Do you plan to develop this project further in the future?

If so what is planned and why? How do you hope to fund this work? (approx. 250 words)

The planned papers. The small funding needed should be supplied by UCL and CRUK, and the WiR working on a volunteer basis.

Do you have any comments you would like to make regarding your Award, the conduct of this work, or any difficulties you have encountered?

Many thanks for the original grant, and the supplementary amount! The project was complex, navigating largely uncharted waters, and although the planned timing did not work out, we feel it has had considerable achievements, and been well worthwhile.

Wellcome Library Engaging Science Archive

The Engaging Science Archive aims to preserve and showcase the work produced by Engaging Science grantholders, to help learn from past projects and to inspire future activity.

The archive provides members of Wellcome Library with direct access to project outputs at the Wellcome Library premises. It will also provide access to view selected content online through the library catalogue.

The full list of outputs we would like to receive along with the most appropriate formats for submitting them, can be found in Appendix 1 of 'Grant Expectations', which you received at the start of your grant. 'Grant Expectations' also contains further information about the archive, including a list of Frequently Asked Questions.

We would appreciate it if you could provide details of the outputs that resulted from your project by completing Table 1 (overleaf).

If you are happy for any/all of the outputs that resulted from the project to be digitised and made available online as part of the archive, we would appreciate it if you could also complete the declaration on the final page.

Please send any copies of digital outputs to engagingscienceoutputs@wellcome.ac.uk and non-digital outputs to Engaging Science, Wellcome Trust, 215 Euston Rd, London NW1 2BE.

How to complete Table 1

Section A: Information about grant outputs

Column 1: Please provide details of any outputs (both digital and non-digital) that resulted from the project, including output type, title of the output and any further details that you feel may be relevant. This information will be used to ensure that outputs from your project are properly catalogued.

Column 2: Please provide an attribution notice for each output (e.g. © John Smith, 2014). If a library user makes use of an output from the archive, they must **always** fully attribute the copyright owner of the output in the manner specified in this column.

Section B: Online access to grant outputs

Column 3: Please indicate whether you are happy for each output to be made available online to registered library users in the future under a Creative Commons (attribution, non-commercial) license.

Column 4: Although we would prefer to make outputs available online under a Creative Commons (attribution, non-commercial) license, we understand that this level of freedom might not be possible for certain outputs. If you wish to impose additional restrictions, please indicate this in column 4 by marking the relevant boxes.