



Workshop 'Outreach'

During the workshop 'Outreach' with ARCHON, we are going to focus on getting academic research (both PhD and RMA) out of its ivory tower and making it accessible to a wider audience. Together with [De Focus](#) (a platform for students and alumni who wish to transform their thesis into an article within the context of science journalism), we are learning through a hands-on approach how one can present the insights resulting from one's research in journalistic yet scientific way, in order to make it easier for a wider audience to understand.

At the end of the workshop, you will leave with your own introduction as a first step toward such an article. Thus, participants in this workshop learn how to communicate academic knowledge toward society. That's not only helpful if you're writing a research proposal, but also when you apply for funding or in other application processes, or merely for the sake of self-advertisement as an expert. In all of these cases you have to convince an audience that also consists of non-experts.

Program

Thursday 6 June 2019, by Thom Hamer and Sonja Pleumeekers from the board of De Focus

13:30 - 13:40	introduction on 'Outreach' and criteria for effective outreach
13:40 - 14:20	part I: editorial teams read and assess their members' concept introductions (see preparatory assignment)
14:20 - 14:30	part II: editorial teams do a quick editing of one of the articles and prepare for the plenary live editing
14:30 - 14:45	global reading of the to-be-presented texts in unedited version
14:45 - 15:25	part III: plenary live editing (what are common pitfalls?)
15:25 - 15:45	tips toward an article + workshop evaluation (including some time margin)

Preparatory 'Outreach' assignment

In preparation of the workshop, you are asked to write an introduction to a journalistic article based on the content of your bachelor thesis, advanced research proposal or already existing article concept, to be submitted by Wednesday 5 June, 23:00 hrs., through mail.

This introduction lacks the strong demands associated with an academic article; rather, it is a concise, easy and appealing read that emphasizes the relevance for readers that may not be so familiar with the discipline in question. Still, the scientific dimension remains evident; indeed, the introduction takes the first steps toward tackling a problem of scientific interest and arguing in a scientifically sound manner for a solution.

During the workshop, editorial teams (consisting of approximately five members, a mixture of PhD and master students) evaluate each of their concept introductions by discerning its strengths and weaknesses, in order to suggest improvements for further versions of the article. Assessment will be guided by specific criteria. In this way, you really get to know the practice of editorial boards and gain a basic understanding of what makes an excellent piece of science journalism.

The introduction has a maximum length of 200 words and can consist of multiple paragraphs. Among the substantive criteria are clarity, accessibility for the layperson, target audience, suitability of the scope, stylistic appeal, and the title's strength. Further guidelines can be found in the [LibGuide on 'Outreach'](#) (particularly, under "How do I write an article?") Finally, please take a look at [the website of De Focus](#) and get inspired by the style and form applied in the published articles.

Assignment during the session

Before the start of the workshop, participants are expected to have submitted their preparatory assignment in their group. This group will serve as an editorial team during the session.

In part I of the workshop, editorial teams read and assess their members' concept introduction (i.e., the preparatory assignments), while the writer of the introduction makes changes according to the teams' criticisms and suggestion. The teams will spend 8 minutes per article. When the bell rings, the groups should finish up and move on to the next article.

Part II concludes the session in editorial groups with a quick editing session. One of the articles is chosen as a case study for the plenary session in part III and is edited by the team. Each case study is circulated so that every other group can globally read the piece in its unedited version.

During part III, we collectively focus on the case studies presented by the editorial teams. Each team takes a few minutes to present the problems it encountered during the editorial session (by making use of the criteria), illustrates these by referring to the text and shows what changes they made to improve the article. Each case study is given 8 minutes.