Globalisation and The Innovation Journey
• 26,000+ students
  • c7,000 international
    • (from 130+ different countries)
  • 400+ under/postgraduate courses
• c3,500 staff
• £241m turnover (2014/15)
• Organisational structure
  • Faculties, Trading Subsidiaries
• £350m+ future investment
New Science & Health Building

• State of the Art Teaching & Research Facilities
• £64m, 11,250 m²
• Five Stories, including:-
  • Biosciences Super Lab
  • Health Simulation
  • Sports Science
• Opening January 2017
Globalisation of HE

• Rapid growth in o/s students and transnational education
• Internationalisation of curriculum for global careers
• Rapid capability development (for academia and industry)
• Mobility – knowledge transfer through people
• Rapid growth in new technologies and e-Science
• Significant research outside any one national context
• Complex problems requiring multiple approaches
• Institutions need international networks for intelligence gathering and brand development
Rhetoric and Reality

• Few universities have a clear sense of what globalisation means or have a coherent strategy to respond
• Many have “traditional” approach; don’t address barriers
• Internationalisation of the curriculum is often superficial
• Partnerships are often individual rather than institutional
• Quantity is often focussed on more than quality
• Few international collaborations last beyond project funding
• Many contacts are based on serendipity, fragile and “historic” and do not reflect capability and opportunity
• The world is changing and disproportionate returns will accrue to those who are entrepreneurial
CU International Strategy Pillars

- Increase numbers on CU courses in the UK
- Grow numbers on CU awards overseas - including through joint ventures
- Leading UK university for "internationalisation" experiences
- Develop capacity and capability to deliver our mission
- Enhance research, reputation and rankings
Building Our Global Presence
2020 Research Strategy

• £250m investment into research staff and facilities
• Focusing on the continuous development of high quality research – targeting ‘Excellence with Impact’
• Internationally renowned, “making a significant difference to the way in which we live”
Research Strategy Complements International Excellence with Impact – Coventry University Research Strategy
The Coventry Journey – A Change Case

Mark Holton
Group Director of Organisation Development
Coventry University Group – Key Facts

- UK Campuses: Coventry University, Coventry University London Campus, Coventry University College, Coventry University Scarborough Campus
- International Campuses:
- Number of Students studying UK 28,000+, Globally 40,000+
- 6 Main wholly owned subsidiaries
- 4 Faculties
  - Business and Law
  - Engineering, Environment and Computing
  - Arts and Humanities
  - Health and Life Sciences
Excellence with Impact – Coventry University Research

- Centre for Applied Biological & Exercise Science
- Centre for Trust, Peace & Social Relations
- Centre for Agroecology, Water & Resilience
- Centre for Research in Psychology, Behaviour & Achievement
- Centre for Communities & Social Justice
- Centre for Business in Society
- Centre for Technology Enabled Health
- Disruptive Media Laboratory
- Centre for Transport & Mobility
- Centre for Complex Systems
- Centre for Manufacturing & Materials
- Centre for Low Impact Buildings
So far, So good …..

**University of the Year**
Times Higher Education Awards 2015

**Modern University of the Year**

**Ranked No. 15 UK University**
Guardian University Guide 2016

**Top University for Student Satisfaction**
The Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide 2016

**95% of graduates are employed or in further study**
DLHE Survey 2013/14

**The Queen’s Award for Enterprise**
International Trade 2015
## The Complete University Guide
### University League Table 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>UCAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>UWIC, Cardiff</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>West of England</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Canterbury Christ Church</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coventry’s Progression in the League Tables
We are a dynamic, global and transformational University Group. Creating better futures, we will be world leading in all that we do.
Organisation Development at Coventry University

Developing Academic Practice

Providing focus and supporting success

The Coventry Way

Developing Individuals, Teams and Leaders

Communities
Organisation Development
at Coventry University

Providing focus and supporting success

The Coventry Way

Communities
We are a dynamic, global and transformational University Group. Creating better futures, we will be world leading in all that we do.
Linking Performance to Progression & Reward

Key to ratings

- **O**: Outstanding
- **E**: Excellent
- **S**: Strong
- **IR**: Improvement Required
- **DR**: Development Required
- **U**: Unacceptable
Organisation Development at Coventry University

Developing Academic Practice

The Coventry Way

Communities

Communities

Communities
The Coventry Journey so far: The Course as ‘Unit of Currency'

What should be the central unit of currency?

- Defining a collective vision at a course level
- Developing and engaging with wider course level communities
- The Course Review process
Strategic Alignment in Course Development and Academic Practice

In Coventry’s case:

- Research inspired teaching
- Multicultural and international engagement
- Community contribution and responsibility
- Innovation and digital fluency
- Embedded employability
- Creativity and enterprise
Core Practices for Academic Leaders in support of Teaching and Learning

• Democratisation and Intelligent use of management information – owned by academic colleagues
• Development and use of student feedback systems
Data

Information

Presentation

Knowledge

EpicGraphic.com
Core practices for academic leaders in support of Teaching and Learning

• Democratisation and Intelligent use of management information – owned by academic colleagues
• Development and use of student feedback systems
• Teaching observation, coaching and mentoring
• Continuing academic Professional Development
• Academic leadership development
• Making informed, strategic decisions that impact on the student experience
Organisation Development
at Coventry University

Developing Communities
The Coventry Way
Developing Individuals, Teams and Leaders
Staff Engagement, Listening, Acting
Leadership at Coventry University

Development Programmes

- Academic and Professional Leadership
- Professional Staff: MBA and Doctoral Programmes
- Managing change
- Coventry Essentials
- Coaching, Mentoring
- Developing Academic Practice
- Skills development Programmes
- International Capability And Mobility
Keep Perspective, don’t lose sight of what really matters
Check understanding and commitment
Get authentic feedback and real views
Review, adapt, learn, grow
Thank You!
Enhancement of HE Research Potential:
Review of HR strategies at EU partners

Coventry University, 20 – 24th June 2016

Dr Rebekah Smith McGloin
Prof. Dobrila Petrovic
Dr Kieran Fenby-Hulse
Dr Heather Sears
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

- 5 days
- 3 days workshops
- Wednesday evening ‘formal’ dinner
- 2 days Coventry Conference
- Mixture of presentations, workshops and time for discussion
Key Themes

- Effecting change
- CU Research strategy
- Doctoral training
- Supervisor development
- Responsible research incl. recruitment
- Researchers’ career progression
## Day One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 - 13:50</td>
<td>Institutional Welcome to International Visitors</td>
<td>Dr Jean-Bernard Adrey, Director of the Centre for Global Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:50 - 14:30</td>
<td>Effecting Change - The Coventry Journey</td>
<td>Mark Holton, Director Organisation Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 - 14:50</td>
<td>Introductions and overview of the programme</td>
<td>Dr Rebekah Smith-McGloin, Research Capability Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:50 - 15:50</td>
<td>Developing Research Capability - Broader UK Context</td>
<td>Dr Rebekah Smith-McGloin, Research Capability Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50 - 16:30</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea and Time for Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: Jaguar Building, JAG28
## Day Two

**Tuesday 21 June**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 10:00</td>
<td>Coventry Context: Research Strategy and Overview of Support for Researchers</td>
<td>Prof. Olivier Sparagano, Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 11:00</td>
<td>Doctoral Training</td>
<td>Prof. Dobrila Petrovic and Prof. Anne James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 - 11:00</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Tour - Engineering and Computing Building</td>
<td>Lidia Bombin Martinez, International Operations Manager, ECB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 12:40</td>
<td><strong>Innovations in Doctoral Training</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Rebekah Smith-McGloin, Research Capability Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40 – 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Introduction to Supervisor Development</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Rebekah Smith-McGloin, Research Capability Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 13:20</td>
<td>Perspectives on Supervising in the UK</td>
<td>Dr. Mike Duncan, Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:20 - 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 14:40</td>
<td>Supervisor Training - Taster workshop: From Supervisee to supervisor</td>
<td>Dr. Rebekah Smith-McGloin, Research Capability Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:40 – 15:00</td>
<td>Case Study: Supervisor Development Programme from the Faculty of Engineering</td>
<td>Prof. Elena Gaurs, Associate Dean Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-16:30</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea and Time for Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Coventry University Enterprises Limited**
Day Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Title</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Responsible Research and Research Integrity</td>
<td>Dr Kieran Fenby-Hulse, Early &amp; Middle Career Researcher Development Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 13:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 14:00</td>
<td>Researchers' Career Progression: Introduction to the Academic Framework</td>
<td>Dr Kieran Fenby-Hulse, Early &amp; Middle Career Researcher Development Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 14:40</td>
<td>Challenges and Opportunities for Early and Middle Career Researchers</td>
<td>Dr Emma Heywood, Dr James Malcolm, Dr Anh Tran, Dr Natalie Garrett Brown, Dr Doug Thake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:40 - 15:00</td>
<td>Introduction to the Coventry Conference</td>
<td>Dr Kieran Fenby-Hulse, Early &amp; Middle Career Researcher Development Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - 15:15</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 - 16:45</td>
<td>Project Update</td>
<td>Prof. Dragana Cvetkovic-Ilic, Dr Milan Zdravkovic, Payle Sekerus, Olivera Mijatovic, Olivera Popovic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wednesday Dinner

• 7.30pm at Coombe Abbey
• Minibus pick-up from 6.45pm
• 5 miles from Coventry City Centre
Day Four

Call for Submissions

Coventry Excellence Awards 2016

Conference Programme

THIS YEAR’S CONFERENCE WILL BE AN ALL-STAFF CONFERENCE FOR BOTH PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND ACADEMIC STAFF ACROSS THE GROUP. WE WILL ONCE AGAIN BE JOINED BY OUR INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS.

The overarching theme of the 2016 Conference is ‘Creating Better Futures’ with the following sub-themes:

- 21st Century Working
- Technology as an enabler and tool for transformation
- Building global communities in Higher Education
- Best Practice Showcases (Teaching & Learning, Research, Internationalisation, Enterprise and Professional Services Support)
- Supporting the equalisation of opportunity and attainment, celebrating diversity findings and achievements
## Day Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Speaker/Workshop</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-09:30</td>
<td>Coventry University Conference: Registration and Coffee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Engineering and Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-09:45</td>
<td>Coventry University Conference: Day 2 Opening</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Engineering and Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:50-10:30</td>
<td>Coventry University Conference: Session choices</td>
<td>Dependent on session choice</td>
<td>Engineering and Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>Action-planning</td>
<td>Dr Rebekah Smith-McGloin, Research Capability Development Manager</td>
<td>JAG28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A note on rooms...

• Tomorrow – Engineering and Computing Building, C Floor, 1-02
• Wednesday – Jaguar Building, A118
• Thursday – Conference is mainly in Engineering and Computing Building
  – Project briefing in EC3-35
• Friday – Conference and then Jaguar, Room 28
DEVELOPING RESEARCH CAPABILITY

• National picture
• Research ecosystem
• Role of teaching-focused institutions
• Practical steps: programmes, funding
• Challenges
• Opportunities
National picture

- UK Research
  - Variety of types of institution
  - Portfolio of funding sources
  - Two streams of govt money ensures excellent research is funded
  - “The Golden Triangle”
UK higher education institutions’ income from research grants & contracts and funding council grants*

- **HM Treasury**
  - Dual support system
    - BIS
      - (£3.1bn from Science Budget)
      - EPSRC, BBSRC, NERC
      - STFC, ESRC, AHRC, MRC
      - Research councils £1,892m
  - Scottish Executive
  - Welsh Assembly Government
  - DELNI
    - Government Departments other than BIS, local authorities, health & hospital authorities
    - £706m

- **Funding bodies £2,266m**

- **UK higher education institutions**
  - UK-based charities £896m
  - UK industry commerce & public corporations £312m
  - EU and other overseas sources £648m
  - Other £51m
The Golden Triangle

University of Oxford
University of Cambridge
Imperial College London

Coventry University Enterprises Limited
• 19 universities
• Critical mass through collaboration
• Funding from EU, charities and industry
• Teaching-focused
Research ecosystem

- Valuable role in the research ecosystem
- Institutional diversity strengthens the national research portfolio
- Specific, high-quality support for researchers
Areas of focus for researcher training and development

• Four “micro-programmes” within each stream that encourage researcher agency and self-development:
  • Research Leadership and Research Careers
  • Research Funding and Policy
  • Research Impact and Engagement
  • Research Communication

• Pump-prime funding
Practical steps: programmes

• Two programme streams: early and middle career
• Four “micro-programmes” within each stream that encourage researcher agency and self-development:
  • Research Leadership and Research Careers
  • Research Funding and Policy
  • Research Impact and Engagement
  • Research Communication
• Consisting of: residential, intensive workshops, reading groups, and online learning.
Practical steps: programmes

- Participants will be required to do preparatory and follow-up work between sessions.
- Cross-over sessions to encourage ECR/MCR cross-stream learning.
- Application-based to assess needs and priority.
Practical steps: Funding schemes

- Research sabbatical scheme
- Visiting professor scheme
- Pump-prime funding scheme
- Research equipment scheme
Challenges – Institutional and National

- Decrease in research income
- Political uncertainty – Brexit?
- Consortia – cartels?
- International competition
- Recruitment: equality and diversity
- UG fees/broken pipeline to PhD
- Research infrastructure
- Balance with teaching
- Research know-how
Opportunities

- Collaboration
- Mobility (international, industry-academia)
- Training and development
- Equality and diversity
- Diversifying funding
- Public engagement – citizen science
- Over-supply of PhDs
Welcome to Coventry University...
Professor Olivier Sparagano, APVC Research
Our History...
1829: Mechanics Institute
1835: Religious and Useful Knowledge Society
1843: Coventry School of Design
1852: Coventry School of Art
1855: Coventry Institute
1902: Technical College
1902: Municipal School of Art
1954: College of Art
1960: Lanchester College of Technology
The institutes merged to become......

1970: Lanchester Polytechnic
1987: Coventry Polytechnic
1990: Coventry Business School

And finally.......

1992: Coventry University
We are a dynamic, global and transformational University Group.

Creating better futures, we will be world leading in all we do.

Our Mission:
University Of The Year 2014-2016

Modern University of the year 2014, 2015 & 2016
Source: Times and Sunday Times : Good University Guide

Ranked 15th UK University in Guardian
Source: Guardian University Guide 2015

Ranked 23rd UK University for 2016 in ‘table of tables’
Source: Times Higher Education

Winner Queen’s Award for Enterprise in International Trade 2015
Source: Queen’s Award for Enterprise 2015

91% of students are satisfied with their experience
Source: NSS 2015

Ranked in the top 2 UK Universities for Teaching Quality 2015 & 2016
Source: Times and Sunday Times : Good University Guide
26,000 students in total in the UK

- Campuses in Coventry (33 Acres), London and Scarborough.
- 7,000 international students from over 140 different countries.
- Research ventures across the globe
- International business activity

Plus 5,700 Transnational Education Students overseas

3,500 staff, Coventry Campus 1/3rd of Coventry City Centre

Local, National and International Presence
Why do students come to Coventry University?

- Course content/format: 74.9%
- Career prospects: 57.9%
- Open Days or other campus visits: 46.1%

(RAO survey in 2014)
Staff age profile 2014:
- 32%: 34 & Under
- 36%: 35-49
- 30%: 50-65
- 2%: 66 & over

Staff ethnicity profile 2014:
- 10%: Black
- 4%: Asian
- 2%: Mixed
- 1%: Other
- 74%: White
- 9%: Unknown

Staff disability profile 2014:
- 3%: Disabled
- 97%: Not Disabled

Staff gender profile 2014:
- 54%: Female
- 46%: Male
Economic Impact 2015/16
• Coventry £231m
• Coventry and Warwickshire £279m
• West Midlands £342m

• **Multiplier effect:** Every £ spent by the University and Students generates an extra 70p in the local economy

The University is worth some £1.5bn to the Coventry Economy over the period to 2020
2021 Corporate Strategy

• Next Evolution in the development of the University Group
• Leading provider of innovative education
• Global education on six continents
• Impactful national and international research
• Recognised by our strategic business partners and governments as an enterprising and innovative University.
• Providing an environment that supports excellence.
• An increased asset base...

Our Future
Future Development

£125m Redevelopment of 4.3 acre Civic Centre Site into a new University headquarters, research hotel, international student centre and business incubator.

Starting in 2017....
- Faculty of Health and Life Sciences
  
  FRC Applied Biological and Exercise Sciences (ABES) (Prof. Alfonso Jimenez)
  
  FRC Technology Enabled Health Research (CTHER) (Prof. Beth Gruntfeld)
  
  FRC Psychology, Behaviour and Achievements (Prof. Clare Wood)
  
- Faculty of Arts and Humanities
  
  FRC cDARE (Dance) (Prof. Sarah Whatley)
  
- Faculty of Business and Law
  
  FRC Business in Society (cBiS) (Prof. Lyndon Simkin)
Faculty of Engineering, Environment and Computing

FRC Materials and Manufacturing (MME) (Prof. Carl Perrin)
FRC Mobility and Transport (Prof. Andrew Parkes)
FRC Flow Measurement and Fluid Mechanics (Prof. Andrew Hunt)
FRC Low Impact Building (Dr Steve Austin)

University Research Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations
(Prof. Mike Hardy)

University Research Centre for Agriculture and Water Resilience
(Prof. Michel Pimbert)
You are all very welcome to Coventry University
Professor Olivier Sparagano
Olivier.sparagano@coventry.ac.uk
INNOVATIONS IN DOCTORAL TRAINING

- National picture
- Coventry innovations
Based on UKCGE report Structural Changes in Doctoral Education in the UK - A Review of Graduate Schools and the Development of Doctoral Colleges.

Dr Rebekah Smith McGloin and Carolyn Wynn

- Maps structures to support PG education in the UK
- Policy review/national data
- Highlights major trends
• Survey was sent to 126 member institutions in UK and Ireland
• Focuses on:
  - role of Graduate Schools
  - development of Doctoral Colleges
  - organisational re-structuring to support DTCs
• Combined data accounted for all 126 institutions, which is 84% of UK HEIs
• Report also reviews the changing nature of:
  - Global trends in doctoral education
  - PGR population
  - Doctoral programmes
  - PGT

• Based on policy review, other publications (Vitae, HEFCE, EC, OECD, British Council) and HESA data
Competition
Complexity
Diversification
Multi-layering
Partnership-working
Growth
Setting the scene:

- UK population trends
- Programme diversification
- Global trends

Organisational Structures:

- Grad Schools
- Doctoral Colleges
- Doctoral Training Programmes
- Doctoral Training Alliance
Population Trends

- PGR numbers increasing (slightly)
- Institutional aspirations
- 30% international
- 51% women
- Still work to be done to increase black and minority ethnic and non-traditional backgrounds
- Older (?) – professional doctorates
- Increase in self-funded
- Impact of undergraduate fees?
Programme Diversification

• PGT/PGR
• More structure
• Professional and practice-based doctorates
• Taught elements
• E-learning
• Distance learning
• Blurred boundaries between part and full-time
• Anticipated p/t decrease but will fees/PG loans change this?
Global trends

• Africa, North America, Europe, Australia
• Regardless of maturity of research environment...

1. Acknowledge/support for diversification
2. Complexity: multi-level/multi-layer working
3. Collaboration
4. Mobility

1. Increased structure
2. Harmonisation (at regional level)
3. Standardisation
4. Regulation
Graduate Schools
71% of 126 member institutions have at least one Graduate School

Doctoral Colleges
21% of 44 responses have a Doctoral School or College

Who are Graduate School Students?
- 100% Serve PGR Students
- 77% Serve PDS Students
- 52% Serve PGT Students
- 45% Serve ECR Students

How many HEIs have graduate Schools in 2015?
- 44 Pre-1992 HEIs have Graduate Schools
- 45 Post-1992 HEIs have Graduate Schools

Models of Graduate Schools in Institutions

Does your university have a Graduate School (or equivalent discrete structure(s) for postgraduate education?

Pre 1992 v Post 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1992</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 1992</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At what level are graduate schools located?

*Data from 1995, 2004 and 2009 is based on responding institutions only where as 2015 data also includes a web search.*
The aims of Graduate Schools v Doctoral Colleges

1. Improving research progression and completion rates
2. Improving the student experience for both PGT and PGR
3. Representing graduate issues within the institution
4. Improving the quality of graduate education for both PGT and PGR
5. Quality assurance on research provision
6. Sharing good practice on research supervision
7. Supporting Doctoral Training Programme Development

1. Improving the quality of doctoral education
2. Improving the student experience
3. Promoting interdisciplinary work
4. Sharing good practice on research supervision
5. Improving research progression and completion rates
6. Representing graduate issues inside the institution
7. Increasing the number of PGR Students

* More tailored training = more competitive offer
* Explicit link to cross-disciplinary/collaborative working required by Doctoral Training Programmes
* Better integration of PGR into research community
What is a Doctoral Training Programme?

- Cohort-based doctoral training programme
- Tailored to the discipline area
- Taught component
- Often comprises residential events/summer schools
- Can be useful to develop niche research areas or can be broader
- Usually funded in the UK by research councils
DOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAMMES

How many Doctoral Training Programmes does your institution have?

- 1-5 DTPs: 60%
- 6-15 DTPs: 46.7%
- 16-25 DTPs: Other 26.7%
- 26+ DTPs: Through the Doctoral College 20%

Of the 28 institutions that responded to this section of the survey, this bar chart shows how the number of DTPs are distributed.
What advantages do Doctoral Training Programmes bring to your institution?

- Promotes interdisciplinary research & relationships
- Develops relationships with other HEIs & partners
- Improves quality of student experience & support
- Provides structure to achieve critical mass
- Promotes best practice

What challenges do Doctoral Training Programmes bring to your institution?

- Sustaining & continuing funding
- Geographical issues with consortia
- Managing a multi-track doctoral system
- Achieving cost efficiency in delivery
- Working across research

Coventry University Enterprises Limited
Is your institution applying for any externally funded DTPs in the next 12 months?

- Yes (86%)
- No (14%)

Is your institution intending to increase DTP provision?

- Yes (90%)
- No (10%)
Funding to increase Doctoral Training Provision

Of the 24 institutions that indicated that they were intending on increasing their Doctoral Training Provision, they indicated how this would mainly be funded.
What does your institution need to deliver/explore the Doctoral Training Model Further?

- Funding from Research Councils, EU, Charities or similar: 88.9%
- Developing Consortia: 81.5%
- Industry Investment: 66.7%
- Change at Policy Level: 29.6%
- Other: 18.5%
“Investment by our own institution”

“We need a change in the funding policy of whom we can support”

“The QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education and HESA reporting structures can impede the establishment of doctoral training collaboration with other partner institutions. The former is more problematic for international collaboration”

“More institutional infrastructure & resource to support to develop both in terms of supporting staff and students”

“Changes at Departmental level to open up access to potential DTP courses for cohorts of PhD Students”
Doctoral Training Alliance Model: “Collaboration and connectivity”

• 3-year national cohort programme
• 4 residential ‘touch stone’ events + online training + electives
• Institutionally funded
• Business/Industry central
• Focus on delivering the difference
• First DTA in Applied Biosciences for Health
• 13 universities across the UK
• Target cohort of 72 by 2017 (~140)
• £6m coordinated investment
• Industry links to leading health, big pharma and multinational companies…
The challenge?

Supervisors do not always have enough time allocated to supervision or to supervisor training. They are not always as research-active as we would like them to be. They may be inexperienced. Although experience is not always a guarantee of quality. Every student is different and will require a different kind of supervision. They may not be the best people to follow administrative rules and ensure compliance in students. Too many regulations takes too much time away from hands on supervision of the research and the student.
How have you tackled it?
• Coventry is at the beginning of a journey
• Strategic priority to increase supervisor capacity
• Academics are time-poor
• Line-managers have other priorities
• Senior management wants ‘supervisors trained’
Historically...

- Training focused on regulatory compliance
- External trainer brought in to deliver multiple instances on pedagogy
- Attendance was motivated by compliance
- Workload modelling allocated very small amounts of time to supervision
- Lack of experienced supervisors to mentor new supervisors
- ‘Sleeping’ supervisors were commonplace
- Supervisors did not necessarily have the expertise in the research area of the thesis
Currently...

- Review of training balance and content
- Mixed modes of delivery – including online
- Senior management engagement with workload
- Pilot mentoring
- Changes in PhD recruitment
- Increase in number of staff undertaking high-quality research
Focus on training

- Partnership: student/supervisor
- Bespoke – addressing Faculty problems
- Flexible
- In-house – tailored to meet the needs of the institution
Examples

• Toolkits for students on managing their supervisory team
• Shared questionnaires to uncover assumptions
• Working directly with ECRs: From supervisor to supervisee to structure conversations about good and bad supervision
• Online basics
This questionnaire is an adaptation of “Expectations in Research Supervision” questionnaire originally developed by Ingrid Moses, from the Centre for Learning and Teaching at University of Sydney. The original has been adapted by various people but an example can be found at [http://www.rsc.qut.edu.au/pdfs/Training/res/expect.pdf](http://www.rsc.qut.edu.au/pdfs/Training/res/expect.pdf)

For each statement you have a maximum score of 15 points that you can distribute in order to demonstrate the relative weighting of responsibility each of these four stakeholders - lead supervisor, co-supervisor, industrial supervisor, mentor and research student - has in the PhD supervision process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who should have responsibility for:</th>
<th>Director of Studies</th>
<th>Co-Supervisor 1</th>
<th>Co-Supervisor 2</th>
<th>Mentor (an individual who offers support but sits outside the formal supervisor relationship)</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of the student’s research topic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the student understands the specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements and format of a PhD?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a schedule for completion of tasks that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the student will undertake during the PhD?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising regular meetings between student and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the student aware of facilities and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to support their research?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the student for public presentations of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research ideas or results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervising PhD students in the UK

Prof. Gordon Crawford
Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations
Coventry University
Models

1. Primary supervisor and second supervisor – 90:10
2. Joint supervisors 50:50
3. Director of Studies (DoS), second supervisor, (third supervisor) 40:30:30
Supervisory team

- Supervision as an iterative process
- Sum of collective input more than the parts
- Avoid potential for conflicting advice
Good practice

- Monthly joint meetings
- Written work (e.g. updated proposal or draft chapter) submitted by student 1 week before
- Written comments submitted to student by supervisors before supervision meeting
- Meeting:
  - discussion of submitted work
  - discussion of future work and plans
Supervision process

- Year 1:
  - Research proposal, especially specific primary research question and secondary questions
  - Literature review and analytical/theoretical framework
  - Ethical review
  - Preparation for fieldwork, including in difficult and dangerous contexts
Supervision process (cont.)

- Year 2:
  - Maintain regular contact during fieldwork
  - Discussion of issues / problems as they arise
  - Issues of power, identity and ethics as ongoing in field

- Year 3:
  - Timetable for writing up
  - Comments on draft chapters
  - Comments on full draft thesis
  - Preparation for viva and mock viva
SUPERVISOR TRAINING: TASTER WORKSHOP
From Supervisee to Supervisor

Dr Rebekah Smith McGloin
Workshop Outcomes

• By the end of the session we will have:
  • Explored UK national and Coventry University regulatory frameworks
  • Explored your expectations of good research supervision
  • Considered where responsibilities lie between supervisor and supervisee
  • Reflected on your own experience of supervision
  • Discussed how supervisors can best support students through key/critical stages of their research degree
What is ‘good’ supervision?

Assure the supervisee is working at the right level
Ensure the supervisee has access to a high quality research environment
Support?
Advice?
Does it change over time?
How do you know what ‘good’ supervision is?

- REGULATIONS
- EXPERIENCE
  - As a supervisor
  - As a PGR
REGULATIONS: STANDARD AND ENVIRONMENT
Regulations

• What are the expectations for work at a doctoral level?

• What are the characteristics of the research environment that should be provided?
UK Regulation and Monitoring

- QAA Level Descriptors
- HEFCE/QAA Code of Practice on PG Research Programmes
  - Chapter B11
- University Regulations
- Supervision records
- PRP (annual review)
- Submission and completion rates
QAA doctoral level outcomes

*Doctorates are awarded to students who have demonstrated*

- the creation and interpretation of **new knowledge**, through **original research** or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and **merit publication**
- a systematic acquisition and understanding of a **substantial** body of knowledge which is at the **forefront of an academic discipline** or area of professional practice
- the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems
- a detailed understanding of **applicable techniques for research** and advanced academic enquiry.
Doctoral Qualifications cont.

Typically, holders of a PhD will be able to:

• make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences

• continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.

and will have:

• the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex and unpredictable situations, in professional or equivalent environments.
Not codified.

Expertise and experience-based.
Contribution to the knowledge economy

- PhD no longer seen as solely a proving ground for academics
- Focus on employability
  - PhDs are an investment in human capital for the economy
- In UK transferable skills training is integral to doctorate
  - Researcher Development Framework
UK QAA Quality Code for Higher Education - Chapter B11: Research degrees

Activity

Read the extract on research environment

What are the key challenges in providing this to your students?

How can you help?
SUPERVISOR & STUDENT EXPECTATIONS
Expectations in Research Supervision

• Complete the University of Adelaide ‘*Expectations in Research Supervision*’ questionnaire.

• Thinking about your responses to the questionnaire:
  - Identify issues/statements:
  - Where you and your colleagues hold similar views
  - Where you and your colleagues have differences of opinion
  - Where you held different expectations to the PhD students
Effective supervisory practice

• Identify what you think an effective supervisor will do to support their student:
  • At the start of their doctorate
  • During the writing-up stage
  • When their project is not progressing well
Possible activities: induction/early phase

• Consults /confirms with Director of Studies and Co-supervisors
• Inducts and familiarises student (builds confidence, guides, gives reassurance regarding level of work)
• Is responsive to student needs and prior experience
• Gives general feedback – be clear and constructive
• Sets out expectations
• Establish relationships, set boundaries
• Is available (within reasonable limits)
• Sets shorter tasks with timelines (to get student going)
• Facilitates networks
• Starts literature review with associated piece of writing
• Focuses on research questions
• Discusses joint publishing – set out possibilities/expectations
• Discusses ethical issues and start process of ethical review
Possible activities – writing-up/thesis pending stage

- Consults /confirms with Director of Studies and Co-supervisors
- Supports student in pulling it all together – getting best possible draft
- Helps student identify/highlight their contribution
- Further encourage to present at conferences
- Prepare the student for the viva
- Quality control for submission
- Negotiate/identify examiners
- Manage the de-escalation of the relationship
- Help the student to think about post-PhD stages (careers, publications, etc.)
Characteristics: middle stages

- Maintains motivation
- Keeps student task focussed
- Encourages ongoing reading and purposeful/substantive bits of writing
- Enables student to have realistic expectations of how long different tasks take to execute/complete
- Helps with time-management skills
- Sets realistic boundaries for submission/turn around of drafts
- Is aware of particular issues that part-time students may experience
- Needs to be prepared to respond to the unexpected
- Encourage networking – internal and external
- Undertakes joint-writing/encourages student to self-publish
- Encourages forward thinking to the next stage
REFLECTING ON YOUR OWN PHD JOURNEY
Activity
What are your own experiences of undertaking a PhD?
Draw your own trajectory.
Where were the high and low points?
What did your supervisor do to help?
What did your supervisor do that really didn’t help?
What other sources of support did you draw on?
Supervisory Management Grid

High | Pastoral | Contractual

Support | | Laissez-faire | Directorial

Structure | | High

Gatfield (2005)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Management Grid</th>
<th>Pastoral</th>
<th>Contractual</th>
<th>Direorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Student has low personal management skills but takes advantage of all the support facilities that are on offer</td>
<td>Student highly motivated and able to take direction and act on own initiative</td>
<td>Student highly motivated &amp; engages in high structural activities (e.g. setting and meeting objectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Supervisor provides considerable personal care and support but not necessarily in a task-driven directive capacity</td>
<td>Supervisor able to administer direction and exercise good management skills and interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>Supervisor has a close and regular interactive relationship with the candidate, but avoids non-task issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisory Management Style Over Time

- **High Support**
  - **Pastoral**
  - **Contractual**

- **Low Support**
  - **Laissez-faire**
  - **Directorial**

- **Phase 1**
- **Phase 2**
- **Phase 3**
Focus on research tasks:
Values completion of tasks leading to degree, and adding skills and knowledge

Direct research:
Maintains hierarchical relations (project director) to ensure control of research

Guide research:
Emphasizes collaboration in research project with student becoming expert in inquiry techniques

Develop student:
Emphasizes growth as a professional while recognizing importance of skills and completion

Murphy et al, 2007
RESEARCHERS’ CAREER PROGRESSION: INTRODUCTION TO THE ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK
Single Academic Framework

- Growing research capability requires us to:
  - recruit research-active staff
  - engage the broader academic community with research
  - develop the research community
  - create a vibrant research culture
  - embed the research agenda
The framework allows us to achieve:

• parity in recognition and reward of the different elements of academic practice
• the optimal balance of activities across all academic staff
• alignment to the University’s objectives in the corporate plan
• insight into staff development needs
• Core document is an overview framework (12 criteria across grades 6-9)
• This feeds into progression criteria
• Used for objective-setting
• Shapes development of new job descriptions
• Currently in pilot phase
- For all academic staff
- Every role incorporates research, teaching and management/leadership
- Segmented within each role according to research or teaching focus
- Expectation that % will change year-on-year
CRITERIA

- Knowledge and Intellectual Abilities
- Planning and delivery in Teaching
- Planning and delivery in Research
- Enterprise
- Internationalisation
- Communication and dissemination
- Organisational and individual collaboration
- Impact
- Developing the capability of others
- Initiative, problem-solving and decision-making
- Planning and managing current resources and income generation
- Professional and career development
Have a look at the following examples:

Process for Academic Progression (Grades 6 – 9)
Academic Year 2016 -2017 Example

ACADEMIC ROLE PROFILES Example

Does your institution have something similar? What would be the challenges and what are the opportunities of implementing a new academic framework?
Case Study: Supervisor Development Programme from the Faculty of Engineering
Professor Elena Gaura
An Introduction to Responsible Research and Innovation
Dr Kieran Fenby-Hulse / @DrKFenbyHulse
We first need to educate citizens before they can participate!

RRI is about much more than only research! It is too demanding for researchers!

Science needs to become Responsible? So scientists are irresponsible now?!

RRI—that’s just old wine in new bottles...

I find it difficult to grasp. What is it and why is it important?

RRI is the end of ‘true’ science!!

Workshops in 30 countries
> 400 participants

We first need to educate citizens before they can participate!
The origin of RRI

- Technology assessment
- Deliberative governance
- Public engagement
- ELSA research
- Corporate social responsibility
- Research approaches
  - Participatory
  - Transdisciplinary
Responsibility as Collective Process

- Individual responsibility
- Taking responsibility for acts: safeguarding research integrity and avoiding e.g. plagiarism and fraud
- Consequentialist judgments – no harm

**However, R&I is multi-actor and multi-level activity with unknown outcomes**

- Responsibility in R&I as collective process
- To counter systemic irresponsibility focus should (also) be on the R&I process, the variety of actors included herein, and on the question under what conditions actors are involved
“Responsible Research and Innovation is a transparent, interactive process by which societal actors and innovators become mutually responsive to each other with a view to the (ethical) acceptability, sustainability and societal desirability of the innovation process and its marketable products (in order to allow a proper embedding of scientific and technological advances in our society).”

(von Schomberg, 2011:9)
Focus Points

❖ Ethics
❖ Governance
❖ Public engagement
❖ Open access
❖ Science education
❖ Gender (equality and diversity)
Towards a working definition

- The academic literature in this field mentions a number of additional characteristics.

- These characteristics can be understood as:
  - responsible impacts and outcomes of the R&I process
  - process requirements of responsible R&I processes
RRI Outcomes & Impacts

**Citizens empowered with competences to engage in RRI process effectively**

- Engaged Publics
- Responsible actors
- Responsible institutions

**Actors think and act according to principles of RRI**

- Ethically acceptable
- Environmentally sustainable (e.g. 7 Grand Challenges (EU))
- Socially desirable innovations

**Contribute to solving societal challenges**

- RRI process institutionalized in academia and other relevant organizations
Variety of researchers from different disciplines and broad range of stakeholders identified.

All relevant stakeholders invited to participate.

Meaningful, addressing purpose and context.

Imagining plausible and desirable futures and technology paths.

Open to needs of others.

Ability to change process and paths.
RRI is an inclusive approach to research and innovation (R&I), to ensure that societal actors work together during the whole research and innovation process. It aims to better align both the process and outcomes of R&I, with the values, needs and expectations of European society.

Focus Points

In practice, RRI consists of designing and implementing R&I policy that will:

• **engage society** more broadly in its research and innovation activities,
• **increase** access to scientific results,
• **ensure gender equality**, in both the research process and research content,
• **take into account the ethical dimension**, and
• **promote formal and informal science education**.

In **stakeholder groups**, think about the opportunities and obstacles presented by RRI. One person from each group should be prepared to feed back.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Community</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry and Business</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policymakers</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers and Innovators</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Opportunities for RRI**

* Involving the public can make more acceptable and accountable policy, research and innovation

* New partnerships

* Enhance competitiveness and creativity

**Obstacles to RRI**

* Policy making is inflexible and doesn't necessarily involve the public

* Difficult to reach representative publics

* Too much focus on the short term

**Actions identified by Policy Makers**

* Enable collaboration between different stakeholders

* Review science practice and funding

* Develop training for research funders and managers on RRI
### Opportunities for RRI

* Increases competitiveness and creativity
* Generate new networks and partnerships
* Provides outcomes and products focused on the final user

### Obstacles to RRI

* We can't do it on our own and we don't have the relationships
* RRI needs to be 'sold' to Industry & Business
* RRI shouldn't generate further bureaucracy

### Actions identified by Industry & Business

* Enable collaboration between stakeholders
* Help finding new markets and models
* Remove any bureaucratic obstacles to RRI
Civil Society Organisations

Opportunities for RRI
* Involve new, more diverse, publics resulting in more informed and engaged citizens
* Enable more open communication between science and society
* Generate new networks and partnerships

Obstacles for RRI
* We can't do it on our own and we don't have the relationships
* Information and communication about RRI and science needs improvement
* Limited resources in small organisations

Actions identified by Civil Society Organisations
* Further and formalise public involvement
* Improve science communication
* Include RRI in organisational structures and strategies
Opportunities for RRI

* Generate new opportunities for individual researchers
* Coordinating existing RRI practices across research and innovation structures
* Generate new networks and partnerships

Obstacles to RRI

* Scientific culture rewards publications not RRI
* Science is unpredictable and academic freedom is important
* RRI shouldn't generate more bureaucracy
* We can't do it on our own and we don't have the relationships

Actions identified by researchers

* Change the current research culture to be more in line with RRI
* Include RRI in training and education
* Review research funding and commissioning through a RRI framework
Opportunities for RRI

* Generate new networks and partnerships
* Improve science education
* More inclusive and diverse engagement

Obstacles to RRI

* We can't do it on our own and we don't have the relationships
* Time is scarce
* Systems and attitudes can be difficult to change

Actions identified by Education

* Change the curriculum to include and reflect RRI
* Train teachers on RRI
* Build a community of practice
**Incorporate future-oriented governance**
- Promoting foresight analysis in a multi-stakeholder basis including public interest groups (CSOs, patient organizations, trade unions, citizen panels) to incorporate RRI principles in all phases of R&I.
- Facilitating frameworks for RRI implementation throughout all stages of R&I process.

**Incentivize RRI from institutions**
- Embracing recognition systems of RRI implementation, such as labels, rewards and indicators.
- Setting up funding calls for research that take into account RRI issues.
- Measuring the impact of mainstreaming and standardising RRI.

**Foster participatory governance**
- Promoting the use of facilitating deliberations methods to induce multifactor participation into R&I policy-making.
- Including public interest groups (CSOs, patient organizations, trade unions, citizen panels) in the supervision of R&I (advisory and evaluation boards, research ethics committees...).
**Facilitate structures for ethical reflection**

- Strengthening ethical committees and legislation about critical issues, some of them being the involvement of children, patients, vulnerable populations in research, the use of human embryonic stem cells and research on animals and non-human primates.
- Promoting ethical issues in scientific policy advice

**Promote and foster research integrity**

- Observing and promoting honesty, reliability, impartiality and independence and objectivity in performing research.
- Avoiding fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other research misconduct.
- Developing legislation about privacy and data protection issues.

**Mitigate and reduce ethics dumping**

- Expanding ethical issues in research beyond EU countries.
- Counteracting the application of double ethical standards when low and middle income countries participate in research.
- Rising awareness of insufficient ethical standards when exploiting vulnerable parties in research.

In groups of 3 or 4, read the scenario you have been given on research integrity.

What would you do? Is there consensus within your group?
Ensure open access policies

- Improving data hosting, access and Governance.
- Reviewing researchers’ careers with a view on creating incentives and awarding researchers.
- Developing institutional repositories to deposit research data and associated metadata.

Embed open access in research practice

- Fostering innovation in publishing pathways and implementation of current open access roads and tolls (Green and Gold).
- Improving and maximizing access to use and re-use of research data generated by projects.
- Joining the Pilot on Open Research Data in Horizon 2020 project.

Foster Open Science

- Incentivizing Open Science in education programs and best practices and extending the input of knowledge producers in a more open science environment.
- Embedding Open Science as a socio-economic driver.
- Changing the way the quality and impact of research are evaluated.

Source: http://ec.europa.eu/research/opendata/index.cfm
OPEN ACCESS

https://www.fosteropenscience.eu/foster-taxonomy/open-access-routes
## Facilitate structures for participation

- Including public interest groups (CSOs, patient organizations, trade unions, citizen panels) in the definition and supervision of R&I (advisory and evaluation boards, research ethics committees...)

- Developing the creation of Science Shops, Living Labs and other related structures aiming at promoting multi-stakeholder dialogue.

## Influence R&I Agendas

- Promoting the use of facilitating deliberations methods to induce citizens participation into R&I policy-making.

- Increasing citizens engagement in monitoring transparency and traceability of outcomes of R&I projects.

- Advancing towards future-oriented decision making.

## Co-develop and co-decide about R&I

- Fostering research projects with more societally relevant outcomes, implementing participatory research designs in an iterative fashion.

- Promoting community-based research.

- Fostering participatory Technology Assessment.

Promote multi-stakeholder collaboration

- Fostering motivations and attractiveness for younger people and general population towards science.

- Increasing collaboration between formal, non-formal and informal education providers, enterprise, industry and civil society.

Incentivize learning-by-doing pedagogies

- Connecting innovation and science education strategies (curricula, skills, programs...) at local, regional, national, European and international levels, taking into account societal needs and global developments.

- Enhancing professional development of teachers to improve learning outcomes.

Co-decide education policies

- Promoting multi-stakeholder participation into science education policy-making, advancing towards future-oriented decision making.

- Shifting from STEM towards STEAM—linking the arts and humanities with science, technology, engineering and mathematics to foster scientific inquiry and innovation.

QUESTION

How do you currently engage citizens more broadly with your research and research area? What tools or approaches do you use?
Some Resources

EU Action Catalogue
http://actioncatalogue.eu/

Cornell Citizen Science Toolkit
http://www.birds.cornell.edu/citscitooolkit/toolkit

Twenty Tips for Engaging High School Students

Science Shop Toolkit:
http://www.livingknowledge.org/resources/toolbox/
Gender Balance in decision making

- European Commission aims at 40% of the under-represented sex in expert groups and evaluation panels.

- H2020, however, aims at 50% for the under-represented sex in expert groups and evaluation panels.

- Inclusion of gender experts in expert groups and evaluation panels.

Gender balance in research teams

- Funding applications request promotion of gender balance at all levels in their teams and in management structures.

- Commitment to promote equal opportunities between men and women in grant agreements.

- Gender balance is a prioritization criterion.

Gender dimension in the content of R&I

- R&I need to adequately take into account the needs, behaviours and attitudes of both women and men.

- Consider gender-specific research to fill knowledge gaps.

- Gender is an important factor in excellent research.

Source: http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafis/index.cfm?pg=policy&lib=gender
Inés Sánchez de Madariaga
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
RRI Tools Advisory Board
The gender-sensitive research cycle (yellowwindow.be)
ERC Advanced Grant 2015 Call
Grantees by panel and gender
Total 277 grants

- Males (225 = 81%)
- Females (52 = 19%)

Number of grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Sciences</th>
<th>Physical Sciences &amp; Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences &amp; Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS1, LS2, LS3, LS4, LS5, LS6, LS7, LS8, LS9</td>
<td>PE1, PE2, PE3, PE4, PE5, PE6, PE7, PE8, PE9, PE10</td>
<td>SH1, SH2, SH3, SH4, SH5, SH6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total grants: 277
ERC Advanced Grant 2015 Call
Nationals in own country and abroad
Total 277 grants

![Bar chart showing the number of grantees by nationality, with categories for nationals in own country and nationals abroad. The chart includes data for various countries.]
In groups of 3 or 4, read the scenario you have been given on an aspect of equality and diversity in research.

How would you address this situation?
This is not a checklist, but a thinking tool!

Engaging a variety of stakeholder groups

Is there a wide variety of stakeholders involved, such that there is a diversity of values and a diversity of types of knowledge/expertise?

Relevant voices

Is there diversity in the stakeholders engaged such that all relevant voices are heard – silent as well as loud?

Demographic diversity

Is there diversity within the stakeholder groups involved in terms of gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, age, disability etc.?

Sufficient amount

Are sufficiently many perspectives and participants included, such that eventual outcomes are robust?
Visioning

What might be...
Multi-layered Approach

International

Institutions

Individuals
Multi-layered Approach

- New Evidence-Based Approaches
- Team and Cohort Training
- International and Cross-Sector Conversations
- Critical Take on Policy
Thank You
Dr Kieran Fenby-Hulse / @DrKFenbyHulse
Three Minute Thesis

History

• The first 3MT competition was held at the University of Queensland in 2008

• 3MT competitions are now held in over 350 universities across more than 18 countries worldwide
3MT- Rules

• Single, static PowerPoint slide is permitted (no slide transitions, animations or movement of any description are permitted).
• No additional electronic media (e.g. sound or video files)
• No props (e.g. costumes, instruments) are permitted.
• Presentations are limited to 3 minutes maximum. Competitors exceeding 3 minutes will be disqualified.
• The decision of the judging panel is final.
3MT- Judging criteria

• **Communication Style** – was the thesis topic and its significance communicated in language appropriate to an intelligent but non-specialist audience?

• **Comprehension** – did the presentation help the audience understand the research?

• **Engagement** – did the oration make the audience want to know more?
3MT – Coventry Final

- Thursday 11.20-12.20, ECG-24
- 14 research students who won research centre and faculty poster competitions in May will present their three minute thesis
- The winner will be entered into the UK semi-final
- Further information on 3MT and running your own competition: [http://threeminutethesis.org/](http://threeminutethesis.org/)
Recommendations

Thursday
• 11.20-12.20: Three Minute Thesis, ECG-24
• 12.25-12.45: Inventing languages, inventing communities, EC1-03
• 15.15-15.45: Managing strategic change across the Coventry University Group, EC2-03

Friday
• 9.50-10.30: The student journey through Conciliation, Appeals and Complaints, EC1-03
Action planning
UNIV. OF SABAJGUO - LESSONS LEARNED

* Burning Platform - keeping people focused on what is important
* Course Teams - possibility to influence change & initiate activities
* Supervisory Teams for PhD students - regular meetings (w/ PhD students)
  feedback reports
* Peer Support to PhD students
* Supervisors’ Training
  - 2021 strategy for Mobility - big challenge for our Institution

Equal Opportunities (gender, minority, socially deprived group)

Trainings for EGR & MCR

Fast Progression to PhD - benefit or threat??
(3+3) vs. (3+2+3)

What will KRR21 in our practice?! (how to achieve)
doctoral training -
1. DoS introduced
2. revisiting the concept of supervision
3. supervisor's position in evaluations by the committee?

also in research
1. plagiarism - ways to fight
2. identifying ethical committees
3. responsible research - intro (new law on HfR research)

organization -
1. creation of consortium within the WB for common doctoral training in the format of Coventry Univ.
2. regional conferences/workshops on research capacity management capability
3. access to online libraries (publications by EU partners in the project)
UNI

- Regular meetings, supervisions, and candidature (Ph.D.)
- Monitoring the impact of research on society, applications
- Introducing a system of awards for good research
- Repository of scientific papers (Open Access)
- More administrative staff
Criteria for the promotion of researchers (to include broader aspects - not only scientific)

Offered possibilities for continuous development of teachers and researchers within the institution, offered support, team support

More links with industry and society (third mission)

Ethical issues (diversity issues, equal opportunity)

Supervision process - (more frequent reporting, more supervisors)