

The Collaborative Researcher

for researchers

Programme leader manual

Vitae resources: developing the
skills and careers of researchers

Conditions of use

'The Collaborative Researcher' published by The Careers Research and Advisory Centre (CRAC) Limited

Vitae, © 2012 The Careers Research and Advisory Centre (CRAC) Limited.

This document is made available to higher education institutions (HEIs) and Vitae members strictly for non-commercial use subject to the following conditions. Material from this document may be adapted, copied and reproduced in any medium by HEIs in the United Kingdom for internal and non-commercial, training and development purposes, provided in all cases that the original source is acknowledged as detailed below. Any material relating to the Researcher Development Framework (RDF) or Researcher Development Statement (RDS) is subject to the conditions of use detailed at www.vitae.ac.uk/rdfconditionsofuse.

UK HEIs outside of the UK, and other [Vitae member organisations](#) who operate outside of the UK HEI sector, may only use this document as detailed above with their own staff and registered students. You must contact manuals@vitae.ac.uk for any other use, including but not limited to, use with partnered research institutes and other associated organisations which are not explicitly included in your Vitae membership agreement.

Intellectual Property Rights

All rights in material from this document shall remain with CRAC and, save as expressly set out in these terms or as permitted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (or equivalent provisions under the laws of copyright in force in other countries), are reserved. The copyright and any other intellectual property rights in any adaptations of this document shall belong to and be assigned (by way of present assignment of future rights) to CRAC.

Acknowledgement

Any reproduction, including by way of adaptation, of these materials shall include the following acknowledgment: 'This resource has been adapted by [name of institution] for its own non-commercial use. It is based on the original resource, [name of resource] developed by Vitae, © 2012 The Careers Research and Advisory Centre (CRAC) Limited. www.vitae.ac.uk'

Other Uses

If material from this document is required for any purpose outside the permission contained in these terms including but not limited to (a) distribution or communication to the public (b) any commercial use, including use for-profit, for commercial advantage or for cost-recovery (c) use outside of the higher education sector in a manner not set out above, please contact manuals@vitae.ac.uk or write to the following address:

Vitae, c/o CRAC
Sheraton House,
Castle Park,
Cambridge, CB3 0AX

Disclaimer

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure these materials are accurate and complete, CRAC is not responsible for any errors or omissions, factual or otherwise, and does not accept any liability arising out of any reliance placed on the information contained within these materials.

Variation

CRAC may revise these terms of use from time-to-time. Revised terms of use will apply to the use of the materials in this document from the date of the publication of the revised terms of use on our website. Please check www.vitae.ac.uk/resourcesconditionsofuse regularly to ensure you are familiar with the current version.

Contents

Acknowledgments	4
Roles and responsibilities.....	5
Programme organiser	5
Programme leader	6
Programme facilitators	7
Planning and timing of the programme.....	8
Pre-course administration	8
Venue	8
Publicity	8
Catering	9
Resources.....	9
Participant communication	9
Participant packs.....	9
Facilitator packs	9
Additional Preparation.....	10
Introduction to the programme manual.....	11
Background of the programme	12
Programme	13
In at the deep end	15
Course introduction	16
Your own strengths for collaboration	17
Toolbox time	20
Collaboration break.....	20
Need (drivers) for collaboration	21
DreamResearchTeam©	23
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (Part 1)	27
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 2).....	30
Collaborative research call on food allergy	43
Introduction to day 2.....	45
Reverse engineering	46
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 3).....	47
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 4).....	48
Managing collaborations	50
Importance of Managing Collaborations	52
Are you ready?.....	56
For what?	57
Are there different rules for different collaboration contexts?	58
Your collaborative future	59
Appendix 1: Planning schedule and checklist.....	60
Appendix 2: Example publicity material	64
Appendix 3: Example booking information/reminders	65
Appendix 4: Example evaluation questionnaire	66
Appendix 5: Materials checklist	68

Acknowledgments

This programme and materials have been designed and developed by Samantha Aspinall and Dave Filipović-Carter, with Jen Allanson, Rachel Clark, Emma Day, Lisa Ellis, Nathan Ryder, and Paul Toombs, for Vitae. They are based on the work of Sara Shinton and Janet Wilkinson, who wrote the accompanying course guide “The collaborative researcher”.

We have tried to identify the owners of all copyrighted material used in the programme and this manual, but would be pleased to acknowledge copyright of any material not identified if this is known.

If you have any details, then please contact manuals@vitae.ac.uk or write to the following address:

Vitae
c/o CRAC
Sheraton House
Castle Park
Cambridge
CB3 0AX

Roles and responsibilities

Effective communication between the programme delivery team is essential to successful management of the 'Collaborative researcher' programme. Programme organisers will need to be in close communication with their programme leader to ensure that everyone has the same understanding of how the programme will run. Each time the programme is run with a new programme leader or programme facilitator complement, you will have to reset any assumptions you have about what your programme team know and expect from you, as will they. The information below will give you a good indication of the responsibilities of those involved in the management of the programme, but please note there will be a great deal of overlap in these roles until you have an established programme within your institution.

The delivery team consists of:

- programme organiser
- programme leader
- programme facilitators.

Programme organiser

The main role of the programme organiser is to ensure that the programme is organised, advertised and run correctly and to minimise the work of the facilitators in the lead up to, and during, the programme.

It is strongly recommended that programme organisers visit a 'Collaborative researcher' programme in advance of planning their own.

Responsibilities

- Plan the programme at appropriate times in the academic year.
- Book venue and programme leader – this should be done at least three months in advance of the programme.
- Advertise the programme with a lead time of **at least** two months, book participants onto the programme and send out reminders.
- In liaison with the programme leader, discuss and agree on the programme content (this is really a matter of agreeing if any use of alternative activities will be necessary, e.g. because of venue restrictions).
- Book supporting facilitators, ensuring that they are aware of the programme timings and learning outcomes. This will include the recruitment of potential future facilitators, from within the institution or locally, to attend as visitors, and to begin the training as programme facilitators.
- Provide any relevant pre-course information, including joining instructions, for participants and facilitators.
- Collect and collate all of the relevant materials, including the programme leader manual and participant learning journals.
- Arrange catering, noting any special dietary requirements of the participants or programme staff.
- Arrange audio visual requirements based on the needs of the programme leader, session leaders and supporting facilitators.
- Be available during the programme to deal with any issues that might arise. However, this should not require you to be in attendance.
- Coordinate the programme follow-up, including collating and distributing participant evaluation results. This will also include sending out review postcards to participants after the programme (usually six weeks or three months after the programme – confirm this with the programme leader).
- Liaise as appropriate with Vitae/your regional Hub contact.

Programme leader

The main role of the programme leader is to set the tone of the programme and run the majority of the activities. In advance of the programme the programme leader should have little responsibility other than agreeing on the programme and delivery team with the programme organiser. However, the programme leader is responsible for ensuring the correct, accurate and successful delivery of the programme. The programme leader must be available for the full duration of the programme and will be expected to be available from 08.00 until 18.00 on both days.

It is essential for the programme leader to have attended a ‘Collaborative researcher’ programme prior to leading the course, unless they have been a facilitator on a previous programme and have been recommended for the programme leader role.

Responsibilities

In advance of the programme the programme leader should:

- have a discussion with the institution around how the programme fits in with their overall programme of provision
- liaise with the institution and the regional Hub contact regarding the suitability of the venue, participant profile and the composition of the facilitator team
- discuss with the institution a strategy of support with running future programmes (for example, the numbers of programmes where they are likely to require external facilitator support, number of facilitators/observers from the institution that should attend the first programme)
- agree on the activities for the programme and requirements (audio visuals, catering and special/extra materials) with the programme organiser
- ensure that sufficient, appropriate facilitators will be attending the programme, and advise them of which activities they will be running and the associated learning outcomes
- liaise with the programme organiser on a regular basis to confirm participant bookings, experience of supporting facilitators and any additional materials they may require.

During the programme the programme leader is responsible for:

- the successful delivery of the programme
- greeting the participants on arrival, setting the tone for the programme, promoting a safe and confidential environment, and taking the lead on sessions as appropriate
- supporting the facilitators and especially encouraging the development of those facilitators from the host institution so that they will be able to take over the delivery of the programme in future, according to the agreed institutional schedule
- looking after and packing up any programme materials
- collecting feedback about the programme and collecting the ‘action planning’ postcards.

After the programme the programme leader is responsible for:

- having a discussion with the institution and the regional Hub contact on the outcomes of the programme and considering any actions that will need to be taken to support the future delivery of the programme.

Additional responsibilities:

- occasionally the programme leader may be shadowed by a future programme leader, and would be expected to guide them as to choice of activities, leading sessions, guiding facilitators, etc.

Programme facilitators

You will need one facilitator for every eight to ten participants who book on to the programme. The supporting facilitators will have different responsibilities depending on their experience, the experience of the programme leader, and their ambitions to lead a programme themselves. For the most part the role is primarily one of aiding the programme leader in the delivery of the programme material, and specifically in facilitating the learning of a group of participants during activities and reviews.

It is highly recommended that supporting facilitators have also attended a ‘Collaborative researcher’ programme prior to being a facilitator, although this is not essential if there is an experienced programme leader.

Responsibilities

In advance of the programme the programme facilitator should:

- familiarise themselves with any areas the programme leader has asked them to introduce or lead
- ensure that they are aware of the programme activities and the learning outcomes.

During the programme the programme facilitator is responsible for:

- introducing and debriefing appropriately, any sessions they have been asked to lead, and providing the learning context for the participants
- supporting the development of one group of participants during the programme
- contribute to general discussions and debriefs as appropriate
- providing feedback on presentations and act as a reviewer/consultant/advisor in some of the activities
- helping the programme leader to set up and clear away activities.

After the programme the programme facilitator is responsible for:

- contributing to the debrief of the programme with the programme leader and identifying the areas that worked and those areas that could be improved.

Additional responsibilities:

- if it is an area of interest, a programme facilitator might shadow the programme leader to potentially take on that role in the future.

Booking facilitators

If you are booking external facilitators you will need to do this further in advance of the programme. Internal facilitators are often easier to book, but you should be aware of the confidentiality issues participants may have with internal (institutional) facilitators. If you have academic facilitators, try to ensure that they are not working on a programme with doctoral researchers from their department – if this is unavoidable, ensure that they are in different groups from these participants. Staff from support units such as careers, student welfare, research training or research support or enterprise should be encouraged to be programme facilitators. If the programme leader does not have a doctorate, it is strongly advised that at least one programme facilitator is educated to doctoral level. Although not crucial, for mixed faculty programmes you may want to seek facilitators from a mix of discipline backgrounds. Likewise, for non-mixed programmes, you may wish to seek facilitators/programme leaders from appropriate disciplinary backgrounds.

Planning and timing of the programme

The 'Collaborative researcher' programme is designed for postgraduate researchers and research staff. The programme should be open to the widest variety of researchers (age/discipline/method of study) possible and is suitable for participants conducting their research on a full- or part-time basis from any discipline.

- the timing of programmes will depend on a variety of factors such as enrolment dates, availability of programme leaders, facilitators and rooms
- the programme runs best with between 18 and 40 participants.

Pre-course administration

Once you have an idea of when you would like to run your programme you can then go about setting up the planning schedule. A suggested planning schedule and checklist can be found in Appendix 1.

Venue

A suitable venue is vital to the success of the programme and it is beneficial if the venue is far enough removed from the participants 'normal working environment' to allow them the chance to relax.

The programme can be run successfully in many different venues. Depending on group size you should ideally aim for:

- one large room with space for:
 - chairs for all participants and up to 15 moveable tables
 - an area for facilitators to base themselves
 - space to lay out programme materials
 - room for refreshments/catering
- accommodation for course team (if applicable)

You will need about an hour at the beginning and end of each day to set up the programme.

Publicity

Once you have confirmations for the programme leader and the venue, the programme should then be advertised to postgraduate researchers with a lead time of no less than two months. This lead time is essential to allow you to plan other aspects of the programme and give you ample time to find supporting facilitators. An example of publicity for the programme can be found in Appendix 2.

Researchers must book on to the programme as you will need a clear indication of numbers to arrange catering and facilitators. They should also be made aware prior to booking that the 'Collaborative Researcher' programme is a two day, interactive programme – and that it is compulsory to attend both days in full. This is because the sessions build on one another, and messages are frequently delivered across the sessions and days, rather than in discrete activities. If participants cannot attend the whole programme they should be advised to attend a later programme wherever possible.

Example acknowledgements for bookings and reminders are shown in Appendix 3.

Catering

Breaks should be provided at the times indicate on the programme. . Ideally you should aim to provide a continual supply of tea, coffee, water and biscuits/fruit for all participants for the duration of the programme.

A hot or substantial lunch makes a great difference to the participants, as the programme is relatively intense. All dietary requirements should be checked and catered for.

Resources

You will need the following resources:

- A minimum of five flipchart stands with extra flipchart pads available
- A large supply of white tac
- At least 50 marker pens (any colour)
- Four laptops (participants may be asked to bring their own but some spares should be available)
- Printer and paper
- Camera
- Spare stationary e.g. pens, stapler, pencils, Pritt stick
- Notebooks per participant for toolbox time (optional)
- Postcards (1 per participant)

Participant communication

It is a good idea to have regular communication with the participants to keep them engaged with the programme. You should aim to contact them:

- Four weeks prior to the course with pre course information
 - Administrative details
 - Facilitator biographies
 - Draft programme
- One week prior to remind them about the course and send any new information or programme updates
- One day prior to remind them or arrival times and course location

Participant packs

On the day participant packs should include:

- Name badge
- Programme
- Facilitator biographies
- Duty of care statement

Facilitator packs

On the day facilitator packs should include:

- Name badge
- Full programme with notes
- Facilitator biographies
- Duty of care statement

Additional Preparation

Handouts

You own strengths for Collaboration handout – 1 per participant

How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration real funding calls handout (Day 2) – 1 per participant

Managing collaborations handouts – half of course 2 x B group, half of course 2 x G group

Cards and Signs

Number cards for In At the Deep end Activity – 1 per participant – 1, 2, 3, 4 – to be given on arrival

Table signs for With Who Activity (Day 2) – naming different people you could collaborate with e.g. NGOs, Schools, Government (local or national) policy groups, industry, international organisations, media, policy groups, Academic website, LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, social media

Table signs for Need (drivers) for collaboration Activity (Day 1) – You, Institution, Funders - enough for appropriate group number

Dream Research Team cards – 1 per group

Introduction to the programme manual

What the programme leader manual contains

This is the 'master pack' for the programme leader and contains all the activity summaries, notes and suggestions that will help you lead the programme.

The programme leader materials are written in an informal style because the culture of the programme is relaxed – you'll be encouraged to dress casually and to create a relaxed and fun environment for your team and the participants.

How the programme leader manual is structured

This manual is delivered as a guide rather than a definitive set of actions – by the time you are leading the programme you should have been a programme facilitator at least a couple of times and should therefore use these opportunities to make notes in your copy of the programme leader manual before you come to lead the programme.

Each activity uses this template:

- **Title:** this includes the overall timing for the session
- **Purpose:** this defines the key aims and objectives of the session
- **Process:** this provides an overview of the activities and any other relevant information
- **Structure:** this gives a breakdown of timings
- **Resources:** this lists all the resources you require to run the session successfully
- **Detail:** this section gives all the relevant guidance, supporting notes, discussion points and background information required to facilitate the session.

Background of the programme

Learning outcomes

These are the learning outcome areas as mapped on to the Researcher Development Framework (RDF).¹ For conditions of use for the RDF please refer to www.vitae.ac.uk/rdfconditionsofuse.

The RDF is a professional development framework for planning, promoting and supporting the personal, professional and career development of researchers in higher education. It articulates the knowledge, behaviours and attributes of successful researchers and encourages them to realise their potential.

A primary outcome is defined as an outcome that is likely to be achieved by all participants irrespective of how the resource is presented. A secondary outcome is that which might be achieved but to a lesser extent than a primary outcome and will vary from participant to participant depending on how the training activity is delivered and what focus is presented.

Domain A: Knowledge and intellectual abilities			Domain B: Personal effectiveness		
A1 Knowledge base			B1 Personal qualities		
1. Subject knowledge	P	S	1. Enthusiasm		
2. Research methods – theoretical knowledge			2. Perseverance		
3. Research methods – practical application			3. Integrity		
4. Information seeking			4. Self-confidence		
5. Information literacy and management			5. Self-reflection	✓	
6. Languages			6. Responsibility		
7. Academic literacy and numeracy			B2 Self-management		
A2 Cognitive abilities			1. Preparation and prioritisation		✓
1. Analysing			2. Commitment to research		
2. Synthesising			3. Time management		✓
3. Critical thinking			4. Responsiveness to change		
4. Evaluating			5. Work-life balance		
5. Problem solving			B3 Professional and career development		
A3 Creativity			1. Career management		
1. Inquiring mind			2. Continuing professional development		
2. Intellectual insight			3. Responsiveness to opportunities		
3. Innovation			4. Networking		
4. Argument construction			5. Reputation and esteem		
5. Intellectual risk					
Domain C: Research governance and organisation			Domain D: Engagement, influence and impact		
C1 Professional conduct			D1 Working with others		
1. Health and safety	P	S	1. Collegiality		
2. Ethics, principles and sustainability			2. Team working	✓	
3. Legal requirements			3. People management		✓
4. IPR and copyright			4. Supervision		
5. Respect and confidentiality			5. Mentoring		
6. Attribution and co-authorship			6. Influence and leadership		
7. Appropriate practice			7. Collaboration		
C2 Research management			8. Equality and diversity		✓
1. Research strategy			D2 Communication and dissemination		
2. Project planning and delivery		✓	1. Communication methods		
3. Risk management		✓	2. Communication media		
C3 Finance, funding and resources			3. Publication		
1. Income and funding generation		✓	D3 Engagement and impact		
2. Financial management			1. Teaching		
3. Infrastructure and resources			2. Public engagement		
			3. Enterprise		
			4. Policy		
			5. Society and culture		
			6. Global citizenship		

Primary (P) and secondary (S) outcomes highlighted (✓)

¹ www.vitae.ac.uk/rdf

Programme

Day 1

- 09.30-10.15 In at the deep end**
A first taste collaborating and managing compromise to achieve consensus
- 10.15-10.30 Course introduction**
An orientation as to the why and how of the course
- 10.30-11.05 Your own strengths for collaboration**
Understanding individual strengths for collaboration, and how to develop them
- 11.05-11.15 Toolbox time**
- 11.15-11.45 Collaboration break**
A further chance to talk with others on the course
- 11.45-12.40 Need (drivers) for collaboration**
Focus on the 'why' of collaborative research, and the external drivers/barriers
- 12.35-12.45 Toolbox time**
- 12.45-13.45 Collaboration lunch**
A further chance to talk with others on the course over lunch
- 13.45-14.15 DreamResearchTeam©**
What mix of skills, experience, personalities makes for an optimum collaborative group?
- 14.15-15.15 How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (Part 1)**
Develop a deeper understanding of the collaborative opportunities available in funding contexts, and how they are presented (or hidden).
- 15.15-15.30 Break**
- 15.30-16.30 How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (Part 2)**
Continuation of the previous session
- 16.30-16.40 Toolbox time**
- 16.40-16.45 Wrap-up of day**

Day 2

09.30-09.40 Introduction to day 2

09.40-10.00 Reverse engineering

Start-of-the-day ice-breaker and quick re-tune into the programme

10.00-10.30 How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (Part 3)

Continuing the process from day 1: Consider how potential collaborations actually look in practice

10.30-11.05 How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (Part 4)

A final processing session of this activity

11.05-11.15 Toolbox time

11.15-11.45 Collaboration break

11.45-12.50 Managing collaborations

Thinking about how practical problems with working collaboratively can be avoided / minimised / solved, and advice for better managing collaborative research

12.50-13.00 Toolbox time

13.00-14.00 Lunch

14.00-14.40 Are you ready?

What does it mean to be a 'collaboration-ready researcher'?

14.40-15.20 For what?

What sorts of collaborative opportunities are potentially there for people, now?

15.20-15.40 Break

15.40-16.00 Are there different rules for different collaboration contexts?

A look at developing a web presence, and collaborating outside of academia

16.00-16.30 Your collaborative future

Final wrap-up session, including planning

16.30-16.45 Evaluations and closing remarks

In at the deep end

(45 minutes)

Purpose

This session is to encourage people to start collaborating to form a consensus.

Process

The participants form groups to complete tasks and this is followed by a wrap up at the end.

Structure

Groups forming	5 mins
Groups prioritising Research Councils societal priorities	15 mins
Developing titles for research and a line describing the project or the institute	20 mins
Wrap-up	5 mins

Resources

On arrival, each participant will be given a number 1, 2, 3 or 4. This can be either in their arrival pack or could be randomly assigned to chairs.

Detail

Groups forming 5 mins

Each participant will be given a number 1, 2, 3 or 4 (approximately evenly distributed, but with most 2s and 3s, then 1s, then 4s). They then need to find enough other people to work with so that your team totals 7 (e.g. 1, 2, and 4). [Smallest possible group is 2, largest is 7]. Most likely average will be around 3-4, i.e. approx 10-15 groups. It should be a bit rough and ready, and there may well be one group at the end that adds up to more or less than 7

Groups prioritising Research Councils' societal priorities 15 mins

Put up the slide showing the Research Councils' societal priorities and give them the handouts which outline the task. Do check as these change fairly regularly which is why they are not on the handout. Ask the groups to prioritise.

Developing titles for research and a line describing the project or the institute 20 mins

After 20 mins ask them to move on to the task that asks them to come up with title and description. Facilitators should move between groups as this can be challenging for them. These need to be captured on a flip chart for each table to be put on the walls.

Wrap-up 5 mins

This is just a short session to check in with them.

How did you prioritise?

How did you come up with ideas for research?

How did you work together?

Course introduction

(15 minutes)

Purpose

This session is run by Lead Facilitator to set the scene and cover some basic information

- Objectives
- Expectations
- The team
- Housekeeping
- Wall of Learning/Wall of Advice
- Toolbox time

Resources

There are PowerPoint slides available for this session.

Your own strengths for collaboration

(35 minutes)

Purpose

This is for participants to explore their own strengths for collaborating and to think about areas where they might develop.

“Hopefully you will get and give good insight into collaborative strengths

Process

Participants begin by reflecting on their own strengths, then go on to share their ideas with two other people before a group discussion reflecting the activity at the end.

Structure

Personal reflection	10 mins
Sharing this with one new person, adding to each other's' ideas	10 mins
Sharing this with one other new person, adding to each other's' ideas	10 mins
Wrap-up	5 mins

Resources

Handouts - Your own strengths for collaboration

Detail

Introduction – the facilitator might want to outline examples when they have been good at collaborating or what they have learnt about collaborating.

Personal reflection	10 mins
Spend 10 minutes reflecting on your own strengths and areas for development	

Sharing this with one other new person, adding to each other's' ideas	10 mins
Now talk to one new person and share your ideas and add to each other's	

Sharing this with one other new person, adding to each other's' ideas	10 mins
Now talk to one other new person and share your ideas and add to each other's	

Wrap-up	5 mins
Share ideas.	
“Who gave some good advice?”	
“Does anyone feel able to share good advice?”	

Encourage them to add their thoughts to the Wall of Advice

Exercise 2 – Your strengths for collaboration

To what extent can you answer these questions positively? How could you improve?

Provide Clarity

Could someone in your department (not your supervisor or a close friend) describe your research in simple accurate terms?

Become Recognisable

Would a key researcher in your field who has attended the same meetings as you in the past be able to identify you by sight?

Build your Visibility

Does your name or work come up in a web search for your research topic?

Identify Ambassadors

Do the right people know you are interested in collaboration and would they feel comfortable approaching you?

Has your supervisor / mentor / PI introduced or recommended you to someone?

Be Reliable

Could your colleagues recommend you as a potential collaborator based on your current performance?

Tune in

What do you think the main research questions will be in your field in five years time?

Translate

Have you described your research in interesting and relevant terms to someone from a different faculty in the last six months?

Be Interested

Do you make a habit of talking to other researchers about their work and do you find them interesting?

Remain Relevant & Current

Are your skills or knowledge in short supply?

Achieve Status

When people discuss your work, do they identify you as the architect of the research?

Turn on your Radar

Do you know who could fund your future research interests?

Create Opportunities

Can you think of three possible applications for your expertise outside your current project?

Toolbox time

(10 minutes)

NB: To be followed each time this activity is used - after most substantive sessions.

Purpose

Time to encourage participants to reflect on what they have covered in this session. If notebooks are provided they may be useful here.

Collaboration break

(30 minutes)

NB: To be followed each time breaks and lunches are indicated on the programme as 'Collaboration'.

Purpose

To allow time for participants to talk to more new people.

Process

You could do one of two activities

- Networking
- Continuum followed by networking

Detail

Networking

Invite all participants to go for tea/coffee and speak to someone with a different coloured badge on.

Continuum followed by networking

Ask participants to form a continuum. At one end people should stand if they have had no experience of collaborating – at the other if they are already involved in collaborating. Having done that, ask people to look who is stood where and use this information to talk to people with different experiences.

Need (drivers) for collaboration

(55 minutes)

Purpose

To help participants understand the motivations and drivers for collaboration and also the barriers and pitfalls.

Process

Groups of participants discuss benefits and pitfalls for their given identity, then groups are put together and each put their flips on the wall/floor to discuss.

Structure

Each group works on benefits and pitfalls for their given identity. 30 mins

Now facilitators to arrange these groups into 3s (with 1 group each having completed tasks 1, 2 and 3)² 5 mins

Each group puts their flips on a wall/the floor (see diagram below). To discuss.
This time includes wrap up which is looking at implications for their discussions. 20 mins

Resources

Flipchart paper and pens.

12 tables need be grouped in 4. Tables 1,2,3,4 with sign 'Institution' on each. Tables 5,6,7,8 with signs 'You' on each. Tables with 9,10,11,12 on with signs 'Funders' on each.

Detail

Each group works on benefits and pitfalls for their given identity 30 min

Working in their same groups, each group is assigned 1 of 3 tasks:

1. What are the benefits and opportunities for You of collaborating on research? And what are the challenges, pit-falls and disbenefits?

2. What are the benefits for Your Institution* of research collaboration? And what are the challenges, pit-falls and disbenefits?

*We can leave this vague: University, Faculty; Institute; Research Group

3. What are the benefits for the Funders/RCUK of having collaborative research? And what are the challenges, pit-falls and disbenefits?

They should produce two flips – one for benefits and opportunities and one for challenges, pit-falls and disbenefits.

Now facilitators to arrange these groups into 3s (with 1 group each having completed tasks 1, 2 and 3)³ 5 mins

² When we assign the tasks, for each group above a number divisible by 3 (i.e. the 10th & 11th or 13th & 14th groups), we simply get them to address task 1. Then when we group them into 3s, we have one or two 4s, with two task 1 groups, with one each of task 2 & 3

³ When we assign the tasks, for each group above a number divisible by 3 (i.e. the 10th & 11th or 13th & 14th groups), we simply get them to address task 1. Then when we group them into 3s, we have one or two 4s, with two task 1 groups, with one each of task 2 & 3

**Each group puts their flips on a wall/the floor (see diagram below). To discuss.
This time includes wrap up which is looking at implications for their discussions.**

20 mins

Ideally, there will be 1 facilitator per group of groups (but we might be 1 short). Their task now is to map (encourage them to draw lines and links) where their individual interests coincide with those of the Institution and Funders, and where they diverge. And then to discuss the implications of this – and what they can do about it.

Institution Benefits / opportunities	You Benefits / opportunities	Funders / RCUK Benefits / opportunities
Institution Challenges / pit-falls / disbenefits	You Challenges / pit-falls / disbenefits	Funders / RCUK Challenges / pit-falls / disbenefits

Followed by Toolbox time (10 minutes) then Collaboration lunch (60 minutes)

DreamResearchTeam©

(30 minutes)

Purpose

To get the participants discussing the make-up of 'ideal' collaborative research teams, as well as the process by which they are formed. It also serves as a quick post-lunch energiser.

Process

Participants form teams to select their DreamResearchTeam from the characters on offer on the handout sheet. These selections are then discussed.

Structure

Briefing	2 mins
Card game	13 mins
Debrief	15 mins

Resources

During lunch, organise the tables and chairs so that there will be 3-5 people per table (and exact number is not required). You may wish to achieve an even number of groups to make the debrief process easier. There should be one set of DRT cards per table (including instructions), but these should not be distributed in advance.

Detail

Briefing 2 min

A short overview explaining that the process of forming teams for research collaboration is important - and so we need to think about what factors might be taken into account, and what information may or may not be available.

"The vehicle to examine this will be a short (card) game - which includes the instructions. The points target is [20]. However, the purpose is not merely to play the game, but to think about forming the best research team for collaboration. You have until ?? o'clock to complete the task." (At this point the games should be distributed, and the timing started.)

Card Game 13 mins

The game contains all of the instructions that the participants should need:

"Your task is to pick your DreamResearchTeam from the characters on offer. Each character has a DRT rating (number in the top-right-hand corner). The total DRT score for your DreamResearchTeam must equal the number given to you by the lead facilitator."

The game has been designed so that there are no rights and wrongs - the permutations are deliberately both pretty flexible, and ultimately quite arbitrary. Also, there is a clear seniority bias, meaning that postgraduate researchers, admin staff and technicians are treated quite dismissively. This may provoke discussion (good), but may also offend, in which case an intervention may be required. The purpose is to illustrate that such views may well be present in those forming research teams, and so to consider the impacts that such views might have.

Debrief 15 mins

On completing the time-allocation for the game, a number of debrief options are present. There is a need to hear back from the teams in some way (try to limit to 3-4 mins):

- For a small course, this could be done in plenary, but is likely to be quite time consuming
- A better option is to pair the groups (if you have an even number of groups), and have them share their decisions, with reasons.

The next stage is to discuss the process that led to the decisions, and what this reveals about how research teams are put together, and/or factors to consider. Listed below (and on a slide) are some suggested questions. There are likely to be too many to cover in the time available, hence you should select perhaps 2 or 3 that best connect with issues that have arisen on the course or during the game:

- How did you go about selecting participants for your DRT?
- Was one person selected first - if so, which one, and why? And were the remainder selected in light of this person?
- How did you feel about the designation of the postgraduate researchers?
- Did you consider the role of the technician / archivist?
- Were the 1 point people simply used to 'make up the numbers'?
- Was it possible to really decide about the team from the information provided? What further information would you have liked?
- Do you think there is any realism in this process?

DreamResearchTeam is copyright material, ©Samantha Aspinall and Dave Filipović-Carter, 2011. It may be used under licence only in the context of this course, as set out above.

Professor Green	7
is a woman who is extensively published in high impact journals. She is always in demand to present at national and international meetings, which she is keen to attend. She has a large team of researchers who she develops to co-write papers to a high standard.	
Dr Sanderson	6
has a reputation for being ruthless in promoting his work in his own field and is extremely successful at doing this. He is highly networked but is also known amongst his students for not always sharing credit fully where it is due.	
Dr Frank	4
is a recent postdoc. She enjoyed her PhD and was also the Chair of the PhD Society in her Faculty. She has two papers published and is keen to carve out an academic career.	
Dr Valera	5
is a newly-tenured academic. He has done two postdocs and now works 70% of his time as an academic and 30% of his time working on his own spin-out company from his research. He enjoys a new challenge but can 'over commit.'	
Dr Jones	3
is a first-time postdoc. She published two papers during her PhD and has begun to carve out a national profile. She enjoys working in small groups and invited her research group to her wedding last year.	
Professor Macintyre	8
sits on the panel for one the Research Councils which assess grant applications. He has a large research portfolio and collaborates with two other disciplines as a key part of his research. Everyone describes him in glowing terms, he enjoys the spark of meeting and working with new people.	
Dr Xie	6
has just arrived from the University of Beijing where she had successful collaborations. She is visiting on a sabbatical for two years and is looking for potential opportunities for collaboration.	
Dr Peake	6
is a recently-appointed reader. She is known as a good communicator and enjoys a high media profile. She is working on a large collaborative project across a number of European Institutions.	
Mr Scholes	3
is a very experienced technical administrator. He has expressed an interest in developing new skills to support researchers.	
PhD student 3 rd year	1
PhD student 2 nd year	1
PhD student about to submit their thesis, looking for a research staff position.	2

- Ms Dyas** 1
a technician who has worked in a number of scientific labs.
- Mrs Piretti** 2
an administrator who has worked for a number of senior academics.
- Professor Jackson** 8
is a Nobel Prize winner. He is often asked to front television and radio programmes and is seen as a 'star' in the department. He is known as having vision and a keen sense of future trends in research.
- Dr Khalil** 4
is on his third postdoc and has published a number of papers. He is keen to try and make his next move into an academic post. He is a team player and often organises social events for the research group.

Instructions

Your task is to pick your DreamResearchTeam from the players on offer.

Each player has a DRT rating (number in the top-right-hand corner). The total DRT score for your DreamResearchTeam must equal the number given to you by the lead facilitator.

How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (Part 1)

(60 minutes)

Purpose

The activity is designed to give participants a perspective on both developing a research idea collaboratively and then seeking a suitable funding source for it, and spotting research opportunities in the light of funding possibilities. Insight should also be gained into the process of collaboratively shaping the bid to meet the funder's criteria. And likewise to give them a perspective on what funders are looking for.

Process

Participants form into groups and into 2 streams to work through the activity

Structure

Introduction	1 min
Streamed introductions	4 mins
Stream 1 - Group select	15 mins
Stream 1 - Work-up projects	40 mins
Stream 2 - Introduction	4 mins
Stream 2 - Develop funding calls	55 mins

Resources

This process requires 2 streams, and therefore 2 areas to work in, with 1 facilitator responsible for each area. The Stream 2 area (the funders in Part 1) should have a laptop per group (3 or 4 depending on overall numbers), although these may be required of the participants. However, a separate computer with printer attached, and data-stick, all need to be available for Stream 1.

In Stream 1's room, a good supply of flip-chart paper and pens is required. Participants will arrange furniture to suit themselves as the process unfolds.

Detail

Introduction

1 min

Simply request volunteers - or randomly select - 9 participants* to go into Stream 2.

* This number might need to vary on a larger course, to perhaps 12 participants, i.e. 4 groups of 3.

Note: If the course is non-residential, it is worth stressing at this point that the activity will be in small groups, and will run for the rest of this afternoon and much of tomorrow morning, i.e. if people might not return on day 2, this will have a significant impact on the learning of others in the group.

Groups split into 2 streams at this point,
and remain in those streams for parts 1, 2 and 3 of this activity.

Streamed introductions

4 mins

Participants are given the overview of the activity, and its aim to give them an insight into developing a research project collaboratively, and then spotting funding opportunities for it. It may be worth just flagging that intellectual property considerations might need to be thought about within the process.

Process will be looking at all of the ideas on the Wall of Opportunities, and then selecting one they would like to work on. Once done, they need to identify others to work with them on it (min group size of 2; max group size of 5). Once they have identified their group, they need to work together to develop the idea into a research project.

Stream1

Group select

15 mins

This is likely to be a messy process. Participants need to be free to spend some time reading the possibilities, and then in finding suitable people to work with - both in terms of shared interest in the potential project, and as regards other factors.

There will need to be a degree of shepherding here:

- Large groups might need to split into 2 smaller groups
- Individuals will have to find a group to work with, even if this means they are not working on their first choice project (since this is a course about collaboration!)
- After 10 minutes, those who have not formed groups could gently be pushed to explore their collective options

Once the groups are formed, they need to find a space and the resources they need to work. Encourage them to get their own version of the original project idea, since the originals need to be returned to the Wall of Opportunity by the end of this session.

Work-up projects

40 mins

In their groups they should take the basic idea and develop it. There is no need for timelines or budgets. The focus should be on developing the idea - what would the project actually entail, what resources might be required, and what roles would need to be fulfilled. There is no output required here, but the groups should be aware that they will be applying for funding for the project at a later stage.

Stream 2

Introduction

4 mins

Participants should be split into 3 groups of 3 (or 4 groups of 3), randomly. They need then to be given the overview that their role will be to develop funding calls, in accordance with specific briefs, which the groups in Stream 1 will be bidding for later. They should aim for as much realism as they can, and should try to use this opportunity to see things from a funder's perspective. Finally, to maximise the potential for bids:

- Their calls should not be tied to any one of the Research Councils' Cross-Council Areas
- They should strive to make their respective calls different in terms of the areas they might cover. They do not need to be too rigorous in this, but a good spread is in the interest of all. (For realism: Would two funders really want to be chasing the same limited pot of researchers? Or would they prefer to carve out their distinct area?)

Develop funding calls**55 mins**

Distribute the briefs. There are 3 different ones, so one per group*. Push them to dive into the task. The end product needs to be a single sheet of A4, on their laptop, ready to copy and print.

These must be ready to print on time, ready for part 2. In the first instance, it may be useful to brief that they need to be completed by a time 10 mins earlier than is actually needed.

* If there are 4 groups, simply double-up on one, i.e. 2 groups will work off the same brief (1 copy each).

Followed by break (15 minutes)

How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 2)

(60 minutes)

Purpose

As above.

Process

Participants work through the activity in their groups from part 1

Structure

Stream 1 - Introduction	5 mins
Stream 1 - Select funding call and work-up bid	55 mins
Stream 2 - Introduction	2 mins
Stream 2 - Review funding calls	8 mins
Stream 2 - Select project from Wall of Opportunity	10 mins
Stream 2 - Work-up bid for funding	40 mins

Resources

Prior to this session, the funding calls developed by stream 2 need to be printed in enough copies for 1 per stream 1 group of each of them. For stream 2, the 'real' funding calls need to be ready, again enough for 1 of each for each of the 3 (or 4) groups.

Detail

Stream 1

Introduction

5 mins

Explain the process, i.e. in the next hour the groups need to select a funding call to apply for (the choice is limited - and that is real...). They need to select the source they feel most comfortable applying to, and the one they believe they have most chance of success with. Their bid needs to explain what their project entails, and must demonstrate how they meet the funding criteria. The aim is not to prostitute their research to get funding, but to look for genuine synergies between what the funders are seeking, and what they wish to achieve. This may lead them to further develop or refine their original ideas.

By the end of the session, their bids must be submitted on time (1 minute late = non-submission, and they have failed.) The format required is a single sheet of flip-chart paper. There are no other requirements.

Work-up bids

55 mins

Funding calls should be distributed at this point.

They must simply follow the instructions. Time management is crucial, since the submission deadline will be strictly enforced.

Stream 2

Introduction

2 mins

Participants now get to see things from the other perspective. Still working in their same groups, they will be given a number of real funding calls to take a quick look at. Once they have a view of these, they need to go to the Wall of Opportunities to select a project to work on, which appeals to them, but which they also believe they might secure funding for from one of the calls.

Once selected, they need to develop a bid for it. Their bid needs to explain what their project entails, and must demonstrate how they meet the funding criteria. It may be worth just flagging that intellectual property considerations might need to be thought about within the process.

Their bid should be 1 sheet of A4 produced on computer, ready to be duplicated. The deadline for submission should be strictly enforced. (1 minute late = non-submission, and they have failed.)

Review funding calls

8 mins

Funding calls should be distributed at this point. They should be read over swiftly - the time available here is very much a maximum. They should be encouraged to visit the Wall of Opportunity as soon as possible.

Select project from Wall of Opportunity

10 mins

They need to choose a project quickly. The aim is for one that interests them as a group, and which they believe they could secure funding for from one of the funding sources. This may be a little messy, with groups reading funding calls while reviewing the project options - this is fine. But, again, time is of the essence - they need to be working on their bid as soon as possible.

Work-up bid for funding

40 mins

They must simply follow the instructions. Time management is crucial, since the submission deadline will be strictly enforced.

Followed by Toolbox time (10 Minutes)

Followed by Wrap-up of day 1 (5 minutes)

Wrap-up of day 1

A chance to draw together any aspects, and also to clarify timings and procedures for day 2 morning. Worth re-emphasising here that they will be continuing in the groups they have just been working in, so any lateness or absence will seriously impact others and needs to be discussed before people depart today.

Energy Programme – CAS Call for Collaborative Research with China on Alternative Energy Sources or Low Energy Usages



Closing date:
16:00 on 16 May 2011

Issue date:
18 March 2011

Call type: Collaborative research

The Research Councils UK Energy Programme wishes to develop collaborative projects between the UK and China in partnership with the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) in the field of alternative energy sources or low energy usages under the following themes.

- New materials, architectures and processes for energy generation, capture, transfer or usage.
- New materials, structures and reactions for use in existing technologies for energy generation, capture, transfer or usage.
- New materials, components and integrated systems for energy generation, capture, transfer or usage.
- Fundamental studies of energy conversion mechanisms or for lower energy usages in existing contexts.

Consortia should consider how their proposal makes the best use of available expertise in the UK, how it networks the UK community and how it positions UK activities against other international opportunities.

Up to £2.5 million is available across the theme areas from the UK side with matched equivalent resources from CAS.

Proposals should include leading UK researchers wishing to develop contacts with leading researchers from CAS institutes in China. Proposals will initially be assessed through anonymous international peer review. This will be followed by an expert Panel meeting which will take place in October 2010. Proposals sent to panel will have the opportunity to respond to reviewers' comments beforehand.

Background

The Research Councils UK Energy Programme wishes to develop collaborative projects in the field of alternative energy sources or low energy usages as a key component of its strategy to foster closer scientific, technological and engineering links with China.

A workshop on alternative energy sources or low energy usages was held in Shanghai in July 2009 between UK and Chinese CAS academics to learn about each others' research activities and identify potential priority themes in this area for a proposed joint call by EPSRC and CAS. Participants gave presentations on their research and then discussed possible topics for joint projects. From these project topics a number of themes were developed as detailed under 'remit of the call'.

In this call up to £2.5 million is available for UK-based researchers to support collaborative research opportunities with researchers from CAS institutes China in the areas covered in this call. **Appendix 1** gives a background to CAS and a list of CAS institutes in China eligible for this call. Proposals should be up to three years in duration, and will start on or after the 01 January 2011. Resources requested can include mobility of the investigators (travel and

subsistence costs), as well as those costs normally permitted such as investigator and research staff salary costs, equipment and consumables costs.

The deadline for receipt of projects against this call is 16:00, Monday 16 May 2011.

Nature of the Proposals

Proposals must demonstrate the adventure and novelty of the research and its relevance to the broader relevant sustainable energy agenda. Proposals should also outline the applicants' longer-term plans for working together with overseas partners and demonstrate how the outputs of the project will be communicated to stakeholders in academia, industry and government, in both the UK and China.

It is important to note that a key goal for this funding opportunity is that transfer of knowledge between partners occurs both ways and continues throughout the project.

Just adaptation responses to climate change in the UK

This call is part of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's Climate Change and Social Justice Programme. The aim of the programme is to support the development of socially just responses to climate change in the UK.

The aim of this call is to fund a project which will help to inform local adaptation responses to climate change in the UK. The project is intended to support local practitioners to take account of social justice issues and to develop decision making tools to assist in the key trade-offs that may need to be made in prioritising objectives.

We expect this call to be of interest to environmental and social policy researchers and we welcome collaborative bids which combine expertise across these fields.

Please note that the deadline for receipt of proposals is **Monday 16 May at 16:00**. Late applications will not be accepted

Just adaptation responses to climate change in the UK

Deadline: Monday 16 May 2011 at 16:00

Timescale: up to 18 months

Budget: £50 - £70k (including VAT) - one project only

Contacts:

Summary

This call is part of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's Climate Change and Social Justice Programme. The aim of the programme is to support the development of socially just responses to climate change in the UK. The aim of this call is to fund a project which will help to inform local adaptation responses to climate change in the UK. The project is intended to support local practitioners to take account of social justice issues and to develop decision making tools to assist in the key trade-offs that may need to be made in prioritising objectives.

We expect this call to be of interest to environmental and social policy researchers and we welcome collaborative bids which combine expertise across these fields.

Please note that the deadline for receipt of proposals is **Monday 16 May at 16:00**. Late applications will not be accepted.

Aims of this research

The aim of this research is to support the development of effective adaptation responses to climate change that are socially just and take account of the needs of particularly vulnerable groups, including but not restricted to, people or places facing poverty or disadvantage. The work should have a UK focus in line with JRF's remit. We wish to fund a single project to examine this issue. The aims of this project are:

- to explore existing approaches to local adaptation and how these take account of social justice issues
- to support the future development of just local strategic responses by developing tools to assist in strategic decision making about approaches and interventions.

We anticipate that there may be a range of approaches to this work and do not wish to be prescriptive about how applicants address this. However the research should seek to address some, if not all of the questions below and is likely to require some case study work in localities.

Research questions

The key questions are:

1. What issues need to be addressed in local climate change adaptation responses if they are to take a socially just approach?
2. How are emerging local climate adaptation strategies and responses developing to take account of the risks and concerns of vulnerable groups, including but not restricted to, people or places facing poverty and disadvantage?
3. What lessons can we learn from the differing approaches of local agencies and service providers about how to develop effective and just local strategic responses?

The questions are intended to offer a guide as to the broad aims of the work and potential lines of enquiry. We also welcome development of these ideas to follow other lines of enquiry.

Approach and methods

The methods are not prescribed for this project. We anticipate that a range of approaches may be possible. However we are keen for this project in itself to provide support for practice learning and therefore an action research approach involving local case studies may be beneficial.

As a whole we anticipate that the project would involve a phase of enquiry with local agencies and a phase of work to develop tools to assist practitioners in climate change adaptation. These tools should support practitioners in key agencies to make strategic decisions that take account of social justice concerns both in priorities for adaptation strategies and funding choices for interventions. We are looking for proposals that take a broad approach that is grounded in local experience and will support local policy and practice development and provide lessons for national policymakers.

BRIC2: Apply for funding

Application deadline: 16:00 GMT, Monday 16 May 2011

A workshop was held on 30 March 2010 at 76 Portland Place, London to accompany the launch of the first call. Presentations on the scope of BRIC2 and on the 5 priority areas are given in the downloads section.

Eligibility

Two or more UK Higher Education Institutions, Independent Research Organizations and institutes of BBSRC are eligible to apply.

Guidelines

Applicants will be able to choose between 2 opportunities for the first BRIC2 call.

- **Standard research grant** - which will be selected through a 2 stage process (outline applications, followed by invitation for full proposal)
- **Enabling funds** - designed to support small or short-duration feasibility studies and/or bring communities together for collaborative purposes. Proposals should explore a specific research theme in BRIC's remit to:
 1. Identify and refine the research challenges or
 2. To produce and assess preliminary methods or data to ensure the success of a new approach to a research challenge. Applicants may seek up to £100k support

The material and strategic differences between **standard research grant** and **enabling fund** applications will be discussed at the call launch workshop.

The objectives of the proposed research, whether submitted through standard grants or enabling fund, must fit within the remit of BRIC, with preference given to those addressing the scientific challenges detailed in the priority research areas.

The 5 priority research areas are as follows. More detailed information about these areas can be found in the BRIC 2/1 call text (see downloads).

- Bioprocessing research challenges for protein products and their host cell producers
- High-throughput bioprocess development
- Effective modeling of whole bioprocesses
- Robust and effective analytics for bioprocessing
- Bioprocessing research for cellular products

The science proposed must fall within the remit of BBSRC and/or EPSRC. Proposals may address more than one of the priority areas and novel approaches to address the research challenges are encouraged. Applications must involve collaborations that bring together academic groups with relevant expertise in bioscience and engineering for the first time. In addition, the BRIC Steering Group will identify research projects at the outline stage where there is previously unrecognized potential for additional collaboration.

Assessment criteria

The primary criteria for assessment are the strategic relevance to BRIC2 and the quality of science proposed.

It is expected that any proposal that goes on to be funded through BRIC2 will be competitive against comparable international work and will demonstrate alignment with the Club's aims.

The following criteria will be used to assess proposals for standard research grants:

- **Strategic relevance to BRIC**
Demonstrated alignment with BRIC themes and priority topics, relevance to the bioprocessing industrial sector, and balance of overall Club research portfolio

- **Scientific excellence**
The extent to which the proposal meets the highest international standards of current research in its field. High performance against this factor will indicate a project of the highest standard, competitive with the best activity anywhere in the world, demonstrating originality and innovative potential
- **Economic and social impact**
The extent to which the output of the research will contribute knowledge that shows direct potential for economic return or societal benefits to the UK
- **Impact of the collaboration on all partners and likelihood on continuation**
- The degree to which all partners will benefit from the collaboration, which wouldn't be achieved working individually, in addition to the scientific strengths contributed, and the potential longevity of the partnerships.
- **Timeliness and promise**
The extent to which the proposal is particularly appropriate at the present time, or offers longer-term benefits over and above the direct value of the research
- **Cost effectiveness**
The extent to which the resources requested, relative to the anticipated scientific gains, represent an attractive investment of BRIC funds
- **Staff training potential of the project**
Where resources are requested for postdoctoral or other research staff, the extent to which the proposed project will provide research training and development opportunities of benefit both to the individual(s) employed, and to the wider science base beyond the completion of the specific project.

Enabling funds will be assessed separately against these same criteria, but with a specific focus of the enabling funds to develop new collaborations to explore novel and high-risk approaches, so as to catalyse further developments that address BRIC2 research challenges.

Special conditions

Recognizing the financial support for the programme from industrial members of the Club, it should be noted that special conditions will be attached to any research grants from BRIC. A letter from the institution's technology transfer office or equivalent, acknowledging that the institution is able to accept those conditions relating to IP, will be requested at the full application stage. The conditions are as follows:

Early access

Commercial parties are entitled to early access to results from research funded by the Club. To ensure this grant holders must:

- Give at least 28 days notice of an intention to publish, outside of the Club, results from research funded by a Club grant
- The material for proposed publication should be submitted to us along with the notice of intent to publish
- We will ensure a copy is distributed to each of the commercial parties who shall have 14 days from receipt of such copy to inform the researcher if in their view the proposed publication may:
 1. Dilute or prejudice the value of proprietary information of a commercial party or
 2. Jeopardise the application for resulting IPR protection or
 3. Otherwise inhibit future exploitation of the results and whether a commercial party has an interest in exploiting those results
- Produce annual progress reports. A form will be available on the BRIC website for grant holder to complete and grant holder will be notified in advance when the final report will be due

- Attend and present the results, progress, and a final report of Club funded research at 6-monthly Club dissemination events. Grant holder will be notified of the dates and format of their presentation
- Give advance notification of any opportunities to exploit intellectual property arising from their grant to the commercial parties

Access to resulting IPR

Commercial parties are entitled, if they wish, to engage in good faith negotiations with the research organisation for terms of access to the resulting IPR to allow further development or commercial exploitation of results, such access rights preferably to include the right to sublicense.

This must be offered before access to resulting IPR can be offered to third parties outside the Club. An interested commercial party can exercise its option right by giving notice to the grant holder within one month of the date of receipt of notice of results or resulting IPR.

Good faith negotiations

Good faith negotiations would imply a willingness to reach agreement with commercial parties on the terms and conditions of a commercial license, to desist from publishing the results or making offers to third parties while negotiation with commercial parties are ongoing and, if such agreement is not reached within a reasonable period (for example four months from the exercise of the option) that the research organisation would not seek to enter into negotiations with third parties on terms substantially more favorable to such third parties.

Additional condition for enabling funds

Researchers awarded enabling funds are expected to begin their project within **3 months** of being notified about the outcome of their award.

More information

For more detailed information read the BRIC 2/1 call text and guidance notes. The case for support form for outline proposals is available in the downloads section. For enabling funds applications and for full stage applications the standard case for support form on Je-S will be used.

AHRC AND BT RESEARCH NETWORKING PILOT FUNDING CALL DETAILS

Key Dates

Applications live on Friday 1 April 2011

Deadline for Applications; Monday 16 May 2011

Introduction

1. The Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and British Telecommunications plc (BT) are pleased to announce a call for research projects of mutual strategic interest under a pilot programme of Research Networking.

2. The research theme for this call will be 'Digital Heritage: understanding the personal, social and cultural contexts of consumers of cultural heritage'.

3. The AHRC and BT are working together to develop a collaboration to bring together the arts and humanities research community with BT researchers and other stakeholders and partners with an interest in digital heritage to facilitate knowledge exchange and collaborative research. Project proposals to this call should involve BT through for example, provision of staff expertise and/or 'in kind' access to technology and capability. Academic researchers should contact John Seton from BT Research (john.seton@bt.com) to discuss appropriate BT involvement and/or other parties with a potential interest in participating in this call.

Aims of the AHRC/BT Pilot Research Networking funding call

4. The AHRC/BT Pilot Research Networking call is intended to support interdisciplinary collaboration between researchers to explore the theme of 'Digital Heritage: understanding the personal, social and cultural contexts of consumers of cultural heritage'. The AHRC and BT welcome networks which involve academic colleagues from the arts and humanities and BT staff as well as non-academic organisations, businesses and other parties whose interests complement the aims of the pilot programme.

5. This pilot programme is intended to enable groups of researchers to explore ideas and maximise opportunities for advances in creativity, insights, knowledge and understanding of digital heritage, with outcomes of value both to the arts and humanities research community, the project partner/s and other contexts where appropriate. Outcomes from projects could be proposals appropriate for consideration under other AHRC funding programmes, including bespoke Knowledge Transfer schemes, or wider cross Research Council priority themes such as the Science and Heritage Programme or the Digital Economy Programme.

Suggested themes and key interests

6. The following themes and questions represent a selection of key interest areas that emerged from preliminary consultations between the arts and humanities community and BT. These themes should be viewed as interrelated rather than discrete topics and they are intended to serve as an indication of current areas of potential research interest rather than as an exhaustive list. Proposals that fall outside of the listed topics are also welcomed:

- How can the availability and accessibility of heritage sites/cultural collections be enhanced across time and space through digital technology?
- What do audiences at/visitors to heritage sites want and need such technology to do? How does this vary at local, national and international levels?
- How does specific technology influence the ways in which we interpret heritage environments e.g. artefacts/exhibits/landscapes?
- What are the legal issues around digital heritage e.g. digital rights, ownership, authority?

- How can we ensure that use of technology in digital heritage does not exclude certain user groups?
- How can we enhance the end-to-end experience of visiting a heritage environment i.e. from the initial discovery of a site to visit through to further exploration and investigation after a visit has been made?
- What are public audiences' and end users' views about digital heritage? How can we leverage these views into potential research projects?
- How might digital heritage blur the boundaries between consumer and curator?

Funding Limits

7. This Pilot Research Networking scheme is intended to facilitate interactions between researchers and stakeholders from a range of disciplines, institutions and organisations to explore and develop research questions around the theme of 'Digital Heritage'. Example activities include a short-term series of workshops, seminars, networking activities or other events.

8. Proposals for up to a maximum Full Economic Cost (FEC) of £15,000 for a period of up to one year may be submitted. The exact mechanism for networking and the duration must be fully justified in the proposal.

Geographic availability

9. UK wide.

Closing dates for applications

10. The AHRC/BT Pilot Research Networking closing date for applications is 16:00 Monday 16 May 2011.

11. In all cases, we aim to tell you the outcome of your application within 6 weeks of the closing date.

Institution Eligibility

12. UK Higher Education Institutions, organisations classed as Independent Research Organisations by the AHRC.

Case for Support

13. You should attach a supporting case for the proposed project of not more than 400 words. This must be produced in typescript (and may include diagrams, etc.) which is legible and sufficiently clear to allow good quality black and white reproduction. The application will be deemed ineligible if the Case for Support exceeds 400 words. It is essential that its content is agreed by all project partners.

14. The Case for Support should be clear, concise and not cluttered by technical jargon. It will be the responsibility of the applicants to ensure that any information is worded in such a way to protect commercially confidential or sensitive areas. AHRC will assume that the applicant has obtained necessary clearances from the BT or any other partner involved in the application. Where there is commercially confidential information that the applicant does not want to be made widely available but is required to support Peer Review, this should be included in a separate document clearly headed "In Commercial Confidence: AHRC Knowledge Transfer Peer Review Panel only".

15. It is important that the key areas listed below are included and that both academic and project partner perspectives are given:

Background

An explanation of why the application is appropriate for funding under the AHRC/BT Pilot Research Networking call. There should be a clear justification for the project rather than just a description. To what extent will the proposed activities generate fruitful and novel interactions? What is the research context in which the activities will operate and how will they advance knowledge and understanding in the fields concerned? What preliminary discussions have taken place between the Principal Investigator and BT and/or other partners and what has been the outcome of these?

- The purpose of the project – aims and objectives of the project should be stated together with measurable goals/milestones.
- Timetable of Activities - You should give a proposed timetable of activities for events such as workshops, symposia, conferences, meetings of the advisory group.
- Key speakers or participants - If there are specific speakers or participants who would be central to the success of project, these should be listed together with their expertise, in addition to some indication of their availability.
- Management and co-ordination - How will the activities be managed? Will there be an advisory group or steering committee? If so, who are the proposed members and does the membership reflect the constituencies the proposal intends to reach? What will be the roles of the Principal Investigator, the Co-Investigator, and other members? Please note that you are permitted only one Co-Investigator under this scheme.
- Dissemination and Exploitation – outline how the proposed activities will contribute to your project partner/s' strategic interests, and how the outcomes of the project will be more widely disseminated. Details of any plans to enable the collaboration to continue once the award period has ended should also be entered in this section.

Justification of Resources

16. State briefly the resources being provided by the academic, BT and any other project partners, including in-kind contributions, and provide justification for them. Please note that AHRC requires a separate attachment for Justification of Resources.

Impact Plan

17. Please note, you are not required to attach an Impact Plan for this scheme.

Costs

18. This Pilot Research Networking scheme will meet the costs of the salary of the applicant for the time spent overseeing and providing intellectual input to the activities, the cost of setting up and coordinating the activities (for example, the salary costs of a coordinator) along with associated Indirect and Estates costs. Time spent by the applicant on the co-ordination of the activities is not expected to form the majority of the cost of the proposal. The salary costs of participants may not be included in the proposal.

19. The scheme is not intended to fund stand-alone events which are not part of the research process, for example events held to disseminate findings from research already undertaken. Fees for consultants or speakers will therefore be considered only on an exceptional basis where it can be demonstrated that their participation is in keeping with the aims of the scheme to facilitate the exploration of new ideas. All costs must be itemised separately within the budget breakdown.

Assessment of Applications

20. Each full proposal will be peer reviewed by the AHRC's Knowledge Transfer Peer Review Panel whose membership includes a range of academic and business experience and expertise. The criteria to be used in the assessment of each proposal are:

- The extent to which the proposal meets the objectives of the AHRC/BT Pilot Research Networking funding call.

- The extent of the strategic fit to the theme of the call.
- The extent of the contribution (including in-kind contribution) and commitment to the project by all partners.
- The significance of the partnership (i.e. why is this partnership of particular individuals important to the project).
- The quality of the research process outlined, including: research agenda, participants, sustainability and appropriateness of methods to foster interactions.
- The extent to which the proposed activities will generate genuine and novel interaction, including the potential for them to lead to advances in knowledge and understanding in the fields concerned and/or new high quality cross-disciplinary research projects beyond the lifetime of the award.
- Whether the Principal and Co-Investigator demonstrate the requisite skills and experience to manage the proposed activities, and whether there is a sufficiently broad range of expertise and experience amongst the other named participants.
- ☐ The extent to which the requested funding delivers value for money in support of the proposal's objectives.

21. The Panel will recommend whether the application should be supported or not, taking into account the fit to the aims and objectives of the AHRC/BT Pilot Research Networking call, the quality of the work proposed and the significance to both partners. Each application will receive one of the following grades:

- Successful: the proposal will be funded. If the value of the award differs to the amount requested then feedback will be provided.
- Unsuccessful: the proposal will not be funded either because it does not meet the requirements of the funding criteria. Feedback to applicants will be provided in all unsuccessful cases.

Collaborative research call on food allergy

The FSA and the Medical Research Council are seeking to expand their portfolio of research and are inviting high quality and innovative proposals from collaborations between immunologists and food allergists aimed at characterising the mechanistic bases of allergic sensitisation and tolerance to food proteins.

Applications should be submitted to the MRC by 16 May 2011.

Immunobiology of food allergy

This notice reflects a close alignment between the interests of the MRC and FSA in delivering public health benefits in food allergy through the funding of high quality research focused on improving our understanding of the relevant immunobiological processes. This notice follows a successful joint MRC-FSA workshop to explore opportunities for greater synergy between immunologists and food allergists in future research to address the current scientific challenges presented by food allergy. A link to the workshop report can be found at the bottom of the page.

Food allergy is common and important, affecting up to 2% of adults and between 5% and 8% of children in the UK. Symptoms vary, but can be severe, resulting in systemic anaphylaxis, and occasionally death. There are currently no established primary preventative measures or therapeutic strategies, and the only means of preventing reactions is complete avoidance of the trigger foods coupled with rescue medication.

Although it is well established that most types of food allergy are associated with IgE antibody, it is becoming increasingly clear that sensitisation to food proteins and the elicitation of food allergic reactions are subject to complex immunoregulatory mechanisms. It is anticipated that a more detailed appreciation of the immunology of food allergy in humans will help provide answers to some important questions, including (but not limited to), the following:

- What immunological parameters, other than IgE antibody, are important in the development, regulation and resolution of the human immune response in food allergy and how do these factors exert their effects?
- What factors are responsible for significant differences between individuals in the severity of food allergic reactions?
- What are the immunological bases for apparent tissue differences in immune and allergic responses to food proteins?
- The timing and route of exposure to food proteins appear to have an important impact on the acquisition of allergic sensitisation – why and how is this effected?
- What are the factors that confer on food proteins the ability to cause allergic sensitisation?

It is anticipated that addressing these issues, via gaining a deeper insight into the fundamental biological mechanisms underpinning food allergy, will enable the delivery of benefits to public health in the following specific areas:

- Identification and utilisation of important opportunities to improve diagnosis, prognosis and management strategies for food allergy.
- Identification of risk factors and susceptible sub-populations, which will inform public health policy and advice to consumers.
- Design of effective interventions and policies to prevent the development of food allergy, and strategies for desensitisation.

Application process

Applications should be submitted to the MRC Infections and Immunity Board by 16 May 2011 via the links below. Applications will be considered in open competition and according to MRC's standard processes.

In addition to MRC's standard terms and conditions, awards will include supplementary terms and conditions to reflect the joint nature of this initiative which you should read carefully.

Introduction to day 2

(10 minutes)

Purpose

To re-engage participants with the material already covered, and to do a little more sharing.

Structure

Plenary introduction

5 mins

Thoughts from yesterday

5 mins

Resources

Have plenty of Post-Its available

Detail

Plenary introduction

5 mins

A good opportunity to review what was covered yesterday, and look ahead to what will be covered today. This should orient participants within the process. Any themes that have emerged, or which it is hoped will emerge can be drawn out within this.

Thoughts from yesterday

5 mins

Remind participants of the Walls of Learning and Advice, and ask them to write one key thing they came across on Day 1 on a Post-It, and then place it on the appropriate Wall. (There is no need to be precious about the distinction between learning and advice, so long as the material gets there.) Encourage facilitators to take part in this as well.

Reverse engineering

(20 minutes)

Purpose

An energiser for the day ahead, that will also re-focus participants on the process they were engaged in at the end of day 1, i.e. what funders are looking for.

Process

Groups form to get as many ideas as possible on the topic on to paper and these are then shared with other groups.

Structure

Briefing	1 min
Activity	9 mins
Sharing ideas in plenary	10 mins

Resources

Flip-chart paper and pens available.

Participants should start the day in the same groups they finished day 1 in, but streams 1 and 2 will be in the same room together.

Detail

Briefing 1 min

The task is to think of what they would include in a collaborative research funding application to ensure that it does not get funded:

- What to include?
- What to leave out?
- What might it look like?

Get as many ideas down as possible onto flips.

Activity 9 mins

The process should be fast-paced, with groups encouraged to think of as much as they can, and to get them down on paper.

Sharing ideas 10 mins

At the end of the process, groups should be asked to call out their ideas, either:

- 1 group at a time gives all of theirs, and subsequent groups encouraged not to repeat, or,
- 1 idea per group, done in rotation around the room.

The aim is to get a good sample of the ideas, rather than to hear absolutely every idea from every group.

After 5 mins of this, shift the focus to producing general advice of what to do (may well be the opposite of what they've just been saying). This should be captured on a central flip (a second facilitator might help in doing this). Once completed, this flip should be appropriately titled, and placed on the Wall of Advice.

How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 3)

(30 minutes)

Purpose

As previous sessions.

Process

In groups participants review bids submitted by other groups and provide written feedback

Structure

Introduction	5 mins
Stream 1 - Review calls and bids and write feedback	25 mins
Stream 2 - Review bids and write feedback	25 mins

Resources

Stream 1: Should receive a pack with the bids from the 3 (or 4) stream 2 groups, along with only those 'real' funding calls that were applied for.

Stream 2: Should receive all bids made to their funding call only.

It is a good idea for this material to be pre-sorted at the end of day 1 and for 1 or 2 facilitators to maintain an overview of which groups are which - a numbering system may help here. This will become especially important during the transition between Parts 3 and 4.

Detail

Introduction 5 mins

All groups will now be engaged in reviewing bids submitted by other groups. The purpose is to explore what funders are looking for from bids, and to reflect on how the material submitted comes across to reviewers, perhaps in contrast to how it was intended.

A few general guidelines:

- "Be kind"
- "Remember, we've all been doing this together, and we've all worked under very tight time pressures"
- "What information can I/we give these people to help them do better next time"
- "Don't get hung-up on the detail. Remember, it is an opportunity for you/them to learn."

Stream 1 - Review calls and bids and write feedback 25 mins

Groups are tasked with reading each bid, and the call to which it applies, and providing written feedback on it. This will mean 3 (or 4) bids to review and give feedback on for each group.

Stream 2 - Review bids and write feedback 25 mins

Groups are tasked with reading each bid submitted to their call, and giving written feedback on it.

If any funder receives no bids, they need to produce a list of reasons why they think that was the case.

How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 4)

(35 minutes)

Purpose

As previous sessions.

Process

In groups participants reflect on the feedback on their bids followed by a plenary debrief

Structure

Distribute Materials	5 mins
Stream 1 - Receive own feedback and reflect	15 mins
Stream 2 - Receive own feedback and reflect	15 mins
Plenary debrief of all 4 parts of activity	15 mins

Resources

Groups now need to receive back their funding bids with feedback.

Detail

Distribute materials 5 mins

The process of getting the right materials back to the right groups is quite messy, It is important that 1 or 2 facilitators retain an overview of this, and what needs to go where. However, since time is tight, it is a good idea not to flag this as a break opportunity for participants, otherwise lots of time will be lost. Imply ask them to be patient with the process.

Stream 1 - Receive own feedback and reflect 15 mins

Once groups receive their bids back, it is time for them to reflect in their small groups. Similar advice applies - not to get hung-up on the detail, but to take this as a learning opportunity.

Stream 2 - Receive own feedback and reflect 15 mins

Once groups receive their bids back, it is time for them to reflect in their small groups. Similar advice applies - not to get hung-up on the detail, but to take this as a learning opportunity.

Plenary debrief of all 4 parts of activity 15 mins

This is an important session in that it needs to draw out the differences in the experiences between the two streams, and to draw together the learning across the various sessions.

Some ideas:

- Take some time to explain the different processes the two streams went through. Use this as a reference point - were there differences in outputs/outcomes or only in the experience? Were they significant?
- "What was it like as a funder - both drawing up the call, and seeing how people applied to it?"
- "How many groups got funded?" Hands up. This can be one source of defusing tensions if they exist.
- "Those groups that said 'Yes' - what did you see that made you think yes?"
- "These are things you already know how to do. It's just applying them in this context." Refer explicitly back to the output of today's ice-breaker.
- Elements: Good, clear communication; Clarity of structure; Address the criteria specifically; Show value for money (despite budgets not being required)
- "And those who didn't fund - why?" (More of the same)

- “Finally, what do you need to do now to get your own research collaboration funded?” If appropriate, draw in advice from the facilitator team, and/or refer participants to the Walls of Learning and Advice

Followed by Toolbox time (10 Minutes)

Followed by Collaboration break (30 minutes)

Managing collaborations

(65 minutes)

Purpose

To consider how practical problems with working collaboratively can be avoided / minimised / solved. And to develop some clear advice for better managing collaborative research groups.

Process

Participants form groups, half will be blue and half will be green. They will then discuss in their groups the briefing they have and form key points. Ideas will then be compared to produce top tips and these shared and reviewed in the plenary.

Structure

Group sort	3 mins
Introduction	2 mins
Situations	30 mins
Compare ideas and produce top tips	20 mins
Share top tips and review	10 mins

Resources

Copies of the two situations need to be ready to distribute, ideally 1 of each per participant, but a minimum of 1 of each per group.

An even number of tables should be set with enough chairs for 2 or 3 people per table. Half the tables should be labelled B1, B2, B3 etc., and half should be labelled G1, G2, G3 etc. B1 & G1 should be near each other, and so on.

Detail

Group sort 3 mins

Get participants to form groups of 2 or 3 people, with people they have not just been working with, and ideally with people they haven't yet worked with, or even spoken to.

Introduction 2 mins

Half the groups should be sat at tables marked B or blue; and half should be at tables marked G or green.

Blue groups: For both situations, what could have been done earlier to prevent the problems arising, or to at least minimise the risks of them?

Green groups: Taking both current situations, what actions would you take to resolve them positively for all concerned?

Situations 30 mins

Groups should discuss according to the briefing, and aim to produce some key points generalised from both situations.

Compare ideas and produce top tips 20 mins

Groups will now pair-up: B1 with G1, B2 with G2, etc., to form larger groups of 4-6 participants.

Exchange outputs and compare strategies. Can you add anything to either of your approaches in the light of the work of the other group? Then, compare the general points made, with the purpose of producing a collective '5 top tips for effectively managing collaborative research groups.'

Share top tips and review**10 mins**

The top tips from each group should be shared in plenary. (These might also be added to the Wall of Advice, if appropriate.) The lead facilitator should use these as an opportunity to draw out some main learning points, as well as potentially reviewing aspects of the discussion if time is required for this.

Followed by Toolbox time (10 Minutes)

Followed by lunch (60 minutes)

Importance of Managing Collaborations

B Group

Vignette 1 - Communication

From: Ian Roberts

Sent: 01 Feb 2012 11:31

To: rnb@uni.ac.uk; spb@uni.ac.uk; davide.pallara@uni.ac.uk

Dear Rob and Sue and David,

I am concerned about how the project is developing. As you know Lars and Frank are coming over on 12 Feb and we had agreed that we would have developed the paper (for presentation in Brussels in May) to get their feedback. As I agreed to pull the data and information together, I need to see Elizabeth's contribution. So far, I have nothing. I have emailed her, called her and her PA says that she is not available to contact at the moment but would not give me any further information. I have found working with Elizabeth frustrating on this project but recognise that her involvement is important to our success as our lead on this.

In addition I have noticed that a number of us have been slipping our timescales, but no-one forewarned me about late submissions. I am extremely busy at the moment with our departmental re-organisation, jobs under threat, but have managed to reach **my** agreed deadlines.

At this rate we are going to slip on the whole project and it will be a rush at the end to pull all this together. We must create a robust project plan so that we can secure the funding. I cannot afford to let this one slip through my fingers.

We have worked hard to get this far. And I am not prepared to compromise my other responsibilities later due to others not pulling their weight now. I might even need to re-consider my position on the project.

How can we progress this?

Regards,

Ian

Your task:

- Understand all of the project's issues
- Understand the potential impact for the project
- Understand the different perspectives

Looking at the situation as it is now, what could have been done earlier to prevent the problems arising, or to at least minimise the risks of them.

Importance of Managing Collaborations

G Group

Vignette 1 - Communication

From: Ian Roberts

Sent: 01 Feb 2012 11:31

To: rnb@uni.ac.uk; spb@uni.ac.uk; davide.pallara@uni.ac.uk

Dear Rob and Sue and David,

I am concerned about how the project is developing. As you know Lars and Frank are coming over on 12 Feb and we had agreed that we would have developed the paper (for presentation in Brussels in May) to get their feedback. As I agreed to pull the data and information together, I need to see Elizabeth's contribution. So far, I have nothing. I have emailed her, called her and her PA says that she is at not available to contact at the moment but would not give me any further information. I have found working with Elizabeth frustrating on this project but recognise that her involvement is important to our success as our lead on this.

In addition I have noticed that a number of us have been slipping our timescales, but no-one forewarned me about late submissions. I am extremely busy at the moment with our departmental re-organisation, jobs under threat, but have managed to reach **my** agreed deadlines.

At this rate we are going to slip on the whole project and it will be a rush at the end to pull all this together. We must create a robust project plan so that we can secure the funding. I cannot afford to let this one slip through my fingers.

We have worked hard to get this far. And I am not prepared to compromise my other responsibilities later due to others not pulling their weight now. I might even need to re-consider my position on the project.

How can we progress this?

Regards,

Ian

Your task:

- Understand all of the project's issues
- Understand the potential impact for the project
- Understand the different perspectives

Taking the current situation what actions would you take to resolve the situation positively for all concerned?

B Group

Vignette 2 - Inconsistent understanding of outputs/aims of the collaboration

A collaborative cross-discipline research group of six people has secured a large grant. The collaboration has been working well, despite people being located in three different institutions. Each person has agreed the groups' requirements, and everyone is meeting deadlines.

A problem has arisen regarding the impact plan for the project. The plan was not exactly an afterthought, but much less time was spent thinking about this part than the rest of the document. There was some discussion about research outputs being used for policy development; others wanted it to be focussed on workshops for external partners. The plan did cover both of these areas, in vague terms with no timescales attached.

The present situation is that in one of the institutions, Prof Smith and Dr Jones, who work in the same department have enlisted the help of a Knowledge Transfer Officer and two very enthusiastic PhD students to start putting together some workshops to cover various aspects of the research. There are four planned in all for March, April and May. As part of the early planning they have been contacting various external partners to see whether there is an 'appetite' for workshops on this subject. It appears that there is and some partners are already signed up in principle having sent enthusiastic messages of support. The seminars are designed to give information but crucially to help design one of the next stages of the research for the social science collaborators. Smith and Jones have decided that this will inform the future direction in the most effective way for this project.

However, in another institution, Professor Kostov has been working hard with a government department in this field that is reviewing current national provision in this area. He has worked with a Member of Parliament, Shirley Clark MP before and is now talking to her Select Committee in parliament about a developing a Private Member's Bill.* Shirley believes that this has a good chance of going all the way to influencing an act of Parliament and becoming Law.

There is a very short deadline for this, it must be done before Parliament goes into recess for the summer. Two issues here:

4. The Professor needs everyone in the collaboration to make gathering data for this an absolute priority - all other activity needs to take second place, including preparation and planning for the workshops
5. The Private Members Bill, once in action, will decide the way the project will be rolled out. The legislation will channel the direction of the research.

*Private Members' Bills are Public Bills introduced by MPs and Lords who aren't government ministers. As with other Public Bills their purpose is to change the law as it applies to the general population. A minority of Private Members' Bills become law but, by creating publicity around an issue, they may affect legislation indirectly.

www.parliament.uk

Looking at the current situation what actions would you take to resolve the situation positively for all concerned?

G - Group

Vignette 2 - Inconsistent understanding of outputs/aims of the collaboration

A collaborative cross-discipline research group of six people has secured a large grant. The collaboration has been working well, despite people being located in three different institutions. Each person has agreed the groups' requirements, and everyone is meeting deadlines.

A problem has arisen regarding the impact plan for the project. The plan was not exactly an afterthought, but much less time was spent thinking about this part than the rest of the document. There was some discussion about research outputs being used for policy development; others wanted it to be focussed on workshops for external partners. The plan did cover both of these areas, in vague terms with no timescales attached.

The present situation is that in one of the institutions, Prof Smith and Dr Jones, who work in the same department have enlisted the help of a Knowledge Transfer Officer and two very enthusiastic PhD students to start putting together some workshops to cover various aspects of the research. There are four planned in all for March, April and May. As part of the early planning they have been contacting various external partners to see whether there is an 'appetite' for workshops on this subject. It appears that there is and some partners are already signed up in principle having sent enthusiastic messages of support. The seminars are designed to give information but crucially to help design one of the next stages of the research for the social science collaborators. Smith and Jones have decided that this will inform the future direction in the most effective way for this project.

However, in another institution, Professor Kostov has been working hard with a government department in this field that is reviewing current national provision in this area. He has worked with a Member of Parliament, Shirley Clark MP before and is now talking to her Select Committee in parliament about a developing a Private Member's Bill.* Shirley believes that this has a good chance of going all the way to influencing an act of Parliament and becoming Law.

There is a very short deadline for this, it must be done before Parliament goes into recess for the summer. Two issues here :

1. The Professor needs everyone in the collaboration to make gathering data for this is an absolute priority - all other activity needs to take second place, including preparation and planning for the workshops
2. The Private Members Bill, once in action, will decide the way the project will be rolled out. The legislation will channel the direction of the research.

*Private Members' Bills are Public Bills introduced by MPs and Lords who aren't government ministers. As with other Public Bills their purpose is to change the law as it applies to the general population. A minority of Private Members' Bills become law but, by creating publicity around an issue, they may affect legislation indirectly.

www.parliament.uk

Looking at the situation as it is now, what could have been done earlier to prevent the problems arising, or to at least minimise the risks of them?

Are you ready?

(40 minutes)

Purpose

To begin the afternoon process of drawing the learning from the course together through focussing on what each individual participant needs to do to make themselves more ready for and open to collaboration opportunities.

Process

The session starts with a short introduction, then groups break off to produce posters. These posters are all put up on a wall together and one participant from each group briefly presents the points on their group's poster. Participants then reflect on whether they are collaboration ready.

Structure

Very short plenary intro	2 mins
Groups produce posters	10 mins
Posters displayed and presented	18 mins
Participants self-reflect on whether they are collaboration ready	10 mins

Resources

Ensure there is sufficient wall space to display all posters, with enough space around it for everyone to gather.

Pre-sort group sizes by placing sufficient resources (pens and 1 sheet of flip-paper) on tables, with enough chairs (aim for groups size 4-6).

Detail

Introduction

2 mins

This needs to be pacey to get energy up after lunch:

- Looking ahead to beyond the course
- All very well talking about collaboration, but are we / you ready to collaborate now?
- Drawing rather than writing, to help us think differently (so it's not about drawing ability). No words allowed. Explain that you are going to give each participant a piece of a postcard.
- "You have 10 minutes to draw what you think a collaboration-ready researcher looks like."

Groups produce posters

10 mins

Groups may do this how they like, but there may need to be some 'chivying'

Posters displayed and presented

18 mins

There is time scope for a little slippage here in terms of getting all the posters up. They should all be together on one wall, with all participants gathered around that wall. Standing is good.

1 participant per group is invited to briefly (max 1 min) present the key points illustrated on their poster. Subsequent presenters are encouraged not to repeat too much, but to focus on new points. Facilitators can add useful comments in here about key learning aspects that could be brought out, including signposting social-media / web presence for later in afternoon.

Participants self-reflect on whether they are collaboration-ready

10 mins

Once everyone has presented, it is time to challenge the participants. "Now it's your turn. Looking at all of those posters – and recalling what we've just been saying: Are you

collaboration-ready? And what do you need to do to become (more) so?" Encourage participants to sit, stand or whatever, but face the posters and self-reflect on what actual, practical things they can do now to become more ready for collaborations.

For what?

(40 minutes)

Purpose

This is to allow participants to explore ways that they might engage in collaboration in different ways formal/less formal settings.

Process

Each participant captures ideas on collaborating then these are shared in their groups. Groups then join with one other group to further share ideas. This is followed by a wrap-up which captures some general themes around these opportunities.

Process overview

Each person to capture ideas about collaborating	10 mins
Share ideas in '7' groups	10 mins
Join up with another '7' group and share more ideas	10 mins
Wrap-up	10 mins

Resources

Groups need to get in to their original '7' groups.

Detail

Each person to capture ideas about collaborating **10 mins**

At this point each person captures some ideas about where they might explore collaboration opportunities either inside or outside academia.

Share ideas in '7' groups **10 mins**

Participants share these thoughts with the others in their small groups adding to them.

Join up with another '7' group and share more ideas **10 mins**

Finally each group joins with another group to add to their pool of ideas.

Wrap-up **10 mins**

This is an opportunity to capture some general themes around these opportunities

Followed by break (20 Minutes)

Are there different rules for different collaboration contexts?

(20 minutes)

Purpose

This is an opportunity to talk about different rules for collaboration both inside and outside academia

Process

Groups discuss potential rules for collaborating with organisations and then these are shared in the wrap-up.

Structure

Each group to discuss potential rules for collaborating with the organisations on their table

15 mins

Wrap-up

5 mins

Resources

Tables with signs on chose some of these:

NGOs, Schools, Government (local or national) policy groups, industry, international organisations, media, policy groups

And some of these:

Academic website, LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, social media

Detail

Each group to discuss potential rules for collaborating with the organisations on their table 15 mins

Ask each group to what about what it might be like collaborating with or through these organisations. What might the risks be?

Wrap-up

5 mins

Ask the groups to share 'nuggets' that might be of some help.

Examples from previous courses include:

"Twitter – post in haste, regret at leisure"

"Industry – think of the IP"

"Schools – need to check ethics"

"make sure your academic website is up to date."

Your collaborative future

(30 minutes)

Purpose

This is the final session of the programme. It is a chance for participants to consolidate their learning and develop ideas for next steps.

Structure

Time to plan next steps

30 mins

Wrap-up

5 mins

Resources

Postcards

Detail

Time to plan next steps

30 mins

As facilitators it is up to you how you make this a useful action planning session. One approach is to use postcards and ask them to write 3 things that they might like to have achieved in 3 months. Collect them in and ensure that they get posted. They may just want some time writing in their notebooks or they might want to return to their '7' groups and just talk through what their plans are as a result of the course. These choices might emerge or change as the course progresses.

Wrap-up

5 mins

Thank everyone for their participation, ask them to look at the stuff written on the walls before they go.

Say goodbye.

Followed by evaluations (if used locally) and any closing remarks (15 minutes)

End of the programme

Appendix 1: Planning schedule and checklist

Planning checklist

Overview of planning		
Time	Action	Who?
Over four months before the programme	If you need to book materials from your institution's central supply put your booking in as soon as possible	Programme organiser
	Book venue and programme leader for programme(s)	
Three or four months before the programme	Confirm programme with programme leader and check that the venue will be appropriate	Programme organiser and programme leader
	Book supporting facilitators – ensure at least one facilitator or the programme leader has a doctorate	
Three months before the programme	Advertise programme and begin to take bookings	Programme organiser
	Book catering and audio visuals	
	Check materials/order materials	
One month before the programme	Print number cards for the icebreaker exercise	Programme organiser
	Send pre-course instructions to participants (copy to facilitators and programme leader)	Programme organiser
	Send out reminder to facilitators and programme leader (you should have all the facilitators confirmed by this point) and confirm accommodation requirements (if you are arranging this)	Programme organiser
Two weeks before programme	Send out programme and timetables to programme facilitators	Programme organiser
	Check programme bookings and re-advertise if necessary	
	Collate and prepare materials	
Time	Action	Who?
Ten days before the programme	Send pre-course instructions to participants (copy to facilitators and programme leader)	Programme organiser
	Re-confirm venue booking details and access times	

One week before the programme	Send out the participant reminders and copy to facilitators and programme leader	Programme organiser
	Send programme list to programme leader with a breakdown of participant subject area	
	Final materials check, including: programme leader manuals for the facilitators, activities, general materials, evaluation forms, programme list, handouts etc.	
On the day of the programme	Arrive one hour before the programme to set up materials	Programme organiser
	Register participants	
	Pack up and stock-check materials as the programme progresses	
	Compile programme review and send to programme leader and programme facilitators	
About two days after the programme	Arrange payment for programme leader and facilitators	Programme organiser
One week after the programme	Input programme evaluation forms Set up facebook group (and consider other social networking) Upload any slides or other useful information to website	Programme organiser
About three months after the programme	Send out action planning postcards – check the timing of this with the programme leader	Programme organiser

Checklist

Date of programme:

Time:

Venue:

Initial planning – three to four months before the programme

Programme leader Name: <input type="checkbox"/> (Tick box when confirmed)	Facilitator 1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Facilitator 2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Facilitator 3 <input type="checkbox"/>
Venue <input type="checkbox"/>	Catering <input type="checkbox"/>	Web advertising <input type="checkbox"/>	Advertising <input type="checkbox"/>
Waiting list contacted <input type="checkbox"/>			

One month before programme

Confirm all details with the programme leader and send facilitators a reminder <input type="checkbox"/>	Send out information and timetables to supporting facilitators <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--

One month before programme

Send out pre-course instructions to participants <input type="checkbox"/>	Collate programme materials in line with programme timetable <input type="checkbox"/>	Re-confirm details with the venue <input type="checkbox"/>	Print evaluation forms and signage <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--

One week before programme

Send out participant reminder, copy to all programme facilitators <input type="checkbox"/>	Send participant list to programme leader with break down of subject area <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---

Day before programme

Send out final reminder to participants, copy to facilitators <input type="checkbox"/>	Update participant list for facilitators and send any changes to programme leader <input type="checkbox"/>	
Check materials <input type="checkbox"/>	Arrange delivery of materials to the venue <input type="checkbox"/>	Finalise catering numbers <input type="checkbox"/>

Post-programme

Compile programme review based on evaluation forms and send to programme leader and facilitators. <input type="checkbox"/>	Send out 'action planning' postcards <input type="checkbox"/>	Arrange programme review with programme leader <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	--

Appendix 2: Example publicity material

‘Collaborative Researcher’ for postgraduate researchers and research staff

Collaboration is more than the icing on the research cake; it now lies at the heart of the research model for the 21st Century. Individual researchers wishing to build successful careers need to connect with, and impress, a broad network of professional colleagues. Projects no longer solely operate under the traditional model of a single researcher or group and draw upon a range of partners from the subjects, institutions and sectors required to answer bigger and more far-reaching questions.

This 2 day residential course looks at the building blocks of the collaborative style of research: inclusive communication, cultural awareness, robust planning, negotiation and the ability to work effectively with others. Whether your collaboration is with another academic in your department, or partners from different subjects, sectors and countries, it helps you to develop winning strategies for connecting and working with others.

What does it involve?

The course is attended by up to 40 researchers from different disciplines and career stages. It is led by a team of experienced facilitators who work with participants throughout the 2 days to support their learning. They will be from a variety of backgrounds with experience in collaboration, academia and other sectors.

This course takes a ‘learning by doing’ approach. There will be presentations on collaboration theory, but for the most part, you will be actively participating in the sessions and activities.

This is an intensive 2 day course and participants are expected to attend both days.

What's in it for you?

This course offers you the opportunity to:

- explore collaboration both in theory and in practice
- work with a team of experienced facilitators from a range of career backgrounds, who will ensure you get the most out of the 2 days
- meet researchers from a variety of disciplines, backgrounds and career stages
- develop your understanding of collaboration theory and how to apply it in practice
- take a few days out from your research both physically and mentally, and have some space in which to consider yourself and your next steps

Who should attend?

The programme is suitable for postgraduate researchers and research staff.

Programme dates

[Insert relevant information]

How to book

[Insert relevant information]

Researchers’ views of the ‘Collaborative Researcher’ programme:

[Insert quotes from previous participants]

Appendix 3: Example booking information/reminders

Programme facilitator reminder:

Dear _____,

'Collaborative Researcher' (insert full programme details)

This is just a brief note to confirm the arrangements for the above session. We currently have *[insert number]* number of bookings for the programme

I have attached the timetable for this programme, and the programme leader manual, which provides further details about the activities – hard copies of both will be available on the programme.

Participant booking confirmation:

Dear _____,

As requested we have booked a place for you on the following programme:
'Collaborative Researcher' *[insert full programme details]*

This is a 2-day programme and we ask that participants commit to attending both days.

Special requirements

If you have not informed us of any dietary requirements or any other requirements you may have, then please contact us immediately.

Timing

The programme will start at 0930 and finish at 1700 on both days.

Venue

The programme will be held at *[insert details]*.
Maps and information on how to travel to the venue are available.

Appendix 4: Example evaluation questionnaire

It is recommended that an evaluation questionnaire is used at the end of the programme in order to help inform specific improvements to future programmes. An example evaluation questionnaire is included below however, you may prefer to use your own institution's standard questionnaire or an online format.

Programme evaluation questionnaire

'Collaborative Researcher'

Date:

Please take a few minutes to complete this programme evaluation questionnaire and either leave it with programme staff at the end of the session or send it in the internal mail to: *[insert address]*

The responses we get from you are very important. We will use the information you provide to modify and improve the content, style and organisation of individual programmes and the programme as a whole.

Name: _____

Overall reaction

1. Strengths

What, for you, were the strengths of the programme?

2. Weaknesses

And what, for you, were its weaknesses?

3. Improvements

How do you think the programme could be improved?

please turn over

4. Programme content

	Very good				Poor
4.1 How would you rate the overall quality of the programme?	5	4	3	2	1

Please explain your answer:

	Strongly agree			Strongly disagree	
4.2 The programme will help me to collaborate more effectively	5	4	3	2	1

4.3 Please comment on the content and style of the programme.
What did you like most and/or find most useful?

4.4 Please comment on the content and style of the programme.
What did you like least and/or find least useful?

5. Programme organisation

	Strongly agree			Strongly disagree	
5.1 Pre-course arrangements (enquiries, bookings, reminders) were organised efficiently.	5	4	3	2	1
5.2 The learning environment (venue, atmosphere etc.) was appropriate.	5	4	3	2	1

Thank you for taking the time to complete this evaluation questionnaire.

Appendix 5: Materials checklist

Session	Item
In at the deep end	Each participant will need a number 1, 2, 3 or 4. This can be either in their arrival pack or could be randomly assigned to chairs.
Course introduction	There are PowerPoint slides available for this session
Your own strengths for collaboration	Handouts - Your own strengths for collaboration
Need (drivers) for collaboration	Flipchart paper and pens. 12 tables need be grouped in 4. Tables 1,2,3,4 with sign 'Institution' on each. Tables 5,6,7,8 with signs 'You' on each. Tables with 9,10,11,12 on with signs 'Funders' on each.
DreamResearchTeam©	During lunch, organise the tables and chairs so that there will be 3-5 people per table (and exact number is not required). You may wish to achieve an even number of groups to make the debrief process easier. There should be one set of DRT cards per table (including instructions), but these should not be distributed in advance.
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (Part 1)	This process requires 2 streams, and therefore 2 areas to work in, with 1 facilitator responsible for each area. The Stream 2 area (the funders in Part 1) should have a laptop per group (3 or 4 depending on overall numbers), although these may be required of the participants. However, a separate computer with printer attached, and data-stick, all need to be available for Stream 1.
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 2)	Prior to this session, the funding calls developed by stream 2 need to be printed in enough copies for 1 per stream 1 group of each of them. For stream 2, the 'real' funding calls need to be ready, again enough for 1 of each for each of the 3 (or 4) groups.
Introduction to day 2	Have plenty of Post-Its available
Reverse engineering	Flip-chart paper and pens available. Participants should start the day in the same groups they finished day 1 in, but streams 1 and 2 will be in the same room together.
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 3)	Stream 1: Should receive a pack with the bids from the 3 (or 4) stream 2 groups, along with only those 'real' funding calls that were applied for.
How to create and spot opportunities for collaboration (part 4)	Groups now need to receive back their funding bids with feedback.
Managing collaborations	Copies of the two situations need to be ready to distribute, ideally 1 of each per participant, but a minimum of 1 of each per group. An even number of tables should be set with enough chairs for 2 or 3 people per table. Half the tables should be labelled B1, B2, B3 etc., and half should be labelled G1, G2, G3 etc. B1 & G1 should be near each other, and so on.
Are you ready?	Ensure there is sufficient wall space to display all posters, with enough space around it for everyone to gather. Pre-sort group sizes by placing sufficient resources (pens and 1 sheet of flip-paper) on tables, with enough chairs (aim for groups size 4-6).
For what?	Groups need to get in to their original '7' groups.
Are there different rules for different collaboration contexts?	Tables with signs on chose some of these: NGOs, Schools, Government (local or national) policy groups, industry, international organisations, media, policy groups And some of these: Academic website, LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, social media
Your collaborative future	Postcards