



**University of Brighton**

**Arts and Humanities**

**CENTRE FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT**

**College of Arts & Humanities Annual Research Festival 2016  
Workshops, forums and seminars  
(Tuesday 12 – Thursday 14 July)**

Our research-focussed workshops were opportunities to explore topics, practices and skills with experienced colleagues from the College, Centre for Research and Development and Research Office.

**1. Research Mentoring**

Charlie Hooker, David Cotterrell and Ross Clark introduced the university's mentoring framework, and the Arts and Humanities' scheme, which will start in the College's four schools at the beginning of the academic year 2016-17. Participants welcomed the scheme and made suggestions to improve its implementation and documents. <http://bit.ly/29SY3TC>

**2. Designing a (realistic) research project for a funding application**

Jo-Anne Bichard and Anne Galliot led participants to start designing their research questions. Participants, in small cross-discipline and cross-experience groups, tried to come up with one overarching and three more detailed research questions that could form the basis of a research proposal funding application. Participants noted the usefulness of testing ideas in a group setting and the unlikely synergies arising in this format. They expressed interest in participating in a longer 'sandpit' style of workshop in the future, to design a research project for funding (such as <http://www.lsri.nottingham.ac.uk/events/sandpit>).

**3. Data capture for research impact**

*Report to follow*

**4. The Good, the Bad and the Ugly: Ethics and Research Practice**

Unfortunately, not enough people signed up for or attended the session so it did not go ahead.

**5. From research idea to draft funding application**

Jo-Anne Bichard and Anne Galliot facilitated this writing workshop where participants used the 'Foolproof Grant Application Template' designed by @ProfessorIsIn, Karen Kelsky. Participants found that working with 'short and fast' timescales on very specific sections of writing was useful to concentrate their ideas. The facilitators suggested running a writing group using the 'pomodoro' technique (<http://pomodorotechnique.com>) in the future, subject to interest.

## **6. Writing a winning AHRC funding application**

Jeremy Aynsley and Frank Gray spoke of their experience of reviewing funding applications on the AHRC Peer Review College and Grant Allocation Panel. They recommended that colleagues understand the AHRC's priorities and policies, and how their project contributes to them. They gave an overview of the many documents required in an application and how these come together to describe the project. The AHRC funding guide is now online:

<http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/funding/research/researchfundingguide/>

## **7. Leading and Managing Large Research Grants**

Jenni Wilburn and Jeremy Aynsley discussed the challenges of managing a large research award. When one becomes a principal investigator (PI), one has to navigate complex tasks that one might not have come across before: from contracts to ethics, employing a research assistant to managing a budget within financial regulations. The PI has to be an outstanding communicator, and manage relationships carefully, working across cultures, systems and disciplines. As the PI, one must remain unfailingly enthusiastic about the project. The Research Office's post-award team is there to help. Their new award acceptance process is helping awardees with making sure everything is in place at the start of their project. Working with a critical friend, informally or through an advisory board, can also help. <https://staff.brighton.ac.uk/ease/ro/Pages/PostAward.aspx>

## **8. External funding schemes for the Arts, Design, Humanities and Media**

Anne Galliot (CRD) and Stuart Headley (Research Office) gave a whistle-stop tour of research funding opportunities in the Arts, Design, Humanities and Media. Register to Research Professional to search funding calls (<https://www.researchprofessional.com>) and browse the CRD's research funding blog (<http://blogs.brighton.ac.uk/crdexternalfunding/>).

## **9. Preparing a winning research sabbatical application**

Paul Sermon, Jeremy Aynsley and Anne Galliot re-introduced the university's research sabbatical scheme that became live last autumn. The scheme is selective (not entitlement) and requires that applicants meet the list of criteria in section 22 of the document. Sermon and Aynsley served on the awarding panel in January 2016. They recommended that applicants should understand where they are in the research cycle: researching an idea and formulating a research problem; collecting data and undertaking primary research; analysing data, interpreting results and testing theories; writing up or disseminating findings; consolidating a project (applying for funding). It was stressed that applicants should be clear about what they need to do in the period of sabbatical leave. Participants requested that successful applications should be available as exemplars, and suggested that colleagues returning from sabbatical leave could give a presentation to the College. <http://bit.ly/29IcUwQ>

## **10. Closing the Loop: evaluating quality**

Anne Boddington and Ross Clark explored how to assess quality in teaching, research and engagement. Understanding one's quality requires first an understanding of one's place in the world. Therefore researchers need to a

sustainable body of evidence as confirmation what they have done, which can be interrogated and compared. Evidence should come from beyond one's immediate circle and oneself to truly evidence quality in the world, for example by external bodies, peer review. Beyond quality assessment, there is quality enhancement: for this, the researcher needs to evidence a stretch, a development and the next steps.

### **11. How to use Converis to archive your research and scholarly outputs**

Anne Galliot and Simon Heath introduced the University's repository of research and scholarly outputs (e-prints), and the database system through which details and electronic copies of output are uploaded (Converis). Participants were able to log into and explore the Converis system, accessing it through the Research Office web pages: <https://staff.brighton.ac.uk/ease/ro/Pages/Converis.aspx>.

### **12. Overcoming Imposter Syndrome and building resilience**

Imposter syndrome manifests itself by a persistent fear of being exposed as a fraud, and an inability to internalise one's accomplishments; graduate students and early career researchers commonly report it and it also targets high-achieving individuals. Newly promoted professor, Julie Doyle, and Annabella Pollen shared their experience and offered advice on building resilience. The suggested that networks are key, both peer support and mentoring in academia, but also beyond. Self-awareness is beneficial; it is important to acknowledge one's journey, consider why one might feel this way, and be kind to oneself. It is OK to say 'I don't know' as doubts can be useful to generate a richer discussion about one's work. The presenters urged participants to understand the different worlds one moves between routinely (class, gender, professional, familial), the different 'clothing' one has to use each time, and suggested that researchers should remember to allow space to be themselves.

### **13. The REF word: preparing for the next Research Excellence Framework**

David Cotterrell and Hilary Ougham (Research Office) explored the meaning of REF and outlined what is known and what is not known about the next one. The University will start a REF Management Group in the autumn. They recommended that researchers discuss their ambitions early, to look at where and when they should publish, exhibit or enter the public domain. They suggested to interpret the four-star grading scale as: 2\*, point of reference for a PhD student for instance; 3\*, compulsory reading if you are investigating a field; 4\* if the output has changed something in the discipline.

### **14. Research Portfolios showcase**

*Report to follow*

### **15. Navigating Arts and Cultural Policy: beyond AHRC funding**

Donna Close, the College's Economic and Social Engagement Manager in the Arts, gave an overview of current art and cultural policy in the UK, and the Culture White Paper of March 2016. She highlighted how its policy of art and culture, as a vehicle for social mobility, is pushing for arts education to become more vocational, to create jobs and be economically productive. Funding themes

include 'national moment', health and well-being, cultural tourism, spaces, conservation, crime prevention, digital collections. The agenda is becoming more international (funding for touring UK artists, and a cultural protection fund to help countries that have suffered cultural destruction) and at the same time pushing for decentralisation/localism (beyond London and the south). Impact is also high on the agenda, sometimes with specific measures and desirable outputs. The three main funders are the Arts Council, the British Film Institute and the Heritage Lottery Fund. All have funding schemes of relevant to researchers in the College.