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Executive Summary

The aim of this project was to design, deliver and evaluate a programme of skills development for staff who had recently entered senior research leadership roles in post-1992 Universities. Specialised provision of this kind was seen as desirable for several reasons. The selective funding of research in core areas of excellence, especially at institutions with large-scale teaching commitments, presents particular challenges for leadership. Conventional managerialism may not be appropriate in these settings, where a complex and flexible approach is needed to facilitate research and balance competing priorities (Briner et al 1996, Mintzberg 1987). Research leaders operate in an environment of multiple demands including the requirements of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and an external environment characterised by uncertainty and budget cuts.

An extensive design phase ensured that the Programme was relevant to research leaders’ perceived needs and did not duplicate provision which is already available. An audit was undertaken of leadership training and development opportunities currently offered to senior research leaders at similar institutions to those in our project. Findings from this were mapped against the VITAE ‘Researcher Development Framework’, to see how they corresponded to the demands of research leadership. Audit findings also formed the basis for discussions in three focus groups where potential participants discussed their experiences and requirements, effectively outlining their own ‘ideal’ programmes.

Priorities for potential participants included research vision and strategy (their own as well as that of their Unit and their institution) and the implementation of these. They were interested in building sustainable research capacity, alongside shorter-term priorities such as those defined by the REF. Other requirements included development for managing people, especially within diverse and often flexibly-constituted teams, and managing change. Context, both institutional and national, was important. However, most felt that some ‘standard’ elements of leadership development training, such as diagnostics and information on operational line and project management, were of less relevance to them. The level of consensus between the groups was relatively high in relation to desired content for the Programme, although there were some differences over its order, emphasis and framing.

The design of the Programme was closely influenced by outcomes from the Focus Groups. National and local experts, all themselves senior academics and research leaders, were approached and invited to lead sessions in an intensive programme held on four non-consecutive days. Fifteen staff with varying experience of senior research roles took part in these interactive workshops.

Participants were asked for feedback on the Programme immediately after its conclusion. This was followed up by a questionnaire administered three months later, in which participants were asked to assess the impact of the Programme on their work. All of the questionnaire respondents felt that the impact had been both substantial and beneficial, especially in relation to their ability to formulate and articulate vision and strategy, lead and influence others, set their work in its local and policy context, and implement short- and long-term aims. These responses indicate that the Programme was highly successful in meeting its aim of delivering relevant and effective leadership development for senior researchers.
1 Introduction

1.1 Project rationale and initiation

This report describes the development, design and delivery of a four-day programme of leadership and management development for senior research leaders in post-1992 Universities, in a project entitled ‘Leading and Managing Research Excellence in post-1992 Universities’ (‘LMRE’). The project was funded by a Small Development Grant from the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, and the bulk of the work took place between March 2011 and March 2012. It was led from the University of Sunderland, in collaboration with Northumbria University and Teesside University (a full list of steering group members can be found in Appendix A).

The aim of this project was to set up and evaluate a programme of skills development for staff who had recently entered senior research leadership roles in post-1992 Universities. This was in response to some apparent gaps between the needs of this group of staff and the content of currently available development opportunities. The context in which they work is relatively specialised. In all of the HEIs included in the project, research is selectively funded of research in core areas of excellence. These are known variously as ‘Beacons and Centres’ (Sunderland), ‘Centres’ (Northumbria) and ‘Institutes’ (Teesside); here they are collectively referred to as ‘units’. In addition, the majority of active researchers also carry a reasonably high teaching load. This presents particular challenges for leadership, both of individuals and of change.

The strategic research management context is currently in a process of substantial change. Some of this results from the introduction of the Research Excellence Framework (REF), replacing the Research Assessment Exercise, and from other developments in government policy and the national and international context of research.

Conventional managerialism may not be appropriate in these settings (Briner et al 1996, Mintzberg 1987). Research leaders need to be flexible in their approach, and able to lead highly diverse teams while facilitating all aspects of research excellence. They must also balance the competing priorities of both individuals and institutions. This includes balancing team members’ aims alongside those of the Unit and the University, and building long-term research capacity while also ensuring that short-term goals are met. The research leaders for whom this programme is designed operate in an environment of multiple demands, including the requirements of the Research Excellence Framework (REF), the teaching commitments of their Departments and team members, and the need to seek external research funding. All of this takes place in external environment characterised by uncertainty and budget cuts.

1.2 Approach

The project had three phases: design, delivery, and evaluation. The first of these was undertaken in order to make sure that the programme met the development needs of its target audience, as perceived by the participants themselves, and did not duplicate provision which is already available to them.

An audit of leadership development opportunities which are offered to relatively new senior research leaders at a group of post-1992 HEIs (including project participants) was conducted. This included both ‘general’ leadership development and some provision aimed
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specifically at researchers. This range of provision was ‘mapped’ against the VITAE ‘Researcher Development Framework’, in order to gauge its relevance to research carers, and to identify any gaps.

Following the audit, the staff who would later take part in the programme joined focus group discussions where they reflected on their own experiences, career stage and requirements. Findings from this provided the ‘springboard’ for the focus groups, each of which negotiated its ‘ideal’ programme.

The focus group outcomes were used to prepare a draft outline for an innovative and intensive four day strategic development programme. This focussed on the priorities and concerns expressed by senior research leaders. Academics with appropriate expertise in leadership and management were then approached and invited to lead development sessions. They were provided with a general outline of what was required and some information about the discussions which had led to the request, but wrote the sessions on the basis of their own knowledge of the subject. The majority of those who delivered the Programme were not members of staff at the participating Universities. This provided an element of externality and freshness of perspective.

A questionnaire was used to examine whether the Programme had met its key aim of helping senior research leaders to develop their aims, vision and strategy, and skills and approaches for implementing these. Where this aim has been achieved, there will be gains for the strategic direction of institutions and Units within them.

We envisage that participant feedback can be used to fine-tune the development Programme further, before it is rolled out to a wider group of research leaders.
2 Design phase

2.1 The audit

2.1.1 Method

An audit was undertaken of existing leadership and management development provision in a sample of post-1992 Universities. The objectives of this exercise were to provide a snapshot of the range and content of existing leadership and management training (formal and informal) in institutions of this kind, and to assess its relevance to senior research leaders. Findings from the audit were used as the basis for discussions in the focus groups (see below) which were conducted with research leaders.

Questionnaires were sent to staff with responsibility for researcher development at seven post-1992 universities in the UK. All of the Universities selected had a similar research assessment ranking (based on the 2010 national league tables published at http://www.thecompleteuniversityguide.co.uk) to that of the three North East universities involved in the project. Questionnaire recipients were asked to identify what development opportunities were offered to research team leaders in their institution, and to indicate how these aligned with their institutional strategy.

We decided to identify any gaps in this provision by mapping the data to the ‘Research Development Framework’ (RDF). This was produced by VITAE (http://www.vitae.ac.uk/researchers/1274/About-Vitae.html), in order to provide a nationally recognised description of the knowledge, skills and attributes which are required for a successful research career at all stages of seniority, including senior leadership. The RDF was developed through a process of national consultations and discussions with researchers and research stakeholders (see http://www.vitae.ac.uk/researchers/428241/Researcher-Development-Framework.html for details).

2.1.2 Scope of provision

As a group, these seven universities offered a huge range of leadership and management development activities. The descriptor statement for each activity was used to ‘map’ it onto one sub-domain of the RDF. The development activities mapped primarily to descriptors in three domains and (within these) six sub-domains of the RDF, as shown in the following table:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDF domain</th>
<th>RDF sub-domain</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Self-management (B2)’</td>
<td><strong>Time management</strong> models and coping strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Responding to change</strong> by innovating, leading and facilitating change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Professional and career</td>
<td>‘Professional and career</td>
<td><strong>Career management</strong> by evaluating and managing a career as a research leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development (B3)’</td>
<td>development (B3)’</td>
<td><strong>Networking</strong> to develop a strategy to build research networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Research governance and</td>
<td>‘Research management (C2)’</td>
<td><strong>Strategy-related thinking and decision-making</strong>, including creating a vision in the context of the REF, external and internal drivers of, and constraints on, research activity, and organisational cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisation’</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project planning and delivery</strong>, including strategic or operational planning, the implementation, monitoring and assessment of research projects, identifying future priorities and enhancements, and compliance with legal, regulatory, ethical and social requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Finance, funding and resources (C3)’</td>
<td><strong>Income and funding generation</strong>, including the economic context and its influence on research strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Engagement, influence and</td>
<td>‘Working with others (D1)’</td>
<td><strong>Financial management.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact’</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure and resources</strong>, including staffing issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Team working</strong> to implement strategies for developing research teams' capacity to work effectively together; includes objective setting, supporting team members, managing workplace stress, coaching for performance, team working and motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>People management</strong> including managing performance in the academic context, developing others, conflict management, and dealing with difficult people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong> of others, including managing employee stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mentoring</strong> of others, including developing mentoring and coaching relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Influence and leadership.</strong> This is a hugely complex area, dependant on many other related aspects of the RDF. Relevant elements of training programmes include expectations, roles and responsibilities, leadership and management (e.g. models/styles of leadership), personal values, ethical and authentic leadership, inspirational communication, motivation, performance and organisational culture, leading diverse teams, giving quality feedback, delegation for work and development, negotiation and assertiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This leadership development provision collectively covered a huge range of activities that primarily map to only a fraction of the RDF. Excluded were all areas of the ‘research knowledge and intellectual abilities’ domain, the majority of the ‘personal effectiveness’ domain, the ‘professional conduct’ sub-domain, the ‘engagement and impact’ sub-domain, and even the ‘communication methods’ sub-domain. Furthermore, Vitae recently introduced a ‘leadership lens’ on the Researcher Development Framework, which identifies at least two descriptors in every sub-domain as important leadership qualities.

These results were not surprising, however. Most leadership and management training provision was targeted at relatively senior research staff, while the RDF includes research knowledge, skills and attributes for all stages of the research career from recent postgraduate to professor level. Having said this, it should be noted that each development activity was mapped onto only a single sub-domain, in order to provide the most straightforward documents possible for use in the focus groups. It would have been possible to map most of these activities to [at least] one more, currently unmapped, sub-domain or sub-domains to provide a better coverage of the RDF.

It was encouraging that all items on this list could be demonstrated to support the development of a strategic research leadership and management plan to some degree.

2.1.3 Access to provision

Institutional practices for providing individuals with access to this training, and the range of opportunities on offer at each institution, both varied widely. The majority of universities offered at least one leadership and/or management programme ‘in-house’, and a small number had a wide selection at many levels from which potential participants could choose. In most (if not all) cases, research leaders could also access a range of external leadership and management programmes by request.

In-house leadership and management development programmes appeared to be biased towards generic operational management approaches, which may be a function of the number of operational managers compared to strategic team leaders at these institutions. At one institution, a generic ‘middle’ management programme was offered to administrative, academic and research staff. At another, a whole suite of courses accredited by the Institute of Leadership and Management was offered to staff including researchers. These programmes were supplemented by other external or internal research based development opportunities to develop these skills in the current research context. Provision of this sort included the use of action learning sets, and one to one mentoring or coaching. Strategic research team leaders at these institutions would probably need to attend a range of different development activities to satisfy all their development needs for strategic and operational management in the research context.
One in-house programme was designed specifically to address the local research leadership context, in relation to the last Research Assessment Exercise. This course was coordinated and delivered by an external coach in partnership with the institution’s Pro-Vice Chancellor for Research and several other academics. Its format and content were largely defined by the Pro Vice Chancellor and the external coach; some in-situ tailoring took place as a consequence of discussions with participants during the course to support specific research issues. The programme was delivered through a combination of lectures and reflective workshops. Since it was originally set up in the context of the RAE and not the REF, it was under review at the time of the audit. Information about feedback on and impact of this programme was not provided, so its outcomes and impact were not clear.

Audit respondents at a small number of universities stated that staff had opportunities to attend development programmes offered by external training providers such as the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, or undertake formal taught university based management programmes. However, with the exception of the programme described above, a single suite of provision designed for the target audience for our proposed programme was not identified.

2.1.4 Relationships between university research strategy and leadership development

Respondents at six out of the seven universities identified links between their leadership and management development provision and between two and four elements of University strategy. These included improving institutional research profile or capacity, supporting individual employment conditions and development, having a positive impact on institutional provision (including student experience and knowledge transfer), and quality of service.

All noted a connection with institutional research strategies, focusing on raising the institutional research profile via the REF, research capacity building, or being recognised for national or world class research. The majority (five) linked provision to the development of people or being a good employer, expressed in terms of employment conditions and development of the individual. Discussions of this strategic aim also referred to external bodies or accreditations, including (for example) delivery of Vitae’s strategic aims, achievement of the Athena Swan Award, or the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers.

Half of the respondents linked provision to knowledge transfer and/or impact; one referred specifically to a strategy involving social and economic progress through research and enterprise activities. There were two explicit references to benefits for students. One mentioned the strategic aim of ‘providing a high quality student experience’; the other referred to enhancement of the research environment for research staff and students. A single respondent listed the aim of being a sustainable and cost effective service, and operating within a culture of continuous improvement.

It was not clear from the information provided whether these diverse strategies generated the variations in the range and quantity of development opportunities, modes of access, or format and content of programmes which were observed at the different institutions. However, there was sufficient overlap between the various Universities’ strategies that the training provision in one institution would probably be equally at home in another. Moreover, it appeared that the training provision from any one institution could in theory serve all the strategic agendas mentioned to meet the collective needs of the research environment, the individual, the institution and other stakeholders for the whole group.
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2.2  The focus groups

2.2.1  Participants and conduct

Three focus groups (henceforth ‘FGs’) were held. Each had five participants and lasted for approximately two hours. The participants were the research leaders who would eventually form the audience for the development programme.

One FG was held at each University, with the participants from each University attending their ‘local’ group. As a result the group members had some commonality of experience in that they all worked for the same institution. Participants were nominated by the Associate Dean for Research (or equivalent) in their Faculty or School, and the groups included a considerable diversity of subject disciplines. A request was made that nominees should be recently appointed or soon-aspiring senior research leaders. Despite this, there was in fact considerable variation between their levels of experience of senior leadership. Groups contained both staff who were relatively new to senior leadership and people with considerably greater experience in such roles (no ‘less senior’ participants were nominated).

Nine participants were male and six were female.

Groups were run by the male Project Manager, who is a researcher developer at one of the Universities. All groups were conducted under ‘Chatham House Rules’, and participants were informed that project outputs would maintain the anonymity of FG participants and in addition would not associate statements made during the FGs with a particular University or subject discipline.

Participants were asked, working individually, to list the activities which they regularly undertake as strategic managers of research. Once participants had completed their individual lists, they were asked to note the enablers and barriers to completing these activities which they encountered. Each focus group, working together, then identified their priorities for development. A summary of findings from the Audit was used as a ‘prompt’ in this latter section of the FG discussion.

2.2.2  The ‘ideal’ programme

Each of the three groups had a different vision of the focus and content of a useful development programme for staff with strategic research leadership responsibilities. These can be characterised as follows:

1) **Vision, strategy and implementation.** Communication and support are key features in this model.

2) **Sustainable long-term vision.** Here the focus was on a sustainable strategic view (with a horizon of around ten years) which also accommodates a shorter, REF-led perspective, and on leading relatively informal teams, rather than conventional management.

3) **Working with people.** The priorities in this area are influence and leadership, followed by elements of people management. There was a strong preference for an approach grounded in ‘coaching’ and leadership, rather than a ‘business’ management style. This is because research teams were seen as peers, and because senior researchers may often find themselves ‘leading’ colleagues for whom they have no formal line management responsibility.
Within all three models, all FG participants felt that the following were important themes:

- Research strategy – providing direction for individuals and research teams.
- the REF – specifically, making individual REF submissions and supporting the REF submissions of others. Some participants favoured an element of short-term orientation towards the REF, to support communication of ideas to both peers and senior management.
- Responding to change and leading others through change.
- Working with people – even where this was not seen as the ideal guiding principle for a development programme, all participants felt that working with, communicating with, and leading others was an essential area for development. The preferred approach was as described above.

However, some elements which are commonly found in leadership and management development programmes (largely those not designed specifically for academics) were felt to be unnecessary or irrelevant to this group. These include:

- Leadership and personality styles questionnaires or other self-assessment diagnostics. Participant views on these were mixed and in some cases very strong. Only two out of fifteen participants viewed this type of questionnaire as useful for them; in both cases this was due to good past experiences. Others felt that these instruments were not particularly relevant, while one felt that this kind of activity was simply a waste of time.
- Classical operational line and project management approaches used for formal line management of staff, including dealing with underperforming staff and associated conflicts. Most participants did not have formal line management responsibilities for their research teams. Instead, they identified the need to consider community and leadership approaches.
- Operational time management was specifically mentioned by one group who felt that they possess sufficient skills in this area. They highlighted instead the need for a discussion of strategic time management.

2.2.3 Emerging themes

The extended discussions of roles, enablers and barriers allowed the identification of a number of sub-themes which were important to participants. There was a reasonably high degree of agreement on these between institutions and subject disciplines.

Participants sought development to support the following activities:

- Building sustainable research capacity.
- Changing aspects of the research culture.
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- Reshaping the perceptions of staff to motivate them towards and beyond the REF.
- Matching research strategy with career aspirations as a research team leader.
- Balancing demands on one’s time while addressing the expectations of others, including the expectation of support for research funding applications.
- Working with research teams which include both those included in the REF and those excluded from it, to support overall research quality and aims.
- Developing and leading research teams for whose members the research leader has no formal line management responsibility.
- Developing democratic and devolved ‘collective’ approaches to leading and managing research; drawing together diverse opinions to influence the individuals and groups who guide the overall research agenda.
- Developing high-quality and credible research that is valued in and beyond the university.
- Developing excellent research alongside the high quality learning and teaching.
- Using REF assessment rules appropriately for strategic planning, e.g. in determining the content of submissions, writing one’s own submission, and supporting others in writing their submissions.
- Balancing short and long term strategic orientation, and formal and informal projects.
- Balancing the affordances and limitations of the REF (which provides visibility and status, but may only offer a minor funding stream for some research teams).
- Scenario planning within allocated funding levels, and leading research within both long- and short-term funding conditions.
- Achieving research which meets national benchmarks for quality and prestige, to provide the competitive edge over other providers (taking into account how the student experience is enhanced as a consequence of research).
- Working effectively with university support teams, Senior Management, and research support staff, all of whom may have different management styles and attitudes.
- Leading and managing research when the main direct funding is from students on taught programmes.
- Cultivating the expectation that staff in QR-funded units will deliver research outputs that can be entered into the REF, especially where the link is not always fully recognised.
- Working in institutional research cultures where the professional identity of academics varies across the University.
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- Working in Units and institutions where different groups have different perceptions of the relative importance of research and teaching; handling competing priorities for time allocated to teaching, research, reach-out and enterprise.

- Leading diverse teams, where attitude, experience, expectations, motivations and capability for research vary widely.

- Working in research environments with a relatively high turnover of research students and research-focused staff, supporting core staff develop their research ability as other researchers come and go.

- Leading change where it is resisted and/or where staff are risk averse.

- Understanding and working with cultural diversity across the workforce, especially in relation to motivation and support needs during periods of change.

- Influencing and motivating teaching team leaders whose main priority appears to be the team’s teaching activities rather than their research. This was framed in terms of academic identities, and in particular the teaching-research nexus.

- Communicating effectively with other research team leaders who have different agendas and perceptions from one’s own. This was seen as improving institutional understanding of research and the research process, as well as the extent to which all researchers’ abilities are recognised and valued.

- Working with people who have different attitudes in order to inspire and influence, without engaging in unhelpful conflict.

- Leading on the research agenda when not in a senior management position with formal line management responsibility for research team members.

- Handling time and work-loading issues, where some find staff find time for research and others don’t; balancing teaching, administration and research.

2.3 Designing the development Programme

The Steering Group considered the content requests from the focus groups along with the underlying themes listed above. The aim was to work out a single coherent structure which would address the requirements and priorities expressed by the participants.

The Group agreed that the Programme should:

- use a sustainable strategic 10 year view which incorporates the shorter REF perspective.

- focus on leading development of the research culture and agenda.

- recognise that many participants lead informally or flexibly constituted teams.
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In addition, it should support participants’ abilities to:

- develop research vision and strategy (towards and beyond the REF).
- respond to and lead change in the current policy environment.

Finally, to gain maximum impact from the Programme, participants should be offered guidance on how to implement strategic vision and change using models and techniques for:

- leadership and management.
- working in teams.
- effective communication.
- coaching and mentoring.

By the end of this Programme, participants should be able to:

- respond to changes in internal and external environments and the research culture in a way that could enhance research in their research unit.
- use innovative and creative ways to generate a research plan that comprises a vision, a set of strategic aims within and beyond the context of the REF, and an implementation plan, taking into account their organisational structures, support systems, and accompanying institutional culture.
- take into account elements of local research culture, as defined by the local funding situations, the professional identity of academics, and the diverse and dynamic work force.
3 Programme content and delivery

3.1 Programme structure and content

The Programme was delivered over four non-consecutive days in autumn 2011, as follows:

Day 1 – morning: ‘Creating a sustainable ten-year vision and research strategy (UK perspective)’:
- Strategic thinking and decision making.
- Research impact (various models).
- Exploration of external and internal drivers.
- Constraints on research activity.
- How to influence research strategy.
- Internal and external research networks.

Day 1 – afternoon: ‘Creating a sustainable 10 year vision and research strategy (local, regional and sectoral perspective)’
- Facilitating change in research culture and agenda.
- Utilising infrastructure and resources (including staffing).
- Working with the economic context including the REF.
- Careers management (own and others).
- Time management for strategic purposes.

Day 2 – morning: ‘Academic Identity: using influence and leadership to innovate, lead and facilitate change’
- Being a positive role model: the expectations, roles and responsibilities of a strategic research leader.
- Harnessing organisational cultures; community decision making and implementation.

Day 2 – afternoon: ‘Responding to and leading change in the current policy environment’
- Responding to change in the current policy environment.
- Academic leadership and management - leading diverse teams through change.

Day 3 – all day: ‘Implementation Toolbox’
- Models and styles of team leadership/management (incl. implementing change).
- Teamworking, networking, decision making and community approaches.
- Conducting high quality reviews to inform senior management teams.
- Conflict management; dealing with difficult people by negotiation and assertiveness.

Day 4 – morning: ‘Coaching and mentoring’
- The importance of mentoring/coaching in devolved management styles for the ‘delegation’ of work, as well as staff development.
- How to support research teams using one to one and team mentoring/coaching for performance enhancement through motivation.

Day 4 – afternoon: ‘Ethical and Authentic Leadership’
- Ethical and authentic leadership approaches to leadership.
- The role of personal values and personal management
- Inspirational communication
3.2 Programme delivery and presentation

Two of the participating Universities hosted one day each, while the lead institution hosted two days. An outline of the content and structure are shown below: Programme materials are available at www.tinyurl.com/DevelopingLeadershipSkills.

The Steering Group and other colleagues in the three participating Universities were consulted in order to identify potential leaders for the various sessions. Relevant journals and conference proceedings were also examined. In order to ensure that all presenters had appropriate experience and expertise, invitations were sent only to senior academics who had worked as research leaders and who also had a strong research interest in the area which they were invited to present. Potential presenters were provided with a session title and a brief outline of the invited content, as well as an overview of the Programme.

In the end seven people presented sessions on the Programme. Three were members of staff at the lead institution, while the others were external experts. Biographies of all presenters can be found in Appendix B.

The sessions were delivered in a ‘workshop’ format, with a mixture of lecture-style presentation and extensive discussion and interactive exercises. Participants provided feedback on the Programme content and delivery at the end of each day, and on the Programme design at the end of day four.

3.3 Feedback – end of Programme

At the end of the final day, participants were divided into three groups, each of which was asked to consider how the design of the pilot Programme could be improved in light of their experience as participants. They were advised that they could add and remove content, as well as alter the timing or order of any session.

One group felt that a fifth day would have been useful. They suggested that the topics dealt with on the morning of Day 1 in fact merited a full day, and also proposed some reordering.

Their suggestions for changes to the Programme overall led to the following outline structure:

Day 1 (was Day 1 morning, now extended to full day): Introduction and course overview, research and development Strategy, creating a research vision (including common identities and culture change).

Day 2: The environment of research and research strategy in a post 92 institution (was Day 1 afternoon), leading and managing change (was Day 2 afternoon).

Day 3: Implementation toolbox (unchanged).

Day 4: Academic identity (was Day 2 morning), Coaching and mentoring (considering the role of academic identity)

Day 5: Impact, sustainability, ethical and authentic leadership, how to take forward the strategies and methods learned on the Programme.
The second group favoured a very similar format. However, they felt that they would prefer guidance on mentoring rather than coaching, as well as opportunities to work with real examples to develop mentoring skills.

The third group suggested that more time should be allocated to participant presentations. They also thought that the session on academic identity should be longer, while the 'toolbox' session could be reduced to half a day. More development in working with specific practical and policy issues, using case studies or scenarios, was also one of their proposals. Their revisions to the Programme were as follows:

Day 1: Vision and Strategy (unchanged)

Day 2: Presentations from participants on their Vision and Strategy (was part of Day 2 morning), Academic identity (was Day 2 morning)

Day 3: Leadership and Change toolbox (was Day 3 - condensed to half day), Leadership and Change in practice (was Day 2 afternoon).

Day 4: Coaching and mentoring (was Day 3 morning, but more focused on mentoring), Impact (including case studies / scenarios), Generating research income in the post 92 sector (including case studies / scenarios).
Evaluation phase

4.1 Introduction

Feedback at the end of the Programme was positive, but provided information only about the experience of taking part. In order to identify longer-term impact on leading research and using the information and skills gained, all participants were contacted three months after the final session and asked to take part in a final evaluation exercise. A questionnaire seeking their views on how the Programme had impacted on their outlook was circulated; twelve of the fifteen Programme participants completed this.

An analysis of their responses indicates that they all felt they had developed, enhanced and validated their vision, aims, strategy and/or plans for implementing the strategy as a result of taking part in the Programme. In order to provide an element of triangulation to this finding, four more senior colleagues of four Programme participants were asked to reflect on its observed impact on the participants’ work. Their statements confirmed that the Programme had had a lasting and positive impact. They reported changes to awareness of and visible commitment to the research agenda, as well as approaches to leadership and strategy. A stronger institutional orientation was also observed. All of this potentially contributes to the strategic direction of research units and the quality of a REF submission. A discussion of comments by the participants is presented below.

4.2 Changes to ‘research vision’ as a result of the Programme

Participants reported that the Programme had helped them to gain a greater awareness of their leadership context and provided a framework for establishing a clearer vision. One felt that this had enabled them to move from operational management involving pragmatic plans to a more strategic approach. Another simply felt that their vision was now more achievable. Several stated that they now had a clearer sense of what was involved, which had helped them to define their vision more effectively, and also articulate it to others. For one participant this was important for the generation of a more challenging and inspiring, and also realistic and achievable, vision. Another felt that it would simply make their vision more achievable.

Some individuals now felt more aware of the challenges relating to research leadership, the spectrum of leadership and management approaches, or the drivers for research across the sector. As a consequence, one felt that they now recognised the value of their personal contribution to the research agenda and also that of others. Another believed they understood better how to accommodate other researchers in higher quality REF submissions.

A number used the Programme as a framework for reflecting on and reviewing their own, their team’s, and/or their university’s visions. In some cases, they felt that this process reinforced or confirmed the appropriateness of the visions. As a result, they were reassured by the process. One participant felt that after attending the Programme, they now had the ability to plan for the future. By contrast, for another individual the process highlighted concerns over potential disparity between departmental, faculty and University visions, in particular over the extent to which research is valued across the institution.
4.3 Changes to ‘research aims’ as a result of the Programme

Most participants felt that their aims had changed. For some this was a matter of shifts in focus; others mentioned the alignment or degree of flexibility of their aims within their research context. As for ‘vision’, some of the benefits were in clarity and communication; several felt that they could now define and articulate their aims more effectively.

Several participants felt that their aims had broadened in focus, with a shift from individual to collegial orientation. One had extended their aims to encompass both the subject discipline and the department/institution; they now included enhancing the research community and recognising the value of their and other researchers’ output. Others had now incorporated the wider research agenda of the university or included a wider range of staff in the pursuit of a research active curriculum for taught programmes. One participant described ‘tailoring’ their aims more to a post-92 institution and developing a research culture within it. Elsewhere, the main gain was in the ability to align local with institutional aims.

A further group of participants felt that, due to the structures of their institution, they lacked some flexibility in defining their aims. Aims were described as being dictated primarily by institutional policies and strategic aims, and by government guidelines around the REF. As a result, some participants felt that their aims had not changed. Another participant who felt that their aims had remained constant wrote not in terms of personal aims but those of their department, research unit and/or institution (‘we have always had fairly clear aims, focussed on research excellence’). These answers raise an interesting question about how participants frame the extent to which research leaders can or should formulate and pursue individual aims.

Regardless of whether they felt that they had changed their aims or not, the evolution of better definitions and articulations for their aims were important in many cases. A number of respondents simply noted that they had better defined their aims without further explanations. However, one explained that the interactions and negotiations on the Programme had been important in developing better definitions, which in turn enabled a better articulation. As a result of developing these aims, their aims were reported to be more specific, measurable, and achievable.

4.4 Changes to ‘strategy’ as a result of the Programme

The vast majority of the respondents felt that their strategy had changed.

An increased sense of collegiality was expressed in various ways. These included a commitment to ‘involving key people’ both in developing and enacting the strategy, knowing ‘what to expect’ of others and oneself, and sharing and/or building on team experience and expertise. Working within institutional structures and involving individuals outside the immediate team was important for one participant. This appeared to operate both at a more abstract strategic level (e.g. in the development of ‘cognate themes’), and also at the practical level of negotiating committee structures.

Both enhancement of the clarity of the strategy itself, and the presence of a clear framework in which to consider, review and develop strategy, were important gains from the Programme. Improved understanding and articulation were mentioned by the majority of those who felt their strategy had changed (e.g. the ability to articulate aspects of strategy ‘unambiguously’). One participant wrote that the Programme had helped them to ‘develop in [their] way of thinking strategically’ to achieve their vision and aims, which had themselves
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changed. Another wrote about taking more practical issues into account in their strategy, such as ‘the need to focus resources strategically’ so that the strategy is more realistic and achievable.

Enhancements in managing the immediate working environment were important. Some participants wrote about feeling better able to work within ‘University and Faculty priorities’, while others were more aware of the need to make the most of their team’s diverse research interests, experience, and abilities within the context of their research unit. All of these comments were essentially about broadening strategy in one way or another.

This included the REF; however, the REF represented the sole driver of strategy for only one individual. For others, it was important to ‘create a positive pathway that takes us beyond REF’ and to ‘think beyond the blinkers of the REF to realise that this is a short-term milepost not an end in itself’.

Among the individuals who felt that their strategy had not changed, one wrote about a situation in which many of the potential positive outcomes of Programme participation (collegiality, clarity, as well as ways of supporting and developing research culture) had already been achieved in their unit. Interestingly this participant wrote in the second person, demonstrating their experience of the first of these values. Another participant who felt that their strategy had not changed nevertheless thought that it had ‘developed and evolved through the interaction and negotiation of the Programme’.

4.5 Changes to ‘approaches’ as a result of the Programme

Considering the extensive experience of research management among the participants, it was both reassuring and surprising that virtually all thought that their approaches had changed as a consequence of the Programme. Participants described changes both to their level of understanding and to their approach to operational matters, as well as to their perception of leadership and management in higher education.

Several reported an increased level of understanding. The Programme had provided the basis for one to ‘think about [their] role and approaches to that role’ and identify ‘[their] style’ not just in research, but in the wider context. A second stated that they felt ‘much more aware of the role’, enabling them to ‘feel more informed’. A third said that they could now ‘better understand the contribution I do/can make towards leadership and management’.

This knowledge and understanding were described as boosting confidence, improving decision making, and enabling one participant to ‘position [them]self more consciously’ in supporting research. There was a real sense of empowerment, where a better understanding of approaches has led to a greater self-belief. For at least one individual, the Programme had helped them reconsider their professional identity to include research leadership as a viable component.

At an operational level, many individuals reported a greater capacity to identify and use ‘drivers’ to influence and motivate others. One stated that this would make it easier to ‘deal with difficult individuals’, regardless of their position in university structures. Another felt it would help them to realise ways to ‘manage people upwards’ as well as within their team. One participant expressed a greater confidence in promoting their ideas as a consequence of the Programme; this was also described as the route to obtaining buy-in for a strategy.
Increased confidence in leading and managing research was also reported as an outcome of the development of leadership approaches.

The language used by some individuals in responses for this section itself revealed changing perceptions of leadership and management. This could be observed in the adoption of vocabulary associated with some of the leadership approaches introduced in the development Programme, which contrasted with traditional business management style approaches. One described the use of ‘positive attributes, to use integrity and ways to influence’ as ‘refreshing’. Another reported learning about approaches to ‘protecting’ research active staff, and thus enabling them to concentrate on generating research outputs, while another wrote about the use of ‘time dependent’ approaches to nurture the team. Using a framework explored on the Programme, one participant reported that they had started to ‘fall into the trap of being a little too instrumental / transactional’, and indicated that they were about to change their approach.

4.6 Perceived effect of changes resulting from the Programme

For practical reasons the ‘impact’ questionnaire was administered only three months after the conclusion of the Programme. As a result, participants felt that insufficient time had elapsed to allow them to judge the full impact of the resultant changes. However, the majority felt that they were having an effect, due to clearer strategic positioning and understanding of the leadership role, or because of a movement from an individual to a wider focus. A number of additional benefits were also listed.

A clearer strategic position had begun to inform the approaches of half the questionnaire respondents. For some, the effects were ‘largely in terms of the clarity of [their] thinking’ and the ability to ‘clarify [their] position and the different challenges, and therefore respond to the different areas more effectively.’ For others, the Programme had helped ‘consolidate [their] approach to the leadership and management of the research, and this has led to [them] being more effective in the role’.

Working with people was another area where benefits were felt. One participant stated that the Programme was ‘helping [them] to understand approaches to staff and roles within the strategy,’ and believed that they now knew ‘how to nurture the potential within the team and to fulfil the strengths and individual aims of staff that inform the institutional aims’.

A movement from individual to wider focus appeared to inform the approaches of the majority of these individuals. They expressed this in terms of more collegial or inclusive working, including the strategic development of their networks. One felt that their attitude to inclusion and diversity had changed. Another wrote about including ‘a wider number of current and potential stakeholders’, while another described ‘forging alliances with influential groups, colleagues and the unions for areas where I can see change is needed’. Some individuals felt that they had developed inter and intra -university networks as a direct consequence of attending this Programme.

The benefits of these changes included networking to remove the traditional departmental boundaries (as identified by one individual), greater enthusiasm for working in larger groups with mentoring and support, increased appreciation of the way that some leaders manage their activities, greater understanding of (or confidence in) team management, a new REF 2012 scoping exercise with a possible 2020 return, and the opportunity to gain formal recognition for a research group within an institution.
4.7 *Did participants think that they will have the opportunity to have an effect?*

It was important for many of the participants to have good opportunities within institutional structures for the articulation of their strategy. They also valued improved articulation of their strategy because this helped them to get their messages across to others. A number of possible effects were expressed as long or short term outcomes.

Participation in the Programme had helped some individuals to make full use of key strategic or operational positions which they held in their university, and also to gain the political support of others. One had been ‘invited to join two important research committees’ and felt that these gave ‘an additional venue to articulate the aims and ambitions of the group’. This individual also noted that other key people had taken up their cause to provide ‘valuable political support’. Another felt that ‘there are a great many political and environmental factors which impact on research and its value in a post-92 university’, and believed that it was ‘vital to have a clear and assured articulation of research, both within the University and externally, for current and future students, staff and other stakeholders’. This was seen as their responsibility. One individual felt that they would have an opportunity to have small ‘micro level’ effects, but would also be happy to support larger changes at their institution if it was desired. As a consequence of this development Programme, they believed that they would be more vocal at a strategic level, even when their message was not popular.

The vast majority felt they would be able have some impact. This was generally part of a long term strategy, of which the REF was mentioned as a part in a small number of cases. Potential impacts included developing a ‘more sustainable’ or ‘stronger’ research culture or environment, and broadening the local research agenda from a strong focus on publications to include ‘greater recognition to externally funded research income and external collaborations’. Mentoring others was also identified as a source of opportunities to have an effect that starts small, but could expand with time if it is valued.

Only one individual identified their effect as applying exclusively to the short term strategy of a better or stronger REF submission. They felt that the Programme had helped to develop their strategic thinking in this area, supporting strategic writing for the REF pilot exercise.

Additionally, it was reassuring to note that one person felt that ‘exchanging ideas and views’ during the Programme itself would have ‘long term impact on their leadership and team management’. Another individual’s recipe for developing a better research culture had been developed during the Programme to include valuing and protecting researchers, as well as providing ‘space’.

4.8 *Did more senior researchers perceive benefits from these individuals attending the development Programme?*

Four senior colleagues of participants provided statements about the perceived effects of the development Programme on a participant from their research unit. They all believed that the Programme had already generated a visible impact, even within the short time since its completion. They also described benefits for the individual both in knowledge development and a greater level of visible and desirable involvement in supporting the research agenda.

One senior colleague stated that the ‘impact of the research leadership course on [xxx] has been substantial’ and added that there was now a real ‘sense of leadership of their team in terms of research’. A second commented on the impact in terms of the desirable actions of the participant in a new research co-ordinator position for a subject discipline. A third viewed
Leadership Foundation: 2011 Small Development Project

Leading and managing research excellence in post-92 universities

Sponsored by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

...impact in terms of the development of an individual’s ‘longer term strategy which is more in-line with [their] colleagues’. The fourth said that the participant had ‘a renewed confidence in developing and working with team colleagues’. As a consequence, they felt that the impact would feed into their REF strategy and contribute to a stronger submission.

The majority believed the participants had a better understanding of research leadership in higher education as a consequence of this development Programme:

‘it is clear the participant understands and now places value on the strategic issues in research...compared with other staff members this participant is now much more aware of the significance of collaborative work in research, of the importance of supporting each other with tasks, of the significance of bidding for funding, of working across the various sub-groups of the department, of encouraging other staff in the team in their research.’

Others felt that participants had developed ‘a deeper knowledge’, or ‘wider insight into the issues relating to research leadership and the role of a research leader within a higher education institution’.

One manager felt that the participant now placed a higher priority on research related issues and saw their role as more strategic or collaborative. As a consequence, ‘... [xxx] voluntarily wrote an impact study for the REF on the work of their team which was really good and much appreciated’. This person was also responding to research related emails much more quickly than before, and leading on new materials in research seminars. The impact had also been visible at research meetings ‘where it is clear the participant understands and now places value on the strategic issues in research, on the significance of publication, on the importance of working as a team, of giving seminars, supporting others in their publication and in being aware of and working towards the REF criteria.’ Other senior managers mentioned ‘a renewed confidence in developing and working with team colleagues’, the development of ‘a longer term strategy which is more in-line with [their] colleagues’ and activities which included having ‘led on several bids [names of bids], worked closely with another staff member to consider the feasibility of [a subject discipline] REF submission (2014 and beyond) and maintains high level of scholarly activity’.

One senior colleague concluded: ‘I would like all the aspiring researchers in our teams to do this or similar courses to help them understand how research culture is created and facilitated and to understand their role in the longer term development of research in their department.’
5 Conclusion

It appears that this Programme has had a swift and dramatic impact on the strategic orientation and long-term vision of its participants, with benefits across the components of their research leadership roles. On the basis of feedback from participants and their senior colleagues after a relatively short period in which to apply learning from the course, it is reasonable to claim that long-term benefits will also be noticeable. Achievement of this level of positive impact is impressive, especially given the very wide range of participants’ leadership experience, which spanned twenty years and numerous subject disciplines.

We have not yet examined the specific reasons for the very high level of positive feedback and perceived impact of this Programme. However, we suggest that at least some of this arises from the ‘tailored’ nature of the Programme and the extensive design phase. In contrast to much of the other generic management training which is available to senior academic staff, the audit and focus groups allowed participants to identify their own development needs in response to their current research environment and culture. They were then provided with a full suite of development for these in one integrated programme.

Some very minor changes to the content and structure of the Programme will be made in light of the feedback. In the short term we plan to repeat the Programme so that it is available to other university research leaders in the region. An online toolkit will be provided so other HE institutions sector can replicate the process we followed and gain programmes which are specific to the needs of their staff and the environment within which they operate. We will also undertake further dissemination of project findings.
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The Steering Group members included members of research committees, central researcher support and researcher development teams, and senior research team leaders. This expertise allowed members to provide guidance in matters relating to the post-1992 strategic leadership context, including research governance and researcher issues such as equality and diversity, and to coordinate local activities in relation to conducting focus groups and providing the development Programme.
Appendix B: Biographical notes on presenters of the LMRE development Programme

Day 1 (morning): Expert in the assessment of impact, REF/RAE Lead

**Dr Jill Jameson** is Director of the Centre for Leadership and Enterprise Research, UoA Education REF/RAE Lead (2004-present), Reader in Education Research and Director of Research and Enterprise (2004-11) in the School of Education, University of Greenwich. Jill is Lead Guest Editor for the British Journal of Educational Technology (BJET) Special Issue (2012) on e-Learning and Leadership: BJET ranks 11/177 journals for education and educational research, with an Impact Factor of 2.139. A finalist for the Chartered Management Institute (CMI) Awards for 'Outstanding Leadership' (2011) for her work leading education research in the post-1992 HEI environment of Greenwich, Jill specialises in educational leadership, e-learning and post-compulsory education research. She leads the Education PhD/EdD programmes at Greenwich and is Chair of the Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) R&D Committee, an SRHE Council Member and was Chair of SRHE Annual Conference 2010. She is Co-Convenor of the BERA Post-Compulsory Education and Lifelong Learning Research Special Interest Group. Author of numerous publications, including five books and two book series in education, Jill is a Fellow of the Royal Society (FRSA), Fellow of the Chartered Management Institute (FCMI) and Fellow of the Institute for Learning (FiL), with a PhD and MA (KCL), MA (Cantab), MA (Goldsmith's), PGCE (Nottingham) and BA, PG Dip (UCT). Jill was the international Co-Chair of ALT-C 2008. Contact: j.jameson@gre.ac.uk

Day 1 (afternoon): Expert in creating and implementing post-1992 research plans

**Professor John MacIntyre PhD BSc FRSA MBCS CEng**. Dean for the Faculty of Applied Sciences and Pro-Vice Chancellor for Science, Technology, Research & the Regional Economy at the University of Sunderland. As Dean, John has overall responsibility for all aspects of the Faculty’s activities in the Departments of Computing, Engineering and Technology; Pharmacy, Health and Well-being; Psychology and Sport and Exercise Science. In each of these areas he leads a team of senior staff, developing and implementing strategies for teaching, research and external engagement. As PVC, John has responsibility for developing the University’s research plans, as well as our STEM activities, and the University’s contributions to city and regional economic development. John works closely with key partners to scope and implement our involvement in the Sunderland City Economic Masterplan, and a variety of initiatives such as the Regional Growth Fund, Technology and Innovation Centres, and Sunderland Software City.

In addition to the above Faculty roles, John has also been heavily involved in cross-University activities, particularly in the development of a framework for exploitation of University activity (for example, through IPR commercialization, or consultancy development).

John worked closely with the Regional Development Agency, ONE North East on the development of their Regional Economic Strategy, and worked closely with various regional bodies such as the Centre of Excellence in Life Science (CELS) and Newcastle Science City. John has collaborated with the RDA on the development of plans to support the automotive cluster, again leading to major funding developments, and was a founder member of the Strategy Group of NEPA (the North East Productivity Alliance), and the board of BII (Biosystems Informatics Institute). In addition, John is leading, together with Paul Callaghan of the Leighton Group, a major initiative to develop a software industry in Sunderland – Sunderland Software City.
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Day 2 (morning): Expert in academic identity

Professor Sue Clegg is Professor of Higher Educational Research, heads the Centre for Research into Higher Education, and is Director of Research Students at Leeds Metropolitan University. The research centre is a pan-university centre that supports the work of colleagues in the disciplines and professions and acts as a focus for HE research. Her personal research includes close-to-practice research, often in collaboration with practitioners, and theoretical work (e.g. on the social and pedagogical significance of the gendering of information technology, the use of information technologies in learning and teaching, and critique of the debate about the nature of ‘evidence-based’ practice). She has written about the importance of critical distance and work which scrutinises higher education as well as serving it. Recently she has taken apparently mundane pedagogical practices, such as those involved in personal development planning, and explored how these are understood by staff and students and reframed in policy discourse. She has written on academic identity as a gendered sense of self and drawn on her work on academic identities to deconstruct the dualism between teaching and research. She has also taken a critical look at institutional practices designed to improve teaching, analysing the rhetorical repertoire of learning and teaching strategies and exploring how these strategies are mediated in practice. She is editor of the journal Teaching in Higher Education and serves on the boards of Studies in Higher Education and Higher Education Quarterly.

Day 2. PM - Case study of combining RAE/REF in research strategy

Professor Robert J. Allison is Professor of Geography and Pro-Vice-Chancellor at the University of Sussex. Bob’s principal responsibility is to participate fully in the leadership and management of a research-intensive university, c. 2,200 staff, 3,500 postgraduates, 8,500 undergraduates and £180 million turnover, with accountability for two activities: strategy, planning & resources, and research, enterprise & innovation. Professor Allison is involved in a range of national and international bodies: he works closely with the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC). Bob has written over 100 scientific papers and a number of books. His research interests examine interactions between earth processes, landforms and material properties. Bob's research has been funded from many sources including the Natural Environment Research Council, The Royal Society, Nuffield Foundation and various industrial collaborators. Professor Allison has received the Jan De Ploey Prize (International Association of Geomorphologists), Charles Lyell Award (British Association for the Advancement of Science) and Cuthbert Peek Award (Royal Geographical Society), for his research.

Day 3: Expert in developing research leadership skills

Professor Richard Harding is Head of the Department of Leadership and Development at the University of Westminster and Professor of Organizational History. He has worked in organization development for over twenty years as a researcher, teacher and consultant. He has been School Research Director and until January 2011 he was Chair of the University’s Research Degrees Committee. He is currently working on the University’s Researcher Development Framework and is the academic lead for the University’s Change Academy initiative. During the course of his career Richard has been Director of the Management Development and Accreditation Centre at the University which specialized in creating and delivering bespoke leadership and development course of corporate clients. He was involved in the development of competency-based, performance assessed programmes as well as peer assessed self and organization development activities. He is currently researching the evolution of leadership theory and practice within navies.
Day 4 (morning): Expert in coaching/mentoring

Dr Angélique du Toit (University of Sunderland). As an academic Angélique is module leader for a number of modules at Masters and Doctoral levels. The modules include subjects in Human Resource Management as well as research philosophy and methods for both the MSc HRM students and the DBA. She also supervises research students on the Professional Doctorate and DBA. Her research interests focus particularly on coaching and adult learning. She is also a member of the corporate programme team and designs and delivers bespoke programmes to corporate clients.

Day 4 (afternoon): Cross university research leader with well-respected ‘authentic’ approach

Professor Peter Smith is Professor of Computing at the University of Sunderland. Peter joined the University as an undergraduate student in 1975 and received his Doctorate in Applied Mathematics in 1981. Since then he has held several teaching, research and management positions at the University. Peter has published over 200 papers on subjects within computing, engineering, mathematics, management and diversity, and has spoken at conferences throughout the world. He has supervised over 40 MPhil, PhD and DProf students and examined over 50 doctoral candidates at Universities in the UK, Ireland, Hong Kong and Spain. Peter has managed EU, research council, regional and industrial projects with total funding in excess of £1M. He is currently Programme Leader for the University Professional Doctorate programme and chair of the University Research Degrees Committee. Peter is a Fellow of the British Computer Society, the Higher Education Academy and the Royal Society of Arts.