The Association of Commonwealth Universities

ACU Spotlight

Supporting research across the institution
The ACU Research, Knowledge and Information Community Study Tour

ACU RKI Community   May 2015

In connection with the launch of the ACU Research, Knowledge and Information (RKI) Community, the ACU organised a study tour for new members in South Africa, visiting the University of Pretoria (UP), the University of Johannesburg (UJ), and the University of the Witwatersrand (UW), to discuss their research management strategies, library structures, and the measures they are taking to overcome the pressures they each face. In May 2015 the ACU and delegates from Botswana, Nigeria, South Africa, the UK, and Zimbabwe came together to discuss their work and that of the three host institutions.

Key points

- *The impact of external actors and factors*

  It was noted that in South Africa external funders and governmental priorities have an overriding influence on the research strategies of the three host universities. This need not be seen as a negative influence.

- *Issues in interacting with researchers*

  Convincing researchers to comply with institutional policy or research manager / librarian requests can be difficult. However it is not necessarily the researcher who is to blame for this poor interaction, there are steps the supportive professional can take.

- *The benefits from cross campus collaborations*

  Staff in university libraries and research offices often have confused perceptions of the other, such misconceptions can block effective collaboration. More effective collaboration, through all aspects of each team's work, can lead to much more efficient processes and closer links with the research community.

Addressing the topic of how research can be supported by offices across the institution, the first ACU Research, Knowledge and Information (RKI) Community study tour sought to explore how the Research Office (RO) and the library could work together. Delegates explored the challenges of reaching a diverse research community of several hundred academics across an often expansive campus, whilst managing interactions with external stakeholders. The discussions throughout the tour revealed many similarities and contrasts in approach.

It should be noted that this report is necessarily skewed by the conditions facing South African universities, and so may not reflect a common experience throughout the Commonwealth. It is

hoped that it will provoke discussion within the ACU RKI Community.

The Research Office (RO)

Universities in South Africa are funded in large part by a subsidy provided by the South African government and the National Research Foundation (NRF) – South Africa's leading scientific body – based upon the number of research outputs produced by that institution. This is outlined in *The Policy And Procedures For Measurement Of Research Output Of Public*

Higher Education Institutions[1], 2003. A formula then awards points to institutions, depending on the type of publication – one point per publication. In cases of multiple authored papers, this point will be split equally between the institutions at which the authors work, so for a paper authored by researchers at two institutions, each university will receive half a point. A pre-defined level of funding per point is then paid to the claiming institution.

It was clear from the presentations that this method of funding research outputs strongly influences the focus of both the ROs and institutional policy. Each of the three universities described joint projects between the RO and the Library to compile a complete and accurate catalogue of the institution's research output. In the case of the UJ, any researcher who failed to advise the RO of their publications would be reported to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (DVC) to ensure that all publications are efficiently reported.

There were noted failings in this system, with one presenter suggesting it can make collaborations between institutions less attractive due to the point being shared. It was also reported that researchers often break one large project into a series of four or five smaller publications to benefit from the cumulative points. Negotiations were reportedly underway with the NRF to amend the system to reduce these complications.

Nevertheless, the institutions all found themselves bound to acting in a manner that results in the greatest financial reward for the university.

A focus on training

The ethos of supporting researchers is common amongst the three institutions, and was confirmed to exist in the institutions of the study tour delegates. Moreover there was a common approach, offering the researcher training rather than simply providing them with completed bid forms or managing their fundraising on their behalf. Each institution stated the belief that it was easier and more effective to build the capacity of research staff rather than attempting to directly assist each researcher when they needed support.

The idiom of not giving a man a fish, but teaching him to fish himself was repeatedly used throughout the group's visits.

Many training programmes are in operation in the three South African institutions. The UP's Graduate Support Hub, for example, works with young

researchers, Masters and PhD students, to train them in soft skills. These training programmes are delivered by academics when relevant, however there are some courses which are outsourced to training providers. The topics covered include:

- Structuring a dissertation
- Data analysis
- Research ethics and plagiarism
- Project management
- Conflict resolution – most often with their supervisors
- Time management

UW's RO offers similar training options, however these are augmented by the Postgraduate Office, which organises a series of events throughout the year, including:

- A number of three to five day writing retreats to actively support postgrads in completing their dissertations or theses
- A series of three-day symposia to develop the presentation skills of postgrads;
- A monthly workshop to build the skills of supervisors and develop the capacity of the research function of the institution

Funded by the RO these training programmes are proven to support the research output of the university.

Offering similar soft-skill training, UJ supplements these sessions with individual support and guidance through the bid application process. This is not to say that UJ was unique in offering dedicated, face-to-face support for individual researchers – each institution has a model for individual support, with each dedicating varying amounts of their staff resources to this task – UJ, however, was notably proactive in this regard.

UJ's Global Excellence Extension (GEE) programme is a R700 million drive to help the institution climb the global university league tables. The programme has a dedicated office and team, working to build the capacity of the relatively young institution:

- The university plans to employ more junior academics to alleviate the teaching pressure on the senior research staff.
- They also plan to employ more junior researchers and a number of established researchers on both a full-time and visiting basis. It is hoped the established researchers will not only conduct research on behalf of the institution, but that they will also contribute towards a strong academic environment, influencing their fellow researchers to great efforts.

On top of the GEE programme, UJ's RO has set up the 'Emerging Researcher' programme, to identify and encourage researchers, and their

---

[1] The Policy And Procedures For Measurement Of Research Output Of Public Higher Education Institutions, South African Government, June 2003 <http://www.dhet.gov.za/Policy%20and%20Developmen t%20Support/Policy%20and%20procedures%20for%20 measurement%20of%20Research%20output%20of%20 Public%20Higher%20Education%20Institutions.pdf> [accessed 19 August 2015]

students, who show potential and promise. Similarly they operate a programme to support struggling researchers to ensure that they do not languish.

The offices within the RO

Each institution has a central RO responsible for managing the research profile of the institution, developing capacity-building training programmes, ensuring quality fundraising activities, and a proactive and supported research community. In order to achieve these many and varied functions, each has developed a unique structure.

Each institution also showcased the work of their Tech-Transfer Office (TTO), working alongside the RO, dedicated to the promotion of patenting research outputs. UJ's presenters notably showcased the position their TTO has within the university, with a distinct identity for the TTO team, including a professionally designed brand and logo. As with the ROs, the TTOs supported a very active approach to engaging with researchers from the earliest moment, ensuring considerations as to how research outputs could be used are factored into every stage of the research work, rather than being a reluctant consideration at the end of the project.

Both UP and UJ reported that their TTO officers deal with contract negotiations, often bringing in the central university lawyers for specialist support. UW differed in this regard by creating a dedicated legal contracts office (currently employing only one lawyer) to ensure research contracts received priority and dedicated support. Similarly, the patent protection is undertaken by a wholly owned subsidiary of UW; Wits Enterprise.

It was also clear how important younger researchers are to the three institutions. Both UP and UW housed their post-graduate offices within the RO - making a clear statement about their intentions to support and foster the research work of the students based at the university. Extending this level of support beyond the student body and the early careers academics, UJ has recently opened the Johannesburg Institute for Advanced Study (JIAS); a joint venture with the Nanyang Technological University (NTU) in Singapore. JIAS is a residence for established researchers to concentrate on their academic projects without, what is often perceived as, interference from the university administration. Just as was stated by UP's Graduate Support Hub, the JIAS hopes to establish a collegiate atmosphere, encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration, fresh perspectives and interactions that ultimately benefit the university's research work.

All efforts, regardless of the RO's structure, are concentrated on building the research capacity of the institution. Whilst some offer more direct, one-to-one support at different stages of the research process, the three institutions favour the advancement of soft-skills within the research community rather than direct support work.

The Library

The university library has long sat at the heart of any institution, it is impossible to imagine a university without its library. Whilst the functions of the library are often changing, diversifying and developing, their traditional responsibility - to ensure research staff and students at the institution have access to the most relevant and up-to-date academic research output - will always remain at the heart of the academic library.

Compiling all research outputs from within the institution, coupled with ensuring the availability and accessibility of existing and recently created research outputs, presents a challenge which academic libraries have faced since their creation. Only now they also face new challenges, brought along by changing approaches to higher education, technical requirements of academic researchers and expectations of students.

Modernisation

In response to the requirements of funding councils, libraries are increasingly required to store and catalogue all research data alongside the research outputs. The benefits of Big Data for an institution - having a searchable, standardised catalogue of research data and outputs - are tempered by the challenges in facilitating this universal access. University libraries face an immense technological challenge that they are largely unsupported in facing, both in terms of the skills to curate such an online catalogue and the funding needed to build the necessary storage.

In addition to this, both UP and UW mentioned their work on digitisation projects; the latter stating the unforeseen and often misunderstood difficulties notably in inputting the meta-data. It is often believed that untrained staff can process the digitisation work alongside their normal duties, however (as with the cataloguing of a research data archive) it proves to be a more complicated process than many university leaders assume. Consequently this leads to a shortage in funding for digitisation of valuable archival materials. UW gradually embracing the digitisation project, investing heavily in commercial-standard scanners, but is facing challenges in sourcing the funding for the associated staffing requirements to adequately catalogue the scanned files.

In other modernisation drives, each university is adapting to the contemporary methods of providing access to research publications differently. The UJ library has implemented a policy of no longer purchasing any hard copies of publications where an electronic copy can be bought. All UJ students are expected to have a 'device' - a tablet computer

or e-reader. If they cannot afford to buy one, the university will provide financial support. Similarly, UP has largely removed its physical research collections, favouring a strong ICT infrastructure and a supportive research commons structure.

Finally, UP proudly showcased their innovative 'MakerSpace', an area within the library for students to utilise new technologies to explore their work. Features include electronic engineering equipment, a 3D scanner with 3D printer, and conference facilities to encourage collaborative work amongst students. 'MakerSpaces' are being adopted by libraries across the world, however UP's is the first such facility on the African continent.

Open access

Despite their slight differences each institution is highly supportive of the open access agenda, and all have an open access catalogue of institutional research, including postgraduate dissertations and theses. These open access catalogues, which are open to researchers all over the world, are maintained separately from the catalogues of electronic, subscription-only journals

In spite of the enthusiasm shown by the library staff and those within the RO, it was noted that the researchers are not always cooperative. The traditional model of publishing your research work within highly respected journals (closed access, subscription based) is still viewed as the best way to develop an academic career. The idea of publishing your work in a truly open access catalogue potentially reduces interest from the respected academic journals - who base their business models on selling access to research - and is consequently unpopular amongst the research community.

This conflict has been simplified for each library by the implementation of university-wide policies requiring researchers to submit their research outputs to the libraries for the internal catalogue (Nb. to circumvent potential copyright issues with publishers who later print the final copy of the research, these catalogues often collect 'pre-publication draft' copies rather than the final article). This catalogue is then shared with the RO to support the application for the governmental subsidy. Despite the apparently coercive nature of the policies they have not been received entirely negatively by the researchers - indeed the UP library reported a much greater level of cooperation than before the policy was issued.

Research commons

The libraries also work to provide free and flexible learning spaces for students and researchers, where they can focus on their work, access all necessary and relevant materials and ultimately write their theses. Established researchers can

access what they need from their desks, while post-graduate students are supported by a physical Research Commons facility. UP exhibited notable pride in its Research Commons' peaceful environment, UJ on its 24-hour access and quiet study areas, and UW on the availability of subject specialists.

UW differs from the other two universities in that it houses its many libraries within the various faculties. Though it was noted that this can lead to duplication of efforts, both UP and UJ favour larger, central or 'main' libraries with senior postgraduate students from various disciplines being based within them to support their students' work.

UP's library team explained the benefits of working so closely with the academic research community; such proximity affords greater understanding of their needs and how to provide clearer and better targeted support. The library also conducts regular surveys to ascertain the training needs of the students. The Research Commons itself goes someway to providing that support, with the researchers themselves providing a collegiate, supportive atmosphere and helping one another.

UJ was applauded for its library's support of disadvantaged students, who make up a large number of the university's population. The entire library system had been designed with the support of disadvantaged students in mind. The additional support offered was viewed as refreshing and a welcome response to the university's environment, with suggestions that such considerations could be extended to consider the practical impact of all research support policies and provisions on the wider student body and research community.

Innovation

Innovation is a key part of each institutions' strategies. Indeed, each institution made a major presentation on the TTO. These teams work alongside the RO to ensure academic outputs can be of practical use to society and industry. All three institutions have a focus on registering patents – with patents being seen as a measurable unit of innovation.

Promoting innovation

Despite differences in focus, the question of how to support and promote innovation amongst the academic research community was raised by each institution. It was generally acknowledged that it was important to differentiate between promotion of innovation and the generation of income for the university. Each university explained they prioritised the societal and practical relevance of a researcher's work over any funding that could be raised. The process of registering the patent ensures that the university is accurately recognised for the role it played in supporting the

research process, both in terms of training and the provision of equipment and research environment.

As an example, UW showcased a cheap calibration system for a blood sampling machine used throughout the South African health system. The research originated from a request made by the South African health department for an affordable calibration system. The cards were cheap to produce and sold at a low price to encourage public hospitals to implement the technology. Though not a profitable enterprise, the team at UW presented this as a massive success story for the university, showing how the technology would have a positive impact for the community, rather than for the university's finances.

It was also noted that researchers can still take some convincing about the need to patent their work, or indeed to engage with the TTO at all. UJ spoke of how tech-transfer is most often seen as an afterthought of the research process. Research was conducted - and only when it was considered that there might be a practical, patentable potential - did the researcher contact the TTO. This delayed approach often causes issues with external funders, bringing to light (in some cases) previously signed contracts that promised the returns of patents to the funder rather than the university.

Ambassadors

To encourage the idea that tech-transfer should not just be an afterthought for researchers, the three TTOs have been working with engaged academics within their various academic faculties. As an 'innovation ambassador', (each institution has a different title, with 'innovation champions' and 'innovation scouts' also used) academics who are familiar with the TTOs, and understand the benefit of working with their staff, are given training and support to work with colleagues in their own departments to ensure that tech-transfer is considered from the very beginning of the research process.

The host institutions reported that the use of 'innovation ambassadors' is a very effective model for interacting with academics given the inherent suspicion of university administrators and the traditional language surrounding tech-transfer. The team at UW are attempting to change the terminology used throughout the university, moving away from discussions of 'third stream income' towards discussion of 'potential funding' for academics - suggesting that tech-transfer work will benefit the researcher rather than the institution. TTO teams found that visiting faculties to discuss ongoing research work led to academics assuming they were agents of the university attempting to claim the benefits of the researchers' work and extract profit from it. Speaking the same technical language as the researchers means the

'innovation ambassadors' can better understand the research work: providing faster, more comprehensive, less frustrating conversations than with non-academic staff. The ambassadors will be able to suggest modifications to the research work that would make the end result more effective or patentable without appearing to be purely motivated by profit. Building this direct relationship encourages trust amongst academic staff as well as with the TTO staff.

Institutional policies

Another complementary approach to that of the Innovation Ambassador, is the implementation of institutional policies on innovation. It was suggested by UP that the implementation of a policy requiring academics to report all research to the RO resulted in a much greater understanding of the role of the research office, and there was a reduction in unreported research outputs. Through robust and clear institution-wide policies, researchers are given greater clarity of their responsibilities and potential reward in engaging with the RO, TTO and libraries.

Intellectual property (IP)

South African law, under the Intellectual Property Rights from Publicly Financed Research and Development Act 2008, gives ownership of the intellectual property of any research produced on site to the university. Each institution has their own policy which details how this is operated and can be used in any contract dispute with the researcher or external body that has provided funds and/or facilities. Nevertheless, each institution reported disputes with funders over ownership of the IP, and discussed their approaches to mitigating such conflict.

UP includes a provision within the student contract, signed by all students when they register to study at the institution, that all IP is ultimately owned by UP. This supersedes any other agreement that may be made by the student or researcher. Nevertheless, researchers will often fail to understand the legal implications of working at the university, and will enter agreements with funders without first checking with the university.

UP estimates each dispute can take between six and 12 months to settle. UW hired a dedicated university lawyer to clear the number of conflicting IP claims, suggesting there were over 300 disputes each year. UP has created a standard formula to share ownership, and thereby profit, of an IP between the institution and the researcher, where UJ assumes total ownership.

Such complexity can cause undue delays to publication, filing patents and ensuring the effective use of research outputs. Clarity through university policy has reduced the prevalence of such conflicts, however they do still persist.

Impact

All three institutions measure innovation by counting patents.

When asked by the delegates on the tour about how this approach may rely too heavily on market forces to guide the research programme, UP reported that they are working on a concept note to help ensure researchers are justly rewarded and incentivised. By introducing relevant key performance indicators in their contracts, this encourages them to pursue research that will have a positive impact on society.

It was noted, however, that measuring the impact of research is complex. Discussions around the end product of the research process focussed on patents and licenses – rather than on communicating these outputs with the public, affecting policy or ensuring innovative solutions to society's problems. When the dissemination of research outputs was raised, one institution stated that communicating research outcomes was handled by the marketing team who uploaded news to the institution's website and produced an annual report. Similarly, there was little suggestion of including the wider community within the research process, bar one example of a funder suggesting a community actor be co-lead researcher which was not positively received by the lead academic researcher.

UJ suggested a slightly alternative attitude to tracking the impact of research. One of the key objectives of their Global Excellence Extension programme is to increase the number of citations that each paper receives. This definition of impact - the impact that research has upon the wider *academic* community rather than wider society - is not the traditional form but arguably remains valid. Fuelling the academic pursuit of knowledge, through the contribution of new research or debates, is arguably a core aim of universities. Equally, the impact research has on society can be said to be indirect: research that references or builds upon research conducted at UJ may have a great impact on society, and the contribution made by the original paper should not be ignored or remain uncredited.

Nevertheless it was clear that performing a service to wider society is important to the three institutions, each explained how they hoped to track societal impact to a much clearer degree once they had developed sufficient systems and metrics for tracking impact on the academic community. This is something that is being debated by those who compile the university league tables, university membership bodies and by individual institutions around the world. The enthusiasm evidenced by the South African universities is certainly not unusual.

Conclusions

During the group discussion, conducted after the three visits, it was noted that the three institutions were reporting on work conducted under a specific national context. South African universities are all undertaking a process of 'transformation' to update and modernise their processes. This is true for the relatively new institutions like UJ – formed in 2005 after a merger of three existing universities – and the more established institutions like UW – founded in 1896.

Despite the impact that the South African system has upon the actions of the researchers, the ROs and the libraries, there were a number of observations which can summarise the challenges that South African universities currently face. In understanding these challenges we can begin to overcome them, through ensuring the appropriate skills needs are met and funding requirements are adequately understood and factored into institutional planning.

These challenges can be categorised briefly as:
1. Embrace external drivers to affect and encourage positive change
2. Employ targeted and personal interaction with academics
3. Improve collaboration between RO and library teams to find creative solutions

1. Impact of environmental conditions

As mentioned above; context is important. The impact of outside forces was frequently debated in the sessions. Those funding the research (namely the South African government in the case of the three host institutions) have the ultimate decision making power. The government's policy of rewarding an institution according to the number of research outputs has forced all South African institutions to be extremely methodical in mapping their research outputs, diverting resources to concentrate on this one task.

This external influence on institutions extends to the mapping process itself. The most frequently referenced method for tracking research output was the Thomson Reuters' catalogue, rather than any internal measurement.

Whilst this kind of involvement on the part of the government is often criticised – with the autonomy of the institution seen as paramount – some institutions have a more positive attitude, external influences can be seen to deliver a 'wake-up call' to institutions. Universities often view themselves as divorced from society and capable of managing their own affairs, however they will need to evolve alongside the changing requirements of the society in which they are based.

External funding is necessary to continue the academic process, the university system cannot

fund all research based on income from student fees, and requirements will be put on researchers in order to justify that funding. As the attitudes and priorities of researchers and funders alike adapt to the world outside the university, so the university must prepare and protect itself through the adoption of institutional policies. It was argued that without external influences, policies that professionalise and streamline much of the RO and library's core functions would not be formed.

As such, the requirements of external funders need not be seen as a negative chain around the neck of ROs and libraries, moreover it should be seen as an opportunity to adapt. Not all the requirements made by funders will truly reflect the attitude of society, or allow for valuable, long-term research, however they should not be dismissed off hand as unwelcome incursions on the academic freedom of an institution.

2. Interacting with researchers, sharing the blame

During the presentations from the three host institutions, it was noted that talking to academics can be difficult. The scale of the task facing ROs and libraries is huge – there are often hundreds of academics and scores of funding opportunities, each with their own requirements that need to be effectively communicated. Meaningful interaction with all academics is almost impossible. UP noted this difficulty, stating that any kind of successful interaction between administrator and academic must be seen as a positive result, regardless of how many academics are reached.

A personal relationship is important. Emails are often ignored. Being able to attribute that name to a specific, supportive person will mean the academic is more likely to consider the content of the email.

However it is not possible to provide a consistent level of support to the entire research community within an institution. Efforts are better placed in providing selective support where necessary and focussing efforts and resources on training the community to support itself. The idiom of teaching a man to fish rather than handing him a fish was frequently invoked; it is the role of the RO and library to help the academics to help themselves rather than do the work for them.

Each institution offers a number of training sessions, delivered by the RO and library, often in collaboration with one another, to support academics. A number of innovative models were discussed, from writing retreats for research students to soft-skills courses for early-career academics, each team proudly described the levels of success each session was having.

Evidently, a clear and simple university policy can prove to be effective in ensuring compliance

between the researcher and an institution's support staff. Similarly, according to the hosts and comments made by delegates, including a requirement to report all publications, or the need to consider patents, within an academic's appraisal encourages their compliance.

Furthermore, it was suggested that the use of bibliometric analytics, compiled by all three host institutions' library teams, during an academic's promotion or appraisal review could encourage academics to produce more high quality research. However, this use of the metaphorical stick was not the preferred method of interacting with academics. Developing the research management skills of researchers should be complemented by ensuring that they will voluntarily comply with university policies, rather than needing to be coerced by management.

Indeed, rather than forcing academics to work with administrative teams, it was suggested by both host institution and delegate alike that administrative staff should demonstrate to the researcher why it's in their interest to work with them. Each institution either stressed the potential funding that working with the RO could attract, or appealed to the academics' philanthropic side by pointing out how their research could be adjusted to the benefit of society.

This is best done through forming a personal relationship. In doing so with a few researchers, these few can spread the word and encourage their fellow researchers to attend training sessions and report their research outputs earlier along in the process. Indeed, the use of 'innovation ambassador' was mentioned by many delegates as something they would seek to implement.

3. Cross-campus collaborations

The central theme of the tour was to explore the interactions and interrelations between the RO and the library. Though discussions expanded to explore many other challenges and pressures faced by the three institutions, it was clear that the role of the library, and the opportunity for true collaboration (rather than ad hoc projects) was frequently misunderstood and overlooked.

The 'traditional' function of the library, to ensure research staff and students have access to the most relevant and up-to-date academic research output, overlaps with the reported focus of the South African universities' RO. Actively providing access to knowledge resources for researchers in their varied academic specialities, and accurately cataloguing the research output of the university's research staff is key.

In spite of this, libraries are often contacted only when a specific service is required rather than forming a lasting and collaborative relationship. Much as the ROs or TTOs decried their functions

being seen as little more than an 'add-on' to the research process, so the functions of the library were often seen as 'add-ons' to the research support process. In viewing the repositories, visiting the research commons and discussing their training programmes and bibliometric expertise, it became clear to the delegates - and, at times, to the hosts themselves - that libraries were more than the sum of their presumed parts. The few instances of cooperation, such as the sessions held by UP's librarian and contracts office staff, remain limited in their scope.

One suggested solution was to align the reporting structures. UJ position their RO, postgraduate office, libraries and TTO all under the remit of the same Deputy Vice Chancellor, and reported a greater level of common understanding and cooperation. This suggestion was tempered by some delegates who suggested this may not be a cure-all solution, however it was acknowledged that it may assist.

Indeed it may be that the library and RO teams simply need to interact regularly, either formally or informally, to discuss their work, challenges and respective expertise to find cooperative solutions. The specific nature and systems necessary to facilitate this greater level of interaction varies between institutions, however many delegates enthusiastically acknowledged the potential benefits that closer cooperation could bring.

The tour was the first of many planned activities for the ACU RKI Community, designed to explore the work of member institutions and discuss how solutions could be adapted and adopted by fellow ACU members. Discussions followed a central theme - that of exploring the opportunities for ROs and libraries to collaborate - but each host institution was invited to showcase creative solutions to their individual challenges and some of their more innovative work.

Overall the delegates reported a keen interest in the inventive approaches to foster collaboration between the RO/library staff and the academic researcher community, but also amongst both the supportive professions themselves. As one delegate reported, the tour enabled the delegates to think strategically and encourage them to '*strengthen the relationship between research support professionals for the benefit of research more broadly'*.

To find out more, contact:

Neil Johnson
Member Engagement Coordinator
rki@acu.ac.uk

The Association of Commonwealth Universities

Woburn House, 20-24 Tavistock Square
London WC1H 9HF, UK
www.acu.ac.uk