

RePAH management board meeting

6th April 2006, HRI, Sheffield.

Present: Prof. M. Greengrass (MG), Prof. S. Brown (SB), Jared Bryson (JB), Robb Ross (RR)

1. Matter arising

None

2. Minutes of last meeting

MG now has the number of researchers within AHRC subject domains obtained from the last RAE.

Agreed: More one to one interviews are needed to augment the data already collected.

Action: JB to develop a list of potential interviewees for telephone interview. The report on this action only needs to give an overview on the conversation, but highlight any 'interesting language'.

Noted: Need to identify sub panels from the Peer Review College to whom we do not have current access.

Noted: If possible. any information concerning the 'cost benefit' of any actions or possible recommendations from the project should be identified and recorded.

3. Budget report

There is a significant underspend identified in the current travel budget.

Agreed: JB will organise more focus groups.

Agreed: Payment in the form of a £10 book token will be offered for anyone wishing to take part in a focus group.

Agreed: Past participants of focus groups (if they can be identified) to be sent a book token.

Action: RR to determine is transfer of funds for salaries has been arranged and completed.

4. Online questionnaire report

A brief discussion took place on the draft report RR produced and what further analysis was required

Action: RR to send MG full text of online questionnaire for the final report appendices.

Action: RR to present a breakdown of the 'other' section on page 8. He will also present a breakdown of this section by domain.

Action: All members of the committee to read report again and provide feedback to RR concerning any further analysis that may be required.

Action: RR to take down online questionnaire at the end of this month.

Action: MG to request heads of projects at Sheffield to complete questionnaire before the deadline above.

5. Delphi exercise report

A brief discussion took place on the draft report RR produced and what further analysis was required

Action: RR to expand upon reasons behind differing numbers of respondents in round 3. Also mention the numbers who were invited to take part in the whole exercise and the number that actually did.

Action: RR to expand conclusions and highlight respondents short term horizons.

Action: RR to expand upon how the ranking developed and what features were static/dynamic across the rounds.

Action: RR to expand upon whether the principle of this exercise was understood by the respondents.

Action: All - bibliographic references to be sent to JB for inclusion in the final reports references.

6. Website log analysis

Cannot fully update on this topic as Claire is not present.

Noted: Data received from Essex and sent to CIBER. No reply yet.

Action: JB to follow up on above point and contact CIBER.

Noted: No log data will be forthcoming from AHDS/Artifact as the data was not kept.

Noted: Reports from CIBER can be included in the final work package report.

The project will need to ensure that our data and log analysis is comparable with that of Humbul's published data. Overall, this section of the work is seen as not having a sufficient breadth of data from which to make any useful judgements. The final report should reflect who has actually contributed data to this part of the work.

Action: JB to begin writing the work package report and it completed by the end of May/beginning of June. He will request help from RR is required.

7. Focus groups/one to one interviews

JB set up focus groups and nearly all subject panels are now covered. Excellent feedback has been received and it appears to triangulate the outcomes from the Delphi and online questionnaire but with a finer level of detail. The demonstrators were very well received.

Noted: JB received feedback concerning the submission of CV information for some aspects of the demonstrator functionality. The consensus was that this would be difficult to achieve/maintain even for a UK based function; it most certainly wouldn't work within the wider European/US communities.

Agreed: JB to include his personal observation of the focus groups in order to capture the 'mood' of the group.

Action: JB to write draft report for next meeting.

8. Demonstrator development.

The demonstrators produce by Dave were used to highlight elements that were being discussed in the focus groups. They were very well received and prompted excellent feedback, especially the modular manner in which they were designed.

Noted: The project needs to identify what recommendations will be put in the report based on the triangulation of all three data collection methods. They will fall into long, medium and short term categories as well as being sub-categorised as ambitious or easily achievable/localised or centralised.

Noted: The report should identify where training opportunities would be required to enable researchers to use the available functionality from a proposed portal.

Action: RR to place the above item on the agenda for the next meeting

9. Work Package reports/final report

Noted: Reports on the bibliography and focus groups will be ready for the next meeting.

Agreed: Each chapter of the report will require a domain specific element that will highlight the differences/similarities of the chapter topic across the domains.

10. Dissemination

Action: MG to send the item about the project for the AHDS newsletter to the rest of the team within the next few days.

Noted: Poster for NCESS has been accepted.

Action: RR to find out what kind of 'poster' it will be – just a print, or will a presentation be necessary?

Agreed: SB's abstract for DRHA was accepted by all present as excellent.

Action: SB to find out if a poster can also be accepted by DRHA to try and elicit some feedback that may be incorporated into the final report. An abstract demonstrator could be used, supplemented by a piece of literature the delegate could take away and return later in the post with written feedback. If poster is accepted SB will write it up and submit to the rest of the project team.

11. Date of next meeting

Agreed: Next meeting will be on 2nd May and be held at DMU.

12. AOB

Action: RR to put a point on agenda for next meeting concerning the future of the website.

Agreed: The final report should be exported to .pdf format and put on RePAH site. We will also look into it being put on AHDS site.

Action: RR to organise final project board meeting for either the 18th or 19th of September.

Agreed: MG will have final report ready for 30th September