The NCCPE and British Council Japan hosted a networking lunch in Bristol which brought together a group of staff working in research administration, knowledge exchange and public engagement in Japan with a group of researchers and public engagement experts from the UK.

AGENDA

12:45-13:00: Welcome and context setting: Paul Manners, NCCPE and Azusa Tanaka, British Council Japan

13:00-13:30: Presentation from Dr Takagi from Hokkaido University about PE in Japan followed by Q&A

13:30-14:15: Table discussions

14:15-14:30: Plenary feedback

A full list of delegates in included in appendix 1

INTRODUCTION

Azusa Tanaka (Head of Education, British Council Japan) provided the context for the event. She explained why the British Council was sponsoring the visit. The overall objective of the British Council was to strengthen the links between the higher education sectors in the UK and Japan; in seeking to do so, it had mapped out the areas of potential mutual interest. One of the things the British Council had wanted to support was the creation of a more systematic dialogue on the theme of public engagement between the two countries. The challenges of the 21st century were global; in order to provide solutions to those challenges, researchers needed to go beyond national boundaries. The British Council saw research managers and administrators as the people who could link their universities with overseas researchers and institutions. Last year, the British Council had organised an international conference on public engagement, which Mr Manners had attended along with Sir Steve Smith, the Vice Chancellor of the University of Exeter, the conclusion of which had been that this agenda was extremely relevant and that the two countries should be working to address the challenges together.
THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

In the UK, the agenda of public engagement had been being discussed for a number of years and the UK had a more coordinated approach. In Japan, although universities had been organising a lot of public engagement activities, they was not yet a national engagement agenda. The question, therefore, was who should play the role of facilitating discussion between the two countries on this subject. One of the conclusions of the 2013 conference had been an agreement to investigate whether university research development offices could be the appropriate people to link universities with stakeholders in society and to facilitate international discussion between universities.

POTENTIAL AVENUES OF COLLABORATION

In the course of thinking about potential Japan-UK collaboration in this area, the British Council had interviewed a lot of people and discussed with them how to achieve this. Some of the ideas that had emerged from these discussions had been:

- To organise policy dialogues in order to develop understanding of the contexts and the challenges in the two countries and of how university researchers could contribute to improving society.

- To organise exchange programmes between the two countries. The concept of public engagement professionals was new in both countries; arranging for British public engagement managers to visit Japan and vice versa could facilitate understanding and the sharing of refreshing views about what public engagement work should look like.

- To have a more proactive approach to public engagement work, for example by creating shared evaluation toolkits between the two countries. The UK had an established approach to evaluating public engagement work; testing the NCCPE's evaluation matrix in the Japanese context was something to consider.
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Dr Yuki Takagi
Research Administrator, Task Force for Research Strategy, Hokkaido University

JAPANESE CONTEXT FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Dr Takagi explained that she had done some research on public engagement in the UK and had discovered that the situation in the UK was similar to that in Japan. Japanese universities faced pressures from society, in the shape of two independent demands. Society demanded:

- Evidence to show publicly-funded institutions were contributing to society.
- Universities to act as a source of innovation to boost the economy.

In this context, ensuring society's understanding of universities’ activities was essential.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Common public engagement activities traditionally included:

- Industry-academia collaboration.
- Open campuses.
- Public lectures.
- Science communication events.

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT

As Ms Tanaka had explained, there were no coordinated activities by the Japanese Government on public engagement; however, the Government had supported several initiatives to promote public engagement activities. For example, in 2004, special coordination funds for the promotion of science and technology had been allocated to promote the communication of science, while in 2010 the Cabinet Office had released a statement aimed at enhancing public dialogue on science and technology. In 2014, the Global Science Campus initiative had been established to strengthen the relationships between high schools and universities.

CURRENT TRENDS IN PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

A wider variety of public engagement activities were now being undertaken by universities, including student-industry collaboration, student collaboration with local communities, and school-university collaboration. Students were now the main actors in public engagement activity in Japan, whereas faculty had traditionally led such activities. In addition, there was
more focus on the importance of the public's view in industry-academia collaboration, as exemplified by the Centre of Innovation (COI) initiative established in 2013, which aimed at encouraging social innovation and required the embedding of the public's view in industry-academia collaboration. Some universities had also established an institutional unit that specialised in public engagement with communities.

**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AT HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY**

**ABOUT HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY**

Hokkaido is located in the northernmost part of Japan; the institution is the only comprehensive university in the region. Earlier in 2014, Hokkaido University had set its future strategic plan, in which it had stated its mission as ‘contributing toward the resolution of global issues’. Public engagement was therefore an important aspect of the institution’s activities.

**FLAGSHIP PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT INITIATIVES**

The Communication in Science and Technology Education and Research Programme (CoSTEP) had been established in 2004. It provided an education programme for science communication; it was the only continuing education programme open to everyone, and was very popular. CoSTEP acted as the implementation unit for science communication; it organised many science communication events, such as science cafes and open lectures.

While CoSTEP disseminated information about the university’s activities to the public, the Future Oriented Public Dialogue, which had been established in 2013, sought to incorporate the views of the public into those activities. The latter initiative organised meetings in three regions within Hokkaido; after speaking to each region, they picked a theme important to that region and then brought faculty who could offer expert advice on that theme together with local residents and gave them the opportunity to communicate with one another. This allowed the faculty to realise the connection between their research and what was going on in society; faculty had fed back positively about the mutual benefits.

**CHALLENGES**

Hokkaido University faced the following challenges in its public engagement activities:

- Most of the current activities were implemented independently and separately, making it difficult to evaluate whether the activities were being conducted efficiently and effectively.
There was a lack of resource. The institution had received an external grant to run its Future Oriented Public Dialogue in 2013, but did not have external funds to run it in 2014.

Public Engagement activities lacked an international aspect. Since the university’s mission was to contribute to the resolution of global issues, it wanted to introduce an international aspect to its activities.

**THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS IN PROMOTING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

University research administrators could:

- Plan and establish the platform for public engagement activities.
- Enhance culture change.
- Plan and implement international activities. Hokkaido had secured an international public engagement grant that would allow it to extend its Future Oriented Public Dialogue to Finland in November.

**FEEDBACK AND QUESTIONS**

Mr Manners invited participants to reflect as small groups on the presentation before reporting back on any things they had found surprising or asking any questions that had occurred to them.

Ms Duncan reported that her group had reflected that, when developing new ways of engaging with the public, it was tempting to choose the ‘easy’ approaches such as giving lectures rather than to engage in a dialogue. They had therefore been surprised that one of the first things Hokkaido University had thought about when starting its public engagement work had been to do a two-way dialogue.

Lucy Williams commented that it was comforting to hear that the issues facing universities in Japan were the same issues UK institutions were dealing with, in particular in terms of proving their value to society.

Dee Smart had been impressed by the international aspect of Hokkaido’s public engagement ambition. She felt the UK was disseminating best practice across the country but was not thinking about international aspects of public engagement. Lisa Mooney added that festivals could provide a good platform for neutral engagement with wider communities and might also bring economic benefits.

Ms Mooney also noted that there was a heavy emphasis on science in documentation relating to public engagement, but many people talked about engagement in terms of societal
impacts and working closely with communities. She asked what the place of the arts and humanities was in Japan. Dr Takagi explained that public engagement activities in those fields were currently very limited; most of the activities were in the field of science. There were, however, big opportunities to integrate other subjects into public engagement. Ms Mooney suggested there were some good models in the UK of how the humanities were perceived and how they evidenced their role in public engagement. For example, these disciplines sought to co-design research with scientists to ensure it contained societal impact. Mr Manners commented that in the UK public engagement felt different depending on which discipline one approached it from; there were therefore opportunities for disciplines to learn from one another.

Ms Duncan asked Dr Takagi to elaborate on the international aspect of public engagement at Hokkaido University. Dr Takagi explained that there had been big financial incentives for extending the Future Oriented Public Dialogue. The project was associated with the COI project. Many academics had been sceptical before the initiative had begun; however, professors had found that the dialogue had exposed them to different views. She provided the example of a meeting they had held at a remote site of the university, which was located in a region in which the population was ageing and young people were leaving. Before the meeting, academics had assumed that people living in that region hoped to sustain their society; however, they had discovered that people were not interested in sustaining the region but rather wanted their children to have a better life and to leave the region. With regard to the international opportunity, Dr Takagi explained that Hokkaido University had a sister institute in Finland; the university had had a relationship with Finnish universities for the past eight years. There was a particularly strong connection between professors in the service management departments of the two universities and the Finnish professor had proposed having a future dialogue in this area.

BREAKOUT SESSION

Mr Manners provided participants with three questions to discuss in their small groups. Following their discussions, the groups reported back on the answers they had reached.

WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES OF EMBEDDING SUPPORT FOR PE WITHIN UNIVERSITIES? HOW ARE THEY BEING ADDRESSED IN OUR DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS?

The first table cited resources as a key challenge, in particular emphasising pressures on staff time. Academics were being encouraged to engage with the public but also had to find time to perform more traditional tasks such as publishing papers, writing books and teaching. The group also identified a challenge in that many smaller institutions in the UK outside the Russell Group did not invest in research support staff with PhDs or research experience,
meaning that they tended to focus on financial tasks rather than on assisting academics with their research activities.

The second table had discussed the challenge of motivating academics and encouraging them to engage with the public. They had also talked about the importance of leadership and university strategy; unless public engagement workers were contributing to achieve a university's goals, it would be a waste of money and time.

The third group observed that a minority of academics believed that universities should be objective bystanders of society rather than engaged with it; there was a challenge associated with trying to change that mindset. The group also considered early-career researchers to be very important; creating a culture in which those researchers could gain the skills and experience of engagement was therefore important, in order to equip them to be the academics generating impact in the future. As a caveat, it was also necessary to ensure researchers were internationally employable; as other countries did not care about engagement, researchers should not be sent too far down that route at the expense of making them employable researchers.

The fourth table had debated what to call 'engagement'. Trying to talk too precisely about public engagement had the consequence of shutting down lots of opportunities to think creatively. The group had therefore argued that it was more appropriate to talk about the 'engaged scholar' and to go on to think about the different kinds of engagement they undertook with different kinds of people outside the university.

**WHAT PARTICULAR CONTRIBUTION CAN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS MAKE? WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT HOW THEIR ROLES NEED TO EVOLVE TO CAPITALISE ON THE OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN THIS AREA?**

The fourth group had discussed whether the people labelled ‘research administrators’ were in fact research administrators. Most of the people in the group had said they were not, because research administrators managed grants and the relationships with research councils; they had argued that they were ‘professional services' who supported academics to do their work, and found that a more comfortable framing. The table also discussed the extent to which they did the work for the researchers and the extent to which they supported researchers. The boundaries between administrators, professional services and researchers required more thought.

Table 3 considered research administrators to be very important but believed there was a role – which may be termed ‘professional services’ – that sat in the space between research administration and research. Those people had a particular set of skills to understand how to animate engagement for the benefit of research and society. The group had also discussed team collaboration, which was a key concept in Japan and was important in generating
thoughtful engagement. Finally, they had reflected that some academics did not think of themselves as members of the public.

The second group had also discussed the lack of clarity in the definition of research administrators; they had considered how to more clearly define the role, as well as how to empower it by working with bodies like the NCCPE and the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) to provide clarity to universities about the different models of administration. They also considered that research administrators could be in a good position to understand what was going on at the policy level and within funding organisations; they were therefore the people who could tell researchers about opportunities and how they could embed public engagement in their research.

The first table had discussed the idea that research administrators could understand why public engagement was important for researchers and act as advocates to influence the researchers. The group did not believe high-level ‘research managers’ were as valued in the UK as they were in Japan; in any exchange programme, Japanese research administrators could act to advocate the need for such leadership.

**WHAT OPPORTUNITIES ARE THERE FOR GREATER COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE UK AND JAPAN? WHAT MUTUAL BENEFIT MIGHT SUCH COLLABORATION SERVE?**

Ms Duncan reported that her group had discussed the need to be strategic at an institutional level about how engagement animated the organisational vision. She understood from Japanese colleagues that they were looking at developing capacity-building activities for researchers to engage with the public; in the UK, training had been developed to do that in different contexts, with different types and purposes of engagement and for different audiences. She suggested that some kind of exchange in which Japanese trainers visited the UK and vice versa could enable some sharing of the ways in which people in both countries worked to stimulate quality engagement. Ms Mooney commented that her institution was using ARMA money to do something similar with the Australian Technology Network.

Ms Tanaka believed that until now exchanges had been dependent upon the commitment on the part of individual universities and researchers to engage; there was a need to upgrade this to a national dialogue. She suggested a pot of money could be created to start such a dialogue, and that the British Council could speak to both Governments to address where there were opportunities to overcome challenges.

Mr Manners commented that his group had discussed the international reach of public engagement. He agreed that the UK had tended to focus on local and regional engagement. Framing public engagement as creating benefit and reach beyond the local and the regional could allow it to ‘catch a wave’ in higher education, as every university wanted to have global
reach. Thinking about how public engagement could be aligned intelligently with that international collaboration could be a powerful thing.

Professor Alan Winfield commented that in the field of robotics there were many research collaborations with Japan at the level of individual researchers and student exchanges. He suggested there may be an opportunity to add a layer of public engagement on top of that existing collaboration. Mr Manners reported that his group had also considered whether sufficient reflection and research was dedicated to the dynamics of engagement. They believed that whatever engagement one was doing, one should analyse what was going on and ensure it was rigorous, robust and evidence based.

Mr Saito mentioned the RENKEI initiative, in which the British Council, six UK universities and six Japanese universities had formed a platform for working groups to explore new forms of academia-industry collaboration. He suggested a similar consortium arrangement could be put in place for public engagement.

Mr Manners and Ms Tanaka thanked the UK guests for attending the session and committed to follow up on the afternoon’s discussions.

WRAP-UP DISCUSSION

Mr Manners asked the delegates for their views about what could be useful in terms of future work. Ms Tanaka observed that there were opportunities for dialogue at the national level. The Japanese Prime Minister had been in London on 1 May for a Japan-UK higher education conference, which had also been attended by the Presidents of 16 UK universities and 14 Japanese universities. At the conference, there had been a lot of discussion about the importance of research collaboration and student exchanges, and the Governments had agreed that they should support more in-depth collaborations. The British Council was now at the stage of coming up with proposals for what the future relationship could look like and for potential programmes and themes. Promoting research links was one important point on the agenda; some ideas for activities in this regard included staff exchanges, capacity building, and collaboration to address the public engagement agenda.

Mr Saito expressed an interest in the idea that had been advanced to utilise existing partnerships between the UK and Japan. He also observed that there had been discussion of the idea of using festivals to bring together different types of stakeholders and disciplines, although acknowledged that this would require some funding. Ms Duncan noted that there was an organisation called Universities UK (UUK), who had recently run Universities Week. The Government had wanted universities to collaborate on messages about how important universities were to the economy, which had led to the establishment of Universities Week; this year, for the first time, the NCCPE had succeeded in persuading UUK to run a public
engagement week rather than a marketing week, which had involved a large exhibition at the Natural History Museum in London as well as events run by individual universities. This could offer a good model for a festival covering a wider area of research than just one theme.

Mr Manners invited the delegates to comment on whether or not they considered public engagement as something important for Japan to push. Mr Yoshikawa believed public engagement was very important; however, it was necessary to go about it step by step. The UK had required four years to develop the concept of public engagement, and Japan had only just started its URA project. The most important thing currently was to permanently install a URA system in Japanese universities. Mr Yoshikawa added that URAs must understand the importance of public engagement and advise researchers of its importance. Universities should collaborate with one another in terms of URA and public engagement and, by going step by step, it may be possible for Japan to shorten the four years to two or three years.

Dr Mutoh was also convinced of the importance of public engagement. However, he agreed with the need for a step-by-step approach. Mr Manners asked whether the delegates had a sense of what those steps might be and who needed to be involved in them. Dr Mutoh said academics and URAs both needed to be involved, along with senior university leaders, such as a Vice President for Research. He added that such leaders may not currently be interested in public engagement; it would be necessary gradually to inform them of its importance and necessity in order to effect change.

Mr Manners suggested it was necessary to create a story about why public engagement was important. The term ‘public engagement’ was meaningless; it was necessary to find ways to make it meaningful and to make people realise that it mattered to them. In doing this, it was important to hold conversations with people. The senior leaders of universities needed to be persuaded to talk about and advocate public engagement, but researchers and partners outside the university system also needed to care and talk about it. Mr Manners believed the British Council could help in making sure engagement was being talked about at a senior policy level. Ms Tanaka commented that the UK’s experience showed that buy-in from Vice Chancellors really mattered; without that high-level commitment the importance of engagement would not be cascaded down to every part of the institution. However, thought also needed to be given at the level of practitioners to how people could learn about public engagement and gain the appropriate skills; it was necessary to discuss the different activities and support that could be put in place for different levels.

Mr Manners asked whether the delegates had seen anything happening in the UK that they had considered particularly valuable or interesting and that could be used to influence their Japanese colleagues. Mr Saito observed that the group at his table had discussed the importance of changing the mindset of senior people; in order to convince senior people of the importance of public engagement, it would be necessary to prevent them with evidence.
He suggested that the case studies and evidence the delegates had seen in the UK could be used for this purpose.

Dr Takagi reported that Hokkaido University was actively committed to public engagement, in part because of the economic incentives it offered, as well as because her manager, Miho Namba, had a very strong background in public engagement. Mr Manners believed the economic incentives were very important. Ms Duncan added that a lot of public engagement in the UK was about social benefit but not about ‘REF-able’ impact. However, money talked. When the REF had been introduced, the NCCPE had noticed that the people working in collaborative research, with partnerships throughout the research process, had been more equipped to create a compelling case study for the REF than those working in science communication many of whom simply disseminated information to the public. This had raised the profile of that collaborative approach to research for researchers who had not been used to working that way. Mr Saito suggested that some academics were only interested in REF-able impact, at the expense of other impacts; in this context, it was necessary not to forget the overall rationale for public engagement, which included societal benefit.

Mr Manners concluded the session, thanking the delegates for their visit. He and Ms Duncan would work together with Ms Tanaka and Mr Saito to write up the outcomes of the session. He praised the work of the British Council and expressed the NCCPE’s desire to help if it could. Ms Tanaka remarked that it had been fascinating to work with the NCCPE. She observed that there would be a session at the British Council’s conference in September to inform people about what they had learnt during this study tour, which would also provide an opportunity to obtain inputs from other people. Mr Manners believed that while it was a good idea to have a step-by-step approach, there nevertheless needed to be some framework and structure put in place, perhaps in addition to some smaller projects, to help maintain the momentum. Ms Tanaka observed that there were other people who had not been present at this session but who were passionate about the subject and who had ideas; the British Council would include those people’s inputs when developing the way forward.
APPENDIX 1: DELEGATE LIST

JAPAN DELEGATES

KANAZAWA UNIVERSITY

http://www.kanazawa-u.ac.jp/e/index.html

Kanazawa University has its origins in the Kaga clan’s Hikoso Vaccination Center, which was established in 1862 and is the third oldest national university in Japan. Our university aims to be “a research university dedicated to education, while opening up its doors to both local and global society”. Our university has 3 colleges, 5 graduate schools, 1 university hospital and 1 Cancer Research Institute. The number of students is around 10,000 in total and the number of staff is around 3,700 (of which faculty number around 1,000). In 2013 the budget total was about 52,600 million yen. In 2012 the grant received from outside the university totalled 4,200 million yen.

- Kanazawa University is engaged with many unique research projects:
- Development of advanced medical treatment for nutritional metabolism-related syndromes
- Environmental monitoring over the Pan-Japan Sea area
- Development of high-speed atomic force microscope (AFM)
- Cultural Resource Studies all over the world (e.g. Mayan archeology, Jordan Archeology Studies).

Kanazawa University has introduced URA since 2007 and has strived to establish a stable URA system. Now we have 14 university research administrators.

Participant: Dr. Miyuki Inagaki

Organization of Frontier Science and Innovation, Assistant Professor, Research Administrator

Graduated in geology from Kanazawa University and received Ph.D. from the same institution in 2006. Has worked as a university research administrator at Kanazawa University since 2007. Main roles include pre-awards, finding grants and developing proposals. Most recently engaged with the planning of research and grant strategies.

KYOTO UNIVERSITY

http://www.kyoto-u.ac.jp/en

The Kyoto University Research Administration Office (KURA) was launched in April, 2012 by using a new national government program. The staff members are professionals for research promotion support with their own experience of academic research and they work to make it possible for the researchers to push forward their research. They provide information and advice on research project planning and applications, and support the setting up and operation of large-scale research projects, and finally support the dissemination of academic research to society and citizens. KURA started with nine members as a central research administration office, and in April, 2013, Kyoto University hired 21 new
departmental research administrators to strengthen supports for the researchers at each department throughout the university. By having the departmental research administrators working closely with KURA, the university established Kyoto University Research Administration network (KURA network) which consists of 30 research administrators and in which KURA plays a central role. Furthermore, using another national government programs for promoting the enhancement of research universities, the university hired an additional 20 research administrators in KURA in April, 2014 to enhance research activities including collaboration with foreign universities and industries for innovation. Now, the KURA network consists of 50 research administrators and has become able to promote a wide range of research activities throughout the university.

Participant: Dr. Seitaro Mutoh

Deputy Director, Research Administration Office

Seitaro Mutoh is the deputy director and senior research administrator of Kyoto University Research Administration Office. He is responsible for the overall strategy and management of the office, promotion of research activities in Kyoto University and planning of collaboration with foreign universities. Prior to his move to Kyoto University in 2012, he had been engaged in research and development of new drugs in a global pharmaceutical company. He served as the director of Pharmacology Research Labs (2001-2010) and an executive officer of the company (2007-2011). He also served as the president of their subsidiary companies in the USA (2010-2011). He graduated from Kyoto University, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences in 1975 and received his PhD in 1980. He has been a Scientific Councillor of the Japanese Pharmacological Society.

TOHOKU UNIVERSITY

https://www.tohoku.ac.jp/english/

Tohoku University was founded in 1907 as the third Imperial University of Japan. From its start, it displayed to the world an unswerving commitment to an “Open Door” policy. Departing from the norms of other imperial universities, it accepted graduates from technical schools and higher normal schools, and despite opposition from government at that time, became Japan's First University to admit female students in 1913. At the time of its founding, Tohoku University was able to attract a group of young and brilliant researchers who had trained around the world to serve on its faculty. For this reason, a “Research First” principle was established, calling upon scholars to not only pursue highly productive research but to also put their findings to work in the teaching of students. Tohoku University is internationally recognized for its outstanding standards in education and research. The university contributes to world peace and equity by devoting itself to research useful in solving societal problems, and educating human resources in leadership skills. Tohoku University consists of 10 Undergraduate and 16 Graduate Schools, 3 Professional Graduate Schools and 6 Research Institutes. There are approximately 5,400 faculty staff and 18,000 students, where about 10,000 undergraduate students, 6,500 graduate students and 1,500 international students belong to these schools. Innovations that set world standard are conducted by Tohoku University, where Yagi-Uda antenna, pin diode, perpendicular magnetic recording were invented and proposed. Tohoku University has more
than 450 Agreements on Academic Exchange with foreign universities, and has 11 liaison offices and 4 overseas offices.

**Participant: Dr. Hirotugu Takizawa**

*Associate Dean for Research, Graduate School of Engineering*

Hirotugu Takizawa received the Ph.D. in Engineering from Tohoku University in 1990. He joined Department of Materials Chemistry, Tohoku University in 1990, and engaged in the research on high-pressure synthesis and crystal chemistry of inorganic compounds. He was promoted to full professor in 2004, and is currently working on the microwave processing of advanced inorganic materials at the Department of Applied Chemistry, Tohoku University. Dr. Takizawa began serving as the associate dean for research in the Graduate School of Engineering, Tohoku University in 2012. He is a member of the URA-task force in Research University 11 (RU11), Japan.

---

**HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY**

[http://www.oia.hokudai.ac.jp/](http://www.oia.hokudai.ac.jp/)

One of eleven leading Research Universities in Japan. Established in 1876 as Sapporo Agricultural College, Hokkaido University has evolved into a comprehensive university. Boasting the largest number of faculties of Japan’s national universities, we cover almost all areas of the humanities and social and natural sciences. Today we enrol approximately 18,000 undergraduate and graduate students, including 1,400 international students from more than 85 countries.

Hokkaido University is developing a host of projects intended to enhance public awareness of this university: the utilization of the Tokyo and international Offices as the bases for transmitting information to society and promoting exchange activities with local communities; the improvement of its websites and public relations magazines; public relations activities, including the Open Campus for high school students and the dissemination of information on entrance examinations; the organization of the Extension Lecture Programs; and the improvement of the Open Course Ware, in which course materials are made available to the world. In addition, we plan to further enhance and utilize bases for joint projects and research with local communities and industries, including the Creative Research Initiative "Sousei" and the Management Center for Intellectual Property and Innovation, to share the fruits of our research activities and strengthen cooperation with society.

**Participant: Dr. Yuki Takagi**

*Specially Appointed Assistant Professor/ Research Administrator*

Yuki TAKAGI is a University Research Administrator at the Task force for Research Strategy, Hokkaido University. Her duties include collecting and compiling information on research activities currently being undertaken at Hokkaido University, providing support for coordinating large scale inter-departmental and cross-disciplinary projects, and strengthening the inter and intra-departmental networks of researchers. She also acts as a contact point for international researchers wishing to
instigate research collaboration with Hokkaido University. Yuki first joined Hokkaido University as an Administrative Assistant at the Research Institute for Electronic Science in 2009.

JAPAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AGENCY (JST)

http://www.jst.go.jp/EN/index.html

The Center for Research and Development Strategy (CRDS) was established within the Japan Science and Technology Agency in 2003. CRDS continually strives to advance science and technology (S&T) towards the fulfilment of societal needs and the realization of our vision of a future society.

Our mission is to:

1. Promote dialogue between S&T policymakers and academia;
2. Survey S&T fields and draw “bird’s-eye view maps” depicting them;
3. Select important R&D subjects to be funded by the government, and investigate effective methods for undertaking R&D on the selected subjects;
4. Compare the technological level of Japan with that of other countries;
5. Propose R&D strategies that can contribute to the realization of our vision of a future society, enrichment of our S&T base, and expansion of research frontiers.

CRDS also actively discloses the results of its studies to the public.

Participants:

Mr. Seiichi Yoshikawa

Principal Fellow, Center for Research and Development Strategy (CRDS)

Mr. Yoshikawa graduated from the University of Tokyo, Faculty of Law in 1969, and joined FUJITSU Ltd. the same year. After becoming Corporate Senior Vice President and Director of FUJITSU Laboratories Ltd., he became Chairman of QD Laser, Inc. in 2011, and Director of Advantest Corporation in 2013. He is also an Advisor on the Executive Committee, Council on Competitiveness-Nippon (COCN). He has been in his current post since 2012.

Dr. Kayano Fukuda

Fellow, Center for Research and Development Strategy (CRDS)

Dr. Kayano Fukuda joined JST in 1997 and is a member of CRDS since 2003. She has served as a Visiting Scholar at the National University of Singapore since 2011, and Docent in Dynamics of Innovation Systems at University of Jyväskylä in Finland since 2012. She received a B.A. in Agriculture from Kyoto University in 1997 and a PhD in Industrial Engineering and Management from Tokyo Institute of Technology in 2008.
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, CULTURE, SPORTS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (MEXT)

http://www.mext.go.jp/english/

In recent years, Japan has experienced difficulties in achieving putting innovative R&D support programs into practice and the previously highly successful Japanese manufacturing sector is now facing difficulty in competition with emerging countries. Japan “excels in technology but loses in business” and in some cases, Japan “even loses in technology.” It is necessary to promote investment in Japanese innovative R&D support programs to revitalize Japan as a “nation based on the creativity of science and technology.” From now, the government will promote innovative R&D support programs focusing on strategic fields, translate the achievements into practical applications, and promote intellectual property strategies and standardization strategies in order to acquire market share. Based on these, the government will strive to be a “nation which continues to be competitive in technology as well as in business.”

To this end, the government will create an environment suitable for science, technology and innovation in universities and research institutes, drastically promote exit-oriented innovative R&D support programs together with institutional reform, and create a system for practical applications/commercialization. Furthermore, the government will encourage the private sector to actively invest in innovative R&D support programs, accelerate development from closed innovation into open innovation and create a virtuous cycle of science, technology and innovation that lead to practical applications/commercialization.

Japan’s S&T administration operates under the basic policies of the Council for Science, Technology and Innovation Policy (CSTI) chaired by the Prime Minister, and works to promote STI in coordination with related ministries. MEXT plans and formulates basic policies concerning STI policy, produces concrete plans concerning promotion and research and development (R&D), and coordinates with related government agencies in relation to promotion and STI.

Participants:

Mr. Naohito Kimura

Director, University - Industry Cooperation and Regional R&D Div, Science and Technology Policy Bureau

BA from University of Tokyo, and MPA from Columbia University. Joined MEXT in 1992. After experiencing wider policy areas such as space development, basic science promotion, nuclear energy technology, and nuclear non-proliferation/security, entered his present position from 2011. During his career, spent three years in the UK as scientific attaché at the Embassy of Japan in London.

As director of the division of university-industry collaboration/regional R&D, has focused on creating an environment in Japan to encourage social innovation through strong academia-industry collaboration.
Mr. Tasuku Aoyagi

Researcher, University-Industry Cooperation and Regional R&D Division, Science and Technology Policy Bureau

Graduated from Ritsumeikan University in 2003 and worked for various financial institutions. Hired by Ritsumeikan University in 2009 and assigned to the industry-university cooperation department.

Seconded to the Ministry of Education in 2013 and put in charge of programs for the purpose of university venture creation and industry-university cooperation.

Interested in how to manage human resources in the area of industry-university cooperation.

Ms. Kana Kobayashi

Trainee, University - Industry Cooperation and Regional R&D Div, Science and Technology Policy Bureau

After graduating from Osaka University was employed as administrative employee at Osaka University in 2009, and assigned to the personnel division. From April 2014 Recruited as a trainee in MEXT from April 2014 and put in charge of programs for developing human resources in URA for industry-university corporation. Interested in the system of industry-university collaboration of universities in UK.

UK DELEGATES

Katie Dingley

MA student / Administrative Support in Vice Chancellor's Office, University of Warwick

Katie has a BA in Modern Japanese Studies from the University of Durham. Upon graduation she worked for the then-Leader of the Opposition in Tokyo, as a translator and researcher. She is currently finishing an MA in International Politics and East Asia at the University of Warwick, and works in a supporting role in the Vice Chancellor’s Office.

Sophie Duncan

Deputy Director, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

Sophie is the Deputy Director of the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, which was set up in 2008 to inspire a culture change in how universities engage the public. Originally trained as a physicist she started her career at the Science Museum in London where she was involved in exhibition design and public events. She then became programme manager with Science Year – a government initiative to engage teenagers with science. Following this, Sophie spent 7 years working at the BBC – managing the creation and delivery of broadcast led national learning campaigns including People’s War and Breathing Places, a campaign to encourage people to make space for nature.
Dr Helen Featherstone

*Acting Head of Public Engagement, University of Bath*

Helen Featherstone, PhD, heads the University of Bath Public Engagement Unit. She works across the university supporting engaged research and creating the conditions for engaged research to flourish. Prior to joining the Catalyst family, Helen was a post-doc researcher at UWE, Bristol looking at the publics’ roles in public engagement. Helen continues to teach on the MSc Science Communication course at UWE. Alongside her research and teaching experience, Helen has extensive experience in practical STEM engagement activities primarily in interactive Science and Discovery Centres. For 14 years she has been responsible for all aspects of these activities including fundraising, project management, content and event delivery, collaborative working and evaluation. For 3 years (2010-2013), Helen was Chair of the Visitor Studies Group. The group for audience researchers in non-profit visitor centres such as museums, galleries and botanic gardens. The VSG advocates putting visitors at the heart of cultural experiences.

Becci Feltham

*Project Associate, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement*

Becci looks after the Public Engagement Ambassador scheme and supports NCCPE projects and communications. Previous to joining the NCCPE as Project Associate, Becci worked as an Economic Development Officer for a local authority and for the Careers Service at the University of Bristol.

Bryony Frost

*Public Engagement Officer, Queen Mary University of London*

Bryony works at the Centre for Public Engagement at Queen Mary University of London. She is responsible for advising and supporting the variety of engagement projects at QMUL, managing funding rounds and training, as well as sharing the public engagement activities at QMUL both internally and externally. After studying for a Physics degree, Bryony initially moved to the School of Physics and Astronomy at Queen Mary University of London, working as the Outreach Officer. This involved organising school events and working with researchers to help communicate their research, including developing a ‘build your own universe’ kit, helping students to understand particle physics using LEGO. Bryony has an MSc in Science Communication from Imperial.

Lucy Goldring

*Project Officer, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement*

Lucy joined the NCCPE in October as the Project Officer for the School University Partnerships Initiative (SUPI). Funded by RCUK, the SUPI programme is supporting 12 school-university partnerships across the UK. Lucy coordinates the SUPI network and helps to develop and share learning between and beyond the projects. Prior to the NCCPE Lucy worked for SustNav (formerly Sustainability South West – the official regional Champion Body for sustainable development) for over a decade. She has a
diversity of experience in coordinating projects and networks of stakeholder research and engagement. Her educational background is in the Social Sciences.

Prof David Gough

Director, EPPI-Centre, Institute of Education, University of London

I direct the EPPI-Centre (https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk) which works on developing methods of systematic review and on the study of research use. For systematic reviews we work with many government departments and with NICE and other what works centres. In research use we run a European network on evidence informed education (http://www.eippee.eu), work with the Alliance for Useful Evidence and I co-edit the journal ‘Evidence and Policy’ (http://www.policypress.co.uk/journals_eap.asp). My colleague Professor Sandy Oliver undertakes a Catalyst project on public engagement. I have contacts in Japan in terms of evidence use in education, innovation studies and child protection research and am speaking on evidence use in education in Tokyo in September 2014. In sum, my interests are in the interface between evidence use, evidence synthesis and evidence production.

Emily Hargreaves

Research Planning Partner, University of Birmingham

Emily was appointed as Research Planning Partner for the Colleges of Social Sciences and Arts and Law in 2011. Until November 2013 her primary focus was on managing the REF submission across these Colleges. This included all aspects of the return but most notably the production of impact case studies and templates. She continues to work with Departments to develop their impact and in April 2014 she was awarded a Universitas 21 staff fellowship to attend the Universities of Melbourne and Hong Kong to investigate international perspectives on the area.

Paul Manners

Director, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

Paul is responsible for the strategic direction of the NCCPE. Originally trained as a secondary English teacher, he worked for twelve years at the Open University as a producer of TV, radio and multimedia before joining the BBC as an executive producer of a number of national public engagement campaigns. He advises a number of national organisations on learning and engagement, including the National Trust and the Science Museum, and attempts to relax through a combination of playing blues guitar, football, reading, sharing music and pottering in the garden.

Dr Kate Miller

Acting Head of the Centre for Public Engagement, University of Bristol

I am the first point of contact for community organisations wishing to work with the University, or for staff with queries about public engagement and impact. My role includes brokering partnerships with outside organisations, running the Engaged University Steering Group and directing the public engagement programme.
Becky Moran

*Project Officer, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement*

Becky works as a Project Officer covering a range of NCCPE projects. Before joining the team, Becky worked on a number of initiatives for the charity Wildscreen, whose aim is to engage people with the wonders of the natural world using stunning imagery. Her background is in zoology, and when not prodding around in ponds she loves to bake.

Prof Peter Rawlings

*Associate Dean; Professor of English & American Literature, UWE Bristol*

I have extensive connections in Japan having worked there (Kyushu University) for 4 years (1996-2000). I have just returned from Kyoto, Fukuoka, and Tokyo and will be going back in November. My research area is international Shakespeare and American Literature.

Dee Smart

*Co-ordinator Public and Community Engagement, University of the West of England, Bristol*

Dee Smart co-ordinates community and public engagement at the University of the West of England, Bristol. Her role involves co-ordinating the University's participation in local and national large scale public events, such as festivals through staff and student engagement. It also involves working with colleagues across the institution to embed PE in their practices and helping community and other organisations work with relevant UWE staff and students.

Grace Williams

*Project Manager (Public Engagement), University of Exeter*

Grace is as a key coordinating point for academics involved in Public Engagement with Research (PER) across the University of Exeter. As project manager of the Exeter Catalyst, Grace will bring researchers together to build on existing PER practice within the University of Exeter while bringing in external partners to share knowledge and learning about PER. Grace has worked within Public Engagement for over six years, including working for the Economic and Social Research Council and Research Councils UK. She joins Research and Knowledge Transfer from the Centre for Medical History (College of Humanities), where she was responsible for creating and implementing public engagement, communications and impact strategies. She has vast experience of supporting and academics in public engagement; including providing training and helping to engage a wide variety of audiences with research.
Alan Winfield

Professor of Electronic Engineering and Director of the Science Communication Unit at the University of the West of England (UWE), Bristol, and Visiting Professor at the University of York.

Alan Winfield conducts research in swarm robotics in the Bristol Robotics Laboratory and is especially interested in robots as working models of life, evolution, intelligence and culture. Alan is passionate about communicating research and ideas in science, engineering and technology, and was awarded a Senior Media Fellowship in 2009. He led UK-wide public engagement project Walking with Robots, awarded the 2010 Royal Academy of Engineering Rooke medal for public promotion of engineering. His book, Robotics: A Very Short Introduction, was published by Oxford University Press in September 2012, and he blogs about robots, open science and related topics at http://alanwinfield.blogspot.com/