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Post-it notes from morning discussion on issues and challenges

- Academics understanding ‘why’ they need to record things / use repository
- Convincing creative staff about importance of documentation
- Different modes of working – what to document
- Need for RDM / repo training for academic staff
- Need for conversation between researcher and repository people/person
- Hard to get people to attend training
- Lack of linking / vulnerability of links
- Timing
- Choosing what to include – demonstrating value/focus of research
- Lack of understanding of tech eg web pages, longevity etc
- Workload of academics particularly creative staff
- Difficult conversations – when?
- Using ‘useful’ tech wrongly eg open science framework
- File sizes / types have to link instead of host eg films
- Knowing what people are going
- People ‘afraid’ of the repository
- Use of technology
- 1. Capturing and describing
- 2. Time
- 3. Communication and engagement
- Reflecting the output correctly (ie a picture doesn’t represent it)
- Boundaries between outputs – when does it become a new one?
- How do I contextualise work as ‘REF able’?
- What an output is and how is it research rather than practice?
- Difficult to trace further information online
- Uniqueness of each output = no one way to do it
- Capturing the complexity flexibly but simply
- Time recording the outputs and engagement
- Lack of time
- Time = paid to teach not record it
- How much time do we expect academics to spend on recording?
- What is the benefit of recording it?
- Getting to the researchers in the first place
- Copyright
- Protecting your copyright
- IP and copyright
• What is practice research? Not just arts!
• Increasing engagement of practice researchers with repository
• Additional burden for repository managers
• Issues of image/content/permission/licences etc
• FORMAT challenge – how to frame PR as ‘portfolio’ / presentation for REF
• Repositories and impact – engaging wider profiles with research
• Capturing → sharing multimedia, multiprocess work
• Unpaid work
• It is not all about REF
• Copyright
• Tension between digital repository as public facing and as submission tool to REF
• Additional burden to document practice
• Challenge of multi-component outputs on digital repositories
• Shared language so that we don’t have to constantly explain ourselves
• How to capture multi-media contextual information to support outputs
• Adapting CRIS and repository systems designed on science journal model for practice
• Video: streaming, hosting, filesize, training
• Lack of systems: appropriate, sympathetic, ‘outdated’, ‘white page’
• Politics of repository – ownership, control capitalism
• Lack of engagement – don’t do repositories
• Documenting research process without needing extra texts
• Repositories framed for STEM
• How can a repository help understand reach / significance/ influence/utility?
• One or many repositories, ‘sexiness’, external fit for purpose
• Staffing conversations – mentors, managers
• ‘Requires unpicking’ – needs more conversation / engagement
• Questions of IP and OA
• Evolving over time – variable DOIs
• Storage issues, accessibly reference – sharing
• Engaging researchers – Arts – practice, science- journals – documenting process
• Questions of PT practitioners, ECR training
• Evidencing impact, repositories as support
• Expressing value of activities overlooked by systems
• What is ‘research’? What is ‘capturing’? Better conversation, boundary of output
• Language of ‘Open Science’, Plan S, Funding models differ
• Non-defined lifecycle. Blurred line between output, data etc
• Blurred lines between event dates – date of creation – spontenaity?
• Not just for REF – long term preservation of research effort
• Diverse nature of ‘practice based’ research – performances, artefacts, software, etc
• REF as a priority does not support long-term preservation
• PDFS – but what about weblinks?
• Copyright
• Policies don’t cover practice research, repositories don’t deal well with diversity
• Lack of diversity in repository design and policy landscape. Visibility and legacy. Copyright a related issue
• Practice research is perceived to be for REF, not on the long term
• Lack of clear definition of practice research and how this links to standards and practicalities
• Effort to describe work already done
• Limits to the mode of submission
• System architecture
• Language matters: “Abstract” vs “Description”
• Future aim: full recognition and support of practice based outputs
• Dates in practice based research: not as simple as “accepted”, “published” etc