

Briefing: Negotiating value at the research–practice interface in the water sector

Aine Gormley-Gallagher PhD

Research Fellow in Water Management, Cranfield Water Science Institute, Cranfield University, Cranfield, UK

Jaime Amezaga PhD

Reader in Environmental Sustainability, School of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK

James Shucksmith PhD

Lecturer in Water Engineering, Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Dragan Savic PhD

Professor of Hydroinformatics, Centre for Water Systems, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

Michael Templeton PhD

Senior Lecturer in Public Health Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London, London, UK

Ewan Mcadam PhD

Lecturer in Process Engineering, Cranfield Water Science Institute, Cranfield University, Cranfield, UK

Paul Jeffrey PhD

Professor of Water Management, Cranfield Water Science Institute, Cranfield University, Cranfield, UK

Lessons from experiences of managing an engineering doctorate programme are delineated in this paper, with particular emphasis on the relationship between research and practice. The paper reports on applied, practice-oriented research at the UK's industrial doctoral centre for the water sector. A descriptive account of the negotiating value at the research–practice interface is presented based on decades of collective practice, during which the engineering doctorate model has matured and grown. Conclusions focus on recommendations pertaining to project management, knowledge transfer and the effective and consistent translation of academic and practitioner project details.

1. Introduction

Theoretical advancement and practical applicability can be divergent targets of research projects. In engineering, the interface between industry-led applied research and knowledge creation by research is increasingly generating interest, demand and value. Although research-based instructional strategies to improve education in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (Stem) subjects have had mixed success and are not always easy to implement, adopt or scale up in education systems (Borrego and Henderson, 2014), there has been increasing interest in models that couple industry-driven research with professional skills acquisition.

In 2009, the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) established a number of industrial doctorate centres (IDCs) to operate at this interface between industry and academia. The IDC model supports trans-sector cohesion in research and skills acquisition. The Stream programme is one of these EPSRC-funded IDCs, providing industry-led postgraduate training for the water sector (see www.stream-idc.net). The Stream programme is delivered by five UK academic centres of excellence in water science and engineering: Cranfield University (the coordinating institution), Imperial College London and the universities of Sheffield, Newcastle and Exeter. Stream is run in collaboration with the water industry (utilities, equipment suppliers, consultants, etc.) to develop industry-driven but also

academically challenging research projects that allow researchers to develop their skills and careers while obtaining an engineering doctorate (EngD) degree.

The programme of research and learning offered through the Stream IDC is informed by contemporary developments in both postgraduate training theory (Barnacle and Dall'Alba, 2011) and higher education programmes for water and sustainability (Missingham and McIntosh, 2013). The syllabus is aligned with the transferable skills priorities advanced by the Engineering Council's UK standard for professional engineering competence (EC, 2014). This skill set, coupled with industry-driven and academically supervised doctoral research projects, is arguably more likely to achieve the desired improvements in Stem skills (Dales and Arlett, 2008) than if the engineers were to receive 'in-house' training from industry alone.

In the following sections the authors draw out lessons from their experiences of managing an engineering doctorate programme, with particular emphasis on the central relationship between academia and industry.

2. One researcher, two governors

The approach to postgraduate research and training detailed above necessarily exposes research engineers to both academic

and industrial working environments; two settings that they are expected to be able to work equally effectively in. Working norms are very different in academia and industry, as are the types of behaviour that are valued and the typical modes of communication. Consequently, research engineers need to develop a nuanced skill set that enables them to deliver quality outputs to different audiences.

Research engineers studying for an engineering doctorate (EngD) find themselves in a strange and often challenging situation. Their work is sponsored by one type of organisation (a commercial company), whereas their ability to secure the award they seek is moderated by a completely different type of entity: a university. Furthermore, their research is overseen by both an academic and an industrial supervisor, imposing a potential divergence in priorities. There will be areas where goals are well or largely aligned and, if managed sensitively and progressively, this triangle of ambition has huge potential to shape successful outcomes for all parties. There will also, however, be times and circumstances where priorities come into conflict and trade-offs are needed. Such instances are typically restricted to time or resource-constrained conditions, although personality clashes can often catalyse disputes over research design and dissemination priorities.

In addition to pursuing their own aspirations through an EngD programme, research engineers are the primary resource through which the goals of the other two stakeholders are delivered. Life at this delivery apex can consequently be fraught and bewildering. At worst, when supervisors are not communicating between themselves, research engineers can be subject to competing requests for action and deliverables and conflicting expectations about quality and progress. This can become tiresome and ultimately affect the progress of the project. Simply ensuring that supervisory teams are aware of these hazards and understand what actions they can take both to prevent such situations occurring and minimise the detrimental impact if they do has been seen as helpful. It is also noted that the consistency of supervisory appointees is closely correlated with successful projects.

So how can such situations be managed so that all parties can exploit the potential benefits of the EngD model? Experiences suggest that it is the academic supervisor who should take ultimate responsibility for both the quality of the relationships and the clarity of communication between the partners. Both differences in emphasis and congruencies between the academic and industrial agendas for the project should be transparent and open to discussion. Guidance and support for the research engineer should be offered with a united voice – even if this means separate bilateral discussions between the supervisors. Industrial supervisors should also be encouraged to play an active role in the research engineer’s professional development. Finally, both

supervisors need to be acutely aware of and sensitive to the very real difficulties that a research engineer faces in trying to operate effectively in both an academic and industrial environment.

Such proactive management of the project, including regular trilateral meetings where progress is monitored and, crucially, expectations for upcoming activities are agreed, are essential for two reasons. First, because applied (practice oriented) research is perhaps more frequently subject to changes of ambition or focus than pure research and such changes in course need to be reviewed, agreed and incorporated into the overall project plan. Second, it is on these occasions that the value of the research for each stakeholder is, either explicitly or implicitly, articulated and negotiated.

3. Negotiating value

As noted above, there is a natural inconsistency in ambitions between the various stakeholders in an EngD project. The authors have seen how this manifests itself in terms of the research engineer’s experience but it also extends to and influences the research project itself. EngD research, as a process, is rarely shaped by the vision of a single individual. It is more commonly the negotiated outcome of a learning process through which the research engineer, academic supervisor and industry supervisor explore the limits of their own ideas, beliefs and preferences.

Projects need to possess an appropriate balance of academically and industrially relevant content if they are to enjoy equally passionate commitment from both sides of the collaborative fence. This parity of engagement is also important if the research engineer is to benefit from the synergies that come from having access to multiple sources of expertise. Figure 1 presents descriptions of three current Stream projects, providing an illustration of the types of research being undertaken through the programme.

All three of these projects illustrate the strong association of scientific understanding with industrial and commercial value that exemplifies EngD research. The uniting of academic thoroughness and industrial pragmatism spawns authoritative and useable knowledge. However, the intellectual and practical insights generated through such research will be ascribed stakeholder-specific value; value that may be incommensurate across research outputs and that may be driven by immediate concerns that intrude into and delay the achievement of longer term ambitions. The various values of research outputs therefore need to be aligned towards such a universally advantageous outcome. Exploring the ways in which different stakeholders can value a single output should be a central concern of the trilateral progress meetings described above.

Experience indicates that, although the academic supervisor is initially more proactive in balancing out value, research

Improving the performance of plastic joints in water distribution systems (Severn Trent Water, WRc and the University of Sheffield)

Although polyethylene pipes are a favoured option for distribution network renewal among the water companies, their electrofusion-welded joints can fail prematurely if best-practice installation principles are not followed on site. The main causes of such failures are pipe scraping, misalignments and contamination. Using an experimental rig retrofitted to an existing servo-hydraulic fatigue-testing machine, electrofusion fittings are cyclically pressurised with a controlled element of joint contamination. These tests have characterised the relationship between joint failure and the dynamic pressures experienced in water distribution systems, and identified those aspects of installation practice in which poor workmanship impacts asset integrity.

Hydrogen production from wastewater using microbial electrolysis cells (Northumbrian Water and Newcastle University)

The production of hydrogen using microbial electrolysis cells (MECs) has long been recognised as having potential as an alternative energy source. MECs that utilise the organic compounds present in municipal wastewater as a feedstock for the bacteria in the cell hold promise, but have only been demonstrated at laboratory scale. By analysing the challenges of technology scale-up and performance under operational conditions, this project brings academic rigour to the process of technology development. Early evidence from the trials suggests that the operational performance of MECs with real wastes at ambient temperatures and larger scales is not well predicted by the warm-temperature, acetate-fed, small-scale systems used in most fuel cell research.

Algae reactors for wastewater treatment (Anglian Water, Severn Trent Water, Scottish Water and Cranfield University)

Impending regulation will impose tighter limits on the discharge of phosphorus from wastewater treatment works with current methods of phosphorus removal looking unlikely to be suitable options due to either operational or economic considerations. The use of immobilised microalgae, which assimilate both phosphorus and nitrogen during their growth, offers a novel alternative process that has low energy requirements. Laboratory-scale experiments have demonstrated that the immobilised microalgae can remediate phosphorus to below 0.2 mg/l at retention times of 6 to 12 h. Additional benefits include the remediation of ammonium and nitrate and an increase in biogas production, offering the promise of an energy-neutral or energy-positive process.

Figure 1. Specimen Stream projects

engineers take an increasingly active role as their understanding of the EngD process matures and they develop confidence in their own ability to shape the direction of their work. One of the developmental indicators that supervisors of postgraduate research students look for is the adoption by the student of project, and eventually intellectual, ownership of the work. It is at this emancipatory juncture in the EngD process that research engineers feel not only confident enough in their own understandings but also sanctioned by their peers (supervisors) to take a more active role in attributing and negotiating the value of their work.

4. Conclusion

Recent experiences of operating an EngD programme led to three broad conclusions regarding what makes for effective management of the interface between research and practice. The first of these pertains to project management. Because the vast majority of research to practice processes involves professionals from both sides of the spectrum, there is an inherent tension between often incommensurate organisational

priorities and working practices. Consequently, close monitoring of the association between project goals/outputs and how the various contributors will value these is needed.

The second inference that can be drawn from this work is that it is those operating at the delivery apex who must develop the knowledge transfer skills needed to bridge the research–practice gap effectively. The skill sets required to excel at this role are not acquired easily or quickly. Many of the competencies are only developed through repeated experiences and, as there are few useful support resources, learning on the job is the primary training measure. Patience is an increasingly rare commodity in contemporary professional life, but in this context it is invaluable.

Finally, attention is drawn to an analogy that is frequently used to help research engineers better understand the role they are being asked to engage with. By viewing activities at the research–practice interface as requiring constant translation in order to be effective, sensible questions can start being asked

about what aptitudes might be needed in order to improve the flow of knowledge. As an intermediary, research engineers find themselves regularly providing explanation, clarification, illustration, interpretation and so on for their colleagues who are less familiar with the academic or practitioner details of a project. Such translation and mediation services are invariably required in both directions. Without them, poor-quality communication (through nobody's fault) constrains or prevents understanding, and without understanding progress is permanently shackled. Richard Saul Wurman, one of the founders of the TED conferences, once said: 'As you learn about something try to remember what it is like not to know' (Wurman, 1990: p. 130). Working at the research–practice interface is a constant reminder of this maxim; one that EngD graduates are perhaps better placed than most to make use of.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support provided to the Stream programme by the EPSRC and their 21 project sponsors. They also thank research engineers Sarah Cotterill, Pedrom Tayefi and Rachel Whitton whose research and communication efforts led to their work being featured in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Barnacle R and Dall'Alba G (2011) Research degrees as professional education? *Studies in Higher Education* **36**(4): 459–470.
- Borrego M and Henderson C (2014) Increasing the use of evidence-based teaching in stem higher education: a comparison of eight change strategies. *Journal of Engineering Education* **103**(2): 220–252.
- Dales R and Arlett C (2008) *Higher Education and the Workplace – Supporting Employer Engagement in Engineering and Physical Science*. Higher Education Academy, York, UK. See <http://www.engsc.ac.uk/engageconf/> (accessed 03/03/2014).
- EC (Engineering Council) (2014) *UK Standard for Professional Engineering Competence*. EC, London, UK. See <http://exchange.ac.uk/engage/conference.html> (accessed 03/03/2014).
- Missingham B and McIntosh BS (Eds) (2013) Water education for sustainability in higher education. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research and Education* **150**: 1–5.
- Wurman RS (1990) *Information Anxiety: What to Do When Information Doesn't Tell You What You Need to Know*. Bantam Doubleday, New York, NY, USA.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

To discuss this briefing, please email up to 500 words to the editor at journals@ice.org.uk. Your contribution will be forwarded to the author(s) for a reply and, if considered appropriate by the editorial panel, will be published as discussion in a future issue of the journal.

Proceedings journals rely entirely on contributions sent in by civil engineering professionals, academics and students. Papers should be 2000–5000 words long (briefing papers should be 1000–2000 words long), with adequate illustrations and references. You can submit your paper online via www.icevirtuallibrary.com/content/journals, where you will also find detailed author guidelines.