

## **GLASGOW CALEDONIAN UNIVERSITY**

### **RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

#### **Minutes of the Meeting held on 2 July 2012**

**PRESENT:** Professor F. Cheater, Professor J. Craft, Dr R. Emmanuel, Professor P. Gillies, Professor D. Harrison, Professor J. Marshall, Professor S. McMeekin, Professor S. Scott (Chair), Professor B. Steves, Professor J. Tombs,

**APOLOGIES:** Professor C. Donaldson, Professor P. Flowers, Dr L. Gray, Professor B. Hughes, Professor A. McKay, Mr P. Queen, Professor D. Smith, Professor B. Stewart, Professor J. Stewart

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr P. Woods (Secretary)

#### **MINUTES**

**011.154 Considered:** The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2012 (**REC11/35/1**).

**011.155 Resolved:** That the minutes be approved as a correct record.

#### **MATTERS ARISING**

**011.156 Considered:** Any matters arising on the above minutes not considered elsewhere on the agenda.

#### **Centralised KT/KE Office for Scotland** (*Arising on RCM11.116*)

**011.157 Reported:** By the Chair that the latest indications were that this centralisation would be virtual.

#### **Social Innovation Event: Social Innovation: New Pathways and Alternative Solutions conference** (*Arising on RCM11.118*)

**011.158 Reported:** By the Chair that a Social Innovation fair would be taking place on 4 September. In addition there are two FP7 bids in this subject area involving GCU staff, one of which is led by GCU.

#### **University Research Governance Structures**

(*Arising on RCM11.125*)

**011.159 Reported:** By the Chair that the subgroup had not met as yet but discussions were ongoing.

#### **Public Engagement with Research**

(*Arising on RCM11.141*)

**011.160 Reported:** By the Chair that a University group, chaired by the PVC External Relations, had been set up to look at public engagement in a wider sense. Research would be a part of that remit.

#### **CHAIR'S REPORT**

#### **Research Excellence Framework**

**011.161 Reported:** By the Chair that she and the Director of Academic Research Development had visited each department to discuss REF preparations. This had been a useful process and the communication process would continue. The context for the next phase of REF preparations was that there would be a mock REF in the autumn and PURE would now feed into this process.

External assessors had been identified for all UoAs except Allied Health Professions. This was being dealt with. A report had been provided on the viability of an Education submission and this had been positive. However, as stated before, there were no definitive decisions as yet regarding the UoAs that would be submitted. Impact case studies would be an important factor in the process towards deciding the shape of the submission.

PURE would be used to model a submission. Draft narratives and case studies would be collected for mock in October, as well as external reports. The position of staff inclusion was still an open process at this moment.

Underpinning the whole process would be staff engagement with PURE and the Committee would be expected to take a lead on this matter.

### **ESRC Research – the Future of Scotland**

**011.162 Reported:** By the Chair that she had attended an event held by the ESRC on the future of Scotland during the pre-independence referendum period. The ESRC plans included good opportunities for GCU in (one year) fellowship bids, and involvement in an international symposium in 2013.

### **Comments invited from the Principal**

**011.163 Reported:** By the Principal that in the context of REF preparations she wished to initiate a conversation about where we were as a University, including a discussion about our strengths, where further support may be needed and our aspirations for REF. She invited comments from Committee members on these aspects.

**011.164 Discussion:** The Chair stated that the MQRG funds to support REF, in terms of teaching buy out and sabbaticals, for example, were in place and it would be a matter of identifying where these could be best targeted.

A number of areas of strength were discussed, good cross discipline research and a number of emerging areas were referred to.

Some concerns were raised regarding income, particularly in the context of the HESA data being apportioned for REF. Professor Marshall stated that this was proportionately of lesser concern than outputs or impact (which accounted for 65% and 20% of the assessment respectively).

In terms of targeted support, statistical support specific to biosciences was cited.

Collaboration was discussed and the need to emphasise collaborations, particularly international collaborations, both for REF and future research development.

The possibility of joint submissions was considered and the Chair agreed to investigate the opportunities mentioned.

Members talked further on impact case study development and the need to create impact stories and/or events and to build on these. The social innovation fair was cited as a case in point.

Finally it was noted that there was a good news story around part-time PhDs and Prof Ds.

**011.165 Resolved:** That the discussion be noted and further reflected on at future meetings.

### **FULL ECONOMIC COSTING MODEL FOR RESEARCH AND RCUK EFFICIENCY TOP SLICE RATE**

**011.166 Considered:** A draft pro forma and flowchart of the process for 2012 (**REC11/36/1**).

**011.167 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that an issue had been raised by RIE surrounding FEC as it appeared that a change had been indicated by the Finance Office. The Finance Office have stated that there is no change to arrangements but it would be useful to re-emphasise that any changes must first be discussed and approved by the Research Committee.

Professor Marshall informed members that RCUK efficiency rate is not an indication of efficiency but indicated that savings were required to be made by applying the efficiency factor (as noted in the letter) to the indirect costs on research grants and by reducing the indexation rate used going forward. It applies to both new and existing grants and a top slice will be applied.

Professor Marshall added that, anecdotally, the use of HESA data in the REF assessment was causing some unease other HEIs, particularly in the larger institutions.

**011.168 Resolved:** That the update be noted

### **PHD STUDENTSHIPS**

**011.169 Considered:** The outcome of the PhD Studentship subgroup (**REC11/37/1**).

**011.170 Reported:** By the Secretary that the report detailed the outcome of the subgroup's deliberations but the administrative work was ongoing.

**011.171 Resolved:** That consideration of the process for next year be taken up in the new session.

### **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK (REF) 2014**

**011.172 Considered:** The draft REF 2014 Code of Practice on selection of staff (**REC11/18/3**).

**011.173 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that the draft had been submitted to the SFC and returned with the requirement for more specificity. The revised version was due to be submitted by 3 August.

**011.174 Reported:** By the Chair that the new information requested had been added and an updated version of the code would be submitted.

**011.175 Discussion:** One member asked about the timing of the quality assessments for REF. The Chair stated that there were tactical judgements to be made which could conceivably occur right up towards the submission deadline and therefore she did not want to be too specific at this stage. This was also particularly as all impact case studies had not yet been received or fully assessed. Professor Marshall added that the mock REF in the autumn would give more detail to the direction of travel.

**011.176 Considered:** Updates on the REF 2014 Management Group, Impact Group and Data Group.

**011.177 Received:** Confirmed minutes of the REF 2014 Management Group meeting held on 9 November 2011 (RMG/2/1).

**011.178 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that 29 impact case studies had been received and there were more in preparation. These had been reviewed by the REF Management Group. He would meet individually with the key leads to discuss the next stage of preparation and the Impact Group would

oversee the case study narratives on a case by case basis. He added that the Group would be streamlined to have one individual per unit, normally, to specifically deal with impact.

The Data Group had also met to review the next phase of preparations, particularly in relation to PURE.

Professor Marshall informed members that forward programme of meetings of the three REF groups would be decided during the summer.

**011.179 Discussion:** Members discussed the methodology of preparing the impact case studies and expressed concern that there would not be enough people involved to complete the task. Professor Marshall stated that training would be available and the Chair added that additional help would be identified for the writing up phase. In general the intention would be to draw on the University's research environment wherever possible. However it was vitally important to know exactly who was responsible for writing the 3a and 3b impact templates in each UoA and to also ensure that the UoA narratives were focused on the research environment and engagement with beneficiaries. The articulation of impact would be key.

The Chair stated that external review of impact would normally be undertaken by the same individuals used to review outputs. She added that externals would also be subject to the Code of Practice and GCU confidentiality.

**011.180 Resolved:** That the update be noted.

#### **PURE CURRENT RESEARCH INFORMATION SYSTEM**

**011.181 Considered:** A workflow paper to accompany the rollout of PURE (**REC11/38/1**).

**011.182 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that there would be a rollout of PURE in August and training would follow. The most important task would be to make sure publications were up to date and validate by the Library. There would also be a tendering process for a new repository in August for a replacement for Digital Commons.

**011.183 Resolved:** That members noted the workflow paper.

#### **EPSRC RESEARCH DATA POLICY**

**011.184 Considered:** The EPSRC policy framework for research data (**REC11/39/1**).

**011.185 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that the GCU "roadmap" had been written and submitted since the last meeting as it had been required by 11 June deadline. The document signals the actions required and a timeline towards compliance with EPSRC policy on access to EPSRC funded research data. It is likely that this type of compliance would be required for all Research Councils in the future.

**011.186 Resolved:** That the document be noted.

#### **HIGHER DEGREES SUBCOMMITTEE**

**011.187 Considered:** Terms of reference of the Higher Degrees Subcommittee for session 2012-13 (**Doc REC/33/2**).

**011.188 Resolved:** That the issue is deferred until the next meeting.

#### **PEER REVIEW COLLEGE FOR RESEARCH**

**011.189 Received:** The current list of staff in the Peer Review College (**REC11/40/1**).

**011.190 Resolved:** That outstanding member details be submitted as soon as possible.

## **SCHOOL RESEARCH COMMITTEES**

**011.191 Considered:** Any matters to report from the School Research Committees.

## **GSBS**

**011.192 Reported:** By the Secretary that one item raised was that *Endnote* referencing software was used extensively across the University and licences were purchased on a case by case basis. This had been raised as an institutional licence may be more cost effective.

**011.193 Resolved:** That the appropriate parties in GSBS and the Library resolve the matter and inform the PVCRC for resourcing purposes.

## **RESEARCH INSTITUTES REPORT**

**011.194 Considered:** Any matters to report by the Institute Directors.

### **Institute of Society and Social Justice**

**011.195 Reported:** By Professor Tombs that:

- There were three new research themes in ISSJ: public management and risk, culture and communications and education and learning innovation.
- That a staff development workshop on PhDs by previous publication had been held

### **Institute of Applied Health Research**

**011.196 Reported:** By Professor Cheater that a Research Institutes review was scheduled for 5 September.

## **GRADUATE SCHOOL REPORT**

**011.197 Reported:** By Professor Steves that:

- UKBA: feedback was awaited on the UKBA visit but initial indications were positive. New procedures were being rolled out. Thanks were due to all who helped, particularly research administrators and PGR tutors.
- The Scottish Crucible workshop had seen some good contributions and attendees had been impressed by the event.
- Scottish Research Careers Co-ordination Forum
- A Research Training programme for students, ECRs and other staff would be planned and developed for the 2012-13 academic session.

## **BLUE CHIP FUNDING SOURCES (raised from part C)**

**011.198 Received:** An updated list of the University's "blue chip" funding sources (**REC11/42/1**).

**011.199 Resolved:** Any changes to the list should be forward to the Committee Secretary and reconsidered at a future meeting of the Committee.

## **LIVE ISSUES**

**011.200 Resolved:** That there were no other issues to report.

## **RESEARCH ETHICS SUBCOMMITTEE**

**011.201 Received:** Confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 2011(**EC11/1/1**).

## **SRIF 3**

**011.202 Received:** Information provided to consultants on behalf of SFC relating to GCU's SRIF 3 projects (**REC11/43/1**).

## **SCOTTISH INFORMATION COMMISSIONER'S DECISION REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF RESEARCH INFORMATION**

**011.203 Received:** Scottish Information Commissioner's decision regarding disclosure of information which is the subject of a funding application (**REC11/44/1**).

## **HIGHER DEGREES SUBCOMMITTEE**

**011.204 Received:** The confirmed minutes of session 2011-2012 (**HD11/26/1, HDC11/67/1, HDC11/130/1, HDC11/176/1**).

## **RESEARCH COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2012-13**

**011.205 Received:** The calendar of meetings for session 2012-13 (**REC11/45/1**).

Pwo/researchcom/agenda/JUL2012