



Department of Governance

<b>GLASGOW CALEDONIAN UNIVERSITY</b>		
<b>UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE</b>		
Minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2016		
<b>Present:</b>	Ms J. Broadhurst, Dr R. Clougherty, Professor A. de Ruyter, Professor C. Donaldson, Professor R. Emmanuel, Dr L. Gray, Professor B. Hughes, Professor M. Mannion (Chair), Professor J. Marshall, Dr P. Martin, Mr V. McKay, Ms M Yakova ( <i>vice</i> Mr M. Stephenson), Professor J Woodburn, Professor B. Steves, Professor B. Stewart	
<b>In attendance:</b>	Mr P Woods (Secretary)	
<b>Apologies:</b>	Professor I. Cameron, Professor S. Hutchinson, Professor A. Morgan, Professor P. Shukla, Professor O. Walsh	
<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>015.119</b>	<b>Considered</b>	The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2016 ( <b>REC15/31/1</b> ).
<b>015.120</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	That the minutes be approved as a correct record subject to noting that the CROS/PIRLS outcomes would be considered by the relevant People Services board rather than RDC.
<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>		
<b>Postgraduate Research Student Experience (<i>arising on RCM 015.096</i>)</b>		
<b>015.121</b>	<b>Reported</b>	By Professor Steves that various proposals, including funding support for PGRs, had been drafted for consultation with the ADRs. It was expected that a policy proposal would be produced following this consultation and further discussion with the PVCR.
<b>RESEARCH INTEGRITY</b>		
<b>015.122</b>	<b>Considered</b>	An update on Research Integrity and related policies ( <b>REC15/42/1</b> ).
<b>015.123</b>	<b>Reported</b>	By Professor Donaldson that the update included a policy statement and other information on existing practice. It represented a statement of where we are at present in respect of research integrity and the Concordat in terms of existing

		<p>policies and procedures and concluded with a number of proposed actions.</p> <p>There were a few things to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• should there be School specific policies/guidelines;</li> <li>• how to make guidelines more accessible;</li> <li>• (People Services) misconduct policies required a review.</li> </ul>
015.124	Discussion	<p>Members made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was agreed this was a good way forward</li> <li>• School guidance should be enhanced but not as deviance from the University's policies</li> <li>• School guidance should be additionality concentrating on external subject area compliance and or PSRB standards</li> <li>• Any subsidiarity needs to be within a University framework as the report to governing body should reflect a consistent picture.</li> <li>• Gathering additional feedback from Schools may be useful (possibly via the School Research Committees)</li> <li>• RESC could be the ideal forum to take an overview of research integrity as well as ethics.</li> <li>• There were other areas of practice to integrate e.g. the authorship guidelines approved by URC previously</li> </ul>
015.125	Resolved	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the proposals are approved.</li> <li>2. That progressed is reviewed again in 6 months (circa November 2016) (<b>Action: Prof.Donaldson</b>).</li> <li>3. That RESC takes a role in the overview of research integrity developments (<b>Action: RESC/CD</b>).</li> </ol>
<b>PGR STUDENTS REPORT - REVIEW OF EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR PGRS AT GCU</b>		
015.126	Considered	<p>A report by Professor Caroline Parker into PGRS career development and related issues at GCU (<b>RDC15/13/01</b>)</p>
015.127	Reported	<p>By Dr Gray that the paper had been presented to RDC and it had been welcomed by RDC members for its comprehensiveness. The paper outlined a set of opportunities for career development of PGRS via a <i>graduate assistant</i> post which would encompass a wider range of roles and not just teaching. The specification was In preparation by People Services.</p> <p>Included in the report was recognition that students would now be paid for all teaching work and the six hours per week teaching commitment would no longer be an element of the studentship stipend.</p>
015.128	Reported	<p>By Professor Steves that, as was noted in the report, the new roles also had implications for completion and would require an agreement or sign off mechanism by supervisors and, ideally, a PGRT and ongoing monitoring of uptake of employment opportunities to ensure satisfactory progression and completion.</p>
015.128	Discussion	<p>Members welcomed the report and asked some specific questions:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the arrangements apply now to all students?</li> <li>• Will there be official notification to students?</li> <li>• The graduate assistant role was welcomed but clarity was asked for on the volunteering role.</li> </ul> <p>Dr Gray and Professor Steves clarified that the contractual changes would apply to all students and that they expected students to be involved in developing the roles set out in the report, including the voluntary role.</p> <p>In terms of communication it was felt that there was a lot that could be done: include in updated guidelines; student handbooks; induction materials; web content.</p> <p>Members were insistent that the oversight of the uptake of any roles should be by the Director of Studies. There was clearly a need to relate the activities to academic progress, possibly in annual reports or more regularly.</p> <p>Another member felt the nomenclature was not right about “emergency” roles – perhaps it is the language used.</p>
<b>015.106</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report is welcomed.</li> <li>2. That there is further work on the guidance to students and staff on the developments listed in 6.2-6.7. (<b>Action: RDC/Graduate School/ADRs</b>)</li> </ol>
<b>PURE AWARD MANAGEMENT MODULE EVALUATION</b>		
<b>015.107</b>	<b>Considered</b>	An evaluation of the award management module in Pure ( <b>REC15/44/1</b> ).
<b>015.108</b>	<b>Reported</b>	<p>By Professor Marshall that the key functions of the module were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deposit of draft proposals for internal review and peer review requests</li> <li>• Formal submission of project funding applications for institutional approval</li> <li>• Acceptance, approval and management of offer of award, agreements and contract documentation related to successful applications.</li> <li>• The creation of ongoing academic project management records including the facility to add milestones related to conditions of award, meeting records, reports, and association with specific project outcomes (outputs, research datasets, activities, impacts)</li> <li>• Creation of ethical review documentation and approval status with content related to project applications</li> <li>• Oversight of progress status for application/award/project approval /outcome processes (both internal and external )</li> </ul> <p>Implementation was a challenge as roles and responsibilities would have to be assigned appropriately.</p>
<b>015.110</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<p>One member asked if signed forms were possible through the workflow. Professor Marshall replied that it depended on the requirement and if needed, the forms could be printed off for signature.</p> <p>Professor Marshall stated that he was not sure if the licensing would be applicable in New York but would check.</p>

015.111	Resolved	That the recommendations be supported and that Professor Marshall seek nominations for implementation group. ( <b>Action: Prof. Marshall</b> )
<b>RESEARCH PROJECT APPLICATION AND AWARDS TRENDS</b>		
015.112	Considered	Statistics on Research Project Applications and Awards 2011-16 (REC15/38/1)
015.113	Reported	By Professor Marshall that the questions arose from the apparent downward trend across the board.
015.113	Discussion	<p>Prof Woodburn felt that HLS were now better on high value but with a lower volume of applications. He thought that there was still an appetite for low value applications but felt they were missing out in mid-range value. There were numerous challenges e.g. RCUK policy and consolidation of doctoral training programmes.</p> <p>Members suggested possible reasons for the downturn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDARs activity planning not being followed through</li> <li>• Staff turnover</li> <li>• Periodic trends i.e. where big successes in the previous years lead to bigger drop off.</li> <li>• Workload implications.</li> <li>• Tough external environment</li> </ul> <p>Members were also keen to emphasise that grants were not the only indicator of research vitality. Quality outputs and joining consortia with other HEIs were another indicator. Collaboration was important for future success.</p> <p>However it was also a fact that SFC Funding was predicated on our income to an extent.</p>
015.113	Resolved	That the statistics be noted
<b>STERN REVIEW OF RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK</b>		
015.114	Considered	Compiled responses to the Stern Review from GCU, Universities Scotland and UUK ( <b>REC15/37/1</b> ).
015.115	Reported	Professor Marshall that the University's response was in line with those of Universities Scotland and UUK.
<b>RESEARCHFISH REPORT</b>		
015.116	Considered	RCUK statistics on GCU submissions to Research Councils in the 2016 submission period ( <b>REC15/43/1</b> ).
015.116	Reported	By Professor Marshall that there was minor inaccuracy in the report due to grant holders having left GCU but it was otherwise complete.
<b>RESEARCH DEGREES</b>		
015.117	Approved	Terms of Reference and Standard Operating Procedures for Research Degree

		Progression and Awards Boards. <b>(RDC15/10/01)</b> .
<b>RISK REGISTER FOR RESEARCH</b>		
<b>015.117</b>	<b>Received</b>	A note outlining the process for completing a risk register for research projects <b>(REC15/40/1)</b> .
<b>GCU RESPONSE TO THE UNIVERSITY INNOVATION FUND CONSULTATION FOR 2016-17</b>		
<b>015.117</b>	<b>Received</b>	A paper providing background information on Government innovation funding <b>(REC15/41/1)</b> .
<b>SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL GRANTS RELATED TO RESEARCH</b>		
<b>015.117</b>	<b>Received</b>	SFC Grants related to Research 2016-17 <b>(REC15/39/1)</b> .
<b>REPLACEMENT FOR THE JE-S SYSTEM</b>		
<b>015.117</b>	<b>Received</b>	A note from the Research Councils about the electronic grants submission system upgrade <b>(REC15/45/1)</b> .
<b>RESEARCH DEGREES COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>015.117</b>	<b>Received</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The confirmed minutes of the final meeting of the Higher Degrees Subcommittee meeting held on 9 December 2015 <b>(HDC15/140/1)</b>.</li> <li>2. The confirmed minutes of the first meeting of the Research Degrees Committee held on 10 February 2016 <b>(RDC15/07/01)</b>.</li> </ol>
<b>SCHOOL RESEARCH COMMITTEES</b>		
<b>015.117</b>	<b>Received</b>	GSBS Research Committee minutes 4 February 2015 <b>(GSBSRC/15/02)</b> .
<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>		
<b>015.118</b>	<b>Received</b>	Notification that the next meeting of the University Research Committee will be held on Wednesday 6 April 2016 in Room B024 (Britannia Building).