



Department of Governance

GLASGOW CALEDONIAN UNIVERSITY		
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE		
Minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020		
Present:	Mr M. Anderson, Professor K. Currie, Professor C. Donaldson (Chair), Professor R. Emmanuel, Professor L. Elliot, Dr L. Gray, Professor J. Harris, Professor B. Hughes, Dr D. Lukic, Professor O. Pahl, Professor B. Steves, Professor J. Woodburn	
In attendance:	Ms M. Daly, Ms D. Donaldson, Mr P Woods (Secretary)	
By Invitation	Mr A. McKinnon(RIO)	
Apologies:	Ms. S. Docherty, Dr J. Thomson	
MINUTES		
019.055	Considered	The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2019 (REC19/13/01).
019.056	Resolved	That the minutes be approved as a correct record.
MATTERS ARISING		
Criteria for Allocation of Open Access Funding (arising on 019.026)		
019.057	Reported	By Mr Ruthven that meetings between the Library and Schools to discuss this matter were ongoing.
Survey Software for Research (arising on 019.050)		
019.058	Reported	By Mr Ruthven that a University working group was being led by Academic Development and could provide an update on the University position.
PURE Online PAF		
019.059	Considered	A discussion item on best practice for assigning staff as PIs/Co-Is on collaborative projects.
019.060	Reported	By Mr McKinnon that he was the lead in RIO for the transfer from the paper-based PAF to the online Pure-based PAF. The aim, currently, is to release the online version on 1 August 2020. He would be looking to the research advisors

		to provide feedback in the development phase and aimed to have workshops in May/June with individual academics who would be asked to trial the online process. For the moment it was business as usual but with the online move there were policy and/or culture changes required and a need to update guidance. PI/Co-I aspects with regard to assigning academic staff as PIs or Co-Is on collaborative projects with other institutions was one example. There may be other things that become apparent, such as mandatory fields that GCU don't use but which can't be switched off, as well as ones we would like to make mandatory but can't.
019.061	Discussion	<p>Members asked who would be responsible if there are gaps in the online form.</p> <p>Mr McKinnon replied that RIO would correct where possible but it may be necessary to go back to the research advisor or academic lead. The online process will make this easier.</p> <p>Members agreed that it is the academic's responsibility to ensure the PAF is completed correctly and RIO's role was as gatekeeper.</p> <p>It was suggested that all fields could be made mandatory although it would be useful, first, if the unnecessary fields could be switched off. It was agreed that contacting Elsevier to ascertain whether or not these fields could be switched off or even to explain why they are currently mandatory.</p> <p>The issue of late submissions was discussed and that it was currently a growing problem. Members also cited extenuating circumstances for some cases and were wary of introducing severe measures potentially penalizing all who found themselves in this situation. However it was suggested that there should be a separation of any extraordinary circumstances and habitual lateness.</p>
019.062	Resolved	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Elsevier be contacted regarding any flexibility for turning on/off fields (Action: RIO). 2. That there is a message from the PVCRC regarding the need to keep to PAF deadlines (Action: PVCRC/Director RIO).
RESEARCH INTEGRITY		
019.063	Considered	A report from the Assistant VP Research on implementation of the revised Concordat to Support Research Integrity (REC19/14/01).
019.064	Reported	<p>By Professor Woodburn that he had attended the Scottish Research Integrity Network meeting in 2019.</p> <p>He found that there was a good appetite for networking on research integrity amongst Scottish HEIs and good potential for sharing of good practice and materials to support research integrity. In that respect it may be worthwhile seeing what we could tap into via the Network before duplicating effort internally.</p> <p>Some key themes were discussed such as the embedded cultural impression that there are no problems with research integrity in the sector and also how best to deal with misconduct when it is discovered.</p>

		<p>He got the impression that research integrity was mostly dealt with via support offices as there was minimal academic representation at the meeting.</p> <p>The network would be co-ordinated by the research integrity manager at Edinburgh University, Alan Campbell. At the meeting it was suggested that the Network could be incorporated into RKEC.</p> <p>In terms of actions for GCU, he recommended the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University adopt the Concordat • That GCU joins the active Network • That GCU be open to hosting SRIN meetings • That RIO be the hub for research integrity co-ordination in GCU • That there is further development work to integrate research ethics, integrity and culture. • To develop research integrity champions at more local levels • Undertake a gap analysis based on the revised concordat. <p>The SRIN were keen to emphasise a co-ordinated Scottish approach based on taking broadly similar approaches and sharing good practice.</p>
019.065	Discussion	<p>Members asked if the “champions” were proposed to be academic staff or support staff. Professor Woodburn replied that there were no concrete proposals but he thought it could be both.</p> <p>Mr Anderson stated that the linkage with the work of RIO (e.g. contracts) made it seem a good fit for a co-ordinating role.</p> <p>Professor Hughes stated that, as Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Subcommittee, some reconfiguration of the subcommittee to take the revised concordat into account would be logical.</p> <p>It was suggested that asking School Research Committees to nominate an integrity champion but members were keen to specify what the role would be first. It was agreed that this could be extrapolated from the Concordat.</p> <p>Professor Steves commented that she could see similar themes in the Concordat to support Research Integrity and the Concordat to support the Career Development of Researchers, encompassing culture and research integrity.</p> <p>Professor Woodburn stated that there was an opportunity to do something quite interesting in terms of developing skills and knowledge in the area of research integrity.</p> <p>It was proposed that research integrity could be a standing item on URC agendas and it was noted that a mid –term review of the annual action plan should be normal practice.</p>
019.066	Resolved	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Concordat to Support Research Integrity be endorsed and recommended to Senate (Action: URC Chair/Secretary). 2. That research integrity be a standing item on the URC agenda. 3. That RIO is the main co-ordinating department for research integrity.

		4. That the other proposed actions be considered further in context of the mid-term review of the action plan. (Action: URC Secretary, PVCRC, AVP Research, Director R&I).
REF 2021 UPDATE		
019.067	Considered	A draft update paper for consideration (before submission to RMG, Executive Board, Senate and Court) (REC19-18-01).
019.068	Reported	By the Chair that this was a draft report and that the completed version would be provided to the Executive Board, Senate and Court. The outcomes of the mock REF Section was still incomplete but would be updated when the data was available.
019.069	Discussion	Mr Anderson informed members that nearly all impact case studies and the environment statements had been received in draft format. Some comparisons with REF 2014 were included in the report with caveats. The Chair added that the report would have some contextualisation for the different audiences.
019.070	Resolved	That the update be noted.
CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCHERS		
019.071	Considered	An item arising from the SHLS ECR network (REC19/17/01)
019.072	Reported	By Professor Currie that the Network had surveyed members towards the end of 2019 and subsequently brought a paper to the School Research Committee. The survey data revealed some issues related to the availability of training and time available for training/development in a group defined as a “grey area” i.e. more than 10 years post PhD but still identifying as ECR/in need of training and development. Workloads and lack of time for training or development were cited as key issues for this group. The report had also been shared with the DARE group. She welcomed members’ thoughts on this report and on challenges facing ECRs.
019.073	Discussion	Professor Steves welcomed the survey report. She informed members that this issue had arisen during the gap analysis for the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers i.e. who does the Concordat apply to. Similar issues had been raised through DARE e.g. training opportunities, time available for training, building in training needs to PDARs. She felt that People Services needed to be included in the wider discussion as it was in relation to staff contracts. Other members commented that this was a significant issue for many ECRs who were feeling under pressure due to short-term contracts and lack of a career development pathway. It was clear there was a need to think carefully and flexibly about how resources are used going forward. Members agreed and that this was a problem facing many institutions across the sector. Professor Steves suggested that one positive note was that developing pathways and wider talent management was possible without

		<p>recourse to large resources.</p> <p>The Chair added that these matters would feed into the gap analysis on the Concordat and ultimately into a report for the Executive Board covering HR Excellence in Research and the Concordat implications, which was being prepared by the Director of the Graduate School. It was an opportunity to make a statement on priorities in relation to REG funding post REF 2021.</p> <p>Members had suggestions on possible ways forward, such as personal development accounts or an allocated reflective period post (PhD) qualification.</p> <p>Some members commented that the problem stemmed from the teaching load and the reduced number of people doing it who were also expected to do research. It was felt that many staff were already doing research in their own time. Another member drew attention to the significance of the sigres figure of 34% in the REF report.</p> <p>There was interest amongst members for re-envisaging the REG resource post REF and mention of action to bridge post-doc to open-ended contracts.</p>
019.074	Resolved	That the report feed into the Director Graduate School's gap analysis and report to Executive Board (Action: Director Graduate School).
SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT – RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ITEMS		
019.075	Considered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A summary of the Muscatelli Report, <i>Driving innovation in Scotland</i> (REC19/15/01). 2. The Programme for Government 2019-20 extracts related to the University sector (REC19-16-01). 3. Universities Scotland RKEC Update and Scottish Government Justice Analytical Services call for proposals (REC19-19-01). 4. A briefing note on Brexit from the Scottish Funding Council (REC19-20-01). 5. An update from UKRI regarding Horizon 2020 funding (REC19-21-01)
019.076	Reported	By Professor Woodburn that he had been in attendance at the RKEC meeting where this was introduced by Professor Muscatelli. The proposals were largely unchallenged at that meeting. The sense is that all HEIs will improve in REF2021 and therefore this is a move to capture the majority of available resources in the research intensive HEIs. He had concerns about the hub and spoke model proposed.
019.077	Discussion	<p>Other members agreed that this report was not favorable to the University or other post '92s. There were areas where the University could target "spoke" opportunities but members had concerns about the proposed model allowing for access to funding.</p> <p>The Chair asked if there was any mechanism to voice concerns. Ms Daly replied that it was difficult as the report was already in the public domain but there may be an opportunity through the outcome agreement.</p> <p>Members saw tie in with ODAs and targeting the "national mission" and highlighting the University's social impact to the Scottish Government. Widening access was a good story for GCU but lobbying would be necessary.</p>

019.078	Resolved	That the PVCR consider a possible response and other lobbying possibilities.
LIVE ISSUES		
019.079	Reported	By Ms Donaldson that Gillian Woodlock, Brand and Content Producer would provide an update for the Committee at the 1 April meeting.
ELIR		
019.080	Reported	By Professor Steves that ELIR4 was complete and there would be Panel visits in March 2020. Members may be asked to contribute to feedback on PGR themes.
019.081	Resolved	The ELIR timetable is circulated to Research Networks (Action: Director Graduate School).
REF 2021 MANAGEMENT GROUP		
019.082	Received	The confirmed minutes of the meetings held on 1. 4 October 2019 (RMG19/08/01). 2. 7 November 2019 (RMG19/09/01).
SCHOOL RESEARCH COMMITTEES		
019.083	Received	1. Confirmed minutes of the SCEBE RC meeting 19 September 2019 (SCEBE/RC/19/08). 2. Confirmed minutes of the SHLS RC meeting 26 November 2018 (HLS/RC/18/07/0). 3. Confirmed minutes of the SHLS RC meeting 19 March 2019 (HLS/RC/18/10/01). 4. Confirmed minutes of the SHLS RC meeting on 8 May 2019 (SHLS/RC/18/14/01).