



Department of Governance

<b>GLASGOW CALEDONIAN UNIVERSITY</b>		
<b>UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE</b>		
Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2019		
<b>Present:</b>	Mr M. Anderson, Professor K. Currie, Professor C. Donaldson (Chair), Professor L. Elliot, Professor R. Emmanuel, Professor J. Harris, Professor O. Pahl, Professor B. Steves	
<b>In attendance:</b>	Ms D. Donaldson, Mr R. Ruthven, Mr P Woods (Secretary)	
<b>Apologies:</b>	Professor R. Clougherty, Dr L. Gray, Professor B. Hughes, Dr D. Lukic, Dr J. Thomson	
<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>018.052</b>	<b>Considered</b>	The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 ( <b>REC18/10/01</b> ).
<b>018.053</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	That the minutes be approved as a correct record.
<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>		
<b>Online Research Surveys (arising on 018.029)</b>		
<b>018.054</b>	<b>Reported</b>	By the Secretary that there had not been any progress since the last meeting.
<b>018.055</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	Members discussed whether or not this was a research exclusive issue and it was concluded that it was not. The relevant departments should be able to take this forward i.e. IT Services, Strategy and Planning and Governance.
<b>Summary of HESA PGR Data, Trends and Processes (arising on 018.043)</b>		
<b>018.056</b>	<b>Reported</b>	By Professor Steves that details of the HESA research data dashboard had been circulated to members with details of how to access.
<b>PhDs: New Admissions and Funding Processes (arising on 018.047)</b>		
<b>018.057</b>	<b>Reported</b>	By Professor Steves that the website would be updated.

REF 2021		
018.058	Considered	The draft REF 2021 Code of Practice ( <b>RMG18/02/03</b> ).
018.059	Reported	<p>By the Chair that the draft Code was being reviewed by the REF Management Group, URC and then would go to the Executive Board. There would be a wider consultation during February and consideration by Senate and Court in March. There was a SFC event related to development of Codes of Practice on 25 February which could provide useful input.</p> <p>After the Court consideration the Code would then be ready to go to SFC. In the light of this process there would be potentially various iterations before the final draft for SFC.</p>
018.060	Discussion	<p>Members discussed the draft code section by section.</p> <p><b>Part 1 – Principles</b></p> <p>Members agreed this was relatively straight forward.</p> <p><b>Part 2 – Identifying Staff with Significant Responsibility for Research</b></p> <p>Some members commented that the section was already improved since the REF Management Group meeting.</p> <p>The Chair reminded members that some selectivity is built in to the REF guidance which will determine staff that are eligible for submission. This identification would be an iterative process with a number of stages. Figure 1 indicated what these stages would look like.</p> <p>The process would be helped by having a history UoA (and potentially one for Education) allowing more staff to be situated in a UoA which would potentially suit their research better than the other identified UoAs.</p> <p>It was suggested that impact case studies could be a major influence particularly in the less developed UoAs e.g. education.</p> <p>2.1.6 sets out the <i>substantive connection</i>. A member asked if all 4 of these qualifiers were required to be eligible. The Chair stated that this was not necessarily the case.</p> <p>It was suggested that “research Centres” should be changed to “themes and groups”.</p> <p>A member queried use of phrase “sufficient quality” (2.1.5, bullet 3). The Chair agreed that this should be changed to reflect that there may be some variation across UoAs. No threshold would be specified in the Code of Practice.</p> <p>One member referred to the allocation of research time and suggested that this is likely to be raised, possibly via the trade unions.</p> <p>On the matter of appeals, some members suggested that it may be useful to</p>

		<p>consult more widely, e.g. take the Code to JCC for consultation.</p> <p><b>Part 3 – Determining Research Independence</b></p> <p>3.1.3 <i>Criteria for inclusion as independent researcher.</i> One member suggested that this section appears more onerous than the significant responsibility definition in the previous section. The Chair replied that ostensibly it is but <i>roman v.</i> (<i>They have had significant input into the design, conduct and interpretation of the research</i>) allows a wider interpretation. It was suggested that this definition may be more useful as significant responsibility qualifier(s). The Chair stated that this could be seen as being more restrictive.</p> <p><b>Part 4 –Outputs</b></p> <p>4.1.13 <i>Procedure for selecting outputs</i></p> <p>The procedure is not specified in the Code as this will be delegated to the UoAs. However, while it was intended to allow some flexibility for subject areas, it was also intended to avoid too much variance between UoAs. The REF Management Group would be responsible for managing any variance.</p> <p><b>Appendix 4: Timetable</b></p> <p>It was proposed to use “internal scoping” to replace “internal assessment” to avoid any confusion.</p>
018.061	Resolved	That draft Code of Practice be updated in line with the above discussion.
<b>RESEARCH DATA MANAGMENT</b>		
018.062	Considered	An update by the Director of Library Services on potential solutions (REC18/11/01).
018.063	Reported	<p>By Mr Ruthven that various suppliers and systems had been looked with a view to moving forward on the aspirational research data management policy, taking the Digital Presearvation Policy into account. Other HEIs had also been looked at with a view potentially sharing services. He also informed members that JISC were in the process of developing a system but it was not ready.</p> <p>Therefore the recommendations were based on all of the assessed options.</p>
018.064	Discussion	A members asked if the Aridhia cloud-based system had been looked at. Mr Ruthven said yes but the scoping was wider than the provision by Aridhia.
018.065	Resolved	That the proposal is taken to the Executive Board for consideration ( <b>Action: PVCN/Director of Library Services</b> ).
<b>ORCID MEMBERSHIP</b>		
018.066	Considered	A discussion on the academic case for GCU Orcid membership.
018.067	Reported	By the Chair that the REF Management Group had said this was not a priority at this stage.
018.068	Discussion	Mr Ruthven stated that in general the Library’s position was in favour but this

		would be for the managed version which cost £10K. We could encourage sign up by staff as this was free, but we would not be able to monitor this. The main benefit was providing a single ID across various systems (Including Pure).
<b>018.069</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	That the Library develop and actions Plan ( <b>Action: Director Library Services</b> ).
<b>RESEARCH INTEGRITY</b>		
<b>018.070</b>	<b>Considered</b>	An update on 2018-19 activity (ref Annual statement) ( <b>REC18/12/01</b> ).
<b>018.071</b>	<b>Reported</b>	<p>By the Secretary that the review was based on the plan of activities for session 2018-19 set out in the 2017-18 annual report.</p> <p>It was to be noted that some progress had been made in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research Degree Regulations</li> <li>• Data Protection Guidance</li> <li>• Authorship guidance refresh</li> <li>• Refresh of RDC forms</li> <li>• Embedding of research integrity in PGRS induction</li> </ul> <p>Further work was ongoing in relation to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refresh of regulations for the Award of PhD by previous works</li> <li>• Authorship guidelines specifically for PGR Students</li> <li>• Continued refresh of RDC forms and PGR student guidance (i.e. the Code of Practice)</li> <li>• Web content creation and refresh</li> <li>• Embedding research integrity in the researcher development programme.</li> <li>• Other research integrity dissemination events.</li> </ul>
<b>018.072</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	That an end of year progress report be brought back to the final meeting of the session ( <b>Action: URC Secretary</b> ).
<b>ECR DEFINITION</b>		
<b>018.073</b>	<b>Considered</b>	A definition of ECR for GCU ( <b>REC18/16/01</b> ).
<b>018.074</b>	<b>Reported</b>	<p>By the Chair that the aim had been identify a group of ECRs in the University using a definition that reflected a modern university like GCU. The definition arrived at was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• anyone 5-10 years post-PhD (but excluding staff who may have a recent PhD but are obviously well-established in research track records);</li> <li>• staff within 5 years of appointment and currently undertaking a PhD;</li> <li>• staff within 5-10 years of a Prof Doc award with a proven record of publication.</li> </ul> <p>Based on this definition there were 94 ECRs at GCU (as of 31 December 2018).</p> <p>This would now feed into the formation of local ECR groups and the refresh of the DARE Steering Group. A more detailed version of this paper would be presented to the Executive Board.</p>
<b>018.075</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	Members welcomed the definition. The Chair stated that he would be

		comfortable with the EB version of the paper being shared more widely.  Professor Steves informed members that local groups had fed into this process.
<b>018.076</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	That the definition be noted.
<b>DARE (Developing Academic Researchers in Excellence) Steering Group</b>		
<b>018.077</b>	<b>Considered</b>	A revised terms of reference and composition for the reconstituted steering group ( <b>REC18/13/01</b> ).
<b>018.078</b>	<b>Reported</b>	By Professor Steves that the researcher development steering group terms of reference and composition had been approved by the University Research Committee. This proposal updated those to describe an overseer role on the HR Excellence in Research action plan and make this group focused on early career researchers and contract research staff. The aim was to be action-focused and plan working groups and draw together activity locally and centrally.
<b>018.079</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	Members welcomed the move on from the CREDO group. It was hoped that there would be a good news story to include in the REF narratives.
<b>018.080</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	That the revised terms of reference and composition for DARE Steering Group be approved.
<b>LIVE ISSUES</b>		
<b>School Research Committees</b>		
<b>018.081</b>	<b>Reported</b>	By the Secretary that there had been some discussion on regularizing terms of reference and compositions. There would be further discussion with relevant stakeholders ( <b>Action: URC Secretary/PVCR/ADRs</b> )
<b>Researcher Career Development: Consultation</b>		
<b>018.082</b>	<b>Received</b>	The Consultation questions on the revision of <i>Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers</i> ( <b>REC18/14/01</b> ).
<b>RESEARCH DEGREES COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>018.083</b>	<b>Received</b>	The confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2018 ( <b>RDC18/08/01</b> ).
<b>NEW PGR CONTACTS LIST</b>		
<b>018.084</b>	<b>Received</b>	New PGR contacts list ( <b>REC18/15/01</b> ).