

**GLASGOW CALEDONIAN UNIVERSITY**

**RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on 25 September 2014**

**PRESENT:** Professor A. de Ruyter, Professor P. Flowers, Professor D. Harrison, Professor M. Mannion (Chair), Professor J. Marshall, Professor B. Steves, Professor B. Stewart, Professor Jacqueline Tombs

**APOLOGIES:** Dr. G. Cassidy, Professor C. Donaldson, Professor S. Hutchinson, Professor K. Miller, Professor J. Woodburn

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

**WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed.

**MINUTES**

**014.001 Considered:** The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 30May 2014 (REC13//1).

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

**MATTERS ARISING**

*Arising on RCM013.136*

**014.003 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that feedback had been received and the consultation response submitted.

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

**014.004 Reported:** By the Chair that there had been discussions at the Executive Board about reconfiguring research management structures and various options were discussed. No position was fully agreed as yet and he would be convening further meetings with the Deans of School.

**014.005 Reported:** By the Chair that the University's REF 2014 results would be released under embargo on 16 December, followed by a release of all results to HEIs under embargo on 17 December and finally the publication of the results to the REF website on 18 December.

**RESEARCH IMPACT – REVIEW OF POST REF 2014 POSITION**

**014.006 Considered:** A summary of potential impact case studies in REF2014 UoA areas (REC14/02/1).

**014.007 Reported:** By the Secretary that the summary had been put together from responses from UoA Leads. Also attached was a summary of the case studies already in Pure, some of which had been submitted to REF 2014.

**014.008 Discussion:** The Chair expressed disappointment at the lack of case studies in some areas and the general lack of detail and understanding of impact that the responses showed. Members agreed that there was a need to learn from the REF2014 experience and to provide both training and support for case study writers. The following was identified:

- Impact would have to be based on research already completed
- There is a need to plan for impact
- There is a need to create impact stories
- There is a need to identify the strongest candidates for impact case studies and to work with the writers to develop them
- Training is targeted to UoAs/subject specific areas.

It should also be noted that although the Funding Councils' intentions on the format of the next REF were not yet known it was likely that 20—25 case studies would be required in total for the exercise.

**014.009 Resolved:** That research impact training is built into the CREDO programme and that ADRs/DRIs provide feedback to Professor Marshall regarding local requirements.

## **RESEARCH INTEGRITY**

**014.010 Considered:** A paper which sets out developments in the external higher education research environment relating to policies and guidance for assurance of research integrity and good practice in research (REC14/03/1).

**014.011 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that the paper brought together policy proposal and guidance for assurance of research integrity and good practice in research in relation to the adoption by the University of the 'Concordat for supporting research integrity'. In this context and to satisfy external research funding body requirements it is also proposed to adopt the UKRIO 'Code of Good Practice in research'.

The adoption of various documents was not enough in itself so there was a need to show what the University is doing in terms of training and monitoring. It also applied to PGRS training.

**014.012 Discussion:** Members asked if the adoption was mandatory or optional. Professor Marshall stated that in the context of the concordat it would be mandatory. A review of processes and procedures would be required and what standards are already adhered to within Schools and Research Centres in order to identify additional requirements for implementation.

**014.013 Resolved:**

1. That recommendations are approved.
2. That training is provided through CREDO to subject to a review of current processes/procedures to identify requirements.
3. That the documentation is circulated to the relevant groups for signing (with a signature required from Pure users; all PGRS).

## **RESEARCH DATA MANAGEMENT**

**014.014 Considered:** A document setting out a University policy framework for the meeting external requirements in relation to the management, storage, and archiving of research data and open access to research data. (REC14/04/1).

**014.015 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that this was an attempt to formalise a research data management policy. The EPSRC roadmap written in 2012 had highlighted the requirements for data access and secure storage with a compliance deadline in May 2015. This paper was intended to establish the policy baseline although there would be resourcing implications with regard to storage capacity.

**014.016 Discussion:** Members asked about timescale for retaining data. Professor Marshall stated that 10 years is standard, as with EPSRC . The next stage would be to formalise operational procedures which Pure would facilitate to some extent. However the unknown quantity is the required data storage capacity and long term data curation.

It should also be noted that this policy would be subsidiary to the overall GCU Information Classification and Handling Policy which is being developed by IT Services.

**014.017 Resolved:** 1. That the proposals be approved subject to the approval of the GCU Information Classification and Handling Policy  
2. That implementation is reconsidered when approval of the GCU Information Classification and Handling Policy is confirmed and the necessary Pure updates are in place.

### **OPEN ACCESS UPDATE**

**014.018 Considered:** Recent developments in open access to research (REC14/05/1).

**014.019 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that a number of charities had created a joint fund, administered by the Wellcome Trust, for researchers at institutions with funding from the charities. They can apply to the fund to cover the costs incurred publishing papers to open access journals.

**014.020 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that a compliance report had been requested by and delivered to RCUK. It showed that GCU had no “gold” publications and 50% compliance through the “green” route for 2013-14. This is now an annual reporting requirement and exceeds RCUK’s current compliance target of 45%.

**014.021 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that RIOXX system had been developed to provide a mechanism for institutional repositories in use in the UK Higher Education sector to comply with the RCUK policy on open access and standardization of metadata. For GCU and most other institutions there are implications as no internal systems are currently compliant with RIOXX. It was expected that Atira will update Pure to be compliant but this is likely to entail extra costs to institutions.

**014.022 Resolved:** That the update is noted.

### **REF 2014 UPDATE**

**014.023 Considered:** A summary of issues related to the REF 2014 Submission (REC14/06/1).

**014.024 Reported:** By the Secretary that the document summarized the REF 2014 audit requests and the University’s responses for the record. A statement on the HESA HR return was also provided for the record noting the method used for notionally allocating staff to one of the 9 Units of Assessment returned by GCU to REF2014. Also provided was a letter from REF outlining the sequence for publication of results, as outlined by the Chair above, and further details of information to be published in 2015.

**014.025 Resolved:** That the update is noted.

### **CARNEGIE TRUST STUDENTSHIPS**

**014.026 Considered:** Information about a proposed visit from the Carnegie Trust and Carnegie Trust studentships (REC14/07/1).

**014.027 Reported:** By Professor Marshall that representatives from the trust had been invited to attend the next Research Committee meeting on 12 November to discuss changes in the allocation of its annual

PhD studentships. He asked members if they had a view about a process for allocating of GCU quota of studentship applications and a single point of contact for managing the process.

**014.028 Discussion:** Members suggested that the priorities should be on interdisciplinarity and supporting the Scottish HE system.

**014.029 Resolved:** 1. The visit to the Committee on 12 November is welcomed.  
2. There is further consideration of the allocation mechanism at the next meeting.

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**014.030 Approved:** The Terms of Reference of the Committee (**REC11/11/5**).

### **COMPOSITION AND MEMBERSHIP**

**014.031 Approved:** The Composition and Membership of the Committee (**REC14/08/1**).

### **RESEARCH COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT**

**014.032 Approved:** The Research Committee Annual Report 2013-14 (**REC14/09/1**).

### **RESEARCHFISH**

**014.033 Received:** Information on the Research Councils UK data collection system (**REC14/10/1**)

### **HIGHER DEGREES SUBCOMMITTEE**

**014.034 Received:** The minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2014 (**HDC13/ 202/1**).

### **SEBE SCHOOL RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**014.035 Received:** The minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2014 (SEBE RC 13/20) and 4<sup>th</sup> June 2014 (**SEBE RC 13/24**).