**Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 24th Sept 2014 at 3pm, Boardroom, Poole House**

Present: J Fletcher (Chair); J Northam; G Beards; J Taylor; A Mullineux; D Patton;

I MacRury; V Hundley; S Page; J Roach; E Crowley; J Deveky; E Mayo; R Hurst

Not in Attendance: C Fowler; J Vinney; M Cash; S Stringer; Don McQueen

|  |
| --- |
| **AGENDA** |
| **1** | **WELCOME & APOLOGIES** |  |
|  |  |
|  | The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting.Apologies were received from: C Fowler; J Vinney; M Cash; S Stringer; Don McQueen |
|  |  |
| **2** | **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (1st May 2014)** |
|  |  |
| **2.1** | All agreed |
| **2.2** | Discussed the actions from the previous meeting:* 1. Investigate whether the quarterly research income meetings and the quarterly finance meetings could be merged

J Northam is liaising with J Jones in F&P to see whether they can be linked up. The first ones are due to start end of Oct/early Nov, if we can then we will. This will be confirmed in due course. A point was raised as to who is the most suitable representative from the schools to attend these meetings DDRE’s to make a decision on who from their school/faculty is invited to the meetings. Accurate information and an understanding of the finances is what are required. Once J Northam has had her meeting with J Jones she can send out a proposal which confirms the purpose of the meetings and then the most appropriate person can be selected to attend. |
|  | **ACTION:** J Northam to send out a proposal which sets out criteria  |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Northam |
|  |  |
| **2.3** | Ensure Research PAD is accessible on the Staff Intranet and the Research BlogResearch PAD is accessible on the staff intranet via an icon at the bottom of the staff portal page. J Northam can add a link to Research PAD on to the research blog. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** J Taylor to send link to J Northam to add to the Research Blog |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Taylor and J Northam |
|  |  |
| **2.4** | Review HEIF BudgetJ Fletcher and J Northam have completed the budget review and spoken to the HEIF project leaders. Regular updates on a monthly basis have been requested as to where we are with the HEIF spending.J Northam spoke to Adrian Day from HEFCE, he is involved with the HEIF management and he has confirmed there will be further HEIF funding, J Northam to speak to him this week to discuss this in more detail.  |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** J Northam to pursue this and disseminate information |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Northam |
|  |  |
| **2.5** | There is now a HEIF committee which consists of HEIF project leaders and a Marketing and Communication rep, and J Northam and J Codling from RKEO. The meeting is chaired by J Fletcher. They will produce a report which comes to this committee.The other sub-committees, including REF and the Research Concordat Steering Group, will also feed in to this committee.URKEC will then report to Senate. URKEC and its sub-committees will meet three times a year, with the occasional meeting in between to address particular issues. |
|  | **ACTION:** R Hurst to circulate minutes from HEIF and REF meetings to URKEC committee. |
|  | **ACTION BY:** R Hurst |
|  |  |
| **3** | **ANNUAL REVIEW OF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (CHAIR)** |
|  |  |
| **3.1** | J Fletcher confirmed that BU is changing the RKE income KPI in the way that is measured. This will be monitored over a three year period instead of annually. KPI1 Academic strength: showing upwards arrow, which is promising, we are currently standing at 55%, target for 2018 is 100% so more work to be done to improve this.With regard to PI1 (research outputs) there was concern that the measurement did not take into account ECRs. J Northam confirmed that PRIME collected this data from the REF submission (including all staff who were considered in the mock exercises) and so ECRs have been included with their permitted reductions in output. However, there isn’t yet a mechanism in place to make allowances for ECRs (i.e. reduced output) for future measurements.J Fletcher has been charged with discussing ways of measuring outputs so we can start looking at alternative ways of recording quality. Quality is as important as volume. The period over which you measure can be changed but not the KPI. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** A small group of project leaders to work with RKEO to scribe out what the composition and justification of the way we measure the KPI’s. |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Northam and I MacRury |
|  |  |
| **3.2** | BRIAN still needs to be used more actively and has recently been introduced as part of the BU appraisal process so should increase KPI5. This should reflect an increase next time round. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Detailed verbal description of the PIs which we could circulate. Sub-set of URKEC to look at this, one rep from each school, RKEO and JF to be invited |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Northam and I MacRury |
|  |  |
| **4** | **URKEC TERMS OF REFERENCE AND THE REMIT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES** |
|  |  |
| **4.1** | Unchanged ToR, membership has changed due to the split in the meetings. URKEC receives reports from the sub committees which feed in to URKEC which reports to Senate. |
|  |  |
| **5** | **GRADUATE SCHOOL UPDATE** |
|  |  |
| **5.1** | The Code of Practice for Research Degrees has been circulated to the committee, the changes are minor. In 2014-15 the Graduate School will be working with EDQ to undertake the first periodic review so we kept the changes down to a minimum with a few individual points strengthened and clarified. Research Pad launched in April 2014 and is working relatively well with a few issues and teething problems. J Taylor thanked the committee for their continued support. The message remains to promote this as much as possible amongst supervisors and PGR’s.Studentships are being launched in a new round in mid-October, five fully funded, 45 match funded studentships.J Fletcher is leading a review across academic staff and PGR’s however in the meantime the graduate school is delivering the PGR Development programme as normal.The steering group will try and establish a mixed model and there should be something in place by Jan 2015.A point was raised as to whether there is scope for collating a CPD programme to record this kind of activity internally and externally and or finding a way of accrediting this. A point was raised as to whether Research Pad has a system of alerting supervisors when something has been added by a student. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** J Taylor to raise this with IT at a future meeting and to feedback results to the committee |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Taylor |
|  |  |
|  | Another point was raised relating to the clarification required for the sign off for the annual review. There is no facility in the software to capture this. It was agreed that permissions should be looked at and given to DDRE’s in all the schools. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** DDRE’S need to be given access to RA permissions on Research Pad |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Fletcher |
|  |  |
|  | It was suggested that some usability sessions be organised to resolve some of the issues we are facing with Research Pad. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** To see if we can set up a usability session  |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Taylor |
|  |  |
|  | The committee were concerned about the lack of research administration in the Schools/Faculty. An inventory list is to be drawn up of what support is and isn’t provided to iron out any gaps in the structure |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** J Northam and Ian MacRury to draft a first version to be sent to DDRE’s  |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Northam and I MacRury |
|  |  |
| **6** | **CODE OF GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE** |
|  |  |
| **6.1** | The current version was last updated and approved in 2006 and is very short. The Code has recently been updated and the plan is to update it annually from now on and bring it to URKEC this time each year for approval. The current version has been expanded upon and covers new topics and the team have looked at good practice nationally and internationally. It was presented to URKEC for ratification that it can become a public document.Comments madeV Hundley requested that the document refers to low and middle income countries and not developing countries and high income countries not developed countries. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Change the current wording in line with the terms of good practice |
|  | **ACTION BY:** Julie Northam |
|  |  |
| **6.2** | The Code pulls together other policies and practices that we already have, for a lot of these policies we will have comms plans, and there will be training events happening around this code of practice. J Fletcher suggested that RKEO are invited to attend the school/faculty research away days to present some of the key points.Research data management (RDM) is a new addition to this area. RDM carries significant resource implications in terms of staffing and sharing and developing trends. This is something that BU needs to invest additional resource in. Other universities have invested and recruited specific posts to support this.  |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Pull out some examples of how this is done in other HEIs and send to J Fletcher |
|  | **ACTION BY:** E Crowley and S Stringer |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Circulate the updated version of this document to the committee. |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Northam |
|  |  |
| **7** | **CODE OF PRACTICE FOR RESEARCH DEGRESS** |
|  |  |
| **7.1** | This was covered in point 5 by J Taylor.One comment was raised regarding the guidelines for studentships on the authorship of publications as much of this information is duplicated in the Publications Policy. There should be one policy rather than two. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** It was agreed this should be a single document |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Northam and J Taylor |
|  |  |
| **8** | **ACADEMIC PUBLICATION POLICY REVIEW** |
|  |  |
| **8.1** | The policy has not been updated since 2011 and was originally written by J Northam and E Crowley.The updated policy now incorporates topics such as Open Access, RDM and REF requirements. Of particular note is that the policy now mandates a requirement for a full version of all outputs to be uploaded to BURO at point of acceptance. Compliance will be monitored via appraisal, academic career progression and by RKEO. It also contains information about authors’ rights to retain their copyright with links to support documents on how this can be done through Sparc. Support can be offered from RKEO and LLS to help with this. It was suggested that a session on copyright issues could be provided. E Crowley can be contacted if this is required.It was discussed that academics are to enter full text articles on to BRIAN as an unsecure pdf which is text mineable as we score higher in REF 2020.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | J Northam presented a brief paper on eBU and encouraged the Committee to use the service, stating the system is locked down to BU staff and students only. The user can login, upload draft papers and receive feedback on their papers and also give feedback to other papers. She noted this is a great opportunity to provide feedback to students and staff on their papers and requested colleagues promote this as a useful tool. Prof I MacRury stated that a group in MS are keen to do something similar; Prof Fletcher would like them to engage with eBU.  |
|  |  |
| **9** | **GRANTS ACADEMY REVIEW**  |
|  |  |
| **9.1** | Dr R Edwards presented a review document on the Grants Academy, sharing background on the scheme which commenced two years ago. Since then 102 members have joined. The scheme requires that three proposals are submitted during their 18 month tenure on the scheme. The scheme includes intense training for academics regarding proposals and there are other resources available. Overall, feedback is positive about the Grants Academy. However, there is a trend that expectation of members is not as high as it was hoped for and a large core of members have still not submitted a proposal as part of the scheme. This is attributed to a lack of strategic recruitment and waning enthusiasm by members, potentially due to expectation and commitment issues. The scheme has developed in isolation from other BU processes which can hinder academic proposals if they are unaware of the processes.  |
| **10** | **UPDATES FROM SUB-COMMITTEES** |
|  |  |
| **10.1** | * REF Committee (tbc)

Minutes will be circulated* HEIF Committee (tbc)

Minutes will be circulated* KTP Steering Group (J Northam)

The group has not met yet* Research Concordat Steering Group (J Northam)

The next meeting is scheduled for this Friday. The group will discuss ratification of the code of practice for the recruitment and development of research staff. This will be circulated to this committee when approved. The group will also discuss the preparation for the two year audit which takes place at the end of 2014. |
|  |  |
| **11** | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS** |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Next agenda to include a discussion point around increasing student engagement with, and awareness of, research. |
|  | **ACTION BY:** All |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Could we have a University wide ECR policy, respect to guidance for training, careers structure. |
|  | **ACTION BY:** J Fletcher (fusion ratification first) |
|  |  |
|  | J Fletcher confirmed that I MacRury will be deputy chair of this committee. |
|  |  |
|  | **Date of next meeting: 26th Jan 2-4pm Boardroom** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Rhyannan HurstCommittee ClerkRKE-14-15-01 Minutes 24 Sept 2014 |