



CITY UNIVERSITY LONDON

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH & ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

MEETING NO. 162 HELD ON TUESDAY, 26 MAY 2015

AT 14:00 IN AG01

Minutes

Attendance list

Name of Member		Meeting 160 15/10/2014	Meeting 161 03/02/2015	Meeting 162 26/05/2015
Professor John Fothergill (Chair)	JF	✓	✓	✓
Professor Igor Filatotchev	IF		✓	✓
Professor Feng Li	FL	✓	-	-
Professor Peter Ayton	PA	✓	✓	✓
Professor Jill Francis	JFr	✓	✓	✓
Professor Panicos Kyriacou	PK	✓	✓	Apols
Professor Andrew Choo	AC	✓	✓	✓
Professor Jo Silvester	JS	✓	✓	Apols
Professor John Barbur	JB	✓	✓	Apols
Professor Jason Dykes	JD	✓	Apols	Apols
Dr Anastasia Nesvetailova	AN			
Dr Laudan Nooshin	LN	✓	Apols	✓
Dr Jan Novotny	JN	✓	✓	
Professor Ken Grattan	KG	✓	✓	✓
Professor Ron Douglas	RD	✓	✓	Apols
Dr Claudia Kalay	CK	✓		
Dr Sue O'Hare	SO	✓	✓	-
Dr Karen Shaw	KS		✓	✓
Lenka Shipton	LS	✓	✓	

✓ Indicates attendance

With: Claire Bensusan, Research Development Manager; Louise Doolan (LD), Director of Library Services; Dr Naomi Hammond (NH), Head of Graduate School Office; Andrew Huddart, Strategic Partnerships Manager; Anna Ramberg (AR), Research Development Manager (Secretary) and Dean Stokes (DS), Director of Planning and Strategy Unit.

Apologies also from Dr Claudia Kalay (CK), Deputy Director of Research Office and Dr Dilly Tawakkul, International Research Development Manager

1. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2015 were approved.

2. Matters arising

i. DTC Application

The Committee received an update from KG on the action point from the previous meeting regarding the DTC. Andrew Jones was leading for SASS. The major issue was around the formalising training provisions for research students as it had been recommended previously that City's offer needed to be more solid for the purpose of an DTC application.

ii. Research and Progress (RAP)

The Committee received an update on RAP. NH was in regular dialogue with Manchester (monthly online meetings) regarding issues around RAP. In addition, dedicated meetings with the STRs were being held. Reports on who had logged in recently were available, which could be used to target those who were not using the system.

3. Research & Enterprise Governance

The Committee considered the proposed arrangement for research and enterprise governance. The Committee noted that the current University Research & Enterprise Committee was not conducive to intense discussion about strategy. Informal monthly meetings had been held with the ADRs for some time to discuss strategic issues, but it was felt that a formal Board would be better positioned to develop strategy. The Research, Enterprise and Impact Strategy Board had therefore been created to discuss strategic issues and develop strategy.

4. Reflection on the Research & Enterprise Workshop

The Committee received a verbal report on the research and enterprise workshop held on 29 April 2015. The Committee noted that the main purpose of the workshop had been to map out what the current processes for research and enterprise were. JF and KS would use the outcomes of the workshop to consider how best to integrate research and enterprise.

5. Updates from Schools by the Associate Deans for Research

i. The Committee received the minutes from the School Research Committees for information.

ii. The Committee received verbal updates from the Schools on research and enterprise developments and/or any issues of concern not covered by their minutes. The Committee noted the following in particular:

Cass:

At the February meeting the School Research Committee had discussed the following:

- REF results, including an analysis of how the School had performed in line with what had been expected. The only concern had been that the aspiration of 4* papers was not well correlated.
- The School had restructured their PhD programmes and introduced the MRes some years ago. However, the change in immigration rules had made it difficult for students. Students were now required to reapply for a visa after the completion of the first year MRes in order to continue with the three year PhD programme. Another restructure to make the PhD a four year programme would therefore take place to avoid the need for two visa applications.

- A new programme, Executive PhD, had recently been launched. The programme was part-time and targeted people in reasonably high managerial roles within their companies. There had been eleven intakes this year, with one drop out. The target was to have an intake of fifteen students per year.
- Work was taking place to move the data from Cass Experts to CRO. However, the two systems were not compatible and the progress was slow. IT was assisting and it was hoped that the transfer would be completed by September.
- A new Dean had been appointed, Professor Marianne W Lewis. Professor Lewis would join from University of Cincinnati at the end of the summer.

SASS

The School Research Committee had held a meeting the previous week where the following had been discussed:

- ARQM – there were degrees of concern regarding the ARQM as SASS had 6 UoAs. This meant there were different areas of activity to evaluate, and some areas were small with no one within the School outside that area equipped to do the evaluations. There was also a need to recalibrate the assessment try to match how the evaluations were done in the REF.
- A degree of concern had been expressed about how the results from the ARQM were being used. This was especially in relation to requiring a GPA of 3* for Category A supervisors as there were programmes in SASS where no members of staff would meet this criteria.
- DTC – the School Research Committee felt that there needed to be senior staff involvement in the discussion with other institutions. The discussions that were going on currently were not with the individuals who would ultimately sign off on the application and these individuals needed to be involved at this early stage in the process.
- The advanced doctoral training programme provision was now on the web. The training was specialised and not generic and over and above the training provided for M-level students. It was important that the programme was available to view externally as the training was available to other institutions, as well as the other Schools at City.
- The School was offering 6 PhD studentships. However, there was a concern in the School for staff attrition due to not being able to get funding for PhD students from the University.

SHS

- ARQM – 307 papers had been submitted, whereof 206 were submitted for the first time. Most of the papers had been rated by two individuals. 55% had been returned with identical rating, whereas 38% had shown a 1 scale point difference. Any output where the ratings showed substantial discrepancies had been reviewed by a third individual. The School noted it had lost quite a few members of staff who had been returned to the REF.
- The School Research Committee was currently discussing the creation of a centre for nursing research as well as reconsideration of the research centre structure in general. The current structure had been set up with the REF in mind.
- As there were no centrally supported University studentships available, the School was using some funds to match studentship where 50% was contributed from external funders/charity/industry. These external collaboration could also help with future impact.

- The School was working towards a data sharing contract with the Health & Social Care Information Centre. In order to access the data a validation process was required. This was a complex process and required evidence of the structure throughout the University, not just the School. Various roles would need to be put in place, for instance a senior risk office and a Caldicott guardian, and formal training would be required as well as changes to job descriptions. A specific wording would also need to be added to all job descriptions across the University. Only six other universities were working towards reaching compliance, with Oxford the only compliant institution currently. The Dean of the School would need to raise this issue with ExCo.

SMCSE – not present

Law

- AC had attended the REF 2014 meeting convened by Law subpanel.
- ARQM – the Dean was keen to engage in major recalibration as the scores had previously proven to be too high. A team of four with an external advisor with previous REF experience had therefore been convened to consider all the outputs. In many cases the scores were found to be lower than previously. It was felt that the ARQM was not a good exercise to prepare for the REF. A more forward looking exercise with better planning and monitoring would be more helpful and appropriate.

The following comments were made in response to the provided updates:

- The ARQM would be reviewed over the summer.
- The Graduate School Committee would discuss the DTC and shared training access across Schools.
- The attendance and completion of training by students should be recorded on RAP so that it could be used for future job applications etc.. NH was currently looking into how this could be recorded.

6. Graduate School Activity

i. The Committee received an update on the key discussions from the last Graduate School Committee meeting taking place on Tuesday 26 May. The following had been discussed:

- University insurance – supervisors needed to be aware that some research projects could require additional insurance as they would not be covered by the policy currently in place.
- The Committee had received the annual report on students who teach.
- The research degrees annual evaluation had taken place.
- The Graduate School currently had enough funds in the conference attendance fund for the next year; additional funding would need to be identified for the following year.

ii. The Committee received an update on attracting and supporting doctoral students. The following comments were made:

- Cass wanted to limit the applications it received and concentrate on the high level applicants. There would need to be a way to set the criteria for applicants to Cass at a higher level than for other Schools. There were issues around who controlled the admission process. Programmes which were joined with other universities could create confusion on the website. However, the idea was that as the

potential student clicked down, the information would be specific to the particular School and programme, with special links to other universities as appropriate.

- The new website would be the first port of call for potential students, though it was recognised that research students often searched for an appropriate academic who could supervise them.

7. Vision and Strategy 2026

The Committee received an update on the first phase of staff engagement open sessions and plans for the coming months to create the University's Vision and Strategy 2026. The Committee noted the following:

- A draft would be taken to Council in May 2016. Until then the strategy would undergo redrafting before another round of consultations with staff.
- In terms of research and enterprise it was expected that the top level of the strategy would be in place shortly, for instance targets for REF2020 and PhDs. It was harder to find a small number of key categories for Enterprise, and it was more generic and aspirational.

8. Research and Enterprise Work Stream Project Report

The Committee received an update on the projects within in the work stream.

9. EPSRC Research Data Management Policy

The Committee noted that, in line with action proposed by the Research Office to implement a research data management solution, a Business Case for the procurement of a data repository and additional staff resource was submitted to PRC in February 2015. Approval was granted for software procurement but not the additional human resource requested. IS had subsequently reviewed the proposed solution in light of other data management issues within the University and was now considering other technical solutions that may offer additional data management capacity. IS had hosted a pan University requirements gathering workshop and reviewed the recently published JISC guidance document and a report was being produced that would suggest next steps for IS and wider groups of colleagues in the University.

The University was therefore not able to assure the EPSRC that it had taken action to ensure compliance with this policy, effective from 1st May 2015. When a technical solution was agreed that enables academic colleagues to store and make their data discoverable in accordance with EPSRC requirements, appropriate policies and procedures still needed to be agreed and communicated, alongside a programme of training to ensure colleagues had access to appropriate resources and support.

Robert Clark (RC) from IS informed the Committee that this was a key business project but that a whole transformation programme would need to be put in place. Workshops with associated RDMs in Schools, IS and RO have been held and some analysis of similar size universities had been undertaken. KS pointed out that this was a particular issue to meet the EPSRC requirements and that City was already over a month behind. What RC proposed could take up to a year so it was imperative to implement a solution which met the EPSRC requirements as soon as possible, although the University strategic solution should go ahead too.

The Committee noted that it would damage the University's credibility to not be compliant.

The Committee agreed that a solution which would ensure that the University was compliant with the EPSRC's requirements would need to be implemented immediately while the strategic solution would go ahead independently.

ACTION: KS and RC to take it forward.

10. Research Management Information

The Committee received the latest Research Management Information report. The Committee noted the following:

- A number of EU grants had been successful.
- An internal competition to select one application to the Leverhulme Research Centres, funded for £10m over 10 years had taken place. The outline application had been submitted in April with decision expected in July.
- Two internal competitions for the ESRC had been held in Jan/Feb, with 4 from the 5 applications shortlisted. Decisions should be available for Transformative research call in late June and Future Research Leaders expected in September.

11. Annual Review of Research Centres, Units and Groups

The Committee noted the current list of research centres.

12. Annual Pump Priming Report

The Committee noted the annual pump priming report.

13. University Events

The Committee noted the upcoming events:

- **University Research Competition**, scheduled for 4 June 2015.
- **Made@City**, scheduled for 11 June 2015.

14. Date of meetings 2015/16

Wednesday 28 October 2015, 14:00, AG01

Wednesday 3 February 2016, 14:00, AG01

Tuesday 24 May 2016, 14:00, AG01

Secretary: Anna Ramberg
Email: Anna.Ramberg.1@city.ac.uk
Telephone: 020 7040 3040