CITY RESEARCH & ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

MEETING NO. 168 HELD ON THURSDAY, 23 NOVEMBER 2017

AT 14.30 IN D427

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

Attendance List

Name of Member		Meeting 167 31/01/2017	Meeting 168 22/06/2017	Meeting 169 23/11/2017
Professor Andrew Jones (Chair)	**AJ**	✓	✓	✓
Dr Tawhida Ahmed	**TA**	S	✓	A
Dr Miguel Mera	**MM**	✓	✓	✓
Professor Charles Baden-Fuller	**CBF**	✓	✓	S
Dr Nicola Botting	**NB**	✓	✓	✓
Louise Doolan	**LD**	A	✓	✓
Professor Ron Douglas	**RD**	A	✓	✓
Dr Elaine Fahey	**EF**	S	✓	A
Professor Ken Grattan	**KG**	✓	✓	A
Professor Chris Hull	**CH**	✓	✓	✓
Professor Paula Jarzabkowski	**PJ**	S	S	✓
Professor Panicos Kyriacou	**PK**	✓	N/A	✓
Dr Laudan Nooshin	**LN**	✓	A	✓
Dr Simone Stumpf	**SS**	✓	✓	✓
Dr Karen Shaw	**KS**	✓	A	A
Dr Sally Barlow	**SB**	✓	✓	A
Dr Nicholas Behn	**NB**	✓	✓	A

Ms Sadie Wickwar	**SW**	✓	N/A	**A**	
Professor Caroline Wiertz	**CW**	✓	A	✓	

✓ Indicates attendance
With: Christine Giroux (CG), Strategic Programmes Manager; Dr Claudia Kalay (CK), Head of Research Support Services; Dr Natalie Cozier (NC),Head of Team (Academic Enterprise), John Montgomery (JM) Head of Strategy and Compliance; Mariah Loukou (ML), Research & Enterprise Policy Officer and Joanna Short (JS), Research & Enterprise Office Administrator (Secretary).

Attendance key:
✓   Present
A   Apologies received
R   Representative in attendance
N/M   Period when not a member
N/A   No apologies received
S   Sabbatical

Apologies also from Alex Elkins (AE), Entrepreneurship Education Manager.

The Committee also noted that Professor Ron Douglas had stepped down from the Committee and Professor Peter Ayton was appointed in his place.

1. Terms of Reference
The Committee noted the terms of reference and agreed the suggested changes.
The Chair has confirmed the role of the Committee as an advisory to the Vice-President of Research and Enterprise. The primary role serves the purpose of achieving City's strategic aims relating to Research and Enterprise.
The Committee noted the current governance review of this Committee, with the possibility of a Research Committee becoming a sub-committee of Senate. In future there could be a two –part Committee: Research having a formal governance function and Enterprise with a less formal function.
With regards to governance of the Committee and terms of reference there are a specific requirement which need to reflect the constitution of the Committee: representation from each school i.e. Associated Deans of Research, the Research Ethics Committee, the Research and Enterprise Office and Senate.
There is a discussion at Senate as to what delegated authority ADR's have from Deans of Schools. The Committee should receive an update sometime in the first quarter of next year.
The Committee noted points which need clarification:
  • Senate delegated authority: Committee's position in moving the implementation of the Research & Enterprise strategy forward.
  • Governance: delegated responsibility of ADR's.
Committee members should be clear on how to progress the Committee's agenda outside this committee.
The Chair confirmed that City's annual assurance report for HEFCE is currently with Senate*.*

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting No.168 held on 22 June 2017 were approved.

3. Matters Arising

I.   The Chair reviewed the action points from the previous minutes. Interdisciplinary Centers: Funds have been allocated in the University budget to support REF which could be used for a second round of resource based calls.

II.   The Committee received a verbal update on the Research and Enterprise Development Programme. A series of events scheduled from January 2018 onwards.

Action 1 (CK): To ensure that all the scheduled events are confirmed and to circulate the final version of the timetable to the Committee members.

III.   The Committee received a verbal update on the Pump Priming Fund.

Action 2 (AJ): Schedule another discussion on the Pump Priming budget.

4. Conflict of Interest Policy

The Committee was presented with a draft of the Conflict of Interest Policy for discussion and aprroval. The policy was developed by the Research & Enterprise Office in response to the self-assessment to ensure City's compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity. The policy has already been circulated to Schools, the Intellectual Property Commercialisation Board and the Executive Team. Comments received have been incorporated into the current draft. Human Resources have requested for the policy to make reference to City's disciplinary procedures. The policy will be presented to ExCo the following week.

Two points and a need for clarification were raised in the ensuing discussion:

Point 1. Conflict of interest cases arising from academics being employed in two Universities or working with competing institutions.

Point 2. Discussion about the integrity of the researcher or academic who could be involved in decision making processes, where their integrity could be questioned. The idea suggests a clear line of reporting to minimize any opportunity for unwanted behavior.

Action 3 (ML): To rephrase certain aspects of the language used in the Policy.

5. Financial Performance Data for Research & Enterprise

To Comittee received a verbal update on financial performance.

The Chair will circulate set of financial information on grant income, grant application, Enterprise income and activities to ADRs at the first instance.

6. Annual Research Quality Monitoring

The Comittee received a verbal update on the progress of ARQM. The work has begun in conjunction with the Library team. New CRO system will allow to rate and make comments. The discussion focused more on the publications in the CRO than ARQM.

The publications will need to be have been placed in CRO instead of being sent as attachments. Ratings on CRO can be anonymous. The system can be set up to allow

academics to see the review. Time permitting a small pilot has been planned to be conducted before the end of the year.

The ARQM measures were set up by council several years ago. ARQM overlaps with REF. However, the primary purpose is not one of replicating the REF process. School of Health Sciences have adopted a rolling system of rating papers throughout the year to build up a pool of papers for the REF. ARQM will be drawn from this pool of rated papers. ARQM outcome has been used in promotions and this could alter academic behavior in selecting and submitting outputs to take less risk which in turn could mean panels do not see a wide enough cross-section of REF suitable papers. The Committee has discussed the issue of the incentivisation of academic staff and the quality and quantity of the papers submitted to the REF. As part of further discussion it was mentioned that REF preparation would be supprted through a REF Stratigic Group and the REF Operational Group.

7. Research & Enterprise Strategy Action Plan

The Committee received a verbal update on the Research & Enterprise Strategy Implementation Plan, which was nearing its final version. The Research & Enterprise Strategy Implementation Plan was an operational plan that would support the Institutional Research and Enterprise Strategy. The current version of the draft was presented to the Committee members for review and comments. The layout was changed to draw out key things that need to be happening year on year and a series of specific actions to be conducted to move the implementation plan forward.

The Chair has confirmed that non-finial version of the draft will go to Senate for comments.

Action 4 (JS) To circulate the latest version of the startegy action plan to the Committee members and ADR's , which includes some significant changes to part two.

8. Research Management System

The Comittee received a verbal update on the progress of the implementation of our new research grant management system from Worktribe. The implementation is on schedule. Go-live date for post-award is end of February. Making post-award go live together with pre-award is currently being considered. The system will cover pre - award costing and approval and post -award information for academics on actual grant spend. A feed from the University's financial system SAP will be set up. There will be changes to the approval process, bringing Deans into the equation. The new full economic costing policy which covers approval will be presented to ExCo next week.

The functionality of Worktribe will enable academics to develop budgets themselves, with approval of a representative from the Research & Enterprise Office.

The system will be loaded with a set of organisations and partners City worked with in the past. There will be a change in the set of guidelines working with overseas partners, more details will be available in the new year. System training of staff within the Research & Enterprise Office is scheduled for the beginning of February, which will be followed by system testing mid-February. The launch is planned by bringing a short demonstration on functionality of the system to departmental meetings at school level. Second stage will include set-up of a contract management module. Technical integration with financial system SAP is key to the success of the new system. The technical team has been given a deadline for implementation by the end of January.

The new system will enable the generation of a rage of useful financial reports.

There will be an import of some historic data. The Chair has requested full cooperation in rolling out the system and assistance to Claudia and her team when introducing the new system in departmental team meetings in the upcoming months.

9. Research Applications and Awards Report

The Chair has proposed forthright approach, increasing the number of applications of research grants. This could be done by approaching the Heads of Department and identify academics who are not applying for grants currently, and look into ways of encouraging them to apply for funding. The process would support academics and value their efforts in creating more opportunities, which would hopefully increase the number of applications successfully securing grants. The committee noted that Worktribe will enable cross-school financial rewards to be recognised and allocated to relevant projects. There is recognition misalignment between research income and outputs and also the grant applications ratio. The Chair recognises that there is a need for a detailed discussion about the collaboration between schools and recognition of financial awards. There is a need for a centralised system across all schools.

The Chair will be looking into a different way of reporting back to the Council where we can put more evaluation on the activities and submissions, as a workload model and not only focus on the financial gain.

Action 5 (AJ): To investigate the way of distributing rewards and update the Committee as to how we can allocate cross-school financial rewards to relevant projects.

10. Doctoral Training Partnerships

The Committee received a verbal update on the upcoming EPSRC CDT and EPSRC DTP review. The Committee noted that there would be an EPSRC CDT call in January. City has received EPSRC DPT funding for two years. The Committee had brief discussion about a successful Doctoral Training Partnership centers, the Chair mentioned that EPSRC CDT is focusing on the thematic priorities bids.

11. CASTS

The Committee received a verbal update on the on the progress of "Capital Accelerate & Scale Tech Superstars".

CASTS was focusing on small and medium sized Enterprises in London, particularly in the technology sector. The project focuses on developing services which support start-up businesses and has progressed extremely well. There have been some staff changes and the new recruitment process has been completed successfully.

The Academic Enterprise team is looking into improving our relationship with Capital Enterprise in terms of accessing investment funds while matching institution priorities. Capital Enterprise have been a partner in a £5M bid to the Connecting Capability Fund, which supports creative industries and specifically immersive technology. Academic Enterprise if focusing on how to match and bridge the gaps between new projects, that relate to individual expertise within the schools. Further clarification is required on responsibilities of moving forward projects and matching institution priorities. There also could be further development opportunities created by the collaboration between the Academic Enterprise Team and Launch Lab.

12. Research Excellence Framework

The Committee noted that the Units of Assessment or subject categories in REF2021 had not yet been published as the consultation between HEFCE and the higher education sector about the next REF was ongoing. The proposals in the consultation

sought to build on the first REF conducted in 2014, and to incorporate the principles identified in Lord Stern's Independent Review of the REF.

It was believed that the rules for REF 2021 would be consistent with and similar to those of REF 2014 and not many significant changes were expected. However, one area which would affect City was the proposed clearer definition of REF Category C staff (staff not employed by the submitting HEI, but whose research was primarily focused in the submitted unit). In REF 2021 researchers in the NHS could be submitted to the REF as Category C staff.

The Committee received a verbal update on the importance of HEFCE's consultation on detailed arrangements for the second Research Excellence Framework (REF 2021). Following consultation, HEFCE published initial decisions on key areas of REF 2021 in September 2017.

The Associate Deans for Research (& Enterprise) expressed their concern about how HEFCE would implement many of Lord Stern's recommendations for REF 2021. These operational and technical aspects formed the basis of the consultation. HEFCE was aware of the potential administrative burden that would accompany Lord Stern's recommendations should they be implemented and was keen to alleviate these where possible.
HEFCE's consultation on detailed arrangements for REF 2021 included the following proposals:
- o Portability of research outputs. When an academic left one institution for another should the publications leave too or should they be shared according to some rule or formula?
- o Incentives for and assessment of interdisciplinary research in REF.
- o Having a minimum and maximum number of research outputs for each member of staff submitted to the REF with a suggested maximum limit of six outputs.

City was beginning to consider its approach to the REF 2021 and implement what was believed to be the final version of the REF guidance. City would likely submit to more units of assessment compared to REF 2014, including English and History.

The ARQM should be revised and updated to mimic the changes in the REF 2021 as it was not fit for purpose in current form. For example, currently the ARQM did not vary the number of outputs but required all staff to have four good outputs unless they had special circumstances. In addition, the ARQM did not differentiate sufficiently between 3* and 4* activity but in the REF 2021 4* activity delivers much higher financial and reputational reward than 3*.

13. KEF
The Committe received a verbal update on KEF.
The framework should be a way to benchmark performance from university - business collaboration and knowledge exchange, alongside the Research Excellence Framework and the Teaching Excellence Framework.

14. Enterprise Education
The Committee received a verbal update on the activities and plans of Enterprise Education.
The following points were noted:

- Twipes won the inaugural GradVenture event beating off competition from all UoL colleges to win £4000
- The CitySpark deadline has just passed with 89 entries being confirmed; an increase of 20% on last year – the final is on the 7th December in the CityBar – R&E board is invited
- Citystarters Weekend – 120 attendees with Londbrella and 'build a bar' taking home the top prizes
- The startup seminars (which take place every Tuesday from 6.30-8.30) have been a huge success with an average attendance of 110 students per seminar
- HEB-CI survey is underway, data collection is not completed but early signs are looking healthy; investment in our companies is at £2.6m Aug16-Aug17
- City Launch Lab now has 60 resident companies – we are full after just 10 months
- The Launch Lab hosted its very first Mentoring open day as part of the Global Entrepreneur Week with 5 mentors spending time with over 20 companies.

Future Planning:
- Nominated for the THE Outstanding Entrepreneurial University of the Year Award 2017.
- Cass MBA was ranked 2nd in Europe and 7th globally for entrepreneurship by the Financial Times
- Social Enterprise festival confirmed to take place on the 13-14th February 2018
- The City Launch Lab is planning for its next intake after the January graduation date. Redevelopment of the programme is underway with consideration given to an extended acceleration model

Action 6 (CW and NC): The Committee also noted that there will be forward discussion between Enterprise Education and Academic Enterprise about further engagement with Alumni in order to increase the number of activities.

15. Minutes for Information
To **note** minutes from the following meetings:

School Research Committees

a. CASS   Minutes September 2017
Paper F

b. SASS   Minutes October 2017
Paper G & Gi

c. SHS   Minutes September 2017
Paper H

d. SMCSE   Minutes June & September 2017
Papers I & Ii

e. CLS   Minutes March 2017

Graduate School   Minutes November 2017
                                    Paper K

Research Governance & Integrity Committee Minutes June & September 2017
                                    Papers L & Li

16. Date of meetings 2018/19
Tuesday 06 March 2018 in The City Launch Lab, 4th floor, Franklin Building: 15.00-17.00

Secretary: Joanna Short

Email: Joanna.Short.1@city.ac.uk
Telephone: 020 7040 3237