

To: Research and Enterprise Committee

From: Professor John Fothergill, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)

Subject: Report on the Research, Enterprise and Impact Strategy Board Meetings

Date: 28 November 2015

The Research, Enterprise and Impact Strategy Board has met three times since the last Research and Enterprise Committee. This provides a report on these meetings for consideration.

1 Meeting of the 4th June 2015

1.1 University Strategy for REF'

The Board was asked to comment on the draft paper 'Towards an University Strategy for REF'. The Board recommended that a REF Working Group be set up with the following roles being members:

- Associate PVC REF (or equivalent) (Chair – a research excellent professor to be recruited from current members of staff)
- The UoA leads from each UoA (12)
- Professional staff (as appropriate)

The Board largely endorsed the paper, which will be finalised in the Autumn following School planning.

The Group would report to the Research, Enterprise and Impact Strategy Board and other committees as appropriate (including School Research Committees, Deans and ADRs). The Group would work on UoA level rather than School level. The Group would be responsible for organising a 'mini REF' during 2016/17.

2 Meeting of the 23rd July 2015

2.1 Impact Strategy

John Montgomery kindly gave the group a presentation on REF Impact including insights on how Cass is preparing workshops in this area. The presentation and discussion will be incorporated into the REF Strategy. It was suggested that we should have an appraisal of what impact case studies are likely to be in preparation for the next REF with a view as to how these could be supported. (To be considered by the REF Steering Group.) Seminars may be rolled out across Units of Assessment to assist in this process.

2.2 Proposals for the Research and Enterprise Professional Service

KS presented the proposals for the Research and Enterprise Professional Service; discussions have been held with each of the Deans. These were largely thought to be reasonable by the Associate Deans for Research present.

3 Meeting of the 24th September 2015

3.1 Progress on formation of groups reporting to the REIS Board

It was noted that the Open Access Implementation Group had met once. The discussion had been mainly about the CRO.

The implementation Group for this Board had not been set up yet. It was noted that the REF Implementation Group and REF Steering Group would need to be set up soon, especially if there were to be a mock REF in the next academic year. The mock REF would include consideration of impact and the number of staff included in the submissions. It was thought that the best way to set up the mock REF would be to do one UoA every couple of months, with each UoA on a rolling schedule. This would be good for learning as well as to keep the preparations moving. It was not yet known when the next REF would be held.

3.2 Consideration of proposal for a new Consultancy Policy

JF presented the proposal for a new Consultancy Policy. The new policy was based on the previous one, but it was felt that the previous policy was too long and complicated. A Consultancy Implementation Group had been meeting to consider how to implement the policy once it had been approved. The new Consultancy Policy offered academics an easier way to do consultancy through the University. This was important that the consultancy went through the University as then the University could be logged and used for the HE-BCI survey.

Various comments were made which are incorporated in a version to go to ExCo.

3.3 Proposals for the Research and Enterprise Professional Service

JF and KS presented the proposals for the Research and Enterprise Professional Service.

3.4 ARQM

- a. ARQM Results – this paper was noted.
- b. ARQM Review – JF presented the Review of the Annual Research Quality Monitoring Process, and in particular the recommendations. It was largely thought that these were reasonable by the members present. Comments would be incorporated and the implementation plan reconsidered before the paper went to UET, ExCo and Senate.