![City University London logo]

_____

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH & ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

MEETING NO. 164 HELD ON MONDAY, 21 MARCH 2016

AT 14:00 IN AG01

Minutes

Attendance list

Name of Member		Meeting 163 28/10/2015	Meeting 164 03/02/2016	Meeting 165 24/05/2016
Professor John Fothergill (Chair)	JF	✓	-	
Professor Andrew Jones (Chair)	AJ	-	✓	
Professor Igor Filatotchev	IF	✓	**Apols**	
Professor Peter Ayton	PA	✓	✓	
Professor Jill Francis	JFr	✓	✓	
Professor Panicos Kyriacou	PK	✓	✓	
Professor Andrew Choo	AC	✓	✓	
Professor Jo Silvester	JS	✓	Ĥ	
Professor John Barbur	JB	✓	✓	
Professor Jason Dykes	JD	**Apols**	✓	
Professor Anastasia Nesvetailova	AN		✓	
Dr Laudan Nooshin	LN	**Apols**	**Apols**	
Professor Ken Grattan	KG	✓	✓	
Professor Ron Douglas	RD	**Apols**	**Apols**	
Louse Doolan	LD	✓	✓	
Dr Karen Shaw	KS	✓	✓	

✓ Indicates attendance

With: Christine Giroux (GC), Strategic Programmes Manager; and Anna Ramberg (AR), Research Development Manager (Secretary).

Apologies also from Dean Stokes (DS), Director of Planning and Strategy Unit.

The Committee noted that Professor John Fothergill had retired from the University and Professor Andrew Jones was now in post and would chair this Committee. The Committee also noted that Professor Jo Silvester had stepped down from the Committee.

1. Apologies

The Committee noted the apologies received.

2. Minutes
The minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2015 were approved.

The Committee noted the following points:
Item 4, Action 1: The University Consultancy Policy had not been updated to include the clause on impact as agreed in the previous meeting. This would however be added now.
ACTION: KS to include the clause in the policy.
Item 4, Action 3: It was not known if JF had contacted Tim Longden about getting the booklet designed in preparation for the application to join the University of London on the website.
ACTION: AJ to follow up.
Item 4, Action 5: The issue of University sponsored studentships had been brought to ExCo, but it had been confirmed that no University sponsored studentships would be available.
Item 6, Action 1: KG confirmed that he had spoken to the Deans about areas of the webpages where the Graduate School required input and that KG, AJ and Tim Longden was currently looking at the Departments where the information available about projects on the webpages needed to be improved.
Item 15: The Committee noted that the project nominated from the University for a Regius Professorship had been from the Faculty of Actuarial Science & Insurance, Cass Business School.

3. Matters arising
i. Doctoral Training Partnership Application
The Committee noted that it had been agreed after discussion at Senate that the University would not write an email to ESRC regarding the concerns over their application process. Instead an institutional response to the ESRC consultation would be submitted. The overall shape of the consortium may still be refined, but currently all eligible disciplines at the University were not part of the bid. Mechanisms needed to change to allow all the eligible areas to be included.

The same process as the ESRC was expected for the EPSRC and the University needed to start planning ahead for the call.

4. School Higher Education Innovation Funding Plans
i. The Committee noted the approval of the School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Mathematics School Higher Education Innovation Funding Plan.

ii. The Committee noted that the remaining Higher Education Innovation Funding Plan had been allocated and approved over email.

iii. The Committee noted the report on the Expert Leadership Programme for Physicians.

5. Research and Enterprise Service
The Committee received a verbal update on the Research & Enterprise Service and noted that the consultation with staff was under way.

6. EPSRC Research Data Management Policy

The Committee received an update on the progress of the implementation of a solution to ensure compliance with the EPSRC Research Data Management Policy. The Committee noted that IS had not progressed with this as expected. KS had therefore decided to take this forward with colleagues in the Research & Enterprise Office. Work to start populating the shared drive and build the architecture of the drive would commence after the Easter break.

The Committee also noted that Research & Enterprise required a dedicated team in IS to ensure that research and enterprise issues and requirements were resolved timely and effectively.

7. Research & Enterprise Report
The Committee received the VC's report to Council on Research & Enterprise Developments and noted the following in particular:

- The REF Strategy did not include enough detail at this point, but the Research & Enterprise Strategy would feed into it once completed.
- The annual report would be more useful if it aligned with the content of the Research & Enterprise Strategy and mapped the key points. The report would also be more useful it was forward looking report.
- It would be helpful for a template to be produced to ensure consistencies in what data was included and how the data and Schools were reported on.

8. Research Management Information
The Committee received the latest Research Management Information report and noted that the report would benefit from being forward looking and linked to horizon scanning instead of comparing the current success rates with the previous year's. Details of applicant (e.g. Department/School), size of grant applied for and where the application had been submitted to would be more useful information.

9. Fulfilling our potential: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice
The Committee noted the University's response to the consultation on the green paper 'Fulfilling our potential: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice'. The outcome of the consultation was expected in October/November 2016 but it was reasonable to expect that the REF rules would be largely the same as for the REF 2014.

10. University Consultancy Policy
The Committee noted the updated University Consultancy Policy and noted the following in particular:

- There had been considerable discussion about the policy in various University committees, and the policy had now been approved.
- It was important to encourage staff to put their consultancy through the University process and explain the advantages to staff, such as publicity and income that could be used for, for instance, bridge funding of staff posts, PhD students and conference costs. Consultancy that is related to research projects that could be used to support impact should particularly be encouraged.
- It was suggested that a roadshow would be a suitable way to present the new policy and that creating a guide to consultancy would be helpful for staff.

ACTION: KS to compile information on profiles of consultancy in Schools and the University.

11. Minutes for Information
The Committee noted the minutes from the following meetings and the following points in particular:

School Research Committees

- Cass, meeting held Dec 2015
- Arts & Social Sciences, meetings held Oct 2015 & Feb 2016
  - Sabbatical applications: a query from Economics had been raised regarding how sabbatical applications were dealt with across the School. The decision-making needed to be more transparent so that staff were fully informed of why an application had been turned down even though it had been signed off by the HoD.

    AJ noted that the Sabbatical Policy was currently under review. Sabbaticals were a strategic tool to allow and enable staff to do research. It was therefore appropriate not to support sabbaticals if the application did not show that sufficient progress would be made. Guidelines for what should happen on a sabbatical could be a useful tool for both staff and those signing off on applications.

- Health Sciences: not provided
  - There were a different number of sabbaticals in SHS compared to SASS as SHS could not allow sabbatical due to the lack of staff. However, this was potentially discriminating staff. The current policy was not tied to research and therefore not fit for purpose
  - The School RC was made up by Research Centre Leads and the Committee was currently considering arranging impact workshops. The centres had been asked to provide information in December about what staff were doing, and then again recently in order to see how/if this could funnel into something helpful for the REF.

- Mathematics, Computer Science & Engineering, meeting held Jan 2016
  - An impact meeting had been held outside the School RC where the Research Centres had put forward a one-page document outline of potential impact. Talal Ous would work with the Centres to ensure they received the support they required.

- Law, meetings held Nov 2015 & Feb 2016
  - There was nothing to note outside of the minutes.

Graduate School
- Graduate School Committee key discussion from 8 Feb 2016.

12. AOB
i. ARQM
The Committee noted that the ARQM was essential in order for the University to establish the current state of its research and where there was potential impact in the institution to enable the planning for the REF. An away day for the members of staff

involved in the REF (UoA leads, REF Steering Group, Research Office) would be useful and would hopefully be held in the autumn. The away day would be an opportunity to discuss where we currently were and what the strategy should be. Consideration of what needed to be done where was also essential, as well as agreeing the responsibility of this Committee to ensure it did not overlap with the REIS Board or the REF Steering Group.

The Committee also noted that it had been established that the data systems for the ARQM were not going to be working seamlessly, which meant that additional work would be generated for staff.

13. Date of remaining meeting 2015/16
Tuesday 24 May 2016, 14:00, AG01

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