Research and Enterprise Committee

Open Minutes

Date of meeting: **Friday, 20 November 2015**

Duration of meeting: **10am** to **12.45pm**

Location: **High Wycombe, room G5.05**

Attendance

Name	Faculty / Directorate	Category of membership
Tim Middleton	Senior Management Team	Chair
Jake Kaner	Design Media & Management	Ex-Officio
Susan Procter	Society & Health	Ex-Officio
Rebecca Chandler-Wilde	Society & Health	Ex-Officio
Lauren Griffiths	Society & Health	Nominated member
Sarah White	Design Media & Management	Ex-Officio
Hilary Mullen (from 11.45am)	Design Media & Management	Nominated member
Miriam Moir	Academic Quality Directorate	Ex-Officio
Anne Evans	Academic Quality Directorate	Secretary
Mel Nakisa	Academic Quality Directorate	Minutes secretary

Apologies

Name	Faculty / Directorate	Category of membership
Piers Worth	Society & Health	Nominated member
Helena Chance	Design Media & Management	Nominated member
Geraldine Walters	Kings College NHS Healthcare Foundation Trust	Ex-Officio
Claire Harbord	Human Resources	Co-opted
Philip Martin	External	Co-opted

Absent

Name	Faculty / Directorate	Category of membership
Mark Stone	Design Media & Management	Co-opted

Apologies for absence

15.01   Six apologies were recorded and accepted by the Chair.

Declaration of conflicts of interest

15.02   There were none to report.

Terms of reference and membership (Paper available on Blackboard)

15.03   The terms of reference and membership of the Committee were noted. They had been defined within the new University committee structure which would be reviewed at the end of the year. A representative from Human Resources had been co-opted on to the membership as the Committee would be examining how to develop and support staff for research and enterprise. Performance development review would need adaptation to include research and enterprise targets and achievements. An external academic, Prof Philip Martin, had also been invited on to the membership.

15.04   The Chair reported that an additional Committee meeting had been scheduled for 13 April 2016 and a number of working groups would be established to enable progress on specific issues.

Chair's report (Paper tabled – available via Blackboard)

15.05   The paper identified some initial thoughts and discussion points on the new Research and Enterprise Strategy which would input into the University Strategy for release in spring 2016.

The following points were noted in discussion:

- Close scrutiny of the modest QR funding was required to ensure optimal use of funds to support research.

- HEIF funding needed to be used to pump prime infrastructure for enterprise activities. It was noted that the funding was not guaranteed after 2015-16.

- A University strategy would only work if it had real meaning to staff and excellent activity needed to be recognised and rewarded. The relative merits of stating 'a' leading University rather than 'the' leading University in the Vision were considered, as an overambitious statement could disengage staff.

- The University would like to grow the REF UOAs it submits to and increase the number of submitted staff in each area.

- RDAP was seen to be integral to credibility as a University.

- A more diverse range of funding would contribute to sustainability.

- The benefits of faculty support versus a central Enterprise Unit were considered. A central hub with a University solicitor or legal resource could provide University-wide support for IP, patents, knowledge exchange and staff development.

- Cross-disciplinary clusters would provide greater resilience, support for PGR and early stage research staff and opportunities for sharing of ideas. Some initial themes were proposed which parallel areas of priority for Research Council and Horizon 2020 funding. These themes needed to be discussed within each faculty.

- Labelling a core theme as health science only would risk loss of funding and collaborative work. The word 'Nursing' needed to be in the title of such a theme.

- A baseline of key performance indicators was required. This was considered to be essential in order to establish a framework and develop sustainability with an appropriate surplus in the budget to be able to invest in staff.

- Greater transparency, consistency and control over research and enterprise activity was needed. Through an agreed framework, key themes would be able to re-invest profit and still contribute to a central resource.

- To determine themes and memberships, events could be held which aligned to each theme and attendance monitored.

The document was commended for further discussion in the faculties.

Action: Heads of Research

15.06 The following actions identified in the paper were agreed by the Committee:

a) Task the Research Degrees Committee to devise a PGR development programme and a programme for supervisors.

Action: Chair

b) The Heads of Research should canvas views in the Faculties and advise the Research Unit of any additional topics for which there is a critical mass of researchers seeking a development session.

Action: Heads of Research

c) The Research Unit should create a doodle poll or similar to enable the University research community to vote for its preferred Bite size workshops.

Action: Research Unit

Definitions of Research and Enterprise (REC15.02)

15.07 The paper outlined definitions for Research and Enterprise which would need translation at a discipline level.

The following points were noted in discussion

- The Enterprise criteria was considered to be quite narrow and may need to be reviewed.

- The Frascati definition of research is very broad. Research activity in the Faculty of Society & Health has been defined as leading to publication in a peer-reviewed journal and such a clarification could helpfully be included in the definition.

- An Enterprise output could be a set of learning materials.

- Appropriate costing of overheads and a sustainable model could enable re-investment in research-theme areas to employ post-doctoral researchers to produce publications from enterprise activities.

- The paper provided a useful definition of enterprise activity at the individual level. It was noted that a framework for the commercialisation of assets was in progress at an institutional level.

- Enterprise activities should become part of the PDR process; some staff may focus on Teaching with Enterprise rather than with Research.

The Heads of Research were asked to translate the definitions of Research and Enterprise into subject-specific terms so they are relevant to all staff. Suggested amendments to these definitions should be brought to the next meeting.

Action: Heads of Research

Research integrity (REC15.03)

15.08   It was noted that a report had been submitted to Council confirming the University's compliance with the Concordat to support Research Integrity. Completion of this assurance document, submitted to HEFCE, is a requirement of the University's eligibility for research council funding and for its students to apply for student loans.

A number of actions had been identified to continue to strengthen research integrity at Bucks:

- Ethical review at department level would be reviewed; some departments have successful processes in place while others are finding engagement more of a challenge.

- It had been agreed at the Research Ethics Panel that all Panel and Sub-committee members would undergo mandatory ethics training. This would consist of completion of an on-line Epigeum course with a follow-up discussion session.

- A wider programme of research development would be implemented. The diversity of undergraduate work presented some challenges yet all levels of work require review, approval and oversight.

- The use of a semi-automated online review process was being investigated. This would facilitate approval of low-risk research enabling focus for ethical review on higher risk work.

Researcher development (REC15.04)

15.09   The paper outlined a programme of development aligned to the nationally-recognised Vitae framework. Development opportunities were needed for research students and supervisors, in addition to wider research development for all staff.

The following points were noted:

- It is a QAA requirement that all PGR students undertake / are offered development. However, as 86% of PhD graduands nationally do not enter teaching or research roles, this development needs to include preparation for other roles and how skills developed translate to other career pathways.

- Use of the Vitae 'Effective Researcher' programme was recommended. This could be made available to all staff to make running the course more cost-effective.

- The Professional Doctorate provides a wider framework of training which may be better understood by employers; this should be considered when advising applicants whether to take the PhD or Professional Doctorate route.

- There is potential for change in the market, with suggestions of more funding to support PhDs and the development of Allied Health Professionals. With Research Degree Awarding Powers the University would be better placed to maximise these opportunities.

Department of Business Innovation & Skills Green paper (November 2015)

15.10   It was noted that the expected Green Paper entitled *Higher education: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice* had now been published and a consultation was ongoing. Part D of this document related to reducing complexity and bureaucracy in research funding and was presented to enable the Committee to consider responses to questions 24-28.   Heads of Research were asked to consult with Faculty management and other colleagues to collate responses and forward these to the Chair by 11 December 2015.

Action: Heads of Research

REF 2021 initial preparation

15.11   In addition to submitting potentially in the four UOAs submitted in REF 2014, the University proposes support for additional units of assessment in REF 2021. Individuals to lead preparation in each UOA needed to be identified and given authority from the Deans to do this work; they would need to have oversight of outputs and impact case studies, lead dissemination of requirements and ensure compliance from colleagues. Leads should be in place as soon as possible to work with the Research Unit to establish a baseline of activity.

Heads of Research were asked to identify UOA leads for existing and potential areas by 30 November and inform the Research Unit.

Action: Heads of Research

Research activity on the Bucks Knowledge Archive and gap analysis (REC15.07)

15.12   The report identified that many staff outputs had not been deposited on the Bucks Knowledge Archive or their entries were incomplete. Many entries were still not compliant with the open access policy.

The challenge of having all articles and additional materials uploaded and fully compliant from April 2016 was considered. It was proposed that work should be ongoing with UOA leads at a local level to improve compliance. An accurate snapshot of all UOAs was needed by the next meeting in February.

The library also needed support to identify which materials might be returned to the REF so that they could prioritise their focus. New content parameters for the BKA may be set at the February meeting.

Institute / Research Group reports 2014-15 (REC15.08)

15.13   Reports had been requested from all Institutes and Centres to help understand research groupings and their respective contributions. Reports would usually be expected in the summer outlining the work completed during the current year with plans for the following year. The plans would be considered by the Research and Enterprise Committee for approval or rejection.

Some of the Institutes were noted to have a website presence but were effectively independent companies who give the University a percentage of profit. Others were more integral to Faculty operation. A set of criteria was required for the establishment and disestablishment of Institutes to include why they were proposed and why maintained.
Action: Chair

a) Centre for Health Communications and Research (CHCR)

Clarity was required over the reputational enhancement the Centre provided. Its activities had been mostly consultancy so it was considered misleading to have the word 'research' in its title. The reasons for outsourcing of activities such as course delivery were queried by Members and it was explained that we currently did not have the staff with relevant experience within the University.

b) Institute of Vocational Learning and Workforce Research (IVLWR)

The IVLWR reported significant income and outputs for organisations that commissioned the activity. There was potential from this work for high-quality publications but the current team did not have the capacity for this and funders would only pay for completion of the work.

It was considered that profits fed into the University by the Institute could be used to employ a Post-Doctoral researcher to assist with academic publication. No model currently exists within University budgeting for this to take place. A mechanism was needed to help enterprise activity feed into research activity through a transparent framework and appropriate charging of overhead costs. Work would be undertaken with both faculties, finance and HR to establish a framework to underpin this work.

Action: Chair

c) Allied Health Enterprise Development Centre (AHEDC)

Similar to CHCR, this small external unit provided consultancy and paid a proportion of profits to the University. This link to Allied Health has facilitated funding bids, but as Allied Health expertise within the Faculty is developed in the future, such a link may no longer be as beneficial to the University.

d) Centre of Excellence for Telehealth and Assisted Living (CETAL)

Income from CETAL was noted to be modest. CETAL was led by a seconded member of staff and had significant investment in facilities by the University. Income was gained from commercial projects, training and development courses and research projects. A former research associate was currently working on publications using some of CETAL's work.

Assisted living and technology was considered to be a good area to develop. The short courses could be integrated within core undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. With additional academic staff, it would be possible to grow the area. A business plan and financial targets were required to identify potential benefits.

e) Institute for Diversity Research, Inclusivity, Communities and Society

IDRICS was noted to be a small research centre, limited by the fact that it is not underpinned by a related teaching programme. The centre focused on an area of high priority for funding from research councils and Horizon 2020. Development of this area would require investment and an associated teaching curriculum. Such an investment would need confidence in potential benefits to the University.

f) Institute of Research in Nursing (IRN)

The IRN was a good example of integration of applied research and enterprise, comprising a range of staff and students. The IRN was considered to be fundamental to the University and had grown since the previous RAE and REF assessments.

g) Institute of Mental Health (IMH)

The IMH arose from a partnership agreement with West London Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust which part funds a Professor at the University. A review of the Institute was currently underway with the Trust.

h) Art, Design and New Media Research Group

It was noted that the funding report did not include significant amounts of Erasmus funding in this area which generated data and academic outputs. Conference costs listed were not net income as charges would have been raised against them.

There are a number of small subject clusters within this research group which might be stronger with a focus on a themed approach.

i) Institute for Sport, Exercise, Recreation and Well-being

Sport was submitted in REF2014 and generated some QR funding. There were considered to be many potential opportunities within this group, particularly through the current integration of this discipline area with health.

Further details of the Erasmus bids in this area were requested by the Chair.

Action: Head of Research DMM

j) DMM Summary

The Head of Research DMM summarised a list of former institutes and centres. Those no longer in operation would be removed from the website.

Action: Research Unit

Grants in progress 2015-16 (REC15.09)

15.14   The Research Unit presented a list of grants in progress and those awaiting outcome of a decision. It was noted that this table only included bids submitted in 2015-16 and the outcomes of some bids made in 2014-15 were still outstanding. All committee members were asked to verify that the details given were correct and to notify the Research Unit of any missing bids.

Action: All

It was noted that details of Erasmus bids should be reported through the Education Committee, rather than through the Research and Enterprise Committee, unless research outputs were produced from the activities.

Research Degree Awarding Powers (REC15.10)

15.15   It was noted that the Department for Business Innovation & Skills had updated the guidance for Taught Degree Awarding Powers and Research Degree Awarding Powers. A mapping exercise illustrating how the new guidance differed from the previous guidance was presented for information. Members were requested to report back to the Faculties noting in particular the references to professional practitioners.

A separate group would take the work on the submission forward.

Action: Chair

Equipment data (Paper REC15.11)

15.16   The Equipment data portal was a Research Council funded initiative to promote access to UK HE research equipment and facilities to reduce costs and facilitate collaboration.   The Committee was asked to review the University data held on the portal for currency and provide the Research Unit with any additional items they would like included by 11 December 2015.

Action: All

Report from the Research Degrees Committee (REC15.12)

15.17   The Committee noted the Annual Review Report of Research Degrees at the University (2014/15). Members were asked to note the positive results from the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey where the University performed well compared to the sector with some challenges around professional development. A number of actions of the Research Degrees Committee included refreshed training development for research students.

Report from Research Ethics Panel (Paper REC15.13)

15.18   The Committee noted the annual report of activity from the University Research Ethics Panel (14/15). One of the actions comprised mandatory training in ethics for all members of the University Ethics Panel and Ethics Sub-Committees. A bespoke workshop would be arranged for staff in the arts and humanities by an external facilitator. This is a relatively new process for some in this area who have not previously considered how ethics relates to them or their students.

The need for robust sign off and consent for assurance of research integrity and ethics was noted along with the role of the Committee in ensuring the University complies with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity.

Date of next meeting: 26 February 2015

15.19   An additional meeting had been scheduled for 13th April 2016. The meeting closed at 12.45pm.