

Draft:	26-Feb-2016
Approved for circulation:	1-Mar-2016
Confirmed by Committee with / without amendments	20-May-2016

# Research and Enterprise Committee

---

## Open Minutes

Date of meeting: **Friday, 26 February 2016**

Duration of meeting: **10.00 to 12.00**

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

## Attendance

Name	Faculty / Directorate	Category of membership
<b>Tim Middleton</b>	Senior Management Team	Chair
<b>Jake Kaner</b>	Design Media & Management	Ex-Officio
<b>Susan Procter</b>	Society & Health	Ex-Officio
<b>Rebecca Chandler-Wilde</b>	Society & Health	Ex-Officio
<b>Lauren Griffiths</b>	Society & Health	Nominated member
<b>Hilary Mullen</b>	Design Media & Management	Nominated member
<b>Mark Stone</b>	Society & Health	Co-opted
<b>Piers Worth</b>	Society & Health	Nominated member
<b>Richard Mather</b>	Design Media & Management	Nominated member
<b>Claire Harbord</b>	Human Resources	Co-opted
<b>Kath Dunn</b>	Careers	Co-opted
<b>Anne Evans</b>	Academic Quality Directorate	Secretary
<b>Mel Nakisa</b>	Academic Quality Directorate	Minutes Secretary

## Apologies

Name	Faculty / Directorate	Category of membership
<b>Geraldine Walters</b>	Society & Health	Ex-Officio
<b>Phil Wood</b>	Design Media & Management	Ex-Officio
<b>Miriam Moir</b>	Academic Quality Directorate	Ex-Officio

## Absent

Name	Faculty / Directorate	Category of membership

### **Apologies for absence**

16.01 Three apologies were recorded and accepted by the Chair.

### **Minutes of the previous meeting**

16.02 The minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2015 were confirmed as a true record with one typographical correction.

### **Matters arising from the minutes not appearing on the agenda**

16.03 There were none to report.

### **Status of actions from the previous meeting**

16.04 The Committee reviewed the action sheet and the status of actions noted. Further updates on items not on the agenda were:

- a) Minute 15.13b)  
Different financial models were under consideration with advice from external consultants.
- b) Minute 15.13c)  
Details of Erasmus bids had been received and were being reviewed with regard to how they related to Erasmus staff and student mobility

### **Chair's Report**

16.05 There were no additional items to report not covered on the agenda.

### **Research & Enterprise Strategy update**

16.06 The Chair reported that discussions had already taken place with senior managers with regard to the shape of the University Strategy, and the Pro Vice-Chancellors would do similar briefings for the Research & Enterprise and the Education Strategies, before wider dissemination.

16.07 The Research and Enterprise Strategy set broad expectations as outlined at the previous meeting. This included increasing research and enterprise activity, being more successful in those activities and celebrating successes more effectively. The University needed to benchmark research and enterprise activities against the sector and provide opportunities for staff development in these areas. The operational details would be finalised through short-lived task and finish groups.

### **REF 2021 initial preparation – UOA Leads and their role**

16.08 In preparation for the next Research Excellence Framework, Unit of Assessment (UOA) Leads were being appointed. Some UOA Leads had already been identified with others to be identified by 4 March.

#### **Action: Head of Research (DMM)**

16.09 The Chair reported that the University would be taking an inclusive approach to a larger number of discipline areas. Ideally each area would be led by both an experienced researcher and an early career researcher. The UOA Leads would work with the Chair and the Research Unit and bring a report to the next meeting of the Committee.

### **Research Degree Awarding Powers update**

- 16.10 It was reported that the Research Degrees Awarding Powers audit was underway with a current response rate of 54%. The audit aimed to particularly include data around professional practice. It may be necessary to conduct follow up interviews with staff to ensure all details are collected. Members were requested to encourage their colleagues to complete the survey which applied to all academics on a permanent contract.
- 16.11 A report from the audit would be brought to the Committee in April to review if there were sufficient evidence to make case for a submission.

### **Grants in progress 2015-16 (REC 16.01)**

- 16.12 A list of bids in progress was presented to the Committee, although noted that it was not exhaustive. Once the tracking sheet more accurately captured data through the revised processes, this would be made available to Faculties for information.
- 16.13 Costings did not currently include profit margins on the activities, although it was noted that whether to submit a bid was a strategic decision relating to the nature of the contribution or return on investment in the longer term.
- 16.14 The current list would be divided into Research and Enterprise bids. It was focused on academics but also needed to capture bid activity being undertaken by professional support teams.

### **Project initiation process (REC 16.02)**

- 16.15 The Chair noted the importance of target setting and benchmark Key Performance Indicators to measure research and enterprise activity, which could then be monitored by the Research and Enterprise Committee. There was currently no single mechanism to record grants in progress, tracking them from the stage when they are in preparation. A project initiation process was presented to the Committee which would enable the Senior Management Team to have oversight of all research and enterprise activity.
- 16.16 The following points were noted in discussion:
- The process would apply to all externally funded research projects.
  - While appropriate for Research Council and EU funding, an 8-week notice period was not practical in a commercial context or for NHS funding.
  - If the 8-week period could not be met, approval through this process would still require a minimum period of 2 weeks.
  - Collaborative projects led by partners should also be recorded through this process.
  - In addition to enabling time for appropriate costings of proposed work, time had been built into the process to enable improvement work including peer review, through an internal panel and/or external advisor.
  - The approval process would assess likely benefits to Bucks (eg research outputs, educational or reputational benefit, foundation for future projects) in addition to any financial gain or loss.
  - Funding application approval would also be judged on the likelihood of success and potential risks for submission, such as reputational consequences or organisational embargoes for failed bids.
  - A fast-track route could be implemented for very experienced staff and existing established partners.

- A funding threshold level may be introduced below which approval would be sought through the Faculties.
- The terms used in the draft project initiation form needed to be adapted for use with Enterprise projects.

16.17 It was agreed that the process would be piloted for all Research projects for the remainder of the academic year. No threshold would be applied for research projects in the first instance. The project initiation form would be made available on the Research organisation of Blackboard and advertised through Digest and the Faculties.

**Action: Research Unit, Chair**

16.18 A separate project initiation form would be produced for Enterprise projects by 11 March 2016.

**Action: Rebecca Chandler-Wilde**

### **Visiting researcher process (REC16.03)**

16.19 The Chair reported that a clear process was required for accepting visiting researchers. This was distinct from the process currently used for honorary appointments of Visiting Professors and Visiting Fellows which were authorised through the Vice Chancellor and Council. A draft process was presented for approval.

16.20 The following points were raised in discussion:

- The process would currently be restricted to visiting researchers from Europe and the UK.
- Visiting researchers need to be added to the 'Associate' database and a separate IT process was required to enable access to the network etc.
- All signatories currently on the draft form were required as each would be authorising the visit from a different perspective.
- A tailored induction process was required for all visiting researchers to cover aspects such as Health & Safety, Data Protection and University facilities.
- All approval processes should be completed at least one month before the start date of the visit.

16.21 Subject to the following amendments, it was agreed to begin to pilot this process:

- The addition of an itemised checklist for resources such as email account and office accommodation with a section to include who was responsible for ensuring these were actioned in a timely manner.
- The addition of a requirement for any requisite permissions to be attached.

The form would be made available on the Research Blackboard organisation.

**Action: Research Unit**

### **Bucks Knowledge Archive – content policy (REC16.04)**

16.22 A draft Bucks Knowledge Archive policy was presented to the Committee for approval. The following comments were made in discussion:

- Not all staff had deposited their journal articles on the repository.

- Wider consultation was needed to establish the degree to which the approach should be inclusive of all items or be more exclusive with regard to a quality threshold.
- A future initiative may take a direct feed from the repository to staff profiles so that no items would appear on a web profile that had not been placed on the repository.
- There were a number of items such as films and case studies which could showcase the work of the University but where the copyright issues were not clear although in such cases a reference could be made to the item without depositing the output.
- The University does not have a publication fund for articles to be published via the Gold route.

16.23 It was agreed that more staff development was needed with regard to Open Access, the nature of the content and copyright issues. Events would be held at both campuses after which the Policy would be refreshed with regard to the content descriptor.

**Action: Chair, Research Unit**

16.24 The Chair reported that the University would be involved in a pilot project with JISC through CREST on a cloud based approach to research data management. A draft process would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee.

**Action: Chair, Research Unit**

#### **Minutes from Research Degrees Committee**

16.25 The Minutes from the meeting of the Research Degrees Committee held on 4 February 2016 were noted.

#### **Minutes from University Ethics Panel**

16.26 The Minutes from the last three meetings of the University Ethics Panel held on 13 November 2015, 14 December 2015 and 22 January 2016 were noted.

#### **Any other business**

16.27 It was noted that the University's Intellectual Property Policy required updating. The Chair would request a group of people to include colleagues from Human Resources and Finance to input into a revised document which would need to go to Senate for final approval.

**Action: Chair**

#### **Date of next meeting**

16.28 13 April 2016