BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY
SENATE
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE COMMITTEE

confirmed

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 01 October 2013 AT 13:00, Board Room

Present: Prof M Bennett (**Chair**); Dr M Cash; Prof M Hadfield; S Jukes; Dr F Knight; P Long; Prof I MacRury; Dr C Ncube; J Northam; Prof S Page; Prof J Parker; Prof D Patton; Prof J Piesse; E Powis; Prof J Roach; Dr C Shiel; Prof R Stillman; Dr M Weaver; Dr K Welham; Dr K Wilkes; Prof J Zhang; Prof T Zhang.

In Attendance: G Beards; Prof B Gabrys; Dr G Esteban; Dr H Hartwell; Prof A Innes; Prof S Noroozi; L Rossiter

Not in attendance: J Garrad; P Hardwick; Dr H Hassani; Prof M Kretchmer; P Lynch; Prof A Mullineux

AGENDA

1   WELCOME & APOLOGIES
The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting.
Apologies were received from: D Kilburn; H O'Sullivan; Prof H Schutkowski;
E Van Teijlingen;

2   MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (1 July 2013)
2.1   The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

3   URKEC TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)
The Committee proposed the following amendments be made to the Terms of Reference:
-   Amendment to clause 7: URKEC will 'oversee' the HEIF-5 budget and not manage it.
-   Membership – SAS Representative should be amended to Academic Services Representative.
-   Membership – Non-voting members and research theme leaders should be allowed to vote. This requested change will need to go to Senate and be reviewed

> **ACTION:** Committee Clerk to make amendments to the Terms of Reference (ToR).
> **ACTION BY:** Geoffrey Rayment will send the amended ToR to Senate for approval in October 2013

4   GRADUATE SCHOOL ACTIVITIES UPDATE
4.2   Professional Doctorate (Research Practice)
Prof Zhang provided an update on the the development of the Professional Doctorate in Research Practice. Informing the Committee that the validation event took place on 3rd September. The validation Panel commended the quality of the discussions during the meeting, the extent of the market research and the facilities for Postgraduate Research Students at BU. Prof Zhang confirmed that the Panel had approved the programme subject to some conditions and recommendations. The document will be revised and, subject to approval, the key facts information sheet will be produced after the 18th October.

4.3   ResearchPAD demonstration
Dr Weaver presented to the Committee screen overviews of the new ResearchPAD system. It was confirmed that the system is 95% complete and they are aiming for all transitional activities to take place week beginning 28th October.

confirmed

Dr Weaver highlighted that the new PAD system will replace the previous paper form PGR reporting. Reassurance was provided by Dr Weaver after he expressed to the Committee that feedback groups had developed tasks for the development of the new system. This raised a list of items to fix and Dr Weaver acknowledged that currently certain sections of the new system are only accessible to people in certain roles. It was confirmed that the system will be able to generate reports but it will only be able to report on data it has access to in Unity. In addition, the Research Themes will be linked to students which will allow reports to be generated around this specific area.

It was emphasised by Dr Weaver that the success of the new system will be reliant on all stakeholders engaging with it to ensure that it's kept up to date. Dr Weaver requested that it would be desirable to run more acceptance sessions and would like to invite members from Schools to receive an in depth opportunity to see what the system does. Dr Weaver and Dr Knight will contact DDRE's to arrange this.

Dr Weaver made the Committee aware that University will be hosting the Conversis UK User Group on the 28th – 29th January 2014. A number of HEI's will be attending this event and some in particular will be very keen to find out how the University has developed this new system.

5   ETHICS: PROPOSED COMMITTEE RESTRUCTURE
The Chair expressed to the Committee that within the last year, the University has encountered a significant number of issues with cases involving ethics. As a result of this, it was important that the University reviewed its current Ethics review policy. Julie Northam presented the paper to the Committee and informed them that it presented an alternative solution to the local School-based ethics committees which address some of these issues while also increasing the importance and emphasis placed on ethics. It is proposed that ethical approval no longer takes place within the Schools, but is undertaken by three cross-School, multidiscipline research ethics panels. Ms Northam added that the proposed restructure has been based upon other models which are currently practiced by Bath and Warwick University. The Chair invited the Committee to discuss their thoughts and views on the proposed restructure.

A Committee member raised their concerns with having 3 set disciplines, adding that there was a risk that certain research ethics issues could fall between the gaps if they did not specifically sit within each discipline. It was also noted that the membership of the committee should be chosen carefully. The members should have adequate experience and the Committee should consist of members who can make timely, informed and sophisticated decisions from cross-disciplinary areas. The Chair requested that each discipline should appoint a Chair who must be a Professor (Prof 2).

The discussion concluded with the Committee supporting the restructure, but the paper will need to be reviewed by the University Research and Ethics Committee (UREC) so that further detail can be worked out.

> **ACTION:** Paper to be reviewed by UREC and further detail to be tweaked
> **ACTION BY:** UREC will review on the 16th October, to implement in the New Year.

6   ETHICS: REVISED CODE OF PRACTICE
6.1.1   The report was noted
6.1.2   The Chair advised if anyone has issues with the paper, please contact Corrina

confirmed

Dickson or Julia Hastings-Taylor in R&KEO

7   ETHICS: MISCONDUCT POLICY UPDATE
7.1.1   The report was noted
7.1.2   The Chair advised if anyone issues with the paper, please contact Corrina Dickson or Julia Hastings-Taylor in R&KEO

8   ETHICS: STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR SPONSORSHIP
        The report was noted

9   KTP DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
        Lucy Rossiter (KE Officer) presented the paper to the Committee. In recent years the number of KTP applications from the University has declined and to address this fall, it was acknowledged that academics require further support in order for them to successfully engage with KTPs. The KTP Development Scheme provides the opportunity for a cohort to develop their understanding of them and in turn successfully apply for one. The Chair invited the Committee to express their views on the proposed scheme.

        It was acknowledged by some members how difficult it is to engage with KTPs, especially when it comes to writing the bids. They supported that the scheme will help academics understand what the Technology Strategy Board expect from a KTP. An example was provided that recently the University had bids turned down because of their business cases, which means that specific training could help with looking at what makes a good proposal.

        A member stated that they thought there was no need for the KTP Development Scheme. It was suggested by the Chair that the scheme would follow the same lines as the Grants Academy; to which the member did not think was a complimentary programme to aid with the development of a KTP.

        The Chair suggested that a strong academic lead who has KTP experience should work with the KE Officer to work on revising the detail of the proposal.

        > **ACTION:** Seeking an academic lead with strong KTP experience to work with Lucy Rossiter (KE Officer) on defining the work plan for the KTP Development Scheme. Please feedback to Chair.
        > **ACTION BY:** Committee

10   ERASMUS MUNDUS RISK MATRIX
        The Chair invited the Committee to discuss the paper. A member commented that it was logistically difficult to make it happen and to implement the matrix. The Chair responded that it was difficult to move forward without this approach but was happy to receive further comments. It was mentioned that if there were particular issues with the matrix, these should be raised with Dr Corrina Dickson.

11   RESEARCH WEBPAGES
        Julie Northam presented the paper to the Committee explaining the proposed new layout of the Research Webpages. Working with Marketing & Communications, the webpages will launch at the end of November to coincide with the REF submission. Ms Northam referred the Committee to the 3 webpage examples detailed in the paper and asked for their feedback on which was their favourite.

        Ms Northam informed the Committee that the comments she had received before the meeting showed preference for example 1, because it was more impactful and unique. Some Committee members fed back that they thought example 1 had too much white space at the top of the page and users may not like to scroll down to find

confirmed

specific information. Although it was commented by one Committee member that

scrolling is no longer a taboo; now that most users access information from their iPads and tablets. It was also acknowledged that the user should make a minimum number of clicks to get to the research which they would like to view. Ms Northam confirmed that the webpages will be able to link between themes. Some Committee members expressed their preference for example 3.

One member asked how the webpages will be maintained and who will own them? Ms Northam responded, commenting that the webpages will be built in Wordpress, which will allow users simple access to encourage them to take ownership to regularly post stories and narrative.

The Chair concluded that if anyone had further comments, they should provide feedback to Ms Northam and Dr Rebecca Edwards.

12   REF UPDATE

12.1.1   The REF Highlight Report was noted and the Chair expressed his thanks to all for their contributions. It was also mentioned that final detail on the narratives was being completed.

12.1.2   Ms Northam provided an overview of HEFCE's formal Open Access and the Post-2014 REF Consultation.

The funding bodies propose the following criteria for open access:

Outputs should be accessible through a UK higher education institution (HEI) repository, immediately upon either acceptance or publication, though the repository may provide access in a way that respects agreed embargo periods.
Outputs should be made available as the final peer-reviewed text, though not necessarily identical to the publisher's edited and formatted version.
Outputs should be presented in a form allowing the reader to search for and re-use content (including by download and for text-mining), both manually and using automated tools, provided such re-use is subject to proper attribution under appropriate licensing.

Ms Northam proposed that outputs fulfilling the following definition must meet these criteria to be eligible for submission to the post-2014 REF:
The output is a journal article or conference proceeding.
The output is published after a two-year notice period (from 2016 onwards).
The output lists a UK HEI in the 'address' field.

Ms Northam briefed that the deadline for responses is 30th October 2013 and the University will be submitting an institutional response that reflects the views of the majority of staff.

ACTION: Julie Northam to circulate document to the Committee and update blog
ACTION BY: Julie Northam, by the 7th October

ACTION: Each School to feedback to Julie Northam on consultation questions
ACTION BY: Deans to feedback to Julie Northam by the 18th October.
Julie Northam will upload the information to HEFCE on the 30th October

---

13   HIGHER EDUCATION INNOVATION FUND

The quarterly reports were noted by the Committee and the following brief updates were provided by Committee members:
VFX Hub - Stephen Jukes informed the Committee that the BFX Festival was

confirmed

extremely successful and they have engaged with lots of freshers.

Destination Development Programme – Philip Long told members that their recent emphasis had been on student engagement.
Bournemouth University Cyber Security Unit – Prof Roach provided feedback that the unit has recently been awarded a KTP and they will be submitting another 2 in November.
Aquatic Consultancy – Prof Stillman confirmed that a Director has been appointed and they have bids going in.
Bournemouth University Dementia Unit – Prof Innes commented that the unit was reaching its targets and responding to enquiries.

14   BU Research Themes: Current Titles
The Chair invited the Committee to discuss the new BU Research Theme titles as there had been feedback that there was significant overlap between 'Lifelong Health and Wellbeing' and 'Ageing, Society and Dementia'.

It was confirmed by the Committee that they thought 'Society' should be excluded from the 'Ageing, society and dementia' research theme title; instead it should now just be 'Ageing and Dementia'. The second title up for discussion was 'Lifelong health and wellbeing'. The proposed change to this title was 'Society, health and wellbeing' but a Committee member felt that including 'society' in the title suggested exclusivity and that it gave the impression that society was linked just to health and wellbeing, whereas it covers other areas too. It was then discussed by other members that they thought it was very important to keep 'society' in the title. It was agreed by members that they would support the removal of 'lifelong' in the title, but 'society' should appear at the end of it. The Chair concluded that the changes would be made to the titles.

> **ACTION:** The following changes will be made to the research theme titles:
> 'Ageing, society and dementia' will change to 'Ageing and dementia'
> 'Lifelong health and wellbeing' will change to 'Health, wellbeing and society'
> **ACTION BY:** Julie Northam, by the end of October 2013.

15   BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY APPS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Due to meeting running over time the paper was not able to be discussed. The Chair asked the Committee to feedback to Prof MacRury on this proposed project,

> **ACTION:** Committee to feedback to Chair and Prof Iain MacRury on the proposal for the BU Apps Project
> **ACTION:** Committee, by the 11th October 2013

16   ANY OTHER BUSINESS
16.1.1 Dr F Knight informed the Committee that the launch of the studentships will take place this week and provided detail that 5 studentships will be fully funded. There will be one round which will lead onto a second round.

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to the match funding for staff and the specific training sessions which are available to help support staff with obtaining match-funding. The training sessions will take place on the 15th October and in January 2014.

16.1.2 The Chair was pleased to inform the Committee that the two BU applications for ESPRC Doctoral Training Centres were going extremely well, having both got through to the second round. In particular he thanked Prof Jian Jun Zhang and Prof Bogdan Gabrys and their respective teams who are currently undertaking

confirmed

preparation exercises for the stage 2 interviews, and commended them on their efforts. It was noted by the Chair that all of those involved had put in a significant amount of effort and the Committee wished them good luck with their proposals. It was also noted by the Chair that congratulations should be wished to Mark Maltby on his recent funding success for his multimillion pound AHRC-funded project for which BU is the lead organisation.

Date of next meeting:
Tuesday 12th November, 1.30pm, Board Room, Poole House

Lucy Rossiter
Committee Clerk
RKE-1314-10-minutes 1 October 2013