

SENATE

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH & KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 15 MAY 2013

Present: Prof M Bennett (**Chair**); Prof M Hadfield; Prof I MacRury; Dr C Ncube; J Northam; Prof J Parker; Prof D Patton; Prof H Schutkowski; Prof R Stillman; Dr K Welham. Dr M Cash

In Attendance: Prof A Blake; Dr G Esteban; Prof B Gabrys; J Garrad; Dr H Hassani; Prof S Noroozi; Prof K Phalp; G Rayment.

Apologies: M Barron; J Beard; Dr H Hartwell; Prof A Innes; D Kilburn; Prof S McDougall; D McQueen (University Board); Prof A Mullineux; Prof A Newton; H O'Sullivan; Prof S Page; Prof J Roach; Dr K Wilkes; Prof J Zhang; Prof T Zhang. Fiona Knight.

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (18th April 2013)

The Minutes were approved as an accurate record.

1.1 Matters Arising not covered elsewhere in the Agenda

1.1.1 The communications and training plan in respect of the Postgraduate Research (PGR) Monitoring system (minute 4.3) would be presented to the June 2013 meeting of the Committee. Other matters arising were dealt with under the substantive agenda items below.

2. ACTIVITY PROPOSAL FORM (APF) PROCESS UPDATE

2.1 Ms Garrad presented her report which provided an update on the implementation of the new APF process. The system went live on 2 April following a pilot in the School of Health & Social Care (HSC). All Quality Approvers (QAs) had received training. Further tweaks to improve the process had since been identified and were set out in the paper. Ms Garrad also explained that some QAs had granted approval without adding the required comments to state how the application met the quality criteria. The system is being amended so that this field is mandatory for future approvals and Deputy Deans, Research and Enterprise (DDREs) were asked to help ensure that colleagues fulfilled this mandatory requirement in future.

2.2 It was also noted that the definition of 'quality' was sometimes being extended to encompass, for example, value for money. The assessment of quality should, in fact, focus primarily on whether there was any risk of reputational damage to the individual or to BU. DDREs agreed to review the definition of risk applied to quality rejections, which would resolve any issues locally. Ms

Garrad confirmed that if the rejection decision was upheld, the PI still had the right to appeal to the PVC.

- 2.3 There had also been some debate as to how the APF process linked with the Research Peer Review Scheme (RPRS). The two were not currently connected but a review was to be undertaken shortly which would consider integrating the two processes. This review would be completed in time for the 2013/14 academic year.
- 2.4 Finally, it was explained that the number of late applications being received were causing some operational difficulties. A clear timeline was provided for the bid preparation and approval process and DDREs were asked to disseminate this within their Schools. Not all bids would need to complete every process shown on the timeline which is based on the steps required for a Research Council bid.
- 2.5 Members enquired about the process in respect of KTPs and it was explained that where KTP proposals were reviewed and approved by the Regional KTP Adviser, this information would be provided to the QA who can approve the proposal on that basis.
- 2.6 Members enquired about how the on-line ethical approval system linked to the new APF process. These are currently separate processes, and whilst it is advised that ethical approval should be obtained prior to submission, this is not mandatory *[NB: the timing of ethical approval in conjunction with the APF process will be discussed at the next UREC]*. Ethical approval can be completed in parallel with the APF process.
- 2.7 The Committee **endorsed** the report and its recommendations.

3. GRADUATE SCHOOL ACTIVITIES UPDATE

- 3.1 The Committee noted the following papers and the Chair invited Members to submit any comments or questions direct to The Head of the Graduate School out of committee.
 - Research degree Admission Policy.
 - Visiting PGR's Provision
 - English Language Requirements
 - Academic School Research Degree Committee Structures Guidance

4. UNIVERSITIES SOUTH WEST EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (ERDF) INNOVATION VOUCHERS

- 4.1 Ms Northam presented this report which informed Members of the ERDF Innovation Vouchers Scheme. The scheme provided funds for start-up, micro, small and medium sized businesses in the South West, to access sources of external expertise such as the University. It was co-ordinated through Universities South West and the conditions for funding were set out in the paper. Universities South West had assigned funding targets to Bournemouth University of £116,000 over three years. So far, however, no projects had been submitted and there was a risk of the funding being withdrawn and allocated to another institution.

- 4.2 DDREs were asked to encourage colleagues to engage with the scheme and approach potential partners. R&KEO were undertaking a number of measures to further publicise the scheme, as set out in the paper, and would give brief presentations to any Schools that requested it.

5. BU's RKE PERFORMANCE

- 5.1 The Chair presented the most recent R&KE performance reports for the third quarter. He would be meeting with Schools separately to discuss their individual results in early June. Overall, performance was showing signs of improvement with DEC, HSC, the Media School and the School of Tourism all closing the gap between income and targets.

6. RESEARCH THEMES: UPDATE

- 6.1 The Chair explained that, following on from the debate at the previous meeting, work was continuing on finalising the revised list of research themes. In producing the revised list he had considered all the comments submitted and attempted to arrive at a consensus. The final list would be circulated in due course.

7. FESTIVAL OF LEARNING UPDATE

- 7.1 Ms Northam presented the update report on the 2013 Festival of Learning and sought views on the arrangements for next year's event. To date approximately 1,600 places had been registered for free-to-access events (the target was 3,000) and feedback so far from stakeholders and the general public had been extremely positive. The Marketing and Communications and Research and Knowledge Exchange Office teams had undertaken an extensive range of marketing activities to publicise the events. Consideration was now being given to how the event might evolve for 2014 and 10 discussion questions were presented for consideration.
- 7.2 Members recognised that it had been very difficult to raise interest in attending paid events. The School of Applied Sciences (ApSci) had used the Festival as an opportunity to test short courses and to engage people. Members also commented on the high quality of the marketing activity undertaken for the Festival and suggested that there might be lessons for the University's on-going marketing of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. In terms of logistical issues, ApSci had appointed a single co-ordinator to handle inquiries about the Festival and take pressure off the academic staff.
- 7.3 Members asked if the flexibility existed to drop the charges for some paid courses. It was noted that such courses would already have been marketed as chargeable in the Festival programme. There may, however, still be scope to advertise them as free of charge through the website. Any such suggestions should be raised with R&KEO who would advise accordingly. In terms of the 10 specific questions raised in the paper regarding the arrangements for the 2014 Festival, Ms Northam would circulate these to Members and seek responses by e-mail.

- 7.4 Members were asked to consider what else could be offered as part of the 2014 Festival which will need more people involved and more activities offered. Members were also asked to encourage their colleagues to attend some of the Festival events in June 2013 to increase awareness of work that is happening across the University and to generate ideas about how they can be involved next year.

ACTION: Circulate questions on the 2014 Festival of Learning arrangements to Members.

ACTION BY: Ms Northam

8. REF HIGHLIGHT REPORT

- 8.1 Ms Northam presented the REF update paper for May 2013 and highlighted the key current and upcoming activities. The final REF mock exercise was in progress and all outputs and environment narratives were being reviewed by a panel of internal and external academics. Impact case studies would be evaluated separately by a different panel, comprising internal staff and external research users, to ensure maximum confidentiality. Work would be undertaken with each UoA to develop and refine the Impact Statements in advance of the 28th June deadline. Two open forums would take place on 10th June (Talbot) and 13th June (Lansdowne) to inform staff of the methodology regarding recommended staff selection thresholds. The Chair reiterated that there would be no adverse consequences for staff of non-selection.
- 8.2 Dr Welham raised an administrative issue regarding the reporting of output reductions by the REF Circumstances Board to UoA leaders and stressed the importance of ensuring accuracy. The Chair agreed and said that these issues would be considered further and resolved at RASG. All data was now being double-checked by the Chair of the Circs Board.

9. EU ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT SCHEME UPDATE

- 9.1 Ms Northam presented this paper and invited the Committee to note the success of the EU Academic Development Scheme (EUADS). This 12-month scheme was launched in 2011/12 to support academics who were inexperienced in bidding for EU funding. The first EUADS cohort had submitted 18 proposals, totalling £4,826,006. Four were awarded, totalling £313,655) and those that were not funded were being revised for re-submission. The Scheme was considered to have achieved its aims and was rated highly by participants who were disseminating their learning amongst colleagues via the Research Blog. The second EUADS cohort is still in progress and a third cohort will start the scheme in 2013-14. The Committee noted the report and endorsed the Scheme.

10. MINUTES OF THE HEIF MANAGEMENT PANEL, 6 MARCH 2013

- 10.1 The minutes were noted. The Chair informed members that, in future, the HEIF Management Panel would be incorporated into the University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee (as a standing agenda item). If necessary, the URKEC membership would be reviewed. He reminded Members that HEIF

funding was still available, but that proposals would have to be 'game changing' if they were to succeed.

ACTION: HEIF Management Panel to be subsumed within the URKEC, with expanded membership if necessary.

ACTION BY: Chair (to review membership)

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 11.1 Prof Parker had circulated a report from the British Academy for the Humanities and Social Sciences' Learned Societies and Subject Associations Network. The note summarised the priorities and strategy for the Academy over the next five years. Prof MacRury offered to collaborate on this out of committee and Prof Parker would send him the full strategy document.
- 11.2 The Chair informed Members that a commitment had been made to develop a BU Experts facility – possibly in the form of a mobile app. Thirty possible individuals had been identified to receive training (for example, in service excellence principles) and to represent the University in this context.
- 11.3 The Chair also informed members that a Digital Summit would be held on 7th June, which would involve a high level of input from local political figures. Samantha Leahy-Harland was the lead contact for anyone requiring further information.
- 11.4 Finally, the Chair provided a brief update on the Fusion Investment Fund. The Co-creation and Co-production strand remained unchanged, as did staff mobility and networking. The Study Leave strand was to be re-launched and would comprise 3 areas: academic study leave; internal secondments; and staff placements and internships. The latter would take effect from 1st December with the others available from July.

Date of next meeting:

Thursday, 6th June, 9.00am, TAG22 (Tolpuddle Annex) .

Geoffrey Rayment
Committee Clerk
rke-1213-6-minutes 15 may 2013.docx