



University of the
West of England

ACADEMIC BOARD

RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE COMMITTEE

CONFIRMED

**Minutes of the meeting of the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee held on
Wednesday 11 June 2014, 14.00 – 16. 30, Dartington Suite, Farmhouse, Frenchay**

Present: Prof. Martin Boddy(Chair),
Prof Jenny Ames, Richard Bond, Prof Richard Coates, Amanda Conway,
Prof Olena Doran, Prof Julie Kent, Prof Glenn Lyons, Prof Nicholas
O'Regan, Chris Potter, Prof Peter Rawlings, Prof Melvyn Smith, Prof Jon
Tucker, Dr Neil Wiley

Apologies: Tracey John, Nick Jones, Dr Paul Manners, Dee Smart, Julia Weston

In attendance: Jane Newton (Officer), Ros Rouse, Angel Lai

WELCOME, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERSHIP

RKEC 14.6.1 The committee noted apologies from Tracey John, Nick Jones, Paul Manners,
Dee Smart, Julia Weston.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RKEC 14.6.2 The minutes of the meeting held on 19th February 2014 were agreed as accurate

ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING

RKEC 14.6.3 RKEC 14.2.6: The annual reporting arrangements to Academic Board have now
been confirmed. Details will be brought to the next meeting.

Action: Chair

RKEC 14.6.4 RKEC 14.2.8: Dr Myra Conway has agreed to Chair the Human Tissue Sub-
Committee. The membership of the sub-committee has also been confirmed.

MEMBERSHIP

RKEC 14.6.5 It was reported that Dr Antonia Beringer had been appointed to an academic role
and is therefore no longer eligible to represent contract research staff on the
committee. Glenn Lyons to organise a replacement.

Action: Prof Lyons

RKEC 14.6.6 Chris Potter, the representative from Hartpury College was welcomed to the
meeting.

RKEC 14.6.7 Myra Conway will represent the Human Tissue Sub-Committee and will be invited to future meetings.

Action: Officer

RESEARCH REVIEW

RKEC 14.6.8 The Chair introduced the paper: 'UWE Research Review, 2014/15, Framework and Terms of Reference'. The paper had been discussed by Associate Deans (Research) and the Research Strategy Implementation Group and needed to be updated. Members of the RKE Committee were also been invited to make comments. Prof Boddy indicated that the research strategy had started to be developed before the 2014 REF submission had been made and would be further developed prior to the announcement of the results. He added that the University needed to start to consider its approach to REF2020 and in doing so would work on the assumption that the format would be similar to REF 2014. In terms of planning, the University needed to develop new areas and continue to work on others, including:

- work on the Research Review document to arrive at an agreed point (Associate Deans to work within faculties between now and Christmas);
- a workshop to be held in September / October on 'Research Futures';
- analysis of REF 2014 to commence in December, once the results were known;
- a conference to be held in February / March 2015: 'Towards REF 2020';
- complete the review of Research Centres;
- analyse data that RBI had started to compile comparing UWE's research standing with that of other institutions;
- continue the work to turn the impact case studies submitted as part of REF 2014 into web stories;
- develop a REF/Impact SharePoint to capture information needed to feed into REF 2020, including:
 - staff – probables and possibles;
 - outputs;
 - data (income, PGR)
 - impact case studies.

This information would be used in a routine way to measure performance during the assessment period rather than holding a series of REF rehearsals as previously.

RKEC 14.6.9

Associate Deans had been asked to look into key areas across the University:

- Jenny Ames – Research Impact;
- Glenn Lyons – KPIs and metrics;
- Peter Rawlings – practice based research;
- Nic O'Regan – business engagement;
- Neil Wiley- PGR numbers.

RKEC 14.6.10 The Chair asked the Committee to consider where they thought the University was placed in terms of its aspirations / ambitions (see page 3 of paper). Jenny Ames felt that the University was currently falling behind its peer-group in terms of research and needed timely action to recover its position (point 3) so that it can progress to higher levels. She queried whether the University had ambitions to be a more research-intensive institution or whether it should be more outward facing and continue to develop partnerships as its usp. She suggested that competing with research-intensive universities was too ambitious an approach and would also mean having to compete with comparators who have adopted this route. Peter Rawlings suggested that one approach didn't preclude the other and that Russell Group institutions, for example, were heavily engaged with businesses. He was in strong support of work stream 3 'Research with Impact' in the UWE Bristol Strategy 2020 document. As an institution we have to undertake research and use it to make the curriculum exciting and relevant for undergraduate students who make up 90% of the University's income.

RKEC 14.6.11 Neil Willey commented that some comparable institutions in the sector have twice the number of PGR students as UWE, Martin Boddy added that UWE's level of investment in PGR was 3 times that of Oxford Brookes. Glenn Lyons commented that every University would have a comparative sector against which they would be looking to raise their game. UWE should focus on the need to be more ambitious and aspirational in terms of its research (point 4) and in doing so would hopefully arrive at where it wants to be / ought to be (point 1). Nicholas O'Regan queried how we know we are falling behind our competitors and added that unless the University was ambitious then it would be in danger of becoming a teaching-only institution. There was no reason why the University shouldn't be in the top 40s in league tables. He asked what the University's research priorities were and whether it was trying to be too all encompassing. Martin Boddy responded that setting research priorities would imply making some tough decisions and a need to identify areas which the University would no longer support. Jenny Ames added that in developing a research strategy the University needed to think creatively and be more focussed although this might mean upsetting some people initially. Research programmes should be designed so that they were inclusive and innovative. Glenn Lyons commented that we already had an organic process for recognising research excellence and that setting priorities and programmes of research could exclude potential areas of excellence from developing. A preferred approach would be to use the REF as a means of prioritising research investment and to use personal research and scholarship plans to support teaching-led and emerging areas of research.

RKEC 14.6.12 Martin Boddy invited any further comments outside the meeting and agreed that he would also contact absent members of the Committee. Comments would be incorporated into the document which would then feed into the workshop to be held in September / October. Associate Deans should circulate the document to Faculty RKEs once the comments have been incorporated.

Action: URKEC members / Chair / Associate Deans

RESEARCH GOVERNANCE

RKEC 14.6.13 Ros Rouse introduced the paper, 'Concordat to support Research Integrity Progress towards compliance'. HEFCE and RCUK require that institutions confirm compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity by December. The aim of the Progress paper was to map the extent to which the University currently meets compliance. The paper did not provide a systematic review but had been based on an early analysis by Ros Rouse and included recommendations and necessary actions to move towards compliance. The University's Code of Good Research Conduct is one of the first steps to ensure that we are Concordat compliant but also more broadly promotes good research practice and a high integrity research culture.

The Committee was asked to recommend the Code of Good Research Conduct and the new Policy on Good Research Conduct for approval by Academic Board at its meeting on 13th June. Ros commented that there were a number of substantive issues that needed to be addressed and subsequent actions necessary in relation to implementation of the Code. The need to ensure that the University was compliant within the tight timescale involved had meant that there had been little time for consultation, although some key Faculty staff had been consulted and contributed to the Code.

Thanks were extended to Ros for preparing an excellent document, but concern was expressed about getting the paper approved by Academic Board without the opportunity to consult more widely. It was felt that implementation of the Code would necessitate significant changes across the University, and Julie Kent raised the query as to how the University would ensure compliance amongst staff. One suggestion was that staff should all sign to confirm they had read the Code and that this could be monitored through staff PDRs. Ros pointed out that there are gaps in staff awareness of research governance, not all staff are aware of the University's ethics pages, for example and that mandatory training should be a first step in increasing awareness and ensuring compliance.

RKEC 14.6.14 The Chair commented that further discussion would be needed regarding the application of the Code. If, for example, it was to be rolled out to all taught students undertaking research then this would be a significant undertaking.

RKEC 14.6.15 A discussion followed as to the timescales for getting the Code approved by Academic Board in time for December. It was agreed that the paper and the recommendations should be **approved** by the Committee **in principle** and that a more formal consultation period should follow to end on 1st August 2014. The paper would then be brought back to URKEC on 12th November 2014 before being recommended for approval at Academic Board on 17th December 2014. The Chair reported that he would be meeting the VC to discuss corporate risk and research governance will form part of this discussion, ensuring that the paper gets the attention it deserves by senior management.

Action: Chair / Ros Rouse

RKEC 14.6.16 The need for training staff was discussed including discussion of whether governance training should be mandatory as in some other HEIs. It was agreed that mandatory training was not desirable as that did not address the issue of promoting a high integrity research culture. Other suggestions included providing training through mentoring or as part of the induction process for new staff. Richard Bond commented that RBI was developing a more structured programme of training for research staff which would cover some aspects of the Code. Peter Rawlings commented that recommendation 6, consideration to providing a programme of CPD for researchers, should be left with Associate Deans to consider.

UREC AUDIT REPORT 2014

RKEC 14.6.17 Julie Kent introduced the report which this year focussed on student research and highlighted the key recommendations:

Recommendation 7: Paul Spencer, the Graduate School Manager, had been invited to become a member of UREC.

Recommendation 14: The University needed to develop a searchable online database to ensure that auditable records were kept.

Recommendation 17: Supervisor training – UREC had asked the URKEC to review the training provision for supervisors. As a result of the audit it had become apparent that not all module leaders were familiar with the ethics process nor that a student placement could involve research. The implications of this would have a significant impact on the need to train supervisors. The management of training was something that would need to be considered by Associate Deans.

Recommendation 21: The Committee was invited to consider whether evidence that an ethical review had been undertaken should be included as part of a PhD submission.

RKEC 14.6.18 Any further comments should be made to Julie Kent outside the meeting.
Action URKEC members / Julie Kent

RKEC 14.6.19 The Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations of the report while noting that the Academic Strategy Implementation Group should be invited to comment on those aspects of the report that involve teaching and learning.
Action: Chair

RESEARCH CENTRES

RKEC 14.6.20 Andrew Mearman, Associate Professor in Economics, joined the meeting to present his proposal for a new Centre of Excellence within the Bristol Business School: Bristol Economic Analysis. A number of queries were raised regarding the proposal, mainly centred around the proposed funding and financial plan. Andrew responded to these by explaining that he aimed to call upon existing resources for the .25 FTE secretary and the budget for publicity would mainly be targeted at launching the centre. All staff included in the proposal were already employed by UWE. Nicholas O'Regan confirmed that a full business case would be developed. Andrew clarified that the added value of the centre would be to provide support for

the current lone Professor and that a central coordinating person in the team would be able to identify funding opportunities and provide bid writing support. There were already ongoing projects within the group and staff expertise had been mapped on Research Council priorities.

RKEC 14.6.21 The Committee agreed that although there were considerable strengths in the proposal that it lacked a business plan that demonstrated future income streams and the full costs of the centre against income going forwards. The Committee agreed that Andrew should be invited to work with Angel Lai from finance to develop a business plan and to resubmit the proposal.

RKEC 14.6.22 Ioannis Ierropolous, Associate Professor in the Bristol Robotics Laboratory, joined the meeting to present his proposal for a new Bristol Bio-Energy Centre. The proposal was well received and considered to be well thought out with enormous potential. In response to queries, Ioannis clarified that the proposed new Deputy Director was already supported through collaboration with the Faculty of Health and Applied Science. There were currently 18 PhD students affiliated with the proposed centre. Work had been ongoing for the last 3 years to develop a spin out company. The company would not inhibit future research development but would open up a new strand of research. The Centre would be initially based in the Bristol Robotics Laboratory and would be part of the collaboration with the University of Bristol. The ambition however was for the Centre to become stand alone. Glenn Lyons confirmed that the process of appointing a Professor to direct the Centre would be followed in the normal way. Nicholas O'Regan confirmed that the same would apply to the Bristol Economic Analysis Centre.

RKEC 14.6.23 The Committee agreed that the relationship between the proposed Centre, the Bristol Robotics Laboratory and the University of Bristol should be clarified in the proposal. Subject to this one adjustment, the Committee agreed that the proposed centre should be recommended for approval by Academic Board.

RKEC 14.6.24 The proposed name change from Bristol Centre for Leadership and Organisational Ethics (BCLOE) to Bristol Leadership Centre (BCL) was approved. The proposal that Richard Bolton should be the Centre Director was also approved.

RKEC 14.6.25 The proposed name change from the Bristol Centre for Enterprise, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Bristol CENTIENT) to Bristol Enterprise Research and Innovation Centre (BERIC) was approved.

RKEC 14.6.26 The re-designation of the Bristol Centre for Research in Lifelong Learning (BRILLE) as a Group was approved. The Chair agreed that he would check if this had to be ratified at Academic Board.

Action: Chair

RKEC 14.6.27 The closure of the Centre for Understanding Social Practices (CUSP) was approved. Jenny Ames commented that she had been reviewing research in the Faculty of Health and Applied Science and wanted to establish a new centre with colleagues from Politics and Philosophy. A research group would be established

first.

RKEC 14.6.28 It was confirmed that there were no issues for contract research staff brought about by the closure of the CUSP and BRILLE research Centres.

RKEC 14.6.29 The Institute for Sustainability, Health and Environment would be wound down and its activities come under the remit of Jim Longhurst in his role of Assistant Vice-Chancellor Environment and Sustainability.

RKEC 14.6.30 The Chair commented that there had been some discussion about the review of Research Centres and that these would be reviewed by Associate Deans in their own faculties rather than as part of a central review at the moment.

GRADUATE SCHOOL

RKEC 14.6.31 Neil Wiley introduced three papers for approval by the Committee all of which had been considered by the Research Degrees Committees and the Graduate School Committee:

1. **PGR Progress Review and Examination:** Approved.
2. **Policy and Strategy for PGR Contributions to Learning and Teaching:** Noted that findings from a survey of PGR students highlighted that most of them were involved in teaching but without any training. The proposal for Policy and Strategy for PGR involvement in learning support and teaching was approved.
3. **PGR: Thesis Deposition Arrangements:** The paper proposed that final copies of theses should be digitised and deposited on the University repository. This would remove the requirement for hard bound copies to be deposited with the library and also for e-theses to be submitted for examination: Approved.

RKE COMMITTEE REPORTS TO ACADEMIC BOARD

RKEC 14.6.32 Richard Bond requested that any comments on either the Committee's Annual Report for 2012/13 or the REF Report to Academic Board should be made as soon as possible to allow time for them to be incorporated before they are submitted to Academic Board.

Action: Richard Bond / URKEC members

BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

RKEC 14.6.33 To be considered at the next meeting.

ATHENA SWAN

RKEC 14.6.34 In response to Olena Doran's request Martin Boddy agreed to attend a meeting of the Athena Swan group.

LIBRARY SERVICES UPDATE

RKEC 14.6.35 Amanda Conway reported that the HEFCE policy on Open Access had now been confirmed. The author's final paper should be deposited on a repository at the point of acceptance. Richard Bond commented that he would bring the University's response to the HEFCE policy to the next meeting.

Action: Richard Bond

DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS:

RKEC 14.6.36 12 November 2014
4 February 2015
22 April 2015
10 June 2015

(Meetings in Dartington Suite, Farmhouse, Frenchay Campus)

Actions:

RKEC 14.6.3	Chair to bring the details of the confirmed annual reporting arrangements to Academic Board to the next meeting.	Chair
RKEC 14.6.5	Glenn Lyons to organise a replacement representative of contract research to join the Committee.	Glenn Lyons / Officer
RKEC 14.6.7	Myra Conway will represent the Human Tissue Sub-Committee to be invited to future meetings.	Officer
RKEC 14.6.12	Research review: Further comments invited from committee members (including those not in attendance). The Chair to incorporate comments into Associate Deans to circulate the document to Faculty RKEs once the comments have been incorporated.	URKEC members / Chair / Associate Deans
RKEC 14.6.15	Research governance: Paper to go to formal consultation ending on 1 st August 2014. To be brought back to URKEC on 12 th November 2014 before being recommended for approval at Academic Board on 17 th December 2014.	Ros Rouse / Chair
RKEC 14.6.18	UREC audit: Comments should be made to Julie Kent outside the meeting.	URKEC members / Julie Kent
RKEC 14.6.19	UREC audit: Chair to invite the Academic Strategy Implementation Group to comment on aspects of the report involving teaching and learning.	Chair
RKEC 14.6.21	Research Centre Proposal: Chair to invite Andrew Mearman to work with Angel Lai from finance to develop a business plan and to resubmit the proposal.	Chair

**RKEC 14.6M
Agenda Item 2**

RKEC 14.6.26	Chair to check if closure of centres need to be ratified at academic board.	Chair
RKEC 14.6.32	Comments from committee members on either the Committee's annual report for 2012/13 or the REF report to be made to Richard Bond.	Richard Bond / URKEC members
RKEC 14.6.35	Richard Bond to bring the University's response to the HEFCE policy on Open Access to the next meeting.	Richard Bond