

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

ACADEMIC BOARD

RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meetings held on 24 February 2011 and 16 March 2011

Present: 24 February: Professor Jane Powell (in the Chair), Dr Catherine Alexander, Professor Les Back, Professor Nick Couldry, Mr Mike Metelits, Professor Len Platt, Professor Irit Rogoff, Ms Julie Taylor, Professor Robert Zimmer, Ms Lynda Agili (Secretary)

16 March: Professor Jane Powell (in the Chair), Dr Catherine Alexander, Professor Les Back, Professor Nick Couldry, Mr Mike Metelits, Professor Len Platt, Professor Irit Rogoff, Ms Julie Taylor, Ms Lynda Agili (Secretary)

Apologies: 24 February and 16 March: Professor Maria Shevtsova
16 March: Professor Robert Zimmer

In Attendance: 24 February and 16 March: Ms Diana Lockyer, Personal Assistant/ Pro Warden (Research and Enterprise), 24 February: Ms Marie Fallon, Research Grants Officer for Items 6, 7 and 8

OPEN BUSINESS

1 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Noted:

(i) Research and Business Development Offices re-focusing

- (a) that Mr Mike Metelits has decided to return to his consultancy practice at the end of July 2011
- (b) that the Business Development Office and Research Office have undertaken a refocusing process which will align the two offices to the integrated research and enterprise agenda via co-ordinated working practices and co-location in Hatcham House.
- (c) that Ms Julie Taylor has agreed to take up the position of Head of Business Development Office

Resolved:

To thank Mr Mike Metelits for his hugely influential development of the Business Development Office and to wish him every success in his return to his consultancy practice

2 MINUTES

Resolved:

to approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2010

3 RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK (REF) DEVELOPMENTS

Received:

(a) a summary of informal departmental output audits, and (b) a proposed structure for an internal REF Advisory Panel (11-64)

Noted:

Informal Output Audit

- (i) that the informal departmental output audit had been a very constructive exercise highlighting critical tasks which needed to be undertaken within departments to strengthen their outputs for the REF submission in 2014
- (ii) that departmental approaches to rating the quality of outputs had been variable and that in the more formal audit preceding the dry run in the summer term of 2011-12, departments should develop and implement more rigorous evaluation processes
- (iii) that it may be beneficial for departments to seek the views of colleagues external to Goldsmiths, especially those with previous RAE panel experience, regarding indicators of output quality within their discipline
- (iv) that as QR will not in future reward any research activity rated below 3*, it is essential that departments critically evaluate all their potentially submissible outputs with the aim of optimising submission decisions

REF Advisory Panel

- (v) that the panel should be asked to advise on the assignment of staff whose outputs are relevant to more than one unit of assessment [UoA].
- (vi) that it may be necessary to set a higher threshold for including staff in the REF than was the case in RAE2008, given the decision that in future 2* activity will not be funded via QR
- (vii) that it may be useful to develop algorithms to indicate how the inclusion of staff with few 3 or 4* outputs might affect (a) the grade point average for the submission as a whole, and (b) the QR income it would generate

Resolved:

- (i) to endorse the proposed composition and remit of the REF Advisory Panel and to co-opt members of staff as particular areas of expertise are needed
- (ii) in the next phase of auditing departmental outputs, which will take place during the first term of 2011-12 prior to the dry run in the summer term, DRCs should as far as possible develop a critical view of factors characterising 3* and 4* work in their particular UoA
- (iii) to make some College Research Funds available to departments to pay for external advice on evaluating their outputs and/or on developing specific aspects of their submission, to a maximum of £250 per department. Any such requests will be considered, and if appropriate authorised by, the PWRE

4 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Received:

(a) the HEFCE document setting out the procedures for assessing research impact, and (b) a written summary of issues arising from the internal Impact Case Study meetings (11-113)

Noted:

HEFCE Impact paper

- (i) that Impact would carry a 20% weighting in REF2014, but would be likely to contribute more strongly in subsequent REFs
- (ii) that case studies have been confirmed as the key method for assessing impact, with an associated 'impact statement' for each submission; this will take the form of a narrative describing how impact has been supported and enabled during the REF period
- (iii) that submissions will be required to provide one case study as a starting point, plus a further one case study per 10 FTEs submitted; this means that the smallest submission (with 10 FTEs or fewer) will need two case studies.
- (iv) that in UoA submissions where FTE is close to a multiple of 10, the availability of strong case studies may be a factor influencing selection decisions
- (v) that the research outputs underpinning case studies must have appeared in the public domain at any time between 1 January 1993 and 31 December 2013

Impact Case Study meetings

- (vi) that all departments had participated in the small group meetings to discuss impact case studies; the meetings had generated a number of suggestions for enhancing the narrative accounts and gathering additional evidence of the significance and reach of the impact
- (vii) that the discussions highlighted the importance of departments from now on being proactive both in developing the impact of ongoing research projects which have impact potential, and in systematically capturing evidence of it
- (viii) that Research Councils have for some time required grant applications to include impact strategies; it might therefore be useful for departments to review the applications for any funded projects to see whether the anticipated impacts have been realised and whether the project could be a basis for a case study in the present or future REFs
- (ix) that it may be useful to explore NGOs' approach to impact, given our extensive collaborations with such organisations and the intrinsically impactful nature of such collaborations

Resolved:

- (i) to plan an 'impact' symposium or meeting focusing on impact issues and case studies; this could involve contributions from external agencies such as NESTA or the AHRC

- (ii) to build a live archive of impact case studies and to promote them via the college website

5 HIGHER EDUCATION INNOVATION FUND 2011-15 (HEIF 5)

Received:

the HEFCE letter outlining plans for HEIF5 (11-114)

Noted:

- (i) that the next 4-year cycle of HEIF funding [HEIF 5] begins on 1 August 2011. We have been provisionally advised that our annual funding will be reduced by about 12% compared with the funding we received in the previous cycle [HEIF 4]. This is a modest reduction by comparison with other institutions which are primarily arts and humanities, reflecting our relatively strong performance against the relevant income indicators in recent HEB-CI surveys
- (ii) HEIF5 allocations are based entirely on income generation during previous years, and consequently favour institutions with disciplines which have high levels of commercial/industrial engagement (e.g. via Knowledge Transfer Partnerships with manufacturing industries). Institutions whose commercial income streams fell below a specified threshold over the preceding 2-3 years will not receive any HEIF5 allocation, and a number of arts-based institutions have consequently lost all HEIF funding
- (iii) that although arts, humanities and social science research often involves extensive collaboration with external organisations, this is not included in the formula for calculating HEIF allocations unless it generates financial income streams. It was noted by the Committee that this lack of reward for external collaborations is inconsistent with Research Councils' encouragement of such collaborative activity
- (iv) that we are required to develop and submit to HEFCE a formal plan associated with our use of the HEIF5 allocation. The deadline for submission is in July. Although we will receive the amount provisionally indicated already for the forthcoming academic year, the allocation in the subsequent three years will depend on this plan receiving approval
- (v) that the BDO and College are currently developing strategies to increase our income generation from consultancy and short courses (or continuing professional development), two indicators which do contribute to the HEIF formula

Resolved:

- (i) to continue developing our strategic relationships and partnerships with a range of external organisations including major international businesses but also museums, galleries, theatres and other creative organisations
- (ii) to seek inputs to the HEIF5 plan from a selected group of academic staff whose work involves external/commercial collaborations, and from relevant non-academic collaborators and partners

6 APPLICATIONS AND AWARDS FOR RESEARCH FUNDING

Received:

(a) summary of applications and awards for the last 5 years and (b) analysis of income and expenditure in the year ending 31 July 2010 (11-65)

Noted:

- (i) that in order to accurately align the summary of applications and awards with the analysis of income and expenditure, the spreadsheets showed data from consecutive periods running from 1 August to 31 July. This represents a change from the periods used in earlier reports.
- (ii) that despite changes in funding resources and programmes, the number of research awards in 2009-10 was similar to that obtained in the preceding two years and included a number of substantial Research Council grants
- (iii) that applications for European Community grants have been increasing year on year, as have the number of awards; Goldsmiths currently holds several large scale FP7 collaborative grants and European Research Council grants

7 FUNDING COUNCIL ROUND-UP

Received:

a summary of changes to Research Council funding mechanisms following the Comprehensive Spending Review (11-66)

Noted:

- (i) that a key trend resulting from the Comprehensive Spending Review is for Research Councils to seek to reduce administration costs by focusing on large scale investments in collaborative grants and programmes with potential for substantial impact
- (ii) that a number of smaller-scale funding schemes have now been curtailed; these unfortunately include some with which Goldsmiths staff have been very successful (e.g. ESRC small grants, post doctoral fellowships and AHRC creative fellowships)
- (iii) that all Research Councils are considering methods to reduce expenditure on peer review and to encourage greater quality control of applications at institutional level
- (iv) that many Goldsmiths academics could be strong candidates for large grants, and should be encouraged to develop applications in response to specific programme calls; in some cases this may entail the development of collaborative relationships with other academic institutions, especially in relation to large-scale funding programmes
- (v) that a relatively small proportion of staff apply for grants regularly, and more should be encouraged to engage in research networking opportunities, to think creatively about collaborative approaches to applying for funding, and to actively pursue internal and external partnerships

- (vi) that Research Office currently has insufficient staffing capacity to be as proactive as it would like to be in stimulating collaborative funding applications via training sessions and events; but that it will consider the Committee's suggestions of holding Open House sessions, offering regular drop-in 'clinics', and running one thematic event a term
- (vii) that departments should be encouraged to establish mentoring systems or groups to help PhD students and early career researchers to develop their careers
- (viii) that with support from the Research Office, academics should explore funding streams from a wider range of foundations and other charitable bodies

Resolved:

- (i) RO to consider how to resource additional training and support
- (ii) BDO to consider establishing a "think tank" relating to a college bid (led by Julie Taylor and Professor Zimmer) to lead an AHRC knowledge exchange hub

8 REVISED PROCEDURES FOR APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING APPLICATIONS

Received:

A proposed revision to the procedures for authorising external funding applications (11-67)

Noted:

that the revised procedures would streamline authorisation of external funding applications; costings will be completed electronically, and the approval form authorised via email circulation.

Resolved:

- (i) that Committee members should send any suggested amendments to the revised procedures to Lynda Agili
- (ii) that the Research Office and Finance Department would work together to finalise the new system during the summer term so that it can be implemented by the start of the 2011-12 academic year

9 ALLOCATION OF REC FUNDS 2011/12

Received:

a paper outlining options for the most effective use of 2011-12 REC Funds (11-68)

Noted:

- (i) that at this point in the REF cycle, priority should be given to activities which are likely to strengthen our REF submissions, and that an important current focus for all departments is the development of impact case studies

Resolved:

- (i) to put out a summer term call for proposals to develop and strengthen impact case studies which have been shortlisted by Departmental Research Committees [DRCs] as candidates for the REF
- (ii) to ringfence some funding (up to £250 per academic department, or approximately £4-5K in total) to provide payments to disciplinary experts for advice concerning aspects of their REF strategy

10 DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH STRATEGIES AND GOVERNANCE RESPONSIBILITIES**Received:**

a proposal for clarifying departmental responsibilities/mechanisms in relation to research strategies and governance (11-116)

Noted:

- (i) that not all academic departments have a Departmental Research Committee, and that they are not part of the formal committee structure of the College; departments therefore vary in their systems for organising and monitoring research activities
- (ii) that the paper articulated a set of specific responsibilities relating to the development and monitoring of research strategies/activities. REC felt that these could appropriately be addressed by departments in different ways, as long as it is clear in each case where the responsibility resides.
- (iii) that the Environment section of REF submissions is likely to require narrative information about how departments engage with the development of research strategy and governance

Resolved:

- (i) to ask departments to identify which committee and/or staff member is operationally responsible for each of a list of specified research issues.

11 CENTRE FOR CREATIVE COLLABORATION**Received:**

a report from the Director of Business Development and the C4CC Working Group on progress made in developing, promoting, and evaluating a range of College usages of the centre's facilities (11-69)

Noted:

- (i) that the C4CC had surpassed its original objectives and hosted 80 projects which had generated over 2000 visitors in the first year
- (ii) that it was important to evaluate the value to Goldsmiths academics of our

participation to date in order to inform decisions concerning future investment in the Centre; in particular we need to ascertain whether it has enabled the development of meaningful and productive collaborations

Resolved:

that the Director of the BDO would carry out an evaluation and produce a written report during the summer term

12 LONDON CENTRE FOR ARTS AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE (LCACE)

Received:

an oral report from the Director of Business Development on recent developments with LCACE

Noted:

- (i) that LCACE had been established since 2004 as a HEIF initiative to promote collaboration between Higher Education and the Arts and Cultural Sector in London, and to support knowledge transfer in the arts
- (ii) that LCACE planned to extend its membership beyond the current nine institutions, and that the subscription would probably remain close to its present level of £25K per annum
- (iii) that the BDO will need to evaluate the benefits of renewing our membership given the relatively high cost of the subscription in relation to our reduced HEIF funding

13 PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE SENSORIMOTOR DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH UNIT

Received:

a proposal to establish the Sensorimotor Development Research Unit with effect from April 2011, as a unit within the Department of Psychology (11-121)

Noted:

that the Unit would provide an excellent focus for the Psychology Department to consolidate approaches to this important area of developmental psychology

Resolved:

- (i) to approve the establishment of the Unit with effect from April 2011
- (ii) to provide funding of £150 to support an inaugural workshop, subject to matched funding from the Department of Psychology

14 GRADUATE SCHOOL

Received:

an oral report from the Dean of Graduate School

Noted:

ESRC Doctoral Training Centre [DTC]

- (i) that the DTC bid with QMUL has been successful and would provide full funding for fifty PhD students over a five year period
- (ii) that an Academic Director from either Goldsmiths or QMUL would be appointed to oversee the Centre
- (iii) that the AHRC is likely to adopt a similar model for administering studentships when the existing five year Block Grant Partnerships come to an end in 2014. It is likely to encourage collaborations between institutions and to fund only PhDs rather than (as at present) taught Masters programmes.

Internally Funded Doctoral Studentships

- (iv) that SMT had taken the view that the 2010-11 scheme for co-funding PhD studentships with academic departments could not be repeated in the current financial climate, but would consider alternative proposals
- (v) that the Dean of the Graduate School had been exploring possible mechanisms for funding stipends through a combination of departmental contributions, paid work within the College, and donations from external sponsors. The Development Office was actively seeking to leverage funds from arts institutions, publishers and businesses who may see the importance of a critical link with Goldsmiths. However, it had become apparent that it would be difficult to generate sufficient funding through these avenues.
- (vi) that the development of strong working relationships with arts organisations and creative industries would enable applications to be made to external Collaborative Doctoral Funding schemes

Resolved:

- (i) to congratulate the Graduate School on the award of the DTC and in particular to thank the previous and current Deans, Professor Carrie Paechter and Professor Les Back, for their efforts in writing the bid and negotiating its development at Goldsmiths
- (ii) to emphasise to the SMT the view of REC that internally funded studentships which attract high calibre students from across the world are strategically important to our research culture and competitiveness

15 ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS POLICY

Received:

the revised Academic Publications Policy (11-70)

Noted:

that whilst the policy was more streamlined than previously, it appeared to lack substantial academic editorial review

Resolved:

to reconsider this aspect of the policy at a summer term meeting of REC

16 RESEARCH ETHICS SUB-COMMITTEE

Received and noted:

the minutes of the Research Ethics Sub Committee held on 09 November 2010 (11-71)

17 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY HORIZON SCANNING

Received and noted:

a report of major research initiatives currently open for application (11-72)

18 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Noted:

- i the following periods of paid leave approved by Chair's action:
 - (a) Dr M Canova-Green, Dept of English and Comparative Literature (23.04.12 – 14.06.12)
 - (b) Prof. A. Downie, Dept of English and Comparative Literature (26.09.11 – 15.06.12)
 - (c) Prof. M. d'Inverno, Dept of Computing (01.05.11 – 30.04.12)
 - (d) Dr. V. Richmond, Dept of History (26.09.11 – 23.03.12)
 - (e) Professor Scott Lash, Centre for Cultural Studies (16.02.11 – 01.05.11)
 - (f) Dr. C. Scott, Dept of English and Comparative Literature (02.05.11 – 24.06.11)
 - (g) Dr M Ward, Dept of Design (17.01.11 – 1.04.11)

- ii the following periods of unpaid leave approved by Chair's action:
 - (a) Ms. L. Seers, Dept. of Art (17.01.11 – 01.04.11)

Resolved:

- iii to approve the reports following leave of absence: (11-73)
 - (a) Dr D Djokić, Dept. of History
 - (b) Ms A Fairtlough, Dept. of Professional and Community Education

- (c) Professor K Nash, Dept. of Sociology
- (d) Dr J Rattray, Dept of English and Comparative Literature
- (e) Professor A Simone, Dept. of Sociology
- (f) Mr A Vakil, Dept. of English and Comparative Literature

19 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

ERROR IN DATA SUBMITTED FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES RAE2008

Noted:

- (i) that it has emerged that a late-stage RAE2008 data entry error resulted in the PGR completion rate for Educational Studies being inaccurately submitted as 10 rather than the true figure of 24 which they had provided. This is unfortunate given that completion rate was one of several factors contributing to the department's RAE Environment score. Now that the Graduate School and Research Office are aware of the error, they will ensure that accurate data are provided where relevant in future publicity and funding applications and that HEFCE is notified of it.
- (ii) that although subsequent investigation has revealed the error to have been an isolated one, it has highlighted the need to introduce additional checking procedures prior to data submission to the REF

20 NEXT MEETINGS

Noted:

that Summer Term meetings for 2010-11 will be held on:

Thursday, 19 May, 2011 at 2.00 pm

Tuesday, 14 June, 2011 at 2.00 pm

LA, May 2011