UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

RESEARCH COMMITTEE
Matters for note by Senate arising from the meeting of Research Committee on 2 February 2022

1. Policy on the Payment of Individuals for Involvement with and Contribution to Research

The Committee received for information the Policy on the Payment of Individuals for Involvement with and Contribution to Research. The following was noted:

(a) Ensuring that the policy was well-communicated and that there was awareness of requirements within the community was essential.

(b) The policy was based on UK tax rates, and so research taking place overseas would need to be considered case by case. The issue of charitable donations in lieu of payments to participants would need further consideration.

(c) Following consideration by URC, the policy would be presented to colleagues at YRAF. A suite of public-facing webpages would be developed in partnership with members of the public, with the aim that these be completed by the summer. An update would be presented to the Committee in June, outlining the webpages and implementation thus far. It would also be disseminated amongst the PGR community.

The Committee endorsed the policy and the proposed dissemination strategy. An update on implementation would be presented to the June meeting of the Committee.

2. Annual report from the Academic Ethics and Compliance Committee

The Committee approved the annual report from the Academic Ethics and Compliance Committee. The following points were noted:

(a) Work was underway to establish a Professional Services Ethics Committee which would feed into the AECC. It was reported that a Chair (Dr Nadia Mifka-Profozic) and Deputy Chair (Dr Adam Dawkins) had been identified.

(b) The question of ethics governance in the new Schools established at the University would be picked up outside the meeting.

(c) Regarding the difficulty in retaining student members, it was suggested that such roles might be best directed towards PGR students with an emphasis on professional development opportunities.

3. Research Supervision Survey: Data and Implications for Practice at York

The Committee discussed a report on data from the recent Research Supervision Survey, including information on implications for practice at York. The following points were noted:

(a) The survey had generated some positive feedback of note: (i) there was a high-level of satisfaction in the role and enjoyment of it amongst supervisors, (ii) supervisors at York were largely confident in their ability to understand and adhere to policies, and (iii) supervisors felt valued by their supervisees.

(b) ███
████████████████████████. It was noted that a focus on improving knowledge of funder requirements as part of professional development opportunities would be beneficial.

(c) The survey had further highlighted areas of focus for supervisor support, which had been taken forward and would be addressed as necessary. The value in setting expectations early on in the supervisor/student relationship was noted.

(d) The issue of workload associated with PGR students who had had their project extended was noted. Although workload models were developed at department-level, it was important that supervisors

were aware of the range of support options across the institution. Further information on the time required for extended PGRs was needed.

(e) Further data on joint supervision would be helpful. Although workload management took place at a department- or Faculty-level, joint supervision was valuable and in need of full consideration.

4. Research Grant Applications and Awards: Year to Date December 2021 including four year comparison

The Committee discussed a report on Research Grant Applications and Awards: Year to Date December 2021 including four year comparison. The following points were noted:

(a) Regarding EU grants, three grants held by the University were due to start in May, however this timing meant they would not be supported by the current government underwrite. The Russell Group was lobbying for the underwrite to be extended beyond April, and was working to demonstrate the value of such funding for UK universities. There was a dearth of specific guidance available for EU funding, and so information was being collated across the sector. Colleagues were asked to notify the Associate Director of RI&KE of any guidance they were in receipt of, to ensure awareness within the institution

(b) It was noted that the Spring call for projects for Research Priming Funds had been cancelled in order to allow a backlog of projects submitted to previous calls to be assessed and supported as far as possible. Regarding industrial funding, it was noted that this was a key area for the University going forwards.

(c) The Committee requested greater clarity as to the rules surrounding sharing data from Tableau, as the benefits of the platform were numerous. Consideration would be given as to what could be shared and at what level.

5. Other Business

(a) Professor S Thompson, Associate Dean (Research) for the Sciences, had accepted an expansion of role to work on two major University initiatives: (i) providing academic leadership for the Professional Services Delivery workstream and (ii) working on improving and further embedding industrial engagement within the institution.

(b) Professor L Carpenter had been awarded an MBE in the 2022 New Year Honours for services to atmospheric chemistry – the Committee congratulated her on this award.

(c) It had been recognised within the institution that opportunities for individuals to receive awards or prizes for their work often involved a large investment of time and effort in developing applications. The Project Officer (PVCs) had initiated work in this area, and a pilot project would soon be rolled out, with opportunities for learning ongoing.

(d) The York Centre for Equity in Doctoral Education (YCEDE) had officially launched.

(e) The ESRC response to the Independent Review of PhDs in the Social Sciences was now available, and included a number of important points of interest to the Committee. York was in a strong position when it came to the provision of support for supervisors, and was exploring ways in which to establish robust mentoring schemes. It was noted that this area was likely to become more explicit in funding requirements in light of the sector focus on research culture.

(f) ██
██
████████

(g) Work continued on the Professional Services Delivery workstream, and progress was being made in the development of Terms of Reference for the working group and the initiation of discussion with key stakeholders. It was clarified that input would be sought from the community. Work on industrial engagement was in the early stages.

(h) Within the Faculty of Arts & Humanities, the Place and Community Fund launch had taken place before Christmas and had offered a key networking opportunity for colleagues. A workshop with York Museums Trust was in development, and a range of collaboration options had been identified. The 'From Researcher to Research Leader' programme was underway with a cohort of approximately 20

researchers. The University was represented on the City of York Culture Forum. Departments were considering the implementation of semesterisation and the establishment of the new School of Digital Creativity and the Performing Arts.

(i) Discussion was taking place to identify goals in the Faculty of Social Sciences. The review of ReCSS would be picked up in due course, following postponement during the C-19 pandemic; there was interest in pursuing a greater interdisciplinary agenda in this space, with options for cross-department working such as open workspaces and facilities designed to aid conversation. The new Dean for the Faculty, Professor K Rowlingson, would be in post soon.

(j) The Committee considered the proposed changes to the Code of Practice on Research Integrity, and requested a number of minor changes. These would be addressed in due course and the draft Code would return to the Committee for further consideration. The Committee approved the creation of a 'Users Guide' to accompany the Code of Practice.

(k) The Committee recommended for approval the proposed changes to the Code of Practice and Principles for Good Ethical Governance. Minor amendments were requested, and the proposed changes to the Code were approved subject to these comments. The need for effective and comprehensive dissemination was noted. As with the above, the creation of a 'Users Guide' to accompany the Code of Practice was approved.

PROFESSOR MATTHIAS RUTH   **MS ZOE CLARKE**
26/04/2022