

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2012**

**Present:** The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) (in the Chair)  
Professor Karl Claxton  
Professor M Beaney  
Dr I D'Amico  
Professor K Fernandes  
Professor P Kaye  
Professor Mark Ormrod  
Professor J Potts  
Dr A Sowden

**In attendance:** Director of the Research and Enterprise Office  
Research Strategy and Policy Manager  
Research Strategy and Policy Officer  
Director of Information and University Librarian  
Assistant Director Information and Head of Content

Apologies for absence were received from Professor M Collins, Professor Brian Fulton, Professor E Hancock Professor S Rees-Jones and Research Grants and Contracts Manager

**12-13/01 Terms of reference and revised membership of the committee.**

The Committee **received** the terms of reference for the Committee and **noted** the wish that those administrative staff in attendance should be made full members. It was **agreed** that advice should be sought on the governance issues relating to this matter.

The three Academic Coordinators were welcomed to the membership of the committee and it was **noted** that Professor Sowden and Professor Potts had been nominated to serve for an additional term, pending Senate approval.

**12-13/02 Minutes of the meeting held on 6 June 2012.**

With the addition of 'as expected' at the end of MM11-12/80, the minutes of the meeting held on 6 June 2012 were **approved**.

## **12-13/03 Research Committee members reports on activities undertaken in relation to the support given to their nominated departments**

The Committee **noted** that Research Committee members had not undertaken any activities in relation to the support given to their nominated departments, other than the work related to the REF preparations, as expected.

## **12-13/04 Update on Open Access requirements**

The Committee **received** a presentation from the Director of Information and University Librarian on the implications of Open Access for the institution. It was **noted** that the current university position was for an institutional repository, but with no formal mandate to require staff to deposit outputs. This position needed review in light of RCUK funder requirements that outputs be freely available (the gold model of publishing) as opposed to simply placing an appropriate copyright compliant version in a repository. It was further **noted** that HEFCE had recently indicated that all research submitted for future REFs might need to be open access. It was unclear how monographs and non-journal based outputs might be included in such requirements.

It was **noted** that there was not yet clear guidance on the exact requirements of the funders but that funding had been made available from BIS to support the costs of developing the Open Access process and some publishing costs. It was further noted that this was a rapidly developing area of activity, but that the university was working with others to identify best practice

It was **noted** that there would be a significant communication and training requirement regarding the changes and implications which should not be underestimated. It was recognised that the Gold model would have significant impact on scholarly publishing within the UK. It was **agreed** that it would be sensible to encourage the green model publishing, providing an alternative to paying for gold access and this might pressure publishers to review their current models. It was proposed that the University mandate staff to lodge research outputs in a repository and to ensure that the White Rose Repository was fit for purpose.

It was **agreed** that the University would need to develop a position statement on Open Access, a policy on how to support open access publishing across the institution, undertake an audit of the costs involved and to introduce procedures to ensure funder requirements were met. The Committee

expressed concern that the requirements would involve an additional cost for the institution that would be unlikely to be significantly offset by any fall in journal subscription charges, at least in the short term. It was suggested that the sector might need to work together to put pressure on publishers to take account of the additional costs.

The additional administrative burden was **noted**, and there was concern that such policies could lead to decisions not to publish some research or for adverse changes in publication strategies for departments based on cost alone. It was **agreed** that this highlighted the need for strong departmental research strategies against which such funding decisions could be made

### **12-13/05 Development of Research Committee Working Groups**

The Committee **received** a paper on the proposed development of Research Committee Working Groups. It was **agreed** that the paper gave a useful starting point for considering the working groups. It was further **agreed** that Chairs of the Working Groups should be drawn from the Academic Coordinators and the PVC for Research.

It was **noted** that the PGR Working Group should be about improving the integration of PGR students and the title be amended accordingly, but that it was recognised that the level of integration did vary across departments.

It was further **agreed** that the Working Groups should be time limited and that the first meeting would need to focus on prioritising the issues to be addressed

The modus operandi of the Working Groups was discussed and whether there should be a large membership or whether there should be a small core group of research committee members, who drew on evidence from across the institution. It was **agreed** that this should be a matter for the Chair of the Research Committee in the first instance. It was also **agreed** that the administrative support for the Working Group would need to be drawn from across the institution and not from within the Research Strategy and Policy Office. It was noted that this Office would have significant input and were already heavily loaded with REF preparations.

Members of Research Committee were asked to send their preferences for which committee they wished to service on to the Secretary at their earliest convenience.

## **12-13/06 Revised copy of the annual operating statement for Research Committee**

The Committee **received** the annual operating statement for Research Committee and with the addition of the word 'strategies' at the end of item 5, the statement was approved.

## **12-13/07 To consider a report on matters relating to REF 2014**

The Committee **received** an oral update on matters relating to REF 2014. It was **noted** the Code of Practice for the Selection of Staff for REF was expected to be approved shortly and that the Equality and Diversity Training for REF was progressing well. Thanks were expressed to the Equality and Diversity Office for developing and delivering the training.

There was a view expressed that, whilst there was an obvious need to take personal circumstances into account, there was concern that in some cases Universities could be seeking dispensation for failures at an institutional level in supporting staff. It was agreed to clarify this matter, via the Equality and Diversity Office, with ECU.

The attention of the Committee was drawn to a number of forthcoming deadlines, which would require action by members. These included reviewing revised research and impact strategies, due to be submitted on 14 November in time for them to be discussed at the 28 November meeting. It was **agreed** that the strategies would be circulated to all committee members for information. Members were also reminded that when reviewing the strategies, one criterion would be how well the document articulated the departmental strategic direction and allowed investment decisions to be made. Where such priorities were not clear, departments would be asked to reconsider their strategy.

It was **noted** that the basic Scopus citation data was expected to be made available within PURE within the next 6 weeks, with normalised field citation data available by February.

## **12-13/08 Departmental HEIF Funding Update (FOI Exempt)**

## **12-13/09 Implications of changes to project outcome reporting: the options.**

The Committee **received** a report on the issues relating to the changes in reporting of outcomes to major funders. It was **noted** that the types of

information requested was now more extensive and that the information gathered would also be of interest to the institution.

It was **agreed** that encouraging staff to use PURE as the central repository for the collection of research activities was the most sensible solution, but that there were concerns relating to the cost of implementation. It was also **noted** that the external reporting requirements were still fluid and hence devising a solution was problematic.

It was **agreed** that an interim solution of encouraging staff to record as much information in PURE as possible, but with the recognition that staff might still need to access external systems for funder specific information or text based information was the most pragmatic. Where this was not possible, departments would be expected to copy any information held in funder databases back into PURE.

#### **12-13/10 Report on Research Grant Income (FOIA Exempt)**

#### **12-13/11 Date of next meeting**

The Committee noted the date of the next meeting on Wednesday 28 November 2012 at 2.15pm

**October 2012**

**Anna Grey**

**Research Strategy and Policy Manager**