## Research Committee Minutes

1 March 2017, 12.00, Room IF-1.16

**Attendees:** Jane Hillston (Chair), Murray Cole, Kousha Etessami, Michael Fourman, Nigel Goddard, Jon Oberlander, Steve Renals, Michael Rovatsos, Martin Wright, Julie Young, Anda Nicolson (secretary)

**Apologies:** Chris Banks, Barbara Webb

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Approval of previous minutes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Minutes from the meeting held on the 1st of March 2017 were approved.</td>
<td><strong>Matters arising from previous meeting:</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) <strong>REF Impact.</strong> Steve Renals plans to give institute talks rather than talking to DoIs exclusively.&lt;br&gt;b) <strong>Internet of Things lab space.</strong> MF has spoken informally with people about this and will follow-up with Ewan Klein about the need to provide a formal proposal to the Quartermile team. MJW noted a need to think about other lab space requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Items for information</strong>&lt;br&gt;The committee noted papers 2.1-2.3b, regarding Success Stories, open access statistics and KPIs.</td>
<td>SR&lt;br&gt;SR raised a minor query about the amount shown for one of the success stories. <strong>Action:</strong> JH and JY to look at this to ensure that our reporting is accurate and to discuss with Kasia Kokowska which figures we are using for our success stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JH noted that it has been a good couple of months for success stories and welcomed the diversity of research which is being shown by these awards.</strong></td>
<td>JH/JY&lt;br&gt;JH noted that it has been a good couple of months for success stories and welcomed the diversity of research which is being shown by these awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our open access statistics have dropped below 90%. Part of this is due to an ATI Fellow who had not been aware that their publications needed to be recorded in PURE. This has now been addressed and we should see an improvement during the next reporting period. <strong>Actions:</strong> DoIs should encourage people in their institute to get their documents in to PURE and to respond to the emails that are being sent from David Beamish to prompt people to verify their record in PURE.</strong></td>
<td>Dols&lt;br&gt;The KPI figures show that we have significantly increased our applications. Our value of awards is also stronger than the same period last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Public engagement – presentation by College Engagement Team</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stuart Dunbar and Peter Reid from the College Engagement Team visited the meeting and gave a presentation about their work. The slides they used will be uploaded to the Research Committee website. The committee noted afterwards that they would like to see more focus on STEM and on local schools. <strong>Action:</strong> JH to pass this information to the team.</td>
<td>JH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Government’s Industrial Strategy**  
At the previous meeting JH talked about the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund. Paper 4.1 is a summary document of the government green paper for information only. Dols may want to review this to see what may be coming in the future in terms of funding.

5. **REF**  
Paper 5.1 was shared to look at the potential REF impact case studies that we have identified in the School at the moment. The purpose of the paper is to identify Impact and to encourage Dols to think about cases in their institute which could be captured as having the potential for Impact in REF2020.

As a School, we are good at doing theoretical work which translates to impact in business. It would be good to be able to provide additional examples of this. We should gather as many potential cases as possible now so that we have the opportunity to evaluate their possible strengths. This is not just important for REF, but to highlight the impact of the work that we are doing in the School of Informatics more broadly.

We need to do workshops in the School to ensure that people understand what a good Impact case study looks like and what mechanisms that they could use to turn their case studies from two-star to four. We should also look to highlight any cross-disciplinary work that we are doing.

6. **Research screen at reception**  
There is a small screen at reception which shows modified research posters to highlight the work we are doing in the School. The posters currently being displayed are out of date. We want to use this screen to highlight our best or more recent work.

A suggestion was made that the information on the screen could be more historical which would require less updating and would be less resource-intensive. A second suggestion was to use the screen to highlight what activities are taking place in the building on a specific day. We could also use the screen to highlight news items and successes from the School.

**Action:** JH to pass this activity to the communications team.

7. **Blavatnik Award**  
These are new awards to this country and have been around in the US for a while. The University is allowed to nominate one person in each category – ours is Physical Sciences and Engineering.

There have not been a lot of responses to the requests for nominations, so we should consider if we have a suitable nominee to send to College. The deadline is tomorrow. **Action:** JM to nominate and respond to JH.

8. **Any other business**  
In the January meeting we discussed new research programmes. Vijay and Boris proposed a new programme, Data-centric Systems, at Research Day yesterday.

**Action:** JH will circulate the slides and ask this committee to decide if it is a suitable candidate for a research programme.
Research Day
Research Day was held yesterday and was a successful activity. Feedback received afterwards asked that we send an email round monthly so that people can see what’s being awarded. It helps them to feel as though things are happening in the School and to see what others are working on. **Action:** JY to ask Comms Team to circulate this list monthly.

MF asked if the data previously used in waterfall format to highlight grant activity was still useful. **Action:** MF to take this to the next committee.

| 9. | **Date of next meeting:**  
12pm, Wednesday 5th July 2017 | JY | MF |