MINUTES OF MEETING
of the
PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
held on
Wednesday, 29 June 2011
10:00 am – 12:00 pm
Turing Room

Present:

Dave Robertson (Chair), Mike Fourman, Jon Oberlander, Michael O'Boyle, Steve Renals, Alan Smaill, Perdita Stevens, Stratis Viglas, Sethu Vijayakumar, Philip Wadler, Barbara Webb, Chris Williams, Marjorie Dunlop (Secretary)

Attending: Elizabeth Elliot, Stephen Gilmore, Neil McGillivray

Apologies: Colin Adams, Stuart Anderson, Johanna Moore, Bonnie Webber

Approval of Minutes
The Minutes of Meeting of 18 May 2011 were approved.

Outstanding Actions from Minutes of Meeting of 23 March 2011

Item 5 – School e-mail

Dave reported that Simon Marsden will attend CSMC (24 May) to participate in a discussion across Schools of the benefits and risks of outsourcing e-mail.

Action
Dave will report back to PRC
Actioned (see AOB)

Item 8 – Any other business
It was decided to reinstate an item that had been dropped. A small group (Mike O'Boyle, Liz and Chris Williams) will develop a financial model for allocation of institute funds.

Action
Mike O'Boyle
Action
The group, consisting of Mike, Joanne Pennie, Chris and Steve Renals will produce a draft which will be presented to PRC for approval.

There was discussion about the recommendations from the International Review Committee especially with respect to the working group and governance and report back to College.

Action
Dave to prepare a formal response to the review's recommendations
Actioned (Working group formed; options cycled to School; final decision made)

AGENDA ITEMS

Item 1 – Research opportunities

There was discussion of the need to attract more external funding for research postgraduate studentships, given that the School will have less internal studentship funding in the coming year.

Item 2 – Recruitment update

Collaboration arrangements with industry in Security were discussed. These may lead to future industrial funding of studentships as well as savings in our staff budget.

Item 3 – Preparations for REF

Stephen and Phil have agreed to be our REF coordinators.

Stephen described the results of our recent survey of publications that could be submitted to the REF. The results of this are encouraging, although there is a need to improve. The goal is for all staff that can be submitted under REF rules to submit four papers that we believe should be rated at 3* or above.

There was also discussion about impact statements. The precise rules for these remain unclear because we lack detailed guidance from the REF administration but we have assembled an initial set of impact statements that we can use as a basis for refinement and extension. The aim is to have a pool of about 15 to 20 prototype impact statements from which we can assemble the (approximately) 12 that we are likely to need.

There was discussion about PURE which will be the standard University vehicle for collating REF material, including publications. We will engage with the PURE development effort as early as we can which should be sometime in August.

We also need to raise our public profile, for example through video lectures, as a means of ensuring that our key papers are widely read.

Further queries were: weighting of journals, ranking of conferences, 2* papers with no funding and no money should perhaps not be submitted, tips for average member of staff, what is a 4* paper?

Action
SG and PW will compose a 100 word "how to"

Some individuals might not have four papers.

Action
DR will talk to those individuals

It was suggested that in some case people might submit software systems (write a paper about a software REF "output"). It was also suggested that a goal is for everyone to submit four 3* (or higher) papers. For each criterion there are qualitative and quantitative indicators.

Item 4 – Head of School's business

a) <u>Marie Curie Fellowships</u>
There was discussion about the Fellowships and PhD students. Marie Curie rules make it impossible to use funds to pay fees; as of last year the centre will no longer pay fees and the School must pay.

Action
DR will flag to College

b) <u>Room Allocations</u>
There will be some shuffling of people and rooms.

Action
All to email Marjorie with comments

c) <u>Retirement charge</u>
There is an early retirement funding charge which the School has to pay on those who retire between the ages of 50 and 60; this can be from £89K to over £100K.

d) <u>CEGIS funding</u>
This funding has not yet come through; it is still with Scottish Enterprise and the Scottish Funding Council.

e) <u>Design Informatics post/ECA budget</u>
Edinburgh College of Art are believed to be keen to recruit before the end of the year for a post to be held in College of Humanities & Social Sciences.

Item 5 – Any other business

a) <u>School e-mail</u>
Dave reported that there was tentative approval from CSMC to outsource email with the decision going back to CCITC, ITC and then back to Dave in September. Phil will use Webmail for a day. Approval may also be needed from Records Management and there may be student consultations. There is still concern about security and the need for IS to quantify the cost of switching for an estimated £200K savings.

Action
DR will keep in touch with this and report back to PRC

Item 6 – Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting is Wednesday, 21 September 2011 at 2:00 pm in the Turing Room.