

LEEDS BECKETT UNIVERSITY

# RESEARCH & ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

Thursday 18 January 2018  
at 2pm in Room G05,  
Old Broadcasting House,  
City Campus

**Governance and Legal Services**

Leeds Beckett University, Old Broadcasting House, Room 101, City Campus, LS2 9EN  
T: 0113 812 7542 F: 0113 812 7522 E: [governance@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:governance@leedsbeckett.ac.uk)



LEEDS  
BECKETT  
UNIVERSITY

**AGENDA** for the Thursday 18 January 2018 meeting

---

The sixty-third meeting of the Research & Enterprise Committee will be held at 2pm in room G05, Old Broadcasting House, City Campus.

14:00	<b>Part A: Preliminary Items</b>	<b>Paper</b>	<b>Led by</b>
	A1 Apologies		A Slade
	A2 Declarations of interest		A Slade
	A3* Terms of Reference & Membership	RES-2017-024	A Slade
	A4 Minutes of the last meeting held on 19 October 2017	RES-2017-025 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	A Slade
	A5 Matters arising	RES-2017-026	A Slade
14:10	<b>Part B: Matters for Information</b>	<b>Paper</b>	<b>Led by</b>
	B1* Overview of Joint Examiners' reports 2016/17	RES-2017-027	K Brown
	B2* Report from the Director of Research & Enterprise Services	RES-2017-028 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	C Barnes
14:20	<b>Part C: Research Excellence Framework Audit</b>	<b>Paper</b>	<b>Led by</b>
	C1 REF Audit reports:		
	(a) Update on the Research Excellence Framework Consultation	Verbal report	A Slade
	(b) UoA 33 Music, Drama, Dance, and Performing Arts	RES-2017-029 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	R Shail
	(c) UoA 32 Art and Design (History and Practice)	RES-2017-030 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	S Morris

(d) UoA 27 English Language and Literature / 28 History / 34 Communication, Culture and Media Studies, Library and Information Management	RES-2017-031 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	R Robbins
(e) UoA 24 Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism	RES-2017-032 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b> <i>(To Follow)</i>	S Backhouse
(f) UoA 23 Education	RES-2017-033 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	J Sharp
(g) UoA 20 Social Work and Social Policy	RES-2017-034 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b> <i>(To Follow)</i>	J Craig
(h) UoA 17 Business and Management Studies	RES-2017-035 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b> <i>(To Follow)</i>	R Tench
(i) UoA 13 Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	RES-2017-036 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b> <i>(To Follow)</i>	I Strange
(j) UoA 11 Computer Science and Informatics	RES-2017-037 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	D Monekosso
(k) UoA 4 Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	Verbal Report <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	B Gough
(l) UoA 3 Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	Verbal Report <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	G Jones

16:10	<b>Part D: Committee Reports</b>	<b>Paper</b>	<b>Led by</b>
D1*	Report from the Research Degrees Sub-Committee	RES-2017-038 <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b> <i>(To Follow)</i>	R Robbins
D2*	Report from the Research Ethics Sub-Committee	RES-2017-039	K Spracklen
D3*	Report from the University Research & Enterprise Forum	RES-2017-040	C Barnes

D4*	Reports from the School Academic Committees		Relevant Directors of Research
	(a) Leeds Business School	RES-2017-041	
	(b) Leeds Law School	RES-2017-042	
	(c) School of Art, Architecture and Design	RES-2017-043	
	(d) School of Built Environment and Engineering	RES-2017-044	
	(e) School of Clinical and Applied Sciences	RES-2017-045	
	(f) School of Computing, Creative Technologies and Engineering	RES-2017-046	
	(g) School of Cultural Studies and Humanities	RES-2017-047	
	(h) Carnegie School of Education	RES-2017-048	
	(i) School of Events, Tourism & Hospitality Management	RES-2017-049	
	(j) School of Film, Music and Performing Arts	RES-2017-050	
	(k) School of Health and Community Studies	RES-2017-051	
	(l) School of Sport	RES-2017-052	

16:20	<b>Part E: Other Business</b>	<b>Paper</b>	<b>Led by</b>
E1*	Schedule of meetings & business 2017/18	RES-2017-053	A Slade
E2*	Date of next meeting: 14:00 on Thursday 22 March 2018, in Room G10, Broadcasting Place, City Campus		

*Shaded items indicate that the Board / Committee is being asked to make a decision.*

*\*Starred items will be taken without discussion unless a member notifies the Chair or Secretary in advance that she or he wishes the item to be open for debate*



## Terms of Reference

The Research and Enterprise Committee is responsible to the Academic Board for overseeing research and enterprise, and the provision of research degrees in the University.

The Committee's terms of reference are to:

- (a) promote the strategic development of research & enterprise and other related scholarly activity across the University;
- (b) advise the Academic Board on the development, review and implementation of the sections of the University's Academic Regulations related to research, and associated policies and procedures, in light of developing national and international expectations;
- (c) oversee the provision of research degrees, in accordance with the Academic Regulations, and monitor the overall recruitment, admission, progress, and completion of research students;
- (d) maintain oversight of the School Academic Committees in relation to: the implementation of the sections of the University's Academic Regulations related to research and associated policies and procedures;
- (e) promulgate good practice, innovation, and ethical conduct in research and enterprise and other scholarly activity.

## Delegated Authority

The Research & Enterprise Committee has authority from the Academic Board to:

- (a) oversee preparations for, and responses to, all external assessments of research or enterprise and monitor the implementation of any recommendations arising from them;
- (b) approve an annual report to the Academic Board on the management of research & enterprise, identifying any institutional matters for consideration and resolution;
- (c) approve examination arrangements for research degrees on the recommendation of the relevant School and ensure that they conducted, and awards recommended, in accordance with the regulations;
- (d) agree the scope of internal quality audits and to appoint members of internal quality audit teams.

## **Delegation**

The Research and Enterprise Committee has established, with the approval of the Academic Board, a Research Ethics Sub-Committee which is responsible for overseeing the development and implementation of the University's Policy & Procedures relating to research ethics.

The Research and Enterprise Committee has established with the approval of the Academic Board, a research degrees sub-committee, which is responsible for the monitoring of adherence to, and application of, the sections of the University Academic Regulations related to research, the Quality Manual for Research Degree Programmes, and the Code of Practice for research students.

In accordance with the Standing Orders, the Committee may establish short life working groups to perform specific tasks and in so doing must determine their terms of reference, membership (including the Chair who must be a member of this Committee), and lifespan.

## **Membership Profile**

Members [17]

Quorum [8]

- Deputy Vice Chancellor (Chair) [1] – Ex-officio
- Director of Research & Enterprise [1] – Ex-officio
- Directors of Research [11] – Ex-officio
- The Chair of the Research Ethics Sub-Committee [1] – Ex-officio
- The Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee [1] – Ex-officio
- One member of the Libraries and Learning Innovation staff [1] – Nominated
- Research Student [1] - Elected

In attendance

- Head of Research & Enterprise
- Head of Graduate School
- Senior Management Account (Research)

For non-ex-officio members, terms of office should normally be three years. Students' terms of office should normally be one year.

The Constitution of the Committee is made by resolution of the Academic Board on 06 July 2016.

## **Research & Enterprise Committee - 2017-2018**

**Membership [17]**

**Quorum [8]**

<b><u>Position</u></b>	<b><u>Members</u></b>	<b><u>Start of term of office</u></b>	<b><u>Expiry of term of office</u></b>	<b><u>Elected / nominated / ex-</u></b>
<u>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Chair) [1]</u>	Professor Andrew Slade	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
<u>Director of Research &amp; Enterprise [1]</u>	Professor Cathy Barnes	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
<u>Directors of Research [11]</u>				
1 UoA 3 Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	Professor Gary Jones	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
2 UoA 4 Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	Professor Brendan Gough	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
3 UoA 11 Computer Science and Informatics	Professor Dorothy Monekosso	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
4 UoA 16 Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	Professor Ian Strange	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
5 UoA 19 Business and Management Studies	Professor Ralph Tench	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
6 UoA 22 Social Work and Social Policy	Vacancy	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
7 UoA 25 Education	Professor John Sharp	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
8 UoA 26 Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism	Professor Sue Backhouse	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
9 UoA 29 English Language and Literature/30 History/36 Communication, Culture and Media Studies, Library and Information Management	Professor Ruth Robbins*	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
10 UoA 34 Art and Design (History and Practice)	Professor Simon Morris	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
11 UoA 35 Music, Drama, Dance, and Performing Arts	Professor Robert Shail	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
<u>The Chair of the Research Ethics Sub-Committee [1]</u>	Professor Karl Spracklen	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
<u>The Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee [1]</u>	Professor Ruth Robbins*	n/a	n/a	Ex-officio
<u>One member of Library and Learning Innovation staff [1]</u>	Wendy Luker	01/09/2017	31/08/2020	Nominated
<u>One research student [1]</u>	Alex Christensen	19/10/2017	31/08/2018	Elected

*\*Professor Robbins occupies two positions on the Committee*

*(UoA = Unit of Assessment)*

## Matters Arising

---

### **Report**

This report summarises the matters arising from the last meeting of the Research & Enterprise Committee on 19 October 2017 that are not covered elsewhere in the papers.

### **Action Requested**

The report is **for information**. The Committee is invited to note the matters arising from its last meeting on 19 October 2017.

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1: CROS & PIRLS 2017 Leeds Beckett University response.

Appendix 2: Revised terms of reference for the Research & Enterprise Forum

### **Author**

*Name:* Stuart Morris

*Job title:* Senior Governance Co-ordinator

*Date:* 09 January 2018

## Matters Arising

---

This report summarises the matters arising from the last meeting of the Research & Enterprise Committee on 19 October 2017 that are not covered elsewhere in the papers:

- (a) *Arising from minute 004(b).2017.RES:* The analysis of responses to the Principal Investigators and Research Leaders Survey (PIRLS) and the Careers in Research Online Survey (CROS) had now been carried out and is set out in Appendix 1 of this report.
- (b) *Arising from minute 004(e).128.2017.RES:* The Research Ethics Sub-Committee would now be considering the revised Research Ethics procedures at its meeting on 07 March 2018 following completion of the testing of the revised online system and the re-writing of the procedures. The Research & Enterprise Committee would then receive the new procedures for consideration at its 22 March 2018.
- (c) *Arising from minute 009.2017.RES:* It was confirmed that the amendments to its terms of reference of the Research & Enterprise Forum to clarify where recommendations that had resource implications should be considered had been made. The revised terms of reference are set out in Appendix 2.
- (d) *Arising from minute 011.2017.RES:* The Deans of School had been asked to ensure that the appropriate monitoring mechanisms had been put in place concerning research ethics activity in their Schools.
- (e) *Arising from minute 015.2017.RES:* The Research Ethics Sub-Committee would, at its 07 March 2018 meeting, be considering any evidence on whether there were any research ethics implications for staff conducting research as part of their apportioned scholarly activity. The Sub-Committee was also currently investigating whether the nil returns that kept being recorded for staff research under the PREVENT questions in the research ethics approval process were accurate and would again report back to the 07 March 2018 meeting.
- (f) *Arising from minute 031.2017.RES:* An update would be provided at the meeting on how the Research Student representative could engage more in the Committee discussions.

## CROS & PIRLS 2017 Leeds Beckett University response

### Introduction

The University participated in the Careers in Research Online Survey (CROS) and the Principal Investigators and Research Leaders Survey (PIRLS). These surveys run biennially with a purpose of collecting anonymous data about the working conditions, career aspirations and career development opportunities for research staff and research leaders in higher education institutions.

The surveys provide data to enable the University to measure its progress in the implementation of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers, maintaining the HR Excellence in Research Award, Athena Swan and enhance the Research Excellence Framework (REF) submission.

### Surveys 2017

The survey period was between 1 February 2017 and 19 May 2017. The details together with the access link were circulated to the Research Staff and Early Career Network email groups (membership 759 colleagues).

In addition, to promote the surveys to a wider audience the details were circulated via a newsletter inviting responses and further regular reminders were sent increasing in frequency until the closing date. Despite the widespread advertising and reminders, we only received a total of 56 responses across both surveys, 34 CROS and 22 PIRLS which equates to a response rate of 0.074%.

The surveys are not classed as a census and there was no compulsion to respond. Therefore, the following results are unlikely to be representative of the total population and could be indicative of those who have either very positive or negative comments.

Headline analysis:

### Careers in Research Online Survey CROS

The survey was separated into six sections and asked a total of 48 questions regarding their research careers, recognition and value, support and career development, recruitment and selection, equality and diversity and a final section 'about you'. There were 34 responses (22% response rate) but not all answered all questions.

#### Section 1: Research careers

The profile of those responding indicated that 49% had been a researcher for less than 10 years and 50% of respondents a researcher for more than 10 years. From these figures 32.4% had been a researcher at Leeds Beckett University for more than 10 years with the second highest figure noted as between 2 years (17.6%) and 3 years (20.6%). These figures suggest that the majority of those who responded had been staff members at the University for over 10 years.

When asked about working patterns, 93.9% of respondents indicated that they were full time and 6.1% part time. From these figures 82.4% held a permanent contract. Respondents indicated that 14.7% held a fixed term contract of 25-36 months duration which was noted to be the most popular (60%). Whilst 40% of those respondents held a fixed term contract for 49-60 months or more than 5 years. The amount of contracted time allocated to research was split equally as 0-20% (40%) and 81-100% (40%) with 20% indicating an allocation time of 21-40%.

From the original REF 2014 units it was noted that there was an equal split of respondents from units 2: Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care (18.2%), 19: Business and Management

## APPENDIX 1

Studies (18.2%), and 26: Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism (18.2%). The remaining responses were spread across other REF Units with the exception of units 22: Social Work and Social where there were no respondents. Some identified units which were not submitted to REF2014, units 3: Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy (6.1%), 21: Politics and International Studies (3%), 23: Sociology (3%),

When asked about the main sources of funding for their research activity, Institutional funding (32%) was by far the most popular. The second highest figure was self-funded (17.6%) and other (14.7%). The AHRC was noted as the research council main source of funding.

### Section 2: Recognition and Value

When asked to what extent do you agree that your institution both recognises and values the contributions that you make as a researcher to Grant/funding applications, responses were mainly agreed / agreed strongly.

Similar responses were received for how our institution values contribution to:

- Knowledge transfer and commercialisation activities?
- Managing budgets/resources?
- Publications
- Public engagement with research?
- Supervising/managing staff?
- Supervising research students?
- Teaching and lecturing?

Interestingly the main responses to peer reviewing using the above criteria were almost equally split between agree /agree strongly and disagree/disagree strongly.

The extent to which our institution treats respondents fairly as a researcher in comparison with other types of staff received a positive response for:

- Access to training and development activities
- Opportunities to attend conferences and external meetings
- Requests for flexible working
- Terms and conditions of employment
- Visibility on website and staff directories

However mainly negative responses were received for:

- Opportunities to participate in decision-making processes
- Opportunities for promotion and progression

Respondents mainly agreed/agreed strongly that they were:

- Integrated into your department's research community
- Integrated into your departmental community more generally
- Integrated into your institution's research community
- Integrated into your wider disciplinary community

The question concerning staff appraisal highlighted that 85.3% of respondents have mostly participated in staff appraisal with 14.7% not having participated in appraisal. Of those 14.7% who have not participated 80% responded that they had not been invited to do so. They were asked to

## APPENDIX 1

rate the usefulness of our institution's staff review/appraisal scheme. Around a third replied that it was not very useful overall but when broken down into the component parts below replied differently:

- To highlight issues over 70% found it useful / very useful
- In helping you focus on your career aspirations and how these are met by your current role, 57% found it found it useful / very useful
- In identifying your strengths and achievements, 76% found it useful / very useful
- In leading to training or other continuing professional development opportunities, 69% found it useful / very useful
- In leading to changes in work practices 49% found it not very useful / not at all useful
- In reviewing your personal progress, 88% found it useful / very useful

When asked to rate knowledge and understanding of the following UK initiatives relevant to staff engaged in research, respondents mainly replied that they had not heard of the following:

- Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research
- Concordat on Open Research Data
- Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
- Concordat to Support Research Integrity
- European 'HR Excellence in Research' Award recognition
- National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE)
- ECU Race Equality Charter

For the following respondents mainly replied that they had some knowledge of/ know it exists but don't know the detail:

- Athena Swan Gender Equality Charter Mark
- RCUK 'Pathways to Impact'
- Research Excellence Framework (REF)
- Vitae Researcher Development Framework (RDF)
- UK Professional Standard Framework for teaching and supporting learning

The following qualitative data is in response to the questions asking respondents to provide additional comments on how they are recognised and valued by the institution as a researcher, what more it could do to recognise and value their contributions, and their knowledge about research initiatives:

- I am recognised and valued as a teacher first, then a researcher. Changing our deployment model to reduce my teaching commitments and having more autonomy over research budgets would have the greatest impact on this.
- Recognise early career researchers with dignity, value and respect.
- As a part-time researcher I feel less engaged and less knowledgeable about some of the initiatives mentioned.
- There is no career or succession planning whatsoever. And the goal posts change regularly. Little help and guidance only "do REF articles"
- My institution always responds positively and promptly when I put in requests to go to conferences, host conferences. Alongside this is a gentle pressure to publish in quality journals which I welcome. Colleagues support by swapping classes and are very accommodating.

## APPENDIX 1

- Practitioners should not be allowed to say that teaching brings money and research does not, because that is not true. If we increase our research rating we will get more students and hence more money. Also, research is not just about money but also about creating knowledge. The University does not share this view and is trying to promote different understanding, but because it is such a mindful and caring employer it does not know how to deal with aggressive behaviour and ignorance.
- Be open to create pathways for researchers and provide opportunities for promotion
- I feel valued by immediate colleagues but not by the University as a whole. Financial pressures and staff cuts means I am expected to manage an impossible workload - multiple research projects with no time to write and develop my publications. The University needs to devote more money to staffing so the workload can be spread and staff can have some time to develop publications and improve their career opportunities. The University does not utilise our skills effectively. I am an expert in a particular area of research and have regularly offered to transfer my knowledge to other staff through our staff development programme but there's no interest for this. I am working well above my role time and time again due to staff pressures but this is only recognised by my immediate line manager. Where research staff are expected to teach then the salary grades should be the same as teaching staff.
- The institution should recognise that research is a time consuming activity and cannot be sustained as a bolt on to a full management role as well. An allocation of 300 hours per year is insufficient to sustain research activity & output thus rendering promotion to reader or professor unattainable.
- The appraisal scheme is useful, ONLY if the appraiser carries out the appraisal with purpose. It really does depend upon who does it as to the quality of the experience.
- I have been supported in my current institution (a sabbatical and some funding for research) unlike my previous one but I do not feel that research is understood by management. Teaching is valued above research perhaps due to being a post 92 institution.
- My abilities and work are recognised by my line managers, who are very supportive, but I feel research is still viewed as secondary to teaching and less important within the wider institution as a whole. This applies to researchers themselves. I am extremely fortunate to have a permanent contract, which is entirely due to supportive managers who see the value of researchers and research as a career. Elsewhere in the institution there are others who still see researchers as disposable and only worthy of short term/temporary contracts. Career progression for research staff is extremely limited. Without applying for new jobs, the only way to progress is to go through the regrading process which is designed for lecturers & ill-suited to research staff

### Section 3: Recruitment and selection

Around a third of respondents had been recruited into their current post in the last two years and replied mainly positively to questions around the application process and what they were provided with:

- A written description summary of what the job entailed (job description)
- Details of the qualifications required of the post-holder
- Details of the specialist research skills required of the post-holder
- Details of the transferable/personal/management skills required of the post-holder

Institutional-wide and departmental induction programmes were felt to be not very useful/not useful at all/not offered whilst the local induction to current roles came out very positively.

### Section 4: Support and career development

Responses were mainly positive to:

- You are encouraged to engage in personal and career development?
- You take ownership of your career development?
- You have a clear career development plan?
- You maintain a formal record of your continuing professional development activities?

63.7% replied disagree/disagree strongly when asked if they use the Vitae Researcher Development Framework to support your continuing professional development activity.

When asked about the areas undertaken, or would like to undertake in terms of training and other continuing professional development activities, responses were mainly undertaken/not undertaken but would like to for these areas:

- Career management
- Collaboration and teamworking
- Communication and dissemination
- Equality and diversity
- Ethical research conduct
- Interdisciplinary research
- Knowledge exchange
- Leadership and management
- Public engagement
- Research impact
- Research skills and techniques
- Supervision of doctoral/masters students
- Teaching or lecturing
- Being mentored

However, 29.4% replied that personal effectiveness was of no interest.

In the long term colleagues aspired to a career in higher education, primarily research and teaching (33.3%) and a career in higher education, primarily research, (54.5%).

However colleagues expected to work in:

- Career in higher education, primarily research and teaching 48.5%
- Career in higher education, primarily research 24.2%

#### *Working with others*

Majority of respondents would like to:

- Collaborate with colleagues outside the UK
- Collaborate in research with businesses or other non-academic research users
- Interdisciplinary research projects
- Mentor and support other researchers
- Supervise undergraduate or postgraduate research projects

- Work as part of a cross-disciplinary team
- Research and financial management

However, 47.1% replied that they currently had no interest in undertaking an internship/placement outside higher education research.

### *Research and financial management*

Respondents indicated mainly that they either have done or would like to:

- Manage a budget
- Plan and manage a project
- Write a grant/funding proposal
- Engagement and impact
- Engage with policymakers and end users
- Knowledge exchange
- Participate in public engagement activities
- Teach or lecture
- Communication and dissemination
- Present work at a conference orally
- Write up research for publication as first author

When asked to provide comments about the training and career development undertaken as a researcher the following responses were received:

- Studying for a PhD so there is training associated with this,
- I was trained to supervise PhD students (but thereafter told that my grade did not allow for this). I have completed grant writing training through an external company which was excellent and I would like to use these skills in the future. I completed basic training in survey software and have now developed this skill myself to an expert level where I am considered the most knowledgeable person in the University.
- I have undertaken a lot of training but value continuing professional development opportunities to keep up with current developments. As I have a clear idea of what I want to research I value time to do it over training so a reduced teaching/admin workload is the most effective way to develop my career in the long term.
- A lot of the training/career development I have undertaken has been self-directed and in my own time

When asked about training and career development opportunities which they would like to undertake and any barriers to your participation the following responses were received.

- Like more information about publishing / impact etc. for REF. Is available but, as a part-time worker, it is hard to get on top of both this and work.
- Barriers is time... too many duties
- Training opportunities are usually supported but the difficulties I face is finding time to write. I am working on several external projects, often managing them despite not being the PI and the day to day running of these, data analysis and report writing is prioritised over writing papers. I have highlighted this issue many times and my line managers are aware of this and are keen for me to write but tell me that I have to prioritise project work then I can write papers. The issue we have is that my line managers keep taking on new projects so

## APPENDIX 1

there is never the gap to write up previous work into a paper. I am also very overworked so find it hard to focus on those tasks when mentally drained.

- I would like to be mentored by an experience research colleague within my area of interest.
- Barriers are usually related to time - time to research being valued would help (my last institution workload was so high I was unable to do research). the workload in my current institution is manageable but still not ideal in terms of fitting in research time.

### Section 5: Equality and diversity

Respondents mainly agreed that:

- I believe my institution is committed to equality and diversity –
- I am satisfied with my work-life balance
- My institution promotes better mental health and well-being at work
- I think that staff at my institution are treated fairly, regardless of personal characteristics such as age, ethnicity, disability, gender or gender identify, in relation to:
  - Access to training and development
  - Career progression / promotion
  - Day to day treatment at work
  - Participation in decision making

When asked about equality in Recruitment and Selection and Reward, responses were evenly balance between agree/disagree.

Respondents mainly agreed that overall staff at the institution are treated fairly irrespective of their:

- Adoption and parental leave
- Age
- Caring responsibilities
- Disability
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Gender identity
- Nationality
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Religion/belief
- Sexual orientation

78.8% did not feel that they had been discriminated against in their post.

### Section 6: About you

Whilst the questions included sexual orientation, disability and religion, for the purpose of this report we have limited it to age group, gender and nationality. The highest ages groups for responses were between 36-40 and 51-55. 61.4% of responses indicated that they were from females. 82.4% identified as UK/British national.

## Principal Investigators and Research Leaders Survey PIRLS

The survey was separated into six sections and asked a total of 33 questions regarding experiences as a research investigator/research leader, recognition and value, what makes a good research leader, support, equality and diversity and a final section 'about you'. There were 22 responses (14% response rate) but not all answered all questions.

### Section A: Your experiences as a principal investigator/research leader

When asked how long have they had been research investigator/research leader, the highest response group was those with more than 10 years (31.8%) with 22.7% having been a research investigator/research leader at Leeds Beckett University. From the original REF 2014 units the highest number of respondents indicated that their main subject specialism was from Unit 4: Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience (18.2%), followed by units 26: Sport and Exercise Science, Leisure and Tourism (13.6%), 2: Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care (13.6%) and 3: Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy (13.6%). The remaining responses were spread across other REF Units with the exception of units 22: Social Work and Social Policy, 25: Education, 34: Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory, and 36: Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management. Some identified units which were not submitted to REF2014, units 3: Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy (13.6%), 21: Politics and International Studies (9.1%), 29: English Language and Literature (4.5%), 30: History (4.5%),

#### *Line management responsibility*

The question relating to the responsibility for line management of academic staff saw the majority 64.7% indicating that they had none. There was an equal split between the respondents who line managed between 4-6 members of staff (11.8%) and those who line managed >20 (11.8%). 5.9% stated they were responsible for 1 member of staff and the same percentage (5.9%) had responsibility for between 11-20 members of staff.

In terms of the line management of research staff, 35.3% indicated that they had none. The second highest figure was 29.4% who indicated that they had responsibility for between 2-3 research staff. It was also indicated that 17.6% had responsibility for only 1 research staff, 11.8% were responsible for between 4-6 research staff and 5.9% between 7-10 research staff.

The same question was asked in relation to having responsibility for postgraduate research students which saw out of the 20 responses the highest number was between 7-10 students (30%), with an equal split between 2-3 and 4-6 students (20%). 15% had responsibility for one student and one respondent indicated that they were responsible for >20. Two respondents (10%) indicated that they had no responsibility for postgraduate students.

In relation to having responsibility for administrative and technical staff, the majority of respondents indicated that they had none 85.7% and 92.3% respectively.

### Section B: Recognition and Value

#### *Research Activity*

Respondents mainly agreed strongly / agreed that our university recognises and values the contribution they make to Academic collaborations (including interdisciplinary and international) and they agreed that this activity is very important in being a successful PI/research leader. Similar responses were given for the following:

## APPENDIX 1

- Collaborations outside HE (with other sectors, research users)
- Good research conduct (ethics, intellectual property, etc.)
- Research outputs, including publications
- Securing research funding

### *Inspiring/leading other researchers*

Only 54.5% of respondents agreed that our university recognises and values the contribution they make to building a research group but 95.4% thought that this activity is very important in being a successful PI/research leader.

Similar responses were received for the following statements:

- Leading a research group
- Providing career development advice to others on careers inside higher education
- Providing career development advice to others on careers outside higher education

### *Management activity*

When asked for comments on our university's recognition and value of the contributions respondents make **against** how important the activity is in being a research leader, the agree response were approximately 20% higher for the second statement for the following activities:

- Appraisal/review of staff
- Budget/finance management
- Developing research staff
- Managing research staff performance
- Managing/supervising other staff

Responses for supervising research students were evenly balanced between our university's recognition and the respondent's perception of the importance of the activity in being a research leader.

### *Engagement and Impact*

When asked for comments on our university's recognition and value of the contributions respondents make **against** how important the activity is in being a research leader, the agree responses were around 20% higher for the second statement for the following activities:

- Demonstrating the impact of research
- Knowledge exchange (through collaborative training, people exchange, commercialisation and development)
- Management and administration within the institution
- Public engagement and outreach activities

### *Teaching and lecturing*

When asked for comments on our university's recognition and value of the contributions respondents make to teaching and lecturing **against** how important the activity is in being a research leader, replies were roughly equal at around 80 % agree/agree strongly.

## APPENDIX 1

The following qualitative section asked for any comments about the importance of research-related activities and how their contributions are recognised and valued by your institution.

- I yet to see a promotion for myself even after contributing to REFs and international recognition for research out produced in my current job unfortunately. Not all levels in the management ladder understands, recognise, and rewards.
- I feel that quality should be prioritised over quantity. The REF exercise is diluting the strength of good research as people are not given enough time to properly conduct their projects over a suitable time period. The idea that people need to get so many outputs produces a backlog in the publishing industry - journals specifically- that makes it next to impossible to get published anyway, so people need to write lots of pieces that lack rigour and reflection. It is a shame. John Rawls took 40 years to write a Theory of Justice and look how much of an impact that has on the field of political theory. The University was about to write him off and he came out with a transformative way of looking at rights, ethics and justice. The pressure to churn out research can be overwhelming and actually stop good researchers from reaching their potential. We are thinkers, and we need time to think, as well as write.
- My institution is only interested in the money that I can potentially make for them
- My contributions are not recognised or valued
- The institution does provide some support in the form of small amounts of cash and access to PhD funding, all of which are great. However, there is little being done to create the necessary infrastructure to support truly world class research; for instance, our lab spaces are wildly insufficient, there is no management level strategic plan for getting more, and no one knows what anyone in the group needs in terms of space except in the broadest least useful terms. What success I've had as a researcher here has come from me having to sweat every single small detail, rather than being able to rest on a stable research support infrastructure.
- Lack of support a major hindrance

### Section C: What makes a good research leader?

Respondents indicated that the statements listed below were very important in reply to 'How important do you consider the following statements to be in the behaviours of an excellent research leader?'

- Advances significantly the discipline/research area
- Appreciates and demonstrates the impact of research
- Creates opportunities and nurtures researchers' careers
- Engages in income generation and advises and supports applications led by others
- Exemplifies the highest standards of research integrity and conduct
- Influences, leads and manages researchers and groups using a range of leadership styles effectively
- Models exemplary continuing professional development behaviour to inspire others

When asked to indicate levels of confidence in relation to the following aspects of leading researchers, respondents were mainly confident but over half felt that they would benefit from more support/training/development in:

- Conducting appraisals
- Leading your people/group

## APPENDIX 1

- Managing group/project finances
- Managing staff performance
- Motivating individuals
- Personal effectiveness (time management, etc.)
- Providing research staff with advice on the range of career opportunities
- Recruiting and selecting group members
- Supervising research students

Further comments were asked for about good research leadership or any aspect of training, support or other development activities.

- There is never any aspect of what we do as a PI that would not benefit from further development
- While funding research is important, I have marked 'the endless hunt for grant income' as not very important because these days it amounts to 'spending all your time trying to win the lottery every couple of years' and that isn't good time management. Also "Engages in income generation and advises and supports applications led by others" is a poor question; these two components are quite independent.

### **Section D: How your institution supports you as a principal investigator/research leader**

90.0% of respondents had been appraised/reviewed in the past two years:

- overall 55% found it not very useful/not at all useful
- for highlighting issues 70% found it useful/very useful
- in identifying your strengths and achievements, replies were split 50/50 between useful/not useful
- in leading to training or other continuing professional development opportunities 60% found it useful/very useful
- in leading to changes in work practices 89% found it not very useful/not at all useful
- in helping you focus on your career aspirations and how these are met by your current role 57.9% found it not very useful/not at all useful
- in reviewing your personal progress 60% % found it useful/very useful

When asked during the past 12 months (or since taking up your current position if that was more recent) approximately how many days have you spent on training and other continuing professional development activities, the optimum replies were 1-3 days.

- I am appropriately rewarded for my contributions to the institution, approx. 50/50 split between agree/disagree
- I am satisfied with my work-life balance 63.6% disagree/disagree strongly
- I believe I am well led by institutional senior management, approx. 50/50 split between agree/disagree
- I feel integrated within the institution 54.6% agree/agree strongly
- I have a good level of job satisfaction, 68.2% agree/agree strongly
- I understand how my research activities are aligned with my institution's strategic priorities, 68.2% agree/agree strongly

Further comments were requested on any comments about review, appraisal and engagement

## APPENDIX 1

- Rewarding research is the one of the major weakness in most of the post 92 institutions especially people from ethnic minorities in the UK HEI.
- The institution is in the middle of a "restrucuture" of academic support, which is negatively affecting my feelings about working here
- Our staff review process is a joke, a mere box ticking exercise in which I am offered nothing useful in the form of advice or wisdom. This institution is very lacking in any form of institutional wisdom, although there are many generous individuals who have helped me out, which has been great.
- Management remote, uncommunicative, mostly people with little research background, managerial, interested in their own short term goals and KPIs

### Section E: Equality and diversity

81.8% believe our institution is committed to equality and diversity

54.6% feel that our institution promotes better mental health and well-being at work

Overall the respondents felt that staff at my institution are treated fairly, regardless of ethnic background, gender, gender identity, religion or belief, sexual orientation, disability or age with regard to:

- Recruitment and selection, 63.7% agree/agree strongly
- Career progression / promotion, 50/50 split between agree/disagree
- Reward, 50/50 split between agree/disagree
- Day to day treatment at work, 68.2% agree/agree strongly
- Access to training and development, 72.8% agree/agree strongly
- Participation in decision making, 50/50 split between agree/disagree
- Overall, I think that staff at my institution are treated fairly irrespective of:
- Adoption and parental leave, 59.4% agree/agree strongly
- Age, 7.3% agree/agree strongly
- Caring responsibilities, 54.6% agree/agree strongly
- Ethnicity, 72.7% agree/agree strongly
- Disability, 54.6% agree/agree strongly
- Gender, 50/40 split between agree/disagree
- Gender identity, 59.1% agree/agree strongly
- Nationality, 68.2% agree/agree strongly
- Pregnancy and maternity, 63.7% agree/agree strongly
- Religion/belief, 68.2% agree/agree strongly
- Sexual orientation, 72.7% agree/agree strongly

When asked if they had felt unfairly discriminated against in their current post, 27.3% said that they had. The following information provides an explanation from some respondents on why they felt discriminated against:

- One of the highest output in research and still they declined my promotion for the past 15 years since started as a PL in my current joined in 2002. They don't offer management role to ethnic minority like me even how hard I work. I am one of the lead research in my subject area of specialisation. I have as a keynote speaker for all international conferences, etc.
- But I have witnessed with others
- other people on my grade do less work and receive more rewards

## APPENDIX 1

- I feel that I have been discriminated against in terms of both gender and pregnancy and maternity. I feel that having taken maternity leave with my two children has severely hampered my chances of promotion.
- different staff seem to be favourites or have privileges relative to others

Additional comments provided on aspects of diversity and equality.

- I believe there is always commitment policy to diversity and equality. However, it wasn't applied in my case even though our HR was sitting in the interview panel. Not strictly applying governance procedures.
- This university talks a good talk but doesn't really walk it; women are still woefully underrepresented at senior levels, for example
- The University does seem to be making some progress on equality and diversity issues, but I would like to see a stronger commitment to tackling sexual harassment and to develop a clear policy to support transgender staff and students.

### Section F: About you

Whilst the questions included sexual orientation and religion, for the purpose of this report we have limited it to age group, gender, disability and nationality. The highest age group of respondents was between 51-55, 31.8% and 50% were female. 4.5% considered themselves disabled. 77.3 % were UK/British national and 64.7% were classified as white.

The survey requested respondents to all any final, additional comments.

- The URO provides excellent support to PIs. Lucy Scott and Ojinika Emenike should be commended for the outstanding support they provide to PIs.
- There really have been a large number of useful opportunities that have come up since i started here; funding for PhD students and research equipment as well as conferences etc. But all of it is very ad hoc and fragmented; none of it reflects any coherent strategy or institutional culture around research. This means I am always fighting some ridiculous battle over something, and that is time away from doing my real job. In addition, while I do get support when I ask, no one has ever really asked me what I do; no one in the senior levels of my school could even vaguely summarise the details of my research. I find this odd, and it does not make me feel like a part of a group.

### Conclusion

Whilst the level of respondents for both surveys was disappointing (56 in total) it has provided some insight of how some perceive the University in terms of career development and support available and required. In terms of career development, it appears that their aspirational views about teaching and research careers did not match to what appears to be the reality. Importantly, the survey raised the issue that staff do not necessarily have knowledge or engagement with national policies such as the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers or ECU Race Equality Charter and this is something which will need to be addressed as we continue to enhance our current provision.

### Recommendations

- A better explanation of the importance of such surveys and how the outcomes will be used.
- A more target approach to encourage staff to participate (not only via the staff bulletin but also through a marketing campaign) so that the data can be more reliable.

## **APPENDIX 1**

- Explore the possibility of following up negative replies if colleagues agree to be contacted, so that if there really is poor behaviour it can be tackled.
- Explore the possibility of redesigning the PDR process for academic staff to focus more attention on research and that an appropriate research active member of staff will always be the reviewer.
- Establish a greater understanding through the website of why national policies are important and how they influence what we do.
- For the Working Group to take on board the comments re: staff development

Authors of the report: Susan Simpson, Research and Impact Officer, Kathryn Brown, Head of the Graduate School

November 2017

## **University Research and Enterprise Forum**

(Formerly directors of research monthly meeting)

### **Terms of Reference**

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of the forum is to provide an opportunity for those leading research in schools and central services to share best practice and to work together on university wide initiatives.

#### **Scope**

The forum is to specifically to discuss initiatives related to research and enterprise

#### **Authority**

The forum has no formal decision making powers but exists to discuss ideas and recommend solutions. All recommendations will be passed to the Research and Enterprise Committee. Strategic resource request may be sent to UET and any individual school level recommendations must be referred to the relevant school leadership team.

#### **Membership**

Membership should be representative of all schools and units of assessment. All Directors of Research and the Director of Research and Enterprise (Chair) are permanent members. Other people can be co-opted onto the forum where appropriate but in particular to ensure representation from all academic areas of the University.

#### **Meeting arrangements**

The forum meets monthly at an appropriate University location with no quorum. Agenda items will be requested one week before and all members are able to raise items. The PA to the Director of Research and Enterprise will take minutes and collate agenda items.

#### **Reporting**

The forum will report activity into the University Research and Enterprise Committee.

#### **Review**

These terms of Reference will be review annually in September.

## Overview of Joint Examiners' report 2016/17

---

### ***Executive Summary***

This report provides an overview of the research degree examinations and their outcomes held during 2016/2017. The Joint Examiners Reports following the viva voce examination have informed the information presented.

### ***Action Requested***

The report is **for discussion**.

### ***Appendices***

Annex 1: Completions 2016/2017

### ***Author***

*Name:* Kathryn Brown  
*Job title:* Head of the Graduate School  
*Date:* 28<sup>th</sup> August 2017

### ***Approval Route***

4<sup>th</sup> September 2017      *Professor Ruth Robbins*

# Overview of Joint Examiners' report 2016/17

## Introduction

- 1 This report provides an overview of the research degree examinations and their outcomes held during 2016/2017. The Joint Examiners Reports following the viva voce examination have informed the information presented.

## Joint Examiners Report

- 2 At the end of each viva voce examination a Joint Examiners Report is completed by the Independent Chair. The report provides the official written account of the examination and includes answers to specific questions, additional comments, outcome and feedback to the student. In addition, the forms provide an indication of the quality of our supervision by providing a useful feedback mechanism within the quality assurance process in line with Academic Regulations 11 Research Awards and the Quality Manual for Research Degree Programmes, 2016. The information provided from these reports has been used in developing this overview. It should be noted that three reports were incomplete in terms of the yes/no/n/a sections 3 (report of the examiners on the oral examination) and 4 (report of the examiners on the thesis and any published work submitted).

## Research Degree Examinations, Current Process

- 2 For the awards of PhD, PhD by Existing Published Work, Professional Doctorates and MPhil the assessment process is based on an appropriate body of work and an oral examination, the viva voce. A qualified examination team is appointed who review the thesis prior to the oral examination and then examine the student at a viva voce. All examination teams are approved by the Research Degree Sub-Committee (RDSC). The assessment of the written thesis and oral defence is based on the assessment criteria for the relevant award. Their conclusions and outcomes are written in the Joint Examiners Report. Currently the Joint Examiners Report is confidential and therefore not available to students. However, on the day of the viva voce the outcome and required amendments are provided to the student by the Independent Chair. This is followed by an official notification from the Graduate School.

A Masters by Research award does not normally require an oral examination and the thesis only is examined by an examination team. The data within this report is representative of the examination outcome rather than the submission date.

- 3 The Graduate School is responsible for the organisation of all aspects of the examination process. The following information provides our University with a profile of examinations and their outcomes. During the academic year 2016/2017 there were 79 research degree examinations which is slightly lower than the previous year (85). The breakdown of the research degree classifications is indicated in table 1.

**Table 1: Total of research degree examinations across the University**

University	PhD	PhDPW	Professional Doctorate (DBA)	Professional Doctorate (EdD)	MPhil	MRes	Total
<b>Total</b>	58	2	11	4	1	3	<b>79</b>

- 4 In comparison with previous two years, whilst the figures have slightly decreased from 2015/2016 they remain higher than in academic year 2014/2015 (Table 2).

**Table 2: Examinations over the three-year period (2014-2017)**

University	PhD	PhDPW	Professional Doctorate (DBA)	Professional Doctorate (EdD)	MPhil	MRes	Total
2016/2017	58	2	11	4	1	3	<b>79</b>
2015/2016	61	4	12	1	3	4	<b>85</b>
2014/2015	55	3	8	1		3	<b>70</b>

- 5 Table 3 provides a breakdown of the type of examinations which have taken place by school. For the second year running Art, Architecture and Design have had no examinations during the date range. Leeds Business School and Carnegie School of Sport continue, as in previous years, to have the highest number of examinations with 26 and 10 respectively.

**Table 3: Number and type of research degree examinations by School**

School	PhD	PhDPW	(DBA)	Professional Doctorate (EdD)	MPhil	MRes	Total
Art, Architecture & Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Built Environment & Engineering	4	1					<b>5</b>
Carnegie Education	1			4			<b>5</b>
Carnegie Sport	8	1				1	<b>10</b>
Clinical & Applied Science	2				1		<b>3</b>
Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering	5						<b>5</b>
Cultural Studies & Humanities	3						<b>3</b>
Events, Tourism, Hospitality & Languages	5						<b>5</b>
Film, Music & Performing Arts	2						<b>2</b>
Health & Community Studies	3*					2	<b>5</b>
Leeds Business School	15		11				<b>26</b>
Leeds Law School	1						<b>1</b>
Social Sciences	9						<b>9</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>79</b>

\*1 PhD student who submitted did not have a first viva and is therefore, not included in these figures

- 6 Table 4 provides the outcomes of the theses submitted for examination. A total of 80 theses were submitted for examination with 76 viva voce examinations held. The 76 viva voce examinations exclude one which was submitted but failed to meet the level required to go forward for an oral examination and the three MRes theses which do not require a viva voce.

Table 4: Viva Voce and MRes Examination (first and second attempt) outcomes by school

School	First Attempt				No viva	Second Attempt		
	Awarded	Minor	Resub/Thesis/oral	Resub/Thesis		Minor	Resub 4 months	
Built Environment & Engineering		1 (PhDPW)		4 (PhD)				
Carnegie Education		1 (PhD) 1 (EdD)	1 (EdD)	2 (EdD)				
Carnegie Sport		5 (PhD) 1 (PhDPW) 1 (MRes)	1 (PhD)	2 (PhD)				
Clinical & Applied Science				1 (PhD) 1 (MPhil)		1 (PhD)		
Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering		3 (PhD)		2 (PhD)				
Cultural Studies & Humanities	1 (PhD)		1 (PhD)	1 (PhD)				
Events, Tourism, Hospitality & Languages		2 (PhD)		3 (PhD)				
Film, Music & Performing Arts		2(PhD)						
Health & Community Studies		2 (MRes)		3 (PhD)	1 (PhD)			
Leeds Business School	2 (PhD)	4 (PhD) 1 (DBA)	2 (PhD) 1 (DBA)	7 (PhD) 8 (DBA)			1 (DBA)	
Leeds Law School				1 (PhD)				
Social Sciences		2 (PhD)		7 (PhD)				
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

- 7 The information in Tables 3 and 4 provides an overview of the outcomes following the viva voce and MRes examinations, by School. Notably we should celebrate the three students from the schools of Cultural Studies and Humanities and Leeds Business School were awarded their PhDs without any amendments. A total of 26 students received minor amendments, 23 of these were at viva voce examination and 3 were at MRes level. A further two students received the minor amendments outcome on their second examination attempt.
- 8 The outcome re-submission of the thesis (only) and re-submission with a further oral presentation equates to (48 out of 76) of the overall viva voce examination profile. The number of students receiving the outcome 're-submission (thesis only)' has increased to 42 (2016/2017) from the 31 in (2015/2016), the 're-submission with a further oral presentation has also increased from 2 (2015/2016) to 6 (2016/2017).
- 9 Regrettably, the examination team for one student in the school of Health and Community Studies felt that the thesis was not at the level required and could not be put forward to oral examination. This decision and the feedback it generated for the student will be

classed as the first examination and received 12 months to re-address the deficiency in the thesis. The information below is taken from the external examiners preliminary reports: ‘There is potential for originality in this project design. However, the thesis presents significant weaknesses. These relate to the handling of theory, method and argument. As these weaknesses are evident in all of the chapters, to varying extent, we recommend that the content and the presentation of the thesis be revised in its entirety and in consultation with the supervisors’.

- 10 There has been an increase in the total number of students receiving the outcome ‘re-submission (thesis only)’ with 42 (2016/2017) from 31 (2015/2016). The total number of examinations has seen a slight decrease, 76 as opposed to 78 in 2015/2016. The rise in the number of students receiving the ‘re-submission (thesis only) outcome is of concern. The Joint Examiners Outcome reports however, indicated that 14 of 42 were thought to be able to make the revisions within a shorter period than the regulatory 12-month period (table 5). The guidance on the Joint Examiner Outcome Report indicates that a student has normally between six to 12 months to re-submit the revised thesis. This presents an option for the examiners to suggest a lesser time period, if they feel it appropriate, without putting the student unnecessarily at risk of failing to meet the shorter deadline.

Table 5: Length of time given for ‘re-submission (thesis only)’ by School

School	Research Degree	Resubmission 3 months	Resubmission 6 months	Resubmission 12 months	Total
Built Environment & Engineering	PhD		2	2	4
Carnegie Education	EdD		1	1	2
Carnegie Sport	PhD	1		1	2
Clinical & Applied Science	PhD MPhil		1	1	2
Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering	PhD		1	1	2
Cultural Studies & Humanities	PhD			1	1
Events, Tourism, Hospitality & Languages	PhD		1	2	3
Health & Community Studies				3	3
Leeds Business School	PhD DBA	1	2	5 7	7 8
Leeds Law School	PhD			1	1
Social Sciences	PhD	1	3	3	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>42</b>

- 11 Apart from the school of Film, Music and Performing Arts, all other schools have received the ‘re-submission (thesis only)’ outcome. Table 6 indicates the number of students receiving this outcome out of the total number of doctoral examinations. The figures below exclude the masters level awards of MRes (3) and MPhil (1) and one thesis which was not put forward for viva.

Table 6: number of re-submission outcome (thesis only) out of total number of doctoral examinations (for schools receiving this outcome)

School	Number receiving ‘re-submission (thesis only)’	Total number of doctoral examinations (for schools receiving this outcome)
Built Environment & Engineering	4	5
Carnegie Education	2	5
Carnegie Sport	2	9
Clinical & Applied Science	1	2

Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering	2	5
Cultural Studies & Humanities	1	3
Events, Tourism, Hospitality & Languages	3	5
Health & Community Studies	3	3
Leeds Business School	15	26
Leeds Law School	1	1
Social Sciences	7	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>73</b>

12 The 12-month timescale given for the outcome 're-submission (thesis only)' is the most common with 28 out of a total of 42. A total of 11 students received a 6 month and 3 received a 3month timescale.

13 Out of the 42 students who received the outcome 're-submission (thesis only), 13 submitted the revisions on time or significantly early and went on to have their award conferred. Whilst students should be encouraged to complete the revisions in a timely manner, it is important that the appropriate time is taken to fulfil the examiners requests. Two students submitted revisions early but did not satisfy the examiners requirements.

Table 7: Actual time taken following the outcome 're-submission (thesis only)'

Number	School	Award	Date of Viva	Outcome period permitted	Date submitted	Actual time taken
1	Built Environment & Engineering	PhD	16/03/17	6 months	13/07/17	4 months
2	Built Environment & Engineering	PhD	31/10/16	6 months	11/04/17	6 months
3	Carnegie Education	EdD	21/02/17	6 months	06/04/17	2 months
4	Carnegie Sport	PhD	12/01/17	3 months	10/2/17	1 month
5	Events, Tourism, Hospitality & Languages	PhD	14/12/16	6 months	03/03/17	3 months
6	Leeds Business School	PhD	07/09/16	6 months	22/02/17	5 months
7		PhD	24/10/16	6 months	29/04/17	6 months
8		PhD	02/12/16	12 months	25/01/17	1 month
9		PhD	17/03/17	12 months	19/05/17	2 months
10		DBA	12/12/16	3 months	23/03/17	3 months
11		DBA	20/01/17	12 months	11/04/17	3 months
12	Social Sciences	PhD	12/10/16	6 months	23/03/17	5 months
13		PhD	19/01/17	3 months	07/03/17	2 months

14 A total of six students received the outcome 're-submission with oral'. Out of the six, two are classified as international students, one on a dependant's visa and the other studying offshore. The examination team for one student (School of Cultural Studies and Humanities) has left the option open to re-examine if they feel it necessary once they have seen the revised thesis.

15 In all cases the examiners required that the theses be heavily redrafted in order to address deficiency in issues of language, grammar, presentation and referencing as well as other major faults identified. Whilst the number of students receiving this outcome had seen a fall since 2013-2014 (7); 2014-2015 (3) to 2015-2016 (2) this academic year has seen an increase to six.

- 16 The Joint Examiner Forms highlighted similar major issues related to:
- A lack of adequate synthesis and evaluation of the context of the thesis
  - Methodological rigor and overall approach
  - Justification of the choice of statistical methods
  - Justification of the choice of study
  - Ambiguities in the use of in-text referencing
  - Fittingness and trustworthiness of data
  - The role of a specified theory
  - A review of the relevant literature to the study
  - A lack of focus
  - A lack of ethical considerations

The Joint Examiner Reports provide intensive feedback for the students. It may be worth using these cases as discussion points future development training for supervisors.

- 17 From the 79 masters and doctoral level examinations which took place during academic year 2016/2017, 37 doctoral level awards have been conferred. No masters level awards were conferred. Table 8 indicates the school and total number of doctoral awards examined and those of which have been conferred.

Table 8: Number of conferment of award against the number examined

School	PhD	Number examined	Number Conferred
Art, Architecture & Design	0	0	
Built Environment & Engineering	PhD	4	2
	PhDPW	1	1
Carnegie Education	PhD	1	1
	EdD	4	2
Carnegie Sport	PhD	8	5
	PhDPW	1	1
Clinical & Applied Science	PhD	3	1
Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering	PhD	5	2
Cultural Studies & Humanities	PhD	3	1
Events, Tourism, Hospitality & Languages	PhD	5	3
Film, Music & Performing Arts	PhD	2	2
Health & Community Studies	PhD	3	0
Leeds Business School	PhD	15	9
	DBA	11	3
Social Sciences	PhD	9	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>75</b>	<b>37</b>

### Research Award Examination Teams

- 18 The RDSC consider and approve the examination arrangements for all research degrees, including the appointment of external examiners and independent chairs, and ensuring that examinations are

conducted, and awards recommended, in accordance with the regulations. To safeguard the integrity of the examination process and to share good practice, it is necessary that the RDSC has oversight of the frequency academic colleagues are asked to act as independent chairs and the use of external examiners to ensure independence from the University. Table 9 provides the number of times academic colleagues have acted as independent chairs for the viva voce examinations during 2016/17.

Table 9: Number of times staff have acted as Independent Chairs

Academic colleague	Number of times acted as independent chair
Ah-Lian Kor	3
Alan Simson	4
Alan White	1
Alex Kenyon	2
Anthony Bryant	3
Ash Ahmed	1
Athanassios Bissas	1
Brendan Gough	1
Claire Surr	1
Dot Moss	1
Edward Halpin	3
Emma Wood	1
Fraser Brown	1
George Lodorfos	3
Ian Strange	2
James Woodall	1
John Sharp	2
Jon Tan	1
Junjie Wu	1
Justine Simpson	1
Karl Spracklen	2
Mark Johnson	3
Muhammad-Ali Nasir	1
Nick Frost	6
Nick Sutcliffe	1
Niki Kyriakidou	1
Paul Turner	1
Pip Trevorrow	2
Rebecca Watson	1
Reinhold Behringer	1
Rhodri Thomas	1
Robert Shail	2
Roberta Bampton	1
Ruth Robbins	2
Simon Gardiner	2
Simon Morris	1
Simon Robinson	2
Stephen Newman	4
Steven Robertson	1
Sue Backhouse	1
Susan Watkins	1
Viv Caruana	4
William Sun	1

- 19 Table 10 provides the name and university of two external examiners who have examined for the Leeds Business School twice in academic year 2016/17. For each of the examinations the supervisory teams were different.

Table 10: Use of external examiners more than once in an academic year

School	Award examined	External Examiner
Leeds Business School	PhD	Hassan Yazdifar Salford University

	DBA	Tony Wall University of Chester
--	-----	------------------------------------

## Conferment of Award

- 19 For academic year 2016/17 the University conferred 66 research degree awards in total. Table 11 highlight the number of conferment of awards by type and by school. A full list of students and thesis titles can be found in annex 1.

School	PhD	EdD	DBA	PhD PW	MPhil	MRes	Total
Built Environment & Engineering	3			1			4
Carnegie School of Education	1	3					4
Carnegie School of Sport	10			1			11
Clinical & Applied Sciences	1					1	2
Computing Creative Tech & Eng	4						4
Cultural Studies & Humanities	1					1	2
Evts Tourism Hosp & Lang	5						5
Film Music & Performing Arts	2				1		3
Health & Community Studies						1	1
Leeds Business School	12		10				22
Social Sciences	7					1	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>66</b>

## Conclusion

- 20 The information provided in the Joint Examiner Reports demonstrates a high level of confidence in our research student processes. The data provided from the Joint Examiners Reports recognises the preparedness and quality of a number of students and this should be viewed as positive. In particular, the three who were awarded their doctoral awards without any amendments and the 28 students receiving their award with minor amendments. The increased number of Independent Chair training sessions has also improved the detail and completion of the Joint Examiner Reports.
- 21 There are still a significant number of students who received the re-submission (thesis only) and re-submission and further oral. In terms of the re-submission (thesis only) outcome 14 students were thought to be able to revise their thesis between three to six months. From the evidence provided in table 7, it appears that those who have been given a shorter timescale have in fact achieved the revisions. The evidence also indicates that three students significantly amended their thesis within a much shorter timescale. Whilst this has worked in these cases caution is needed to ensure that students complete the revisions needed prior to re-submitting. There have been instances where a student has submitted early and failed to meet the examiners requirements. In these cases, further

minor amendments are needed and we then run the risk of exhausting the available outcomes in the regulations.

- 22 The examiners' decision to use the 12 month re-submission (thesis only) and suggest a short timescale is reflective of the amount of revision required but also can be due to the students' personal commitments. This should be a consideration when looking at the data.
- 23 It is still disappointing that one student who submitted their thesis did not meet the level required to go to examination. The research student process, particularly Confirmation of Registration and Progression should be used to identify future students and intervene as appropriate to prevent future problematic situations.
- 24 For the first time the report covered the frequency of use of academic colleagues for the role of independent chair and the potential over use of external examiners. This information will help to guide the RDSC when considering and approving examination arrangements.
- 26 Whilst the evidence presented demonstrates that overall students are prepared for the examination, there is still work to be done on the thesis which at times is poorly structured. It is also evident from the examiners comments particularly those with the re-submission and re-examination outcome that enhanced student training is needed in relation to for example the use of methodologies, data collection and literature review. The Graduate School and the appointed Working Group from members of the RDSC are reviewing the training and development needs of students and academic staff and will take into consideration the points made in this report.

Kathryn Brown  
22 August 2017

## Annex 1: Completions 16/17

School	Name	Award	Title
Built Environmnt & Engineering	Nafa Duwebi	PhD	Sustainability Integration into Project Management: Evidence form Top Sam listed companies
	Richard Cozzens	PhD	The effectiveness of hybrid and on-line teaching for an engineering and technology curriculum provided to rural high schools in Utah
	Karen Horwood	PhD	The green infrastructure policy-making process in the North West Region and Manchester City Region 2005-2010
	Kevin Thomas	PhD EPW	Critical Engagement with Environmental and economy policy discourses in new governance space
Carnegie School of Education	Fawziya Alzadjali	PhD	The impact of curriculum prescription on English teacher professional identity in Oman
	Ericcson Mapfumo	EdD	Assessing Improvement Options on the Thermal Performance of Historic Windows: With Specific Reference to the Refurbishment of Sash Windows in a Large Educational Estate.
	Suzanne Richards	EdD	Understanding part-time, mature students' 'sense of belonging' when studying higher education in the further education sector
	Elizabeth M Whalley	EdD	The role of the graduate pedagogical leader with children from birth to thirty months
Carnegie School of Sport	Elisabeth Board	PhD	Autonomic Cardiovascular Modulations During Ascent To Very High Altitude: Impact Of Intermittent Hypoxic Pre-Acclimation
	Elisabeth King	PhD	Exploring the Psychosocial Impact of YHA's Outdoor Adventure Programmes for Young People
	Lysander Pollitt	PhD	Neuromechanical and Functional Effects of Adaptation to Dynamic Surface Instability Training
	Alan Thomson	PhD	The Socially Constructed and Embodied Meanings of Effectiveness in the Lives of Physical Education Teachers: An Ethnographic Study
	Julian North	PhD	Sport coaching research and practice: Ontology, interdisciplinarity, and critical realism
	Jennifer Hester	PhD	Young People with Obesity: Accounts of Intervention Impact
	Jon Finn	PhD	Emotional Regulation During Academy-To-First-Team Transitions in English Male Professional Sport
	Nicola Arjomandkhah	PhD	Fuel Utilisation During Prolonged Exercise On Acute Exposure To Altitude
	Daniel Bates	PhD	Demystifying Community Sport Development: An Examination of Practice and its Empowering Potential
	Spencer Swain	PhD	Khat-Chewing and Dark Leisure: An Ethnography of Liminal Spaces, Liquid Modernity, and Resistance
	John Lyle	PhD EPW	The development of a conceptual framework for sport coaching
Clinical & Applied Sciences	Rehab Astita	PhD	An In-Depth Investigation of the Relationship Between Body Fatness and Pain Sensitivity
	Jennifer Throp	Mres	To Understand The Patients' Lived Experience Of Occupational Therapy Within A Major Trauma Ward, In A UK City.
Computing Creative Tech & Eng	Thiemo Kastel	PhD	Live Performances and Broadcast Productions with Augmented Reality
	Chika Emma-Ogbangw	PhD	Enhancing Immersion in Mainstream Video Games Through Gestural Controls.
	Richard C Stevens	PhD	Scores for High Scores: Addressing Ludonarrative Dissonance in Video Game Music Through Integrated Design
	Sabir Doski	PhD	Implementation of E-Government in Kurdistan Regional Government, Iraq
Cultural Studies & Humanities	Rebecca Crowley	PhD	A Kristevan Analysis of Representations of Anorexia in Post-1978 Popular Prose Fiction by Women Writers'
	Tom Evans	Mres	Local Pride and the Development of Urban Areas: an Exploratory Case Study
Evts Tourism Hosp & Lang	Marianna Kornilaki	PhD	Sustainability and small tourism firms in Crete: A grounded theory approach.
	Katarzyna Wrobel	PhD	What is the Speaking Skill and How can we Teach it
	Barbara Gesicka	PhD	Motivating Polish Matura Students to Write in English
	Samantha Isaac	PhD	Why are small Businesses Engaged in Sustainable Tourism?
	Mohamed Elansari Ali	PhD	University Social Responsibility Model for Transnational Partnerships: UAE and UK Higher Education
Film Music & Performing Arts	Phil Harding	PhD	A Reflective and Oral History of The Technology and Culture of Manufactured Pop and BoyBands of the 1990s
	Justin Morey	PhD	A study of sampling practice in British dance music, 1987-2012
	Michael Ward	MPhil	An investigation into Signal Techniques For Machine Listening To Percussive Performance
Health & Community Studies	Lauren Turner	Mres	An Evaluation of the Introduction of a Playwork approach to After School Provision in Two Edmonton Communities
Leeds Business School	Mavis Amo-Mensah	PhD	Exploring Corporate Social Responsibility Communication in the Telecommunications Industry in Ghana.
	Gift Roman	PhD	A Phenomenological Evaluation of Organisational Health and Growth of SMEs in Nigeria
	Babajide Shoroye	PhD	Derivative Action in The UK: Is the Requirement for Permission of Court Desirable?
	Bhimsen Abacousnac	PhD	Impact of internal marketing on service quality in public hospitals in Mauritius
	Jane Gaukroger	PhD	Organisational Wisdom – What is the Contribution of the Organisation Development (OD) Practitioner?
	Womba Kamuhuza	PhD	SME entrepreneurship: access to finance for female entrepreneurs in Zambia
	Ourvashi Bissoon	PhD	The Challenges for achieving Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development in sub-Saharan Africa.
	Fiona Robertson	PhD	An Interpretive Phenomenological Study of the Adoption and Diffusion of Integrated Reporting Within UK Companies
	Fabiana Mariutti	PhD	Country Reputation Theory: Brazil's Brand Image in the United Kingdom
	Adam Mukhtar	PhD	The effects of adopting enterprise risk management on banks' performance: an empirical investigation of the Nigerian banking sector
	Saeed Alshamsi	PhD	The Investigation of Key Features of Common Leadership Style in the Abu Dhabi Police
	Patrick Nalere	PhD	Partnerships between NGOs and Community Groups: Implications for Central Uganda's Rural Development
	Michail Kanakis	DBA	Customer Satisfaction and Financial Performance in Greek Retail Banking
	Peter Agunloye	DBA	The Impact of Budgetary Participation on Managerial Performance (Case Study of Nigeria)

	Lucy	Laville	DBA	Evaluating PR Practitioners' Value Creation through Relationships
	Paul	Willis	DBA	Leadership, Empowerment and Letting Go: A study with Public Relations Practitioners
	Goodluck	Obi	DBA	Important considerations in developing a framework to effectively regulate the Nigerian upstream oil sector
	Eyiwumi	Tosan	DBA	Is State Police the Antidote for Effective Policing in Nigeria?
	Moses Igho	Nagbiku	DBA	Effective Corporate Governance Practices and Sustainable Performance in the Nigerian Banking Industry
	Oliver	Jones	DBA	Coaching for Capability: An Intervention research study of how to develop process improvement routines in a University.
	Michael	Agamah	DBA	Governance, Risk Management and Corporate Performance: A Survey of Nigerian Companies
	Robin	Phoolchund	DBA	Building Human Capital: A study of Human Resource Development Practices Within SMES in Mauritius
Social Sciences	Winnifred	Bedigen	PhD	Traditional Conflict Resolution: The Nilotic LWO in South Sudan
	Unjyn	Park	PhD	Exploring the Concept of Spiritual Crisis Among Tibetan Buddhists: An Interpretive Approach
	Jessica	Drakett	PhD	Construction of Gender and Humour in Technology Work: A Feminist Poststructuralist Analysis
	Adewale	Aderemi	PhD	Power Elites And Economic Development In Rentier States: Nigeria And Indonesia 1966-1998
	Miriyagalla	Senevirathna	PhD	The Changing Role of Development International Non-Governmental Organisations in Sri Lanka"
	Jason	Round	PhD	Cannabis Use in the UK: The Role of Tobacco in Impulsive Behaviour and Stress Reactivity
	Gemma	Ahearne	PhD	A Thematic Analysis of the Experiences of Sex Workers in Prison
	Connie	Smith	Mres	Promoting confidence and reducing anxiety after stroke – a feasibility study of using tailored relaxation techniques delivered on a relaxation DVD

## Report from the Research Ethics Sub-Committee

---

### *Executive Summary*

This paper provides an overview of the matters discussed at the fifty first meeting of the Research Ethics Sub-Committee held on 06 December 2017.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name:* Stuart Morris  
*Job title:* Governance Officer (Academic)  
*Date:* December 2017

### *Approval Route*

*December 2017*                      *Professor Karl Spracklen*

## **Research Ethics Sub-Committee 06 December 2017**

---

### **Summary of Proceedings**

*Then fifty second meeting of the Research Ethics Sub-Committee was held at 1400 on 06 December 2017. Papers for the meeting are available on the research Ethics Sub-Committee webpage: <http://www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/partners/academic-governance/research-ethics-sub-committee/> The Research Ethics Sub-Committee's proceedings are summarized below. Full minutes will be published on the website once they have been approved by the Sub-Committee at its next meeting 07 March 2018.*

---

### **2016/17 Research Ethics Audit outcomes – action plan monitoring**

- (a) The Sub-Committee noted the progress being made by the following Schools in addressing the action plans that had been formulated following the 2016/17 research ethics audits.
- (i) Built Environment & Engineering
  - (ii) Computing, Creative Technology & Engineering
  - (iii) Carnegie School of Education
  - (iv) Leeds Business School / Leeds Law School
  - (v) Clinical & Applied Sciences
  - (vi) Health & Community Studies
  - (vii) School of Social Sciences
- (b) It was confirmed that completion of the action plans for all of the above Schools remained on track.

### **PREVENT update**

- (c) The report provided an overview of applications made on the on-line system in 2017/18 academic year for approval to undertake research that falls under the Prevent Duty. It was confirmed that in the period 01 September 2017 to 21 November 2017 there had been seven student applications for approval to undertake research that fell under the Prevent Duty. Four were rejected as they were sent by mistake. Two gained approval by the Chair of URESA as all were low-risk. One was sent back as it required further supporting material. The students involved in the applications were all Level 6 project / dissertation students from across the University. It was confirmed that there had been no staff applications to approve.

### **Research Ethics Procedures**

- (d) The Sub-Committee was informed that members of the Sub-Committee had been provided with access to a test version of the new online system to test and send feedback to IT Services. IT Services would be taking this feedback into account and then finalising the online system for final testing in January / February 2018. IT Services

would attend the meeting of the Sub-Committee in March 2018 to provide a full demonstration of the system to members.

- (e) It was confirmed that the re-drafting of the written procedures continue to be delayed as a decision on how research ethics could be supported by the Research & Enterprise Office still needed to be made. *The Sub-Committee agreed that the Chair and Secretary would discuss this matter with the Director of Research & Enterprise in an effort to resolve this matter and ensure that it was clear how the administration of research ethics would be co-ordinated across the University.*

### **2016/17 Research Ethics Audit outcomes**

- (f) The Sub-Committee received the following School Research Ethics Audit reports for 2016/17:

- (i) Art, Architecture & Design
- (ii) Cultural Studies & Humanities
- (iii) Events, Tourism, & Hospitality
- (iv) Carnegie School of Sport

- (g) *The Sub-Committee agreed that research ethics was being managed by the above Schools and that practice was compliant with the University regulations.*

- (h) The School Research Ethics Audit report had not yet been received from the School of Film, Music & Performing Arts. *The Sub-Committee agreed that the report, when submitted, would be circulated to all members for comment. The Secretary would then collate the feedback and the Chair would make a decision, via Chair's action, on whether research ethics was being managed effectively by School.*

### **Interim Report on Ethics and International Research**

- (i) The Sub-Committee received a report providing an update on the development of a risk protocol for research undertaken abroad. The paper provided an interim report, offering initial findings drawn from research into some aspects of this issue developed by others. The team working on the protocol would be meeting in the forthcoming weeks to develop a Leeds Beckett University protocol and guidance regarding risk and liability. A draft protocol would then be drawn up and considered at the next meeting of the Research Ethics Sub-Committee for discussion, revision, and approval. The protocol, once agreed, would provide a clear basis upon which all international research could be undertaken in light of ethical and risk factors associated with such research.

### **European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity**

- (j) The Sub-Committee received a report providing an overview of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. *The Sub-Committee agreed that following initial reading of the Code the University appeared to be compliant however it was agreed that a fuller mapping of the Code against the University's Research Ethics policy would*

*be carried out and considered at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee in March 2018.*

**Proposal for away-day for research ethics in the University**

- (k) The Sub-Committee received a report providing a proposal for the third annual away-day for the management of research ethics in the University. The aims of the event would be to:
  - (i) Provide colleagues with an overview of how each School is managing research ethics within our institution and allow the opportunity to provide feedback on and discuss good practice;
  - (ii) Provide a forum to drive debates concerning research ethics that will lead to further consideration and discussion at university and school level research ethics fora;
  - (iii) Provide an overview of the new version of the online research ethics approval system and proposed changes to the Research Ethics Procedures that will come into effect from 01 September 2018.
  
- (l) *The Sub-Committee approved the proposal to hold the away day and agreed that it would take place in late February 2018. This date was earlier in the year than previous events in order to provide the opportunity for more colleagues to attend the event as it will fall outside of any main exam or holiday periods.*

## Research and Enterprise Forum

---

### *Executive Summary*

This report provides an brief overview and highlights key items of discussion from the R&E Forum.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None

### *Author*

*Name:* Cathy Barnes

*Job title:* Director of Research and Enterprise

*Date:* 10 January 2018

## **Quarterly Overview from Research and Enterprise Forum**

---

### **Introduction**

This report summarises the discussions from the Research and Enterprise Forum.

### **REF 2021 Update**

A number of colleagues have attended external consultation events focussed around the Stern review report and the new rules for REF2021 over the past few months. HEFCE released the final report in December 2017 and the Directors of Research are currently looking to draft a tailored approach to fit their unit of assessment reflecting the implications of the new rules, of particular concern to the institution relates to eligibility of academic staff.

### **REF Audit 2017/18**

All Directors of Research were required to produce an overview of the current state of publications within their units based upon the new REF requirements by the end of this year.

### **Research Student Supervision**

Andrew Slade asked all Directors of Research to monitor and be held accountable for PhD supervision, including any noncompliance within schools. It was recognised that 75 hours supervision per student was the universities recommended amount, with no strict split between DOS and 2nd supervisor. The supervision guidelines, once finalised, will go to RDSC to formalise a standardised approach.

The issues surrounding supervision and appropriate recording raised a few concerns and the Director of R&E suggested that university may want to subscribe to a suitable software package, in light of the larger student numbers and extra work this would bring, an appropriate platform would become a necessity.

### **HEIF and QR**

All Directors of Research have been given QR money based on their unit of assessment. The HEIF uplift for the industrial strategy has been allocated out to projects around the University.

### **Staff Development**

Following up from the success of the professional development residential which was arranged by HR earlier in the academic year. The Directors decided that another residential would be useful for leadership development, due to busy diaries it was agreed that it would take place in May 2018.

### **Membership**

A formal code of practice was confirmed to reflect the membership of the forum. It was agreed that the invitations would be restricted to the following; Director of Research and Enterprise, Directors of Research (or appropriate Deans) and the secretary.

## School Academic Committee Report: Leeds Business School

---

### *Executive Summary*

The report provides an overview of discussion from Leeds Business School's School Academic Committee held on Tuesday 7th November 2017.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None

### *Author*

*Name:* Louise Clayton-Thaxter  
*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer  
*Date:* 18<sup>th</sup> December 2017

### *Approval Route*

20<sup>th</sup> December 2017      Professor George Lodorfos (Dean and Chair of SAC)

# **Leeds Business School: School Academic Committee Summary Report (Nov 2017)**

## **Introduction**

1. The points below were discussed at the first meeting of the LBS School Academic Committee.

## **Recommendations / Referrals**

2. There are no matters to be considered by the Committee for referral/recommendation.

## **Major Discussions**

### **3. School Research Update**

- (a) Three colleagues in the School have been promoted to Readers and four promoted to Professors.
- (b) A number of colleagues have presented at conferences in the UK and internationally over recent months.
- (c) The University has some Higher Education Innovation Funding (HEIF) money available which the Business School has submitted several bids for support based on existing projects with external funding
- (d) The School also has some Quality-Related (QR) funding from the 2014 REF which is earmarked for small bid research funding. This is being matched by the School and the Director of Research is allocating to collaborative projects in the New Year.
- (e) The School has 116 active doctoral students on roll (28 DBAs and 88 PhDs), of which 75 are HESA returnable.
- (f) The School ran its 8th staff research conference in September and will be running the 8th student research conference in January.
- (g) The School also ran the Network of International Business Schools (NIBS) conference this year which was very successful.

### **4. REF Strategy Implementation Update**

- (a) The School is currently auditing staff research and potential contributions to REF. An audit of REF outputs is being collected for early 2018. The REF units of assessment have changed numbers and make up since the last cycle. A decision on the submission of staff from the Business School will be made nearer the final census date i.e. under Unit 17 (Business & Management) or by individual units (such as Economics, Media, etc.)

### **5. Enterprise Update**

- (a) The implementation of the European Regional Development Fund (EDRF) AD:VENTURE programme is progressing well; this provides opportunities for SMEs based in the Leeds City Region to work with University academic colleagues. Delivery up to December 2017 includes four Masterclasses and three Entrepreneur Knowledge Exchange Learning Sets, with more classes planned for 2018.
- (b) The Leadership Centre are delivering programmes with brands such as Sky Betting & Gaming, Serco Leisure, BrewDog and Santander.

## **6. Research Ethics Audit**

- (a) The School achieved an overall ethics compliance rate of 82%, which was slightly lower than the 2015/16 outcome of 84%. This is mainly due to issues regarding franchise submissions, as supervisors do not have access to the online form.

## **Conclusions and recommendations**

For information

## School Academic Committee Report: Leeds Law School

---

### *Executive Summary*

A summary of the proceedings of the fourth Leeds Law School Academic Committee meeting, held on the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

### *Action Requested*

The Report is **for information.**

### *Author*

Name: Professor Simon Gardiner  
Job Title: Professor, Leeds Law School  
Date: 04 January 2018

### *Approval Route*

n/a n/a

## **Leeds Law School Report for the Research & Enterprise Committee, January 2017**

---

### **Introduction**

The 4<sup>th</sup> Leeds Law School Academic Committee took place on the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2017. This is a summary report of discussions relating to Research & Enterprise activities.

### **Research**

1. The School has established a Research & Enterprise Group which will meet four times during the academic year, reporting into the School Academic Committee. The Group met for the first time on the 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017. Membership of the group was discussed. A Research student representative is required.
2. It was confirmed that responsibility for Research Ethics, previously considered at a Faculty Level, will now sit solely in the Law School and will be supported administratively by the Secretary to the Research & Enterprise Group.
3. University wide Representation of the Law School's Research activities was discussed. Without a Director of Research, the Law School does not have a single School Representative for all Research Matters. It was confirmed that Dr Jess Guth would be attending the University Research & Enterprise Committee during the 2017/18 Academic year. A verbal report on proceedings of the Research & Enterprise Committee, October 2017 was presented.
4. The Committee considered and approved a modification to the assessment for the H7 module Independent Legal Research Practice. The word count for all Postgraduate Research modules were reviewed to ensure consistency across the School's Postgraduate Courses.
5. A calendar of School Research activities 2017/18 was discussed. Events scheduled include Research Seminars on War Crimes, Policing for large sports event and Legal Education Training. A Terrorism & Human Rights Symposium is to be arranged. Law School staff were encouraged to attend all Events.
6. It was confirmed that the Research & Enterprise Group are responsible for the oversight of staff development funding in relation to School Research activities. The Group discussed different modes of budgeting e.g. a set budget per staff member, an overall defined budget to which staff are invited to apply for funding. A confirmed School policy will be presented to the next School Committee.
7. Since the last report of the Law School Academic Committee in June 2017 Law staff have attended and presented at Conferences organised by the University of Sheffield, the Association of Law Teachers, Law & Society (Mexico City), Futures of Legal Education and the Leeds Beckett Excellence in HE Conference.
8. Three new Graduate Teaching Assistants have joined the Law School since July 2017, working on areas linked to the Law School Priority areas – Legal Education and Terrorism Law & International Human Rights.

9. A launch event will occur for the Legal Education Research Group during the 2017-2018 academic year.
10. It was agreed in November 2017, in consultation with Professor Andrew Slade, that the Law School will progress plans for a Law Unit submission for REF 2021. Dr Jess Guth will coordinate this process.

### **Enterprise Plans & Activities**

11. The current focus of Law School Enterprise activities is the establishment of International partnerships, including the development of Distance Learning Promotion Partners and the franchising of Law courses. An Approval of Collaborative Delivery Event will be held in January to approve the franchise delivery of the Legal Practice Course to a new partner in Dubai.
12. The first cohort of students for the Vocational Certificate in Coroner's Law completed their studies in July 2017. There is currently no 1718 cohort for this programme. Discussions re future deliveries of the programme, including the potential for distance learning, are being discussed.
13. A new course proposal for a Solicitor's Degree Apprenticeship was approved by APCG in October 2017. Potential partners for this delivery are currently being sought by the Law School. The proposed course would include an Undergraduate Honours degree & a Postgraduate Diploma in Legal Practice Skills.
14. The Law School intends to deliver, in partnership with two professionals, a series of short courses in 2018 in how to Avoid the Legal Costs of Stress Management at Work. The first course is scheduled to be delivered on the 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2018.

18<sup>th</sup> January 2018

## School Academic Committee Report: School of Art, Architecture & Design

---

### *Executive Summary*

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2017. The proceedings of the meeting are summarised below.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name:* Hannah Brotton  
*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer  
*Date:* 03 January 2018

### *Approval Route*

4<sup>th</sup> January 2018

*Lisa Stansbie, Chair of the School Academic Committee*  
*Professor Simon Morris, Director of Research for Unit 32*  
*Professor Ian Strange, Director of Research for Unit 13*

# REPORT FROM THE SCHOOL OF ART, ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN SCHOOL ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

## 1. Introduction

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2017. Discussions regarding Research Unit 32 Art & Design: History, Practice and Theory, and Research Unit 13 Architecture, Built Environment and Planning are summarised below.

### School Research Activities: Unit 32

## 2. Latest REF update from HEFCE, September 2017.

The census date to record eligible staff would be 31 July 2020.

Explicit time and resources would be made available for staff to engage actively in independent research. All Academic Staff currently had 10% on their deployment for Research & Scholarly activity and could bid for competitively awarded one-semester sabbaticals on an annual basis.

The following were key attributes of Staff engaged in research:

- 0.2FTE or greater.
- Was engaged with PhD supervision
- Was eligible to apply for research grants

The guidance would be built on a generic definition from 2014: Undertaking independent research, leading or acting as a Principle Investigator (PI) or equivalent on a research grant or significant piece of research work.

HE institutions would need to implement a Code of Practice that would determine:

A fair approach to selecting outputs.

Use ORCID as an identifier.

The average for Output submission was set at n2.5.

The minimum submission for any member of staff was: 1 Output per academic

The maximum submission for any member of staff was: 5 Outputs per academic.

There was a transitional approach to output portability. For the purpose of this forthcoming REF exercise, REF 2021, Outputs could be submitted by:

HEI employing the staff member at the census date and by the originating institution where the staff member was previously employed when the Output was demonstrably generated.

One case study per 15 FTE staff returned up to 105FTE staff and then it would reduce to one additional impact case study per 50 FTE staff.

Summer 2018: Draft Guidelines on Submissions will be released.

January 2019: Final Guidance on Submissions

- 3. HEIF funding support for Research in the School.** Cathy Barnes, Director for Research & Enterprise had kindly agreed to fund the following through some HEIF funding that had been made available. The Higher Education Innovation Fund only supported projects that involved working with external partnerships. The School of Art, Architecture & Design had been awarded the following:
- A. A three-year partnership had been agreed with the Henry Moore Foundation for Yorkshire Sculpture International. £75k at a cost of £25k per annum for three years. Yorkshire Sculpture International (YSI) was a unique partnership project that comprises the Henry Moore Institute, Leeds Art Gallery, The Hepworth Wakefield and Yorkshire Sculpture Park. Staff were working towards major sculpture exhibitions across the partner institutions and public realm commissions in Leeds and Wakefield taking place from June – October 2019 with a public engagement programme starting in Summer 2018. It would involve twenty selected international artists responding to a provocation by a world-leading international Sculptor.
  - B. A fully funded PhD bursary for three years with Leeds Beckett contributing £45k for the three-year period of study and the Henry Moore Foundation contributing a further £15k. This was a fully funded PhD scholarship with an annual tax-free stipend for three years of £14,553 per annum. The doctoral student would work three days per week on the Yorkshire Sculpture International project, gaining invaluable professional curating skills and the remaining time on their evolving PhD topic.
- 4. Sabbaticals.** The Unit planned to offer at least one Sabbatical per year. It was important to offer our academics the opportunity to apply for competitively awarded research leave to support their work. It also supported new research centre LARC by giving it credibility in terms of what it could offer research active staff.
- 5. External Grant Funding Success.**  
The feminist collective (Dr Liz Stirling, Jo Hassall & Casey Orr) had secured an Arts Council England grant for £14,250. Professor Simon Morris had secured two separate grants from the Henry Moore Foundation. One £2000 grant towards a new publication by Craig Dworkin entitled *Def* and one £2000 grant towards a new publication by Pavel Büchler entitled *Perfect Love*.

### **School Research Activities: Unit 13**

Unit 13 was organised through research groups and clusters that focussed on providing high quality research activity and outputs across a range of disciplinary areas. Research groups in building performance and energy, civil engineering water research, spatial and neighbourhood planning and architectural history and theory support the work of the following subject groups – *Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Civil Engineering and Construction Management, Planning, Housing and Human Geography, and Surveying* - with research linked closely to industry through partnerships and professionally supported activities

Delivering the University's research and enterprise KPIs:

The Unit currently had 79 staff (headcount). 59 staff were in the School of Built Environment and Engineering while 20 staff were in the School of Art, Architecture and Design. The Unit currently had 49 registered research students (of which 10 were staff) and approximately £2 million of research income over the current REF period. To help achieve the University's research and enterprise KPIs

staff had already instituted the following processes:

- The appointment of highly-qualified research active new staff
- The creation of different opportunities for staff to apply for University research funding on a competitive basis;
- The formal mentoring of bidding process for external income;
- The expansion of our postgraduate research candidate community (primarily at PhD level) and the development of the DEng Programme and other professional routes for Doctoral level study.

**Unit/School initiatives that would be developed to achieve the Research and Enterprise KPIs over the current REF period.**

- Protection of research time through measurable link to deployment based on our 4Ps system
- Protection of research time through better timetabling
- Formalisation of current research mentoring scheme
- Continue with the research Cluster scheme to develop new research competencies
- Consolidate our FEC approach to all R&E activities and implement time buy-out system
- Stronger collaboration with Architecture/Landscape Architecture staff on research initiatives/projects
- Establishment of a competitive research leave system
- Build on current staff PhD development programme
- Better use of existing MA students –conversion into research degree students
- Build on GTA system to improve research output and support staff
- Use ‘Bid mentors’ and bidding teams to increase staff capability in applying for external income
- More strategic use of wide industry/professional connection

**Unit 13: Future direction of research**

For academic year 2017/18 the Unit would receive £31,000 of RDF income to help develop and strengthen the Unit for submission to REF 2021. Staff in the Unit would shortly be receiving guidance on the process for accessing this funding and its strategic orientation.

Consultation of the details of the REF 2012 were ongoing. While the picture on issues such as output portability, eligibility for inclusion and submission numbers was beginning to clarify, the exact nature of REF 2021 guidelines and guidance was still to be finally determined. It was expected that this issue would be resolved by HEFCE by the end of 2017. There would be a Unit-wide meeting to discuss the guidance once it had been published.

## School Academic Committee Report: School of Built Environment & Engineering

---

### *Executive Summary*

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 30th November 2017. The proceedings of the meeting in relation to Research and Enterprise are summarised below.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name:* Chris Fletcher  
*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer  
*Date:* 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2017

### *Approval Route*

*2<sup>nd</sup> January 2018* Ian Strange Director of Research - School of Built Environment & Engineering  
*8<sup>th</sup> January 2018* Professor Akintola Akintoye, Dean and Chair of the School Academic Committee

## **REPORT FROM THE SCHOOL OF BUILT ENVIRONMENT & ENGINEERING SCHOOL ACADEMIC COMMITTEE**

### **1. Introduction**

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 30th November 2017. The proceedings of the meeting in relation to Research and Enterprise are summarised below.

### **2. Directors Update**

(a) The Director of Research updated the Board on recent developments with Research and Enterprise. It was noted that the next set of guidance for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) was being released with the full guidance being available in the next 6 to 12 months.

(b) It was reported that although less than 100% staff can now be entered into the REF, all staff employed on the census date of 31 July 2020 with significant responsibility for research must be submitted. The outputs required per UoA submission are 2.5 average for each full-time equivalent researcher, with a minimum of one and a maximum of five outputs being submitted per staff member. Submissions are to include a minimum of two case studies (i.e. one impact case study, plus one further case study per up to 15 full-time equivalent staff submitted). All Units will need to submit at least two case studies.

(c) The Director reported that there is School funding for attendance at research conferences, networking and the research leave scheme and a call for funding applications had been sent to all staff. The Director of Research also reminded committee colleagues that there is still QR Research Funding available and asked the Committee to encourage staff to keep applying.

(d) In relation to the Research Leave scheme, the Director of Research advised Colleagues wishing to apply to discuss their applications with him and get approval of their Heads of Subject prior to submitting an application.

(e) The School annual research seminar has commenced and 18 staff attended the most recent Research Seminar. The next Seminar is due in December.

(f) It was noted that the University Research and Enterprise Committee would meet in January 2018. This meeting would discuss the process of reviewing and auditing of the January 2018 REF staff research outputs. It would also discuss the University's processes for developing the University REF Code of Practice

### **Author**

Chris Fletcher  
Academic Quality Support Officer  
22<sup>nd</sup> December 2017

## Report from the School of Clinical & Applied Sciences School Academic Committee

---

### *Executive Summary*

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 7 December 2017. This report summarises the proceedings of the meeting.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name* Jess Greenwood-Owens

*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer

*Date:* January 2018

### *Approval Route*

January 2018

*Dr Duncan Sharp, Dean and Chair of the School Academic Committee*

# REPORT FROM THE SCHOOL OF CLINICAL & APPLIED SCIENCES SCHOOL ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

## Introduction

1. The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 7 December 2017. The proceedings of the meeting related to research matters are summarised below.

### School Strategic Plan 2016-2021

2. *REF* The Dean reported that the University had been made aware of the rules for the REF and what would constitute 'significant research' within their role – this would be an average of at least 2.5 publications (but could range from 1-5 publications). Where a member of staff was researching within another Institution, both Institutions could make a return for that member of staff. The School had more scope for choosing which members of staff to return, some staff would be undertaking research that couldn't be considered within the REF. The final version would be available in Summer 2018.

### REF and School Research Activities Update/ School Research and Enterprise Group

3. The Committee **received** tabled reports on C2 REF and School Research Activities Update and the C3 School Research and Enterprise Group. The Committee were asked to note the items. Dr G Jones was unable to attend the meeting to present these items.

### School Research Ethics Group

4. The Committee **received** a report on the School Research Ethics Group from Dr R Brooks.

---

*Jess Greenwood-Owens  
Quality Assurance & Governance Officer  
December 2017*

## School Academic Committee Report: School of Computing, Creative Technologies and Engineering

---

### *Executive Summary*

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 5 December 2017. The proceedings of the meeting are summarised below.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

N/A

### *Author*

*Name:* Anne C Stephenson  
*Job title:* Quality Assurance Officer  
*Date:* December 2017

### *Approval Route*

*December 2017*                      Professor Colin Pattinson, Dean & Chair of Academic Committee  
Professor Ruth Robbins, Director of Research, UoA 34  
Professor Dorothy Monekosso, Director of Research, UoA 11

## **REPORT FROM THE SCHOOL OF COMPUTING, CREATIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND ENGINEERING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE**

### **Introduction**

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 5 December 2017. The proceedings of the meeting are summarised below.

### **School Research Activities UoA 34 (formally 36) Communication, Culture & Media Studies, Library & Information Management:**

Key outcomes of the Stern Review of the REF were noted. Clarity provided on the definition of research-active staff and the process by which colleagues would be included (or not) in the University's submission were received.

<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/ref2021/>

The School was asked to think about the implications of the paper, especially if the School was to meet its own and the University's Key Performance Indicators.

It was agreed that it would take time for the School to increase its research outputs and this would remain a challenge for the School.

A meeting with the Director/s of Research, the Group Heads, Professor Abbott-Halpin and the Course Director: Broadcast Media to be convened for early January 2018.

Professor Jayne Raisborough's inaugural lecture will be held on 6 December.

<http://www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/events/inaugural-lectures/inaugural-jayne-raisborough/>

The second #Lebeme (Leeds Beckett Media Conference) will be held on 19 January. Professor Jayne Raisborough is the key contact for details.

### **School Enterprise Activities UoA 36 Communication, Culture & Media Studies, Library & Information Management:**

The Director of Research Unit 36 was our university's lead on a University Alliance led bid for AHRC doctoral students. The bid for that activity (if successful, likely to be around 10-12 students per annum) was submitted in October.

The Centre for Culture and the Arts Cultural Conversation Series continued, in partnership with Palgrave (the publishers) and Leeds City Council. In September, Jayne Raisborough discussed her research into media representations of ageing (and also participated in a local media campaign to publicise this work); in October, Robert Burroughs presented his research into the Congo atrocities from the point of view of the Congolese peoples (and also appeared on Radio Leeds to publicise his talk); and in November, Melanie Chan discussed social media, lifestyle apps and cookery.

Rob Burroughs also presented research at the Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren, 18 October 2017. This was as part of the third and final event of the EU funded initiative, 'The Congo

Zoë Tew-Thompson was invited Plenary Speaker at the *Spaces & Flows: Eighth International Conference on Urban and ExtraUrban Studies* in October. The special theme of this year's conference this was 'Enculturing the City' and held year at the University of Hull. The conference formed part of the Hull 2017: UK City of Culture bid.

Professor Alison Oram gave the inaugural Queer History annual lecture at Goldsmith's University in November on the title 'Outing Octavia: Transforming Queer Heritage in Britain.'

James McGrath's book, *Naming Adult Autism*, was launched in October.

Heather Shore's co-authored book, *Young Criminal Lives: Life chances and life courses from 1850* (with Barry Godfrey, Pamela Cox, and Zoe Alker) published by OUP.

Kelly Hignett's co-authored book, *Women's Experience of Repression in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe* (with Melanie Ilic, Dalia Leinarte and Corina Snitar has been published by Routledge.

### **School Research Activities UoA11 Computer Science & Informatics:**

The 2017 REF audit is in progress.

#### Phase 1

- Assessment of output according to REF star rating system.
- Colleagues must ensure that their output is available through Symplectic
- This process will be completed by end of year.

#### Phase 2

- Preparation of impact case studies will proceed from January 2018 onward for submission by March 2<sup>nd</sup>
- Case studies will be based on existing 2016 cases reviewed for appropriateness.

The weekly research seminar series has returned

A monthly PhD student workshop has been introduced where students are encouraged to present their work to others.

### **School Enterprise Activities UoA 11 Computer Science & Informatics:**

- Meeting with LEP and Access Innovation team— a number of colleagues will be meeting with to discuss opportunities to work with local businesses
- In preparation Open Access tutorial to be run by library staff
- A new researcher will be joining the research team in January 2018

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

This report is for information

## **Authors**

Professor Ruth Robbins, Director of Research: Uo34 Communication, Culture & Media Studies,  
Library & Information Management:

Professor Dorothy Monekosso, Director of Research: UoA 11 Computer Science & Informatics

## School Academic Committee Report: School of Cultural Studies & Humanities

---

### *Executive Summary*

A summary of the proceedings of the fifth Cultural Studies & Humanities School Academic Committee meeting, held on 4 December 2017.

### *Action Requested*

This report is for information. The Committee is invite to note the report.

### *Appendices*

N/A

### *Author*

*Name:* Miss Charlie Garfoot  
*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer  
*Date:* 8 January 2018

### *Approval Route*

January 2018                      *Professor Ruth Robbins, Director of Research*

# Summary Report of the School of Cultural Studies & Humanities School Academic Committee

## Introduction

The fifth meeting of the School Academic Committee took place on 4 December 2017. The Committee's proceedings are summarised below.

## School Research Activities

### 1. STERN Review

The Committee noted that the final outcomes of the STERN Review:

- All staff with 'significant responsibility for research', should be returned to REF2021. Whilst the meaning of the phrase was still unclear, it was likely to include; time and resources devoted to research above and beyond standard RSA time; status as an independent researcher eligible to supervise PhD students, and apply for grants in the researcher's own right.
- In terms of outputs, each unit would be expected to submit on average 2.5 outputs per full-time equivalent member of the Team. Shortfalls on the average could be covered by some colleagues submitting up to five outputs.
- Institutions would be expected to develop and apply a code of practice relating to submissions, and any colleagues included or excluded. The selection criteria were likely to be on the evidence of independence noted above.
- In terms of portability of outputs, colleagues who moved between jobs in the REF period, would be eligible to be submitted by both/all institutions at which they had worked.

2. Colleagues not currently included on the list of approved Supervisors for the Research Degrees Sub-Committee were advised to apply, as well as ensure that they had an Open Researcher and Contributor ID number on ORCID linked to their Symplectic account.

3. The Committee noted the date for absolute compliance with the Open Access system for REF on 1 April 2018.

### 4. Financial Context

Directors of Research were awarded some monies from central QR funding to support REF efforts. Readers and Professors discussed the ways in which the sum of money should be spent, and came to the view that support for impact case studies and for the Centre for Culture and the Arts activities would be appropriate priorities for the year. Subsequently, however, the School had come under severe budgetary constraints, and a further meeting was to be held to discuss other ways of investing this fund.

### 5. Institutional Audit Process

The Committee noted that in preparation for REF 2021, a more formalised version of the annual audit was to be undertaken, which involved two stages:

- Stage 1 related to local assessment of the outputs that were already in the public domain. The work was being undertaken by Readers and Professors and was based on reading

those outputs and rating them according to the REF star rating system. The process would be completed by the end of the year, and reported to the Research & Enterprise Committee in January 2018.

- Stage 2 involved completing draft versions of the Environment/Impact Statements and draft Case Studies, which were to be submitted to the Research & Enterprise Service by 2 March 2018, and reported to the Research & Enterprise Committee. Colleagues involved with case studies would be asked to complete drafts early in the New Year.
6. Colleagues were congratulated on a number of successful events, promotions and publications: these included; the Centre for Culture and the Arts Conversation Series in partnership with Palgrave and Leeds City Council; Dr Rob Burroughs's research presentation at the Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren as part of 'The Congo Free State across the Languages, Media & Culture of Europe'; Dr Zoe Tew-Thompson plenary speaker at the *Spaces & Flows: Eighth International Conference on Urban and Extra Urban Studies*; Dr Jessica Van Horsen's involvement with publicising the environmental impacts of plastic in the ocean filmed by Sky; Professor Alison Oram's inaugural Queer History annual lecture at Goldsmith's University; the Carnival Conference; the publication of Dr James McGrath's book on autism in culture; the publication of Professor Heather Shore's co-authored book on young criminal lives; and the publication of Dr Kelly Hignett's co-authored book on women's experience of repression in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

## School Academic Committee Report: Carnegie School of Education

---

### *Executive Summary*

The Carnegie School of Education School Academic Committee met on 08 November 2017. Key points arising from the meeting concerning research matters are summarised as follows:

### Research Matters:

The Committee received the School's Research Ethics Audit for 2016/17. It was reported that the report contained statistical data which showed the number of ethical applications that had been submitted across the three levels. The data also compared the number of students on individual courses and the number of ethical submissions for that course. Given the nature of change within the institution in its transition from Faculties to Schools and number of school actions had been identified. The remit of this committee would now be to monitor the progress of these actions and they would be discussed in more detail at the July School Academic Committee.

The Director of Research wish to formally express his gratitude to Lianne Sweeting Richardson for preparing and collating the data used in the school Ethics Audit".

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name:* Lianne Sweeting-Richardson  
*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer.  
*Date:* December 2017.

### *Approval Route*

n/a

## School Academic Committee Report: School of Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management

---

### *Executive Summary*

The School of Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management School Academic Committee met on Wednesday 18th October 2017. Key points arising from the meeting are summarised as follows:-

### **REF Update.**

The Director of Research provided an update on preparations for REF 2021.

There had been an increase in the weighting of the impact criteria to twenty five percent of the overall score. The Director of Research explained that she was confident in the viability of the unit following consideration of current activities.

A number of uncertainties remained including the number of impact case studies required and the minimum, maximum and total number of outputs the University would be required to submit. There was a lack of clarity regarding the submission process.

The University would be required to provide details of open access, collaborative activity outside of higher education and equality and diversity amongst others.

Further discussions and confirmation of the University approach would take place following formal notification from HEFCE.

The process of reflection and audit would take place over the next twelve months. Staff would receive an email explaining the process.

There had been an intentional drive to strengthen performance. It was likely that the number of submissions within the unit would double.

### ***Action Requested***

The report is **for information.**

### ***Appendices***

None.

**Author**

*Name:* Lyndsey Pearson

*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer.

*Date:* 20<sup>th</sup> December 2017.

**Approval Route**

*20<sup>th</sup> December 2017* Rhodri Thomas, Dean of School and Chair of the Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management School Academic Committee.

## School Academic Committee Report: School of Film, Music and Performing Arts

---

### *Executive Summary*

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017. The proceedings of the meeting are summarised below.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name:* Professor Robert Shail  
*Job title:* Director of Research  
*Date:* December 2017

### *Approval Route*

September 2017                      *Andrew Fryer, Dean and Chair of the School Academic Committee*

# REPORT FROM THE SCHOOL OF FILM, MUSIC AND PERFORMING ARTS SCHOOL ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

## 1. PhD recruitment

- a) The Committee were informed that Alex Kelly in Performing Arts had recently successfully completed his doctorate.
- b) It was reported that the current number of registered research students stood at 36 and the next intake application deadline was confirmed as February 2018.

## 2. REF activity

- a) It was stated that the REF Audit was now closed and the review process was underway. The first assessment completed, for Performing Arts, had produced very encouraging results.
- b) It was noted that Stern had recommended a dual option approach to REF 2021. Universities could choose to submit all staff or they could be selective. It was confirmed that Leeds Beckett University would opt for the second option which would give the Unit a good prospect of performing strongly.
- c) The Committee were informed that a 'Code of Practice' would be introduced to define which staff were 'research active' and therefore included in the REF submission. It was confirmed that individual submissions would be between one and five, resulting in a Unit average of 2.5 per person.

## 3. Income generation

- a) It was stated that bids included the following:
  - Three AHRC networking projects in development (popular music history, dance hub, and community health/arts development)
  - A major AHRC funding bid from Professor Spracklen in Music;
  - An AHRC Doctoral Awards application submitted in conjunction with AAD and CSH;
  - Following the announcement of the AHRC Creative Clusters scheme, a bid has been submitted by Paul Thompson in Music;
  - A second partnership submission to the EU Capacity Building scheme led by Jenny Granville. It was also stated that Jenny was preparing a major bid to the AHRC to extend the CINAGE project.

#### **4. Environment**

- a) The Committee was informed that the Leeds Arts Research Centre (LARC) had been successfully launched at an event on 18 October hosted by the DVC for Research and the website was now live.
- b) It was reported that both the Louis Le Prince event and the ELOA Conference (European Network on Education and Learning of Older Adults) had taken place and had generated a substantial amount of positive press coverage.
- c) It was stated that the Leeds Live Music events had taken place at the Town Hall on 29-30 November with a strong presence from Leeds Beckett.

**Professor Robert Shail**

**Director of Research**

**School of Film, Music and Performing Arts**

18 January 2018

## School Academic Committee Report: School of Health & Community Studies

---

### *Executive Summary*

The meeting of the School Academic Committee was held on 5 December 2017. The proceedings related to research and enterprise are summarised below in the extract of the meeting's full proceedings.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

Name: Sheila Casey  
Job title: Academic Quality Support Officer  
Date: 18 December 2017

### *Approval Route*

18 December 2017 Sue Sherwin, Dean of School and Chair  
Professor Gary Jones, Director of Research, UoA 3

## SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

The meeting of the School Academic Committee took place on 5 December 2017. The Committee's proceedings related to research and enterprise only are summarised below.

---

### School Risk Register

- 1 The Committee received the Risk Register from the Academic Services Manager. There was currently one red risk (recruitment and support of research students). The Register would be reviewed at the next meeting of the School Strategic Leadership Team.

### School research activities annual report 2016-17

- 2 The Committee received the annual report from Dr James Woodall on school research activities. For research and enterprise activity and income (the School's KPI 2.3), 67 bids were submitted to REMS from School staff, and there were 26 successful bids, whose funding exceeded our target. There were 196 registered publications (KPI 2.1) on Symplectic, including 86 journal articles.
- 3 There had been some tremendous successes in relation to these two aspects of the School's core business and the School exceeded its KPIs for the year. Staff were encouraged to continue to use REMS and Symplectic to record their research activity to ensure accurate data capture.

### Centre for Health Promotion Research annual report 2016-17

- 4 The Committee received the annual report from Dr Louise Warwick-Booth (Centre Director), for the Centre for Health Promotion Research. The Centre was established in 1997 and was now the largest academic health promotion research centre in the UK. There was a number of new and ongoing projects and the team were working on new bids. The Centre's research was likely to contribute to two UoAs in the REF.
- 5 The staff provided supervision at all levels for undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research students, and contributed to the delivery of the courses in the Health Promotion subject group. Looking forward, the Centre would continue to bid for larger scale projects, combined with smaller scale local research, where applicable. The Centre would be seeking recognised research centre status in the University, which was supported by the Committee.

### Centre for Dementia Research annual report 2016-17

- 6 The Committee received the report from Professor Claire Surr on the Centre for Dementia Research for 2016-17. The Centre was formally approved in the University in May 2017 and had four core staff members, with other members from eight schools. The Centre has been successful in a number of bids, and staff hoped to contribute to UoA 3 in the REF.

### School postgraduate research students annual report 2016-17

- 7 The Committee received the report from Professor Nick Frost on research students in the School, which included information on the research student training programme and on standard entitlements. Professor Frost had overall responsibility for the School's research students, and liaised with the School's Research Lead and the newly formed Graduate School in this role. There were currently 44 research students in the School and approximately five new applications were being

processed. Many PhD students were nearing completion, including some staff members, which would increase the supervision pool in due course.

#### REF 2021: UoA 3, Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy update

- 8 The Committee received an update from the Director of Research for UoA 3, Professor Gary Jones. Details of the decisions taken by HEFCE relating to some of the rules for REF 2021 had recently been released. A summary has been compiled by the Council for Allied Health Profession Research and some key points from this summary were reported to the Committee, including that all staff with significant responsibility for research would be returned to the REF, provided they were independent researchers. HEIs, working with their staff and with guidelines, would identify who was in scope for submission among staff meeting core eligibility criteria. Staff with significant responsibility for research were those for whom time and resources were made available to engage actively in independent research, and that was an expectation of their job role. Further guidance to define this would be developed through working with the main panels. The census date for staff would be 31 July 2020. There was a transitional approach to the non-portability of outputs in REF 2021, whereby outputs may be submitted by both the HEI employing the staff member on the census date and the originating HEI where the staff member was previously employed when the output was demonstrably generated.
- 9 The funding bodies required all HEIs submitting in REF 2021 to provide a code of practice to cover the institution's processes for ensuring a fair approach to selecting outputs and where applicable, the institution's processes for identifying submitted staff. The average number of outputs required per FTE would be 2.5. A minimum of one output was required for each staff member with significant responsibility for research employed in the submitting unit on the census date and a maximum of five outputs may be attributed to individual staff members, including staff who have left. Outputs needed to be deposited as soon after the point of acceptance as possible, and no later than three months after this date. A deposit exception would be introduced from 1 April 2018 to allow outputs unable to meet this deposit timescale, to remain compliant if they were deposited up to three months after the date of publication. Submissions would include a total of one case study, plus one further case study per up to 15 FTE staff returned to the REF. Further guidance on the implementation of this framework would be issued in due course.

#### REF 2021: UoA 20 (REF 2014 UoA 22), Social Work and Social Policy update

- 10 An update was provided by Professor John Craig for UoA 20. After recent discussions on unit boundaries, the 'unit footprint' has been confirmed as broadly covering School colleagues in Social Work and in Children, Youth and Community Studies. In the School of Social Sciences, it covered colleagues in Politics and International Relations, Sociology, and Criminology. Meetings for the unit had been held last week on different days and times to encourage staff attendance. A Professors and Readers group has been established for Social Work and Social Policy to support the development and implementation of the strategy for the unit. Professor Nick Frost, Dr Pamela Fisher and Dr James Woodall were included in this group.
- 11 The annual REF audit was underway and this year the Unit Lead has to identify how many outputs each individual has, the quality of these outputs and the number that they planned to publish by the end of 2020. Colleagues have been contacted for this information. Staff were to be reminded of the requirements for submission with regards to open access for outputs. The unit has been allocated some QR funding to support research activity and bids have been invited from colleagues within the unit footprint. The bids would be reviewed by the Professors and Readers group for the allocation of this funding. Professor Colin Webster was co-ordinating the impact case studies for the unit and has contacted all colleagues in the footprint to ask them to identify work they have undertaken that might develop as a REF impact study.

Administrative support for research in the School

- 12 The Chair provided an update on support for research and advised that the new secretary, who was due to be in post in January, would have a 0.5 role to support research administration.

Operation of research ethics processes at school level

- 13 The Committee received the report presented at the Research & Enterprise Committee's October meeting on the operation of research ethics processes at school level. Guidance would be sent in due course on research ethics activities' reporting to School Academic Committees.

Sheila Casey, Academic Quality Support Officer  
School of Health & Community Studies  
December 2017

## School Academic Committee Report: Carnegie School of Sport

---

### *Executive Summary*

The meetings of the School Academic Committee held on 26 October 2017 and 14 December 2017. The proceedings of the meetings are summarised below.

### *Action Requested*

The report is for information.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name:* Clare Prentice  
*Job title:* Academic Quality Support Officer  
*Date:* 20 December 2017

### *Approval Route*

*9 January 2018* Peter Mackreth, Dean and Chair of the School Academic Committee  
Prof Susan Backhouse, Director of Research, Unit 24, Sport and  
Exercise Science, Leisure and Tourism

## **Report from the Carnegie School of Sport School Academic Committee**

### **Introduction**

1. This report presents the summary of proceedings from the meeting of the Carnegie School of Sport School Academic Committee held on 26 October 2017.
2. The Committee received the notes of the Research and Enterprise Steering Group meetings (20 September 2017 and 18 October 2017) for information.

Summary of key points discussed on the 20 September 2017 Research and Enterprise Steering Group are noted below.

### **Carnegie Research Mentoring (CaRM) update:**

3. It was confirmed that the voluntary scheme would be reintroduced in the School (by way of updated webpages) in October/November 2017. Mentors will be Professors, Readers and Senior Research Fellows as a starting point, and the CaRM development team will be made up of the R&E Leads, School Research Admin team. Professor Kevin Hylton will be appointed CaRM co-ordinator and it was anticipated that this role would be rotated every 2 years.
4. The group discussed whether staff undertaking part-time PhDs would have access to a mentor. It was confirmed that staff studying for a doctorate would not be advised to take on a mentor as they were already supported by their supervisory team and Director of PGR students. It was noted that a mentee could seek a mentor for the purposes of gaining insight into being on a supervisory team.

### **Graduate School update**

5. The Graduate School will support PGR students and staff development associated with PGR student support. Dr Beccy Watson is seconded to the Graduate School as part of her role, as the academic lead alongside Head of the Graduate School, Kathryn Brown. Part of Beccy's role will involve developing the supervisory and research training programmes. R&E Leads were asked to consult subject groups about current supervisory training and suggestions for improvements.
6. Changes in the overall structure of research and enterprise services, due to the professional services review, was discussed. Alongside Kathryn Brown, Head of the Graduate School, is Simon Baldwin as Head of Enterprise and Operations. This team encompasses the Post Award Team. There will also be a Research Team Leader (currently a vacant post), which will encompass research funding and research impact support. It was noted that there have been some issues with the research and enterprise services provided, during the review period.

### **Research Excellence Framework 2021 Update**

7. HEFCE 'Initial decisions on the Research Excellence Framework 2021' document was discussed and the following key points were summarised, for information:-
  - a) The issue of portability is still to be determined.
  - b) Definition of 'independent researcher' still to be finalised by HEFCE

- c) The Russell group of 'research intensive' universities expected to submit all colleagues for the next assessment; other institutions can opt to not submit all staff but have to burden of responsibility for confirming who us an independent researcher within their unit. It was confirmed that this will not change the strategy of supporting and enabling all academic staff in the School of Sport to be research active.

### **Confirmed decisions for REF 2021**

8. Increase in impact weighting, now at 25%, outputs 60% and environment 15%. Regarding the environment statement, there will be a further structured template with greater expectations placed on the statement. In particular, we are asked to outline how our unit supports: (1) interdisciplinary research, (2) collaboration with organisations beyond HE, (3) open access/open data, and (4) equality and diversity.
9. Nominations for panel Chairs were being sought. Sub-panel members will be nominated through nomination bodies.
10. It was reiterated the importance of impact, and developing staff knowledge and expertise of planning for impact, and evidencing impact. It was agreed there was a need for additional sessions focussing around impact to raise greater awareness in terms of measuring, assessing and recording.
11. The new professional services structure will include Impact Managers; it is intended Unit 24 will have a dedicated Impact Manager to work with. Once all promotions have been confirmed, a notification will go out for expressions of interest for a School Impact Coordinator to lead on impact activities.

### **Website update**

12. The development site for the School of Sport webpages was shared. The site has received positive feedback. However it was noted there was a need for further diversity of image stock used.

### **ISPAL Conference**

13. It was confirmed the ISPAL conference will now take place on Monday 18 December 2017. The current programme was shared with Research and Enterprise Subject Group for comment.
14. It was noted additional sessions were requested on:
  - a) Symplectic session to replace second research ethics session;
  - b) Experienced supervisor training session (across 1.5 hours);
  - c) Mixing methodologies
15. Sessions would be recorded (if session leads are happy) and uploaded to the conference website to allow access to all sessions.

Summary of key points discussed on the 18 October 2017 Research and Enterprise Steering Group are noted below.

### **Supervisor training**

16. The new training was introduced which was a one-day workshop replacing parts A, B, C and D of the old training for new supervisors' workshops. R&E leads were to share the draft programme with their groups for feedback purposes, and feedback before the next meeting on the 15 November 2017.

### **Research Excellence Framework update**

17. The 'What we know' paper and assessment of outputs worksheet was shared with the group. It was confirmed the minimum number of outputs required/maximum number permitted for submission, or the meaning of 'significant responsibility for research' was still unknown.
18. The group were updated on the request from DVC (Research & Enterprise) to submit a REF review by 15 December 2017. It was confirmed that Unit 24's approach to this exercise was 'deliberately developmental' in order to instil a sense of collective responsibility, and autonomy for REF, amongst the team. This exercise will involve the following:
  - a) Select up to six publications in the REF Module on Symplectic (from a choice of: journal articles, reports, books, book chapters, patents)
  - b) Order the list with 1 being your best output
  - c) Assess each selected output for originality, significance and rigor and include a justification for each rating in the text box provided (using the output assessment template provided).
  - d) Taking the overall assessment of originality, significance and rigor into account, provide an overall classification for each selected output.
19. It was confirmed a notification will be sent to colleagues who have been approved to supervise PGR students through the Research Degree Sub-Committee (RDSC) (91 in total). Communication to RDSC approved colleagues will be sent on Monday 23 October, with a deadline of Friday 8 December for submission through Symplectic. For multiple author publications, colleagues will be asked to agree on who will assign the output to their selection.
20. The group discussed the importance of communicating to all academic colleagues in the School to make staff aware of the REF self-assessment and how it is being approached. It was agreed a School-wide email would be circulated on Monday 23 October. In reference to star rating, it was suggested that star rating statistics from REF 2014 be included to guide colleagues on appropriate star ratings. It was agreed this would be added to the notification email to be sent to colleagues asked to self-assess.
21. It was confirmed that the REF 'review period' can include outputs from 1 January 2014 – December 2020.

### **Article processing charges**

22. It was confirmed a small fund can be generated for APC or page charges, if colleagues wish to request this please requests should be made to the Director of Research explaining why it is imperative to pay to publish in that specific journal.

### **Gender Research Conference**

23. It was confirmed there will be a Gender Research Conference taking place on 6 March 2018, the initial flyer for the event will be circulated in due course.

## **Report from the Carnegie School of Sport School Academic Committee**

### **Introduction**

1. This report presents the summary of proceedings from the meeting of the School Research and Enterprise Steering Group, which took place on the 15 November 2017 and the Carnegie School of Sport School Academic Committee held on 14 December 2017.

### **The School Research and Enterprise Steering Group**

2. The School Academic Committee received the notes of the Research and Enterprise Steering Group meeting, which took place on the 15 November 2017, for information. Summary of key points discussed at the steering group are noted below.

### **Professional Doctorate**

3. The development of a Professional Doctorate in the Carnegie School of Sport was discussed. In order to progress this award a working group has been established to take forward the Professional Doctorate within the School. The working group will be led by Dr Kevin Till.

### **Impact Co-ordinator Service Role**

4. As part of a continued investment in delivering impact, the School has appointed an Impact Co-ordinator – Dr Leanne Norman. Engaging directly with academic researchers on a regular basis, the Impact Co-ordinator will work across the research areas in order to create an enabling environment for impact activities to take place, and be recorded. A priority of the role will be to support the development of strong and evidenced case studies to demonstrate the impact of our research in our REF 2021 submission and with other key research funders.
5. Working closely with the Director of Research, Research Steering Group, the Research Administrative Team and the University Impact Officers, the Co-ordinator will drive the research impact agenda within and across the School and its Research Centres. The appointment of an impact coordinator provides the School with the opportunity to foster an environment where impact is at the heart of what we do, and it will enable the School to put practical mechanisms in place to enable and embed a culture of impact generation within the School and support our research strategy.

### **PhD Studentship Recruitment – February 2018**

6. The Carnegie School of Sport, in collaboration with various external funders, will be appointing to four PhD studentships to start in February 2018. Each studentship has been funded in part by QR or HEIF funding, and matched by external partners. The studentship appointments include:
  - a) **Carnegie School of Sport in collaboration with the Rugby Football Union**  
The research will explore the physical preparation of athletes for intensified periods of competition.

**b) Carnegie School of Sport in collaboration with Catapult Sports and the Rugby Football League**

The research will explore A Comprehensive Evaluation of Super League Match Demands.

**c) Carnegie School of Sport in collaboration with the English Institute of Sport and the British Triathlon Federation**

The research will explore Acclimation interventions for Olympic competitions in hot and humid environments.

**d) Carnegie School of Sport in collaboration with the England and Wales Cricket Board**

The research aims to develop a greater understanding of the key decision-making characteristics and practice histories of expert umpires in cricket; with a particular focus upon the factors that influence umpires' capability to make correct decisions under common match stressors.

### **Thinking through the REF**

7. On 24 October 2017, colleagues in the Carnegie School of Sport and the School of Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management, were contacted following instructions from the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) to conduct a REF Review.
8. It was reported for this exercise, academic staff who were on a 0.2 contract or above who have Research Degree Sub-Committee Approved Research Award Supervisor Status were contacted; a total of 98 staff were contacted across the two Schools.
9. The review, to be submitted by 5 January, was the start of a co-ordinated, preliminary process of output self-assessment (for selected outputs published since 1 January 2014). As highlighted in the '*REF 2021: What we know*', the weighting of outputs continues to be high (60% of overall profile score). Therefore, staff were asked for support and engagement to take stock of outputs. In short, staff were asked to critically appraise the quality of their current outputs (up to six), according to the REF quality criteria.
10. It was reported staff were contacted with instructions in order to complete the exercise via the REF Assessment Module. Support from both the Carnegie School of Sport Research Office and the Research Services Advisor - Libraries and Learning Innovation was available. Additional support for staff was provided through their Research and Enterprise Leads, Research Centres and staff were encouraged to discuss their submissions with their immediate research colleagues.
11. It was noted the feedback process was being finalised with research leaders across the Carnegie School of Sport and the School of Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management. Following the REF publications with self-assessed scores submitted the following was noted:-
  - a) Quantitative analysis of number of papers and scores submitted;
  - b) Subject leads to convene meetings to discuss School return in general, and the return submitted by their group specifically;
  - c) Research and Enterprise Subject Leads and group members to select papers of various grades submitted by them for discussion to explore how individuals made their

assessments of each paper. For example, staff who submitted papers self-assessed as 2\* or 3\* can be invited to discuss how they differentiated between the two papers and what criteria informed their decision.

12. Following these meetings staff will be invited to reflect on how they came to assess their own papers as they did, and if they feel it necessary to adjust the scores they gave to a paper.

## **School Academic Committee**

### **Research Excellence Framework**

It was noted a report outlining the approach would be discussed at the Research Institute day on the 18 December 2017. It was reported not all staff would be submitted through the Research Excellence Framework exercise but staff with a reasonable responsibility for research i.e. outputs, supervisory roles would be expected to submit and an average of 2.5 outputs was required.

## Schedule of meetings and business 2017/18

---

### *Executive Summary*

The report presents the Committee's schedule of meetings and business for 2017/18.

### *Action Requested*

The report is **for information.** The Committee is invited to note its schedule of meetings and business for 2017/18.

### *Appendices*

None.

### *Author*

*Name:* Stuart Morris  
*Job title:* Senior Governance Coordinator  
*Date:* 09 January 2018

### *Approval Route*

n/a n/a

## Research & Enterprise Committee schedule of meetings & business 2017/18

19 October 2017 Deadline – 04 October 2017	18 January 2018 Deadline – 03 January 2018	22 March 2018 Deadline – 07 March 2018	14 June 2018 Deadline – 30 May 2018
Membership & terms of reference	Overview of Joint Examiners' reports 2016/17	Allocation of central investment funding	REF Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal agreement of Units of Assessment*</li> <li>• Code of Practice for selection of staff*</li> </ul>
Outcome of the Research Excellence Framework Consultation	REF Audit	REF update	Progression & Completion data update*
Research & Enterprise Strategy Update 2016/17	Annual Research & Enterprise Strategy Update 2016/17		
University Research & Enterprise Forum	Viva Outcomes – data over 3 years		
Annual Director's Report from Research & Enterprise Services	Formal plan for Student Scholarships		
Operation of Research Ethics in Schools	Research Ethics Procedures		
<b>Standing items</b>			
Declarations of interest	Reports from committees (Research Ethics Sub-Committee / Research Degrees Sub-Committee / School Academic Committees)		
Minutes of the last meeting	Report from the directors of research meeting		
Matters arising	Schedule of business		
Report from the Director of Research & Enterprise			

\*For consideration by Academic Board