

Research Committee

Notes from the Meeting held on 28th June 2016

Present: Mark Jerrum (Chair), David Arrowsmith, Christian Beck, Michael Farber, Alexander Gnedin, Bill Jackson, Christopher Joyner, Boris Khoruzhenko, Vito Latora, Malwina Luczak, John Moriarty (via Skype), Jo Young

Apologies: Joaquín Miguez, Cho-Ho Chu

Secretary: Reiko Vermeulen

Minute	Summary of Agreed Actions	Who	When	Progress
28.06.16-3b	Chair and Research Manager to finalise aspirational journals lists for each Research Group	Chair and Research Manager	End of August	
28.06.16-3d	Chair to categorise the School's best publications into below-3*, 3* and 4* quality categories, taking advice from HoGs, and ask individuals to provide justifications for publications they consider 4*	Chair	End of August	
28.06.16-3e	Research Manager to draft an agreement regarding Open Access for all relevant academics to sign, circulate and collect the signed forms.	Research Manager	ASAP	
28.06.16-4c	HoGs to ensure that staff adhere to the new requirement on Open Access and to test the Open Access repository system	HoGs	Ongoing	
28.06.16-6	HoGs to prepare a one page proposal on School's recruitment strategy.	HoGs	11 th July 2016 (Next HOSAG meeting)	

Agenda Item	Reports, Discussions and Actions	Who	When
1. Minutes	Minutes of the meeting held on 29 th February 2016 were reviewed. All actions were completed except for the one related to Aspirational journals. This led to discussion under item 3.		
2. Matters Arising	No matter was raised.		

<p>3. Research Outputs: Aspirational journals list and REF selection</p>	<p>REPORTED, DISCUSSED and AGREED:</p> <p>a) It was discussed whether it was possible to have a list of aspirational journals, containing only truly 4* journals. The efforts so far seem to only produce lists of 3* and 4* and such lists should not then be called ‘aspirational’. These include, in chronological order, (i) lists produced by HoGs; (ii) Australian Research Council’s Journal Ranking, which we used for REF 2014; (iii) a list based on what top 10 REF (2014) performing Maths departments returned to REF; (iv) lists based on top 10 leaders in each research area, named by each research group, produced and returned to REF 2014.</p> <p>b) The difficulty was acknowledged but it was agreed that it would still be useful to have a list of 4* journals for each research group, and it was fine for the lists to be of different lengths.</p> <p>c) These lists are to be truly ‘aspirational’, i.e., ones where you should try to publish in, but how difficult it is to have your papers accepted is widely accepted.</p> <p>d) At the REF status meeting for the School in April, which was chaired by Bill Spence, we were asked to review publications and categorise staff based on their outputs so far – to see how many 3* and 4* publications are being produced by the School’s academics.</p> <p>e) It would also be useful to know in general how suitable and on track individual academics are for submission to the next REF.</p> <p>f) It was reported that there will be an external review of outputs for the purpose of assessing our readiness for the next REF. It was agreed that it would be a good idea to have an external reviewer for each research group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACTION-3b: Chair and Research Manager will apply other matrixes, such as Google H-index and impactors to the latest existing list of aspirational journals (list (iv) above), consult HoGs and finalise a list for each group. - ACTION-3d: Chair will categorise the best publications, which we compiled for the REF status meeting in April, into below 3*, 3* and 4* quality categories. In doing so, taking advice from HoGs, and ask individuals who consider some of their publications to be 4* to justify why these publications should be considered 4*. - ACTION-3e: HoGs to report to BK and Chair on the suitability of their group members for the next REF 	<p>Chair and Research Manager</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>HoGs</p>	<p>End of August</p> <p>End of August</p> <p>End of August</p>
<p>4. Open Access: monitoring Open Access compliance</p>	<p>REPORTED and DISCUSSED:</p> <p>a) It was reported that upon checking compliance so far, most accepted papers seem to have been deposited in Elements and are compliant with the policy, although some technical issues were noted.</p> <p>b) Repository and Research Information Team check that the bibliographic record has been created properly and an accepted manuscript has been correctly deposited (or a correct doi or URL link has been provided). This process can take 2-4 weeks.</p> <p>c) It was agreed that it is essential to inform all academics of their responsibility in making sure that their papers comply with the policy, and to put a process of monitoring compliance in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACTION-4-c: Research Manager to draft an agreement form for all relevant academics in the School to sign, stating that they are 	<p>Research Manager</p>	<p>ASAP</p>

	aware that it is their responsibility to comply with HEFCE's Open Access Policy, circulate the form and collect the signed forms.		
5. School policy on sharing grant applications	REPORTED, DISCUSSED and AGREED: a) Research Manager reported that there was some uncertainty about the School's policy on sharing successful grant applications, especially among the newer joiners. b) It was agreed that the School's policy still is to share successful grant application (but not letters of support from partners), and there is no need to obtain permission from the PI, unless the PI expressly indicates otherwise.		
6. Research-related items from HOSAG away day	DISCUSSED: a) Following on from discussion at the HOSAG away day, which was a day before this Research Committee meeting, the need to converge on an appointment strategy was highlighted. b) There are currently 13 vacancies, and it is essential that we agree on what we are trying to achieve with each appointment. c) It was agreed that we should move immediately to recruit a Lecturer in Numerical Relativity. d) A few options for consideration were raised: (i) to establish a new group, which is not too distant from our current areas of expertise; (ii) to grow the existing research groups; and (iii) to develop a proposal for a programme grant. e) It was agreed that we should recruit T&R staff, not T&S staff. f) A lecturer in Operational Research was generally seen as a good idea. g) A suggestion was made about using head hunters h) It was agreed that this issue should be discussed further at the next HOSAG meeting.		
	- ACTION-6: HoGs to prepare a one page proposal on how they would like to expand their areas, also noting the benefit of such expansion to the School, and any other suggestions.	HoGs	By the next HOSAG meeting
7. Any other business	DISCUSSED and AGREED: A question was raised as to whether the School should pay for publication fees for academics to publish their papers in certain journals that require such fees (note, this is not Open Access fees). It was agreed that the School will cover publication fees for papers to be published in <i>Nature Communications</i> , <i>Nature</i> , <i>PNAS</i> and <i>Nature Physics</i> .		
8. Date of next meeting	REPORTED: That the next meeting of Research Committee will be held at 13:00 – 15:00 on Monday 21 st November 2016.		