

School of Mathematical Sciences
Research Committee
Notes and Actions from Meeting held on 27 November 2018

Present: Christian Beck (CB), Ginestra Bianconi (GB), Reto Buzano (RB), Matt Fayers (MF), Sasha Gnedin (SG), Bill Jackson (BJ), Mark Jerrum (MJ) (Chair) (DoR), Boris Khoruzhenko (BK), Rodrigo Panosso Macedo (RPM), Abhishek Saha (AS) (DDoR), Juan Valiente-Kroon (JVK).

Apologies: John Moriarty (JM), Jo Young (JY).

Secretary: Elisa Piccaro (EP) (RM).

Minute	Summary of Agreed Actions	Who	When	Progress
27.11.18 – 2i	Discuss multiple affiliations at the next RC meeting.	RM	This will be added to the agenda	
27.11.18 – 2ii	JM to decide if this is feasible and coordinate the work.	JM	Next RC	
27.11.18 – 3i	Look at the draft REF guidance and find information about supplementary material. Can supplementary material be submitted to the REF?	Chair/ RM	Next RC	
27.11.18 – 3ii	Academics to be reminded that the REF scores are not and should not be taken into account in promotions.	BK	March 2019	
27.11.18 – 3iii	HoGs to remind academics that the REF scores are not and should not be taken into account in promotions during their appraisals.	HoGs	Next appraisal	
27.11.18 – 5	The Chair to liaise with the Library and Faculty to understand when the allocation is made every year and how it is possible that it has already been spent.	Chair	Next RC	
27.11.18 – 6	RM to liaise with Megan Liddle about the application form for sabbatical leave and whether there is reference to teaching and administration duties.	RM	Next RC	

Agenda Item	Reports and Actions	Who	When
1. Minutes of the meeting held on 07 October 2018	<p>REPORTED: The minutes from the meeting held on 09 October 2018 were approved.</p>		
2. Matters Arising	<p>REPORTED: Action 09.10.18 – 2i – This was an attempt to describe academics’ work on the webpages in layman’s terms. Some work on this was started by JY in 2015 and the relevant information has been passed to Emily Pickett to take it forward.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 2ii – Done. Action 09.10.18 – 3 – Done. Action 09.10.18 – 4 – Done.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 5i – A fee banding has been introduced and this is set at £400/ £100/ £0 per month with fee waivers needing faculty approval. If the external sponsors are willing to pay the fee the School should charge £100 per month (the fee of £400 per month is intended for School with lab facilities).</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 5ii - Fees will be waived for Erasmus students.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 6 – Multiple affiliations The ATI asks fellows to acknowledge the ATI in their outputs and does not require an affiliation to be added. SMS does not have a policy on this. Although this is not relevant for REF 2021 it will be relevant in the next REF, therefore the need to have a School policy. What seems reasonable is that the academic adds the current institution as their affiliation. If the academic arrives at QM and publishes a paper about work that was done at the previous institution, then it seems fair that the affiliation can be the previous institution. However, the Committee acknowledges that there may be so many different scenarios that may fall outside this simple rule. For instance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What if the academic is paid 100% by the ATI? - What should be a good percentage of buyout to allow academics to add a second affiliation to the QM one? <p>The Committee will discuss this in the next year, and in the interim it was agreed that no double affiliation should be added without discussing this with the School. Academics on unpaid leave should be able to add the affiliation of the institution that are covering their salary. There will be more complicated scenarios that will have to be looked at case by case. In the meantime talk to DoR. This will be discussed in more details at the next RC meeting.</p>		

27.11.18 – 2i	<p>ACTION: Discuss multiple affiliations at the next RC meeting.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 8i and 8ii – The Chair reported that Leeds have now removed their impact case studies previously advertised on their webpage. Our general opinion is that it would be ok to advertise ICS, even current ones.</p>	RM	This will be added to the agenda
27.11.18 – 2ii	<p>ACTION: JM to decide if this is feasible and coordinate the work.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 10 – QMUL Code of Practice. No feedback received but the Chair has sent a response to the consultation.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 11i – The Chair had a brief meeting with Simon Rawstron to see what is possible. It seems as if it is feasible to allocate a research day without tutorials if there is no request for a particular day. The introduction of a seminar day seems also feasible for tutorials. For lectures this task seems to become more difficult as it would introduce too many constrains. This is still under discussion and the work is coordinated in conjunction with Mark Walters.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 11ii – A reminder has been sent out by the HoS.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 12i – Done.</p> <p>Action 09.10.18 – 12ii – One of the research themes will be the multiple affiliations.</p>	JM	Next RC
3. REF Dry Run	<p>REPORTED: The academics have been asked to submit their outputs by Friday 30 November 2018. The Chair clarified that the so called ‘agreed scores’ are actually better described as ‘moderated scores’.</p> <p>DISCUSSED: Some HoGs think that it is hard to score papers and decide which ones to submit because there are no objective parameters to base a decision on. The Chair and BK commented how it is not possible to give definitions and objective indicators. The exercise is handled by the Faculty and the real submission to the REF by QMUL centrally, with difficulties in many cases to find external reviewers. Furthermore, the ranking of the journal is not always a good indicator. The Chair added that if the academics think that a newly accepted/published paper (since the last dry run submission) may score better than some of the previously assessed then they should submit them. BK explained that the School will submit to UoA 10, therefore the REF</p>		

<p>27.11.18 – 3i</p>	<p>definitions should be applied to the original mathematical content.</p> <p>GB pointed out that PRL papers do not have mathematics in the paper but only in the supplementary material. In those papers the mathematics is hidden because they are meant to describe the results.</p> <p>ACTION: Look at the draft REF guidance and find information about supplementary material. Can supplementary material be submitted to the REF?</p> <p>CB added that there is a psychological impact to the academics when they are told that their papers are judged to be a 2*.</p> <p>BK clarified that the REF does not play a role in promotions. Also, the School's judgement in the REF dry run is realistic. For instance in the last REF we had a good match (on average) with the internal scores over the years. When moderating the scores, BK and the Chair have found that the individual scores and the HoGs scores are too high.</p> <p>The Committee agree that academics in the School should be reminded that the REF scores are not and should not be taken into account in promotions, and that they should accept these from a School strategy's point of view.</p>	<p>Chair/ RM</p>	<p>Next RC</p>
<p>27.11.18 – 3ii</p>	<p>ACTION: Academics to be reminded that the REF scores are not and should not be taken into account in promotions.</p>	<p>BK</p>	<p>March 2019</p>
<p>27.11.18 – 3iii</p>	<p>ACTION: HoGs to remind academics that the REF scores are not and should not be taken into account in promotions during their appraisals.</p>	<p>HoGs</p>	<p>Next appraisal</p>
<p>4. Impact Acceleration Account</p>	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>The Chair reminded the Committee about a QMUL call for three funds devoted to accelerate impact. Academics interested in these should submit and EoI by 3 December 2018. The funds is for current impact case studies and also for future ones. The funding is from EPSRC, STFC, and some High Education Innovation Fund.</p>		
<p>5. Article processing charges</p>	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>The Chair reported that, although this happens less frequently, some publishers still charge the processing charges and some academics are chased by the publisher for failing to pay these charges.</p> <p>There will be a problem of funds. The library only pays (when possible) for OA fees). PIs with Research Enabling Fund can use this allocation to pay. However, there are academics with no grants that may face a problem.</p>		

<p>27.11.18 – 5</p>	<p>The School can pay only if there will be savings elsewhere and it is not clear where the saving can come from.</p> <p>The Chair added that we still do not know whether we can spend some of our annual library allocation for more journal subscriptions.</p> <p>DISCUSSED:</p> <p>Given the recent update from the library about the OA fees allocation been already spent in full, the Committee would like to know how this is possible given that the financial year has only started in August. CB commented that a possible cause could be due to the fact that the OA fees have increased dramatically with Nature communication charging over \$6000.</p> <p>ACTION: The Chair to liaise with the Library and Faculty to understand when the allocation is made every year and how it is possible that it has already been spent.</p>	<p>Chair</p>	<p>Next RC</p>
<p>6. Sabbaticals</p> <p>27.11.18 – 6</p>	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>The Chair explained that the College may introduce demand management on how many academics are allowed to go on sabbatical every year. Therefore the School should be clear about the rules for approving such requests. Should these be a reward for excellent past performance or should be an incentive for producing more quality research? Attracting external funding should be giving you more chances to have a sabbatical leave approved or not? The School management needs to know what the RC's view is on this.</p> <p>The School does not know how many sabbaticals can be allocated per year going forward. But this estimate should be known soon.</p> <p>DISCUSSED:</p> <p>MF thinks that the academic's track record should be taking into account, but not only based on research but teaching and administrative duties too.</p> <p>BJ and CB commented that writing a grant proposal during your sabbatical should be a condition for obtaining a sabbatical leave, but not the only one. Also, the track record should be rewarded for academics who have been in the School longer, but not for academics in their initial stage of their career.</p> <p>BK added that the application form for sabbatical may not include reference to teaching and admin but we will check and report to the Committee.</p> <p>ACTION: RM to liaise with Megan Liddle about the application form for sabbatical leave and whether there is reference to teaching and</p>	<p>RM</p>	<p>Next RC</p>

	<p>administration duties.</p> <p>The Committee asked again if it would be possible to agree on a list of aspirational journals.</p> <p>BK has a list that covers mathematics but not physics nor statistics. We should soon try to converge to a final one.</p> <p>BK added that one possibility is to offer 6 months sabbaticals.</p>		
7. REF Impact	Not discussed as JM could not attend the RC meeting.		
8. Any other business	None		
9. Date of next meeting	The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 26 February 2019.		