

## Research Committee

### Notes from the Meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016

*Present: Yan Fyodorov (Chair), Christian Beck, Michael Farber, Alexander Gnedin, Bill Jackson, Joaquín Miguez, Boris Khoruzhenko, Vito Latora, Cho-Ho Chu, Jo Young, Christopher Joyner*

*Apologies:*

*Secretary: Reiko Vermeulen*

Minute	Summary of Agreed Actions	Who	When	Progress
29.02.16-3	HoGs to provide a list of 4-6 best publications for each eligible member in their groups, and to provide justification for inclusion of any publications in journals that are not A*.	HoGs	Within 2 weeks	
29.02.16-3	Research Manager to circulate Australian Research Council's Journal Ranking and the REF definitions of quality.	Research Manager	ASAP	
29.02.16-3	Chair and Research Manager to collate information on impact cases and environment for the next REF review.	Chair and Research Manager	Beginning of April	
29.02.16-4	HoGS to ensure that staff adhere to the new requirement on Open Access and to test the Open Access repository system	HoGs	Ongoing	
29.02.16-4	Research Manager to invite the Library & Archives team to the next School Meeting	Research Manager	ASAP	
29.02.16-5	HoGS to inform staff about the existence of the impact information sheet and to co-operate with Impact Champion and Research Manager with regard to impact discussions.	HoGs	Ongoing	
29.02.16-6	Chair and Research Manager to continue analysing the data using various metrics to produce a list of aspirational journals.	Chair and Research Manager	Ongoing	
29.02.16-7	HoGS to advise on staff intending to submit grant applications to inform Research Manager.	HoGs	Ongoing	

Agenda Item	Reports, Discussions and Actions	Who	When
1. Minutes	Minutes of the meeting held on 23 <sup>rd</sup> November 2015 were approved.		
2. Matters Arising	Christopher Joyner was welcomed as the new representative for postdoctoral researchers. No other matters arising were raised.		

<p>3. REF Review 2016: School Response</p>	<p><b>REPORTED and DISCUSSED</b></p> <p>a) We now have a detailed guidance notes on REF preparation stages within College, which was circulated with the agenda.</p> <p>b) We receive over £1m of income from REF – none from 2* publications, little from 3* publications.</p> <p>c) The next REF review meeting is in April 2016. For this, we must prepare information on research outputs, potential impact cases, underpinning research for impact, and environment.</p> <p>d) For research outputs, we must provide for each eligible researcher in the School a list of 4-6 of their best publications since 1 January 2014 to date. We discussed and agreed that ‘best publications’ are those published in journals ranked A* in the Australian Research Council’s Journal Ranking, or at least of REF 3* quality, if not an explanation must be given as to why the publication should still be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> HoGs to provide a list of 4-6 best publications for each eligible member in their groups, and to provide justification for inclusion of any journals that are not A*.</li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> Research Manager to circulate the list of Australian Mathematical Society’s Journal Ranking and the definitions of quality used for REF 2014.</li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> Chair and Research Manager to collate information on impact cases and environment.</li> </ul>	<p>HoGs</p> <p>Research Manager</p> <p>Chair and Research Manager</p>	<p>Within 2 weeks</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p>Beginning of April</p>
<p>4. Publications for REF 2021, Open Access Requirement &amp; Collecting Evidence</p>	<p><b>REPORTED and DISCUSSED:</b></p> <p>a) Journal publications and conference papers published after 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016 are eligible for submission to REF <i>only if</i> a copy of the accepted version is deposited into Queen Mary’s Open Access repository, or disciplinary repository, such as arXiv, no later than three months after the date of acceptance.</p> <p>b) Library &amp; Archives team would like to come and offer a drop-in or training session. We discussed and agreed that the team should be invited to the next School meeting to provide initial information.</p> <p>c) We will see in due course if a separate drop-in or training session would be useful for our colleagues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> HoGS to ensure that staff adhere to the new requirement and to test the Open Access repository</li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> Research Manager to invite the Library &amp; Archives team to the next School Meeting</li> </ul>	<p>HoGs</p> <p>Research Manager</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>ASAP</p>
<p>5. What is REF Impact?</p>	<p><b>REPORTED:</b></p> <p>a) Research Manager met with a number of academics to gather information about impact cases potentially being generated by their research. It was felt that there is much uncertainty about what is impact and how to evidence it.</p> <p>b) Research Manager has therefore created a new brief information sheet highlighting the essential aspects of impact for REF including some examples of impact cases from REF 2014.</p> <p>c) The new Impact Champion, Joaquín Miguez, will be meeting with staff whose research has potential to generate impact.</p>		

	- <b>ACTION:</b> HoGs to inform staff about the existence of the impact information sheet to co-operate with Impact Champion and Research Manager with regard to impact discussions.	HoGs	Ongoing
6. Aspirational journals analysis	<p><b>REPORTED:</b></p> <p>a) Chair and Research Manager have continued the analysis of where we are publishing and where leading academics are publishing with the view to improving our REF outputs score.</p> <p>b) Questions were raised at the last meeting about the method of comparing how many occurrences each of the top 10 REF institutions had in each journal compared to our performance, as those institutions' areas of expertise may not be the same as ours, and it was impossible to distinguish what were aspirational and what were routine places of publication.</p> <p>c) Chair had therefore requested from Heads of Group for top 10 leading academics in the UK in their areas of expertise to see where they were publishing and which of their publications were submitted to REF.</p> <p>d) Research Manager has collected the relevant data and has circulated to the members.</p> <p>e) Chair shared his initial results of the analysis showing which journals the leading researchers seem to value, and therefore submitted to REF, rather than where they frequently published.</p> <p>f) Some members felt that the results were not representative of their research areas, queried the methodology and suggested analysing the data using a combination of metrics such as the ARC rankings, impact factor and citation counts.</p> <p>g) Nonetheless, it was agreed that a list of aspirational journals is useful and helpful particularly for our younger colleagues</p> <p>- <b>ACTION:</b> Chair and Research Manager to continue analysing the data using various metrics.</p>	Chair and Research Manager	Ongoing
7. Grant Pipeline	<p><b>REPORTED:</b></p> <p>Research Manager reminded HoGs to ensure staff inform her of any planned grant applications in order to keep the School's pipeline up to date and to be able to offer support in a timely manner.</p> <p>- <b>ACTION:</b> HoGs to remind staff intending to submit grant applications to inform Research Manager of the intention.</p>	HoGs	Ongoing
8. Any other business	No items were raised		
9. Date of next meeting	<p><b>REPORTED:</b></p> <p>That the next meeting of Research Committee will be held at 13:00 – 15:00 on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> June 2016.</p>		