

School of Mathematical Sciences
Research Committee
Notes and Actions from Meeting held on 13/06/2018

Present: Mark Jerrum (MJ) (Chair), Boris Khoruzhenko (BK), Ivan Tomasic (IT), Franco Vivaldi (FV), Reto Buzano (RB)

Apologies: Ginestra Bianconi (GB), John Moriarty (JM), Felix Fischer (FF), Rodrigo Macedo (RM), Pau Figueras (PF), Jo Young (JY), Sasha Sodin (SS)

Secretary: Elisa Piccaro (EP)

Minute	Summary of Agreed Actions	Who	When	Progress
27.02.18 – 3	Liaise with the library about journal subscriptions to try to subscribe to the missing journals.	Chair	Before the next research committee meeting	
13.06.18 - 1	Report any potential impact to CY.	ALL	July 31 2018	
13.06.18 – 2	Find ‘research for dummies’ narratives from JY	RM/CY	ASAP	
13.06.18 – 3	Create a template for all Research landing pages and cascading pages based on Statistics.	EP	Next meeting	
13.06.18 – 4	Any newsworthy stories/discoveries to be reported to EP	ALL	Ongoing	
13.06.18 – 5	MJ to report decision regarding web design and communication strategy to HoSAG.	Chair	Next HoSAG meeting	
13.06.18 – 6	Review optimal times for the School Colloquium with regard to teaching via Simon Rowstrom and preference via ‘doodle poll’			
13.06.18.- 7	MJ to review Research Committee membership and frequency with Hos and Elisa Piccaro upon her return.	Chair/RM	Next meeting	

Agenda Item	Reports and Actions	Who	When
1. Minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2018	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>The minutes from the meeting held on 27 February 2018 were approved.</p>		
2. Matters Arising	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>Action 27.02.18-1 The guidelines for the approved Near Miss Scheme have been added to the Maths Intranet Research Pages.</p> <p>Actions 27.02.18-2 Reviewers comments have been assessed by both MJ and CY. Scientific cases are generally unproblematic. Costings and budget are being questioned. CY has developed a standard response regarding overheads. Where budget, ambition of the project and impact are questioned the bids were unsuccessful, despite high scores. These seem to have become a deciding factor.</p> <p>Action 27.02.2018-3 Deferred.</p> <p>Action 27.02.18-4 To be discussed under agenda item 5</p>		
3. REF Dry Run Update	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>The Chair summarised the recent meeting with Faculty to discuss the results of the dry run. Generally the results of outputs were positive. Scores cannot yet be communicated as not all papers have been externally reviewed. This was due to a limited number of reviewers, not any decisions regarding quality of papers. Our Impact Case Studies are in need of further development.</p> <p>DISCUSSED:</p> <p>RB, FV & IT all raised concerns at the lack of review scores on all papers. MJ reassured that this was in hand and that faculty were sourcing more reviewers and that scores were delayed. MJ reiterated that the scores were good and that there was no concern regarding their quality. BK reiterated the importance of the Impact Case Study Score and explained that a slight change in output score does not affect our overall result, however a change in Impact score substantially affects rankings and so this should be foregrounded. Staff should concentrate on creating one 4* paper over lots of 3* papers, but Impact is prime.</p>		
4. Impact	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>CY led in JM's absence. Taking into account the feedback from the REF Dry Run the school and faculty have undertaken a review of all Impact Case Studies. CY reiterated the problem did not lay with the nature or quality of the impact of academic research, but rather in the communication of that impact in the submitted Impact Case Study templates. Those that were submitted to the Dry Run will be investigated further and rewritten by mid-August 2018. Those that were submitted to REF 2014 will be reassessed and followed up on. Impact Questionnaires are being revisited and potential impact explored. Nascent KE projects are also being explored as potential Impact Case Studies for REF 2021 or REF 2028. CY and JY are requesting additional resource and support from faculty to improve the communication of Impact. CY requested that all staff report anything that might be impact to her or MJ.</p>		

	<p>ACTION - 1: Report any potential impact to CY.</p>	<p>ALL</p>	<p>JULY 31 18</p>
<p>5. Communicating our research and impact</p>	<p>Emily Pickett (EP) joined the meeting in her capacity as Marketing and Communications Officer.</p> <p>DISCUSSED:</p> <p>MJ began the discussion by requesting thoughts on the current Research Pages on the QMUL Maths Website.</p> <p>FV responded that the pages were dull, outdated, have dead pictures, dead links, are uneven, need pictures in frames, needs communal lists and needs a restructure. The group broadly agreed with this description and the need for change. There was general discussion as to what should be changed, how it could be improved and what the problems were.</p> <p>The main consensus was that we did not have opportunities to ‘tell our stories’ and who what we do.</p> <p>BK asserted that there had been an exercise asking each academic to write a paragraph on their research ‘for dummies’ and suggested that we should find these and use as content.</p> <p>There was a general discussion regarding the use of Elements to generate information for biographical web pages including publications, teaching, impact activities.</p> <p>CY asserted that the purpose of Elements was to store this information and it was easy to draw this through to T4 without extra work for academic staff.</p> <p>RB expressed his concerns at this as it seemed to be additional work and would it function. This point will be discussed at a later date.</p> <p>There followed a general discussion regarding the audience for the webpages and it was generally agreed that the audience was broad – ranging from school children and parent to prospective students and professional peers. The need for good, clear research pages is key to this and should cascade with increasing detail from research landing pages to research area pages, to project pages to biographical pages.</p> <p>FV suggested that all seminars should be included in an ‘events page’ and upcoming events be flagged up on Research Group landing pages.</p> <p>There was a general consensus that we need more pictures.</p> <p>RB suggested that the Statistics page was a good template and that we should follow the format with additional functionality. This was broadly agreed.</p> <p>IT & FV & RB suggested that biographical thumbnails on the ‘people’ page should include a symbol/link to the relevant Research Group. This was agreed.</p> <p>FV suggested that news stories should be shown on the Maths homepage and should be recent.</p> <p>A discussion ensued as to how best academics can communicate ‘news’ to the PR & Comms team to have them added to the website.</p> <p>RB suggested that academic staff may not feel comfortable approaching PR and Comms. It was suggested that HoGs could act as a conduit, and that any findings explored in the Colloquium series be a trigger to invite PR & Comms to investigate.</p> <p>MJ asserted that he had already alerted EP to a potential news story.</p> <p>It was decided that any potential news items, be communicated to EP in the first instance by whichever route the academic felt most comfortable.</p>		

	<p>EP reported that an internal newsletter is being discussed and may create a starting point for wider news stories on the website.</p> <p>EP suggested that Leeds had a very good format and this was largely agreed. MJ pointed out that the functionality was not great. It was agreed that we wanted something that looks as good as Leeds but with better functionality, although this would only be achievable within the limits of T4.</p> <p>BK queried whether the discussion should be taken to HoSAG for further discussion. It was decided that as the group were happy with the decision to use Statistics as a template and allow EP to present version for review, further discussion was not necessary at this point. Instead the decisions should reported to HoSAG for information only.</p> <p>Emily Pickett left the meeting.</p> <p>ACTION – 2: Find ‘research for dummies’ narratives from JY.</p> <p>ACTION – 3: Create a template for all Research landing pages and cascading pages based on Statistics.</p> <p>ACTION – 4: Any newsworthy stories/discoveries to be reported to EP</p> <p>ACTION – 5: MJ to report decision regarding web design and communication strategy to HoSAG.</p>	<p>RM</p> <p>EP</p> <p>All</p> <p>Chair</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>Next meeting</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Next HoSAG</p>
<p>6. Seminar Series</p>	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>The Chair explained that it had been the intention to present the Athena SWAN analysis of the Seminar series as per an exercise carried out by the Executive Officer. Unfortunately not all data had been submitted and so there was no report.</p> <p>DISCUSSED:</p> <p>RB suggested that the Colloquium Series was an excellent opportunity to share research and should be a focus of activity. He raised concerns, however, as to the timing of the seminar: Mondays may not be ideal and 4:30-5:30 may be problematic for childcare considerations.</p> <p>BK asserted that Athena SWAN would suggest core hours of 10 – 4 would be optimum.</p> <p>IT suggested that a better venue may be an option.</p> <p>It was generally agreed that the series was important and that opportunities for attendance by as large a group of staff as possible were optimised.</p> <p>CY suggested Wednesday afternoons as teaching is limited. MJ suggested that committees may be a problem there. Some bookings have already been made for Semester 1 2018/19</p> <p>It was decided to review the Colloquium ready for Semester 2 2018/19 taking into account all concerns.</p>		

	ACTION – 6: Review optimal times for the School Colloquium with regard to teaching via Simon Rowstrom and preference via ‘doodle poll’		
7. RC Under proposed governance structure	<p>REPORTED:</p> <p>The Chair reported that a change had been proposed to the school committee structure in line with a recent consultation. It has been suggested that HoSAG be disbanded. This would mean that HoG meetings and Research Group meetings would report into the Research Committee, which would in turn report to the Senior Management Team Meeting as outlined in document RevisedGovernanceStructure. The Chair suggested that this change would require a change in frequency and membership of the Research Committee.</p> <p>DISCUSSED:</p> <p>MJ suggest that HoGs should make up the core of the committee as they would report from the Research Group Meetings. RB suggested that ECR staff often brought a different perspective to the group and would ideally remain involved. This was generally agreed. MJ suggested that the group should contain the DoR, RM, HoGs, some ECRs and a PDRA representative. This was agreed.</p> <p>ACTION – 7: MJ to review Research Committee membership and frequency with Hos and Elisa Piccaro upon her return.</p>	Chair & RM	Before the next meeting
8. Date of next meeting and AOB	<p>The date of the next meeting will be confirmed with Elisa Piccaro upon her return.</p> <p>There was no additional business.</p>		