

# UNIVERSITY OF YORK

## Senate

### RESEARCH COMMITTEE

#### Matters for note by Senate arising from the meeting of Research Committee on 23 January 2024

##### 1. University Research Strategy: Key Performance Indicators

The Committee considered an oral report on the Key Performance Indicators. It was reported for context that a Council-level review of KPIs was underway, and it was expected that two Council KPIs would be aligned to research, drawn from a shortlist of five.

The Committee endorsed the proposed KPIs for further consideration and discussion at the upcoming UEB ThinkTank session on the topic, and made a number of recommendations which would be considered in more depth as appropriate.

##### 2. Research Culture Action Plan

The Committee endorsed the Research Culture Action Plan (RCAP).

The Committee observed that further clarity on timescales would be beneficial, particularly whether actions were intended for completion before or after the upcoming REF. It was recognised that a number of actions required the involvement of other teams across the institution and as such specificity was sometimes difficult, however the timeframes would be updated as the RCAP was worked on. Further, more detail was requested as to how such actions would be tackled and how success might be assessed. The Research Culture Working Group would review the document in six months to make any required amendments.

##### 3. Results of the Postgraduate Researcher Experience Survey (PRES)

The Committee **received** an oral report on the Results of the PRES. The report, which was presented for information, outlined the PRES results and highlighted action areas. A report on departmental reflections on the results would be presented at an upcoming meeting of the Committee.

It was observed that the University could look to other institutions as exemplars, for instance in the case of support for conference attendance. There was great variation in how support for PGRs was provided across departments, CDTs and DTPs, and as such the most effective action from YGRS would be to develop a checklist outlining best practice.

##### 4. Research Entities Policy and Procedure

The Committee approved revisions to the Research Entities Policy and Procedure.

It was noted that the Research Entities Policy and Procedure would be reviewed again for the September meeting as previously stated. It was clarified that URC approval would only be required for Model 3 entities. All others would be approved at Faculty level, with lists received by URC annually for the purpose of accurate record-keeping.

The approval of Faculty lists of research entities would take place in alignment with the ARR process. Further information on the process for developing the lists within Faculties would come in time as part of the consideration of next steps. Webpages were under development and would be updated as appropriate.

##### 5. Code of Practice on Sustainability in Research

The Committee endorsed the draft Code of Practice on Sustainability in Research. Minor modifications had been made to the text of the Code of Practice following consideration at the June meeting of the Committee. This included clarifying the place of the Code of Practice in relation to other research policies.

Following approval, a range of communication activities were planned. Guidance materials were also in development and conversation would take place with the Research Culture Working Group and the Director of RIKE (in relation to

pre-award impact assessments). An annual review process was planned. The communications plan would likely not be finalised before the launch of the Code, however the team was keen to publicise the Code as soon as practicable and follow up with guidance as appropriate. The Committee noted that an executive summary would be helpful for communicating the key aspects of the Code, alongside an informational graphic.

## **6. Other Business**

- a. The Committee considered an update on the REF, and discussed the potential implications of changes to the process. It was noted that a level of 'game-playing' was expected from other institutions to optimise their REF returns, and that it was vital that York developed an effective Code of Practice which outlined clearly how selections were made.
- b. Approval would be sought via written resolution for amendments to the Terms of Reference to include representation from the PGR and ECR communities.
- c. The implementation of the E2E continued across the Faculties, with the pre- and post-award support teams becoming more embedded within the institution.
- d. The Research Entities Policy and Procedure had prompted discussion within the Faculty of Social Sciences regarding the role of and expectations for entities. A framework for minimum expectations was currently under development. Within the Sciences, the process of implementing the Research Entities Policy and Procedure had resulted in a revised list of research entities which are currently active within the Faculty. Further information was requested as to the interaction between entities and the ARR process.

**PROFESSOR SARAH THOMPSON**  
**16/04/24**

**MS ZOE DEACY-CLARKE**