UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Tuesday 11th February 2014 at 2.15 pm
in CM2.08 Claus Moser Building

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES AND ABSENCES
Simone Clarke and Jen Paddison to attend for discussion item 3.

2. MINUTES
To approve the attached minutes of the meeting held on 10th September 2013.

3. DISCUSSION ITEM: ‘Keele beyond 2015: Research’
A number of papers are attached to help frame the discussion. It is proposed the discussion is broken down into the following:

- Impact
- Research Time
- Organisation of Research and funding
- Research planning and performance monitoring
- Research metrics (REF, grant income, PGR)
- Partnerships

Attached papers to inform the discussion:

- Positioning paper from the Vice-Chancellor on ‘Keele Beyond 2015’
- ‘Feasibility of the Strategic Overview for Keele Beyond 2015: Research’
- ‘Research: Key Principles and Proposals’
- Humanities and Social Sciences post-REF review workshop – paper from Professor Ann Hughes
- Research metrics report on grant income, research contribution, grant applications and awards, and PGR students

4. Research Excellence Framework (REF)

4.1 Summary of REF submission
To consider the attached paper summarising Keele’s REF 2014 submission.

4.2 Equality and Diversity Analysis
To receive the attached Equality and Diversity Analysis on Keele’s REF 2014 submission
5. **European Funding and Horizon 2020**  
To receive an oral update from the Chair on European funding matters

6. **Open Access strategy**  
To consider the attached paper and proposals for Open Access (Paul Reynolds to attend for this item) (paper to follow)

7. **HEFCE TRAC Return 2012/13**  
To receive the attached paper summarising the University's 2012/13 TRAC Return

8. **Research grant awards and highlights**  
To receive the attached paper reporting recent research grant successes

9. **HESA HEBCIS Return 2012/13**  
To receive the attached paper, which provides a summary and contextual summary of Keele's 2012/13 HEBCIS submission.

10. **Knowledge Exchange strategic map**  
To consider the attached draft strategic map for Knowledge exchange from Dr Hooper

11. **Update from Head of Research & Enterprise Services**  
To receive the attached report detailing key support functions from Dr Hooper

### RESEARCH STUDENT MATTERS

12. **University Postgraduate Research Committee**  
To receive the attached minutes of the meeting held on 7th October 2013 and an oral update of the meeting held on 3rd February 2014

13. **Research Student Liaison Committee**  
To receive the attached minutes of the meeting held on 24th October 2013.

14. **SUB COMMITTEE REPORTS**

   a) **Research Ethics**  
   To receive the attached minutes of the meeting held on 9th October 2013.

   b) **Research Governance**  
   To receive the attached minutes of the meeting held on 14th October 2013.

15. **Any Other Business**

16. **Date of Next Meeting**  
The next meeting of the University Research Committee is scheduled for Tuesday 13th May at 2:15 pm in the University Committee Room, Room CM2.08, Claus Moser Building.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Held on Tuesday 10\textsuperscript{th} September 2013 at 2:15pm
in the University Committee Room, room CM2.08

1. APOLOGIES AND ABSENCES
For a record of attendance, apologies and absences, see attached list.

The Chair welcomed Mike Hessian, RI Manager for the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences to his first meeting of the Committee. It was also noted that this would be the final meeting of the Research Committee for Rama Thirunamachandran, Deputy Vice Chancellor and the Committee expressed their thanks to him for his support to the Research agenda during his time at Keele and his useful knowledge and insights into HEFCE policy.

2. MINUTES
The minutes of the meeting held on 14\textsuperscript{th} May 2013 were approved as a true record.

3. MATTERS ARISING
The Committee received the actions list from the meeting held on 14\textsuperscript{th} May 2013 and noted the following;

4.1 50.a. Matters Arising : 7.1 REF Strategy
The Committee noted that in order to support the REF submission, the Research Institutes have provided additional support where available and the Humanities and Social Sciences Institute have received additional support from Katherine Shepherd, EU Funding Officer and Kim Billington-Baddeley, Faculty Enterprise Manager, whilst they have been without an RI Manager.

4.2 51. Chair’s Report: Full Economic Cost (fEC) Diary Exercise
The Committee noted that the Chair would circulate to Deans the fEC underpinning data, to provide opportunity for analysis.

4.3 52.1 REF Submission Update: Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences
The Committee noted that as mentioned under item 3a above, support had been provided for the Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences and that the appointment of the RI Manager had now been made.

4.4 52.1 REF Submission Update: Institute for Environment, Physical Sciences and Applied Mathematics
The Committee noted that the Chair had circulated to Unit of Assessment leads, a document which detailed the central contribution to the REF 3a Impact Template part of the REF submissions. The Committee noted that this section of the submission was notably the most challenging for the Units of Assessment and the least advanced of the submissions.

4.5 52.4 Template REF Submission Notification Letter
The Committee were informed that subsequent to the Heads of School meeting, it was agreed that RI Directors would notify individuals of their inclusion in the submission. The Committee noted that a significant proportion of the letters had now been sent, with the rest expected to be sent within the next couple of weeks.

It was noted that with the departure of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, there would be a requirement for an alternate Chair of the Appeals panel to be appointed. The Committee suggested that it may be possible for the Dean to assume the role of Chair, as they will have been independent of the original decision, but also hold a suitable level of strategic understanding. The Committee agreed that a decision regarding who will Chair the appeals committees will be made and members will be informed of the reviewed process.

**ACTION: Chair**

4. **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK**

4.1 **Institutional Submission Update**

The Chair informed the Committee that at the last RAE Keele had scored a GPA of 2.41, which ranked Keele 56th in the national league tables. This REF submission was aiming for an improvement on these scores, the requirement for which was further strengthened by the reduction in 2* research funding over the REF period.

The profile of the submission will result in approximately 250-260fte being submitted, which was more than the predicted 205-225fte at the start of the 2012/13 academic year. This will result in a greater than 59% of the eligible population being submitted to the REF (in the RAE 2008 submission, 59% of eligible staff were returned). The Committee noted that this increase in fte being submitted was not as a result of the lowering of standards, but as a result of there being an increased quality in the Units of Assessments (by a number of new appointments, returning colleagues etc.) and a decrease in the total volume of academic staff over the REF period.

It was noted that the shape of the REF submission would be considerably different to the RAE submission, with an increased submission of 42% for Health, 26% Natural Sciences and a decrease by 60% for the Humanities and Social Sciences submission, with both Business and Politics being considerably smaller than the RAE 2008 submission.

The Committee noted that for an institution such as Keele, which considers itself to be research-led, a submission of c60% is appropriate, and this is particularly the case if it is considered that a large proportion of the remaining 40% are Nursing, Physiotherapy and Education academics, who are less likely to be research-active.

4.2 **Research Institute and Faculty Update**

**Primary Care and Health Sciences**

It was reported that the preparations for the Primary Care submissions were well underway, with the A2 (Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care) priorities focussing on ensuring that all pending publications will be eligible to be included in the submission and the finalising of the environment, case studies and impact templates.

The A3 (Allied Health Professions) submission contains a Primary Care component and final decisions on who will be included, which outputs and environment contributions are being resolved.

It was also reported that a small grouping of Primary Care staff are being considered under C22 (Social Work and Social Policy) and that the decisions on these individuals was still awaiting confirmation.

**Institute for Science and Technology in Medicine**

The RI Director reported that the institute had been working to achieve a balance across all three Units of Assessment that staff within the institute may be submitted to (A3, Allied Health...
Professions, A5, Biological Sciences and B15, General Engineering). 1st drafts of all documents have been completed for the 3 Units of Assessment and reported that access to the PGR awards and grant income data, to optimise the allocation of this, would now be beneficial at this stage.

It was reported that some external consultancy had been used for the development of the impact case studies and that also the case studies, for all Units of Assessment were being reviewed by ‘critical friends’ such as the members of Council and the College of Fellows. It was reported that these comments are being collated and would be fed back to the Unit leads, as appropriate.

**ACTION: Chair/Secretary**

Institute for Environment, Physical Sciences and Applied Mathematics

It was reported that EPSAM staff will be submitted across 7 Units of Assessment, (A3, Allied Health Professions, A5, Biological Sciences, B7, Earth Systems and Environment Sciences, B9, Physics, B10 Mathematical Sciences, B10, Computer Sciences and B15, General Engineering). It was reported that the A3, A5 and B15 submissions were taking good shape, with EPSAM members providing a supporting role to the development of the environment narratives and other supporting documentation.

The Physics submission still required some significant strategic decisions to be made in relation to the ‘cut-off’ for the quality threshold, but this was with regard to the other strong submissions expected within the sector. The Mathematics submission was reported to be in good shape, with significant progress made on the supporting documentation.

Computer Sciences is a new submission for Keele in the REF and has been developed on the basis of 2 external reviews which were very positive for the submission. The submission has two strong case-studies underpinning it which makes the small submission look likely to become reasonably strong and will help to generate a research profile for Keele in this area.

Likewise, it was reported that the Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences submission will be new for Keele in this REF submission and will again, help to develop a research profile for Keele in this area, which is reasonably critical, given the University’s strategic aims within this research-field. The Committee noted that this may be a difficult group to gauge, given that Keele has not submitted to this unit previously and that there will be a number of large submissions from other institutions. It was however noted that for both Computer Sciences and Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences that analysis of the RAE2008 submissions shows that some smaller submissions, equivalent to Keele’s size, did score well, which indicates that Keele stands a strong chance for these submissions, particularly due to the focused approach to research within these wider research fields.

Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences

The RI Director reported that the Humanities and Social Sciences RI was submitting to 9 Units of Assessment and that all decisions on individuals were now made, with Social Work and Social Policy (C22) still awaiting letters to be sent, which would be completed by the end of the week. It was reported that all supporting documentation for the submissions had been drafted, although some was in need of finessing.

Thanks were expressed to Katherine Shepherd, EU Funding Officer and Kim Billington-Baddeley, Faculty Enterprise Manager, for their support during the intervening period after the last Committee meeting.

It was noted that the reductions in the submission sizes across the Faculty were mainly as a result of staff losses over the REF period, than as a product of selectivity and that where it has been considered appropriate, internal and external reviews of subject and unit submissions have taken place, to help inform the REF panel decision-making process.
The Chair expressed his thanks to all of the RI Directors, Unit of Assessment leads and other individuals involved in the supporting of the REF preparations.

4.3 Outstanding Actions and Internal Deadlines
The Chair reported that there were 80 days to go until the REF submission was due and as such, circulated a timetable for the final deadlines of each component of the Unit of Assessment submissions.

The Committee were reminded that the staff snap-shot would be taken on 31st October 2013 and therefore any contract variations or new appointments must be made and in place by this date. It was also reported that any supporting statements with regard to reductions, both complex and clearly defined, would be completed by this date.

The Committee were reminded that final decision letters must be issued by 10th October 2013 to allow sufficient time for the appeals process and as such, RIs should ensure that this deadline is adhered to in all but the exceptional circumstances whereby staff members are newly appointed after this date.

Individuals’ outputs will need to be verified and finalised on the Sympletic database by 4th October 2013. There will be some capacity to amend outputs and replace with stronger outputs up until the date of submission, but this should be for the minority of outputs that will be included. The 100 word statements of additional information are requested by 18th October.

Finally, the date of guarantee that a ‘forthcoming’ output will be published before the census date (31st December 2013) is 15th November 2013. The Committee noted that the guarantee should be a statement issued from the publisher confirming the publication date and where this hasn’t been issued; the output will not be included in the submission, unless an ‘early-view’ arrangement can be made within the RI/School.

The Committee noted that the uploading of environment, impact templates and case-studies was relatively straight forward, but that it was important to ensure that the formatting requirements of these documents was correct. It was noted that there is expected to be a significant number of these documents were expected to be received before the deadline and that this was welcomed by the REF team. It was also reported that staff who wished to receive access to the REF submission software could do so by requesting access from the REF team.

4.4 Research Income and Doctoral Awards
The Committee received a report of the Research Income and the Doctoral Awards that are eligible to be included with the REF submission, split by Units of Assessment. This report was provided as a follow-up to the information circulated in April, aimed at supporting the development of the REF5 narratives and highlights the positive messages than can be communicated about each of the UoAs.

The Committee noted that the data had been allocated to each UoA on the basis of which UoA the Principle Investigator of the Grant Award and Lead Supervisor for the Doctoral Award would be submitted to. Some highlights of the report were noted including a 77% increase in income per FTE per year since 2007/08, with a 53% increase in research income per year over the REF period. Also it was noted that there has been a 50% increase in Doctoral Awards per FTE per year over the REF census period, compared to the RAE in 2008.

The Committee noted that a number of these awards were linked to individuals who were no longer at Keele or for facilities and infrastructure for use by all and therefore it was agreed that some of this data could be apportioned out across the UoAs. It was also noted that commentary on EU income and other income streams can also be included in the REF5 narratives, although it will not appear in the REF4 data.
The Committee requested that current numbers of Doctoral students are also provided, to show the current research environment and it was also suggested that if it was possible to obtain an indication of the current sector medians for grant income and doctoral awards, this would be helpful information to share.

**ACTION: Chair/Secretary**

5. **HEFCE CONSULTATION ON OPEN ACCESS**
   The Committee received the HEFCE consultation on Open Access and noted that the Chair would be attending a HEFCE event at the beginning of October on the consultation. The Committee were invited to share their views and comments on the consultation with the Research Support Manager who would provide an institutional response to the consultation.

   The Committee were pleased to note that the emphasis for the consultation had moved to ‘green’ access, although concerns about the application of Open Access agenda for the next REF continue. The Committee were invited to provide their views and comments and noted that HEFCE have requested responses to the consultation by 30th October 2013.

6. **RESEARCH GRANT AWARDS**
   The Committee received the report of recent research grant awards and noted several recent successful awards including Professor Scott McCraken’s AHRC award for the ‘Dorothy Richardson Scholarly Editions’ which was noted to be an impressive achievement.

7. **UPDATE FROM HEAD OF RESEARCH & ENTERPRISE SERVICES**
   The Committee received an oral report from the Head of Research and Enterprise Services on recent activity within the team including the forthcoming HEBCIS return and the activity being undertaken by RES and the RIs to gather all of the relevant information in time for the return in December. It was noted that this activity, combined with the developments within the Enterprise team, including the new Enterprise Strategy, should allow more support over the next REF period for the development of Impact, IP and Licencing which is becoming a significant part of the HEFCE Research agenda.

   The Committee noted that there were two members of RES staff leaving within the next few weeks, Katherine Shepherd, EU Funding Officer and Andy Brooks, Enterprise Business Manager for EPSAM. It was noted that adverts for the replacement of these two posts would be published shortly, with a view to making appointments in the shortest time-frame possible. The Committee expressed their thanks to both colleagues and noted the particular impact that the EU Funding Officer post had achieved across the institution and expressed a desire to build upon this success with the new appointment.

8. **EU FUNDING UPDATE**
   The Committee received an oral report from the EU Funding Officer to note that Keele had secured a membership of the West Midlands European Service, which has an office based in Brussels and provides the University with intelligence and information on EU research policy and opportunities. The arrangement provides Keele with a physical space to host events, opportunity to invite members of the Commission when required and also insight into who are the right people to invite to our events and which events we would like to attend.

   It was noted that this was a 1-year joint agreement with Staffordshire University, in conjunction with the Local Economic Partnership (LEP) and members of the Committee were asked to identify areas in which this arrangement could be used at an RI and thematic level to the University’s best advantage.

**RESEARCH STUDENT MATTERS**

9. **GRADUATE SCHOOL BOARD**
   The Committee received the minutes of the meeting of the Graduate School Board held on 2nd May 2013.
10. RESEARCH STUDENT LIAISON COMMITTEE
   The Committee received the minutes of the Research Student Liaison Committee held on 18th June 2013.

11. SUB COMMITTEE REPORTS
   a. Research Ethics
      The Committee noted that the next meeting of the Research Ethics Committee will be held on 9th October 2013.
   b. Research Governance
      The Committee noted that the next meeting of the Research Governance Steering Committee will be held on 14th October 2014.

12. TERMS OF REFERENCE
    The Committee received the amended terms of reference and recommended them to Senate and Council for approval.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING
    The next meeting of the University Research Committee will be held on Tuesday 12th November 2013 in the University Committee Room, room CM2.08, Claus Moser Building.
## RESEARCH COMMITTEE

### ATTENDANCE LIST – 10th September 2013

#### MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Mark Ormerod</td>
<td>PVC Research &amp; Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama Thirunamachandran</td>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellor and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Andy Garner</td>
<td>Dean of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor David Shepherd</td>
<td>Dean of Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Pat Bailey</td>
<td>Dean of Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Professor Elaine Hay</td>
<td>Director of Institute for Primary Care and Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Rhian Hughes</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Institute for Primary Care and Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Professor Alicia El Haj</td>
<td>Director of Institute for Science and Technology in Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Ann Hughes</td>
<td>Director of Institutes for Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Clare Holdsworth</td>
<td>Social Sciences Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Professor Graham Williams</td>
<td>Director of Institute for the Environment, Physical Sciences &amp; Applied Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Lisa Ironside</td>
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</tr>
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</table>

#### IN ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Peter Hooper</td>
<td>Head of Research &amp; Enterprise Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Shepherd</td>
<td>EU Funding Officer, RES (for item 8 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Smith</td>
<td>RI Manager, Institute for Science and Technology in Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hessian</td>
<td>RI Manager, Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Weston</td>
<td>RI Manager, Institute for the Environment, Physical Sciences &amp; Applied Mathematics</td>
</tr>
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<td>Ellie James</td>
<td>Research Support Manager</td>
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<td>Jen Paddison</td>
<td>REF Executive Support, Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- *: Absent
- **A**: Absent with apologies
Special Meeting of UEC - Keele Beyond 2015

Feasibility of the Strategic Overview and Position Paper for Keele Beyond 2015: Research

Keele Beyond 2015: Overall Shape and Size

The strategic positioning paper proposes (in section 4) that by 2020, Keele has a profile of 14,000 headcount total student numbers, with 12,000 of those based at Keele, with a ratio of UG:PGT:PGR of 80%:14.5%:5.5%, an annual turnover of £170m and research income of 22.5% of turnover.

This equates to a headcount of 770 (or 660 based on non-TNE) PGR students and total research income of £38m.

Current profile

Current research income (grants + PGR Fees + QR) is £21.5m, corresponding to 18% of the £120m annual turnover (HEFCE Research Capital funding and HEIF, and consultancy and license income currently add ca. £1.2m and £2.7m, respectively, to this).

Current registered PGR numbers by headcount are 626/435 (and by FTE 363), ca. 4.3% by FTE, and 6.3/4.8% by headcount of Keele’s ca. 10,000 students (8,500 FTEs). There are currently 277 Home/EU and 86 overseas PGR FTEs. Thus, by FTE, 24% of our current PGR students are overseas, an increase from 18% two years ago.

Growth in research income and PGR student numbers and decrease in QR since 2009/10

Both research grant income and PGR student numbers have grown significantly in recent years. Research grant income has increased by 51% since 2007/08 (from £8.92m to £13.48m in 2012/13), and by 15.0% since 2009/10 (from £11.71m to £13.48m in 2012/13), representing average annual increases of just under 9% and 4.8%, respectively.

Research grant income per academic staff FTE has grown by 70% since 2007/08 (from £18.3k to £31.2k in 2012/13), and by 19.6% since 2009/10 (from £26.1k), equating to average annual increases of just over 11% and 6.2%, respectively.

PGR student numbers (by FTE) have increased by 45% since 2009/10 (from 250 to 363 in 2012/13), an average annual increase of 9.5%. Per member of academic staff, PGR numbers (by FTE) have grown by 56% since 2009/10 (from 0.54 to 0.84 in 2012/13), equating to average annual growth in this metric of almost 12%.

Overseas PGR student numbers (by FTE) have increased by 54% since 2010/11, with much more marked growth of 28% on last year as a result of a number of specific initiatives, most notably our successful engagement with the Iraqi PhD Scholarship Scheme launched in summer 2012.

Total QR income has decreased since 2009/10 by £436k (6.6%) to £6.20m, with a £838k (16%) decrease in mainstream QR due to the removal of funding for 2* rated research being partially offset by a £291k (38%) increase in QR RDP funding relating to the above sector average growth in Home PGR student numbers over the corresponding period, and a £265k (91%) increase in QR
charity support funding due to the above sector average increase in charity research funding over this time period.

**Potential future growth in research income and PGR student numbers**

**Continued growth in research grant income**

Research grant income has shown very good growth (51% (9% p.a.)) since 2007/08, with continued but more modest growth since 2009/10 of, on average, 4.8% p.a.. Based on current academic staff numbers a continued 5% per annum increase in research grant income would result in an increase in research grant income to £19.0m by 2019/20. (10% year on year growth would give research grant income of £26.3m by 2019/20).

However, if the extra 3,400 student FTEs proposed in the paper are achieved, this would mean around 170 additional academic staff FTEs in post in 2019/20 (assuming an SSR of 20). 5% annual growth in current research income per FTE, would give average annual research income per staff FTE of £43.9k in 2019/20, or an additional £440k research income for every 10 additional academic staff FTE. Based on these numbers and growth, an additional 170 academic staff FTE could provide around £7.5m additional research grant income in 2019/20, taking research income to around £26.5m based on continued 5% year on year growth in research income per academic staff FTE. With currently budgeted QR and current PGR Fee income this would give annual research income of £33.5m in 2019/20.

**Opportunities for more significant/step-jump increases in research grant income**

Although the above analysis provides a basis for potential future growth in research income, it should be noted that research grant income is strongly dependent on the Health Faculty (which includes Life Sciences in this analysis), with currently 77% of total research grant income in 2012/13, and particularly Primary Care where there are small student numbers. Research income is significantly lower in other discipline areas, particularly in Humanities and Social Sciences. However, if the growth in student numbers is reasonably distributed across the institution, and additional appointments are made, wherever possible, to areas of existing research strength or clear growth potential, the above analysis shows the potential to grow research income significantly by 2019/20 by continued year on year increases and significant growth in academic staff numbers underpinned by the proposed significant growth in student numbers.

Generally it is felt that step-jumps in research grant income in Humanities and Social Sciences and Natural Sciences are unlikely beyond increases which can be achieved by continued year on year increases of the order outlined above and increased academic staff numbers underpinned by significant increases in UG and PG student numbers, although there are areas where there is potential for more significant growth from current, relatively low, levels.

Significant further growth in research grant income is considered achievable in Health. Research grant income has more than doubled in Primary Care and Health Sciences since 2007/08 from around £3m to £6.5m, and there is potential to achieve a similar step-change in grant income in ISTM/HSRU/UHNS, as well as further growth in research income in PCHS. The new Clinical Trials Unit will be critical to this. To achieve this will require continued major investment, from UHNS as well as Keele, in research infrastructure, facilities and staffing in this area, with ultimately a new research and development building on the new hospital site. Research income in Pharmacy is
currently low, and this is an area with significant potential for growth in research income by 2020 as research capacity is built and the research environment is developed.

**Continued growth in PGR student numbers**

Both Home and Overseas PGR student numbers have shown very significant growth (45% and 54%) since 2009/10. There is evidence, however, that the number of Home PGR students is starting to plateau as the step-jump in PGR intake achieved in 2010/11, which has been sustained in subsequent intakes, has now worked through all years of PhD study. Institutional matched-funding and fees waivers through Acorn and other Faculty funding have been critical to achieving this step-jump in Home PGR numbers from pre-2009/10 levels.

Further significant growth in ‘traditional’ Home PGR student numbers will be challenging in the current external funding climate (Keele is currently bucking the general national decrease), even though the number of PhD students per academic staff FTE in some areas remains low compared with many research-intensive institutions. There are opportunities for further growth in Humanities and Social Sciences, in Humanities on the back of the success of the new AHRC DTP and in KMS, further development of Professional Doctorates, particularly in Health, Social Sciences and Counselling, and intercalated Masters and other research Masters, and potentially in part-time PGRs in some disciplines, though further growth in PGRs in all areas should be a major strategic priority. Some growth in Home PGR numbers should also be associated with increases in academic staff numbers though the dependence on fixed Acorn funding and ‘quota’ studentships should be noted. These increases combined are likely to fall well short of the FTE increases proposed in the positioning paper (less so in headcount terms).

Institutional ‘Acorn’ funding has been hugely successful in helping drive the increase in Home PGR student numbers through matched funding and fees waivers. Demand significantly exceeds current funding availability in most discipline areas. Thus a significant step-jump increase in Home PGR student numbers could be achieved through a significant (two to four fold) increase in institutional Acorn funding from the current level, though obviously this would require healthy institutional surpluses being generated given other financial pressures.

In contrast there has been a 28% increase in the number of overseas PGR students this year on last, which can be attributed to a number of specific initiatives, most notably our successful engagement with the Iraqi PhD Scholarship Scheme. Sustaining and building on this success with similar/further increased intakes over the next few years will lead to progressive increases in the number of overseas PGR student numbers and on this basis growth to around ca. 110 FTEs is realistic, although challenging given that a number of overseas governments are becoming increasingly selective in how they allocate their PhD scholarship schemes.

With continued strong engagement with overseas government scholarship schemes and the development of new academic partnerships with overseas institutions, together with increased institutional international marketing and recruitment activity and profile (see significant increases in overseas PGR application numbers in both 2012/13 and 2013/14), coupled to increases in academic staff numbers, the number of overseas PGR students proposed in the positioning paper, whilst being ambitious and challenging, is potentially feasible.

Mark Ormerod  
18th December 2013
UEC - Keele Beyond 2015 – the next stages

Research: Key Principles and Proposals

1. Overview

Discussions at UEC, SMG and Council Away Days, and in other forums, have all strongly supported the vision of Keele as a smaller, research-led, broad-based institution, with a reputation for excellence in both research and education. The focus here is on how Keele can build on what has been achieved over the last few years in terms of significantly improving research metrics (research income +77% per staff FTE since 2007/08 and postgraduate research student numbers +75% per staff FTE since 2009/10) and the research environment, culture and engagement with research, and the profile of research within the institution, to enhance Keele’s research position, profile and reputation in the context of the significant challenges of increased research concentration and the highly competitive external research funding climate.

Looking forward the three current research KPIs of RAE/REF, research income and PGR student numbers will remain. Although the outcomes of the REF will not be known until the end of 2014, and the financial implications until March 2015, and will inevitably inform our future research strategy, the shape of Keele’s REF submission is known.

Key to enhancing Keele’s research position, profile and reputation are:

- Improving research performance
- Enhancing research quality
- Increasing research impact (academic and non-academic)

2. Improving Research Performance and Research Quality

Improving research performance and research quality is multi-faceted, with all the following principles being key to improving performance and quality. Many of these principles are inter-linked and are also either linked or complimentary to or have to be balanced against other institutional priorities, such as undergraduate and postgraduate taught education and recruitment, high quality student experience, internationalisation, financial sustainability, business engagement.

- Continuing to improve research KPIs
  o REF/RAE, Research income, PGR students
- Research performance monitoring and planning
- Increasing focus in areas of research excellence
  o will be further informed by REF outcome in Dec. 2014
- Recruitment and support of high quality staff/researchers (at all levels)
  o Attracting high quality researchers at all levels (PGR, PDRA, ECR, Professors)
  o Staff retention - retaining high quality researchers (especially top ECRs)
- Investing in research excellence and protecting research time
  o REF, research income, impact
  o Capital investment
  o Optimising research support infrastructure
  o Capacity building and opportunities for research growth
- Enhancing research environment and culture
  - increasing research time
  - increasing research engagement

- Building national and international Strategic Partnerships
  - Strategic research-led partnerships based on high quality research collaborations
  - Academic and business and external organisations
  - Institutional, discipline & academic level
  - Link to overarching themes of health, sustainability and ageing, and areas of research excellence

**Proposals**

**Research metrics**

- The introduction and monitoring of discipline-level research income and PGR student number targets has been an essential development. These need to be revisited, informed by the sector-wide REF outcomes (known March 2015) and closely monitored at discipline (UoA) level.

**Research planning and performance monitoring**

- Annual review of research for all academic staff (generally by Centre/Theme/Cluster Head) based on annual report of research activity (including publications, active grants, grant applications made, PGR students, external dissemination, esteem factors and contribution to discipline, impact activity) over past 2 years and planned activity (including publication strategy, grant application strategy, active grants and PGR students, external dissemination, impact activity) over next 12 months, with agreed targets. Link to progression and promotion process.
- Linked to above, strong, active research mentorship of staff, particularly new ECR appointments (some good models exist, e.g. Primary Care)
- Head of Research Centre/Cluster/Theme to produce annual research report following above reviews, detailing overall research activity (including publications, active grants, grant applications made, PGR students, external dissemination, esteem factors and contribution to discipline, impact activity) over past 12 months and planned future activity and strategy including: preparations for REF 2020; increasing research income and grant applications; increasing PGR students, in particular international PGR numbers; building strategic partnerships and research collaborations
- Increased involvement of Schools/Heads of School in research planning

**Focus**

- Review research focus January 2015 following outcome of the REF in late-December 2014

**Strategic partnerships and collaborations**

- Free up staff time (and resource) to develop strategic partnerships and high quality research collaborations, and major collaborative grant proposals. Clearly recognise such activity in promotion criteria
- In conjunction with BERP, develop strategy to increase engagement with business, LEP and build regional partnerships
**Increasing research income**

- Need to continue to increase engagement with European and other international/non-UK research funding, providing dedicated, specialist European support, backed up by institutional and RI/Centre-level funding events and workshops
- Implementation of annual research planning (all academic staff, Centre/Theme/Cluster, RI) and performance monitoring will increase focus and planning grant activity
- Important role of mentoring and internal peer review within RI
- Free up staff time for major collaborative grant applications
- Reward (significant) grant applications as part of research time allocation
- In conjunction with Business, Economic and Regional Partnerships (BERP) group, develop strategy to increase engagement with business, LEP and build regional partnerships

**Increasing PGR numbers**

- Acorn funding has been hugely successful and extremely good value for money in terms of increasing PGR student numbers, increasing research activity and outputs, pump-priming grant applications, improving the research environment and QR (RDP) benefits. Clearly there are resourcing pressures, but demand outstrips current funding, and significantly increasing Acorn funding would bring significant benefits.
- International PGR student numbers have increased significantly in recent years, and there are positive signs of further growth, particularly in some areas ISTM, HumSS, through engagement with overseas government scholarship schemes (Iraq, Libya, Sri Lanka), academic partnerships and general profile-raising. There is definitely potential to build on this activity and new opportunities continue to emerge (e.g. Indonesia, Kazakhstan) and increasing overseas PGR student numbers through all three of these must be a key part of institutional and RI/Centre strategy.
- In recent years we have seen good growth in the number of students taking Professional Doctorates and Masters. There is scope to increase the numbers of such students in targeted areas, particularly Health Professions and Education/Social Policy (Faculty/RI/Centre planning)

**3. Increasing research impact and profile and reputation raising**

The research impact agenda will only grow in importance, and is much broader than just the REF (it is clear that impact will continue to remain a significant part of future REF exercises, with current ‘proposals’ recommending 25% weighting), not least in terms of future research funding and institutional reputation and profile. It is essential that Keele continues to develop its strategy and capability to maximise both the academic and non-academic impact of its research, and to increase institutional/staff awareness or and engagement in impact

- Research quality
- Profile and reputation raising
  - Research performance and quality
  - National and International League Tables – these are hugely important, e.g. overseas PGRs, establishing strategic partnerships. The metrics predominantly non-research driven
- Strategic research-led partnerships based on high quality research collaboration
- External engagement – regional (LEP), national and international
Maximise engagement with Open Access

Proposals

- Develop strategy and increase capability to maximise the academic and non-academic impact of Keele’s research, and increase staff awareness and engagement in impact,
- High quality (evidenced) impact activity should be fully embedded in academic promotion criteria (and research time allocation)
- Each Faculty/RI, and Centres/Themes/Clusters, to start to identify potential case studies in 2014 to support (including at institutional level – MAC) and gather evidence for REF 2020, and for other profile and reputation-raising activity, fund-raising, dissemination.
- Increase engagement with Open access – for REF and to promote impact and raise profile
- In conjunction with BERP, develop strategy to increase engagement with business, LEP and build regional partnerships

4. Research structures, infrastructure and environment

The dedicated RI/Faculty level research support and administrative infrastructure is now highly effective in terms of identifying funding opportunities, assisting with grant applications and helping manage grants, resources, supporting impact, and PGR student administration, support and training. This is supported by the centralised Research and Enterprise Services, which provides specialist institutional research support on inter alia European Funding, contracts, liaison with funding bodies, research ethics and governance, business engagement, enterprise and technology transfer.

With four devolved Research Offices across Humanities and Social Sciences, EPSAM/Natural Sciences and ISTM and Primary Care, and a centralised Research and Enterprise Services, the balance of dedicated/specialised research support infrastructure against the volume of research activity and resource involved is fairly optimised. Work will continue to further optimise the research support and administrative infrastructure to maximise the effectiveness and efficiency of these structures to support research activity.

Proposals

- Maintain current devolved RI/Faculty level research support infrastructure, with centralised specialist institutional research support on inter alia European Funding, contracts, liaison with funding bodies, research ethics and governance, business engagement, enterprise and technology transfer.
- Increased engagement of Schools in research and of Schools and Heads of School in research planning as part of strategic planning, including physical infrastructure, and of RIDs in all staffing planning and new/replacement appointments
- Capital funding - each RI, through Centres/Themes/Clusters, to identify on annual basis future short- and longer-term research equipment and physical infrastructure needs
- Develop strategies to increase research engagement and protect/increase research time linked to other strategic planning, e.g. review of undergraduate education, efficiency of programmes
- Allocate research time based on research performance and activity (see annual review of research), and specific targeted research activities, such as develop strategic partnerships, high quality research collaborations, and major collaborative grant proposals
- Review HEIF funding strategy to maximise benefit for research
- Review Management Information and systems, including institutional repository, to ensure they are fit for purpose

Mark Ormerod
November 2013
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Post REF Review workshop

2.00pm, 22 January 2014, Claus Moser Research Centre

In attendance: Professor Ann Hughes, Professor Emma Bell, Professor David Amigoni, Professor Scott McCracken, Sheena Bateman, Professor Barbara Kelly, Professor Brian Doherty, Professor Tony Bradney, Professor Michael Murray, Helen Farrell, Richard Smith, Professor Karen Hunt, Ellie James, Professor Tsachi Keren-Paz, Mike Hession

INTRODUCTION

This workshop was led by Professor Ann Hughes to review the processes and issues of REF 2014, to learn lessons for the next REF, and also to explore what REF revealed about the strengths and weaknesses of research in the Faculty. The workshop was informed by a paper from Professor Hughes, which is attached as Appendix 1.

SECTION ONE: REF PROCESS

Timing

There was noted that the reading for REF commenced two years before the submission date, and it was felt that this could have been started sooner.

There had been ‘surprises’ during the reading for REF, where, despite expectations, some colleagues had not produced four good quality publications. It was hoped that the annual research planning process would mean that for future exercises REF leads would have a better appreciation of how colleagues’ publications were developing, and it was agreed that the research plan form would be amended to explicitly ask for a current view of REF outputs. The form might also include a reference back to the definitions for 3* and 4* work.

Recommendation 1: There should be an internal ‘dry run’ three years before the next REF submission.

Recommendation 2: The Research Planning form would be amended to ask for an individual’s current view of what their best, ‘REFable’ publications were.

Recommendation 3: The Research Planning form should be amended to include definitions of 3* and 4* outputs.

Publication listing/database

It was noted that the data in Symplectic about publications did not always make it clear which outputs were actually published. There was a general discussion about the ease of use of the database: it was also noted that the next exercise would also require the large majority of work to
be available through an online repository. Ellie James reported that there was new functionality within the system which used labels, and this might help with the selection and tagging of publications for REF. It was noted that up-to-date publication lists were an essential aspect of PGR recruitment.

There was a discussion about confidentiality of publication gradings. Some people felt that there was too much secrecy around this, but it was also recognised that being open about judgments on publications could also lead to problems.

Recommendation 4: RES should consider a further round of training and information to ensure staff were using the system to best effect.

Recommendation 5: RES would work with faculties to consider a system for online management of research plans, and should explore whether research plans could be linked to Symplectic to automatically extract publication data.

Communications

It was felt that the realities and expectations of REF had not always been communicated well to individual colleagues. Too many staff were struggling for four good publications near the end of the census period. It was also apparent that some staff did not have a good working knowledge of where to publish, or what to avoid (for instance, duplication/overlap between books and articles). It was noted that Steve Wilkinson’s publication guidance had been very useful, although such guidance really had to be sensitive to disciplinary differences. In order to ensure the importance of good, REFable publications to the University, the recruitment process should include a robust assessment of publications submitted prior to interview. It was suggested that disciplinary expertise should be more strongly represented on appointing committees.

It was also noted that we did not inform people which of their publications were returned to REF. In some cases, these would not have been the publications expected by the individual.

There was discussion on whether external readers should have been used as a matter of course. It was felt that the need for an external view varied from discipline to discipline. Some found an ad hoc external view of certain publications worked well, whilst others found it extremely helpful to have an external reading across all the publications under consideration.

Recommendation 5: REF leads, Heads of Centre and others should develop clear, discipline-specific advice to researchers on publications.

Recommendation 6: The letters informing individuals of inclusion should explicitly state which articles were to be returned.

Recommendation 7: Greater use of external readers should be made early in the process for the next REF. This would have resource implications.

Recommendation 8: Disciplinary expertise should be more strongly represented on appointing committees.
**Environment and Impact**

It was noted that the additional resource in the Faculty Research Office had been a key factor in the success of the final stages of REF submissions. Hannah Merry had been invaluable in providing a link between academics and RES. Louise Rutt had been essential in the final year to work on the development, documentation and evidence base for the impact case studies (22 for the Faculty). The identification, support and capture of the next crop of impact case studies should be happening now; this could not be done on top of somebody’s ‘day job’. Similarly, managing and contributing to REF submissions is a major undertaking, and doing it alongside an undiminished academic workload introduces an unnecessary element of risk to the returns.

Recommendation 9: Impact should be supported by a dedicated post at Faculty level.

Recommendation 10: Managing a REF return should be formally recognised in an individual’s academic workload.

**SECTION TWO: RESEARCH**

**Developing the research environment**

There was a general discussion about the particular research environment and culture of Keele, as a relatively small and geographically isolated University.

It was noted that it was important for our scholars to go outside Keele, participating in and leading external research seminars, conferences, editorial boards etc. It was important for this to be incentivised and also robustly recorded, and it was agreed that the Research Plan would be the tool for capturing this data.

It was noted that some of the academic units at Keele were small, and it was important for there to be a culture where researchers could get support beyond their immediate discipline. Clare Holdsworth reported briefly from a recent ESRC event launching a report on support for mid-career researchers, where the main messages were that smaller research environments could be problematic, and that mentoring was a two way process: it was important for individuals to feel that they could seek help and advice from more senior colleagues.

There are many individual subject-based seminars and lectures across the Faculty, possibly too many: but it was felt that the RI should be able to host broader, thematic and cross-disciplinary events which would have a wider appeal, and would help to strengthen the research culture and encourage new partnerships between researchers from different backgrounds. Some good models already existed, such as the History Hour, Work in Progress series, and the Postgraduate Research Conference.

Recommendation 11: The research plan should be reviewed to ensure that it encourages individuals to make contributions to their overall disciplines through external conferences,
editorial boards etc, and that this information was captured and reviewed as part of the planning process.

Recommendation 12: The RI should develop a series of high profile, themed events, mainly aimed at internal researchers, which encouraged staff to come together beyond their immediate disciplines.

SECTION THREE: QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

For the final stage of the meeting, there was an open discussion of the following questions, which had been circulated with the agenda:

1. How can we support individual researchers, and should we support all research?
2. What can we do to support and embed impact activity?
3. How can we develop bigger, more ambitious grants, and how can we encourage work with other strong academic partners?
4. How can we use the research planning process to support publications and projects for the next REF?

Research support

How can we support individual researchers, and should we support all research?

There was a discussion particularly of question 1, around how far the University could and should support all researchers, or whether it should ration its scarce resources. It was mooted that perhaps all staff should be expected to do scholarship, but only a subset would carry out research. Others felt that there were advantages in having an inclusive research culture. It was noted that the research planning system was a very useful addition, enabling those with responsibility for researchers to have a closer and more regularised understanding of RI members’ research performance. However, there was some feeling that the distribution of time or even recognition for research was too flat: other universities managed systems which varied the level of research time, depending on performance, and reviewed this every year.

It was also noted that within the Faculty it was becoming increasingly difficult to accommodate researchers in Health disciplines such as nursing, which had a different research culture and were geographically remote.

Recommendation 13: The RI, in consultation with RES, should review the allocation of research time, extending the progress already made through the introduction of Research Plans

Impact and dissemination

What can we do to support and embed impact activity?

This item had been covered earlier on in the meeting, but it was agreed it was vital to have support in place as early as possible in the REF cycle. It was noted that the Impact element was new for REF2014, and so the expectation from REF panels, and the demands of the REF submission process,
were likely to increase for REF2020. There was an urgent need to identify the most promising research impact stories and to consider how to support these, including the systematic capture of evidence. An impact support post would not just be REF-focussed, as high quality research often resulted in excellent impact.

It was also noted that there was a need to translate research findings and to ensure they were understood by a non-academic, or non-specialist, audience.

Recommendation 14: there should be a new post of Impact Officer at Faculty level, tasked with working with researchers to develop best practice around impact, to improve dissemination, and to ensure there were robust systems in place to capture the best impact stories for REF and marketing purposes.

Recommendation 15: the Faculty should work with MAC to work on the translation of excellent research into compelling stories aimed at a wider, non-specialist audience.

Grants
How can we develop bigger, more ambitious grants, and how can we encourage work with other strong academic partners?

It was noted that colleagues working on large grant proposals should consider at an early stage who might be included from outside their immediate circle. This might be an early career researcher, but equally could be a mid-career colleague. The expertise of the Faculty Research & Enterprise Officers could be invaluable in making these links.

There was a discussion on development workshops for staff, especially around academic writing. It was noted that there were many models for this, and they could be led internally or externally. Some Learned Societies even funded workshops.

Recommendation 16: Consideration would be given to the development of a set of resources, either led by senior staff or through participation at regional level, to support colleagues in writing for bids and journals

Recommendation 17: The Faculty Research Office should work with the RID to identify large scale opportunities and, in the development of these proposals, should consider whether there were appropriate colleagues from across the University who might add value to the bid.

Research Planning
How can we use the research planning process to support publications and projects for the next REF?

It was noted that the planning process had been discussed throughout the meeting, as it covered so many essential components of research. It would be ideal to have an integrated online Research Planning process which would make the process more efficient, and would help ensure that the plans were live, updated throughout the year rather than only referred to annually.
It was also noted that the general minimum expectation of one grant every three year cycle and one good publication submission per year should be stressed within the Research Planning form and guidance.

Recommendation 18: The Research Planning process would be reviewed, both in terms of how it integrated with other central processes such as SPRE, but also whether there could be online support for the process.

Recommendation 19: The minima of one grant application per three year cycle and one publication per year should be stressed and monitored through the Research Planning Process.
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences: post REF review of research in the faculty: for meeting on 22 January 2014.

It is important that we review the mechanisms used to organise the recent submission to the Research Excellence Framework, while everything is still fresh in our minds – to note for the future what worked and what we could have done better. More importantly, however, we need to explore broadly what the REF revealed about the strengths and weaknesses of research in the faculty, and the effectiveness of the processes by which it is encouraged and supported. What are the main issues and priorities for the future? These are my (parting) thoughts, intended to promote discussion and debate at this meeting and throughout the faculty.

1. RESEARCH

Publications: many colleagues are producing important and influential work, but we could do more to encourage well-planned, ambitious and appropriate publication. In too many cases there were only four items to choose from; the best submissions were selected from a greater number of outputs.

The REF guidelines are some help in encouraging ambitious, high-quality publication. The criteria for assessing outputs are originality, significance and rigour. Main panel C (the social science panel) expands on this: four star, world-leading research would exhibit some of the following: ‘outstandingly novel in developing concepts, techniques or outcomes’; a ‘major influence’ on the intellectual agenda of a research theme or field; a primary or essential point of reference; has exceptionally rigorous research design, and the highest standards of intellectual precision. Three star work is ‘an important point of reference’; contributes knowledge, ideas and techniques that are likely to be of lasting influence; has robust research design with intellectual precision. Two-star research (which will not be funded) offers valuable knowledge to the field or sub-field, and incremental advances in knowledge.

Main panel D (the humanities panel) defines four star research as a primary or essential point of reference; of profound influence; developing new practices, paradigms or audiences; expanding the range and depth of research; outstandingly novel or creative. Three star research is an important point of reference and of lasting influence; a catalyst for new thinking, policies or paradigms; a significant expansion of the range of research and significantly novel. Two star research is a recognised point of reference, of some influence, a useful contribution.

So the bar is set pretty high – publications that make a difference to our disciplines have to be based on a coherent, ambitious and focused research agenda. What methodological or substantive contribution are we hoping to make – what are the approaches we are influenced by, extending or challenging? Productive researchers should publish in many forms and for many audiences – book reviews, textbooks, reports, encyclopaedia entries and other generally accessible works are worthwhile. But if we have many calls on our time, or find writing difficult the priority must be to produce at least four high-quality items that make a difference to our disciplines. The other types of output are a luxury.

Disciplines vary as to how rigidly they believe in hierarchical journal rankings but it is likely that material submitted to a competitive rigorously peer-reviewed journal will be better than a chapter commissioned by a friend for a collection of essays or a special issue. It is paradoxical that simply
planning to write four things for each REF cycle rarely leads to excellent work (the starting point should be the research agenda); on the other hand we should all be aware of the demands of the REF when we are planning our publication strategies. Reviewing and mentoring annual research plans should focus on ensuring colleagues are on track to produce a convincing REF submission.

**Grant income:** this remains a weakness across the faculty with too few larger grants in particular. Despite the funding constraints of which we are all aware we need to encourage more ambitious applications, and more engagement with European funders. Developing networks, and building collaborations beyond Keele is crucial – as co-investigators as well as leads. In the faculty office we can be more pro-active now the REF is over, and we need to focus our support on the most promising and significant applications, and on responding to major calls. The struggle to make the internal peer review college successful remains important.

**Postgraduate research:** this in contrast is a success story. We have increased our numbers, maintained decent completion rates, and also provided a good research environment with excellent facilities, good training, and intellectual and social support. We must ensure that students continue to see the value of high-quality training under our new arrangements; we could do more to encourage our students to take advantage of opportunities to network beyond Keele. It will be difficult to maintain our recruitment of high-quality students in the current funding climate, although international partnerships may help here. Humanities disciplines and Law will benefit from involvement with the AHRC’s Northwest Doctoral Training Centre. Extending opportunities for work placements in a variety of non-academic contexts and ensuring that PGR students feature prominently in the University’s employability initiatives are other priorities.

**Impact:** it is clear from colleague’s research plans that there is wide-ranging commitment to what we have to call the ‘impact agenda’: to public engagement, addressing broad audiences, policy-related research, contributions to debate on vital contemporary issues, and creative activity. We did submit decent case-studies to the REF. But REF 2020 will demand that institutions provide more consistent support for research impact, more evidence of reflective and deliberate policies to achieve impact, and much more systematic and convincing evidence for that impact. I think this is a massive challenge for Keele to provide the necessary resources (chiefly in staffing) to promote, monitor, and record impact. My experience over the last three years convinces me that this is most effectively provided at faculty level rather than centrally, through dedicated and pro-active administrators who have sympathy with and understanding of the faculty’s disciplines. It is equally important that university-wide initiatives are fully communicated and coordinated across the institution. I understand, for example, that a Business, Economic and Regional Partnership Group has been discussing possible initiatives for Keele post-2015, but there has been no formal discussion of how their plans might be relevant to or might benefit from this faculty’s research. A review of how RES understands and supports activities in this faculty might also be necessary. Support for impact is an urgent priority for the university; we need soon to identify likely impact case studies for the next REF.

**Dilemmas:** Keele’s strategic plan, as we all know includes as aim three to ‘deliver international excellence and impact in focused areas of research’. Are we focused enough? In practice, we have aimed to support as much research and as many people as possible. I am sympathetic to this approach. I believe that to recruit and retain high-quality staff, we need to support their research, and that good researchers are almost always the best teachers. I do not accept that there is a conflict between a good ‘student experience’ and support for research; I do not mind if on some accounting models, teaching ‘supports’ research. Indeed in most of our faculty our sustainability is founded on a combination of healthy undergraduate recruitment and research excellence. At an individual level, everyone appointed to the lecturing grade expected at Keele to do research; if after
several years an individual is not performing well here that is a failure for all of us. But this is a good
time to pause and think about:
1) are there areas of research that we are not able to support effectively – or at least not through
the resources of this faculty?
b) in what circumstances might we/should we decide that an individual’s research career
could/should no longer be supported – and what would be the most appropriate next steps? These
issues are not static and not to be explored in isolation, and we are agreed, I think, that non-
submission to a REF is not a sufficient reason to remove support.

REF PROCESSES: (these are mostly very personal – things that made me weep or scream)
a) timing: it should be possible to establish at a much earlier stage what unit of assessment people
are being submitted to. This should be at the start not the end of the discussions.
b) publication listings/database: we must make sure that the status of outputs (ie whether or not
they are actually published) is absolutely clear. Some items on the database turned out to be little
more than first drafts.
c) communication: this is a complex issue and one that has caused some criticism and heart-
searching. I am sure that we could have done better in providing regular, timely and fruitful
communication to colleagues. Some colleagues felt we should have informed them sooner if their
outputs were not meeting the threshold so they could have produced better work. I am not sure
that was realistic in the timeframe but it should be possible through feedback on the annual
research plans to warn colleagues earlier if they are not being ambitious enough (compare
comments on publication above). We could have done more to develop understanding of the quality
thresholds, and, as sensitively as possible, to stress that the priority for the REF submission was to
get the best possible result for the university as a whole in terms of prestige and funding; it was not
about individual careers. I know we made decisions that naturally were distressing for the individuals
concerned; I hope we showed some sensitivity.

There are inevitably tensions between a commitment to openness and a need for rigorous review of
outputs by internal and external readers. Internal and external assessments of colleagues’ outputs
were done systematically, guided by the REF criteria, and, I think, fairly. Most external reviewers
worked on a confidential basis, as would research council or journal peer reviewers. I think that was
the way we obtained the most useful assessments. There were variations within the faculty in the
extent and timing of feedback given to colleagues, and we might want to think about best,
consistent practice for the future. The letters were better than in 2007 but they could have been
more specific (and became so as time went on).

d) Environment data: it was more difficult than it should have been to collect data for the
environment template. Staff shortages were one factor, another was the failure to consider
archiving issues during the reorganisation of the social science RIs. This should not happen again. But
everyone did a fantastic job with the templates.

e) Impact template: we need from now to be recording impact initiatives as the material was rather
haphazard for this round. How, who and where? But again I think we did well.

f) Impact case studies: these were a rush towards the deadline, and we could have worked more
consistently at them, but we got there in the end. I think the initial selections and the meetings
between different units of assessment worked well, but with a longer time scale we could have benefited from broader feedback.

Ann Hughes, 9 January 2014
Research Metrics Update – February 2014

This paper provides an update for University Research Committee on key metrics relating to research income, research contribution, research grant applications and awards and postgraduate research student intake numbers and population for 2013/14, in comparison to performance in previous years at both institutional and Research Institute level. A more detailed longitudinal analysis of research income and PGR metrics will be brought to the May meeting of Research Committee.

1. Research Income

Figure 1 shows the growth in research grant income over the last five years, with research income for 2013/14 extrapolated as £14.7m, based on grant income to the end of January 2014. This suggests an increase of ca. £1.2m (ca. 9%) on last year’s record research income, which was an increase of 4.4% on that in 2011/12.

The chart also shows the research income associated with the use of Research Council supported facilities over the same time period. This income contributes to the research income submitted to the REF/RAE, and totalled over £4m in 2012/13, representing 23% of the University’s total research income. This proportion has progressively increased year on year from 19% since 2008/09.

Figure 1: Research grant income and Research Council facilities income since 2008/09

Combining research grant income and (REF-returned) RCUK facilities income gives total research income approaching £20m this year, corresponding to a 71% increase in research income since 2007/08.
When research income is expressed per academic staff FTE, this equates to £43.2k per academic staff FTE in 2013/14, compared to £23.0k in 2007/08, an 88% increase in research income per staff FTE.

**Table 1 Data behind chart 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>extrapolated 13/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research grant income (HESA data)</td>
<td>11,021,578</td>
<td>11,713,709</td>
<td>11,945,010</td>
<td>12,904,708</td>
<td>13,475,305</td>
<td>14,688,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities 'in kind' income (REF data)</td>
<td>2,603,130</td>
<td>2,826,749</td>
<td>3,156,617</td>
<td>3,371,680</td>
<td>4,054,912</td>
<td>4,541,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal University Research Income</td>
<td>13,624,708</td>
<td>14,540,458</td>
<td>15,101,627</td>
<td>16,276,387</td>
<td>17,530,216</td>
<td>19,230,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.2 Research Contribution**

Figure 2 provides a summary of the University’s total research contribution since 2008/09, which includes research grant overheads, directly allocated costs on research grants for academic staff time and the Charity support funding (from QR), with an extrapolated figure for 2013/14. The Charity support funding is directly based on total charities research income normalised to the total across the sector, effectively providing some overhead income for charity research grants. For 2013/14 charity support funding within QR totals £557k, a not insignificant amount, and an increase of 91% (£265k) since 2008/09.

The extrapolated research contribution for 2013/14 is ca. £3.3m, representing a 22% increase compared to 2012/13, and a 68% increase in total research contribution since 2010/11. A research contribution of £3.3m in 2013/14 represents ca. 22.5% of research income for this year, a significant year on year increase on the 16.5% in 2010/11 (18.6% in 2011/12 and 20.0% in 2012/13).

**Figure 2: University research contribution since 2008/09**
1.3 Future Research grant income

Figure 3 shows the growth in research income to 2019/20 (excluding Research Council facilities time) based on a simple 5% increase in institutional research income per annum from 2012/13 research income, which would result in research income of £19m in 2019/20. Note the extrapolated research grant income for 2013/14 currently shows a 9% increase on 2012/13.

**Figure 3: Research grant income to 2019/20 (excluding Research Council facilities time) with 5% year on year growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Grant Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>£10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>£13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>£15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>£17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>£19m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>£21m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>£23m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>£25m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Research Grant applications and awards

Figures 4 and 5 below show, respectively, research grant **applications** by RI and research grant **awards** by RI. Research grant applications are down to £17.2m for the first 6 months of 2013/14, which is down 25% from £22.8m at the same point last year, although grant applications may have been directly affected by the REF submission, as well as by the impact of the launch of Horizon 2020 at the start of 2014.

Primary Care had a significant increase in applications to £19.2m during 2012/13, while those in Humanities increased to almost £1.6m from £1.1m. There was little change in the total application value in EPSAM, but there were significant decreases in total grant application value in both ISTM and Social Sciences.

Figure 5 shows the grants awarded (to date) and particularly the 2012/13 figures could increase as panels continue to make awards. Consistent with the total value of grant applications in 2012/13, Humanities and Primary Care have seen an increase in total award value from applications made in 2012/13, while ISTM, EPSAM and Social Sciences total award values have all decreased on 2011/12.
Figure 4: Research grant applications by RI since 2010/11

![Bar chart showing research grant applications by RI since 2010/11.]

Figure 5: Research grant awards by RI 2010/11 to 2012/13

![Bar chart showing research grant awards by RI 2010/11 to 2012/13.]

The report to the May meeting of Research Committee, will include more detailed analysis of research grant success rates and the distribution of grant value by RI.
2. Postgraduate Research Students data

2.1 PGR Intakes

Intakes (new starters) data represent the number of new PGR students who have enrolled on a research degree during the academic year. Figure 6 shows the total University PGR intakes over the last 6 years. The chart shows the step-jump in PGR intakes from around 70 FTE in the years up to 2009/10 to around 100-110 FTE from 2010/11 onwards. 2010/11 saw a record PGR intake of 113 FTE enrolling, followed by intakes of 99 FTE in 2011/12 and 102 FTE in 2012/13, and currently 93 FTE to date (22/1/14) for 2013/14.

Figure 6: PGR intakes over the last 6 years (in FTEs)
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Figure 7 shows the variation in PGR intakes across individual RIs over the past 6 years. The increase in the PGR intake in ISTM over this period is particularly noteworthy, which has led to a very significant increase in PGR numbers in ISTM over recent years, together with general increases in the PGR intake (and hence PGR population) in EPSAM and Humanities.

Figure 7: Intake data (by FTE) by RI over past 6 academic years
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2.2 PGR Population

Figure 8 shows the very significant increase in each of the total, Home/EU and international PGR populations at Keele since 2009/10, from 250 FTEs to the current population of 383 FTEs. This represents a 53% increase in the total PGR population by FTE.

Since 2009/10 international PGRs have grown significantly from 48.6 FTE to currently 84.4 FTEs, a very encouraging 74% increase, with an increase of 26% in just the last year, due to the very successful engagement with the Iraqi MOHESR and their PhD Scholarship Scheme, as well as other specific academic initiatives, and an increase in external profile and international recruitment activities.

Figure 9 shows the current PGR population by Research Institute. Social Sciences has the largest PGR population (151 FTE), of whom 34 FTE (23%) are overseas PGRs. ISTM has the
The highest proportion of international PGRs is 35% (31 FTE). It can be seen that the proportion of overseas PGRs is particularly low in Primary Care and Humanities, at 7% and 9%.

**Figure 9: Current PGR Population (by FTE) by RI**
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Figure 10 and Table 2 show the RI population (taken from the FTE Count ‘Snapshot’ in December 2013) compared to the budgeted targets for 2013/14 and 2014/15. These targets cumulatively give an institutional PGR population of 400 PGR FTE by 2015, the institutional target identified in the 2010-2015 University Strategic Plan.

**Figure 10: RI PGR Population (by FTE) Progress against targets**

![Chart showing actual FTE in December 2013 and targets for 2013/14 and 2014/15 by institute.]

Pie chart showing areas of focus for the next 12 months.
Table 2: RI PGR Population December 2013 and Targets 2013/14 and 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Institute</th>
<th>Actual FTE Dec. 2013</th>
<th>Target 2013/14</th>
<th>Target 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCHS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTM</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSAM</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>401</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that ISTM, Social Sciences and EPSAM have exceeded their budgeted target for 2012/13, with EPSAM having already exceeded its target for 2014/15, and ISTM being close to its 2013/14 target. Primary Care and Humanities are both quite significantly below target. The overall PGR population currently exceeds the budgeted target by 13 FTE (4%).

The step-jump in Keele’s PGR intake occurred in 2010/11, and these intakes have been essentially maintained in subsequent years. As the last of the lower pre-step-jump intakes has largely worked through for full-time PGR students, further growth in the PGR population will become progressively more difficult from 2013/14 without further increases in the PGR intake, and current intake levels must at the very least be sustained.

2.3 Transition from Keele PGT to PGR

At the May 2013 meetings of University PGR and Research Committee data were presented showing that 53% of the Keele PGR population had completed their undergraduate degree at Keele. A report relating to progression from PGT to PGR study at Keele was requested. These data are summarised in Table 3 below for the last three years.

Table 3: Proportion of PGRs who have previously undertaken PGT study at Keele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis shows that approximately 30% of PGR students at Keele have previously undertaken PGT study at Keele, with a higher proportion amongst part-time PGR students, although it should be noted that nearly all overseas PGRs are full-time students, which distorts the above data.

Mark Ormerod, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Enterprise)
Ellie James, Research Support Manager
7th February 2014
**Summary of Research Excellence Framework (REF 2014) Submission**

**Overview of REF 2014 submission**

Keele made its REF 2014 submission at the end of November. This report provides a brief summary of Keele’s submission, details of the ongoing REF audit and is followed by the Equality Impact Assessment from Human Resources which is required by HEFCE. The outcome will not be known until December 2014, and the HEFCE QR funding resulting from the REF until March 2015.

Keele made submissions to 17 different Units of Assessment in the REF (summarised in Table 1), three more than in the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise, with submissions to Allied Health Professions, Biological Sciences, Computer Science, Earth Systems and Environmental Science and Philosophy, where there were not submissions in RAE 2008, with no submissions this time to Russian or Other Laboratory based Clinical subjects.

The overall size of the submission was 267 staff FTE. Although this is 18 FTE (6%) less than in the 2008 RAE, it actually represents a slightly higher proportion of academic staff (61% compared to 59% in 2008), despite higher quality thresholds being applied due to the more selective national funding context, reflecting the growth in research activity over the REF cycle, as well as the significant reduction in academic staff numbers since 2008 to bring staffing costs down closer to the sector average. In headcount terms 288 staff were submitted, just 6 staff (2%) fewer headcount than in RAE 2008, as relatively more staff on fractional contracts were submitted.

However, as the two charts and the table below show the profile of Keele’s submission has changed significantly, in that 47 more staff FTE were submitted from the Health (+62%) and Natural Sciences (+23%) Faculties compared to the 2008 RAE, with Primary Care, ISTM and EPSAM showing 66%, 41% and 37% increases in the volume of staff submitted, and 66 FTE fewer staff were submitted from Humanities and Social Sciences, a 35% reduction in the volume of staff submitted across these disciplines, with the majority of this reduction being in the Social Sciences, although staff from Humanities and Social Sciences still constitute 42% of Keele’s total submission.

### RAE 2008 submission profile

- **Health**: 15%
- **Natural Sciences**: 23%
- **H&SS**: 62%

### REF 2014 submission profile

- **Health**: 27%
- **Natural Sciences**: 31%
- **H&SS**: 42%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Assessment</th>
<th>FTE REF 2014</th>
<th>% REF 2014</th>
<th>FTE RAE 2008</th>
<th>% RAE 2008</th>
<th>FTE change</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>+11.5</td>
<td>+66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTM</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>+17.5</td>
<td>+41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSAM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This to a significant extent mirrors changes in Keele’s shape and academic staffing profile over the same period, as well as increased research capacity and/or quality in some areas of Health in particular and in Natural Sciences over the REF cycle, research activity over the census period, and the application of higher quality thresholds for inclusion.

There are a number of submissions which were significantly smaller than in 2007, most notably, Business and Management (-20 FTE) and Politics and International Studies (-16 FTE), which are both less than half the size of the RAE 2008 submissions. Social Policy (-9.5 FTE), General Engineering (-9 FTE), Law (-7.5 FTE) and History (-6 FTE) were also all smaller submissions than in RAE 2008.

The submissions to three units of assessment, Allied Health Professions (44 FTE), General Engineering (35 FTE) and Social Policy (30 FTE), constitute 41% by volume of Keele’s submission. The submission to Allied Health Professions is a broad submission across three themes, including staff from Primary Care, ISTM, including the Health Services Research Unit, and EPSAM. This is the first time Keele has submitted to this unit, and highlights the significant growth of research in this area.

The submission to General Engineering again includes staff from both ISTM and EPSAM, but this time included only the ‘environmental engineers/sustainable materials’ chemists and the biophysics staff from EPSAM, with the geoscientists/geo-engineers being submitted to Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences, along with other staff in earth and environmental sciences and physical geography. The submission to Social Work and Social Policy is a broad submission including, in addition to staff from Sociology and Criminology and Public Policy and Professional Practice, the Human Geography staff and three staff from Primary Care.

The submissions to Physics (Astrophysics), Mathematics (Applied Mathematics), Psychology, Music and English are very similar in scale and focus to those in 2008. In addition, there were also a number of smaller, focused submissions to Primary Care (effectively the Arthritis Research UK Primary Care Centre of Excellence), Biological Sciences (based around the applied entomology and parasitology research group), Computer Science, Earth Systems and Environmental Science and Philosophy.

**Summary of RAE 2008 submission and performance**

In the 2008 RAE Keele submitted 286 staff FTE, corresponding to 59% of academic staff (by FTE), to 14 Units of Assessment. 85% of the research was rated as 2* or better, with 46% rated as 3* or better. Thus 54% of the research submitted was rated as 2* or less, of which 15% was rated 1* or below. The overall Keele Grade Point Average (GPA) was 2.41 placing Keele 56th in the Sector League Table.

Table 2 summarises the quality profile, submission size and other relevant data for the submission as a whole and for each unit of assessment. The largest submissions were to: General Engineering (44 FTE), Social Policy (40 FTE), Business and Management (38 FTE), Politics (30 FTE) and Law (26 FTE).

6 submissions, Music (2.8), Social Policy (2.75), Applied Mathematics (2.7), History (2.6), English (2.55) and General Engineering (2.5), obtained a GPA equal to or better than 2.5
8 submissions, Other Laboratory based Clinical subjects (1.75), Psychology (1.9), Politics (2.15), Russian (2.2), Physics (2.25), Business and Management (2.3), Primary Care (2.40 and Law (2.45) had a GPA below 2.5, with Other Lab based Clinical subjects and Psychology having GPAs below 2.0.

**Appeals**

Unlike in the 2008 RAE there were no appeals from academic staff in relation to non-submission to the REF. This is attributed to a significantly improved approach to communication with academic staff throughout the REF process.

**Early Career Researchers (ECRs)**

Early career researchers (ECRs) are defined for the purposes of the REF as staff who started their career as an independent researcher after 1st August 2009. ECRs are reported as a distinct category in both the REF submission and the HESA staff return. Keele’s submission included 66 ECRs, representing 23% of the submission, which compares to 31% in RAE 2008. There are a number of factors which have contributed to the quite significantly reduced proportion of ECRs being returned in the REF, including the reduction in staffing since 2009 and the changed funding context resulting in higher quality thresholds. Table 1 highlights there are significant differences in the proportion of ECRs across different disciplines, ranging from none in Primary Care, Mathematics, Computer Science, Music and Philosophy, to over a third in English (41%), General Engineering, Law and Psychology.

**Individual circumstances**

There were 132 individual circumstances, corresponding to 123 individual staff (43% of all staff submitted), with some having multiple circumstances. Each of these required a separate one page supporting statement to be written to justify the case for individual circumstances.

**Research income**

Keele’s total research grant income over the five year REF/HESA census period (1st Aug. 2008 – 31st July 2013) was £75.7m (£15.1m per annum). This equates to £56.7k per researcher per year which represents a 43% increase on this metric compared to RAE 2008. Table 1 shows the breakdown by UoA.

**Doctoral awards**

A total of 324 Doctoral awards were included in the submission (over the 5 year census period), which equates to 1.2 Doctoral Awards per staff FTE. Doctoral awards per staff FTE per year show a 60% increase compared to RAE 2008.

The number of Doctoral awards, and hence awards per FTE per year, will continue to increase significantly as a result of the step-jump in PGR intake numbers which occurred in 2010/11, with subsequent intakes maintained at this significantly higher level, so none of these significantly increased PGR students have reached the stage of obtaining PhDs by the REF census date, but will do so through the next REF cycle.
Current PGR student numbers

Current PGR students per staff FTE show a 75% increase compared to in 2007 when the RAE 2008 submission was made, with a step-jump in PGR student intake occurring in 2010/11, and with this intake level being sustained in subsequent years (significantly due to institutional Acorn funding as well as increased overseas PGR students). These significantly increased PGR numbers will be reflected in substantially increased Doctoral awards per staff FTE in the next REF.

Impact

Non-academic ‘impact’ was a new element for this REF compared to previous Research Assessment Exercises, worth 20% of the final quality profile. Writing and collecting evidence for the cases studies and the impact templates added significant work, with each of the 17 submissions requiring a distinct, discipline-focused Impact Template and a minimum of two impact case studies. A total of 43 Impact Case Studies were submitted across the 17 UoAs, which equates to one per 6.2 staff FTE submitted to the REF.

A number of the impact case studies were particularly strong. As an institution we must seek to use these case studies, and current ongoing high quality, impactful research which has external impact, and build on this, to increase the external impact (and profile and reputation) of our research, and Keele’s external profile.

HEFCE QR funding 2009/10 – 2013/14

Total Quality-related (QR) income from has decreased since 2009/10 by £436k (6.6%) to £6.20m, with a £838k (16%) decrease in mainstream QR to £4.45m due to the removal of funding for 2* rated research being partially offset by a £291k (38%) increase in QR RDP funding (funding related to PGR students) to £1.05m, relating to the significantly above sector average growth in Home PGR student numbers over the corresponding period, and a £176k (46%) increase in QR charity support funding due to the significantly above sector average increase in charity research funding over this time period.

For 2013/14 the mainstream QR income of £4.45m, equating to £15.5k per submitted FTE (and £9.2k per total academic staff FTE). QR RDP funding has risen from £760k in 2009/10 to £1.050m in 2013/14, and from 14.4% to 23.6% of mainstream QR. This increase is despite the change to a more selective methodology for allocation of RDP funding in 2012/13 based on the proportion of 3* and 4* research, and reflects the very significant growth in our PGR numbers relative to the sector as a whole.

REF submission audits

In the first part of the REF audit, the Random Staff Sample Audit, Keele was asked to provide evidence for 20 staff, who were in the Biological Sciences and Allied Health Professions submissions. This has involved evidencing they were on a Keele employment contract on the staff census date, which included ‘research’ as a primary function (which was done providing snapshots from payroll, employment contracts, and snapshots from the HR dashboard), and providing specific evidence to support and verify individual staff circumstances, such as early career researchers,
fractional contracts, maternity leave and leaves of absence. Eight of the 20 staff had individual staff circumstances.

**Priorities post REF 2014**

Preparations are already underway for the next REF, most likely in 2020. Four key areas are:

1) Ensuring researchers produce (a minimum of) **four high quality outputs** to be included in the next REF submission which, along with other research metrics (research grant income, PGR students), will be monitored through annual reviews of research and research plans of individual staff.

2) Continue to **improve the key research metrics** of grant income and PGR numbers. These will continue to be carefully monitored in line with Keele’s aspirations for 2020.

3) **Non-academic impact** will continue to be a key agenda going forward (not just for REF). The REF preparations have highlighted that significant work must be done to disseminate and promote Keele’s research, and how best to support impact as an institution is a key theme being taken forward.

4) Linked to impact of research is the **Open Access** agenda, which aims to make research outputs freely available. Post-REF we are developing our policy (and associated funding strategy) to support this important agenda.

Mark Ormerod / Ellie James
6th February 2014
Table 1: Summary of Keele’s submission profile for REF 2014 and RAE 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>School/Department</th>
<th>REF 2014 FTE</th>
<th>RAE 2008 FTE</th>
<th>FTE difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>REF head-count</th>
<th>RAE head-count</th>
<th>REF ECRs (h/c)</th>
<th>RAE ECRs (h/c)</th>
<th>% ECRs REF</th>
<th>% ECRs RAE</th>
<th>total no. of research outputs</th>
<th>no. of doctoral degrees awarded</th>
<th>PGR awards per FTE</th>
<th>total research income (5 years)</th>
<th>research income per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>-7.30</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>£21,463,481</td>
<td>£2,332,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>8,004,953</td>
<td>£182,034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>£1,115,190</td>
<td>£76,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>£10,555,425</td>
<td>£1,005,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 7</td>
<td>Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>£1,066,958</td>
<td>£104,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 9</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>£10,555,425</td>
<td>£1,005,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 10</td>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>£1,478,667</td>
<td>£184,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 11</td>
<td>Computer Science and Informatics</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>£540,219</td>
<td>£108,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 15</td>
<td>General Engineering</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>£19,298,572</td>
<td>£560,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 19</td>
<td>Business and Management Studies</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>£463,286</td>
<td>£25,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 20</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>-7.60</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>£628,202</td>
<td>£34,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 21</td>
<td>Politics and International Studies</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>-16.05</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>£703,940</td>
<td>£51,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 22</td>
<td>Social Work and Social Policy</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>-9.40</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>£3,944,621</td>
<td>£131,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 29</td>
<td>English Language and Literature</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>£449,578</td>
<td>£32,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 30</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>-6.30</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>£412,260</td>
<td>£32,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 32</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>£130,021</td>
<td>£32,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 35</td>
<td>Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>£157,154</td>
<td>£19,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266.92</td>
<td>266.92</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>£7,572,176</td>
<td>£283,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other laboratory based clinical sciences in RAE 2008
**Includes 2 staff submitted to Russian in RAE 2008

Note:
- ECR= Early Career Researchers
- RAE= Research Assessment Exercise
- PGRs = Postgraduate Research Student
### Table 2: Summary of Keele’s performance in RAE 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Assessment</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Mean score (GPA)</th>
<th>Keele as % of total submissions in UoA</th>
<th>Sector ranking based on proportion above 3* score in UoA</th>
<th>Sector max GPA score in UoA</th>
<th>Keele overall proportions (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality profile</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Cat A</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage of research activity at each quality level)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat B</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat C</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat D</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat E</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat F</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat G</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat H</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat I</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat J</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat K</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat L</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat M</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat N</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat O</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat P</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat Q</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat R</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat S</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat T</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat U</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat V</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat W</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat X</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat Y</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cat Z</td>
<td>% 3* or above</td>
<td>% 2* or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keele overall proportions (in %) 285.15 11% 35% 38% 14% 1% 46% 85% 2.41
Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 - Equality and Diversity Analysis

1. Introduction

The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the system for assessing the quality of research in UK Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). It replaces the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and will be completed in 2014 (with submissions 2013).

The REF will:

- inform the selective allocation of research funding to HEIs
- provide benchmarking information and establish reputational yardsticks
- provide accountability for public investment in research and demonstrate its benefits

The REF assesses research quality in each discipline or Unit of Assessment (UoA). Each UoA has the following weighting:

- Outputs (65%)
- Impact (20%)
- Environment (15%)

Every submitting University was required to develop, document and apply their own Code of Practice (CoP) on selecting staff to include in the REF submission and to handle individual staff circumstances. The CoP was submitted to and formally approved by HEFCE, and the Vice-Chancellor confirmed adherence to the code.

Keele University's REF CoP was drafted carefully following the detailed requirements received from HEFCE and the Equality Challenge Unit. It was discussed in detail at University Executive Committee and Research Committee, along with UCU representatives, and was approved at Senate on 30th November 2011, and submitted to HEFCE in April 2012 (the earliest opportunity permitted by HEFCE). It was formally approved by HEFCE in September 2012.

As a key measure to support equality and diversity in research careers, in all REF Units of Assessment, individuals may be returned with fewer than four research outputs, without penalty in the assessment, where their circumstances have significantly constrained their ability to produce four outputs or to work productively throughout the REF staff assessment period (1st January 2008 to 31st October 2013). This measure is intended to encourage institutions to submit all their eligible staff who have produced excellent research.

To ensure that REF processes are fair, the University collected data on individual staff circumstances from all staff eligible for submission. The data was used to identify which staff were eligible for submission with fewer than four outputs. Each Research Institute member was therefore asked to voluntarily provide details of any applicable circumstances as follows:

Individual circumstances can be clearly defined which includes:

- early career researcher status (i.e. started career as an independent researcher on or after 1st August 2009)
- absence from work due to part-time working, career breaks or secondments
• periods of maternity, additional paternity or adoption leave
• other circumstances that apply to units in Main Panel A (UoAs 1-6)

Individual circumstances can also be complex, and may include:

• disability
• ill health or injury
• mental health conditions
• constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, paternity, adoption or childcare
• other caring responsibilities
• gender reassignment
• other circumstances

Full details, including the definition of individual circumstances and how clearly defined circumstances were treated can be found in Annex C of the CoP.

The University’s CoP underwent a full equality impact assessment, resulting in a recommendation that the following equality analysis would be undertaken:

• Workforce profile data of eligible staff for REF 2014 by race, gender, disability, age, and where possible sexual orientation, religion or belief, and gender identity.
• REF submission data by race, gender, disability, age, and where possible sexual orientation, religion or belief, and gender identity.
• Individual circumstances data (in a non-identifying way)
• Appeals data by race, gender, disability, age, and where possible sexual orientation, religion or belief, and gender identity.
2. Workforce profile of eligible staff and submitted staff

A total of 494 members of staff were eligible for submission to the REF (2014), of whom 288 were submitted (58.3%).

**Gender**

Of those staff who were submitted 173 were men and 115 were women. The data below show the breakdown of eligible and submitted staff by equality groups.

Figure 1 demonstrates the proportion of eligible staff, by gender, submitted for the REF. 63.4% of eligible men and 52.0% of eligible women were submitted. This represents a significant increase compared to the 2008 RAE where only 41.5% of eligible women were submitted.

**Figure 1**

![Graph showing percentage of eligible men and women submitted to the REF 2014.]

**Age**

Table 1 shows the numbers (and percentages) of eligible staff, by age group, submitted to the REF.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Eligible Staff</th>
<th>Submitted Staff</th>
<th>% of eligible staff submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the total eligible staff, 58.3% were submitted to the REF. The reduction in submitted proportions of staff occurs in the 40-49 and in particular the 50-59 age groups. There are a number of factors which contribute to this, one being a result of staff taking on managerial and major administrative roles, with less of a focus on personal research outputs.

**Ethnicity**

Table 2 illustrates the numbers of eligible staff and staff submitted to the REF 2014, organised by ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total eligible staff</th>
<th>Total submitted staff</th>
<th>% of eligible staff submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that 58.1% of eligible white staff were submitted for the REF, whereas 51.4% of eligible BME staff were submitted to the REF. It should be noted that of all eligible staff, there was no ethnicity record for 37 members of staff (7.5%), and of those submitted there were no ethnicity records for 25 members of staff (8.7%).

**Disability**

Of those eligible staff who declared as not disabled, 267, (56.9%) were submitted. Of those eligible staff who declared as disabled, 6 (40.0%) were submitted. It should be noted that the overall rate of staff disclosing a disability at the University is low; the disabled staff in this selection represents 15 eligible staff.

**Religion or belief**

Figures were not available for religion or belief monitoring, as they had not routinely been collected during the REF period.

**Sexual Orientation**

Figures were not available for sexual orientation monitoring, as they had not routinely been collected during the REF period.

**Gender identity**

Figures were not available for gender identity, as they had not routinely been collected during the REF period.
3. Individual circumstances

There were 132 individual circumstances for 123 individuals (some individuals were granted reductions as a result of more than one circumstance). The breakdown of the cases is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Number of individual circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early career reductions</td>
<td>66 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time reductions</td>
<td>35 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity reductions</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex case reductions</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result 263 output reductions were granted, with an average of 2.1 output reductions per person. The following shows the breakdown of areas in which reductions were granted for individual circumstances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>Output Reductions</th>
<th>Reductions per staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

Of those staff submitting individual circumstances, as an average, men were granted on average 2.1 output reductions, and women 2.2 output reductions.

**Ethnicity**

As an average white staff who submitted individual circumstances were granted 2.1 reductions, and BME staff were granted 2.3 output reductions.

**Disability**

As an average, non-disabled staff who submitted individual circumstances, were granted 2.1 output reductions, and those staff declaring a disability were granted 1.7 output reductions per person (NB the disabled staff figure is based on very low numbers (3 members of staff) as declaration rates amongst staff remains low across the workforce).

4. Appeals

There have been no appeals against REF decisions.
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1. Introduction

As part of the Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC), HEFCE requires each higher education institution to submit an annual TRAC return by the final working day of January. The Return is based on the previous year’s audited accounts.

The Keele 2012/13 TRAC return has been compiled in accordance with the latest guidelines. Each year HEFCE provides benchmarking feedback to participating institutions, with institutions compared to those of a similar size in terms of research income. It is anticipated that benchmarking feedback will be provided at the end of February or early March 2014.

Annex A is a copy of the TRAC and benchmarking return to be submitted to HEFCE by 31 January 2014 and is based on the audited accounts to 31 July 2013. The Return takes the total expenditure of £115,514k included in the annual accounts (this includes the £66k loss in the joint venture) and increases it to reflect both a return for financing and investment adjustment and an infrastructure adjustment. These adjustments are intended to provide costing on a “full economic costing basis” that allows for the maintenance of the capital infrastructure and the future development of activities – supporting long-term sustainability. The University’s total income of £120,859k is also included in the Return.

Annex B outlines the methodology used in compiling the Return.

The draft Return has already been reviewed by both the Director of Finance and IT and the fEC Working Group, chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise). UEC is now requested to approve the Return for submission to HEFCE.

2. Section (A) TRAC income and costs by activity

Within section A of the Return, the income, cost and resultant fEC income percentage are analysed across the following four main categories:-

- Publicly funded teaching; including both the regulated provision (HEFCE) including fees payable by the relevant students and the SLC and non-regulated provision (non-HEFCE)
- Non-publicly funded teaching (mainly overseas students)
- Research
- Other

The outcome for the above major categories is as follows:-

- A deficit of £566k (2011/12; £1,491k deficit) on publicly funded teaching. This represents a recovery on full economic costs of 99.0% (2011/12; 97.4%). This deficit comprises a £1,064k surplus (2011/12; £296k deficit) on regulated provision (HEFCE funded) less a deficit of £1,630k (2011/12; £1,195k deficit) on non-regulated provision (non-HEFCE funded e.g. Nursing & Midwifery NHS contract, Health & Rehabilitation NHS contract, PGCE).

- A surplus of £3,752k (2011/12; £4,233k surplus) on non-publicly funded teaching. This represents a recovery on full economic costs of 133.4% (2011/12; 142.9%).

- A deficit of £10,157k (2011/12; £9,976k deficit) on Research. This represents a recovery on full economic costs of 69.5% (2011/12; 69.7%).
• A surplus of £2,045k (2011/12; £2,731 surplus) on Other activities. This represents a recovery on full economic costs of 108.6% (2011/12; 111.4%). Other activities include, for example, catering, residence, intellectual property and interest receivable.

The deficit on publicly funded teaching has improved significantly by £925k in comparison to the University's 2011/12 TRAC return as a result of the fee income generated by the increase in fees charged to home and EC undergraduate students (£1,064 surplus on regulated provision compared to £296k deficit in 2011/12). However this has been partly negated by the increased deficit (£1,630k compared to £1,195k) from the non-regulated provision where average income per student has increased by 2.5% compared to a 6.8% increase in fEC per student FTE (average fEC per taught student FTE across all categories and Faculties increased by 6.9% in 2012/13).

Although the surplus on non-publicly funded teaching has reduced compared to the previous year, the reported 2012/13 surplus ratio of 133.4% income to fEC is equal to the sector average of 2011/12.

The percentage recovery on Research activity has showed a year on year improvement up until 2011/12 from below 60.0% to 69.7% in 2011/12. The current year deficit ratio of 69.5% income to fEC is almost exactly the same as the 69.7% reported in 2011/12. There were improvements in the overall deficit on all sponsor types with the exception of the ‘Industry’ sponsor type that showed a significant deterioration with the cost recovery reducing from 57.7% to 49.4% income to fEC. Additionally since the cost recovery for this category is below 75% of fEC an explanation is required as part of the validation process for the TRAC return.

The expenditure of the Other category included the LGPS FRS17 pension adjustment of £1.4m and this is the reason the surplus of this category was depressed by comparison to last and recent years. It was considered reasonable to include this cost within this category as it related to prior years, was non-recurrent and didn’t relate to either teaching or research activities. Any allocation to teaching or research would have increased overhead costs and similarly cost recover rates used over the next 12 months.

3. Section (C) Research income and costs by research sponsor type

This table shows an analysis of the income and costs by the main sponsor type. For each sponsor type it also shows the percentage recovery of full economic costs.

Guidance issued in March 2010 changed the minimum requirements for this part of the TRAC Return. An additional category was introduced requiring universities to report recurrent research funding from HEFCE (QR income) separately from institution own-funded research. No costs are to be reported against the recurrent research funding category. Additionally a change to the academic time allocation process was introduced requiring all universities to record research by the 7 main research sponsor types as listed in this section. As a consequence the University in 2010 changed the research categories within its fEC Diary Exercise to comply with this requirement. Consequently research activity by sponsor type has been collected for all the four exercises conducted since 2010. Universities are required to be fully compliant with this new process by 2013/14. The fEC Working Group has reviewed the research allocation outcomes from these four fEC Diary Exercises and concluded that the Keele process is sufficiently robust to be considered compliant with this requirement.

The apportionment of research indirect costs to sponsor type was done using the average of the fEC Diary Exercise data captured in the three fEC Diary Exercises since 2011. Whilst
total research activity at around 29% of academic time remained broadly consistent with the previous years, the split by sponsor type produced some interesting outcomes. Of particular interest is the cost of Postgraduate Research and Research Councils, both of these outcomes have been discussed by the fEC Working Group over recent years.

- **Postgraduate Research:** The benchmarking outcome from January 2013 showed the average income to be around 56% of fEC in both the sector and Keele’s Peer Group comparator. Income to fEC at Keele for the 2012/13 TRAC return is 38.0% which lies between the sector average and lower quartile for last year. The performance for this category continues to show a year on year improvement as PGR student numbers have increased very significantly at Keele since 2010/11, although the result partly reflects Keele’s comparatively lower number of students compared to large research-intensive Russell Group institutions, increasing the fixed cost per student. It should be noted that the HEFCE QR RDP funding which currently provides £1,050k of income to fund Home/EU research students is not included in the income under this heading, so the real deficit on postgraduate research is significantly lower in practice.

- **Research Councils:** Although cost recovery for this sponsor type has continued to improve, from 62.1% of income to fEC last year to 63.5% in 2012/13, the Keele outcome in the TRAC return compares unfavourably with the sector average in January 2013 of 73.8% being closer to the lower quartile of 62.1%. Interestingly the sector average has decreased from 75.3% in January 2012. The fEC Working Group has discussed this outcome and believes that it is partly attributable to the relatively small base of RCUK grants at Keele and staff focusing a significantly greater proportion of time on these awards. Additionally, and potentially more significantly, the University holds a significant proportion of grants in this category that provide little or no overhead contribution despite the fEC regime being in place. The reasons for this are varied; one large grant funded on the less favourable pre-fEC terms and there are many small British Academy and Royal Society grants where no overheads or academic time have been awarded, but often involve significant academic staff time, and grants where the funded element is only sufficient to cover the direct costs of the research. British Academy and Royal Society grants must be classed within this sponsor type of Research Council.

- **Other Government Departments:** The cost recovery for this sponsor type continues to improve and in 2012/13 increased to 69.0% from 67.3%. The improvement continues to be driven by the well-funded grants awarded to Primary Care in particular and ISTM through the various NIHR schemes. These represent £5,060k of the £6,250k income within this sponsor type category. However, despite the significant improvements the cost recovery within the category still lies behind the average for the sector of 73.8% reported in the 2011/12 benchmarking exercise.

**Industry**

Each university is required to comment on any outliers on this table. One of the figures disclosed in the Keele return did not fall within the tolerances set by Research Councils UK being the ‘Industry’ funded research. Commentaries are required from Universities reporting

- A recovery on full economic costs on industry activity as less than 75%

Keele’s recovery rate was 49.4%. The category Industry refers to all grants not only from UK industrial sponsors but those awarded by sponsors based in the European Community (excluding EC Government) and all other overseas sponsors including overseas charities and government agencies. Keele holds a number of grants reported in this category from overseas charities and government agencies. Overhead contribution on this category only totalled £83k or 7.3% of total grant
income, with only 59 of the 147 grants contributing towards either overhead or pay costs. The Keele grant portfolio together with the reported outcome is similar to previous years although there has been deterioration in the cost recovery in 2012/13.

The commentary to be provided is as follows:-

Keele received income from such sponsors totalling £1,231k during 2012/13. The funding method for many grant awards in this category was similar in many instances to that of UK Charities awards in that there was limited contribution towards overhead costs and academic salary costs. Frequently the grant awards are small and only fund non-pay costs such as travel, tuition fees and studentships.

The University continues to explore ways of improving the income it receives from such sponsors through greater contributions towards investigators’ salary costs and an increase in overhead recovery.

4. Benchmarking, Assurance Programme & Efficiency and Effectiveness

i) Assurance and Validation

A new Research Councils UK assurance programme began in April 2010. This new process is designed to test both the pre-award and post-award compliance with each research-intensive university visited every three years. It consists of a two day audit to each university; however Keele has yet to be notified of any audit visit but is aware that such visits are taking place within the sector. RCUK contacted the University in December 2012 to request that it took part in a funding assurance desk-based review. The University responded to the request for information and in June 2013 received an excellent assurance report with the highest performance rating from the RCUK assurance team as to the outcome of its review.

ii) Benchmarking

The results of our TRAC submission will be benchmarked once more against the Peer Group B universities (see Annex B), which are generally those universities with most research activity/intensity outside the Russell Group. Of most interest are the FTE overhead recovery rates for the University.

The University’s fEC cost recovery rates from section D of the TRAC return are disclosed in the table below along with the previous year comparatives. The estates and indirect cost recovery rates will be used in the University’s fEC estimates for 12 months from 1 February 2014, but the indirect cost rates will be subject to an efficiency adjustment as described below.

The comparison shows a year on year reduction in the indirect rate. This reflects both the small increase in support cost expenditure in Schools and also an increase in the total of academic, Research Assistants and PGR FTEs from 282.5 to 286.1 (PGRs = 0.2 FTE) during the year.

The estates lab-based rate has increased by 21.0% and is now above the Peer Group B average from January 2013, whilst the estates non-lab rate has decreased by 6.2%. The lab based estates increase relate to higher expenditure on space costs such as computing and other equipment in research active schools coupled with a reduction in the FTE denominator from 195.1 to 181.4. The reduction in the non-lab based estates rate reflects an increase in the research FTE denominator from 228.1 to 248.6 whilst cost in this category only increased slightly during the year.
As a consequence all indirect cost and non–lab estates rates appear reasonable outcomes. The lab based rate appears reasonable taking into account the above explanation as to the combined effect of the increased cost and reduced research FTEs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estates Research Costs - Lab based</td>
<td>£14,757</td>
<td>£12,191</td>
<td>£11,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates Research Costs - Non-lab based</td>
<td>£4,945</td>
<td>£5,270</td>
<td>£6,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Research Costs</td>
<td>£34,834</td>
<td>£34,903</td>
<td>£37,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iii) Efficiency and Effectiveness

RCUK published its response to the Wakeham Review in March 2011 entitled ‘Efficiency 2011-15: Ensuring Excellence with Impact’. This document announced three changes to the way in which RCUK funded research through fEC;

- Efficiency factors would be applied to every university’s indirect cost recovery rate depending upon the rates disclosed in the 2009/10 TRAC return.
- Inflation indices would not be applied to awarded research grant budgets for a period of two years from April 2011. The funding of inflation awards from April 2014 is still to be clarified.
- Equipment purchases over £10,000 on all new grants would only be funded at 50%. Large purchases over £121,588 would be the subject of a specific business case proposal and the funding level on successful applications would be decided on a case by case basis.

Keele’s cost recovery rate was originally assessed as being in the efficiency group C with a 2% reduction applied to overheads awards on successful grant award for 12 months from April 2011. The University was re-categorised in efficiency group B following the January 2012 TRAC return after showing a 9.0% reduction in its submitted indirect cost rate. Last year Keele was returned to efficiency group C last year as the 0.5% reduction in its indirect cost rate was deemed insufficient to maintain the group B status. The current TRAC return shows a reduction of just 0.1% in the current year submission is likely to see the University benchmarked in group C with 2% efficiency reductions applied to the overheads awarded on successful bids from April 2014.

It should be noted that the applied efficiency reductions are year on year reductions applied for a period of up to 3 years after the award of the grant. Consequently for efficiency group C there is a reduction of 4% in year 2 and 6% in year 3.

### 5. Key Risk Sign off

Key risk sign off is now a TRAC requirement. Institutions must carry out a full self-assessment of compliance on each point listed in the Statement of Requirements to be carried out at least every three years.

The University completed its most recent self-assessment prior to submission of the January 2013 TRAC return. This assessment was completed by Director of Finance & IT and fEC Management Accountant and no areas of non-compliance were identified in this process.
This work was subsequently reviewed by the University’s internal auditor, who agreed with their assessment. The self-assessment checklist accompanied by the internal auditor’s report was reviewed by the Audit Committee at their meeting of 3 March 2013. This process will be repeated in January 2016 as part of the three year cyclical requirement to confirm compliance with the TRAC Statement of Requirements.

An internal audit of the University’s TRAC methodology identified three areas where processes could be further improved being; independent review of the TRAC model, reconciliation of student FTEs in the TRAC model to those declared in the annual HESA return and independent review of the two TRAC cost adjustments used in the Return. These recommendations were agreed by the Audit Committee and have been added to the TRAC process for the work carried out in producing the Return shown in Annex A of this paper.

The Committee is requested to approve the Return for submission to HEFCE.

6. TRAC for Teaching

All universities are required to provide a further subject related analysis of the publicly funded regulated provision (HEFCE funded) by 28th February 2014 based upon the January 2014 TRAC return.

This data is currently being prepared and will be submitted to the Committee for approval in time to meet the 28th February deadline.
## Institutional results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collected for use by the Funding Councils</th>
<th>As a % of expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Operating Surplus</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income* (per audited financial statements for 2012-13)</td>
<td>120,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure* (per audited financial statements for 2012-13)</td>
<td>115,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating surplus/(deficit) per audited financial statements</td>
<td>5,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Operating Surplus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure adjustment</td>
<td>3,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return for financing and investment adjustment</td>
<td>6,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target surplus for sustainable operations (infrastructure adjustment + RFI adjustment)</td>
<td>10,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability gap (difference between target surplus for sustainable operations and operating surplus/(deficit))</td>
<td>4,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full economic cost (total expenditure + target surplus for sustainable operations)</td>
<td>125,785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The income and expenditure lines as reported in the financial statements should be adjusted, where appropriate, in line with section B.1.7 of the Statement of Requirements (version 4.2 October 2013) in respect of joint ventures, minority interests and endowments.

### Notes:

1. Exceptional items (as defined by FRS 3 - i.e. those items appearing after the operating surplus/(deficit)) should not be included in the total income or full economic cost lines above.

2. Please ensure that the net RFI adjustment on expenditure is calculated in accordance with the guidance provided at section B.2.6 of the Statement of Requirements (version 4.2 October 2013) and Update 6 [http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/revisions/](http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/revisions/)

---

Institution: Keele University  
Code: H-0121  
UKPRN: 10007767  
TRAC Peer Group: B

IN CONFIDENCE  
To be returned no later than 31st January 2014. Earlier submissions welcome.

This worksheet has passed all validation checks

Is your institution eligible for and applying dispensation from 1 April 2014? Please select Yes/No from the drop-down box  
No

(Eligibility is defined as institutions with less than £3,000,000 annual research income from public sources. A rolling average of Research income (over five years) is used to assess whether £3,000,000 has been reached or not. More information on dispensation can be found in section A.4 of the Statement of Requirements: [http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/require/](http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/require/) )
Analysis of TRAC results

(A) TRAC income and full economic costs by activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly funded</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-publicly funded</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>56,909</td>
<td>15,002</td>
<td>23,176</td>
<td>25,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAC full economic costs</td>
<td>57,475</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>33,333</td>
<td>23,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of full economic costs (income as a % of full economic costs)</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>133.4%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>108.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Income allocation guidance is contained in Annex 16 of the TRAC guidance and can be found here: [http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/annexes.htm](http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/annexes.htm)

Section B (Teaching and Research income by source) has been removed. These data are no longer collected by the Funding Councils.

(C) Research income and full economic costs by research sponsor type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurrent research funding from the funding councils</th>
<th>Institution-own funded</th>
<th>Postgraduate research</th>
<th>Research Councils</th>
<th>Other govt departments</th>
<th>European Union*</th>
<th>UK-based Charities</th>
<th>Industry**</th>
<th>Total Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>6,178</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>23,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAC full economic costs</td>
<td>4,734</td>
<td>6,484</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>9,060</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>33,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of full economic costs (income as a % of full economic costs)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is your allocation of academic staff time to research sponsor types robust? Please select Yes/No from the drop-down box. Yes

For further details of definitions please see B.1.5 and B.7.2a of the Statement of Requirements (version 4.2 October 2013).
### (D) Calculation of indirect and estates cost charge-out rates for Research

**Data collected for use by the RCUK and for benchmarking**

Please select box (shown on the right) if you do not calculate an estates laboratory rate or an estates non-laboratory rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per TRAC allocated to research</th>
<th>Estates non-laboratory</th>
<th>Estates laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff FTEs (i)</td>
<td>437.3</td>
<td>220.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% research time of academic staff (Please enter as a % out of 100) (ii)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resulting in direct time of academic staff (i) * (ii)</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants and fellows FTEs</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRs FTEs</td>
<td>348.7</td>
<td>218.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weighted by</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weighted FTEs</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>109.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total FTEs:** 286.1 248.6 181.4

**Rate (£):**

- **Indirect:** 33,270
- **Estates non-laboratory:** 4,558
- **Estates laboratory:** 13,601

**Indexation (two years) %:**

- **Indirect:** 4.7
- **Estates non-laboratory:** 8.5
- **Estates laboratory:** 8.5

**Indexed year 1 rate (£):**

- **Indirect:** 34,834
- **Estates non-laboratory:** 4,945
- **Estates laboratory:** 14,757

**Note:**

The lab estates should exclude all costs of laboratory technicians and major or small research facilities (which are reported under E.1 below). The non-laboratory estates costs should include relevant elements of these costs, unless you are charging them separately (when again they would then be reported under E.1).

**Do you calculate and apply different indirect rates for each department? Please select Yes/No from the drop-down box**

- Yes [x]

**Do you calculate and apply different estates rates for each department? Please select Yes/No from the drop-down box**

- Yes [x]

### (E) Calculation of laboratory technician and research facility charge-out rates for Research

**Data collected for use by the RCUK and for benchmarking**

In section E, it is not a TRAC requirement to identify laboratory technician costs in non-laboratory departments separately from estates costs. If you do identify laboratory technician costs separately, please respond using the drop-down box (this will provide you with cells to enter data in the tables below).

Please choose an option from the drop-down box to inform us if you have no lab technicians and/or no research facilities

#### E.1 Total costs allocated to Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-laboratory £000</th>
<th>Laboratory £000</th>
<th>Total £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

1. Many institutions will not have identified these costs separately from estates costs in non-laboratory research disciplines. It is not a TRAC requirement.
2. Major research facilities and small research facilities should include all costs included in the calculations of the charge-out rates for MRFs and SRFs, whether charged as DI or DA.
3. Please enter the costs of all DI technicians allocated to research irrespective of whether their salary was allocated wholly to DI, or partly to Support and partly to DI.

**Please describe the rates that you calculate and apply on small research facilities and major research facilities on table E(a) in the worksheet Departmental rates**

**Institution:** Keele University

**Code:** H-0121

**UKPRN:** 10007767

**TRAC Peer Group:** B
### E.2 Analysis of total estates costs allocated to Research

#### E.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-laboratory</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Estates costs included in the estates cost rate calculation</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gross estates costs (i.e. estates plus all technicians and all research facilities.)</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>2,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-laboratory</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % of gross estates costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Major research facilities and small research facilities</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Laboratory technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. DI</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Pool</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Infrastructure</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E.2.3 Calculation of laboratory technician infrastructure rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-laboratory</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Estates costs (excluding research facilities and lab technicians)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic/researcher/PGR FTEs</td>
<td>247.8</td>
<td>180.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support time of academic staff</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support staff in academic departments</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-staff costs in academic departments</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E.3.1 Non-staff costs in academic departments |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>£000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Support for Teaching, Support for Research, Support for Other</td>
<td>41,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estates and Indirect costs</td>
<td>13,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other standalone enterprise activities such as residences, catering and (most) trading companies</td>
<td>3,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E.3.2 Total Estates and Indirect costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>£000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Support time of academic staff</td>
<td>3,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central services</td>
<td>15,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff in academic departments</td>
<td>7,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-staff costs in academic departments</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return for Financing and Investment</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect costs</td>
<td>30,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estates and Indirect costs</td>
<td>41,329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** It is assumed here, for benchmarking purposes only, that all research facility and laboratory technician costs were originally part of a gross estates cost (even though in practice some of these costs would have been DI and not in the estates cost total at all and some of these costs may have been in indirect costs). The gross estates cost is calculated for you on row E.2.2. No research facility or laboratory technician cost (whether DI or DI) are in the estates cost total that is used for the estates cost rate calculation - row E.2.1.

### E.4 Calculation of laboratory technician infrastructure rate

#### E.4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-laboratory</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Estates costs (excluding research facilities and lab technicians)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic/researcher/PGR FTEs</td>
<td>247.8</td>
<td>180.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support time of academic staff</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support staff in academic departments</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-staff costs in academic departments</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E.4.2 Total Estates and Indirect costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>£000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Support for Teaching, Support for Research, Support for Other</td>
<td>41,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estates and Indirect costs</td>
<td>13,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other standalone enterprise activities such as residences, catering and (most) trading companies</td>
<td>3,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E.4.3 Total Estates and Indirect costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>£000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Support time of academic staff</td>
<td>3,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central services</td>
<td>15,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff in academic departments</td>
<td>7,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-staff costs in academic departments</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return for Financing and Investment</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect costs</td>
<td>30,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estates and Indirect costs</td>
<td>41,329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** It is assumed here, for benchmarking purposes only, that all research facility and laboratory technician costs were originally part of a gross estates cost (even though in practice some of these costs would have been DI and not in the estates cost total at all and some of these costs may have been in indirect costs). The gross estates cost is calculated for you on row E.2.2. No research facility or laboratory technician cost (whether DI or DI) are in the estates cost total that is used for the estates cost rate calculation - row E.2.1.

### (F) Analysis

#### Data collected for use by the RCUK

**F.1 Analysis of Support costs**

**Estates costs and indirect costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other-academic department activities</th>
<th>Other-standalone Enterprise activities such as residences, catering and (most) trading companies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates costs (excluding research facilities and lab technicians)</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return for Financing and Investment</td>
<td>9,193</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>13,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estates costs</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>23,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>Support for Teaching, Support for Research, Support for Other</td>
<td>30,156</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estates and Indirect costs</td>
<td>41,329</td>
<td>13,120</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>71,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Please refer to TRAC Update 6 September 2011.

#### F.2 Analysis of staff time

**Number of academic and research staff in the year (FTEs)**

| Academic staff covered by Time Allocation Survey¹ | 437.3 |
| Research assistants & fellows (wholly charged to R) | 137.4 |
| Other academic staff (wholly charged to T or O) | 4.0 |
| Total academic and research staff FTEs | 604.7 |

¹ Academic staff covered by the time allocation survey reported in the table above should be the total number of academic staff who are covered by the current AST percentages, irrespective of whether they provided time estimates this year or in either of the two prior years, or whether they were actually part of the sample selected to provide data or not.

**Academic staff covered by Time Allocation Surveys for the whole institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% time unweighted for salaries¹</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% time weighted for salaries</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff costs (£000s)</td>
<td>15,348</td>
<td>6,175</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>4,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See section 2.7 of the TRAC Update 6 September 2011 for further detail.

This table shows the institutional total of the department percentages that have been used to allocate academic staff costs.

**Support for Teaching, Support for Research, Support for Other should all be shown under Support.**
### Institutional section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>% difference 2010-11 to 2011-12</th>
<th>% difference 2011-12 to 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>112,112</td>
<td>114,322</td>
<td>115,514</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure adjustment</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI adjustment*</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>6,972</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure+RFI adjustment</strong></td>
<td>8,619</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>10,271</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As a % of total expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure adjustment</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI adjustment</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target surplus for sustainable operations (infrastructure adjustment + RFI adjustment)</strong></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As a % of adjusted income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin for Sustainability and Investment (MSI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New guidance regarding the RFI adjustment was introduced in 2010-11. Please see section B2.6 of the Statement of Requirements (v4.2 October 2013) and Update 6 [here](http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/revisions/).

** Please note that the MSI is calculated as a % of adjusted income, while the RFI and infrastructure adjustments are shown as % of expenditure.

### TRAC income and full economic costs by activity

Source: Section A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of full economic costs (income as a % of costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly funded Teaching</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-publicly funded Teaching</td>
<td>146.1</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>108.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research income and full economic costs by research sponsor type

Source: Section C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of full economic costs (income as a % of costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent research funding from the funding councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-own funded research</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate research</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research councils</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other government departments</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European union *</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK charities</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry **</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total research</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* European Union covers EU government bodies including the Commission. This is the same as that defined under 3(e) in Table 6b of the HESA Finance Statistics Return.

** Industry should include all other organisations such as UK industry, commerce and public corporations, EU non-government organisations (i.e. EU-based charities, EU industry and EU other), Overseas charities, Overseas industry and Other sources.

For further details of definitions please see B.1.5 and B.7.2a of the Statement of Requirements (v4.2 October 2013).
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Analysis of support costs, indirect costs and estates costs
Source: Section F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>2010-11 to 2011-12</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>2011-12 to 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total estates costs</td>
<td>14,865</td>
<td>19,233</td>
<td>21,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of estates costs allocated to research</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect costs</td>
<td>47,229</td>
<td>48,383</td>
<td>49,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of indirect costs allocated to research</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect costs excl RFI adjustment</td>
<td>45,778</td>
<td>46,234</td>
<td>46,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of indirect costs (excl RFI adjustment) allocated to research</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New guidance regarding the RFI adjustment was introduced in 2010-11. Please see section B2.6 of the Statement of Requirements (v4.2 October 2013) and Update 6 (http://www.jcpg.ac.uk/guidance/revisions/).
Please ensure all aspects of the TRAC return have been completed in accordance with this checklist.

Select Yes, No or N/A from the drop-down boxes.

1. Do academic and research assistant/fellow staff numbers reconcile with those used as cost drivers?  
   Yes
2. Do PDR numbers reconcile with those included in student number cost drivers?  
   Yes
3. Have research facility and laboratory technician costs been allocated to Teaching and Other activities where appropriate and excluded from the research facility or laboratory technician rates?  
   Yes
4. Have PGR scholarships, bursaries etc been excluded from the indirect costs for Research?  
   Yes
5. Have Teaching costs been taken into the TRAC (T) model? (select N/A if you are an institution in Wales)  
   Yes
6. Are total income and total expenditure (institutional results section) consistent with the data reported in the financial statements?  
   Yes
7. Have figures been compared to those of prior years and significant differences understood and explained (see commentary section and 'Summary' worksheet)?  
   Yes
8. Has a Board Committee confirmed the results have been prepared in accordance with the TRAC requirements based on a full self-assessment of compliance (Statement of Requirements section A.5.3)?  
   Yes
9. Has your TRAC Steering Group considered how they can use TRAC data internally or how it might be used in the future (see TRAC Update 6 paragraph 3.2)?  
   Yes
10. Do you currently use TRAC data for internal management purposes?  
    Yes
11. Is your institution going to implement the new workload planning/management approach to time allocation data (if relevant) (see TRAC Update 6 paragraph 3.3)?  
    No
12. Do you consider that your time allocation data and TRAC cost data (once any new methods, if applicable, have been fully implemented) will be both robust and provide utility to your institution (see TRAC Update 6 paragraph 3.5)?  
    Yes
13. Has the RFI adjustment been calculated in accordance with the guidance provided at section B.2.6 of the October 2013 Statement of Requirements (v.4.2) and Update 6?  
    Yes

* The income and expenditure lines as reported in the financial statements should be adjusted, where appropriate, in line with section B.1.7 of the Statement of Requirements (version 4.2 October 2013) in respect of joint ventures, minority interests and endowments.

Commentary Section

Please upload an electronic commentary document along with your completed return to explain any of the following (if highlighted in purple):

Commentary documents should be submitted as a Word or PDF document via the secure area of the HEFCE website.

1. Recovery of full economic costs on PFT is more than 105%.  
   Yes
2. Recovery of full economic costs on MPFT is less than 100%.  
   Yes
3. Recovery of full economic costs on industry** activity is less than 75%.  
   Yes
4. Recovery of full economic costs on Research Councils activity is less than 30% or more than 80%.  
   Yes
5. Recovery of full economic costs on Research Councils activity is less than the recovery of full economic costs on charities activity.  
   Yes
6. Recovery of full economic costs on Research Councils activity is less than the recovery of full economic costs on charities activity.  
   Yes
7. Recovery of full economic costs on Research Councils activity is less than the recovery of full economic costs on European Union activity.  
   Yes
8. Recovery of full economic costs on Research Councils activity is less than the recovery of full economic costs on European Union activity.  
   Yes
9. Indirect cost rate is more than £45,000 or less than £30,000.  
   Yes
10. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
11. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
12. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
13. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
14. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
15. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
16. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
17. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
18. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
19. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes
20. Estates laboratory rate is less than estates non-laboratory rate.  
    Yes

In addition:

1. Please comment on any material unusual movements in your TRAC return when comparing the data with your 2011-12 TRAC return. See 'Summary' worksheet for examples of year on year comparisons.
2. The request for an explanation does not mean that your figures are wrong, simply that they may require further review and explanation. Please also note that figures for the rates quoted here are not the lower quartile and upper quartile figures, which would show a much narrower range.
3. ** Industry should include all other organisations such as UK industry, commerce and public corporations, EU non-government organisations (i.e. EU-based charities, EU industry and EU other), Overseas charities, Overseas industry and Other sources.

Workbook validation checks

If, for any reason, you get any validation failures/warnings, you should review your figures to ensure they have been completed correctly before submitting your return to HEFCE. If you have a genuine reason for a validation failure/warning, please submit a commentary document with an explanation of this.

Commentary documents should be submitted as a Word or PDF document via the secure area of the HEFCE website.

1. The name of a Board Committee and a date of the meeting at which compliance with the TRAC requirements was confirmed should be entered in the 'Signoff_Sheet' worksheet.
2. Only those institutions who have selected that they are not eligible for or applying dispensation should complete section D, E and F.
3. The RFI and the infrastructure adjustments would usually be greater than zero.
4. Total income recorded in section A should equal total income recorded in the institutional results section.
5. Total full economic costs recorded in section A should equal the full economic cost recorded in the institutional results section.
6. Recurrent research funding from the funding council should be recorded in the income line of the first column in section C.
7. Total research income recorded in section C should equal total research income recorded in section A.
8. Total research costs recorded in section C should equal total research costs recorded in section A.
9. The question on robustness of the allocation of academic staff time to research sponsor types should be completed.
10. If you have identified that you do not calculate an estates laboratory rate or an estates non-laboratory rate in the drop-down box in section D, then the relevant columns should be left blank.
11. Academic staff numbers allocated to estates should be equal to or within 10% of those allocated to indirect costs.
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Your workbook has passed all validation checks

Post submission Validation Section (England and Northern Ireland only)
If for any reason, you get any validation failures/warnings, you should review your figures and/or the response in checklist question 6, to ensure they have been completed correctly. If this is a data error then please correct your figures in the annual TRAC return and resubmit your workbook to HEFCE.

39. Total income reported in the Annual TRAC return (institutional results section) should be consistent with data in table 1 of the Financial Tables returned in December 2013*.

40. Total expenditure reported in the Annual TRAC return (institutional results section) should be consistent with data in table 1 of the Financial Tables returned in December 2013*.

* The income and expenditure lines as reported in the financial statements should be adjusted, where appropriate, in line with section B.1.7 of the Statement of Requirements (version 4.2 October 2013) in respect of joint ventures, minority interests and endowments. For further information on how the post validation checks are calculated, please see the "Instructions" document included in the package you have downloaded from the secure area of the HEFCE website.
Annex B - Methodology

Costs

Cost adjustments

The costs from the annual accounts are increased to take account of two adjustments

i) The return for financing and investment adjustment.

This is required to cover the surpluses required for rationalisation, updating and development together with the costs of raising and servicing capital, including short-term borrowings.

The return for financing and investment adjustment (RFI) is comprised of two elements. The RFI on assets is derived by applying a rate of 5.75% to fixed assets (net of deferred capital grants and revaluation reserve) of the University. The second element is the RFI on expenditure calculated by applying a rate of 2.85% to the total expenditure figure (excluding exceptional items) disclosed in the annual accounts. Reorganisation costs are deducted from the calculated RFI on expenditure to produce a net figure, should the result be negative a zero figure must be included for this part of the calculation.

The result from the fixed assets calculation is added to the TRAC estates costs, whilst the result from the expenditure calculation is added to the TRAC indirect costs.

The TRAC Development Group is considering replacing the RFI adjustment with a different adjustment called the Margin for Sustainability and Investment. This new adjustment will be the subject of a bespoke calculation by each university. Data is being requested as part of the current TRAC return so that outcomes relating to this change can be assessed.

ii) The infrastructure adjustment.

This ensures that institutes adequately reflect the use and consumption of tangible fixed assets and also allow for the adequate renewal and upgrading of these assets. It is calculated by comparing the depreciation on buildings charged in the accounts with the same rate of depreciation charged on the higher valuation of buildings used for insurance purposes.

Analysis of expenditure

In order to analyse the adjusted expenditure figure between the five categories all direct costs were coded to the relevant academic schools, research institute or central services directorates. The costs of central services were then allocated to academic schools as appropriate using the methodology developed for the RAS. As an example estate costs were allocated to all departments based on weighted space usage.

The costs of each academic school and research institute, including attributed indirect costs and overheads, are then split between the five main categories. This was achieved by allocating pay and the majority of overhead costs on the basis of the diary exercises completed during November 2010, April 2012 and February 2013, estates costs on the basis of the space audit carried out during the summer of 2013 and equipment costs on the basis of analysis of the equipment assets held in the fixed asset register. These provided a robust method of allocating costs to the five categories. Publicly funded
teaching costs were split between HEFCE and non-HEFCE funded using taught student
FTE figures, with a weighting applied to postgraduate part-time and taught masters
students reflecting the extra cost of delivering such courses.

The other category includes costs that cannot reasonably be allocated to teaching or
research activities including, for example, catering, residences, intellectual property and
interest receivable.

**Income**

The income figures disclosed in the University’s Consolidated Income & Expenditure
Statement were classified into the five categories and sub analysis by research sponsor type
in accordance with the updated HEFCE guidance issued in October 2013 for the allocation
of income.

**Internal Audit**

Review of the University’s TRAC methodology by its internal auditor UNIAC no longer forms
part of the mandatory TRAC guidelines. However, best practice would be to conduct an
external review of TRAC methodology and an internal audit of TRAC methodology was
carried out in February 2013. The outcome of this work was reported to the Audit Committee
on 3 March 2013. Furthermore the University’s internal auditor reviewed the responses given
to the self-assessment process and reported its findings to the Audit Committee on 5 March
2013. No issues of non-compliance were reported during these processes. An update on this
process is being carried out in January 2016.

**Peer Group B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Bath</th>
<th>Royal Holloway, University of London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birkbeck College</td>
<td>University of Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranfield University</td>
<td>University of Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Durham</td>
<td>University of York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
<td>University of Ulster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Education</td>
<td>University of Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Essex</td>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
<td>Heriot-Watt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths College</td>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keele University</td>
<td>University of Strathclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent</td>
<td>Aberystwyth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>Bangor University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough University</td>
<td>Swansea University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Humanities and Social Sciences RIs

**Prof. Mihaela Kelemen** (Centre for Economics and Management Centre / Keele Management School)

**AHRC, £ 83,547 (£50,000 to Keele)** (amount to be confirmed)

Title: “Evaluating the Legacy of Animative and Iterative Connected Communities Projects: A Three Dimensional Model of Change”

Professor Mihaela Kelemen, Keele Management School, has been successful with her application for an 18 month project to the Arts and Humanities Research Council entitled "Evaluating the Legacy of Animative and Iterative Connected Communities Projects: A Three Dimensional Model of Change" worth £83,547, with funding of £50,000 to Keele. The project is a collaborative project with collaborators at Leicester University and the New Vic Theatre, Newcastle-under-Lyme and Jericho Road Solutions.

**Dr. Helen Wells** (Centre for Social Policy / School of Sociology and Criminology)

**The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Staffordshire, £ 31,500**

Title: “Evaluation of the Crash Course intervention for drivers caught using a mobile phone whilst driving”

Dr Helen Wells, Centre for Social Policy, has been awarded £31,500 from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Staffordshire. The project has resulted from an approach made by the 'Crash Course' team, in conjunction with Staffordshire Police/Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Staffordshire, to Dr Wells regarding the potential for an evaluation of a specific educational intervention offered as a diversion from standard prosecution for drivers detected using their mobile phone whilst driving. The principal hazard of phone use while driving is that it distracts the driver, taking their attention away from the task of driving. Research has found that drivers’ reaction times were 50% slower when using a mobile phone. In 2003 a law came into force to prohibit drivers using a hand held mobile phone while driving. The penalty was initially a fixed penalty of £30 but from 2007 this increased to £60 and three penalty points. Most drivers caught using a mobile phone whilst driving are dealt with in this way. However, drivers caught in Staffordshire may be offered the chance to attend 'Crash Course' as an alternative to paying the fine and receiving penalty points. The 'Crash Course' is a programme of approximately one and a half hours delivered by a multi-agency team. It is delivered to drivers caught using a hand held mobile phone as an alternative to penalty points and to people caught not wearing a seatbelt. It is a ‘hard hitting’ presentation including real footage of road crashes, filmed interviews and first-hand accounts from presenters. It includes testimony from those who have cared for casualties, investigated deaths on the road, experienced the results as families or victims, or suffered the consequences of their actions on the road in terms of convictions or even custody. Preliminary analysis of reconviction data for this offence suggest that diversion may be a more effective way of changing driver behaviour, but this project aims to carry out a longitudinal evaluation of the scheme's effectiveness at changing attitudes.
Dr. Stephen French (Centre for Economics and Management / Keele Management School)
Sir Halley Stewart Trust, £ 21,855 (£11,646 to Keele)
Title: “Longitudinal research into the utilisation of migrant workers and their employment experiences”

Dr Stephen French, in collaboration with Dr Geralidine Lee-Treweek from Manchester Metropolitan University, has been awarded £21,855 from the Sir Halley Stewart Trust to carry out longitudinal research into the utilisation of migrant workers and their employment experiences. The project will involve interviewing employers, employment agencies and migrant workers in North Staffordshire and East Cheshire who have been involved in a previous study Dr French led. The research focus will examine the changing employment patterns and workers' experiences of mobility and discrimination.

Crucially, it will be undertaken against the backdrop of the full opening up of the UK labour market to Bulgarian and Romanian nationals in January 2014 and against recent claims by the TUC that the Agency Workers Regulations (2010) have been ineffective in addressing poor employment conditions for agency workers.

Professor Karen Hunt (History / School of Humanities)
AHRC, £ 7,100
Title: “Our Place in the First World War”

Professor Karen Hunt of the School of Humanities is one of the researchers selected by the AHRC to participate in the BBC's 'World War One at Home' project. The AHRC-funded BBC project will tell the story of the First World War through the people whose lives were transformed - in their homes, schools, churches, theatres, streets and factories. These stories are planned to be broadcast on local radio and regional television in BBC English Regions. Within the West Midlands Professor Hunt will contribute to the production of a 100 stories covering a wide range of themes including how the war front affected the home front. Professor Hunt will focus particularly on everyday life during the First World War and hopes to use her research to broaden the ways in which we remember the war and whose contributions are commemorated. Over the years of the centenary, 2014-18, these stories will be part of how the BBC enables us all to commemorate the first 'total' war with a real sense of what it was like to live through such novel and challenging times. The AHRC is funding researchers to work with broadcast journalists in the BBC Regions in England to source, select and showcase stories related to the First World War.

EPSAM

Dr. Alastair Channon (Computing / School of Computing and Mathematics)
BBSRC, £ 465,000 (£90,000 to Keele) (amount to be confirmed)
Title: The theory and practice of evolvability: Effects and mechanisms of mutation rate plasticity
Dr Alastair Channon from Computing within the School and Computing and Mathematics, in collaboration with Drs Knight and Krasovec from Manchester University and Dr Belavkin from Middlesex University, has been awarded a grant of £465,000 by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) for a three-year project entitled “The theory and practice of evolvability: Effects and mechanisms of mutation rate plasticity.”

The team’s recently completed £426,000 EPSRC project led to a new understanding of optimal mutation rate control. That project involved both the evolution of DNA and the much faster evolution of sequences in computer experiments, using tables of DNA-to-protein binding affinities and running on general purpose graphics processing units. The BBSRC project will build on this by testing the mechanism and role of mutation rate plasticity in the process of evolutionary adaptation. Experiments will primarily be in the bacterium Escherichia coli, with complementary computational modelling of the evolution of density-dependent mutation rate plasticity in order to keep a close link with theory, which will also be developed in the project. One aim is to advance knowledge of how bacteria evolve antibiotic resistance, with a view to subsequently helping to develop ways of preventing the spread of antibiotic resistant ‘superbugs’: a global challenge which the UK Chief Medical Officer has warned poses a ‘catastrophic threat’ to humanity and which the UK Science Minister put top of the agenda at the 2013 G8 meeting of science ministers.

**Dr. Aleksandar Radu** (Materials and Analytical Chemistry / School of Physical and Geographical Sciences)

**EU Framework 7 Marie Curie IRSES, €279,300 (£99,000 to Keele)**

Title: Network for Sensor Knowledge Transfer (IBS-Network)

Dr Aleksandar Radu, of the Materials and Analytical Chemistry Group within the School of Physical and Geographical Sciences, has been awarded an EU Marie Curie IRSES Grant of €279,300, as part of the FP7 Programme, to establish world-wide network of research groups working in the field of Ionophore-based Sensors (IBS-Network). The project aims to establish the scientific basis from which the utility and potential for IBSs can be extended in a range of new sectors. The IBS-Network combines expertise from a number of disciplines and backgrounds, including analytical science focused on IBSs, organic synthesis, material science, microfluidics and statistics. It brings together a multidisciplinary team of 10 research groups from nine institutions (four from the EU, two from USA, two from Australia and one from China).

It is expected that the research exchange between the groups will achieve, through a balanced, two-way exchange of researchers and expertise between countries inside and outside Europe, the following main goals; to greatly expand the utility and potential for application of IBSs in a range of new sectors with recognized potential for benefit (climate action, health, wellbeing, marine and maritime research and food security); to strengthen existing and create new research collaborations between experts from a number of disciplines, techniques and equipment; and to provide the basis for long-term, sustainable collaborations in research with the knowledge to take forward developments in the IBS field.
Dr. John Taylor (Astrophysics / School of Physical and Geographical Sciences)  
The Leverhulme Trust, Philip Leverhulme Prize worth £70,000

Dr John Taylor of the Astrophysics Group has been awarded the highly competitive Philip Leverhulme Prize, worth £70,000. The award will provide funding to support a PhD student to work with Dr. Taylor as well as providing funding for travel and materials.

Although the first extrasolar planet (a planet orbiting a star other than our Sun) was only discovered in 1995, the number of known extrasolar planets already exceeds one thousand. The jewels in the crown are the transiting planets: those which pass in front of their parent star each time they orbit. For these planets we can measure their true masses and sizes, and thus their densities and surface gravities. Dr. Taylor’s work concentrates on obtaining these quantities with the highest possible precision and reliability, in order to maximise our understanding of the properties of planets.

Dr. Taylor’s two main projects for which the prize has been awarded are to use telescopes deliberately driven out of focus to obtain high-quality observations of planetary transits, and to re-analyse the known transiting planets using identical methods and so determine their properties in a statistically meaningful way. His results ultimately inform our understanding of how planetary systems form and evolve.

Dr. Jacco van Loon (Astrophysics / School of Physical and Geographical Sciences)  
Royal Society, £11,760  
Title: “Getting to know the Milky Way from studies of M33”

Dr Jacco van Loon of the Astrophysics Group has been awarded £11,760 by the Royal Society to support international collaboration with astronomers in Iran. The project will include a study of the nearby spiral galaxy Triangulum in order to understand how our own Milky Way Galaxy works, and the creation of an all-sky map of mysterious absorption thought to be due to molecules of an as yet unknown nature. Drs Atefeh Javadi and Habib Khosroshahi at the IPM in Tehran and several Iranian postgraduate students are involved. The Royal Society grant will fund exchange over a two-year period. This collaboration established by Dr. van Loon has previously been funded by the Leverhulme Trust and the Royal Astronomical Society.

ISTM

Prof. James Richardson, Prof Sally Roberts, Dr Jan-Herman Kuiper, Dr Helen McCarthy, Dr Johanna Wales, Dr Bernard Tins and Prof Iain McCall (RJAH Hospital, Oswestry / ISTM)  
MRC, £610,579 (Amount to be confirmed)  
Title: “Investigation of the Structural Quality of Bone and Cartilage Repair Following Cell Therapy”

Prof. James Richardson, Prof Sally Roberts, Dr Jan-Herman Kuiper, Dr Helen McCarthy, Dr Johanna Wales, Dr Bernard Tins and Prof Iain McCall of ISTM based at the Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Hospital, Oswestry, have been awarded funding of £610,579 from the MRC for a
major programme grant entitled, “Investigation of the Structural Quality of Bone and Cartilage Repair Following Cell Therapy”. This clinical trial will study the structural quality of bone and cartilage repair tissue in degenerate or injured knee joints following cell therapy with either chondrocytes and/or mesenchymal stromal cells. A related study has already been granted funding by Arthritis Research UK to carry out a randomised controlled trial in 114 subjects to compare the clinical benefit of the three cell therapy strategies (Autologous Stem cells, Chondrocytes Or the Two, “ASCOT”) and has already recruited its first patients. Clinical experience has shown Prof Richardson’s team that the full benefit of cell therapy is seen around one year after cell implantation. They will use a range of techniques to identify and quantify the different types of repair tissue produced in patients already in the ASCOT study: Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), visual inspection of the joint itself during knee joint surgery, and examining biopsies of repair tissue. To which patients will benefit most from cell therapy, the researchers will measure which of the thousands of genes are switched on in the implanted cells. By comparing between the genes and the measurements taken at one year, it is hoped to find gene patterns that identify such patients.

Prof. Alicia El Haj
MRC UK Regenerative Medicine Platform, £261,518
Title: “Acellular approaches for Therapeutic Delivery: UK Regenerative Medicine Platform Hub Application”

MRC UK Regenerative Medicine Platform, £17,500
Title: “A hub for Engineering and exploiting the stem cell niche”

Prof Alicia El Haj has been awarded funding to join two national MRC Hubs which are part of the UK Regenerative Medicine Platform (UKRMP), the Acellular Delivery consortia and the Cell Niche consortia. The UKRMP is a research hub which brings together teams of scientists from the UK with skills and expertise in focused areas to tackle the major challenges in regenerative medicine. The UKRMP is jointly funded by the MRC, BBSRC and EPSRC.

The Acellular Therapeutic Delivery Hub, funded to the tune of £3.8million by the MRC, is led by Keele’s longstanding partners, Prof Kevin Shakesheff (University of Nottingham) and Prof Molly Stevens (Imperial College London). Keele is a core partner together with Southampton and Manchester Universities, alongside nine companies involved in the ambitious project, to focus on complex cell and protein delivery systems, specifically through expertise in nanotechnology. The research hub’s goal is to develop and feed out to clinical and industrial partners at least five viable regenerative medicine projects which stand a clear chance of making an impact in clinical treatment of patients over the next 5 to 10 years.

The second Hub, with a total MRC award value of £4.5million, is headed by Edinburgh and Manchester Universities aimed at “Engineering and exploiting the stem cell niche” and involves collaborators at Bristol and Strathclyde Universities, Imperial College, Kings College London and Keele. Keele will receive an initial award of ca. £280k over 4 years to carry out research during both projects with a second tranche of funding available in Year 2 of the programme.
Dr. Catherine Merrick (School of Life Sciences / iSTM)
MRC, £268,069
Title: “Virulence gene dynamics in the human malaria parasite”

Following her twin success in 2012 securing both a three year project grant of £357,000 from the BBSRC and a one year New Investigator grant of £142,000 from the MRC Early Career Researcher Scheme, Dr Catherine Merrick, of the School of Life Sciences and IST, has been awarded a further MRC grant to continue her pilot study of "Virulence gene dynamics in the human malaria parasite". This funding for 30 months of £268,069 will allow a complete investigation of the role of unusual non-helix DNA structures in controlling the expression of key virulence genes that are implicated in severe malaria. The grant will support postdoctoral researcher Dr Lynne Harris and Catherine has now secured sufficient support for her own post to enable her to commit 70% of her time to research until summer 2016.

Prof. Gwyn Williams (School of Life Sciences / ISTM)
Prostate Cancer UK, £50,000
Title: “The role of GA55 IncRNA in the development and therapy resistance of castrate-resistant prostate cancer”

Professor Gwyn Williams from the School of Life Sciences and IST, has been successful in obtaining funding of £50,000 from Prostate Cancer UK for a 12 month project entitled, “The role of GA55 IncRNA in the development and therapy resistance of castrate-resistant prostate cancer”. The project will explore an area of research, non-coding RNAs, which has generated a great deal of excitement in cancer research very recently. This is a new and unexplored area which may provide key information about how prostate cancer develops and progresses. This new information may lead to the development of novel therapies to treat men with prostate cancer.

Prof. Gwyn Williams (School of Life Sciences / ISTM)
Breast Cancer Campaign, £19,800
Title: “Oligonucleotide hormone response element (HRE)-mimics as novel breast cancer drugs”

Professor Gwyn Williams from the School of Life Sciences and IST, has been successful in obtaining funding of £19,800 from the Breast Cancer Campaign for a project entitled, “Oligonucleotide hormone response element (HRE)-mimics as novel breast cancer drugs”. This new grant under the Breast Cancer Campaign Pilot Grant scheme provides Prof Williams’ group with consumables and a new mini-centrifuge. It continues work under his previous £200,000 Breast Cancer Campaign grant awarded in 2012.

Prof. Christine Roffe
NHS National Institute for Health Research, £7,000
Title: “Tranexamic Acid for hyperacute primary Intracerebral Haemorrhage (TICH-2)”
Professor Christine Roffe has become one of a group of the UK’s leading stroke specialists to be involved in a large new clinical trial funded by the National Institute for Health Research, with a total award value of over £2.5 million. The "TICH-2" study will assess in a phase III randomised controlled trial whether Tranexamic Acid is safe and reduces death and dependency after hyperacute primary intracerebral haemorrhage (within 8 hours of onset). The study is led by Dr Nicola Sprigg and Professor Philip Bath of Nottingham University, and the co-investigators include experts from London, Edinburgh, Leicester and Keele stroke centres. Tranexamic Acid is inexpensive, easy to administer and is already used in the NHS for other conditions such as bleeding after trauma or surgery. If this research shows that Tranexamic Acid reduces the number of people who die or who are left dependent after haemorrhagic stroke, it could be rapidly introduced to stroke care across the NHS.

**Prof. Christine Roffe (ISTM)**

EU 7th Framework via Greater Glasgow Health Board, £4,090

Title: “Efficacy and safety of MRI-based thrombolysis in wake-up stroke: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (WAKE UP).”

Professor Christine Roffe is part of a large European Collaborative Research project WAKE-UP (Efficacy and safety of MRI-based thrombolysis in wake-up stroke: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial). WAKE UP is a European collaborative research project launched by a consortium of academic and SME partners destined to improve the treatment of stroke patients. The core of WAKE UP is an investigator led randomized controlled trial of MRI based thrombolysis in patients waking up with stroke symptoms. The WAKE UP consortium brings together leading stroke researchers from European academic institutions, highly specialized SME partners, and patient organizations providing a wide range of clinical and scientific expertise in stroke, image processing, and the conduction of clinical trials. The WAKE-UP project is aimed to promote a paradigm-change in acute stroke treatment, and to provide effective treatment to a large new group of patients. The results of WAKE-UP are expected to change guidelines of acute stroke management and clinical practice. WAKE-UP will help to reduce the burden of stroke related disability in the EU.

**Dr. Mark Skidmore (School of Life Sciences / ISTM)**

Royal Society, £15,000

Title: “Optimized, carbohydrate based, next generation anti-malarials”

Dr Mark Skidmore from the School of Life Sciences and ISTM, has been awarded a Research Grant from The Royal Society worth £15,000. The project, which represents a new multidisciplinary collaboration Dr. Skidmore and Dr Paul Horrocks aims to identify and characterise bioactive anti-malarials. The project will provide provisional data for future, fully synthetic, synthesis approaches permitting enhancement in activity and future production, along with pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic studies for these drug-leads.

**Dr. Daniel Bray (School of Life Sciences / ISTM)**


EU 7th Framework Marie Curie Intra European Fellowship
Title: “An innovative semiochemical based tool for monitoring and control of biting midge vectors of bluetongue and Schmallenberg disease (MIDGETRAP)”

Dr Daniel Bray of the School of Life Sciences and ISTM has been awarded a Marie Curie Intra European Fellowship (IEF) for a two year project titled "An innovative semiochemical based tool for monitoring and control of biting midge vectors of bluetongue and Schmallenberg disease (MIDGETRAP)". Daniel will be hosted at Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet (Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences) where he will build on the links developed on Professor Gordon Hamilton’s Wellcome Trust Brazil project which he is currently working on. It is hoped that he will return to Keele at the end of his Fellowship.

Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, £541,500

ISTM has been awarded several Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MOHESR) PhD Studentships worth a total of £541,500 in terms of full overseas Tuition Fees and funding for materials and consumables. Details of the PhD studentships are given below:

Dr. Ruoli Chen (School of Pharmacy / ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Biochemistry (Clinical Molecular Biochemistry)
Title: “Characterisation of novel specific prolyl hydroxylase inhibitors on human mesenchymal stem cell culture”

Dr. Frank Rutten (School of Pharmacy / ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £49,500
PhD in Chemistry (Analytical chemistry/Separation techniques)
Title: "Separation and analysis techniques for the monitoring of pharmaceutical reaction mixtures"

Dr. Nick Forsyth
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Clinical Biochemistry
Title: "Determination of trace elements composition in the serum of patients and an exploration of their roles in autologous stem cell in biology"

Dr. Divya Chari (School of Medicine / ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Cell and Tissue Engineering
Title: "Use of animal tissue culture models to examine the effects of anti-inflammatory therapies on regenerative processes following neurological injury"

Dr. Mirna Maarabouni (School of Life Sciences / ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Clinical Biochemistry
Title: "An investigation of the roles of specific genes in breast cancer"
Dr. Alan Richardson  (School of Pharmacy / ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Pharmacy (Pharmacology)
Title: "Drug combinations to sensitize ovarian cancer cells to chemotherapy"

Dr. Nick Forsyth  (ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Pharmacology
Title: "Developing mesenchymal stem cell-based systems for localized inflammatory response suppression"

Dr. David Mazzocchi-jones  (School of Life Sciences / ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Neuroscience
Title: "Manipulation of native neuronal nmda receptor sub-unit conformation using magnofection"

Dr. Tony Curtis  (School of Pharmacy / ISTM)
Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 3 Years, £61,500
PhD in Pharmacy (Pharmaceutical Chemistry)
Title: "The development of novel cytotoxic drugs for targeted delivery systems"

Primary Care and Health Sciences

Prof. Elaine Hay, Prof. Kysia Dziedzic and Prof. Danielle van der Windt
Arthritis Research UK, £365,758
Title: “The clinical and cost effectiveness for steroid injection compared with night splints for carpal tunnel syndrome: a pragmatic randomized trial in primary care”

Professor Elaine Hay, Director of the Arthritis Research UK Primary Care Centre at Keele, with colleagues Professor Krysia Dziedzic and Professor Danielle van der Windt, have been awarded the second tranche of their clinical studies grant, £365,758 by Arthritis Research UK. This is a continuation of funding for a randomised controlled trial in primary care investigating the clinical and cost effectiveness of steroid injections and night splints for the treatment of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (CTS) is a very common condition which essentially traps nerves in the hand and wrist, causing symptoms of pain and tingling. It generally affects adults aged over 30, and particularly affects women. It is a major cause of upper limb pain, sleeping problems, difficulty with day to day tasks and reduced capacity to work and as such has a major impact on both quality of life and work performance.

The multi-centred trial will be conducted nationally and represents a successful collaboration between the Centre at Keele and members from the network of General Practitioners of the Primary Care Rheumatology Society headed by Dr. Graham Davenport. This is the first study to directly compare commonly used treatment options for CTS in a primary care setting. The results
of this trial will inform clinical management as well as future research into treatment options for patients with CTS.

Dr Kikia Konstantinou  
HEFCE / NHS NIHR Senior Clinical Lectureship, £250,000  
Title: "Sciatica in primary Care: from epidemiology to optimal treatments"  
Dr Kikia Konstantinou has been awarded a prestigious five year NIHR Senior Clinical Lectureship worth £250,000.

Prof. Elaine Hay  
NHS National Institute for Health Research, £70,000  
Title: "Capacity Award"  
Start 1 January 2014 for 33 months

Prof. Elaine Hay  
NHS National Institute for Health Research, £30,000  
Title: "Partner application to The School for Primary Care Research (SPCR) Tranche II - Administrative Funds"  
Start 1 January 2014 for 21 months

Prof Nadine Foster  
NHS National Institute for Health Research (via Warwick University) £7,103  
Title: “UK FASHION: Feasibility study for a randomised controlled trial comparing hip arthroplasty with best conservative care of patients with femoro-acetabular impingement”

Prof Carolyn Chew-Graham  
Department of Health (via Manchester University), £2,923  
Title: "An Exploratory Randomised Controlled Trial of Guided self-help for Women with Chronic Pelvic Pain (CCP) in Primary Care"

Prof Carolyn Chew-Graham  
Department of Health (via Manchester University), £5,680  
Title: "Collaboration for leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRC)"

Prof Carolyn Chew-Graham  
Department of Health (via Manchester University), £2,923  
Title: "RCF - Collaboration for leadership in applied research and care (CLAHRC)"

Mark Ormerod, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)  
Donna Sumner, Ann Diskin, Caroline Pugh, Research and Enterprise Services  
5th February 2014
HEBCIS, the Higher Education Business and Community Interactions Survey, is part of the annual HESA return, capturing metrics of enterprise-related activity in the HE sector. It directly informs the allocation of HEIF funds. HEIF11-15, the current round of HEIF, started in August 2011, with institutional allocations informed by HEBCIS returns from 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10, weighted in a 1:2:7 ratio.

In last year’s return, for 2011/12 enterprise activity, enterprise income was up by £170k, helped in particular by increases in collaborative and contract research. Consultancy and CPD income both fell, as did licence income. Reasons for this were analysed and reported to SPC, but a key impact was a major reduction in health-related enterprise metrics due to changes in healthcare markets (DoH, NHS). This year, total enterprise income has risen very significantly by £2.4m (just over 30%), taking enterprise income to over £10m for the year. The detail behind this increase is analysed below. As last year, the return is structured into 5 tables, each focusing on particular elements of enterprise activity. These are:

1. Research related activities
2. Business and Community Services
3. Regeneration and Development programmes
4. Intellectual Property
5. Social, Community and Cultural Engagement

The full detail of this year’s return is available if required. Major changes at main heading level between last year and this year’s return are set out in the table and commentary below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Research related activities</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaborative research incl public funding</td>
<td>£4,098k</td>
<td>£3,693k</td>
<td>£2,979k</td>
<td>+£405k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contract research</td>
<td>£802k</td>
<td>£1,202k</td>
<td>£1,068k</td>
<td>-£400k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Business and Community Services</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultancy contracts</td>
<td>£2,071k</td>
<td>£1,055k</td>
<td>£1,120k</td>
<td>+£1,016k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Facilities and equipment related services</td>
<td>£215k</td>
<td>£403k</td>
<td>£343k</td>
<td>-£191k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Courses for business and the community</td>
<td>£1,948k</td>
<td>£905k</td>
<td>£1,168k</td>
<td>+£1,043k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Regeneration and development progs</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td>£540k</td>
<td>£82k</td>
<td>£441k</td>
<td>+£458k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Intellectual Property</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>IP Disclosures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Patents filed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Patent portfolio</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Licence numbers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IP income</td>
<td>£585k</td>
<td>£527k</td>
<td>£577k</td>
<td>+£58k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spin-off activity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Social, community, cultural Engagement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total attendees</td>
<td>29,267</td>
<td>15,126</td>
<td>10,286</td>
<td>+14,141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals | Total enterprise income | £10,259k | £7,867k | £7,696k | +£2,392k |
Commentary on 2012/13 vs 2011/12 changes in HEBCIS return

**Table 1: Research related activities**

**Heading 1: Collaborative research involving public funding**

As last year, a significant increase of £405k, and £1.12m on 2010/11, due to two factors: increased expenditure on existing Research Council and ITN network grants, particularly in EPSAM and ISTM, and a number of new collaborative projects.

**Heading 2: Contract research**

A significant reduction in SME income due to two factors, firstly a revision in one longstanding SME contract (with ESEU (Earth Science Education Unit)), which moves £170k from contract research to CPD, and a general decline in the value of other contract work, although the number of contracts has held up, 110 compared to 103 last year.

**Table 2: Business and Community Services**

Table 2 provides analysis of the different areas of consultancy contracts, facilities and equipment related services and courses for business and the community.

**Heading 1: Consultancy contracts** - requiring expert advice, analysis, testing across all staff activities

A very substantial uplift of over £1m, to nearly double last year’s return, due to a steadying of consultancy activity generally, a major one-off arrangement (£900k) with an NHS organisation (National Institute for Innovation and Improvement Centre) to undertake quality-related work for them, and some service provision via the Science Learning Centre.

**Heading 2: Facilities and equipment related services** - organisations involved and income for knowledge transfer

This income line has nearly halved, falling by £191k to £205k. A general reduction in eligible activity across conferences, Science Park facility use and equipment use have all contributed to the decrease. The new Anatomy suite should have a positive impact on this category in future years.

**Heading 3: Courses for business and the community** - Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses and Continuing Education (CE) (excluding pre-registration funded by the NHS or TDA)

A very substantial uplift more than doubling to nearly £2m, due in large part to stronger performance across the University's health economy, plus the addition of Science Learning Centre metrics due to a change in eligibility. This business stream remains fragile due to a heavy reliance on health service budgets.
Table 3: Regeneration and development programmes

Table 3 provides analysis of regeneration income and activity. Regeneration funding is an important way for HEIs to invest intellectual assets in economic, physical and socially beneficial projects.

ERDF funding currently forms a minor component of Keele’s regeneration and KT initiatives. the £458k increase this year comes from a variety of KT activities related to JISC, HIEC and SLC projects.

Table 4: Intellectual Property

Table 4 provides more detailed analysis of intellectual property (IP).

Heading 1: Disclosures, patents filed and patent portfolio

Disclosures remain low but of a high quality, with a good increase in the number of new patent filings (8 compared to 3 in 2011/12 and 4 in 2010/11), which should feed into new licences over the next year.

Heading 2: Licence numbers – includes all active licences, assignments, MTA’s with income

Licence numbers are unchanged but there is a slightly different mix of licences.

Heading 3: IP Income

IP income has increased by just under £60k, largely due to a final payment of royalties under the GE licence, which finally came to an end in June this year. There will be significant fall in licence income next year unless a major licence opportunity or spin-out sale arises in the interim. Neither are currently expected.

Heading 4: Spin-off activity – including staff and graduate start ups

The start of SPEED Plus, our ERDF-funded student enterprise initiative, and new activity on social enterprise, means that the number of start-ups is up significantly this year, from 4 to 17.

An update on Keele’s current spinouts is given in Annex 1 to this report.

Table 5: Social, community and cultural Engagement

Table 5 provides an analysis of social, community and cultural events intended for the external community. It is designed to measure the impact of activities where financial income is an inappropriate proxy for impact. It includes public lectures, performing arts, exhibitions and museum education.

Our metrics here continue to grow very significantly, with another year-on-year doubling of recorded visitor numbers. There are likely to be a number of factors at play including, the 50th anniversary year, lots happening at the Observatory and the Hub, the impact of improved marketing activity and the appointment of a new Arts Officer, who has developed a strong Arts programme, and improved data capture. Although the metrics have little impact
on the HEIF calculation, they send a powerful message about our engagement with the local community and beyond, and contribute to the impact agenda.

**Actions being taken to support increased HEBCIS metrics**

A number of actions were reported on last year, aimed at supporting the areas reflected in the HEBCIS metrics. Under Table 1, a new dedicated European Research Funding Officer role demonstrated significant results with a significant increase in bids to FP7 funding, and some notable successes now being announced, including two recent major Marie Curie bid successes. This will be reflected in collaborative research income in future years.

For Table 2, the Head of Employer Engagement is supporting a more proactive approach to the development of employer engagement activity, especially CPD and particularly with KMS. Professor Steve Chapman’s move to a more focused Enterprise role in the School of Pharmacy is leading (in a difficult market) to an increase in Pharmacy-related CPD and consultancy. This continues to be a major component of both consultancy and CPD metrics in our HEBCIS returns.

Table 3 metrics remain low for Keele but our profile in the LEP should positively affect our ability to lead or be part of sub-regional initiatives that allow us to bid for and draw down funds for regeneration. Significant opportunities now exist to develop initiatives focused on increased ERDF/ESF funds and this will be a priority for development in future years. HEIF-funded resource in CBE will help contribute to this.

Activity under Table 4 (IP commercialisation) remains a priority and the Head of RES and the Technology Transfer Manager will focus on driving opportunities going forward, with a major IP awareness programme in train to improve the flow of disclosures and licence opportunities.

The hugely increased visitor numbers over the last two years highlighted in Table 5 benefits from increased outreach activity, corporate event marketing and improved data capture. The two Enterprise Business Managers, plus the relatively new Arts Officer in MAC, add to the resource supporting this activity.

**Keele performance relative to the sector, 2011/12 data**

The following figures indicate Keele’s performance in comparison to three groupings:

1. UK HEIs (all 160 UK HE institutions)

**Index to charts:**

1. Chart 1 – Keele ranking over time against all HEIs
2. Chart 2 – Keele ranking over time against WM universities
3. Chart 3 – Keele ranking over time against benchmark group

These comparisons are for 2011/12, the most recent set of data available for the sector. Normalising the data for size of institution does not radically change our broad position.
In summary, the data show that we punch above our weight on IP income, and are well above average for collaborative research income, and (on 2011/12 data) are some way below where we would want to be on consultancy, contract research and CPD income streams, where our performance has decreased significantly since 2008/09. Our performance in 2012/13 should move us up significantly on consultancy and CPD (unless other institutions demonstrate similar increases) but contract research will still be a significant area of underperformance.
As one of four research-led institutions in the West Midlands we should expect to perform well on IP revenues and contract research. There are more institutions with strong consultancy activity (including Coventry, Wolverhampton and Staffordshire) and similar for CPD. Again, this year’s (2012/13) performance should move us up the rankings in consultancy and CPD.
This chart is more concerning: against our benchmark institutions we only show well on IP income. For all other categories, we rank below most institutions and are close to bottom in CPD and contract research.
Annex 1: Spinout company update

Summary of Spin-out companies based on Keele University intellectual property

The University had the following investments in spin-out companies as at 31st July 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Investment</th>
<th>Class of share</th>
<th>Proportion held by University</th>
<th>Nature of business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Orthopaedics Limited</td>
<td>Ordinary C</td>
<td>18.8% (KU, SU and UHNS)</td>
<td>Devices for orthopaedic operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nanoTherics Limited</td>
<td>Ordinary A Ordinary</td>
<td>4.7% total</td>
<td>Gene transfection technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribing Decision Support Limited</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Software to assist prescribing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciCorr Limited</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>NDT instrument for rust detection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the above companies are registered in England and Wales.

Summary details by company

Intelligent Orthopaedics Limited

Incorporated On: 6th August 2002

Directors:

Alistair Taylor (Chairman)
Susan Hartman (CEO)
Peter Ogrodnik (Staffordshire University/UHNS academic founder)
Peter Thomas (UHNS academic founder, formerly Keele University)

Observers:

Mark Payton (Mercia Fund)
Jonathan Lowe (Catapult Fund)
Peter Hooper (Keele University – also on behalf of Staffordshire University and UHNS R&D due to joint ownership of intellectual property)

Secretary: Alistair Taylor

Intelligent Orthopaedics Limited specialises in the design, development and manufacture of orthopaedic trauma devices for treating fractures of the tibia. They have recently raised £200k on the back of the sale of non-core IP and are boosting sales activity through the appointment of their first full time sales manager. Turnover c. £100k
nanoTherics

Incorporated On: 2nd August 2007

Directors:

Bob Penney (Chairman)
Carlton Jones (CEO)
Jon Dobson (Keele University academic founder)
Mark Payton (Mercia Fund nominee)
Andrew Waterfall (Angel investor)

Observers:

Jonathan Lowe (Catapult Fund)
Peter Hooper (Keele University)

Secretary: Peter Cunliffe

nanoTherics develops and commercialises innovative magnetic nanoparticle-based products for the life-science sector. Their unique scientific devices and reagents improve the uptake of biomaterials into cells, a process called transfection, to greatly facilitate research and development of gene-related diseases and disorders. A recent funding call was oversubscribed at £400k, the current focus is on product enhancement and building sales. Turnover last year was £250k.

Prescribing Decision Support

Incorporated On: 2nd August 2007

Directors:

Stephen Chapman (CEO, Keele University academic founder)
Simon Thomas (Sales and Marketing Director)

Observers:

Peter Hooper (Keele University)

Secretary: Simon Thomas

Prescribing Decision Support (PDS) has developed a series of computerised decision support tools that aim to address the more practical challenges related to the adoption of guidelines and the implementation of evidence-based medicine. The company is effectively embedded in the School of Pharmacy and although turnover last year was c.£200k.
SciCorr Limited

Incorporated On: November 2012

Directors:

Rob Painting (Chairman, angel investor)
Bob Rennison (CEO)
Roger Dale (Secretary, angel investor)

Observers:

Peter Hooper (Keele University)

Secretary: Roger Dale

SciSite, our previous spinout using this ferrous corrosion detection technology, went into receivership in late 2012. The IP reverted to Keele and was re-licenced to SciCorr, a new company with a new set of investors from CEBA (Central England Business Angels). The technology uses a unique, non-contact, non-destructive method of directly detecting the presence of rust on steel. The corrosion probe is currently being trialled by a range of local authorities and construction companies, largely in applications related to road bridge and flyover repairs. Developing the product and generating sales have been subject to a number of delays and the company is currently seeking to raise further funds from shareholders.

Mark Ormerod, PVC Research & Enterprise
Peter Hooper, Research & Enterprise Services
January 2014
Keele University Knowledge Exchange Strategy

The Keele University KE Strategy reflects and supports the University Strategic Plan 2010-2015, specifically those aspects concerning Keele’s innovation, collaboration and outreach, and has a dual intent of maximising:
(a) the impact of Keele’s research, teaching, community and estate on society and the economy; and
(b) the revenue earning potential from our intellectual and physical assets.

The KE Strategy supports all elements of Keele’s wider strategy, but in particular:
**Strategic Aim 3**: to deliver international excellence and impact in focused areas of research
**Strategic Aim 4**: to contribute positively to the society, economy, culture and health of the communities we serve through our research, education and enterprise.
**Strategic Aim 6**: to manage and develop resources effectively to ensure the University’s sustainability and development.

The underpinning strategic objectives are:
- To be recognised as an influential University making a positive contribution within academia and wider society.
- To foster innovation and enterprise with partners.
- To be outward-reaching to business, public bodies and the third sector, contributing positively to regeneration, economic and social development, in particular locally and regionally.
- To share and provide the University’s expertise in environment and sustainability to local, regional, national and international communities and partners.
- To grow and develop the University’s commercial activity in support of the institution's research and educational mission.

**Enterprise-related Key Performance Indicators** - Current KPIs for KE are:
- CPD income
- Collaborative research income
- Contract research income
- Consultancy income

**STRATEGIC AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

1. **Impact**
- To use KE to generate significant social, cultural, environmental and economic impact, working with external partners and collaborators to benefit society
- To effectively communicate our KE successes regionally, nationally and internationally to promote our distinctive contribution, raising our external profile and reach
- To foster innovation and enterprise engaging with business and external partners
- To maximise the potential of engagement with the LEP and other sub-regional partners

2. **Income**
- To maximise the generation of income from education-led KE, in particular CPD
- To increase consultancy income through the effective marketing of the expertise of Keele’s academic community
- To identify, secure and commercialise IP assets across all areas of the University’s activity
- To maximise income generation from external use of Keele’s physical assets, including technical equipment, conference space and the Science Park
- To grow KE income from EU funding sources, in particular ERDF and EFS funds via the LEP
3. Interaction
- RES to work closely and in partnership with all Schools and RIs to raise awareness of KE opportunities
- To foster relationships with external partners and stakeholders to facilitate the dissemination, impact and promotion of KE outcomes
- To engage widely with business (particularly Science Park tenants) and other external partners across the full range of KE activity
- To engage widely with the public and local schools to promote greater public engagement and understanding of the role of universities
- To maximise the opportunities for KE presented by increased external footfall across Keele’s campus(es).

4. Initiatives
- To promote all appropriate KE initiatives to Keele staff and to external partners
- To optimise the use of grant funds, particularly HEIF, in developing and supporting new Keele-led KE initiatives
- To work closely with the LEP in developing and supporting initiatives aimed at innovative SMEs
- To increase the number of KTPs
- To encourage and develop staff and student entrepreneurs, including social entrepreneurs
- To work closely with national and local partners, such as Business in the Community and the Aspire Group, in the delivery of community-focussed initiatives in line with Keele’s wider strategies

5. Inspiration
- To engender a culture of innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurship across Keele
- To inspire staff and students to engage in new and exciting ways to work with external partners, be that in research, education, teaching, outreach or other ways
- To inspire our external partners to come up with new and innovative ways of working with Keele in support of their own organisation’s strategic objectives
- To inspire visitors to Keele to engage with the University, our staff and our students, across the widest possible range of agendas.
Research & Enterprise Services

Report to Strategic Planning Committee:

Update on RES activity 2013

1. Overview

Research & Enterprise Services (RES) is a central support office of the University, reporting to the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research & Enterprise). The office consists of a number of specialist teams offering expertise in support of: (1) core academic activity - contracts advice; research grant support; research policy; research governance; research ethics; and (2) enterprise support - business development; technology transfer; employer engagement and student enterprise.

This paper provides an update on the full suite of activity of the teams within RES. A detailed report on Keele’s most recent performance in enterprise activity, based on our 2012/13 return to the HE-BCI survey (Higher Education Business and Community Interaction), will be brought to the March SPC once Keele’s data have been validated by HESA.

In the course of the year there have been a number of changes in RES staffing and structure. The current make-up of the office is indicated in the organisational chart below (p.2). With the advent of the new section of Academic Legal Services the suite of support functions now spans an increased range of University academic activity, across all Schools and RIs.

To add some context to this update report, over the past five years there has been over a 50% increase in research grant income to the University, and a concomitant growth in PGR numbers. This has led to significantly increased activity in RES, particularly in Research Support. The scale of increased activity in Health, particularly iPCHS but also iSTM, has added to workloads with more complex grants and in particular increasing demands on Research Governance and ethics support. This increase was also one of the key determining factors in the creation of a joint RES/PAA Contracts Unit (now badged as Academic Legal Services) in RES.

Enterprise activity more generally, particularly knowledge exchange and knowledge transfer, has been impacted to some degree by the economic situation over the past five years, but the increased research activity and increased support for employer engagement mean that new IP, projects and initiatives are now feeding through to the enterprise agenda. Employer Engagement and Student Enterprise are contributing to enhanced courses and student experience, the development of graduate attributes and the increased employability of Keele graduates, which will be a contributory factor in NSS performance, recruitment and League Tables.
2. RES Key Functions

2.1 Role of Head of Office

In addition to managing and leading RES, and supporting individual teams on particular issues (covered below), the remit of the Head of RES includes a number of wider responsibilities:

- External representation at meetings – national and regional, including LEP and UniversitiesWM; ERDF/ESF, KTP, Skills. Some of these are on behalf of or designated by the VC, DVC, PVC R&E or PVC E&SE. With enterprise and other funding streams increasingly LEP-driven this will be a significant priority through 2013/14 and beyond. The Head of RES has recently become chair of the LEP’s Growth Hub Steering Group, which will oversee the delivery of a £4m business support initiative targeted at SMEs.

- Working closely with the Director of CBE - on business/employer engagement, particularly regionally e.g. the Business Innovation Group, Science Park, Staffordshire Chambers of Commerce.

- Working with the Director of CBE, the PVC R&E and the Director of KMS on business engagement.

- The HEIF agenda: HEIF funds over half of RES posts, with the next round due in 2015.

- Institutional lead on operationalising Research Governance, particularly in respect of clinical trials. A major priority for 2013/14 and beyond.

2.2 Research Support Unit

Remit

The remit of the Research Support Unit is to provide central support for research activity across the University, working closely with and in support of the PVC (R&E), the Research Institutes and Research Finance. Its main activities are supporting research policy and strategy; and research grants support (including specialist EU support).

Key activities

Research Policy and Strategy: support for the REF, executive support to PVC (R&E), supporting Research Committee and Graduate School Board, providing management information and project-specific support (e.g. responses to consultations). Other activities include a greater involvement in PGR, including supporting the Graduate School Board and PGR matters generally, since the discontinuation of Graduate School in 2010/11 and the responsibility for PGR coming under the remit of the PVC R&E in 2011; and administratively overseeing and acting as contact point for overseas government PhD Scholarship schemes such as Iraq and Indonesia. Support for the REF, which has been reported on in some detail to Council, was a major priority for Research Support staff through the last year. 288 staff (headcount), were submitted to 17 Units of Assessment

Research Grants: checking costings and applications pre-submission, drawing up budgetary information for awards, management information (including research highlights), information, advice and guidance (IAG), particularly around grant funders’ terms and conditions.
Research income reached a record high of £13.475m for 2012/13, with almost £50m of research grant applications across the University and a research grant success rate of 26%. European Funding – support in developing proposals, capacity building, IAG on funding developments, representation and brokerage on strategic groups and initiatives. A new post of European Funding Officer was instrumental in raising awareness of EU funding opportunities and has led to increases in grant submissions and awards in this important area. The post-holder left Keele for a position at Birmingham University late last year and recruitment is currently under way for a new European Research Funding Manager.

2.3 Contracts Unit (Academic Legal Services)

Remit
The Contract Unit’s remit is to review and approve all academic-related contracts – i.e. those relating to research-related and education-related activity - in such a way so as to enable the University to accurately assess contractual risk. To do this, the Unit drafts appropriate contractual terms and negotiates these terms with the University’s partners to minimise and/or mitigate the University’s exposure. The Unit is jointly funded by RES (HEIF) and PAA. The Unit does not advise on specialist employment matters, procurement contracts or estates/property matters. The Unit has recently been expanded to incorporate the Research Governance activity and will become RES’s Academic Legal Services Unit. Overall, the Unit dealt with 332 contracts in 2013 and has a current caseload of 148 projects.

Key activities
Research Contracts: the Contracts Unit reviews all research and enterprise contracts within RES’s overarching remit. This encompasses collaboration agreements, studentships, contract research, grant share agreements, consultancy, CDAs, secondment agreements, material transfer agreements, and other documents which may have legal or contractual implications such as letters of intent, MOUs and similar. For many of these arrangements, template agreements written by the Unit are available or are under development. RES currently seeks external legal advice for specialist contracts such as licensing agreements, patent arrangements (e.g. powers of attorney and IP assignments) or corporate transactions associated with Keele’s spin-out companies.
‘Education’ Contracts: currently about 55% of the contracts reviewed relate to educational or other academic-related activity, such as teaching partnerships, strategic relationships, collaborative overseas provision, overseas partnerships, MOUs and similar. These contracts tend to relate more frequently to specific one-off arrangements and are often complex in nature.
General legal advice: although the Unit does not have the capacity to offer general legal advice to the University, advice in relation to specific academic matters is provided to senior University staff, subject to the approval of the Head of Office. The Unit will shortly commence development of a staff development course to educate staff in relevant areas on general contract issues.
Research Governance: advice on research governance and research ethics policies, support to Research Governance Subcommittee and Research Ethics Subcommittee, IAG on ethics submissions, IAG on relevant regulations and standards, central monitoring of clinical trial activity. An additional Research Governance Officer role has recently been approved, which will allow RES to more effectively support the University’s increased obligations with respect
to clinical trial activity and an expected forthcoming inspection by the Medicines and Health Regulatory Authority (MHRA).

2.4 Technology Transfer Unit

Remit
The remit of the Technology Transfer Unit is to work with academic colleagues in the identification, assessment, protection and commercialisation of intellectual property (IP) created in the course of research, education and enterprise activity. The three key activities are creating IP awareness across Keele staff and students; identifying, protecting and managing an IP (patent) portfolio; and commercialising IP to create revenue for the University – primarily via licensing activity but on occasion via the creation of spin-out companies. Managing Keele’s relationship with its spin-out companies and representing Keele’s interests at board meetings is currently the responsibility of the Head of Office.

Key activities
Creating IP awareness: giving seminars and short talks to academic staff on IP matters; offering general IAG on IP issues; working with the University’s patent attorneys to raise awareness of IP across the Institution.
Identifying, protecting and managing a patent portfolio: the Unit, with the Head of Office and Enterprise Business Managers where relevant, reviews IP disclosures and assesses the requirement for protection. Where IP protection is needed, the team liaise with academic inventors and Keele’s patent attorney to develop and file a patent application. The Unit currently manages (in terms of patent prosecution decisions and actions, renewals and other matters) an IP portfolio of 49 patent families and 82 individual filings.
Commercialising IP: a key part of the Unit’s remit is to ensure Keele’s IP is utilised appropriately, to create revenue or in some instances to ensure maximum dissemination of good practice (e.g. the licensing of best healthcare practice). To identify licensees, negotiate licences and monitor royalty streams. For spin-out activity, to liaise with the Head of Office, Finance and external legal advisors on appropriate corporate matters. A more detailed update on technology transfer activity, licences and spin-out companies will be provided as part of the Enterprise/HESA HEBCIS update to SPC in March.

2.5 Business Development Unit

Remit
Business Development is the function performed by RES’s two Enterprise Business Managers. The two EBM s each cover a thematic remit across the University, one on Environment & Sustainability, the other on Ageing, Arts & Regeneration. The roles are broad-based and cover a range of activities to facilitate collaboration with external partners, via bid/initiative development and support, and outreach and engagement activity. Although each role is nominally centred on a particular Faculty (FNS and HUMSS respectively) they both reach across all three Faculties. RES support for business development in the Faculty of Health is also provided by the Head of Office and the Technology Transfer Manager. The activities covered are: collaborative and contract research; consultancy; innovation and knowledge transfer; Training/CPD; IP and commercialisation. Two long-serving EBM s left
RES during the year for roles at Manchester and Harper Adams universities: one vacancy has been filled by a very able candidate, the other is currently being recruited to.

**Key activities**

**Collaborative and contract research:** support the development of grant applications, tenders and bids to secure funds for collaborative and/or commercial activities. Advise RIDs, RIMs and academics on funding policies and rules of sponsoring organisations. Negotiate contracts.

**Consultancy:** identify and facilitate opportunities, where appropriate act as project manager and monitor contract. Negotiate contracts.

**Innovation and Knowledge Transfer:** work with the academic community and external partners on the development and/or delivery of new initiatives. Includes support for Knowledge Transfer Partnership (KTP) development and Social Enterprise. Both of these latter two initiatives are key Institutional priorities; Social Enterprise has a strong volunteering element and links well to the Distinctive Keele Curriculum (DKC). Although we do not as yet have any KTPs, we have bid for and won two successive (small) grants to develop Social Enterprise support at Keele and are currently developing a LEP-level collaborative bid for further support funds.

**Training/CPD:** identifying opportunities and supporting the development of business cases, plus negotiating contracts.

**IP and commercialisation:** work with academic staff to commercialise their expertise and research, raising awareness of opportunities.

### 2.6 Employer Engagement and Entrepreneurship Unit

**Remit**

The Employer Engagement and Entrepreneurship Unit’s remit is to support the development of CPD and short courses across the University, in parallel with facilitating an increase in the use of student placements in the curriculum and graduate internships. This is done by close working with Schools and by wide engagement with employers. The key activities are employer engagement, development of CPD, student placements support and graduate internships initiatives. Employer Engagement has been merged with what was previously the Student Enterprise team so that student-facing activity in RES benefits from a single team with greater critical mass. The Student Enterprise element supports enterprising and entrepreneurial students (and to a lesser degree staff) in setting up their own businesses. Support is very much geared to ‘lifestyle’ businesses and ones not based on Keele IP. Two main activities are supported: SPEED Plus; and student entrepreneurship. Both are used to promote student recruitment in terms of the opportunities and employability, with student entrepreneurship being a strong part of the DKC, graduate attributes and employability.

**Key activities**

**Employer engagement:** meeting employers to ascertain business requirements and where applicable cross-selling other employer-related provisions above and beyond those situated in the Employer Engagement Unit, external networking events, facilitating links between Schools and businesses, running Keele-based employer engagement events.

**Development of CPD:** establishment of CPD protocol and processes across relevant Schools, generating CPD opportunities/leads for Schools, support in development of CPD
tender proposal, market intelligence, matching modules to business need, in conjunction with senior management devising a CPD incentivising initiative for Schools

**Student Placements support:** assistance to Schools in establishing placements provision in the curriculum, understanding employer opportunities, signposting employer opportunities to Schools, establishing and maintaining appropriate placement agreements and protocols.  
**Graduate Internship initiatives:** managing internship programmes (Santander Universities Internships, Graduate Advantage Internships, Keele-led initiatives), graduate engagement and recruitment, employer engagement on to internship programmes, running Keele-based student/graduate engagement events, marketing/PR and finance activities associated with the programmes.

**SPEED Plus:** a collaborative ERDF-funded programme with HEIF match, to support, mentor and train Keele students, staff, graduates and recent alumni living in the West Midlands, to set up and run their own business.

**Student entrepreneurship:** run spin-off projects such as Keele Launchpad; support and work with Keele’s Enactus Team (student entrepreneurs) in their enterprises both on and off-campus; run the annual Santander Entrepreneurship Award competition; contribute to DKC.

The following is a summary of core Employer Engagement activity and success to date:

**Internships:**
- Since 2009, placed graduates into 400 internships
- Connections with local businesses – placed graduates with over 250 companies across West Midlands (since 2009)
- Current internship schemes, 42% of internships led to permanent graduate-level job
- 51 internships in 2013 for current schemes, from 23 regional employers

**Membership of Employer focus groups (March 2013):**
- Regional-level employer focus group
  - Aspire Group
  - Barrington Ltd
  - 15 Digital
  - Staffordshire County Council
- National-level employer focus group
  - Cap Gemini
  - JCB
  - Santander
  - Network Rail
  - Teach First
  - Michelin

**CPD developments**
- Identified and working with three priority schools for CPD growth
  - PPPP
  - KMS
  - Physical & Geosciences
- Pricing/costing guidance for non-credit bearing CPD produced
- CPD opportunities actively being developed with employers
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
(Formerly the GRADUATE SCHOOL BOARD)

Held on Monday 7th October 2013

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
The Chair welcomed Jo Ladwa, Acting Head of Planning and UK/EU Admissions to the meeting for item 6.

For attendance and apologies please see the attached list.

2. MINUTES
The minutes of the meeting held on 2nd May 2013 were approved as an accurate record subject to the removal of ‘and that a recent Judicial Review had emphasised this message’ from item 27.e.

3. MATTERS ARISING
The Committee received the actions and outcomes report and noted the following:

(a) 3g. International PGRs
It was reported that the pre-sessional in-house English Language sessions that had taken place over the summer were successful with an intake of 96 students and that the course will run again next year. Additionally, the Committee were informed that the Head of International Recruitment and Development had been liaising with International Study Group (ISG) to see if they would be able to provide an ITLEs 4 – 4.5 entry English Language course provision, to prevent Keele needing to re-locate students to either Chester or Walsall and then back to Keele once they begin their Doctoral studies. It was reported that ISG could run a course with a minimum intake of 10 students, but that they would wish to fix the start dates, which would be difficult for Keele to do at this stage.

It was agreed that discussions regarding this initiative should continue to be explored, with an aspiration that if PGR numbers continue to grow, we will be able to provide up to 3 intakes throughout the year, with approximately 10 students on each.  

ACTION: LR

(b) 10b. Emeritus and Honorary Appointments
The Chair informed the Committee that whilst no formal confirmation had yet been received, that the Chair had received agreement from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost, that Honorary and Emeritus Professors should be eligible for the supervising of PGR students and that this would be confirmed to the next meeting of the Committee.  

ACTION: Chair

(c) 3d. Chair’s Report: International Activity and Developments
It was reported that the International Recruitment and Development team would compile a list of events that the team were scheduled to be at and share this with the Secretary for dissemination to the Committee members.  

ACTION: LR

It was also agreed that the RI Managers should be asked to ensure that where strong world links exist within their RIs, that this is communicated into the International Recruitment and Development team to ensure that they are aware of expertise or potential representatives for events in that...
(d) 4. Chair’s Report: Research Supervisor Development Programme 2012/13
The Committee were informed that the programme had been successful and that scheduling of
dates for the next programme in January and April was underway.

(e) 4. Chair’s Report: Postgraduate Prospectus 2014/15
The Committee noted that significant progress had been made on the organisation of the
Postgraduate Prospect for 2014/15 but also discussed the possibility of developing some materials
aimed specifically at the PGR market only, emphasising Keele’s strengths for PGRs. It was agreed that
once the initial scoping work had been completed by the International Recruitment and
Development team, that the proposals and costing should be circulated to the Committee for further
discussion. ACTION: LR

(f) 4. Chair’s Report: Postgraduate Student Surveys
The Chair reported that the outcomes of the PRES survey had been sent to the Pro Vice-Chancellor
for Education and Student Experience and that any PGR specific issues, would be circulated and
presented to the next meeting of the Committee for consideration and action. ACTION: Chair

(g) 33. PGR Report
The Committee were informed that this report relating to progression of PGT to PGR study at Keele
would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee. ACTION: Secretary

(h) 34. RCUK Consultation on Revised Funding Arrangements for Researcher Development
The Committee were informed that the consultation response was submitted on 30th May 2013. It
was noted that the response had not yet been circulated to the Committee, but would be included
with the minutes of the meeting. ACTION: Secretary

(i) 37. Any Other Business: Research Degrees Committee – Acting Chair
The Committee noted that the action was incorrect, in that the Chair was not required to be a
member of Senate and that this should be amended. The Committee were asked to approve that the
role of Chair would be filled on a cyclical basis between the PGR Directors for the duration of the
Chair’s Research Leave.

The Committee resolved
that the role of Chair of Research Degrees Committee would be filled on a cyclical basis between the
PGR Directors for the period of 6 months.

The Committee also expressed their thanks to the Research Degrees Committee, Ian Britton, QA
Officer and Catherine Greaves, PGR Records and Examinations Officer for their support in processing
the PGR Awards in time for inclusion within the REF submission.

4. CHAIR’S REPORT
- PGR Intake Numbers
The Chair reported that PGR intake numbers were currently at 77ftes, which was a strong and
positive start to the year, putting us slightly ahead of this time last year. It is expected that the
University should be able to sustain PGR numbers in excess of 100fte again this year, based on these
initial starters.

- Induction
The Chair reported that the induction event for PGRs had been well received and that the
contribution from Student Support and Development Services was felt to be a benefit. It was agreed
by the Committee that further development of the pre-induction information would be helpful for


the future and that the group looking at the development of the web-based induction pack, for those PGRs joining throughout the year, should also include Jen Smith as representative for LPDC.

5. **PGR DOCTORAL AWARDS AND CURRENT PGR STUDENT METRIC REPORT**

The Committee received some summary data being used for the University’s REF submission, which highlights Doctoral Awards during the REF period considered by Unit of Assessment and also by RI. The report also included a summary of the current PGR students at Keele by RI and Unit of Assessment and it was noted that whilst these metrics will not be included in the REF return, there is the option available to reference current PGR numbers in the REF Environment narratives.

The Committee welcomed the report and noted the usefulness of the information. The Committee discussed the strategic use of data such as this, to help inform future REF submissions and maximising the University’s future returns, including, for example, the re-coding of overseas funded PGRs onto ‘R’ codes, to evidence the research income generated by these students. It was agreed that the Research Support Manager should review the RCUK rules to ensure that the University is able to maximise its position with regard to PGR numbers and research income.

**ACTION:** Secretary

The Committee were also informed, in advance of the REF submission that the PGR Directors would be asked to review each Unit of Assessments’ awards. It was noted that the purpose of this exercise would be to provide an audit trail for any discrepancies found between the University’s records and the HESA returns with regard to students Units of Assessment, as in the early part of the REF period, PGR students were returned to RAE Units of Assessment, which do not necessarily map directly onto the REF Units of Assessment.

**ACTION:** Secretary

6. **POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS REVIEW REPORT**

The Committee received an oral update on PGR Admin process review from Jo Ladwa, Acting Head of Planning and UK/EU Admissions. It was reported that the review was considering all aspects of PGR administration, including Governance, enrolment and induction, bursaries and scholarships and HESA reporting and Management Information.

The proposed Governance arrangements have been considered by the PGRD Forum and whilst all are in agreements with the arrangements in principle, it was noted that further work to clearly define the Terms of Reference for these arrangements was required. A number of enrolment and induction actions have already been implemented, which have helped to streamline processes, particularly for those students who join Keele throughout the year. It was also reported that amendments to the Keele Bursary wording have been implemented, again to improve clarity and understanding.

It was reported that the Governance proposals would be developed over the forthcoming months and reported to the February meeting for approval. In addition, over the following weeks, a review of HESA reporting and MI work would take place, with the final stage of the review focussing on appeals, extenuating circumstances and Leave of Absence. It was also noted that this work would likely require a re-writing of the PGR Code of Practice to include the new EC, LOA and appeals processes.

It was agreed that a report would be provided to the next meeting of the Committee.

**ACTION:** SC/JL/Secretary

7. **STUDENT MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS**

The Committee were reminded that on-line monitoring for PGR students was expected to be developed in time for the start of the academic year as part of the Attendance Monitoring project. It was noted that International PGRs equate to about 30% of the PGR population and at present, they were regularly being contacted regarding ‘sign-in’ and that this was starting to cause frustration to the students.

The Committee noted that the MIS component of the Attendance Monitoring project has stalled over the summer, but that work was progressing to get the on-line monitoring in place. In the mean-time, it was
agreed that the automated follow-up emails could be removed from the system, meaning that the total number of communications to the students would be lessened.  

ACTION: JL

The Committee also noted that it would be helpful for the International Recruitment and Development team to provide the PGR Directors and RI Managers with a list of all communications that they are sending to the PGR students, as they will not normally be informed of these from sharing this information with the Faculty Business Managers or RI Directors.  

ACTION: Secretary/LR

8. VIVA ARRANGEMENTS  

(a) Independent Viva Chairs  

The Committee received a paper outlining the current difficulties experienced by the PGR Directors in finding Independent Chairs for student viva examinations. The report outlined that a number of Universities have chosen to not have an independent Chair, but it was felt by the Committee that this was not a strong a position for the University to adopt.

The Committee agreed that the main difficulty about finding an independent chair is mainly availability and it was agreed that this could be overcome by establishing a pool of ‘registered’ chairs that may consist of either Emeritus or long-standing experienced members of staff and career-young staff who wish to gain the experience of chairing the viva’s. It was suggested that if these individuals were either nominated or appointed for a 2-year term, with a limit on how may viva’s they would be expected to chair each year, that a sustainable pool of chairs could be identified, which would help to support the development of career-round academics and also utilise the expertise of the more experienced academic staff.

The Committee agreed that in principle, the idea seemed like a strong solution to the problem, but that further work on the idea was required, in order for the Committee to make a final decision. It was agreed that Dr Jackie Potter, Head of LPDC would develop a paper with contributions from Dr Simone Clarke, Director of PAA and her team and the PGR Directors/Forum and that this paper would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.  

ACTION: JP

(b) Appointment of Two External Examiners for Staff Viva  

The Committee also considered the requirement that currently for any member of staff who is undertaking a viva, there is an expectation that both examiners will be external, to avoid any cases of conflict of interest. The Committee recognised that where a member of academic staff is involved in a viva, it is appropriate for both examiners to be external; however, this was not as necessary in the circumstances when considering a Marie Curie fellow, Graduate Teaching Assistant or a part-time Teaching Fellow. The Committee therefore agreed that the Code of Practice requires a change in its wording to clarify that this is necessary for ‘academic members of staff’ and that a clear definition of who this would and wouldn’t apply to is required.  

ACTION: NC

9. FAMILY HOUSING FOR OVERSEAS PGRS  

The Committee received a copy of a paper presented to the Finance and Resources Sub-Committee on 27th September 2013 on providing decant accommodation on campus for overseas PGRs and their families at the beginning of their studies. It was reported that the proposal had been approved by the FRSC and that as soon as a Staff House became available, work would begin to renovate the property and use it for this purpose.

The Committee commended the idea and noted that the progress had been very swift which was pleasing. It was noted that there would be a two week maximum limit on the time that a family could stay in the property and that the letting of the property would be coordinated through the accommodation team, with PGRDs and International Recruitment and Development acting as conduits between the students and the accommodation team.

10. RESEARCH STUDENT LIASION COMMITTEE  

The Chair informed the Committee that there was some uncertainty regarding who was responsible for identifying PGR representatives from the RIs. It was agreed that a list of RI PGR representatives was required in order to ensure that they were able to receive papers and updates on the Research Student Liaison Committee.
11. REPORT FROM KPA PRESIDENT
The Committee received the report from the KPA President. The Committee questioned whether a list of PGR mentors could be provided to the PGR Directors, as it would be helpful for them to be aware of who was engaging with this role. It was reported that the training for the mentors took place in August and was well attended and it was agreed that a report on the mentoring scheme and a list of those signed up to it would be provided to the next meeting of the Committee.

**ACTION: JP**

12. TERMS OF REFERENCE
The Committee considered the revised terms of reference as a result of the change to the Committee name at the end of the last academic year and **resolved to recommend**

that the revised terms of reference be recommended to Senate and Council for approval.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
a) QAA Institutional Review
The Committee were informed by Dr Jackie Potter, Head of LPDC that the QAA Institutional Review recommended that the University monitors the quality of PGR students who teach or are demonstrators whilst studying for their PGR award. Dr Potter proposed that the minimum 30 credits of the TLHE course are used as the minimum benchmark, but that a review of how this work is taken forward is required, including the Heads of Schools and School Managers, in addition to the PGRD Forum to establish the correct processes. It was agreed that this review should be conducted and the outcome reported to the next meeting of the Committee.

**ACTION: JP**

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the University Postgraduate Research Committee will be held on Monday 3rd February 2013 at 10:00am in the University Committee Room, room CM2.08, Claus Moser Building.
MEMBERS
Professor Mark Ormerod (MO) Pro Vice-Chancellor Research & Enterprise (Chair)
A Vacant (RT) Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost (Ex-Officio)
A Professor Fiona Cownie (FC) Pro Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience
Dr Jackie Potter (JP) Head of Learning and Professional Development
Professor Trevor Greenhough (TG) Research Institute PGR Director (ISTM)
Dr Nigel Cassidy (NC) Research Institute PGR Director (EPSAM)
Dr Jane Richardson (JR) Research Institute PGR Director (PCHS)
Professor Tony Bradney (TB) Research Institute PGR Director (Social Sciences)
A Dr Ceri Morgan (CM) Research Institute PGR Director (Humanities)
A Professor Carole Thornley (CT) Chair of Research Degrees Committee
A Dr Emma Head (EH) Research Institute PGR Associate Director (Social Sciences)
Dr Simone Clarke (SC) Director of Planning and Academic Administration
Liza Roger (LR) Head of International Recruitment and Development
Vicky Carter (VC) KeeleSU President
A Lisa Ironside (LI) KPA President

IN ATTENDANCE
A Dr Peter Hooper (PH) Head of Research and Enterprise Services
Jo Ladwa (JL) Acting Head of Planning and UK/EU Admissions
Dr John White (JW) Deputy Director of Finance and IT

SECRETARY
Jen Paddison REF and Research Executive Support

Key
* Absent
A Absent with apologies
RESEARCH LIAISON COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 24 October 2013

1. Absences/ Additional Presences
   Apologies are noted on the attached attendance list.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
   The minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2013 were approved as an accurate record.

3. Matters Arising
   The Committee reviewed the action spreadsheet from the previous meeting and updated the actions list.

4. Chair’s Report
   The Committee received an oral report from the Chair who confirmed that the University has exceeded its end of year target for recruitment of students. The Committee was also asked to note the excellent teamwork between the Keele Postgraduate Association, Student Support and Development Services, the Learning and Professional Development Centre and the Library which had facilitated the development of an induction programme for postgraduate students. It was also noted that it was an important step forward to recognise that postgraduate students commence throughout the year and to ensure there is provision for induction.

5. Terms of Reference
   The Committee reviewed the terms of reference and membership and agreed that no changes were necessary.

6. Report from the President of the Keele Postgraduate Association
   The Committee received the report from the President of the Keele Postgraduate Association. Members noted the following matters:
   - Steph Cutts had been co-opted as a KPA Officer to fill the vacancy of Environmental Officer. Ms Cutts will be tasked with looking at the Green Impact Scheme on behalf of the KPA.
   - Discussions have taken place to extend the Postgraduate Mentoring Scheme to PGT students with recognition that as many of their programmes only last for a year, the format will be slightly different to the Mentoring Scheme for Research Students.
   - The KPA has been made aware of a project called Women in Academia and is planning to consider representation at postgraduate level in this context.
   - The KPA has been looking at ways it can support undergraduate progression to PGT and possibly PGR programmes.
   - Masters students have reported that they are having difficulties accessing study facilities, particularly during semester time. The KPA has been raising awareness of existing arrangements such as the facility to book teaching rooms around the University for study, whilst it considers a way forward. Dr White highlighted that the PC labs in the library are not
timetabled over lunchtime this year which should provide some space and free up access for postgraduate students.

- The grading of the KPA Bursary scheme has been reviewed to reflect the current position. The application process is due to open in mid-November and it is hoped that the high quality of applications seen in recent years will continue. The Committee noted that the scheme provides relevant experience for students in writing applications which is valuable when applying for external funding.

7. Commercial and Business Engagement Report
The Committee received the report from Commercial and Business Engagement. Members noted the following points:
- Laundrette Services are being monitored and the provider is due to be on site again in the coming week to deal with queries and provide advice.
- Prices for Sports have been fixed for another year and swimming at Jubilee Pool is available for £2 on presentation of a Keele Card, without the need to purchase the Council's leisure card.
- CBE are leading a consultation on future developments for the Keel Card, a meeting with KeeleSU and the KPA will take place in November.

8. Student Support and Development Services
The Committee noted the written report from Student Support and Development Services.

9. Advice & Support at Keele Report
The Committee noted the written report from Advice and Support at Keele.

10. Library
The Committee received the report from the Library. Members noted the following points:
- The extended opening hours of the library over the vacation were well received and it is intended that this will be repeated next, the number of PCs has also been increased.
- The Library is looking to re-subscribe to Wiley Blackwell online journals, previously these were cost prohibitive however, it is hoped a favourable deal can be reached.
- The Library contributed to the HEFCE consultation on Open Access and the outcome is awaited. It was noted that this week is International Open Access Week.
- The Library offers training for researchers in starting their literary search and how to use REF works. Suggestions from the Committee were invited for any other areas of training the Library could look to provide.

11. IT Developments
The Committee received the report from the Director of IT, members noted the following points:
- Licenses have been purchased for desktop management software on all PCs across campus which would enable a fully managed desktop service, more responsive to user demand and providing better access to generic software.
- After initial roll out of Wi-Fi across campus, settings are now being optimised to address some teething problems. Statistics show approximately 18,000 connections over a day with some 4,000 devices connected at the peak time which was lunchtime.
- After lengthy negotiation, WiFi is now available at the hospital sites associated with Keele.
- A new HR and Payroll system has been procured which has interactive features for staff. This is to be phased in with interactive features becoming live gradually.
- The laptop loan scheme has been extended, simplifying the loan process and improving short term loan facility.
An online absence management system for undergraduates and postgraduate students has been established.

12. Learning and Professional Development Centre
The Committee received the report from the Learning and Professional Development Centre. Members noted the following points:

- The Learning and Professional Development Centre are continuing to offer specialist courses for PGR students and they are also able to access staff training.
- Work is being undertaken on the Postgraduate Teaching Certificate to make it more accessible to PGR Students.
- The LPDC is looking to offer presentation skills training to support Postgraduate Research students who are going to conference for the first time.
- Work is continuing on the Peer Mentoring Scheme to support mentors, as well as mentees, as part of their development to ensure that the process is student friendly in line with the DKC.
- As a means to encourage career progression for female students following completion of PGR programmes, the LPDC is offering the Springboard course to entry level academic staff and is interested in whether or not the Committee feels this could also benefit PGR students.

Discussion took place regarding the logistical implications of this for PGR students and it was felt that the course would be too big a commitment alongside their research, however, it was noted that if elements of the course could be developed into a more flexible package, tailored for PGR students, this would be beneficial.

13. Feedback from PGR Representatives
13.1 Demonstrator Payments
It was reported that there had been occasions where the deadline for submission of expense claims for demonstrator payments had been such that payment was not received until up to two months after the event. For continuation students, this can be their only source of income and as such the delay can be a problem. This was noted however, as demonstrations do not form part of Research, Professor Ormerod agreed to raise this with the relevant school. **ACTION:** Professor Ormerod to discuss with Professor Bailey and ask that the matter is raised with Heads of Schools.

17. Next Meetings
The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place at 9:30am in room 2.08, Claus Moser Building on Thursday 6 February 2014.
ATTENDANCE

Prof Mark Ormerod, PVC Research & Enterprise (Chair)
* Prof Fiona Cownie, PVC Learning & Student Experience
Dr Simone Clarke, Director of Planning & Academic Administration
A Sue Underwood, Head of Accommodation, Commercial & Business Engagement
Paul Reynolds, University Librarian
Dr John White, Deputy Director of Finance & IT, IT Services
A Ian Munton, Head of Student Support & Development Services
Dr Jacqui Potter, Head of the Learning & Professional Development Centre
A Fay Harris, Head of the Independent Advice Unit
Lisa Ironside, KPA President
Ian Mahoney, KPA Association Secretary
A Adam Duell, KPA Finance Secretary

Research Institute Student Representatives
Chris Adams, ISTM (Keele Campus)
Lisa Rump-Goodrich, ISTM (Oswestry)
* April Woodward, PCHS
* Mark Kitchen, ISTM (Guy Hilton)
* Katie McGettigan, Humanities
A Stella Coyle, Social Sciences
* Jenny Liddle, Social Sciences
A Scott Walker, EPSAM

PGR Directors
A Dr Nigel Cassidy, EPSAM
A Professor David Amigoni (Acting), Humanities
Professor Trevor Greenhough, ISTM
* Dr Emma Head, Social Sciences
A Dr Jane Richardson PCHS
* Professor Anthony Bradney, Social Sciences
* Dr Alexandra Lamont, Social Sciences
* Dr Elisabeth Carter, Social Sciences
* Professor Christina Goulding, Social Sciences

Additional Attendees:
Claire Snape, Assistant Director Commercial and Student Services (Representing Sue Underwood)
Jo Sylvester, Governance Officer (Secretary)
Laura Harrison, Governance Support Officer (Minutes)

* Absent
A Absent with Apologies
1. **APOLOGIES AND ATTENDANCE**

For apologies and attendance please see page 7.

2. **WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

Professor Read formally thanked outgoing members, Dr Emma Head and Dr Catriona Kelly, for the work they had undertaken whilst on the Committee and welcomed Dr Monte Gates and Dr Mark Skidmore to the Committee.

3. **MINUTES AND ACTIONS**

3.1 Minutes of the last meeting held on Tuesday 30 April 2013

The minutes of the above meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.

3.2 Actions List

The actions list was noted.

4. **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

3.1 Update on provision of research ethics training

It was noted that research ethics training sessions are now included in the Keele Knowledge Programme. Research ethics training sessions have been organised for Wednesday 4 December 2013 and Wednesday 19 February 2014 and these sessions will be led by Dr Jackie Waterfield and Dr Bernadette Bartlam respectively.

It was noted that a research ethics training session has been arranged for Committee member and Ethical Review Panel (ERP) members on Wednesday 12 February 2014.

3.2 Upholding the University’s reputation – update on guidance issued

It was noted that following ratification by the Committee, the paragraph concerning upholding the University’s reputation has been added to the University’s research ethics webpage. Research Institute Directors and Managers were informed that the research ethics page had been revised and were requested to asked remind their members that information regarding research ethics and details of processes/procedures for research ethics approval can be obtained via [http://www.keele.ac.uk/researchsupport/researchethics/](http://www.keele.ac.uk/researchsupport/researchethics/).
3.3 Update on UK Universities Guidance on Security Sensitive Research Material

It was noted that work is progressing with regard to implementing the above guidance as appropriate and raising awareness of this issue across the University. The Committee requested that Dr Peter Hooper provides an update on progress at the next meeting.

ACTION: Dr Hooper

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The current terms of reference (dated November 2011) were reviewed and it was agreed that no amendments were required.

6. UPDATE ON AMENDMENT TO REGULATION 8 SECTION 11

The Committee considered and approved the draft process for investigating alleged offences at school level. It was noted that a paper requesting approval of process will be considered at the next University Learning and Teaching Committee (November 2013). When the process has been approved by University Learning and Teaching Committee, Schools will be notified that the process has been formally approved by the University and Schools will be advised of the need to look at the implications this process may have.

ACTION: Professor Read / Nicola Leighton

It was suggested that in order to ensure consistency within Faculties it may be useful for the various Schools within each Faculty to agree on the minimum penalties that could be imposed.

7. SCHOOL STUDENT PROJECT ETHICS COMMITTEE (SPEC) ANNUAL REPORTS 2012/13

The School Student Project Ethics Committee Annual Reports 2012/13 were reviewed. It was noted that there was a marked improvement in the quality of this year’s reports compared to previous years.

General points

Nicola Leighton highlighted that the three general issues that were fed back to Schools following review of reports for 2011/12 (in October 2012) and outlined the following improvements seen in these areas in the annual report for the academic year 2012/13:-

a) SPEC should include at least one member from outside the school

It was noted that all but three schools had a member from outside the school on their SPEC. These schools will be reminded of the importance of having a member from outside the school on the SPEC.

b) Members of SPECs should not have managerial roles

It was noted that three schools had members with managerial roles. These schools will be reminded that whilst it is acknowledged that resources may be limited it is best practice that SPEC members do not have managerial roles.
c) **Opportunity for school members to comments on the report**

It was noted that only two schools did not provide an opportunity for academic members of the school to comment on the report. These schools will be reminded that academic staff should be given an opportunity to comment on the report.

d) **General Administration**

It was noted that finer details such as titles of SPEC members and affiliations had been omitted from the reports 2012/13. Ensuring these details were included would have helped the Committee in the review of these reports. All schools will be reminded to ensure that these details are included in future reports.

**Points relating to individual schools**

This information from this section has been extracted from this set of minutes.

School reports for the academic year 2012/13 were reviewed and discussed by the Committee and feedback will be provided to individual schools as appropriate.

*ACTION : Professor Read / Nicola Leighton*

It was suggested that ways to recognise the work that SPEC members undertake in reviewing student ethics applications (PGT and undergraduate) should be explored.

*ACTION : Professor Read / Nicola Leighton*

8. **INFORMATION LEAFLET ON RESEARCH ETHICS**

The draft information leaflet, produced by Nicola Leighton and Professor Read, which consolidates key points regarding ethics and acts as sign posting tool for researchers was reviewed.

It was suggested and agreed that the following points should be added to the leaflet:

- a sentence regarding the minimisation of harm to the researcher
- a point outlining that research involving commercially obtained cell lines does not need ethical approval
- information regarding any training sessions that are available

It was agreed that once the above revisions had been undertaken, the leaflet should be circulated to members of the ERPs for further comments and ratification by the ERPs. The leaflet will then be circulated across the University.

*ACTION : Nicola Leighton*
9. RESEARCH ETHICS TRAINING / CPD

It was noted that significant progress has been made in developing a robust framework for research ethics at Keele. However, it was highlighted that training and support for staff and students on ethics may be an area that requires attention.

It was suggested that it would be timely to undertake a scoping exercise to identify information regarding current training and CPD opportunities relating to research ethics within the University, staff/student experiences of research ethics training and their thoughts on the suggestion for CPD/refresher training for research ethics. It was agreed that a proposal outlining a request for the above scoping exercise should be produced and forwarded to Dr Hooper for consideration.

ACTION: Professor Read / ERP Chairs / Nicola Leighton

10. LIGHT TOUCH REVIEW PROCESS / ELECTRONIC APPLICATION SYSTEM

The Committee noted that work concerning the light touch review process and electronic application system was in progress. Nicola Leighton to provide an update at the next meeting.

ACTION: Nicola Leighton

11. UPDATE FROM ETHICAL REVIEW PANEL (ERP) CHAIRS (rolling item)

11.1 ERP1

It was noted that during the period 01 October 2012 to 30 September 2013 there were 49 new applications received, of these 2 did not need University ethical approval, 3 were approved outright, 4 were rejected and 40 required revisions before approval could be given.

It was noted that due to high number of applications received in October 2012 an extra ordinary ERP meeting, constituted by members from both ERPs, was held to review 5 applications. Of these 5 applications, 1 was rejected and 4 required revisions before approval could be given.

11.2 ERP2

It was noted that during the period 01 October 2012 to 30 September 2013 there were 50 new applications received, of these 2 were withdrawn by the applicant, 2 did not need University ethical approval, 8 were approved outright, 6 were rejected and 32 required revisions before approval could be given.
11.3 Update on ERP applications/administration of the ERPs

It was noted that the number of ERPs applications being submitted is increasing as predicted and that the situation is being closely monitored. However, it was suggested that the number of applications requiring full review by the ERP may reduce when the light touch review process is implemented. The number of applications received and the number requiring full review and number requiring light touch review will continue to be monitored.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

It was also suggested that the checklist used by the SPEC in KMS may be a useful tool that could be adapted for the ERPs to use when reviewing applications. Nicola Leighton agreed to contact the Chair of the SPEC to request permission to use and adapt the checklist for ERP purposes.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

12. APPEALS DEALT WITH BY UNVIERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (rolling item)

No appeals to report.

13. PGR ISSUES (rolling item)

No PGR issues to report

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

14.1 UK Universities Research Ethics Forum meeting 18 June 2013

Nicola Leighton informed the Committee of salient points of the above meeting. The salient points included:-

- It was clarified that if a University is a member of AREC then anyone who sits on an ethics committee at that University is a member of AREC. Nicola Leighton agreed to ensure that SPEC members were aware of this.

  **ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

- It is expected that the final version of the Quality Assurance Framework for University Research Ethics Committees (formally Kite Marking Scheme) will be available sometime in October 2013. Nicola Leighton agreed to circulate this Framework to the Committee when available.

  **ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

14.2 Teaching Innovation Scheme

It was noted that the Teaching Innovation Scheme application forms will, as of the next call, include a box that applicants will tick if their project requires ethical approval or has ethical issues. Staff from the Learning and Professional Development Centre will alert Nicola Leighton to any applications that have this boxed ticked and arrangements will be made to ensure the applicant obtains ethical approval prior to commencement of the project.
14.3 Details of external training events

The following external training events were noted:-

- Making an application to an NHS REC (25 November 2013)
- Integrating Research Ethics (AREC Annual Conference – 15 November 2013)

14.4 Research Ethics Journal

The latest edition of the AREC Research Journal (Vol 9; No 2, pp49-92) was tabled.

15. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 22 January 2014 at 10.00am in Room CM2.08, Claus Moser Building
Wednesday 14 May 2014 at 10.00am in Room CM2.08, Claus Moser Building

University Research Ethics Committee attendance list – 09 October 2013

Professor Susan Read (Chair)
A Dr Anthony Wrigley (Vice-Chair), School of Law
Dr Deidre McKay, Faculty of Natural Sciences
Dr Mark Skidmore, Faculty of Natural Sciences
A Dr Brian Doherty, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences
Dr Susan Hunter, Faculty of Health
Dr Monte Gates, Faculty of Health
A Dr Jackie Waterfield, Chair of ERP1
Dr Bernadette Bartlam, Chair of ERP2
A Dr Peter Hooper, Head of Research and Enterprise Services
A Dr Carole Thornley, Chair of RDC
Lisa Ironside (KPA Chair)

In attendance
Nicola Leighton, Research Governance Officer (Secretary)

A= Apologies
UNIVERSITY OF KEELE

Minutes of the Research Governance Steering Committee
Held on Monday 14 October 2013 at 2.00pm in the Boardroom, Research & Enterprise Services,
Dorothy Hodgkin Building

1) Apologies for absence

For a record of attendance, apologies and absences, please see page 5.

It was noted that Professor Susan Bruce has stepped down from the Committee and a new representative for Humanities and Social Sciences will be identified prior to the next meeting.

2) Minutes and actions

2.1 Minutes of the last meeting held on Wednesday 17 April 2013

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.

2.2 Actions list

The actions list was noted.

3) Matters arising from the previous meeting

3.1 Research Governance arrangements in Primary Care

Further to the changes to NHS structures Mrs Helen Duffy, Consortium Manager, Research Institute of Primary Care and Health Sciences updated the Committee on the current research governance arrangements for research undertaken within primary care sector. The salient points are as follows:-

For portfolio studies, the Comprehensive Local Research Network (CLRN) undertakes a governance review of submitted applications and the CLRN provide a letter for the Chief Investigator to forward to GP practices. It is then the responsibility of each individual GP practice to give local approval for the research to be undertaken at their practice.

Dr Ken Deacon, in his capacity as Medical Director for NHS England Staffordshire and Shropshire Local Area Team, signs off Honorary Research Contracts (HRCs) and Letters of Access (LoAs) on behalf of the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in the Staffordshire and Shropshire area. However, it was noted that the Department of Health are hoping to streamline this process and the proposed process is for one HRC to be issued that will cover the research for the whole of the country. It was noted that a pilot of the proposed streamlined process will be undertaken.

For non-portfolio studies within primary care, the CCGs have commissioned Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust to undertake the research governance processes for these types of studies.
3.2 Research Governance processes in ISTM

The Committee noted that work is currently in progress to ensure there is a consistent research governance approach within the two Research Institutes within the Faculty of Health.

It was noted that an initial meeting has already taken place between colleagues from the Research Institute for Science, Technology and Medicine (ISTM) and Research and Enterprise Services (RES) and that a follow up meeting will be arranged.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton / Peter Hooper**

It was also noted that a subsequent meeting will be arranged to also involve colleagues from the Research & Development Department at University Hospital of North Staffordshire.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton / Peter Hooper**

The Committee requested an update on progress at the next meeting.

**ACTION : Peter Hooper**

4) Terms of Reference

It was agreed that the sentence pertaining to the scope of the Committee should be updated to reflect the changes to NHS structures. It was agreed that the words ‘NHS Trust-based’ should be replaced with ‘healthcare’. The sentence should now read:-

Scope: All matters relating to the implementation of the Research Governance Framework within the University and between the University and its social care or healthcare research partners

Nicola Leighton agreed to ensure that the correct process is followed to ensure this change is approved as appropriate.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

5) Human Tissue Authority (HTA) Reports

The Committee noted that the Anatomy Suite was inspected by the HTA on Thursday 26 September 2013. The feedback of findings by the HTA were excellent; they found the premises and practices to be suitable in accordance with the requirements of the legislation; the Anatomy Suite was found to have met all the HTA standards and particular examples of strength and good practice were noted.

6) Policies, specifications and guidelines (rolling agenda item)

6.1 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)

The Committee noted that:-

Nicola Leighton is liaising with Teresa Jones, R&D Manager at Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Hospital (RJAH) with regard to making minor amendments to ensure it is appropriate for RJAH.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

Nicola Leighton is liaising with Professor Ruth Chambers with regard to making minor amendments to the MoU to ensure it is appropriate for Stoke on Trent CCG.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**
Nicola Leighton is liaising with Hazel Mackay at North Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Partnership Trust to take the MoU forward with the Trust.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

Nicola Leighton is currently in the process of contacting appropriate colleagues at North Staffordshire CCG to take the MoU forward with North Staffordshire CCG.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

### 6.2 Revised Research Passport Policy

It was noted that work is in progress to clarify some issues that have been raised relating to DBS disclosures. Once processes have been clarified and agreed the policy will be updated to reflect the arrangements and will be circulated to the Committee for ratification.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

### 7) Compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity

The Committee noted the circular from Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) regarding compliance with above Concordat. Nicola Leighton informed the Committee that a gap analysis was being undertaken. The Committee requested that the findings of the gap analysis should be reviewed by the Committee at the next meeting.

**ACTION : Nicola Leighton**

### 8) Update on Research Ethics

Professor Read updated the Committee on issues relating to research ethics. It was noted that:

**a) Research Ethics Training**
- Research ethics training sessions are now included in the Keele Knowledge Programme. Research ethics training sessions have been organised for Wednesday 4 December 2013 and Wednesday 19 February 2014 and these sessions will be led by Dr Jackie Waterfield and Dr Bernadette Bartlam respectively.
- A research ethics training session has been arranged for Committee members and Ethical Review Panel (ERP) members on Wednesday 12 February 2014.

**b) Upholding the University's reputation**
- A paragraph concerning upholding the University’s reputation has been added to the University’s research ethics webpage. Research Institute Directors and Mangers were informed of the revisions and were requested to remind their members that information regarding research ethics and details of processes/procedures for research ethics approval can be obtained via [http://www.keele.ac.uk/researchsupport/researchethics/](http://www.keele.ac.uk/researchsupport/researchethics/)

**c) Range of penalties for students who do not obtain ethical approval (PGT/UG)**
- At the last meeting UREC approved the draft process for investigating alleged offences at school level. A paper requesting approval of process will be considered University Learning and Teaching Committee. When the process has been approved by University Learning and Teaching Committee, Schools will be notified that the process has been formally approved by the University and Schools will be advised of the need to look at the implications this process may have.

**d) Light touch / electronic system**
- Work is underway to develop a light touch review process.
- Work is underway to develop an electronic application system for both light touch and full review.
e) Guidance from Universities UK on Oversight of Security Sensitive Material
   • Work is progressing with regard to implementing the above guidance as appropriate and raising awareness of this issue across the University

f) Ethical Review Panels (ERPs)
   • The number of ERPs applications being submitted is increasing as predicted and the situation is being closely monitored

g) Annual Reports for 2013/14 from School Student Project Ethics Committees (SPECs)
   • SPEC Annual Reports for 2013/14 were considered at the last UREC meeting. Schools will be provided with general and specific feedback relating to their school.

h) Information leaflet on Research Ethics
   • The above leaflet, produced by Nicola Leighton and Professor Read, was tabled and was endorsed by the Research Governance Committee.

i) Proposed Scoping Exercise (Research ethics training / CPD)
   • A proposal to undertake a scoping exercise to identify information regarding current training and CPD opportunities relating to research ethics within the University, staff/student experiences of research ethics training and their thoughts on the suggestion for CPD/refresher training for research ethics is being prepared for consideration.

9) Reports / Minutes (rolling agenda item)

   There were no reports / minutes to consider.

10) Any other business

10.1 Clinical Research Network transition plan

   It was suggested that it may be useful for the Committee to be updated on the Clinical Research Network transition plan. Nicola Leighton agreed to put this as an item on the agenda for the next meeting and arrange for the appropriate colleague(s) to provide an update.

   ACTION : Nicola Leighton

10.2 Fitness to Practice

   The Committee were given advance notice of the fitness to practice training session that will be held in February 2014.

11) Date, time and venue of next meeting

   Friday 17 January 2014 at 10.00am in Room CM2.03, Claus Moser Building
   Wednesday 16 April 2014 at 10.00am in Room CM2.03, Claus Moser Building
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