

**SOAS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE**

To be held on Wednesday, 22nd October 2014 at 10:00am in Room 116

AGENDA

- | | | |
|-------------|--|-------------------|
| I | Membership & Terms of Reference | Appendix A |
| II | Minutes
To note: Minutes of the meeting held on 19 th May 2014 previously circulated | Appendix B |
| III | Action taken
To receive: Updates on action taken | |
| IV | Matters Arising | |
| V | SOAS Journals
To discuss: SOAS journals – initiating a consultation on governance structures | Appendix C |
| VI | Research Plans
To note: Paper on department and individual research plan progress
To agree: Direction of travel and timeline in relation to research planning | Appendix D |
| VII | Research Centres and Institutes
To note: Terms of reference for research centres and institutes | Appendix E |
| VIII | Research Income
To note: Report from the Research Finance Manager | Appendix F |
| IX | Centennial Research Themes
To note: Revised paper on centennial research themes | Appendix G |
| X | Postgraduate Research Matters
To note: Report from the Director of Doctoral School | Appendix H |
| XI | Research Ethics
To note: Report from the Research Ethics Panel | Appendix I |

These minutes are for information only. Any corrections to the minutes will be recorded in the minutes of the subsequent meeting of the committee.

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES

RESEARCH & ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

Held on Wednesday, 22nd October 2014 at 10.00am in Room 116

MINUTES

Members: Professor Richard Black (Chair)

Ms Silke Blohm
Dr Ayman El-Desouky
Professor Richard Fardon
Professor Stephen Hopgood
Professor Nirmala Rao
Dr Mandy Sadan
Professor Gurharpal Singh
Professor Harry West

In Attendance: Mr Marcus Cerny
Mr Raphaël Jacquet (attended the meeting for minute 5)
Dr Alex Lewis (Secretary)
Dr Rowan Pease (attended the meeting for minute 5)
Ms Louise Roberts
Ms Jane Savory (attended the meeting for minute 7)
Mr Robert Whiteing

Apologies: Dr Rachel V Harrison
Professor Matt Craven
Dr Yoriko Otomo
Professor Anne Pauwels
Mr John Robinson
Mr Mohamed Taha

1 Membership & Terms of Reference

The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) drew the Committee's attention to the Membership & Terms of Reference (Appendix A).

2 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st May were **approved**.

3 Action Taken

- (i) Minute 25 – The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) reported that a system of internal peer review of applications for external research funding had been **agreed** and implemented by the Faculty of Law & Social Sciences. It was **noted** that implementation of peer review by the Faculty of Languages & Cultures was not consistent and was only being applied in the Faculty of Arts & Humanities by the Department of Anthropology & Sociology.

It was **noted** that the internal peer review system would be presented at the next meeting of the Faculty of Arts & Humanities' Research Panel. The Committee **agreed** that implementation of the system need not be overly rigid and that there was no need to change existing arrangements that had proved effective.

It was **agreed** that the Research Manager would liaise with the three Faculties about embedding internal peer review into their research funding application processes.

- (ii) Minute 26 – The Enterprise Manager reported that consultancy workshops had been arranged to begin dissemination of the new policy on external professional activity.
- (iii) Minute 27 – The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) reported that the proposed CHASE consortium led by Sussex had been withdrawn and that a new proposal that SOAS and Birkbeck join as associate members was under consideration.
- (iv) Minute 37 – It was **agreed** that there should be a standard template for an annual report on the use of Faculty seed corn funding which should be presented to the first REC of the year. The Research Office would devise the template and circulate to Faculties.

4 Matters Arising

The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) reported that:

- HEFCE had issued a consultation document (tabled at the meeting) on whether the next Research Excellence Framework (REF) should be made international. Committee members were asked to send their comments to the Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) who would collate them and prepare an institutional response.
- SOAS had been chosen as a case study for the review of its knowledge exchange activity and that the Enterprise Office would be managing the process in consultation with relevant academic colleagues. Committee members have been invited to send their input.
- The SOAS library was conducting a consultation on its membership policy and encouraged colleagues to respond.
- The review of sabbatical leave had been postponed until Spring and that information gathering was still underway.

- The current SOAS Centenary Research Fellow was Dr Dilip Simeon (independent scholar and recent visitor at Sciences Po, nominated by Development Studies) who is working on labour and violence in Indian politics.

The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) reported that the ESRC demand management report had been received. Five research funding applications had been submitted to the ESRC by SOAS in the period and all had been unsuccessful. The Committee **agreed** that SOAS needed to improve its intelligence about failed applications in order to gain a better understanding of why they were unsuccessful and improve the chances of success for future applications. It was **agreed** that the Research Manager and the Director of Research & Enterprise would meet with the Associate Deans of Research to consider the best way of utilising the existing bank of failed and successful applications and reviewers' feedback.

5 SOAS Journals

The Editorial Managers presented a paper on initiating a consultation on the governance structures of the SOAS journals (appendix C).

The Committee **noted** that no consistent governance structure was in place and that there was no formal appointment process for editors of SOAS journals.

The Committee **agreed** that a review should be initiated and that a report would be presented at the next meeting. The Pro-Director (Research and Enterprise) **agreed** to approach candidates to lead the review.

It was **agreed** that it would be useful to investigate the governance structures at comparable journals in order to provide benchmarks for good practice.

The Committee **noted** that there are likely to be legitimate historical reasons for the governance structures of the SOAS journals and that these should be explored by conducting a questionnaire of the current editors to help properly understand the existing arrangements and priorities.

The Committee **recommended** that the current editors be invited to participate in the review as they would be best placed to advise on the distinctive histories and characteristics of the respective journals.

The Committee **recommended** that the Chair of the Publications Committee of the journal *Africa* be invited to act as an adviser to the review.

6 Research Plans

The Pro-Director presented a paper (appendix D) on research planning. The Committee was asked to agree a way forward in relation to research planning over the coming academic year.

The ADRs reported that there had been a good response to completing the personal research plans.

It was **agreed** that:

The wording of the first recommendation should be amended such that the distinction between personal research plans and the Staff Development Review (SDR) was made clear.

The Head of the Doctoral School, the Director of Research & Enterprise and the Research Manager would meet to discuss the possibility of the delivery of online training modules for research supervisors in areas such as research ethics and open access.

The Head of the Doctoral School, the Doctoral School Manager and the Associate Deans of Research would review the committee reporting structure to ensure that Faculty research plans, including postgraduate research student number targets, were presented to the Research & Enterprise Committee as a matter of routine.

The REC would undertake an annual review of research faculty plans.

7 Research Centres and Institutes

The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) presented a paper (appendix E) on the terms of reference for research centres and institutes.

It was **noted** that an informal working group had been established to explore the possibility of setting up an Africa Institute by 2015 (the 50th anniversary of the Centre for African Studies) and in advance of the SOAS centenary celebrations in 2016/17.

8 Research Income

A report from the Research & Enterprise Finance Manager on research income (appendix F) was **noted**.

9 Centennial Research Themes

The revised paper on the SOAS centennial research themes (appendix G) was **approved**.

10 Postgraduate Research Matters

The Head of the Doctoral School reported that:

The School's first priority was to establish a viable financial model, but that progress was difficult following the recent departure of the school's administrator.

Investigation was underway into the possibility of creating a mechanism whereby departments could appoint a chair to oversee the conduct of a viva, should the need arise.

11 Research Ethics

A report from the Research Ethics Panel (appendix I) was **noted**.

Minute	Item	Action	Deadline	By
3	Action Taken	<p>i) Research Manager to liaise with the three Faculties about embedding internal peer review into their research funding application processes</p> <p>iv) The Research Office to devise seed corn funds reporting template and circulate to Faculties.</p>	<p>03-02-15</p> <p>01-10-2015</p>	<p>AL, MS, RH, SH</p> <p>AL</p>
4	Matters Arising	<p>1) Committee asked to respond to HEFCE questions on International REF</p> <p>2) Research Manager and Director of Research and Enterprise to meet with the Associate Deans of Research to consider the best way of utilising the existing bank of failed and successful applications and reviewers' feedback</p>	31-10-2014	<p>ALL</p> <p>AL, SB, MS, SH, RH</p>
5	SOAS Journals	A review to be initiated and to report back at next Committee	03-02-2015	RB, RJ, RP
6	Research plans	The wording of the first recommendation should be amended such that the distinction between personal research plans and the Staff Development Review (SDR) was made clear		RB