**The University of Dublin**
**Trinity College**

There will be a meeting of the **Research Committee** on Tuesday 06 October 2009 at 11.00 in the Arts Building Conference Room (Room 2026), College.

**A G E N D A**

**Section A: Policy Items**

**A.1 Minutes**
Meeting of 18 June 2009 (encl)
**A.2 Matters Arising from the Minutes**
**A.3 Intellectual Property Policy**
Status of IP Policy and Campus Company Formation 01 October 2009 (encl)
Proposed New Approach to the Establishment of Campus Companies 21 August 2009 (encl)
Campus Company Formation Process from August 2009 (encl)
**A.4 Research Quality Metrics (RQM) for the Resource Planning Model (RPM) Metrics**
Internal Memorandum from the Dean of Research (encl)
**A.5 TCD/UCD Innovation Alliance**
Briefing Document to Innovation Taskforce (encl)
**A.6 Annual Research Report to Council**
Trinity Research & Innovation Outline Content for Annual Report and Service Plan 2009/2010 (encl)
**A.7 Research Committee Budget**
Summary to follow
**A.8 Any Other Business**

**Section B: Implementation Decisions**

**B.1 FP7 Working Group**
Minutes of Meeting of 21 May 2009 (encl)
**B.2 Committee on Business and Industry**
Draft Minutes of Meeting of 31 March 2009 (encl)
**B.3 Any Other Business**

**Section C: Items for Noting**

**C.1 Research Committee Terms of Reference**
Terms of Reference (encl)

*01 October 2009*

*Dr J Callaghan*
*Secretary to Committee*

**Membership 2009-10**

Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Chair)
Dean of Research (Deputy Chair)
Dean of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences
Dean of Engineering, Mathematics & Science
Dean of Health Sciences
Director (or Associate Director) of Trinity Research & Innovation
Dean of Graduate Studies
Professor James Wickham
Professor Paul Holm
Faculty of Health Science representative (tbc)
Professor Linda Doyle
Professor John Boland
Academic Secretary
Professor Shane Allwright
President, Graduate Students' Union
Chair, Trinity Research Staff Association

*In attendance:*
Ms Doris Alexander
Ms Deirdre Savage
Ms Maria Treanor (Minute Secretary to the Committee)

**A.1 Minutes**
Meeting of 18 June 2009

**The University of Dublin**
**Trinity College**

**Minutes of Research Committee Meeting, 18 June 2009**

Present: Prof. Shane Allwright (*Board member and Chair*), Dr James Callaghan (*Associate Director of Trinity Research & Innovation, ADoTRI and Secretary*), Dr David Lloyd (*Dean of Research, DoR*), Prof. Carol O'Sullivan (*Dean of Graduate Studies*), Prof. Roger Stalley (*Heads of School representative*), Prof. Dermot Kelleher (*representative of College research community*), Mr Ronan Hodson (*President of the GSU – ex officio*)

In attendance: Dr Camilla Kelly (*Research Development Office*), Ms Maria Treanor (*Research Development Office*), Ms Deirdre Savage (*Nominee of Treasurer*), Ms Doris Alexander (*Research Development Officer*)

Apologies: Prof. Patrick Prendergast (*Vice-Provost*), Prof. Margaret O'Mahony (*Bursar*), Prof. Patrick Honohan (*representative of College research community*)

**RS/08-09/35 Minutes of 06 and 23 April 2009**
Changes were incorporated, and the minutes were approved and signed.

**RS/08-09/36 Matters Arising from the Minutes**
RS/08-09/17 Research Committee Sub-Committees and Working Groups: The Vice-Provost will sign off on the minutes of the last Business and Industry Committee meeting by 26 June 2009, and the minutes will then be circulated to the Committee.

RS/08-09/23 Working Group on Research Careers: The revised Report of the Joint Research Committee/PAC Working Group has not been reviewed by the Research Committee because it was superseded by activities in the strategic planning process. This may be an on-going action point and the revised document should be circulated to the Research Committee in due course.

RS/08-09/28 Research Proposal and Award Management System (RPAMS): Donal Lyons met with the Directors of Research.

RS/08-09/33 Trinity Research & Innovation: The TR&I Annual Report 2007/2008 will be made available to all new academic and research staff as part of the Staff Office's induction pack.

RS/08-09/34 Meeting with Directors of Research: The Research SPT document was sent to Heads of School and Directors of Research.

Re. Open Access Publications (OAP), it was agreed that three actions would be taken up during 2009/10.

*Action: Vice-Provost to sign off on Minutes of last Business and Industry Committee meeting by 26 June 2009; minutes will then be circulated to the Committee.*

*Action: ADoTRI to provide TRI Annual Report to Staff Office for inclusion in the induction pack for all new academic and research staff.*

*Actions re. Open Access Publications: DoR to send letter to all staff asking for their views on OAP for publicly-funded research; DoR to ask Niamh Brennan to send out a list of OAP tips and suggestions to the Directors of Research for their feedback; and DoR to invite Niamh Brennan to make a presentation on OAP at the next meeting of the Research Committee with Directors of Research.*

**RS/08-09/37 Any Other business**

The DoR reported that staff compliance with the Research Support System PRTLI5 data sheets has been low. DoR will send a reminder to Heads of School before the PRTLI site visits asking staff to complete the PRTLI5 data sheets.

*Action: DoR to send a reminder to Heads of School before the PRTLI site visits asking staff to complete PRTLI5 data sheets.*

## Section A: Policy Items

**RS/08-09/38 Good Research Practice (GRP)**

The Research Ethics Working Group reviewed the GRP policy document. It was subsequently sent to all staff for comment via Directors of Research and Heads of School and, in general, the update was welcomed.

The Research Committee is responsible for articulating a policy position on GRP for approval by Council and Board. The document will also be reviewed by the College solicitors.

The Committee stipulated that the declaration of compliance of GRP is devolved to the individual at the point of application and receipt of funding, and validated through the appropriate Ethics Committee.

It was agreed that a Garda vetting process may be required for staff working with children. DoR will check this at Council.

Regarding stem cell research, TCD is subject to the law of land and is not going to have guidelines which do not comply with the law. Evidence of compliance must be provided to the relevant ethics committee. Where a request is outside the competence of an ethics committee, another ethics committee must deal with it.

It was agreed that a statement regarding early discussion of authorship and publication practice should be included.

Regarding supervision of research, it was agreed that the Dean of Graduate Studies will review the feedback, update the graduate studies document, and take it to the Graduate Studies Committee next year.

The College's data protection policy will become an appendix to the main GRP document. This appendix will be kept updated by the Information Compliance Officer, Tom Turpin, and the Chair will communicate this to him. It was suggested that some of the Research Committee budget could be used to buy storage for researchers' data, and that this could be managed by the Trinity Centre for High Performance Computing.

The Committee asked the Chair to write to the Research Ethics Working Group to thank them for their work on the GRP document.

*Action: forward GRP document to Council and Board, preferably before Council's last meeting of the year, and also to College solicitors.*

*Action: DoR to raise the issue of Garda vetting for staff working with children at Council.*

*Action: Dean of Graduate Studies to review the feedback on supervision of research, update the graduate studies document, and take it to the Graduate Studies Committee next year.*

*Action: The College's data protection policy will become an appendix to the main GRP document. This appendix will be kept updated by the Information Compliance Officer, Tom Turpin, and the Chair will communicate this to him.*

*Action: Chair to write to Research Ethics Working Group to thank them for their work on the GRP document.*

**RS/08-09/39 IIIS Bid for Institute Status**

The Committee delegated authority to DoR to review a detailed three-year financial plan due from the IIIS as part of its bid for institute status. He will then write to the Committee with his recommendation for approval (or not), and Committee members will formally approve (or not) by email.

Subject to the approval of the IIIS three-year financial plan by the Treasurer, the Committee delegated authority to DoR to review the documentation concerning the IIIS bid for institute status. He will write to the Committee with his recommendation of approval or otherwise, indicating the issues which have been addressed and including copies of the documents. Committee members will then formally approve or otherwise by email. It was agreed that if the Treasurer had concerns about the financial plan, this would be communicated to the Committee via DoR, and approval of the IIIS as a Trinity Research Institute would not occur until the process was revisited at the next meeting of the Research Committee.

*Action: If the Treasurer has no concerns about the IIIS financial plan, DoR will review it and write to the Committee with his recommendation. Committee members will then formally approve (or not) by email.*

## Section B: Implementation Decisions

**RS/08-09/40 Definition of Research Active**

It was agreed that the revised document on research-active definitions will be used, possibly with some minor corrections, including the use of the term research-productive instead of research-active. There was some discussion about Research Quality Measures, given that academic units are to be rewarded on the number of research productive staff. The RQMs are based on quality measures (as defined by individual academic units), research productivity (research outputs) and benchmarking.

**RS/08-09/41 Research Committee Funding Schemes**

The results of the Start-up Grant 2009 will be published on an internal College website. For future funding rounds, the application form will advise applicants that results will be published on the web.

*Action: Maria Treanor to find out how many new eligible staff do not apply to the Start-up scheme.*

**RS/08-09/42 Any Other business**

A recommendation has been made that the Research Committee should become a Committee of Council rather than of Board as

Council deals with academic matters. It has been proposed that the Vice-Provost will chair the Committee.

Signed: …….

Date: …….

**A.3 Intellectual Property Policy**

Status of IP Policy and Campus Company Formation 01 October 2009

Proposed New Approach to the Establishment of Campus Companies 21 August 2009

Campus Company Formation Process from August 2009

**Internal Memorandum**

**TO:** **Research Committee**

**FROM:** **Dr. James Callaghan, Associate Director Trinity Research & Innovation**

**DATE:** **1st October 2009**

**SUBJECT:** **Status of IP Policy and Campus Company Formation**

---

This is a cover note to explain the background to two papers to be presented at the Research Committee Meeting of 6th October 2009.

The first paper "Proposed New Approach to the Establishment of Campus Companies" outlines some of the keys issues with the extant IP Policy and how it relates to campus companies. This paper is based on a presentation made to the Planning Group meeting of 3rd June at which a derogation from the current IP Policy was requested in order to trial a new approach that was cognisant of and consistent with the emerging Strategic Plan 2009-2014.

In the interests of transparency, and as a pilot of a potential new policy aimed at the acceleration of the rate of campus company formation, the paper outlines the key elements of the proposed new approach.

The second paper "Campus Company Formation Process from August 2009" outlines the streamlined process to support the pilot of the proposed new approach.

The feedback from the academic community so far is that the proposed new approach is being seen as a very positive and progressive initiative across College toward generating greater levels of commercialisation across all disciplines.

With the extant IP Policy and prior to the pilot of the new approach, the rate of campus company formation for the calendar year 2009 would have been the 1-2 companies, as in previous years. With the advent of the new approach, we already have approved 3 companies, 4 more are in the final stages of approval and are expected to be launched by end of October, and up to 3 more are expected to be formed before the end of December 2009. Also in the pipeline are 2 more companies expected to be formed in Q1 2010.

Dr James Callaghan
Associate Director, Trinity Research & Innovation

**Internal Memorandum**

**TO:** **Executive Officers Group**

**CC:** **Professor Patrick Prendergast, Vice Provost/Chief Academic Officer**
**Mr. Tony McMahon, Interim Chief Operating Officer**
**Dr. David Lloyd, Dean of Research**

**FROM:** **Dr. James Callaghan, Associate Director Trinity Research & Innovation**

**DATE:** **21st August 2009**

**SUBJECT:** **Proposed New Approach to the Establishment of Campus Companies**

---

**Background**
The existing IP policy was adopted in June 2005 but there have been a number of developments since then that necessitate a fresh look to explore enabling models for business creation. These include:

- The large increase in research income over the past few years and the need to demonstrate how College is contributing to the development of the 'Smart Economy', especially via job creation and start-up companies
- The increase in resources in Trinity Research & Innovation dedicated to technology transfer. This has grown from 1-2 people until 2008 to a total of 7 full time staff (TTO Manager, 4 TT Case Managers, Industry Liaison Manager, IP Database Administrator). This team has only been in place since the end of August 2008. The additional 5 people are funded until 2012 by Enterprise Ireland under the TTSI (Technology Transfer Strengthening Initiative)
- The recognition that the optimum return to College will likely be over the medium to longer term, whereas the return to the nation needs to be visible in the shorter term.

Relatively speaking the rate of campus company formation compares well against other leading academic institutes. For example, for the two calendar years 2007-2008 there were 4 spin-out companies from College and a research expenditure of €145.5m. This equates to 2.7 companies per €100m and is comparable to:

- Cambridge: 0.6 spinouts per €100m
- Oxford: 2.2 spin-outs per €100m
- Imperial College London: 3.7 spin-outs per €100m
- MIT: 2.2 spin-outs per €100m

It should also be borne in mind that the Technology Transfer Offices at these other institutions have much higher staffing levels and have been in operation for a great

deal longer. For example, Cambridge Enterprises have a total of 42 people, while MIT has a complement of 33 people.

**Comparison of Existing IP Policy in Relation to Company Formation**
The main elements of the existing policy are as follows:

- Campus company: 15% of equity to college, 85% of equity to founders, very preferable licence terms to College IP (Intellectual Property) + PIs remain members of College staff
- Spin-out: Typically 3% of equity to College, very preferable licence terms to College IP + PI(s) take leave of absence or reduce time in College
- Low anti-dilution trigger (typically €200k)

This compares very favourably to other institutes often seen as cynosures in this domain as follows:

- MIT: low single digit equity to institute, high anti-dilution trigger ($5m to $10m), licence to IP on real commercial terms

- Stanford: 15% of equity to Tech Transfer Office, 56.6% to University, 28.4% to founders, no further anti-dilution provision, licence to IP on very commercial terms

The other Irish Universities employ similar conditions to those of College with the exception that they employ much higher anti-dilution triggers. It should be noted that the approach now being adopted by Enterprise Ireland is that they will not invest in any campus company if the University insists on having any anti-dilution conditions (contrary to international best practice). As an initial investor, Enterprise Ireland, seeks to protect its investment through the acquisition of redeemable preference shares in the campus companies. This acts as an anti-dilution mechanism for the Enterprise Ireland equity stake only.

**Issues with Current Policy**
With respect to the formation of campus companies, the current IP policy is a confusing mix of guidelines, 'how-to', 'must-do' and is, to a certain degree, open to interpretation. In particular, there is a lack of clarity with respect to the amount of time a founding PI is permitted to spend working on activities related to the company and the amount of time spent fulfilling their academic role. This leads to divergent interpretations of whether a company should be classified as a "campus" rather than a "spin-out" company.

The policy states that the equity position in the formation of a campus company is a separate issue from the licensing terms surrounding any College IP but in practice this leads to protracted discussions due to founders wishing to "trade" equity against more preferable licence terms.

As a result, the policy is fine in theory but difficult to implement in practice. In essence, the policy is perceived to act almost as an inhibitor rather than an enabler.

Crucially, it also relies on the founding PI having an entrepreneurial skill set. This again acts almost as a natural limiter on the rate of company formation.

**New Approach to Campus Company Formation**

The new approach is based on the following principles:

- Optimise the rate at which campus companies are formed
- Reduce real or perceived delays to forming a campus company
- Maximize the level of knowledge transfer
- Ensure a fair and reasonable return to College

In order to pilot a new approach, derogation from the current policy is required. The recommended key elements of this new approach are as follows

- The definition of a campus company is where a company is formed for the purposes of exploiting College IP. This is synonymous with the terms spin-out, spin-off or spin-in.
- College equity share in campus companies shall be 5%
- Removal of anti-dilution conditions so as not to prohibit EI investment
- Reasonably commercial licensing terms to College IP, in line with international best practice and so as to avoid conflict of interest issues and potential infringement of state-aid rules
- Amount of time founding PI(s) spend on campus company activities is a matter for negotiation between the PI(s) and the appropriate Head of School
- Recommendation of approval of campus company status to be delegated to Associate Director of TR&I (as is currently the case) with notification to the Chief Operating Officer, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Research.

A period of at least one academic year, commencing 2009-2010 is required to pilot the new approach. A period less than this will cause too much uncertainty and will inhibit company formation.

The economic landscape and prevailing conditions under which we will spin-off campus companies will change markedly, and with unprecedented celerity, over the next year. The above approach will then be evaluated to ensure that College and the relevant stakeholders are best placed to enable and benefit from a significant increase in the rate of campus company formation.

Dr James Callaghan
Associate Director, Trinity Research & Innovation

**Campus Company Formation Process from August 2009**

**Introduction**

In recognition of stated government policy of encouraging and promoting new, technology-based company formation, and with specific endorsement from the College authorities, a more flexible approach to the evaluation and approval of TCD campus companies has been introduced.

**New Process**

The College staff involved with a potential new company meet the relevant Technology Transfer Case Manager and discuss:

- the outline business plan,
- the company team, including any external promoters and the proposed involvement of the College promoters (mindful of potential conflict of interest)
- the nature of the intellectual property to be licensed from College and the outline terms of such a licence
- the source of funding for the project during which the IP was created, and application for consent to licence such IP, if required

The College staff, and/or the external promoters, and the TT Case Manager meet the Associate. Director of Trinity Research & Innovation (TR&I) to seek approval of the formation of the campus company. College's policy is to retain 5% of the equity, and give 95% to the promoters for division in their sole discretion.

**NB** The Associate Director must be assured that any College staff promoters of the company are satisfied with what has been agreed between them and any external (i.e. non College staff) company promoters regarding proposed future involvement with the company, share of equity (if any) and other such arrangements.

The Associate Director issues a letter of approval for the formation of a TCD Campus company, based on the template attached. Notification is then sent to the Dean of Research, the Vice-Provost and the Chief Operating Officer.

********

The TT Case Manager and the company conclude a licence agreement, mindful of potential conflict of interest if the College promoters who have created such IP are shareholders in the company.

The campus company may be incorporated at any stage in the process – it is a separate issue.

***On TR&I headed notepaper***

RE: Approval of a new TCD Campus Company

**Letter of Agreement**

between

……(***insert names***) as promoters of [EITHER *the proposed company……Ltd*. OR *registered company ……Ltd*. (***insert name and address and CRO number***] (hereinafter "***insert short name***")

And

The Provost Fellows and Scholars of the College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity of Queen Elizabeth near Dublin, of College Green Dublin 2, Ireland also know as Trinity College Dublin (hereinafter "TCD").

WHEREAS the promoters of ***short name*** have approached the Associate Director of Trinity Research & Innovation of TCD ("Associate Director") seeking TCD approval to promote ***short name*** as a TCD Campus Company; and

WHEREAS the promoters of ***short name*** have provided the Associate Director with a satisfactory business plan; and

WHEREAS the promoters of ***short name*** have provided the Associate Director with written evidence that all TCD staff associated with the proposed TCD campus company are satisfied with the terms of their future involvement with such company; and

WHEREAS in consideration for being granted TCD Campus Company status, ***short name*** has agreed to provide TCD with 5% of the equity in ***short name*** in accordance with the terms of ***short name's*** shareholders' agreement.

NOW THEREFORE it is hereby agreed that ***short name*** is approved as a TCD Campus Company.

| Signed for and on behalf of TCD | Signed for and on behalf of ***short name*** |
|---|---|
| _____ | _____ |
| Name: Dr James Callaghan | Name: |
| Title: Associate Director, Trinity Research & Innovation | Title: |
| Date: | Date: |

**A.4 Research Quality Metrics (RQM) for the Resource Planning Model (RPM) Metrics**

Internal Memorandum from the Dean of Research

Attached

**A.5 TCD/UCD Innovation Alliance**

Briefing Document to Innovation Taskforce

Attached

**A.6 Annual Research Report to Council**

Trinity Research & Innovation Outline Content for Annual Report and Service Plan 2009/2010

**Trinity Research & Innovation**

**Outline Content for Annual Report and Service Plan 2009/2010**

**1. Introduction and Overview of Role and Activities**

High level view of activities, achievements, issues, resourcing.

**2. Review of the Year 2008/2009**

Detailed achievements of each section of TR&I to include:

- Research Development Section:

  Statistics and commentary on: research applications, level of funding requested, various sponsors and programmes, involvement in PRTLI5 proposal, recurring issues, progress towards introduction of RPAMS

- Contracts Section:

  Statistics and commentary, broken down by sponsor, on contractual documentation entered into for the year. Issues and risks relating to non-research contracts

- Technology Transfer Section:

  Statistics and commentary on invention disclosures, patenting activity, licensing, campus company formation, IP collaboration agreements, materials transfer agreements, non-disclosure agreements

- Entrepreneurship Section:

  Commentary on activities relating to Entrepreneurship training across College, accreditation of Entrepreneurship Training Programme, involvement in Innovation Academy, involvement in innovation and entrepreneurship networks.

**3. Key Objectives and Targets for 2009/2010**

**4. Organisational Structure**

**A.7 Research Committee Budget**
Summary

To follow

**B.1 FP7 Working Group**

Minutes of Meeting of 21 May 2009

**FP7 Working Group 21 May 2009**

Present: Doris Alexander, Oonagh Kinsman, Esther Fortune, Mary Tracey Deirdre Savage, Vincent Wade, John Fitzpatrick, Carol Newman, James Callaghan, Pat Daly
Invited: Keith Creedon, Paul Coote
Apologies: Carol Newman;

1. Actions from previous meeting.

Marie Curie Contracts: Pat Daly confirmed that no operational issues have arisen since the introduction of employment contracts for Marie Curie funded PhD students.

Charging FP7 contracts for PhD students: The action from the previous meeting is being deferred, at the request of John Fitzpatrick, to the next meeting

2. Review of the aims of the FP7 working group

The proposed aims were reviewed and any comments on these should be forwarded to the Secretary.

The FP7 working group was formed in 2006 to discuss the implementation of processes needed to meet the challenges presented by rule changes in Framework 7. Topics of discussion at the start included: proposal submission requirements, time recording for all staff working on EU projects, calculation of costs of academic staff time, methods for recording and recovering a greater proportion of direct costs, cost control during the projects, and management of overheads. The meetings are now held at least once a term and discussion now includes review of successful projects and participation across Schools and new FP7 programmes. In the future the effects of full economic costing and the process of moving from the transitional indirect cost rate to actual indirect costs will be reviewed. Minutes are forwarded to the Research Committee.

The composition of the committee was reviewed and the existing working group considered that it to be appropriate bearing in mind the aims of the group.

3. FP7 application rates

Details of success rates was not discussed but application rates were presented. It was noted that 179 proposals were made in 2007, 98 in 2008 and 35 so far in 2009. Further analysis will be carried out and a strategy put forward to increase success rates where possible. However it was noted that in a report from Enterprise Ireland on participation in FP7 that TCD obtained substantially higher funding than other institutions. Trinity Research & Innovation are working closely with project officers in both the Schools of Computer Science and Statistics and Medicine in relation to FP7.

4. PhD fees and Marie Curie fellowships

Further discussions will take place between the Treasurer's Office and the Research Development Office to explore ways of including PhD fees as eligible costs in reference to the clarification from the European Commission dated 3 March 2009..

5. Academic staff time input; discussion of any issues arising in contract implementation

It was noted that the time commitment should be realistic at the budget stage and this is then achievable in contract implementation. Whilst there is no rule, the rule of thumb is between 3-10% PI time per grant (6-20 days a year) but it is dependent on the extent of the research portfolio/other duties of the PI in question. The time indicated must be provided but it is always possible to spend more time on the project but not charge/claim the time. The issue of "claimable time" was discussed in relation to a standard working day.

6. Progress with the Full Economic Cost project

Keith Creedon from the Treasurer's Office updated the meeting on the SIF funded Full Economic Cost project which is being coordinated by the IUA. In July 2009 pilot data based on 2007/2008 data would be available for internal use only. In summer 2010 the first full run of FEC data based on the 2008/2009 financial and academic year will be carried out. For the research overhead one indirect cost rate for each university will be calculated. This will involve all academics completing an academic activity profile which will have 9 categories including 3 teaching, 3 research and 3 other categories and will allow the research component to be determined. Completion of these profiles is voluntary. However IFUT and SIPTU have advised all their members not to participate with this activity due to the breakdown of National Partnership talks.

7. Feedback from the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment and Forfas on changes to the transitional rate for indirect cost

Doris Alexander and Oonagh Kinsman instigated a meeting with the Department of Enterprise Trade and Employment, Forfas and other stakeholders to discuss how to best represent the Irish university view to maintain the transitional indirect cost rate at 60% after 1 Janaury 2010. The meeting took place on 23 April when it appeared likely, based on a reported CREST communication, that the Commission would maintain this rate until the end of FP7. It was agreed that the IUA should provide a 2 page paper to support this position and circulate to DETE and Forfas.

8. TCD participation in FP7 Research for the benefit of SMEs: TCD's participation as a service provider

Doris Alexander provided background information on this programme, discussed financial and intellectual property issues that have arisen in TCD becoming involved

either as a 'research performer' or a 'coordinator' or both. The overall key issue is that the distribution of the EC contribution to the project which differs from ordinary collaborative projects. The distribution of the EC contribution to the partners is not according to a standard mechanism but has to be agreed by the partners collectively and therefore a change to one partner costs affects all other partners and each project may be done differently. Both Vinny Wade and John Fitzpatrick could see benefits with working with SMEs and agreed to look into the programme in more detail before specific proposals were put forward.

9. Salary scales for core staff and IUA scales

Based on a meeting between the Treasurer's Office, Research Development Office and Staff Office, IUA scales (Irish and Non Irish) have been adjusted on the Research Development Office web site to include 3% inflation. (Wellcome Trust, HRB and SFI have their own rules). It was agreed that the Staff Office would update the core staff salary scales (schedule 1 and 2) to include no inflation for year 1 and 3% thereafter.

**B.2 Committee on Business and Industry**
Draft Minutes of Meeting of 31 March 2009

**The University of Dublin**
**Trinity College**

**DRAFT Minutes of Business and Industry Committee Meeting**

**31st March 2009**

Present: Prof Patrick Prendergast (TCD Vice-Provost– Chair), Dr James Callaghan (Trinity Research & Innovation), Prof. Margaret O'Mahony (TCD Bursar), Ms Helena Acheson (Forfas), Prof. Darina Murray (TCD Engineering, Maths & Science)

Apologies: Dr. David Lloyd (TCD Dean of Research), Mr John Herlihy (Google), Prof. John Murray TCD Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences), Prof. Dermot Kelleher (TCD Medicine), Mr Damian O'Connell (Pfizer), Mr Damian Lawlor (Google), Mr Terry Gallagher (Trinity Foundation) and Dr Leo Bishop (IDA).

In attendance: Ms Deirdre Savage (pp Treasurer/Chief Financial Officer), Dr John Whelan (Trinity Research & Innovation), Mr Chris Lyons (TCD Chief Operating Officer) and Dr Margaret Woods (Secretary to the B&IC).

**Agenda item 1. Introduction**

Prof Prendergast, welcomed those present and noted that he was acting as pro-Dean of Research to chair the meeting in the Dean's absence. He invited those present to introduce themselves.

The Chairman noted that the meeting was not quorate. After discussion, the Chairman proposed that, in order to conduct the business of the meeting, those present should declare the meeting to be quorate, subject to the assent of the absent B&IC members. Agreed.

**Agenda item 2. TCD Policy on Campus Company formation.**

James Callaghan gave an overview of TCD's policy, and referred to those sections in the TCD Policy, Practice and Regulations on Intellectual Property document which relate to the formation of campus companies.

**Agenda item 3. Application to form "Empower the User" as a campus company.**

James Callaghan noted that he had been in discussions with the promoters of ETU regarding the relevant regulations for formation of a campus company.

The promoters of ETU – Profs Vinny Wade and Michael Gill and Drs Brian Fitzpatrick and Declan Dagger, all of TCD – joined the meeting. VW presented an overview of the underpinning ADAPT research; DD presented an overview of the ETU company's plans for commercialisation. After discussion of pertinent issues, the Chairman thanked the promoters and informed them that the B&IC would revert to them through JC. The promoters left the meeting.

The Chairman noted that TCD wants the company to form and he proposed that the B&IC approve the formation of Empower the User as a campus company

subject to final negotiations with TR&I via JC and subject to ETU's completion of all College procedures required for campus company formation.

Agreed.

**Agenda item 5. Application to form "Treocht" as a campus company**

JC explained that there had been quite a lot of interest from companies seeking to licence the IP developed by the two TCD promoters, Professors Colm Kearney and Khurshid Ahmed. The formation of a campus company was only considered after some potential US licensees/promoters sought to set up an Irish company in order to apply for Enterprise Ireland funding to collaborate with the TCD promoters in conducting further research on the technology.

Professors Colm Kearney and Khurshid Ahmed joined the meeting and gave an overview of their proposal to form a campus company as per the document which had been circulated in advance of the meeting. After discussion of various relevant issues, including shares in equity, the Chairman thanked CK and KA, and CK and KA withdrew.

After further discussion, the Chairman proposed that the B&IC approve the formation of Treocht as a campus company as soon as satisfactory negotiations with JC and a resolution of the issues are completed.

Agreed.

JC queried the procedure in the event that he and the promoters of Treocht cannot reach agreement. Noting that CK and KA, as senior College academics had raised certain questions, the Chairman proposed that this should be an Agenda item for a future B&IC meeting.

Agreed.

**Agenda item 4. Application from Codex Discovery**

A copy of the Codex Discovery draft business plan had been circulated prior to the meeting and JC confirmed that the promoters had indicated to him that they were happy to follow TCD procedures for the formation of Codex as a campus company. JC sought approval from the B&IC to enter into detailed negotiations with the promoters of Codex. Agreed.

**AOB.**

JC mentioned that TR&I are in discussions concerning the possible formation of a TCD:UCC campus company to exploit IP jointly-created by TCD and UCC. It has been provisionally agreed that TCD and UCC would share the University equity stake between them, *pro rata* in the same ratio of 75:25 TCD:UCC as has already been agreed for IP ownership. JC sought the guidance of the B&IC as this is a new mechanism; hopefully it will be the first of many joint campus companies.

The Chairman said that as long as the total university equity share is 15%, this mechanism would be acceptable to TCD. JC is to check, and send a note to the B&IC.

ACTION: James Callaghan

## C.1 Research Committee Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

## RESEARCH COMMITTEE

### Terms of Reference

The Research Committee is an Academic Committee of Council and reports directly to Council.

**1. Membership**

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Chair)
The Dean of Research (Deputy Chair)
The Faculty Deans
The Director (or Associate Director) of Trinity Research and Innovation
The Dean of Graduate Studies
Professor James Wickham
Professor Paul Holm
Professor Dermot Kelleher
Professor Linda Doyle
Professor John Boland
Academic Secretary
Professor Shane Allwright
President, Graduate Students' Union
Chair, Trinity Research Staff Association

*In attendance:*
Ms Doris Alexander; Ms Deirdre Savage
Ms Maria Treanor (Minute secretary to the Committee)

*Others may be invited to be in attendance as appropriate by the Chair*

**2. Functions**

The main functions of the Research Committee are:

2.1 To formulate policy on all research related matters which impact on the strategic objectives of the College[1].

[1] Articulation of College's over-arching Research Strategy is the responsibility of the Dean of Research and the Faculty Deans, informed by School and Faculty Strategies and building on established and emergent strengths of the College. The Research Committee will operate with the understanding that the broad areas of Trinity's research strategy encompass the totality of the College's research activities, and facilitate all levels of investigation, down to the individual scholar. The Research Committee, in formulating policy, shall be cognisant that College policy must reflect best international practice and should support and facilitate all facets of research activity towards attainment of international excellence in the context of a holistic institution which pays equal and due regard to the individual scholar while cognisant of the importance of international differentiation, scale and achievement.

2.2 To consider and make recommendations on matters of policy relating to research including matters referred to it by Council and other College committees.

2.3 To review and oversee the implementation on College's policy on research ethics.

2.4 To monitor, primarily through the feedback mechanism of the *Research Forum*[2], the relevance and efficacy of established policy – addressing shortcomings and anomalies so as to facilitate high quality research activities within the College structures.

2.5 To oversee quality assurance and improvement measures in respect of research activity, including the efficacy of research quality measures.

2.6 To advise the Dean of Research in his role in reporting internally and externally on research and related matters.

2.7 To review Annual Reports relating to research matters and to make recommendations to Council.

2.8 To approve procedures for allocating research funds and monitor their implementation.

2.9 To establish Advisory Committees and Working Groups as required to develop and oversee policy in respect of research matters.

**3. Meetings, Quorum and Sub-Committees**

3.1 The Research Committee shall meet once per term or more frequently if the business requiring its attention should so dictate.

3.2 The quorum for meetings shall be 50% of the membership plus one.

3.3 Other College Officers shall attend meetings by invitation for specific agenda items. The Committee may also invite any Officer of the College, or other person to attend any meeting(s) of the Committee, as it may from time to time consider desirable, to assist the Committee in the attainment of its objectives.

3.3 The draft Minutes of the Research Committee shall be circulated to the University Council as soon as possible for noting and/or discussion/decision as necessary.

[2] The Research Forum is constituted by the Dean of Research (Chair) and the Directors of Research in the Schools and the Directors of Trinity Research Institutes.

3.5 In order to aid its operation the Committee may from time to time arrange for subgroups to consider specialist issues and bring forward recommendations to the Research Committee. These subgroups will involve members of the College community with relevant expertise and experience.

3.6 Minutes of the Graduate Studies committee should be distributed to the Research Committee members, and vice-versa.

3.7 The Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Committee shall be an Advisory Committee of the Research Committee.

**4. Authority**

4.1 The Committee shall operate under delegated authority from the University Council.

4.2 Through the Committee membership and the *Research Forum,* the Committee shall act as a channel of communication between the Council, the research community of College and the research administration, and shall report to Council with its considered recommendations pertaining to its remit as appropriate.

4.3 The Committee may investigate any matter falling within its terms of reference, calling on whatever resources and information it considers necessary to so do.

4.4 The Committee is authorised to seek any information it requires from any employee of College to enable it to discharge its responsibilities and shall have made available to it on a timely basis all information requested from any employee in a clear and well organised manner.

**5. Performance Evaluation**

5.1 The Research Committee shall, at least once a year, review its own performance and its terms of reference and shall report its conclusions and recommend any changes it considers necessary to the University Council.