The University of Dublin
Trinity College

Minutes of Research Committee Meeting, 8th June 2010

Present: Professor Patrick Prendergast *(Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer and Chair)*, Dr David Lloyd *(Dean of Research, DoR, and Deputy Chair)*, Dr James Callaghan *(Associate Director of Trinity Research & Innovation, ADTRI, and Secretary)*, Dr Patrick Geoghegan *(Associate Dean of Research, ADoR)*, Professor Michael Marsh *(Dean of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences)*, Professor Colm O'Moráin *(Dean of Health Sciences)*, Professor John Boland, Professor Poul Holm, Ms Patricia Callaghan *(Academic Secretary)*, Ronan Hodson (*President of the Graduate Students' Union*), Dr John Walsh (*Chair of the Trinity Research Staff Association (TRSA)*)

In attendance: Dr Camilla Kelly (*Research Development Office & Minute Secretary to the Committee*), Ms Doris Alexander (*Research Development Officer)*, Professor David Grayson *(Nominee of Professor Clive Williams (Dean of Engineering, Mathematics & Science))*, Professor David Dickson, School of School of Histories and Humanities (for item RS/09-10/61), Trevor Peare, TCD Library (for item RS/09-10/61)

Apologies: Professor Clive Williams *(Dean of Engineering, Mathematics & Science)*, Professor Carol O'Sullivan *(Dean of Graduate Studies)*, Professor Shane Allwright, Professor James Wickham, Professor Linda Doyle, Ms Deirdre Savage (*Nominee of Treasurer*)

Not present: Professor Dermot Kelleher *(Faculty of Health Science Representative)*

Section A

RS/09-10/55   **Minutes of 4th May 2010**
The minutes of the meeting were approved and signed subject to the following amendments

Item RS/09-10/48
Paragraph 2:
Change wording to
"The meeting also asked whether it was appropriate to take funds indirectly."

RS/09-10/56   **Matters Arising from the Minutes**
All noted in agenda of 8th June 2010

RS/09-10/57 Research Area in the Library

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer welcomed Professor David Dickson, School of School of Histories and Humanities, and Mr Trevor Peare, TCD Library, to update the meeting with regard to the research area in the library. He noted that Council had requested that this matter be considered by the Research Committee.

Mr Peare and Professor Dickson informed the Committee that the Library is in the process of relocating books from its reference section to other areas in the Library (Berkley). The intention is to move the main subject reference books closer to the relevant textbooks. However, a small collection of reference books will be maintained in the same area. It is also in the process of trying to introduce group study spaces. The move has become an issue because of a lack of communication; the idea has circulated that all the reference books would be moving to Stacks – this is not the case. It was noted that the demand for reference material may become less and less, but that any decrease would be very hard to quantify. It was also pointed out that a given School may have a very different view to that of the Library in terms of what a research Library should offer.

It was asked whether the changes would affect the service that the Library currently provides. In reply, it was noted that, in addition to providing new group study spaces, the changes should bring an improvement in service. The DoR asked whether there was a service level agreement in place for the Library, and suggested if there was not, it could be discussed by the Planning Group.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer suggested that the Library and Information Services User Committee would be an appropriate place to discuss the current changes in the Library. Mr Peare noted that the Library would welcome invitations from Schools to discuss their needs and any issues arising. It was also suggested that a Library representative could be invited to join a Directors of Research forum.

In conclusion, the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer suggested that this issue should be discussed further at the Library and Information Services User Committee, which should invite submissions from Schools on the subject.

Action: ADTRI to forward a copy of this minute to the Library Committee.

RS/09-10/58 Review of Research Centres

The Committee noted a report from the ADoR dated 31st May 2010 that was circulated to members in advance of the meeting.   The ADoR gave a brief overview of the contents of the document.

The ADoR presented a number of possible options arising from the review:

1. Leave things as they stand. Allow Centres to continue with their work, and only require new Centres to meet the established criteria. This option would not appear to be in the best interests of either College or the Research Centres. Without any review process there is no way of discovering which Centres are active and which ones are inactive, there is no way of identifying potential problems and attempting to resolve them, and there is a danger that College will be promoting the research activities of Centres that no longer exist.
2. Remove official recognition from those Centres which do not meet the established criteria. This could only be done following a formal review as it would require contacting all the principal researchers, and requesting formal submissions about outputs and achievements. This option would be time-consuming and would also be of negative value to College. College would lose out on whatever work is currently done by these Centres, some of which would cease to exist, without gaining anything tangible in return.
3. Create a fourth category of research cluster: the Advanced Research Centre which would come between Centres and Institutes in the research hierarchy. All current Research Centres would maintain their status as Research Centres. However only those which apply to the Research Committee to become an Advanced Research Centre (and who meet the criteria established in the 2005 and 2007 documents, or preferably new criteria drawn up by the Research Committee) would be given be given strategic priority in College and would automatically appear in the Calendar and the Strategic Plan.
4. Hold a forum for Directors of Research Centres (and Directors of Research Centres seeking recognition) and discuss shared concerns and issues. It would also be worthwhile to consider the existing criteria for recognising Research Centres and whether new criteria needed to be devised. The forum would also discuss the definition and purpose of a Research Centre and how it contributed to the strategic objectives of the College.

A member of the Committee noted that the document was a very illuminating one, and that although all 3 options were very sound, the 3rd option would be the best way to go, and should be put to a forum of Directors of Research. The question was then asked as to where the funding for these Advanced Research Centres would come from.

Another Committee member commented that there was no sense of what outputs would be important for a Centre. The criteria for being a Centre should be linked to outputs as well as inputs. It is more important that a Centre is doing things of consequence rather than be of a certain number of PIs and a certain size. Centres should be informing the direction in which a School goes.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer commented that the document did not contain any criteria for Advanced Research Centres.

Some members of the Committee raised concerns about space for centres and sought clarification about the added value Research Centres brought to College. It was suggested that it needed to be demonstrated that Research Centres provided a genuine focal point for research activity (for example papers, books and seminars), which could not take place in their absence.

In closing the discussion, the ADoR agreed to hold a forum for the Directors of Research Centres (and Directors of Research Centres seeking recognition) to discuss the recent information gathering exercise and the various issues arising out the report and the meeting of the Research Committee (for example, the definition of a Research Centre, criteria for recognition, and whether it is worth creating a fourth category of research grouping). The ADoR would report on this forum at the next meeting of the Research Committee.

Action: The ADoR to hold a forum for Directors of Research Centres (and Directors of Research Centres seeking recognition) in September to discuss the recent information gathering exercise and the various issues arising out of the report, and return to the Research Committee with the results of the forum together with suggestions for new criteria for recognising Research Centres.

RS/09-10/59   Dean of Research Annual Report
A copy of a draft report was circulated with papers for the meeting. The DoR provided a brief overview of the contents of the document.

The document provides an overview of activity over a 1 year period (08/09).   The document starts with the grant application processes and highlights issues that need to be addressed e.g. the volume of late applications. The document also provides an overview of the sheer volume of contracts that pass through Trinity Research & Innovation (TR&I). The next section provides a summary of bibliographic data.   The last section gives a review of activity in the Technology Transfer Unit, the first since being fully staffed.

- Data shows that applications to FP7 were down in 08/09 from 07/08. However, indications for the current year (09/10) are that FP7 applications are on the rise.   It is also interesting to note that the number of application deadlines peaked in 2008.   There is also a significant amount of activity associated with the PRTLI5 application in early 2009 that has yet to come to fruition.   It is also worth noting that TCD takes the most amount of FP7 money nationally.

- TCD is doing very well on a national level in the European Research Council Grants programme.

- It is worth pointing out that grants such as the Interreg scheme do not generate any overheads, which could be a problem for College.   Enterprise Ireland is also beginning to withdraw funding from the university sector.

- A third of College's turnover arises from research.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked the DoR, ADTRI, and TR&I staff for the report, noting that the report would really come into its own next year when there is data for direct comparison. The Committee was invited to comment on the draft.

There was some discussion of the inclusion of conference papers in the Research Support System, with some of the Committee noting that it was not something they were aware should be included.

Another Committee member suggested that some of recommendations in the report could be streamlined.

It was also suggested that the Research Development Office should focus less on sign off for grant applications and more on getting information on grants out to staff. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer indicated that sign off for some applications could be done at School & Faculty level.

Another member of the Committee suggested putting a calendar together for major funding deadlines.

Action: ADTRI to streamline recommendations in the report.

RS/09-10/60 **Contract Academic Staff and Research Funding Proposals**
The Committee noted and approved a briefing note from Doris Alexander, Research Development Manager, Trinity Research & Innovation, dated 1st June 2010. The note lists the major national sponsors to be lobbied with respect to eligibility of contract staff.

This policy change (also see RS/09-10/46), applicable as of 1st October 2010, refers to lecturing/professorial staff only AND is subject to sponsor eligibility criteria. This policy does not pertain to those who receive or have received TCD recognition in the rank of Senior Research Fellow. In particular, the latter recognises that someone who has attained the TCD title of Senior Research Fellow 'may hold research grants in their own name as lead Principal Investigator'. This does not, however, confer a right to apply for funding to research schemes where the applicant (the Senior Research Fellow) is not eligible or which contravenes contractual obligations of existing grants. A Senior Research Fellow must be able to secure his/her salary from the application being applied for in proportion to the time he/she will allocate to that grant.

RS/09-10/61 **US Department of Defence Funding for Non-Military Purposes**
The Committee noted an updated memorandum from Doris Alexander, Research Development Manager, Trinity Research & Innovation, dated 31st May 2010. The memorandum details College's current stance with respect to Department of Defence

(DoD) funding and the various types of DoD funding schemes that are currently available. The Committee was invited to comment.

The DoR reminded the Committee that the Board-approved Code of Ethics was clear about the types of research College should and should not engage in; any application for funding that required a 'statement of military relevance' may not be acceptable. Where there is a requirement for such a statement, it will be submitted to the DoR for consideration. The military relevance statement should clearly indicate a benefit to mankind.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer summarized by saying that College should now consider DoD funding for non-military purposes. Since most of the DoD Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs do not require a statement of military relevance, applications to these schemes could go ahead without internal review by the DoR. Proposals to other DoD agencies would need to be submitted to the DoR for consideration.

RS/09-10/62 Sustainability, Governance and Funding of Trinity Research Institutes
The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer informed the Committee that this matter is currently under consideration by the Planning Group and a report will go forward to the next Board meeting.

RS/09-10/63 External Communication of Research
The Committee noted a memorandum from the Communications Officer, dated 3rd June 2010. The memorandum outlines the role of the Communications Office in publicising TCD research. The DoR spoke to document, informing the Committee that it was put together on foot of various concerns about the external view of College.

The meeting noted that the memo only mentions peer-reviewed papers, and does not seem to recognize the fact that books may also be newsworthy. The meeting also commented on the level of staffing in Communications Office and that perhaps it was under resourced for a University this size.

The comment was also made that we are not trying to impress Communications Office, but are trying to get information out to public. The question was asked as to whether there is a service level agreement with Communications Office that outlines its targets.

The DoR suggest that these issues should be addressed at the Provost's Communications Advisory Group.

Action: The DoR and Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer will raise these issues with the Communications Office. They will request metrics from the office and ask what it intends to achieve in terms of newspaper articles, TV items etc. They will then bring the item to the attention of the Provost's Communications Advisory Group.

RS/09-10/64 Publications – Open Access Policy

The Committee noted a memorandum, circulated, from Niamh Brennan, TCD Library. The memorandum proposes a new draft publications policy, where staff and students will be required to submit to College an e-copy of the final draft of all scholarly articles immediately upon acceptance for publication. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer stated that the document could not be approved until some clarifications were made. One such clarification relates to why articles would need to go directly to the Provosts Office.

Action: DoR to request clarification from TCD Library.

Section B

RS/09-10/65 Amendment to the current Indirect Cost Policy

The Committee noted and approved a memorandum from the Research Accounting Manager, dated 31st May 2010, outlining an amendment to the Indirect Cost Policy. The amendment is as follows: "Grants bearing indirect cost provisions above 20% of the eligible direct costs, 50% of the direct costs provision will pass to College for investment in central supports and services and 50% shall pass to the academic units(s) (Schools and/or recognised Trinity Research Institutes) generating the provision on a pro rata basis derived for the proportional activity on the grant. *However this is subject to the terms and conditions of individual sponsors."*

RS/09-10/66 Review of Quality Review Process for Schools

A copy of a report of the Working Group on School Reviews was circulated with papers for the meeting. The report was circulated to the Research Committee on foot of the approval by Council at its meeting of the 19th May 2010, of a recommendation from the Quality Committee. The Quality Committee recommended that the Research Committee consider the report of the Working Group on School Reviews (a subcommittee of the Quality Committee) as it relates to the review of research centres.
The Committee noted the report.

RS/09-10/67 Adoption of College Principles for Industrial Engagement

The Committee noted and approved a memorandum from the DoR, dated 1st June 2010, proposing a set of over-arching principles for industrial engagement. These principles will be published on the TCD website.

Section C

RS/09-10/68   **Name change: Centre for Telecommunications Value-chain Research (CTVR)**
The Committee noted and approved a memorandum from Professor Linda Doyle, Director CTVR, dated 18th May 2010.   The memorandum requests a name change from the Centre for Telecommunications Value-chain Research (CTVR) to The Telecommunications Research Centre (CTVR).

RS/09-10/69   **Newly Approved Campus Companies**
The Committee noted a memorandum from the ADTRI, dated 1st June 2010 outlining the 6 new campus companies approved from January to May 2010. These companies are: TrinityHaus Futures Limited; Trinity Clinical Apps Ltd., SiTy Analytics Ltd., Synergy Flow Ltd., Codex Discovery Ltd., and CodeX Oncology Ltd.

RS/09-10/70   **Items for Discussion at Future Meetings**
(i)   governance structures to support innovation
(ii)   review of Good Research Practice policy (as per BD/09-10/51) Oct 2010
(iii)   annual review of Research Committee and its terms of reference

Signed: ………………………….

Date: ………………………….