

REF Draft Code of Practice Consultation

11-14 March 2019

REF Code of Practice *Working Group*

Wayne Cranton, *Dean of Research*

Anita Gurney, *Head of Research Services RIO*

Keith Fildes, *Research Development Manager RIO*

Hilary Hughes, *Senior HR Business Partner HROD*

Anya Louis, *UCU Representative*

Rinella Cere, *UCU Representative*

Aloma Onyemah, *Head of Equality and Diversity HROD*

John Reidy, *Head of Dept. (Psychology, Sociology and Politics)*

Talk Outline

- ▶ REF
- ▶ Changes since 2014
- ▶ Code of Practice (CoP)

- ▶ Draft CoP Consultation Questions
 - Communications
 - Staff
 - Appeals Process
 - Outputs
 - Staff Circumstances
 - Former staff - Redundancy and Misconduct



REF

- ▶ The **Research Excellence Framework (REF)** is the government's periodic assessment of HE research. The next one will take place during 2021, with submissions due at the end of 2020.
- ▶ REF-related income accounts for approximately a third of the University's annual research funding. REF performance is also a strong determiner of rankings in university league tables and can impact on funding applications to Research Councils.
- ▶ REF assesses three components – **outputs (60%)**, **impact (25%)** and **environment (15%)**
- ▶ *More information available via the Creating Knowledge Hub:*
- ▶ <https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/creating/ref/>

- **Outputs** consider the **corpus** of publications produced by each **Unit of Assessment (UoA)**. Each UoA will submit a fixed No. of its highest quality research outputs that is **2.5 x the total FTE of staff submitted by the unit**.
- **Impact** is assessed via **impact case studies** (ICSs), which demonstrate the benefit of research on culture, society and/or the economy, beyond academia. UoAs will submit a fixed No. of ICS determined by the FTE of staff.
- **Environment** is assessed via a narrative statement that details the UoA's research strategy, impact strategy, staffing strategy, researcher development, infrastructure and facilities. **Grant income and doctoral completions** are key quantitative metrics in this element.

REF Changes since 2014

REF 2014

- ▶ Staff selected for entry. Required 4 outputs at a requisite quality threshold (*set by SHU at 2.5**)

REF 2021 (Post the Stern Review)

- ▶ All staff with significant responsibility for research must be returned
- ▶ Universities have to develop their own criteria for determining this
- ▶ Output target set at unit-level = $2.5 \times \text{FTE}$ submitted to UoA
- ▶ Every individual needs a minimum of 1 output, and cannot have more than 5 in the corpus (*excluding co-authorship*)
- ▶ Outputs de-coupled from staff for assessment and publication of results

REF Changes since 2014

Post-Stern Thinking

- Assessment is of the **unit and the corpus, not the individual**
- Individuals are not selected to be 'in' or 'out' - everyone with **significant responsibility for research (SRR)** is 'in'
- Estimated that this will result in approximate doubling of SHU staff submitted - from 16% to ~ 30%
- Staff and outputs will be decoupled - staff will not be submitted with a categorical number of publications
- Every individual's contribution will be '*at least one output*' for staff identified as having SRR

- ▶ Required by Research England - all institutions submitting to REF require a Code of Practice approved by Research England's Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (**EDAP**)
- ▶ The Code of Practice specifically needs to set-out (within the parameters/criteria established by Research England) the University's processes for:
 - identifying which staff have significant responsibility for research (SRR)
 - determining which staff meet the definition of an independent researcher
 - ensuring the fair and transparent selection of outputs
- ▶ Equality and diversity considerations are imperative to the processes established in the Code of Practice, and will be monitored throughout the preparations for the REF

Code of Practice Development

- The Draft Code of Practice has been developed by a dedicated working group consisting of members of the academic community, representatives from UCU, and colleagues from RIO and HR&OD
- A consistent approach is being taken to the principles of the Draft Code of Practice, with all aspects being applied university-wide
- Specific key items for consultation are highlighted in the questions and we would also welcome any additional feedback and suggestions
- *(Note that the structure, order and headings on the document are fixed by Research England and cannot be altered)*
- Feedback via <https://shu.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/ref-code-of-practice-consultation>
- **Open until 1 April**

REF Draft Code of Practice Consultation

Extracts from the Draft CoP - with associated questions

Full version of the Draft CoP is available via the Creating Knowledge Hub at:

<https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/creating/ref/preparations/code-of-practice/>

Communications

► Section 1.5 text...

The Code of Practice will be published on the University's external website.

An email will be sent from the Dean of Research to all academic staff, advising that the Code of Practice can be accessed in those places. The email will also state that the Code of Practice can, on request, be made available in large print format.

Category A eligible staff who are absent from the University (e.g. due to sickness, maternity leave, paternity leave, adoption leave, or any other absence) or who may have difficulty accessing email, will be identified by Human Resources and Organisational Development (HR&OD). Absent Category A eligible staff will receive a hard copy of the Code of Practice at their home address.

Staff will be advised of any subsequent updates to the published Code using the same process.

Key points.....

Communications ... *Key Points*

- ▶ CoP will be published on external web
- ▶ All staff will receive email notification advising where it can be accessed
- ▶ All absent staff (sickness, maternity/paternity/adoption leave etc.) will receive a hard copy to their home address
- ▶ Q1 - Is the approach to communications regarding the Code of Practice clear?
- ▶ Q2 - Would you suggest any alternative or additional communications methods?

Eligible Staff vs Submitted Staff

Category A eligible

- 'Teaching and Research' or 'Research only'
- Independent researcher
- Minimum of 0.2 FTE
- Substantive connection

Accurately identifies staff with significant responsibility for research

Some T&R staff do not have significant responsibility for research

Category A submitted

100 per cent returned

Staff with significant responsibility returned, following process developed, consulted on and documented

Code of Practice

Significant Responsibility for Research

Staff with significant responsibility for research are those for whom:

- a. **'Explicit time and resources are made available'**. Indicators of this could include:
 - a specific proportion of time allocated for research, as determined in the context of the institution's practices and applied in a consistent way
 - research allocation in a workload model or equivalent.
- b. **'To engage actively in independent research'**. Indicators of this could include (HEIs are also advised to refer to the indicators of independence, paragraph 132, as additional guidance on this aspect):
 - eligibility to apply for research funding as the lead or co-applicant
 - access to research leave or sabbaticals
 - membership of research centres or institutes within the HEI.
- c. **'And that is an expectation of their job role'**. Indicators of this could include:
 - current research responsibilities as indicated in, for example, career pathways or stated objectives
 - expectations of research by role as indicated in, for example, job descriptions and appraisals.

▶ Inputs not outputs

Significant Responsibility for Research

► Section 7.1 Identifying staff who have SRR

Staff Group	Status
Professors	All have significant responsibility for research; other than exceptionally those whose focus is not research, e.g. teaching excellence, knowledge exchange and/or senior management
Readers	All have significant responsibility for research
Research Staff	
Principal Research Fellows (G9), Senior Research Fellows (G8), Research Fellows (G7), Researchers/Research Assistants (G6)	All have significant responsibility for research; other than exceptionally those with a specific consultancy/knowledge exchange focus. <i>(Grade 6 staff will not be independent, while grade 7 staff will have their independence determined)</i>
Academic Staff	
Principal Lecturers (G9), Senior Lecturers (G8), Lecturers (G7)	Research and Scholarly Activity (RSA) time (10.8%) does not, on its own, constitute a significant responsibility for research Additional Research time (+ ≥10%), in combination with RSA, and allocated against agreed research plans, constitutes a significant responsibility for research
Atypical Staff	Do not have significant responsibility for research; except those with explicit research objectives in their role descriptor

Research allocations are distinct from any time allocated for **Academic Development (AD)** to undertake, for example, specific scholarly activity, research skills development, or a doctorate etc.

SRR is determined by an individual's status on the **census data (31 July 2020)**, not retrospectively or averaged over time - this is mandated by Research England

Appeals: Any staff member who feels the university-held data that informed decisions does not reflect their status in terms of having significant responsibility for research, can appeal against this

REF CoP Consultation

Significant Responsibility for Research

► Section 7.1 Identifying staff who have SRR

Staff Group	Status
Professors	All have significant responsibility for research; other than exceptionally those whose focus is not research, e.g. teaching excellence, knowledge exchange and/or senior management
Readers	All have significant responsibility for research
Research Staff	
Principal Research Fellows (G9), Senior Research Fellows (G8), Research Fellows (G7), Researchers/Research Assistants (G6)	All have significant responsibility for research; other than exceptionally those with a specific consultancy/knowledge exchange focus. <i>(Grade 6 staff will not be independent, while grade 7 staff will have their independence determined)</i>
Academic Staff	
Principal Lecturers (G9), Senior Lecturers (G8), Lecturers (G7)	Research and Scholarly Activity (RSA) time (10.8%) does not, on its own, constitute a significant responsibility for research Additional Research time (+ ≥10%), in combination with RSA, and allocated against agreed research plans, constitutes a significant responsibility for research
Atypical Staff	Do not have significant responsibility for research; except those with explicit research objectives in their role descriptor

Q3 - Is the categorisation of significant responsibility for research clear?

Q4 - Is there anything/any group that has not been considered?

Staff: research independence

► Section 8.1 text

Staff on teaching and research contracts are normally considered to be independent, where they are identified as having significant responsibility for research. For staff on research-only contracts, the University will implement the Research England criteria for determining research independence, specifically: 'an individual who undertakes self-directed research, rather than carrying out another individual's research programme'. A combination of the Research England indicators will be used to assess this, in particular:

- leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on an externally-funded research project
- acting as co-investigator on an externally-funded research project (Panels C and D only)
- holding an independently-won, competitively awarded fellowship where research independence is a requirement
- leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package

A member of staff is not deemed to have undertaken independent research purely on the basis that they are named on one or more research outputs.

All Principal Research Fellows (G9) and Senior Research Fellows (G8) are independent researchers.

Research Fellows (G7) will be considered under the research independence criteria, where they may exceptionally be found to be independent. The process is set-out in Appendix 5.

Researchers/Research Assistants (G6) do not, according to their role profile, undertake independent research.

Key points.....

Staff - research independence...*Key Points*

- ▶ **Only affects staff on research-only contracts**
- ▶ All Principal Research Fellows (G9) and Senior Research Fellow (G8) are considered to have research independence
- ▶ All Researchers/Research Assistants (G6) are not considered to have research independence
- ▶ Research Fellows (G7) are assessed individually against the Research England criteria:
 - Leading or acting as a PI or equivalent on an externally-funded research project
 - Acting as a Co-I on an externally-funded research project (*Panels C and D only*)
 - Holding an independently-won, competitively awarded fellowship where research independence is a requirement
 - Leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package
- ▶ Q5 - Is the categorisation of research independence clear?
- ▶ Q6 - Are there any other considerations with regard to research independence?

Communications on Status

► Section 4.1

All Category A eligible staff will be contacted to confirm whether, following their work planning discussion and in accordance with university-held data, they have been identified as Category A submitted staff (determined to have both significant responsibility for research and be an independent researcher) or not. Category A eligible staff will also be given information on how to appeal this designation, if it does not agree with their understanding of their position following their work planning meeting... While confirmation will be communicated from a central source to ensure consistency, one-to-one follow-up conversations will then occur with line managers, where requested by the staff member.

Key points.....

Communications on Status...*Key Points*

- ▶ Central communication to confirm whether, following work planning discussion and in accordance with university-held data, individuals have been identified as **Category A submitted staff** (determined to have both SRR and be an independent researcher) or not
- ▶ Can appeal if this does not agree with individual's understanding of their position following their work planning meeting
- ▶ Central communication for consistency, but one-to-one follow-up conversations with line managers where requested
- ▶ Q7 - Is the approach to communications on status clear?
- ▶ Q8 - Are there alternative or additional ways we can communicate about status?

▶ Section 5.2

If an individual wishes to make an appeal they should submit written communication to the Dean of Research stating the grounds of the appeal. Appeals should be submitted between 1 August and 11 October 2019.

An individual has the right to appeal against the accuracy of the university-held data that informed the decision that they do not meet the agreed criteria for having significant responsibility for research (see Section 7 for criteria) and/or for not being an independent researcher (see Section 8 for criteria). They can also appeal the reverse – i.e. they have been deemed to be Category A submitted staff, but do not feel that they actually meet the criteria.

▶ Section 5.3

Appeals will be investigated by the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Global Engagement, or a suitable nominee, who is not a member of the REF Management Group and has not been involved in making decisions about significant responsibility for research or research independence.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Global Engagement will have ultimate responsibility for deciding the outcome of an appeal, but can take advice from a panel consisting of:

- a member of the Equality and Diversity Team in HR&OD - to advise on equality and diversity related issues
- a member of the Research and Innovation Office - to advise on REF 2021 process and guidance issues
- the University's Head of Research Ethics - to advise on academic related issues

A written response will be provided by the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Global Engagement to the member of staff who has lodged the appeal, as soon as possible, and all appeals will be responded to by 13 December 2019.

Key points.....

REF CoP Consultation

Appeals Process... *Key Points*

- ▶ Written appeals to be submitted between 1 August and 11 October 2019
- ▶ Staff can appeal against the accuracy of the university-held data that informed the decision that they do not meet the agreed criteria for having significant responsibility for research (SRR) and/or for not being an independent researchers
- ▶ Appeals will be investigated by the PVC/R or nominee, who is not a member of the REF Management Group, nor involved in decisions regarding status
- ▶ Written responses provided as soon as possible, and by 13 December at the latest
- ▶ Q9 - Is the appeals process clear and transparent?
- ▶ Q10 - Are there alternatives to the centralised appeals process that you feel should be considered?

Outputs

► Section 9.1

Since REF 2014, UoA reading groups have periodically reviewed outputs in their corpus against REF criteria and awarded them ratings on the 1-4* scale. All outputs are reviewed by at least two members of the reading group, and moderated within the Unit. Samples are also sent to external reviewers for calibration.

When the output target is fixed on the census date, UoA Co-ordinators will rank their outputs according to the star rating assigned to each output during their review processes. The UoA Co-ordinator will then select their best quality outputs up to the target number, ensuring the minimum of one and maximum of five per individual stipulation has been met.

While research quality is the primary criterion for the selection of outputs, assessment will also be made on the representativeness of the community in the submission. This will look at both the profile of the population in terms of equality characteristics and research themes. The representativeness of the UoA will play a particular role in deciding between outputs that have been assigned the same rating by the UoA reading group.

All members of reading groups are required to have completed the requisite equality and diversity training.

Key points.....

Outputs: reminder of REF scoring criteria

Table A1: Overall quality profile: Definitions of starred levels

Four star	Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
Three star	Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.
Two star	Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
One star	Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
Unclassified	Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purposes of this assessment.

- ▶ Only 4* and 3* outputs attract QR funding

Outputs...*Key Points - Reviewing*

- ▶ Outputs have been internally reviewed by reading groups since 2015
- ▶ Outputs are taken from Elements/SHURA. Some use of self-selection by staff - best one for Mini-REFs 2015 and 2017. Some UoAs requested nomination of best five for the First Draft (2018)
- ▶ All reviewed by at least two members of the reading group - generally Professors and Readers with reviewing experience
- ▶ Internally moderated within the UoA, then samples externally moderated. Externals, where possible, were 2014 panellists
- ▶ All members of reading groups are required to have completed the requisite equality and diversity training.

Outputs...*Key Points - Corpus*

- ▶ Unit output required totals are set on census date at ***FTE of staff x 2.5***
- ▶ UoA Co-ordinators rank all outputs in the UoA according to the star rating assigned to them during the reviews.
- ▶ UoA Coordinators will select the corpus of quality outputs up to the target number, **ensuring the minimum of one and maximum of five per individual** requirements have been met
- ▶ Quality is the primary criterion, but representativeness of the UoA in terms of demographics/equality characteristics and research themes will also be considered, especially where deciding between outputs that have been assigned the same rating
- ▶ Q11 - Is the output selection process clear?
- ▶ Q12 - Are there any additional aspects in regard to output selection that you feel should be considered ?

Outputs: worked example

- ▶ UoA has 17 staff (**16.8 FTE**) with SRR
- ▶ Hence, outputs target No. is $16.8 \times 2.5 = 42$ **outputs**
- ▶ Highest ranking 42 outputs in corpus are:
 - 10 internally assessed at 4*
 - 10 internally assessed at 3.5*
 - 10 internally assessed at 3*
 - 6 internally assessed at 2.5*
 - 32 internally assessed at 2*
- ▶ Therefore the 2* outputs need to be revisited to identify the 6 best quality outputs of the 32 rated 2*
- ▶ Also need to ensure **all 17 staff have at least 1 and no more than 5** amongst the 42 outputs, plus that the submitted corpus is broadly representative of the UoA

Staff Circumstances

▶ Section 9.1

All staff with significant responsibility for research will be invited to declare any circumstances which have had a significant effect on their research productivity.

Clearly defined circumstances - relating to qualifying as an early-career researcher, periods of family-related leave, or secondments or career breaks outside of higher education - will be validated by HR data.

Complex circumstances - relating to disability; ill health, injury or mental health condition; constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, paternity, adoption or childcare; other caring responsibilities; gender reassignment; or other circumstances relating to protected characteristics - will be considered by a dedicated staff circumstances panel.

The University will operate a process to enable staff to disclose their circumstances in an appropriate and confidential manner, building on processes and learning from REF 2014. The information provided by staff will be used exclusively for the purposes of the REF 2021 submission.

Key points.....

Staff Circumstances...Key Points

- ▶ All staff with SRR will be invited to declare any circumstances which have had a significant effect on their research productivity
- ▶ **Clearly defined circumstances** - early-career researchers, periods of family-related leave, or secondments or career breaks outside of higher education - will be validated by HR data
- ▶ **Complex circumstances** - disability; ill health, injury or mental health condition; *constraints relating to* pregnancy, maternity, paternity, adoption or childcare; other caring responsibilities; gender reassignment; or other circumstances relating to protected characteristics - will be considered by a dedicated staff circumstances panel
- ▶ The process will enable staff to disclose their circumstances in an appropriate and confidential manner. The information provided by staff will be used exclusively and confidentially for the purposes of the REF 2021 submission
- ▶ Q13 - Is the centralised process for considering staff circumstances appropriate - does it facilitate the confidential disclosure of circumstances? If not, what would you suggest as an alternative?

Staff Circumstances: consideration of reductions

- ▶ **Reductions are applied to the unit/corpus**, not against an individual
- ▶ The only exception is where very exceptional circumstances mean an individual is being returned without the minimum of one output
- ▶ ***Worked Example.....***

Staff Circumstances: worked example

- ▶ UoA has 17 staff (**16.8 FTE**) with SRR
- ▶ Hence, outputs target No. is $16.8 \times 2.5 = 42$ *outputs*
- ▶ **Minus 3 outputs due to staff circumstances = 39 outputs**
- ▶ Highest ranking ~~42~~ **39** outputs in corpus are:
 - 10 internally assessed at 4*
 - 10 internally assessed at 3.5*
 - 10 internally assessed at 3*
 - 6 internally assessed at 2.5*
 - 32 internally assessed at 2*
- ▶ Therefore the 2* outputs need to be revisited to identify the ~~6~~ **3** best quality outputs of the 32 rated 2*
- ▶ Also need to ensure **all 17 staff have at least 1 and no more than 5** amongst the 42 outputs, plus that the submitted corpus is broadly representative of the UoA

Former staff: consideration of outputs

- ▶ Outputs of staff who have left the institution, **may be considered** for inclusion in the corpus by a UoA
- ▶ Outputs in the submitted output pool may be attributed to former staff, if they were previously employed as Category A eligible in the assessment period *and* when the output was first made publicly available
- ▶ There is no minimum requirement for submitting the outputs of former staff. No more than five outputs may be attributed to any individual staff member (including former staff)

Former staff: consideration of outputs from staff made redundant

▶ Section 9.1

The University will not include in its submission outputs produced by any member of staff who has been made redundant during the REF period. Where there has been internal co-authorship, outputs naming staff made redundant may still appear in the corpus.

Outputs of staff who have taken voluntary redundancy or retired during the REF period will be considered. Outputs of staff whose fixed-term contracts ended during the REF period will also be considered, ensuring compliance with the Fixed-Term Employees (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2002.

Outputs produced by any member of staff dismissed on grounds of research misconduct will not be included. Where there has been internal co-authorship, and the integrity of the outputs have not been brought into question in misconduct hearings, outputs naming staff dismissed for this reason may still appear in the corpus.

Key points.....

Former Staff: redundancy and misconduct ...*Key Points*

- ▶ Outputs of staff made redundant will not be included
- ▶ Outputs with internal co-authorship may still appear in the corpus
- ▶ Outputs of staff who have taken voluntary redundancy or retired may be considered
- ▶ Outputs of staff whose fixed-term contracts ended during the REF period may be considered
- ▶ Outputs of anyone dismissed on ground of research misconduct will not be included. Outputs with internal co-authorship may still appear in the corpus, if the integrity of the outputs have not been brought into question in misconduct hearings
- ▶ Q14 - Are the approaches to consideration of outputs from former staff made redundant clear and transparent?

- Q1 - Is the approach to communications regarding the Code of Practice (section 1.5) clear?
- Q2 - Would you suggest any alternative or additional communications methods?
- Q3 - Is the categorisation of significant responsibility for research (section 7.1) clear?
- Q4 - Is there anything/any group that has not been considered with regard to significant responsibility for research?
- Q5 - Is the categorisation of research independence (section 8.1) clear?
- Q6 - Are there any other considerations with regard to research independence?
- Q7 - Is the approach to communications on status (section 4.1) clear?
- Q8 - Are there alternative or additional ways we can communicate about status?
- Q9 - Is the appeals process (sections 5.2 and 5.3) clear and transparent?
- Q10 - Are there alternatives to the centralised appeals process that you feel should be considered?
- Q11 - Is the output selection process (section 9.1) clear?
- Q12 - Are there any additional aspects in regard to output selection that you feel should be considered?
- Q13 - Is the centralised process for considering staff circumstances (section 9.1) appropriate - does it facilitate the confidential disclosure of circumstances? If not, what would you suggest as an alternative?
- Q14 - Are the approaches to consideration of outputs from former staff made redundant (section 9.1) clear and transparent?
- Q15 - What is your overall view of the Code of Practice?
- Q16 - Do you have any other specific comments on the Code of Practice? Please clearly reference the section you are referring to

Where you do not agree with an approach, please try to suggest an alternative

REF Draft Code of Practice Consultation

Full version of the Draft CoP is available via the Creating Knowledge Hub at:

<https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/creating/ref/preparations/code-of-practice/>

If you have queries, please contact **the working group** - REFsupport@shu.ac.uk.

UCU members are also encouraged to contact the UCU reps directly

Wayne Cranton, *Dean of Research*

Anita Gurney, *Head of Research Services RIO*

Keith Fildes, *Research Development Manager RIO*

Hilary Hughes, *Senior HR Business Partner HROD*

Anya Louis, *UCU Representative*

Rinella Cere, *UCU Representative*

Aloma Onyemah, *Head of Equality and Diversity HROD*

John Reidy, *Head of Dept. (Psychology, Sociology and Politics)*

Presentation will be available on the Creating Knowledge Hub

Supplementary Slides

Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
Unit of Assessment (UoA)	Academic subjects are organised by Research England into 34 disciplines. Universities map their staff to these and make returns to a selection of them. Assessment takes place at UoA level by expert panels known as sub-panels.
Category A eligible staff	<p>Category A eligible staff are defined as academic staff with a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater, whose primary employment function is to undertake either 'teaching and research' or 'research only'.</p> <p>The University determines this by the 'Contract type' field on the CORE HR system being either 'Teaching/Research' or 'Research', and the 'FTE' field being 0.2 or greater.</p> <p>The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) requires the University to align all Category A eligible staff to a UoA.</p>
Category A submitted staff	<p>Category A submitted staff are those from the Category A eligible staff pool who, through appropriate process, are determined to have both significant responsibility for research and be an independent researcher.</p> <p>All Category A submitted staff must be returned in the REF.</p>
Significant responsibility for research	<p>Staff with significant responsibility for research are those for whom explicit time and resources are made available, to engage actively in independent research, and that is an expectation of their job role.</p> <p>The University process for determining staff with significant responsibility for research is set-out in Section 7.1.</p>
Independent researcher	<p>An independent researcher is defined as an individual who undertakes self-directed research, rather than carrying out another individual's research programme.</p> <p>The University process for determining research independence is set-out in Section 8.1.</p>

- ▶ SRR will be implemented via requesting and agreeing research time as part of the work planning process, which allows for discussion and agreement of the research objectives, along with expectations of support and the resultant outcomes
- ▶ Decisions will be made locally between the staff member, their line manager and a local research lead, with sign-off by a Head of Research Centre/Institute/Department. ADRIs will have oversight of the process.
- ▶ Some faculties/departments already have research time request and agreement forms, which generally align with these aims; but a common SHU approach may be established
- ▶ The key is that requests/agreements are fundamentally **forward looking - i.e. based on research plans**. But this will inherently be supported by information relating to track record and trajectory
- ▶ **Research time** will be recorded in the AWP system, distinct from **RSA** and **Academic Development time**.
- ▶ Timeline - needs to be in place for HESA returns this summer. So needs to be a consideration in work planning work happening now, with provisional allocations subject to final approval of the CoP after 7 June

▶ **Outputs**

- ▶ "Theses, dissertations or other items submitted for a research degree including doctoral theses may not be listed. Other assessable published items based on research carried out for a research degree may be listed."
- ▶ Outputs from PhDs by Publication and Article-Based PhDs can be included - it is anything with the exception of theses or dissertations
- ▶ "HEIs may not submit any output produced by a research assistant or research student supervised by a Category A eligible staff member employed in the unit, unless the staff member co-authored or co-produced the output."

▶ **Underpinning Impact Case Studies**

- ▶ "'Research produced by the submitting unit in the period 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2020' means that staff carried out research within the scope of the relevant UOA descriptor, while working in the submitting HEI (even if those staff have since left)."
- ▶ "Research undertaken solely by research students is not considered as having been carried out by staff while working in the submitting HEI."
- ▶ Outputs based on staff doctorate work can underpin ICSs, so long as the individual had Category A Eligible status at the time

▶ **Significant Responsibility for Research**

- ▶ Any% Academic Development time for staff doctorate \neq SRR
- ▶ Any% Academic Development time for staff doctorate + $\geq 10\%$ Research time for staff research = SRR

Reductions for Staff Circumstances

Qualifying periods of family-related leave

6. The total output pool may be reduced by 0.5 for each discrete period of:
 - a. Statutory maternity leave or statutory adoption leave taken substantially during the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2020, regardless of the length of the leave.
 - b. Additional paternity or adoption leave²², or shared parental leave²³ lasting for four months or more, taken substantially during the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2020.

Table L1: Early career researchers: Permitted reduction in outputs

Date at which the individual first met the REF definition of an ECR:	Output pool may be reduced by up to:
On or before 31 July 2016	0
Between 1 August 2016 and 31 July 2017 inclusive	0.5
Between 1 August 2017 and 31 July 2018 inclusive	1
On or after 1 August 2018	1.5