

DEVELOPING A CODE OF PRACTICE

A work in progress.....

Jane Boggan
Goldsmiths, University of London

Ben Pimlott Building, Goldsmiths, University of London



WHERE DID WE START?

- 1. Re-visited Goldsmiths' Code of Practice from 2014**
 1. Checking out the institutional memory on how well (or otherwise) it worked
 2. Looking at CoPs from other institutions
 - 2. Read the EDAP report from 2014**
 - 3. Drew up a timeline working back from 7th June, taking in the main committee dates**
 - 4. Noted that Goldsmiths will not need a process to determine 'significant responsibility for research'**
-

KEY MESSAGES

- The strategy for REF 2021 is to maximise the quality of submissions.
- Final decisions will not be taken into account in relation to any promotion, progression, extension of contract or performance management procedures.
 - This is repeated throughout the document

RESEARCH INDEPENDENCE

- Provide each HoD with a list of all R-Only staff (0.2FTE and above), irrespective of contract end date & taken from HR system.
- They will meet with each R-Only member of staff and consider their job role against the indicators.
- We will provide a template to record the outcome.
- If eligible, this will be recorded in our HR system.

- Appeal process

SCHEDULE

- **1st review point – Spring 2019** – people identified here as *potentially* REF eligible, will be included in the Mock REF in November 2019
- **2nd review point – Spring 2020** – confirm tentative decisions made in Spring 2019, and review anyone appointed since then.
- **After Spring 2020** – review new appointments on on-going basis.

EIAs will be done Spring 2019, Spring 2020 and at the census date of 31 July 2020.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Benchmark data will show the protected characteristics of the cohort of research-only staff

This will be compared to the profile of the protected characteristics of the cohort who are deemed to be independent researchers.

Question for EDAP: the benchmark group identified in the Guidance is described as '*appropriate comparator pool for junior academic staff...*'. Why would you not use the total cohort of R-Only staff as the benchmark group?

EIA CONTD...

If there is clear under/over representation - we will firstly review our process to ensure that the process is not, in itself, discriminatory.

If that suggests that there is a more fundamental problem of restricted opportunity or support for research development, then the issue is beyond the remit of the Code of Practice.

We will then refer the issue to the HR & Equality Committee and the Research and Enterprise Committee for action. Reflect outcomes in Environment Statement.

SELECTING OUTPUTS

4 Internal Output Review Points

- January 2019 – largely developmental. T&R Only
- November 2019 – Mock REF. All Cat A staff (irrespective of contract end date)
- July 2020 – Draft submission. All Cat A staff in post on census date
- November 2020 – Final submission
- EIA at each point – same principles apply as previously

SELECTING OUTPUTS CONTD...

The quality of research outputs will be judged using a combination of internal peer review (by at least 2 reviewers) and external advice, referenced to the published REF criteria.

Reviewers and advisors will be selected on the basis of:

- relevant research expertise and seniority in the field, and
- being representative of the cohort of eligible staff (as far as possible).

SELECTING OUTPUTS CONTD...

Feedback to researchers (from Heads of Department or their nominees) regarding the assessment of individual outputs should be:

- brief and constructive in tone;
- referenced to the REF criteria for the relevant panel, and
- summarised in writing.

SELECTING OUTPUTS CONTD...

The data generated from the scoring process will allow us to build quality submissions by:

- attributing a single output to each individual in such a way to maximise the overall quality profile;
- selecting the ‘best of the rest’ of the outputs up to the quota required for the submission (ie FTE x 2.5), ensuring that no individual has more than 5 outputs; and in such a way as to maximise the overall quality profile.

SELECTING OUTPUTS CONTD...

Selection decisions may change if it is possible to make the submission more inclusive without a diminution of quality.

Where decisions need to be made between outputs scoring the same, then the secondary criterion that will apply is representativeness in terms of:

- 1) protected characteristics of staff included in the submission;
and/or
- 2) research areas in the Unit of Assessment/department.

EXPECTATIONS OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Goldsmiths recognises that there may be many reasons why individuals publish at different rates, and does not expect every eligible staff member to contribute equally to the volume of outputs submitted.

Having satisfied the minimum requirement that everyone should be submitted with one output, the remaining outputs will be selected on the basis of quality as the primary criterion.

DISCLOSURE OF CIRCUMSTANCES

...invite staff to disclose, in confidence, relevant circumstances that have constrained their capacity to contribute to the pool of eligible outputs.

The outcome of the disclosure process may mean:

- that an individual has had such exceptional circumstances that they can be submitted without the minimum of one output, without penalty; and/or
- that there is a case for submitting a request for a Unit level reduction

QUESTIONS FOR EDAP...

Do we need to be more specific around the articulation of expectations about individual staff contributions to the output pool?

How specific does the 'list of circumstances that will be taken into account' need to be? It would be useful to share some examples.

Do we need an appeal process for Special Circs decisions?