

**University of Portsmouth
School of Computing
Research and Innovation Committee**

Minutes of the meeting held on 15th October 2014, 14:30 in BK1.15

Present

Jim Briggs	Chair
Benjamin Aziz	New researcher rep
Alexander Gegov	Reader
Carl Adams	Information Systems group
Mo Adda	Pervasive Computing Group
Angela Muscat	Minutes Secretary

1. Apologies for absence

Nick Savage
Ivan Jordanov
Honghai Liu
Djamel Ait-Boudaoud
Mark Gaterell
Nedyalko Petrov

2. Approval of previous minutes

The previous minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

3. Matters arising

(i) **Ivan** to compile a list of hot desks for part-time Phd Students. Carried forward.

(ii) **Ivan** to remind Phd students to update web entries. The SoC and PhD Student pages still seem to be outdated. Carried forward.

(iii) **Alex** to take the subject of DORA to the University Research Committee for consideration. There has not yet been a meeting. Carried forward.

(iv) Following his attendance at the Knowledge Services Operational Meeting at the Business School, Carl is now in the process of organising an event to attract interest from outside the University. This will take place in December.

4. Reports on recent activity

Jim Briggs distributed graphs prior to the meeting.

- a. **Publications.** Jim reported that the current number of publications looks more promising than at the last two meetings. Since the last report there have been increases to each of the 2011, 2012 and 2013 figures, making the trend from 2008-2013 look flatter. We probably won't be confident of the 2014 figure until well into 2015 as people tend to delay entering their outputs into Pure/Parade.

Jim reminded the Committee that if publications are not available in open access, they may not be accepted for the next REF. This rule has already changed many publishers' policies. As long as a paper is open-access within 12 months that is OK. Alternatively, some publishers allow post prints to be

stored on Parade. The downside is that some publishers aggressively defend their copyright.

Jim informed the Committee that Emily Bennett had sent a lengthy email with regard to the University being audited on open access. The audit showed that 65% of papers that should have been on open access actually were. It did highlight that if the Lead Author is at another university, you cannot rely on them to put it in, we must have it at Portsmouth. The School of Computing also needs to tag where publications where publications are shared among internal authors.

Carl pointed out that with regard to writing, referencing and impact, other universities actively encourage staff to reference other people within their department. Jim commented that it is more useful for other universities to reference us. He also said that the best way to improve impact is to make sure that people read the publications. There are several ways of doing this including networks like LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, etc., make sure you email your publications to everyone in your research area and also email around the department encouraging colleagues to read and reference. There is a need to drive up impact case studies. This is not the academic impact but the impact on industry, public services and changes in government policies.

Funding. Jim reported that there were no new major wins – one small one by Sanaz. The dip in the blue line reflects that all the H2020 bids submitted by Honghai and Alex (and some others) were rejected.

Ben advised the Committee that funding from H2020 is very difficult to get. To be successful the proposal seems to need to get a score of 13.5 points out of 15. His proposal that was rejected received a very high score of 12. It is very competitive. Ben has another H2020 proposal which will be submitted around February 2015 in a different category to gauge whether or not there is more hope of success.

Carl may have some more bids later in the year. The collaboration with Portugal was rejected but there will still be a workshop running with them next year.

Mo has one bid with the Academy of Science Research on Nano-Antennas. Honghai is interested in this but it is still very early. Mo will be publishing a book about the work and will take it from there.

Alex has had a proposal rejected but plans to resubmit with stronger partners. Honghai will take over as coordinator and take into account the feedback from the original proposal.

Jim has three proposals at different stages. A KTP is in and we should hear later this month. He has been approached by a consortium in Munich which he will be working on at the end of November. There is also a proposal with the Technology Strategy Board Biomedical Catalyst Fund to work on a monitoring system for people at home with spinal cord or brain injuries. This was rejected in the summer but will be re-submitted in January.

Carl asked if funding for charities could be considered. Jim informed the Committee that the procedures have now changed and the PVC is required to sign off bids that require matched funding. If the proposal involves a Research Council or prestigious sources, it will be approved. If it is up to £50K, it will certainly be approved. The PVC will have a budget for this.

Jim informed the Committee that the rule on overheads from research projects has changed. Finance has been told that overheads will now be held centrally.

b. Research students.

(i) Completions. There have been no completions since the last meeting.

(ii) Progress. Jim confirmed that there are currently 2/3 students who should have completed but are currently on a valid extension. In some cases, it seems that only the first supervisor is actively involved with the PhD student. We need to encourage all three supervisors to be involved. **Jim** will send an email to all supervisors. Jim reported that Mark Gaterell had suggested that a useful policy would be for PhD students to have published at least one paper before they submit their thesis. Jim said that this was too restrictive and was not likely to happen. It is too difficult in certain subjects.

ACTION – Jim to email supervisors

(iii) Admissions. The blue line continues to rise as we admit even more PhD students. There have been 9 new admissions plus another 3 late starters since the last meeting.

d. SoC and CSI seminars.

Alex advised that the seminars are progressing well and attendance is good. They are still not well attended by Engineering or CT.

ACTION - Jim will email Steve Hand to encourage attendance.

e. New appointments and departures.

None.

f. Incoming Visitors.

Jim circulated a graph relating to meetings. Clearly the drop-off in activity over the summer can be explained by people being on leave, but actually it may be under-reported: only three members of staff have reported meetings since June. All the members of the Committee confessed they were guilty. Ben stated it was not easy to find the link. Jim circulated the link in an email last week. Jim commented that our good activity is going unreported and this must be kept up to date.

g. Outgoing visits, meetings, conferences attended.

None reported but Jim reiterated that these should be recorded on the spreadsheet.

h. Web pages.

Mo commented that the web pages still need update. Nick shuffled some staff around so the groups need to be updated and the title needs changing. PhD students should be reminded to update their information and an action was carried forward from the last minutes for **Ivan** to chase the students

regarding this. An action was put on **everyone** to review the pages and get their information up to date. Jim asked Angie to maintain the information relating to students leaving and joining the department. **Angie** must email Steve Fisher regarding changes in future.

ACTION - Ivan to chase PhD students to update web pages.

ACTION – All to review web pages and keep the information up to date.

5. Report from Faculty R&I Committee

Meeting not yet taken place. Due in the next couple of weeks.

6. School's action plan for research

Nick was not present and Jim was not aware of any updates.

7. New research centre in computational intelligence.

Honghai was not present. Alex reported that the name being considered was 'Centre for Human Machine Systems'. The Committee did not think that this name was a good one. The title needs to form an identity outside of the University to promote the work of the group.

ACTION Honghai, Ivan and Alex to discuss and have a rethink.

8. Information Sharing.

To improve the quality of our research bids, Jim suggested that all good/successful bids should be shared. This would give ideas on how successful bids should be presented. This could be shared in the form of a PDF on Google drive or in some kind of Registry of Bids.

Jim thought that it would be good idea to share job descriptions. When new posts come up, HR send a template with a list of duties to add. It would be useful to have a list of previous job descriptions to make this task easier.

9. AOB

Queries were raised on the PhD process and how new applications were being dealt with. Mo and Ben expressed some concern that there did not appear to be many new applications coming through. Jim speculated that we are still receiving high volumes of applications but Nick is reviewing them and rejecting unsuitable applicants.

Next Meeting

18th February 2015, Head of School's Office