Research Activity and the Role Profiles Policy
(Amended Feb 2013)

Preamble

Following extensive discussion between UCU and managers at Liverpool Hope University an agreement has been reached regarding the levels of research required of academic staff as outlined in this policy. The two grades that are covered by this agreement are grade 7 and 8 (Lecturer and Senior Lecturer). A significant factor in these discussions was coming to an agreed interpretation of the relevant phrases in the role profiles that form part of the Framework Agreement.

The starting point for this agreement is the recognition that all academic staff at Liverpool Hope are required to engage in research activity. Such is a core requirement of their role. Not to undertake research is understood to be a potential performance issue which might lead to capability or discipline measures. In order to avoid such, clarity of expectation is needed so that staff know precisely what are the minimum requirements deemed to meet the expectations of the role profile. (Some staff will of course want to go beyond these minimums and for such staff a revised system of 'recognised researchers' is here put in place). The University and UCU have now agreed what those minimum requirements are. The following chart captures this understanding.

For Lecturer (Grade 7)

With PhD/EdD	1. One presentation at a Hope research event
	2. Publication of four externally peer reviewed research outputs in each five year period.[1]

---

[1] It is recognised that in some disciplines, for example some aspects of practice-based subjects and computer science, 'publication of one externally-reviewed research output' will not necessarily entail traditional print-based publication in such formats as journal articles, book chapters or books. It might rather mean the production and public exhibition of an artefact or the dissemination of new software. In these cases the basic principle holds: the 'research output' should be placed in the public domain via a process which includes external peer-review. Examples might include exhibition of a painting in an external public space following its review by experts in the field (i.e. in a curated exhibition), the staging of a play (also in an external public space) which then receives a level of critical acclaim, the performance of a musical score by an independent orchestra or the commercial or academic distribution of software judged to be a contribution to the field by external experts. It is the Dean together with the relevant Head of Department who will come to a view on any particular case. Where necessary external expert advice will be taken. It is also worth noting that the guidelines on academic quality set out in the 2008 RAE documentation on this subject covers all these issues (such

Without PhD/EdD	3. Either:
	    a. PhD or EdD study (for a maximum of five years) *and*
	    b. One presentation per year at a Hope research event or at the University where the PhD/EdD is being undertaken
	4. Or: completion of research outlined in '1' and '2' above

For Senior Lecturer (Grade 8)

With PhD/EdD	5. One presentation per year at a national-level conference or at a Hope research event. 6. Four externally peer-reviewed articles in each five year period in a journal with an established reputation[2] in the field or equivalent.[3]

Without PhD/EdD	7. Either:
	    a. PhD or EdD study (for a maximum of five years) *and*
	    b. One presentation per year at a formal

---

as the standing of performances, exhibitions etc.) well and may be used as a guide to the basic subject-specific principles regarding the nature of such research (though the RAE level is *not* a requirement at Grade 7).

[2] In many cases it is relatively easy to establish whether a journal has 'an established reputation in the field': for example those with an impact factor fall into this category by default and in many disciplines there are published lists of journals together with their impact factors. Other key considerations are longevity (a journal that has been going for several years is more likely to have 'an established reputation' than one that is in its first edition or two), its publisher, the quality of other contributors and the extent to which it is indexed in the field (that is are articles in the journal indexed in subject-specific research databases)? The key consideration (other than impact factor), however, is the quality of its editorial board. It is the Dean together with the relevant Head of Department who will come to a view on any particular case. Where necessary external expert advice will be taken.

[3] In this context 'or equivalent' refers to a research output that is equivalent in level to but in a different format from a journal paper. Examples might be the publication of a book chapter, a monograph or the kind of research outputs described in footnote 1 above (but at an SL level). Any such publication must, however, be subject to external peer review and be 'research' and not 'scholarship' (as defined in the University's *Research and Scholarship Development Plan*). It is the Dean together with the relevant Head of Department who will come to a view on any particular case. Where necessary external expert advice will be taken.

	research event such as an external or Hope-run conference or a departmental or faculty research seminar
	c. Or: completion of research outlined in '5' and '6' above

Agreed Notes and Explanations

8. Lecturers will have 35 hours of research time factored into their workload allocation models. This is in addition to the standard 140 hours under the national contract.

9. Senior Lecturers will have 70 hours of research time factored into their workload allocation models. This is in addition to the standard 140 hours under the national contract.

10. There should be no assumption that the allocation of 35 or 70 hours for research translates automatically into reduced teaching. It may rather result in a reduction in hours spent in any of the areas covered by the role profile (for example administration).

11. Given that the requirement is for four pieces of research in five years, as outlined in '2' and '6' above, this would normally equate to one item in each 15 month period. It is possible of course that the actual publication of the four pieces will not be so evenly distributed. However, in any given fifteen month period there must be clear, documented evidence of progress towards the overall 'four in five' target. This evidence might, for example, take the form of a letter from a journal editor confirming acceptance for publication.

12. Exceptions to '11' above are possible and in some cases very much in the individual's and the University's interests (for example where a monograph is being undertaken or where extended research is done ahead of a series of publications in relatively quick succession). This is understood. In the interests of fairness and equity, however, any such exception must be formally agreed with the Dean. If such an alternative pattern is agreed, this will be recorded and an appropriate research plan put in place. The individual staff member still needs to demonstrate commensurate activity within this plan and in line with the overall requirements of this policy. If the Dean/HOD believes this is not the case they have the right to utilise the capability/discipline policy.

13. At the end of every year of PhD or EdD study a report is required from the supervisor or director of studies indicating progress. This is already what happens in most cases since such a report is required by Professor Newport's office before the invoice for fees is paid. Satisfactory progress is of course required if the research requirements of the role profile are to be met.

14. It is understood that staff at grade 7 and 8 are not required to be in the research excellence framework (see 'recognised researcher' below).

15. For those who have received letters informing them that the University is of the view that they are not currently meeting the role profiles on research
    a) Original targets will be reviewed to ensure that they conform with the principles in this agreed paper
    b) Three months will be added to any deadlines set
16. In the case of part-time staff there is no reduction in the requirement for the *quality* of research outputs, which must meet the same standards as those for full-time colleagues. There is, however, a reduction in *quantity* of outputs which should be calculated on a pro-rata basis. This would normally mean, for example, that for a .5 member of staff the requirement would be for two outputs in a five-year period with demonstrable progress towards meeting those outputs in each 30 month period. Any variation will be agreed by the Dean in advance of the set period for publishing research.

Recognised Researcher Status: Revised Policy

The revised procedure for the award of recognised researcher status is agreed as follows.

1. Recognised researcher status expires for *all* staff on 30 September, 2010.
2. From 1 October, 2010 recognised researcher status will be available only to those staff who meet both of the following requirements
   a. The name of the staff member is found on the list of staff who have been identified as likely to be submitted to the REF by the PVC Research and Academic Development who will make any final decision based on the recommendation of the Chair of the REF Steering Group.
   b. The staff member is employed at academic grade 7 or 8 at the University (Professors and Associate Professors have generous research time build into their standard workload allocations by default).
3. Recognised researcher status is not available during the probationary period.
4. A recognised researcher may be allocated *up to* a total (including the 140 hours research and scholarship time that comes as part of the National Contract) of 490 hours research time on the workload allocation model. How the remaining hours are allocated is a matter for the Dean and HOD to decide. There should be no assumption that the allocation of 490 hours for research translates automatically into reduced teaching. It may rather result in a reduction in hours spent in any other area covered by the role profile (for example administration). The '*up to*' is to be taken seriously: not all research projects will justify the award of the maximum time allowance.
5. A recognised researcher is also entitled to apply for funds from those ring fenced for REF outcomes (this fund will continue to be administered by the PVC and the Chair of the REF Steering Group). Professors and Associate Professors are also eligible to apply for these funds. A separate policy applies to Principal Lecturers. However given the significant increase in potential time to 490 hours for research (the maximum previous was 294), these funds would not normally be available for 'buy out' from teaching though in exceptional cases such requests can be considered where there is an obvious benefit to the University and it can be seen that the release from further teaching has the potential significantly to enhance Hope's REF submission. These would be exceptional cases however (since in effect it would take the time allocation beyond even the 490 hour normal limit).
6. The award of recognised researcher status and the number of hours that can be allocated for additional research time will be the responsibility of the Chair of the REF Steering Group who will take the decision in consultation with the Dean, the HOD and the PVC (Research and Academic Development). It is reviewed annually.

This policy is firm but fair. It grants certain very tangible privileges in return for research outputs that will enhance the University's REF submission and assist Hope to meet its strategic research goals. It is selective. However, it is important to note the following two points

7. That the 'REF List' is open. Any member of staff can apply at any time to be added to it. The only criterion is that there is a realistic probability, based upon hard evidence, that the staff member will be submitted to the 2014 REF.

8. That this policy is driven exclusively by the REF. For non-REF research Hope already has in place a number of mechanisms to support all academic staff in their research. Such mechanisms include the funding devolved to faculty committees for non-REF research activity, research resource funding (at both University and faculty levels), the creation of a research equipment fund, the generous provision of PhD and EdD funding and workshops such as the 'getting published' series.

September 9, 2010