



Department of Computer Science HEADS OF RESEARCH GROUP MEETING

Tuesday 20th September 2011
15:00-17:00 Malet Place Engineering 6.12

MINUTES

Present: Danny Alexander (DA) Mark Harman (MH) Brad Karp (BK) Jens Groth (JG) John Shawe-Taylor (JST) Simon Arridge (SA) Jill Saunders (JS) David Jones (DJ) Duncan Brumby (DB) Anthony Hunter (AH)

In attendance: Melanie Johnson (MJ) Diane Austin (Da)

- 1. Apologies for absence: Ingemar Cox, Angela Sasse, Ann Blandford**
- 2. Confirmation of Agenda**
- 3. Notice of any other business**
None
- 4. Minutes from previous meeting**
None
- 5. Matters arising from the Minutes**
None
- 6. REF (MH)**

The assessment of research outputs will require that a 100 word statement be written about the *significance*, *rigour* and *originality* of the paper or journal submitted. The criteria of *significance* being all important, the 100 words will need to show the academic and non-academic impact. Citations should not be included in the final statement but may be considered e.g. google scholar citations may be considered when self-assessing the paper/journal or in discussions with your research group. Other criteria for assessing the submissions include whether it led to a conference on the topic, a new area or a key note talk.

It is now time to start collating the information as an informal decision on who will be included or not needs to have been made by Christmas. An additional Heads of Research group meeting will be held in the first week of November to discuss entries.

Publications can be considered if they appeared from 1st January 2008 and need to at least have appeared online by December 31st 2013. A paper that you are about to submit now may reach the desired status by this deadline. Each researcher should choose four submissions in print and four in the pipeline. For those not in print there should be a supporting narrative. There is a provision for early career researchers to submit less than four entries. Publications should be self-assessed and then a dialogue should take place in research groups as the research group will make the ultimate decision on which papers/journals to put forward. MH did suggest that a useful marker may be whether the publication has appeared in an internationally recognized *and* excellent venue rather than in an internationally recognized but not excellent venue. In writing the 100 word statement, questions should be asked such as 'what can I say about this publication to show that it is internationally leading and why is it so well cited? It should be set in the context that shows its significance. There is no bias against conferences in favour of journals and co-authored publications cannot be duplicated.

It was suggested that Anthony Finkelstein could be consulted regarding ratings for papers and JST thought that it would be useful to get Professor Keith Van Rijsbergen, University of Glasgow, who was the chair of Computer Science & Informatics Sub-Panel for the Research Assessment Exercise in 2008 to give a talk.

The deadline for reviewing publications to enter is **Friday 14th October 2011**.

JS will send round a spreadsheet for researchers to fill in by the deadline.

On the subject of what information we should collect; basic data will be supplied centrally, and responsibility for checking will fall to CS staff. The department will take the stance of collecting as much research output information and including as many people as possible.

[Actions: JS to send round spreadsheet, MJ to organize Heads of Research group meeting in first week of November]

7. Changes to PhD Application processing system (BK)

BK commented that he has a prototype of a new application reviewing system that is faster than the current system and will allow for longer feedback to be left. The postgraduate administrators will be responsible for assigning applicants to be reviewed. There will be a short form to be filled in by the reviewer, controlled by Brad Karp and Anthony Hunter. The system will send reminders to users and will be managed primarily by the postgraduate administrators. Deadlines for feedback can be set in line with the panel system for reviewing applications. There is functionality to add additional reviews so the system should allow for applications to be passed on to other groups.

BK commented that he will have to investigate security for the system and that someone will have to be found to keep the server running.

[Action: BK to find someone to keep server running]

8. RPS for research notes (PG Admin)

MJ commented that RPS is being used by most staff but not fully as only the abstract and not the full text is uploaded. To use the system to its full advantage, all research staff and postgraduate research students would need to have a personal account.

Advantages of using the system include the maintenance of data by RPS Support, the reports being searchable anywhere and available for public viewing via UCL Discovery and the ability to use the reports in statistics about the department's research and to enhance the department's profile.

There are two options to choose between in using RPS. We can continue to house the full text of the note on the CS website and only input basic data on RPS, which will contain a link to the CS website for the full report or we can upload the full text on RPS and no longer use the CS website as an interface. However, a list of notes would be available on the CS website. The postgraduate administrators would be responsible for inputting the data onto RPS.

John-Shawe Taylor showed support for changing over from CS housed research notes to using RPS.

Mark Harman asked whether we could have a template cover sheet for research notes and an extra page at the end of the note, which lists other reports in the series. David Jones commented on the negative impact having a log-on to access the reports may cause.

See Appendix 1 for a full report on using RPS for research notes.

[Actions: MJ to investigate possibility of an extra page at the end of the note/paper, MJ to check whether reports can be accessed directly or via a log-in]

9. Events advertising:

DA reminded all groups to make sure that all their events (seminars, lectures etc) are up on the CS events listings page. It should show as many events as have been confirmed, no matter how far in the future.

10. Recent research student completions (PG Admin)

See Appendix 2

11. Recently awarded research grants (OD)

OD reported that we had accrued £4.5million in grant income over the past six months. Over the previous six months £4.9 million was earned but this included a 2.5 million grant whereas the £4.5million earned is spread over a number of grants.

There is an upward trend in the number of EPSRC awards being made.

12. New funding opportunities

There are candidates in the pipeline for an ERC grant with a 12th December 2011 deadline. BK mentioned that he was investigating a funding opportunity with the American air force in the area of network security.

JST noted that you can find a key paragraph within a research proposal that can lead to collaboration.

It was suggested that Kyle Jamieson might give a talk about his experiencing securing the European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grant, "Building Scalable, Secure, and Reliable 'Chaotic' Wireless Networks."

OD commented that [UKRO](#) (the UK Research Office) can provide advice for accessing EC funding.

13. Any other business

None

14. Date of next meeting

Tuesday December 13th but a meeting will also be scheduled for November