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# INTRODUCTION

The information contained in this handbook is aimed both at early-career staff for whom this is one of their first academic appointments, and at established staff, as well as at new appointees to Manchester who have significant prior experience, but who may benefit from an introduction to some of the research opportunities, processes and policies specific to this school and this institution. The latter are thus welcome to read the pack selectively. In particular, we would draw their attention to sections 2-3, 6-7, 14 and 18. Early-Career Researchers are encouraged to find time to read the pack in its entirety, but they might like to pay particular attention to sections 2-5, 7-10, 12-13 and 15-16. Seasoned SALC researchers may also like to use the handbook to update and refresh their knowledge on a selective basis, and in order to source relevant policy statements.

Much of the information contained in the handbook is available separately elsewhere, in many cases on the School research intranet pages ([www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/staffintranet/research/](http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/staffintranet/research/)). It has been collated from a variety of sources (though much of it was generated by the School’s Research Committee). In some instances, rather than reproduce lengthy documentation, we have referred you to the relevant internet link. We hope that readers will appreciate the convenience of having it all brought together in one place.

We will update the guidelines each year and would value any suggestions for additional information to be included, or on ways in which we might improve the presentation of the material.

# SUPPORTING RESEARCH IN SALC: WHO DOES WHAT AND WHAT IS AVAILABLE?; ROLES AND REMITS

Research in SALC is overseen by the School Research Committee chaired by Professor Roy Gibson (Research Director) and consisting of research coordinators from each of our seven divisions, along with the Research Support Manager (Raksha.Parmar@manchester.ac.uk), the Associate Research Director (Impact), Professor Yaron Matras, Research Support Officers (petia.mehandjieva@manchester.ac.uk and Edward.Salter@manchester.ac.uk) and attended in part by representatives from three major research institutes / centres housed in SALC (CIDRAL, JRRI and HCRI), and from the University Library. The divisional research coordinators are responsible for, amongst other things, advising on day-to-day research-related issues, including publishing and dissemination goals and strategies, and the intellectual and strategic aspects of applying for research funding. It is advisable that you introduce yourself to your divisional research coordinator soon after you begin work here. The school research director has ultimate oversight of research strategies, policies and processes in the school, and for representing and promoting the school’s research interests at School, Faculty and University levels.

The School’s Research Support Office (located in Samuel Alexander, A21) will provide advice on, and support for, the technical and practical aspects of research funding applications of all kinds (including budgets), as well as help you with questions about research council policies, processes, research expenses and funding opportunities. If you win a research grant, the Research Finance Team (also located in A21) will help you take care of budgetary and expenditure issues, providing you with regular updates on your grant budget. Details are as follows:

**Research Support Manager**

Raksha Parmar Raksha.Parmar@manchester.ac.uk

**Research Support Officers**

Edward Salter Edward.Salter@manchester.ac.uk

Petia Mehandjieva petia.mehandjieva@manchester.ac.uk

**Research Support Administrators**

Abigail Saffer Abigail.saffer-2@manchester.ac.uk

Rhiannon Rothwell Rhiannon.Rothwell@manchester.ac.uk

Fiona Daniel Fiona.Daniel@manchester.ac.uk

Abigail Saffer and Rhiannon Rothwell will administer funds relating to Research Grants and Personal Research Allowances for colleagues in Languages Based Area Studies, Languages and Intercultural Studies and Linguistics and English Language. Petia is also the administrator for Visiting Academics to the school.

Abigail Saffer and Rhiannon Rothwell will administer funds relating to Research Grants and Personal Research Allowances for colleagues in Art History, Drama & Music, Archaeology, Religions and Theology, Classics & Ancient History, English, American Studies & the centre for New Writing and History.

Rhiannon Rothwell will administer funds relating to Research Seminars, Research Support Fund and Research Network Fund for colleagues in all subject areas.

**Senior Research Finance Officer**

Karina Moulinec-Rojas

Karina.Rojas@manchester.ac.uk

**Research Finance Officer**

Palminder Uppal

p.uppal@manchester.ac.uk

**The Research Support Team** provides assistance to academic colleagues in preparing and submitting funding applications and managing new awards. Their remit includes: understanding and explaining funder requirements; preparing budgets; formally submitting and accepting awards on behalf of the University; supporting internal peer review processes; co-ordinating approvals for new research staff appointments and contracts; arranging internal ethics screening; providing management information on applications and awards. Research Support Managers additionally provide strategic research support to Heads of School, Directors of Research and School Research Committees and form part of the Faculty Management Team for the delivery of RSS services.

**The Research Finance Team** sets up awarded projects on Oracle Financials, arranges fEC journals and transfers, prepares and submits reports to sponsors and provides general financial guidance throughout project lifecycles.

We are lucky to have available an impressive range of schemes designed to provide you with financial support for your research, none of which, however, are intended as a substitute for the more substantial amounts available from external sources. Within the School we have:

* A **Personal Research Allowance** (£1000 for the current year)
* A **Research Seminar Budget** held at the divisional level and designed to support your division in organising research seminars and paying for external speakers
* A **Research Support Fund**, to which you can apply for up to £2K per year for pilot project funding leading to external grant applications, or for enhancing non-academic research impact
* A **Research Network Fund**, to which you can apply for up to £2K per year to cover expenses relating to the setting up or consolidation of a network of researchers in your field
* **A UoA Support Fund** to which you can apply for up to £1.5K per year to support the enhancement of research environments (as defined by HEFCE), or to support the progress and completion of identified research outputs by current REF-eligible staff members, for submission to the Research Excellence Framework 2021.
* A **Research Impact Support Fund,** to which you can apply for up to £2K per year to support engagement, collaboration, partnership building and knowledge exchange activities that bring together SALC researchers and non-academic partners and audiences.

For more details, see below. In addition, you are strongly encouraged to co-organise events with **CIDRAL** (Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Languages, directed by Francesca Billiani), which has quite a generous external speakers’ budget.

At Faculty level, there is a **Humanities Strategic Investment Fund** (H-SIF) which operates on a bi-annual basis (with deadlines currently for September 2017); the research strand (which includes provision for early-career researchers and for impact enhancement), as well as social responsibility, large, collaborative research bids and PGR strands. Currently this fund is designed, where the applicants are from SALC, to support collaborations with international partners, particularly the University of Melbourne.

At the University level, the **University of Manchester Research Institute** (UMRI) runs an annual competition to support pump-priming projects designed to build major interdisciplinary research networks and other initiatives. It is able to make up to 50K available to research groups, though awards are generally lower than this.

CONSTITUTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE SALC RESEARCH COMMITTEE

1. The SALC Research Committee will consist of the School Research Director, the Associate Research Director (Impact), the Research Support Manager, and the Research Coordinator from each constituent division of the School except the Language Centre. Representatives from the University Library, the cross-School centre, CIDRAL (Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Languages), the cross-Faculty centre, Human and Conflict Response Institute, and the University’s John Rylands Research Institute (based in SALC), will have *ex officio* membership and will be invited to report on the respective activities of these centres at the end of each Research Committee meeting. Others (e.g. Grant Writers, External Relations Director) may be invited to attend.
2. The Research Committee will:
3. play a strategic role in the planning of research activity in the School;
4. ensure the implementation of the research section of the School’s Strategic and Academic plans;
5. stimulate and monitor the global research activity and research profile of the School;
6. take the lead in creating an environment which fosters engagement with the users of SALC research, and in maximising its academic and non-academic impact;
7. create, implement and monitor mechanisms that foster a culture of interdisciplinary, and other, collaboration across SALC and beyond;
8. ensure that the activities of Centres and Institutes in the School are in line with School research strategy;
9. oversee, and initiate improvements to, the School’s overall Research Environment in relation to REF;
10. make recommendations to the Policy, Planning and Resources Committee, concerning applications for Institutional Research Leave;
11. manage the process by which applications to the School’s Research Support Fund are called for, evaluated and decided upon;
12. advise, where appropriate, the Head of School, on resource allocation in the area of research;
13. Co-opt additional members if issues arise requiring specific expertise.
14. In relation to (viii), and in other appropriate circumstances, the Research Committee will appoint subcommittees consisting of full committee members and, when necessary, co-opted additional members, in order to make recommendations to the Research Committee for approval.
15. The Research Committee will normally meet 5 times per academic year: twice in the Autumn Semester and three times in the Spring Semester. Other meetings outside this schedule may be called as and when necessary.
16. The above terms of reference are liable to be amended at any time in response to changes in University and/or School strategy, and in consultation with the committee membership and with relevant School bodies and officers.

ROLE PROFILE: RESEARCH DIRECTOR

1 To assume executive responsibility for the School’s research strategy and take a leading role in shaping that strategy

2 To lead the planning process for the School’s submissions to national research assessment exercises.

3 To represent the School on the Faculty of Humanities Research Strategy Committee, and on any other relevant Faculty and School level Committees as appropriate.

4 To chair the School Research Committee.

5 In close collaboration with the Research Support Manager, oversee the effective implementation of the policies, functions and duties of the Research Directorate as outlined in the Terms of Reference of the Research Committee.

6 To take the lead in formulating plans to foster School researchers’ engagement with user communities, and in maximising the impact, academic and non-academic, of School research.

7 To take the lead role in fostering a culture of interdisciplinary, and other, collaboration across the School and beyond. Specifically to ensure that the activities of Centres and Institutes in the School are in line with School research strategy.

8 To oversee, and initiate improvements to, the School’s overall Research Environment in relation to REF.

9 To serve as a source of advice and guidance to the Head of School, in all matters pertaining to research.

ROLE PROFILE: ASSOCIATE RESEARCH DIRECTOR (IMPACT)

1. To work closely with key stakeholders to implement, manage and monitor the School plan for research and knowledge exchange
2. To develop and roll out a knowledge exchange strategy and associated activities for SALC.
3. To identify opportunities for knowledge exchange activities, with the support of Faculty RSS staff, and disseminate best practice across the School.
4. To monitor and respond to the capacity-building needs of SALC’s staff and research centres concerning knowledge exchange.
5. To liaise with and monitor the progress of the School’s research centres as hubs of impact and knowledge exchange.
6. To disseminate good practice in knowledge exchange across the School.
7. To advise on and support future SALC impact case studies in preparation for REF 2021.
8. To liaise and foster relationships with impact and knowledge exchange stake-holders.
9. To help promote and showcase significant SALC research impact achievements and activities.

ROLE PROFILE: DIVISIONAL RESEARCH CO-ORDINATOR

The following points describe the role of the Divisional Research Coordinator in relation to the School Research Committee. How the role is carried out within divisions may vary from division to division; some of the duties may be delegated to, or fulfilled in close collaboration with, other colleagues.

Divisional Research Co-ordinators will:

1. Represent the Departments within their Division on the Research Committee.
2. Serve as the link between the UoA(s) in their Division and the Research Directorate, specifically in relation to preparations for REF.
3. Be aware of and sympathetic to the full range of research in their Division, and foster an active research culture within the Division.
4. In close consultation with the Research Development Manager, oversee the organisation of, and financial support for, Departmental seminar series, where these exist.
5. Where applicable, advise on and/or coordinate Departmental rotas for Institutional Research Leave.
6. In close consultation with the Head of Division, oversee research strategy at the Departmental and Divisional level, including the planning and co-ordination of internal and external research bidding activity.
7. Ensure that applicants to external research funding schemes receive advice, guidance and, where appropriate, internal peer reviewed commentary, when preparing their submissions.
8. In close consultation with the Head of Division, and with other colleagues as necessary, advise on the approval of all applications for external research funding prior to submission.
9. Be a source of advice and guidance to individuals in their Division, in matters pertaining to research.

SUPPORT FOR STAFF RESEARCH

**Introduction**

These guidelines deal with support for individual staff research in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures. They do not cover support for School seminars, or for larger, School strategy-led research collaborations (these are treated in other documents),

The School provides significant material, organisational and intellectual support for individual staff research development in the School. In so doing it aims to respond to (1) research plans at the University and School levels, and (2) the research programmes of national and international funding bodies (especially the AHRC, ESRC, Leverhulme Trust, British Academy, Nuffield Foundation, the European Science Foundation and the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 programme). Applications for School research support should be framed with these two goals in mind. Staff for whom research is part of their contract should subscribe to [www.researchprofessional.com](http://www.researchprofessional.com) which provides regular information about external funding opportunities. Details of School and University research strategies are available on the web.

**Research funding**

Research funding for individuals is set aside by the School and administered by the Research Support Office on behalf of the Research Committee. The amount of money and time available to our internal research support schemes depends entirely on our ability to attract funds not only from the Higher Education Funding Council for England via its Research Excellence Framework but also (and more immediately) from the funds-rich external bodies referred to in the Introduction above. The School’s criteria for supporting research are designed to reflect this reality. The funding is distributed as follows:

1. Staff Personal Research Allowance
2. Research Support Fund (operates on a competitive basis)
3. Research Network Fund (operates on a competitive basis)
4. Research Impact Support Fund (operates on a competitive basis)
5. Unit of Assessment (UoA) Support Fund (operates on a competitive basis).

**Supplementary and alternative funding.** In order to maximise the amount of resource available to researchers in the School and to add value to existing support you are urged to seek ways of partially or wholly obviating the need to use School funds by, for example: applying for sources of funding outside the School (as above), taking up expenses-paid invitations to speak at conferences, or using discipline-specific endowment income. It is recognised that not all types of need can be sensibly and cost-effectively bid for externally, and that external bids may be enhanced through prior, dedicated support provided by the School. However, on occasion, the Research Committee may recommend that applicants look elsewhere for funds to support their projects, or that School awards be made contingent on the securing of matching funding from other sources.

**Personal Research Allowance**

SALC will annually offer all eligible current staff (see below) a research allocation, with the specific amount announced at the start of the academic year. This can be spent on a broad remit of activity (in addition to research-related travel). Note: the PRA is subject to fluctuation in value from year to year. Staff who make future commitments to the full amount of a current PRA value, cannot be reimbursed for funds in excess of the future PRA value, where the future PRA value is lower than the current PRA value. So, if in year X the value of the PRA is Y, and the researcher makes commitments for year X+1 to the value of Y, but where the actual value of the PRA in year X+1 turns out to be equivalent to Y-250 GBP, then the researcher can only claim Y-250 GBP in year X-1, not Y.

**Eligible staff:**

Due to the increase in the personal allocation and the limited nature of the budget the eligibility criteria remain strict and include only the following:

* Current academic staff on permanent or fixed term **lecturing** contracts, and for whom research is part of their contract.
* Current externally funded research fellows - excluding Simon & Hallsworth fellows and all other post-doctoral fellowships which have separate research expenses attached to them, e.g. British Academy post-doctoral fellowships, Leverhulme post-doctoral fellowships, Marie Curie, etc

If you have any uncertainty as to whether or not you are eligible for the basic allocation please check with your Research Coordinator in the first instance prior to incurring any research related expenses for which you may later wish to claim.

**The definition of eligible fellows is below:**

1. *Research fellows are current members of academic staff who hold specific awards on the basis of their own research record or research proposals. Examples of such fellowships are Research Council Fellows (senior, advanced and post-doctoral) and Royal Society Research Fellows and Professors.*
2. *A fellowship should be awarded to a named individual in recognition of independent research achieved or proposed, rather than being awarded to the research project on which an individual is employed. Fellowships should only be recorded as such when they are periodically subjected to significant expert peer review (including competitive review), generally involving an input from outside the institution. Fellowships are often for a fixed term, typically three or five years. Funding for these awards comes from a range of sources outside the institution, but can be channelled through it so that the individual remains an employee of the institution.*

Staff will be allocated the amount as per their contract entitlement e.g. a 0.5fte member of (eligible) staff will be entitled to one-half of a full basic allocation.

**Those not eligible for the basic allocation:**

1. Teaching assistants (GTAs) and others who hold small contracts with the School/University, and are also researchers, for example as postgraduate students or recent research graduates
2. Externally funded research staff on grants/projects (Research Assistants/Associates). RAs research expenses would be included in their project budgets.
3. Teaching Fellows and lecturing staff for whom research is not part of their contract
4. Honorary staff
5. Emeritus staff
6. Visiting fellows
7. Any Research Fellows working on or supporting a project are not eligible for PRA

NB the Research Directorate reserves the right to make all final decisions on eligibility. Any appeals will be heard through the formal channels.

**New Staff**

Please note that new (eligible) members of staff are entitled to a pro rata amount of the basic personal allowance depending on when in the year they were appointed (i.e. in semester two, one-half of the full basic allocation will be available).

**The Basic Allocation**

**Amount:** The specific amount will be determined following annual confirmation of the School’s Research Budget. It will be announced at the first Research Committee meeting of each academic year.

**Purposes of Fund:**

1. The purpose of the School’s Personal Research Allowance basic allocation is to support colleagues wishing to attend scholarly conferences or to carry out research visits to libraries, galleries, museums, archives or research sites OR
2. For colleagues who require support to complete a publication or requiring small amounts of teaching relief or research assistance to complete a project OR
3. For colleagues wishing to organise a conference\* at Manchester and who wish to pool their basic allocations. (e.g. three colleagues may decide that they can use the combined amount to fund a small-scale conference/seminar/workshop)\* OR
4. For colleagues who require support towards the costs of performances, installations, recording, etc. of research works OR
5. For colleagues who require specialist software or research equipment not otherwise available through University support\*\*

\* All conferences must be costed and planned in liaison with the School Conference Office

\*\* Please note the funds may NOT be used to purchase books, laptops or iPads etc.

**Eligible Costs include:**

**Eligible travel costs:**

* 1. All forms of research travel are eligible for support from this fund, including conferences, visits to museums, archives, galleries, libraries, archaeological and other sites, live performances, and networking, provided in each case that there is a clear benefit to the traveller’s research.
	2. Costs covered include travel, accommodation, meals and appropriate fees (e.g. at conferences). **IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO CLAIM FOR EXPENSES NOT LISTED IN THIS POLICY.**
	3. **PLEASE ENSURE THAT ALL CLAIMS FOR EXPENSES RELATING TO BASIC ALLOCATION ARE SUBMITTED TO THE RESEARCH OFFICE WITH ALL CORRECT AND RELEVANT RECEIPTS WITHIN ONE MONTH OF THE ACTIVITY TAKING PLACE. THERE IS NO GUARANTEE THAT CLAIMS SUBMITTED AFTER THAT DATE WILL BE REPAID.**
	4. It is the individual’s responsibility to keep track of their PRA expenditure and their remaining balance. Any overspend will have to be paid back to the School. Any late receipts/expense forms will not be able to be processed.
	5. Ensure your expenses incurred and to be claimed are eligible for PRA and is incurred within the same financial year.

**Eligible research support costs:**

1. Publication costs, including reproduction/copyright costs, procurement of translations, indexing.
2. Small amounts of research assistance, such as reference-checking, proof-reading, large-scaling photocopying of articles, etc.
3. Contributions towards the costs of performances/installations etc. of research works
4. Specialist software not otherwise available
5. Small amounts of replacement teaching
6. Any other reasonable purpose

**Eligible conference costs:**

1. Costs associated to the conference venue (room hire, media equipment, portering).
2. Delegate fees, accommodation and travel for plenary speakers.
3. Publicity, refreshments, conference packs etc.

**Conference hosting**

1. For staff wishing to use some or all of their basic allocation towards hosting a conference, the Research Office will require a code from which the basic allocation amount can be transferred into. It will not be possible to claim for any conference expenditure without a specific code.
2. Staff wishing to host a conference should contact Abigail Saffer (abigail.saffer-2@manchester.ac.uk) in the first instance and from there they will be directed as to how to get a code for the conference created by the school Finance Office.
3. Once the code for your conference has been generated please contact Abigail Saffer in the Research Office via email indicating the code and the amount of the basic allocation due to be transferred.
4. Abigail will then liaise with the Finance Office regarding the transfer of the basic allocation into the conference code.
5. All conference related claims should be submitted via the Conference Administrator and NOT the Research Office.

**Procedure for claiming funds awarded**

1. For reimbursement of expenditure from the Personal Research Allowance basic allocation, staff should complete the university online claim form, which can be found by logging into [MyManchester](https://login.manchester.ac.uk/cas/login?service=https%3A%2F%2Fmy.manchester.ac.uk%2F) and following the ‘my expenses’ link under ‘Finance’. You will need to know the relevant project code or account code your expenses are going to be charged to. Please indicate the relevant academic year in the ‘Reason for Claim’ section of the claim form before sending it - **together with original receipts** - to the Research Office for authorisation and onward transmission to Finance for payment.
2. All claims (reimbursement forms) must be received by the Research Office within 1 month of the activity taking place.
3. All monies allocated to an individual member of staff will have to be accounted for, and their expenditure will be monitored by the Research/Finance Offices. An annual report of expenditure on research travel will be produced and presented to the Research Committee.
4. All conference related claims should have their own individually generated code – see above under ‘Conference hosting’.
5. All conference related claims should be submitted via the Conference Administrator and NOT the Research Office.
6. Any expenditure relating to travel or any other research activity due to take place in August CANNOT be claimed from the budget of the previous academic year. Instead it will have to come from the following year’s entitlement, the amount of which will be unknown until announced at the first Research Committee of that academic year.
7. For further information relating to submitting claims please contact the Research Office and a member of the team will be able to provide advice and guidance.
8. All monies allocated to an individual member of staff will have to be accounted for, and their expenditure will be monitored by the Research/Finance Offices. An annual report of expenditure on research travel will be produced and presented to the Research Committee.

**It is not necessary to inform the Research Office of your intention to use your basic allocation** and instead it is expected generally that all eligible staff will make use of it. However, if for whatever reason you know that you will not be using yours then please notify the Research Office at the earliest opportunity. Any staff who have not submitted a claim for their basic allocations by March of each academic year will be written to asking if they intend to spend it, and, if sufficient funds remain, the Research Committee may put out a second call for applications.

Finally, please note that the fund is only available for activity and expenses occurring up to the **31st July of each academic year.**

**Research Support Fund**

The Research Support Fund is intended to foster and enhance external income generation and impact beyond the academy by individual staff engaged in research. It cannot be used to pay for the kinds of expenses covered by the Personal Research Allowance and unrelated to research income generation, nor for the running of seminars, or for group-led networking initiatives (see Research Networking Fund). The deadline for applications is normally in July.

Criteria:

This fund operates on a competitive basis. Preference will be given to projects that clearly and convincingly demonstrate how the funds applied for will enhance an existing externally funded project, or lay the ground for a new application for external research funding. Eligible costs could include (but are not restricted to):

a. pilot projects and feasibility studies designed to strengthen future bids to external funders (project development includes the development of IT systems/tools and associated equipment/software.)

b. funds to bridge postdoctoral research fellows doing externally supported research between one project and another;

c. activities relating to externally funded projects that enable a PI to cover unanticipated additional expenses, or to extend a project outcome in a new, unforeseen direction;

d. career-building conference visits undertaken by funded postdocs to give papers on topics not included within the project remit;

e. individual participation in research networks intended to prepare the ground for bids to European funding schemes, or to build links with other Faculties at Manchester in anticipation of joint funding initiatives

f. activities which enhance the non-academic impact of existing research, whether externally funded or not (if the research to which the activities relate is externally funded then those activities should be distinct from anything planned under the ‘pathways to impact’ section of the original application)

Eligibility:

All research-active staff (that is those with research listed in their employment contract as an expectation), including postdoctoral researchers. Two or more individuals may combine forces and submit a joint application. However, in the case of projects involving collaboration with individuals from other Schools or institutions, we will expect to see evidence of matching funding.

Amount and number of awards:

The maximum amount for which you (or your team) can apply is limited; the maximum for teaching relief as an element in a bid is also limited.

Exceptions:

In addition to paying for seminars, or for expenses incurred by a School strategy-led research team, the Fund cannot be used to cover:

* School-sponsored study leave (departments should organise teaching and administration in such a way as to accommodate the absence of a colleague on study leave without additional resource).
* running conferences (funds available via departmental seminar allocations)
* the purchase of material for the University Library, or books.
* equipment (the School’s Equipment Fund administered via the School Office should be approached).

Examples of uses for funding:

* teaching relief – this needs to be justified, with an explanation specifically referencing why the project work needs to take place during term-time
* travel and subsistence associated with the project (except conference travel)
* specialist printed or recorded resources needed on site in addition to University Library provision, where justified
* hourly paid research assistance

Form of application:

Applications should take the form of a letter to the Research Support Services Manager and include:

* a description of the project’s aims, objectives and outcomes (500 words maximum) (Research Coordinators and professorial colleagues can be expected to advise on drafting).
* a brief account of how the appropriate criteria are met
* a clear statement of project costs (advice on costs and the overall drafting of applications is available via the School Research Support Office)

An electronic copy should be emailed to salc.research@manchester.ac.uk and copied to the Research Co-ordinator of the relevant unit (in the case of formally constituted Research Centres/Institutes through the Director in consultation with relevant Research Co-ordinator(s))

Selection process:

Applications are assessed by the School’s Research Committee.

Spending/Reporting:

Spending should be completed by 31st July 2018. Also a brief report (no more than a side of A4) should be submitted within one month of the award end date. It should specify how projects have enhanced existing externally funded projects or prepared the ground for new bids, and explain how the RSF support has contributed to that process. We intend to use selected reports as the basis for a section of the SALC Research web pages designed to publicise the benefits of the RSF.

**Research Networking Fund**

The current budget for the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures includes a sum for each academic year set aside for the purpose of raising the profile of research groupings (existing and putative) within the School. In the spring semester, the Research Directorate invites bids from groups of researchers (including, but not restricted to, current centres and institutes) for initiatives that will enhance national and international research networking capabilities. This may, for example, mean building and/or consolidating networks of international scholars in a particular research area (given that such networks are likely to be of future benefit in securing European and other international funding). It could also mean establishing links with actual and potential research users (reflecting the growing importance of ‘impact’ to the School and the University). The establishment of bilateral links with one other significant research partner is as eligible as multi-partner networks, provided that the case for added value is made appropriately. Other possibilities will also be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Lead researchers within SALC groups interested in applying for these funds should submit an application to the SALC Research Office in July (the precise date differs slightly from year to year). These applications will be considered by the SALC Research Committee. They will be ranked on merit against criteria based on the extent to which they (a) improve the chances of securing external funding for the group in question (b); enable a new grouping to establish itself; (c) increase the academic and/or non-academic impact of the group’s research, and (d) provide good value for money.

Applications should include:

* the name and contact details of the lead researcher(s)
* a brief account of the work of the research grouping (in no more than 100 words)
* a narrative of no more than 500 words explaining how the bid meets the criteria and the added value the proposed network would bring to the research grouping and the School
* a detailed budget with costings for all activities; eligible items include, but are not limited to, travel, accommodation and living expenses; room hire and equipment; communication costs; dedicated part-time administrative support.

Funding decisions will be announced by the end of September each year. All expenditure on successful bids should be completed, and a report on spending submitted, by July 31st 2018. Also a brief report (no more than a side of A4) should be submitted within one month of the award end date. It should describe progress towards establishing/extending the network in question; identify specific benefits and outcomes resulting from network activities, and outline plans for further network-related developments and initiatives.

**UoA Support Fund**

The School runs a Unit of Assessment Support Fund. This fund operates on a competitive basis and welcomes applications both from individuals and from REF Units of Assessment as a collective. Applications must clearly and convincingly demonstrate how funds will support the enhancement of research environments (as defined by HEFCE), or that support the progress and completion of identified research outputs by REF-eligible staff members, for submission to the Research Excellence Framework 2021.

Eligible costs include (but are not restricted to):

i. UoA-led training workshops specifically designed to enhance the UoA Environment by (for example) supporting equality and diversity, or fostering interdisciplinary research

ii. UoA-led training workshops specifically designed to assist the completion of identified outputs by REF-eligible staff members

iii.  One-off research events (such as workshops, symposia) with aims directly and explicitly linked to the production of identified outputs by REF-eligible staff members

iv.  A research trip directly and explicitly linked to the production of an identified output by a REF-eligible staff member. (NOTE: attending or giving a paper at a conference is explicitly excluded from eligibility: use Personal Research Allowance.)

v. Obtaining research materials directly and explicitly linked to the production of an identified output by a REF-eligible staff member.

vi. Obtaining photographic images, figures, or other materials for inclusion in an identified output by a REF-eligible staff member

vii. Employment of research assistants or technical professionals in order to enable the completion of an identified output by a REF-eligible staff member.

viii. Editorial and publication costs (e.g. translations, reproduction rights, publishers’ subventions) related to an identified output by a REF-eligible staff member. (NOTE: indexing and proof-reading are explicitly excluded as eligible cost: it is expected that staff undertake these as part of normal duties.)

ix. Costs incurred in producing identified outputs that result from practice-based research, such as audio or audio-visual recordings of REF-eligible music compositions

In instances where the Personal Research Allowance can be used to fund any of the costs applied for, applications may only be made for sums in excess of the current Personal Research Allowance total of 1K: i.e. if your total costs are 1.75K, then you may only apply for 0.75K. Partial exemptions can be made in exceptional circumstances (please specify these in your application).

Eligibility:

The fund is open only to UoAs as a collective or to current staff members on permanent contracts where research is included as part of the expected duties.

Amount of awards:

The maximum amount for which you (or your team) can apply is currently 1.5K. There will be two Calls for Bids each year.

Exceptions

The Fund cannot be used to pay for the kinds of expenses covered by other funds available across the School, except where they exceed the level of the Personal Research Allowance, as outlined above. Funds cannot be used (e.g.):

• for attending or giving a paper at a conference (see Personal Research Allowance)

• for running general conferences (see Personal Research Allowance)

• for running of divisional or subject area research seminars (see SALC Research Seminar fund)

• for group-led networking initiatives (see SALC Research Networking fund)

• for grant-winning activities (see SALC Research Support Fund)

• for Impact activities (see the Impact Support fund)

• for teaching relief (general grant-winning activity).

Form of application:

Applications should take the form of a letter (maximum 2 pages) to the Research Support Manager and include. Applications must be accompanied by a statement of support from the Research Co-ordinator of the subject area, who must also certify that the beneficiaries of the application are REF-eligible members of staff on open-ended contracts that include research as part of the expected duties. Applications are assessed by the School’s Research Committee.

Spending/Reporting

Spending should be completed by 31st July 2018 and a brief report (no more than a side of A4) should be submitted within one month of the award end date. It should specify how the objectives of the application have been met in relation to the identified REF outputs or UoA Environment.

# RESEARCH PLANNING FOR NEW ACADEMICS

Useful general advice to those planning a career in academia can be found on the Faculty website at:

<http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/humnet/our-services/faculty-research-office/early-career/>

LONG-TERM PLANNING

Publish what you can. A PhD is supposed to represent publishable, original research; but from thesis to book is a big step

Some publishers have special ‘dissertation series’ (e.g. MRHA); not necessarily the best bet, but worth considering.

At a certain point you need to leave your PhD behind. When moving beyond it, do so in an ‘organic’ way

### The expertise you acquired should not go to waste

### You are more likely to make a convincing switch into a new area if it is grounded in existing work

LONG-TERM PLANNING: The Research Trajectory

### Plan ahead when applying for promotion etc. You need both movement and continuity: a coherent trajectory

### Where do you see your research career in 3-5 years?

### What are your ‘big’ questions for the next 5-10 yrs?

### See your work as a ‘programme of research’ in which one discrete project leads naturally to another

### One-off projects are refreshing but may not make a convincing narrative

### Build in ‘read around’ time (vital for the long-term health of your research)

## LONG-TERM PLANNING: Research and the Career Trajectory

### Research is one element in your career trajectory; you will teach and do administration as well as research

### Different career trajectories emphasise different activities at different times

### At most points you must balance these 3 activities (you will have annual meetings to discuss this balance with senior colleagues)

### Find out what the expectations are at each stage (familiarise yourself with career progression guidelines)

### We must think about the potential long-term impact of our research on non-academic users, and of Knowledge Transfer opportunities; this, too, requires planning

### SHORT-TO-MEDIUM TERM PLANNING: THE LOCAL DIMENSION

## Time Management is crucial

### Protect and regularise your research time

### Establish a clear routine and divide up your time between your various duties accordingly, setting aside clearly defined slots for each

### Set yourself targets for the week, month, year

### Read the School’s policy on probationer loads

## So are people …

### Make good use of any senior mentor assigned to you

### ALWAYS get other people to read your work before you present or submit it

### ‘Put yourself about’ by offering to present papers at internal seminars, or to initiate or join discussion groups etc

### Seek as much advice as you can about publishing outlets, grant schemes

### Talk to other probationers/new academics

### Collaboration is the life-blood of good research

## Opportunities

### We are expected to apply regularly for external funding for our research; ask in the Research Office about opportunities relevant to you

### Familiarise yourself with research support funds and opportunities within SALC; don’t be afraid to enquire about particular kinds of support: be creative

### SALC makes an effort to prioritise the needs of ‘Early Career Researchers’; take advantage of this

### A grant application or joint publishing project with a more senior researcher is an excellent way of getting on the research income ladder

### But make sure your contribution is properly recognised

## ‘Threats’

### Not knowing what is expected of you (be clear about the targets you are set and the opportunities available to you)

### Lack of self-discipline (don’t get side-tracked into activities which prevent you from meeting your research goals)

### Loss of sense of priorities/perspective (remember what it is you are going to be judged on)

### Overcommitting yourself in lower-priority areas (do you REALLY need to be on that new committee?)

### BUT never forget that you are part of a team; team-players are always highly valued

### Perfectionism (that new course unit needs to be very good, but it is unlikely to be perfect in its first ‘outing’)

### Writer’s block: it is a good idea to be writing something at every point

# SHORT-TO-MEDIUM TERM PLANNING: THE EXTERNAL DIMENSION

## Establishing a profile

### Make sure your web page is up-to-date and makes a good impression on potential new PhD students, external collaborators etc.

* Social media (in particular Twitter) is increasingly being used by academics as a tool with which to disseminate information and to share news about research. Make sure you have (and use) a Twitter account
* For further advice, see Section 4 below

## Stay smart!

### Find out about schemes and ‘allowances’ for Early Career Researchers (e.g. the AHRC’s ECR scheme for grants – up to 200K)

### Start small and build; the BA Small Grants Scheme (up to 7.5K) is a first rung on the research income ladder

### Know what is going on in your research community at large, and at a national level (THE). The environment is changing rapidly and predictably

# THE WIDER PICTURE

## Have confidence in what you are doing: you must be getting something right or you wouldn’t be here!

## But listen very carefully to all advice you get

## Departments look to new academics to revitalise the research environment and renew the agenda

## This is an opportunity for you, too

## Be bold and willing to challenge the status quo

## Learn to handle and make use of criticism: it is the lifeblood of academia

## The creative freedom and flexibility an academic career offers also presents a dilemma: how to keep your research out of places it doesn’t belong

### Draw clear dividing lines between ‘work’ and ‘home’ (even if you do much of your research work at home)

### A healthy work/life balance is going to make a better scholar and a better colleague of you

### Remember the old adage: “It’s only a job” (or the wisdom of *The Wire*: “The job will not save you”).

# MAXIMISING RESEARCH QUALITY AND ACADEMIC IMPACT: GUIDE FOR NEW ACADEMICS

1. There are 2 forms of impact relating to research which you might have heard mentioned in recent discussions at the University and the national level: (a) impact on fellow researchers in your subject field; (b) impact on the wider community beyond academia, and on society more generally. These notes deal with type (a) only. For type (b) see page 32.
2. The surest way of achieving academic impact for your research is to generate publications of outstanding quality and depth.
3. The REF has hitherto required 4 publications per individual and places most weight on these publications when arriving at a quality profile for the unit to which you submit. Following the Stern report this number has dropped to 2.5 (as an average across all members of a Unit of Assessment). You should therefore prioritise quality over quantity. This effectively means one high quality, high profile publication (roughly) every two years.
4. In many areas of the humanities, the research monograph is likely to remain the ‘gold standard’ of excellence and the primary route to achieving academic impact. This is, however, not the case for all areas and, in consultation with senior colleagues; you should identify the best form of output for maximising impact. The REF normally allows for the ‘double weighting’ of monographs, and, if you are in a field in which the monograph is predominant, you should construct your long-term research plans around the writing of major works such as this, building in institutional leaves, and external fellowship applications, at the appropriate point.
5. In order to achieve the necessary focus and to prioritise your most important publications, – those which will have the most impact – you will need to be disciplined and to learn to say ‘no’ to many of the numerous requests you will receive for contributions of a lesser order: book reviews, encyclopaedia entries, text books, etc. As your career develops this becomes harder and harder, yet more and more important. Get into good habits early!
6. The standing and quality of outlets are important, especially in the context of the REF, in which it is unlikely that everything will be read, but also more generally, in terms of enhancing your profile and performance. You should discuss the appropriate output for each piece of work with your mentor from the very point that you begin planning the research for it.
7. Aim high – for the most prestigious publishers and the most highly regarded refereed journals in your area. You will need to talk to you mentor and to other senior scholars in order to get a sense of the ranking of particular outlets. The ‘easy route’ (publishers which give contracts without sending manuscripts out to referees; journals which do not subject contributions to rigorous peer reviews) is always tempting, but not in your best interests in the long run, and in terms of maximising your research impact..
8. Build in a contingency plan for the ‘revise and resubmit’ response, and, indeed for rejection (the very best journals reject the majority of the submissions they receive). Remember that, even in the case of a rejected piece, you will have received 2-3 peer reviews of your work for free and you can incorporate the feedback into a revised submission.
9. For most fields, your goal should be to ensure that your publications are read by, and influence thinking in, not only your own research domain, but in other, wider domains. The criterion of ‘significance beyond the immediate research field’ is important when your research is assessed in the REF, for promotions, and in other formal contexts. (There are exceptions to this rule; the degree to which it applies depends on the nature and scope of the field, and you are advised to discuss the issue with a relevant senior colleague.) So, for example, an ‘impactful’ analysis of the short stories of Chekhov might have implications for our understanding of the development of 19th century Russian literature, and of European realism more generally, or for the way we theorise our approach to studying the genre of the short story. It is unlikely that you will achieve this impact at the very beginning of career, or in every publication, but it should remain an aspiration.
10. Note that ‘citation indices’ do not play an important role for the humanities in REF, but, used selectively and with care, can serve as a useful indicator of the impact your research is having on peers.
11. Achieving the goal of influencing wider research domains may, or may not mean publishing in a more ‘generic’ journal. It will depend very much on your field. *Slavic Review*, for example, whose focus is limited by region, is considerably more prestigious for a Slavist than *Modern Languages Review* which covers work across all European cultures. Here again, it is crucial to talk to senior scholars in your field.
12. To stress again, feedback on your research should be sought and used at every stage. Plan for this in your annual cycle of work. So, for example, an internal seminar paper at which you outline some ideas in the broad sense, might be succeeded by a conference presentation, following which you write up the first draft of a journal article which, in turn, forms the basis for a larger topic leading to a monograph. It is rarely a good idea to present at a conference material that has already been published.
13. Discussing your ideas, and those of others, internally is invariably helpful. Reading groups, for example, may seem to require an input of time that you can ill afford, but in the long run they may pay dividends that solitary hours at a keyboard may not.
14. Equally, however, it is good to train yourself into the writing habit, and to try to organise your research in such a way that you never go for longer than a month or two without being engaged in drafting or writing up something, whether a conference paper, a journal article, or a book chapter. It is all too easy to develop ‘writer’s block’, but not if you don’t allow it to happen.
15. Make good use of institutional leaves. We are very lucky to have a leave scheme at Manchester; many universities do not have them. It is normally expected that you generate at least one publishable output from your semester’s leave (or progress with an Impact Case Study). The dedicated time you have for this is precious and comes around once every 3 years. You should reserve this time for an output of significance, not to ‘catch up’ on book reviews and other odds and ends you have promised.
16. Get your work read by as many people as possible; it is often helpful if someone a little outside your field takes a look, along with a subject specialist. The former may sometimes be able to convey a better sense of the wider relevance of your ideas than the latter. Readers will, of course, always find fault with your writing, and may therefore delay your timetable for submission. But, first, addressing feedback should be incorporated into your research planning, anyway, and second, dealing with potential problems with your work at the pre-submission stage may well save you lots of time in the long run.
17. The School has a pool of experienced academics across all fields willing to read and comment on your work and you are strongly encouraged, via the Research Coordinator for you Division, or the School Director of Research, to draw on this resource.
18. Equally, however, try to read the work of others when asked to do so. You can learn from it and make the same request in return.
19. Do not see the preparation of major research grant applications and the writing of excellent publications as being in tension with one another. A successful grant application is likely to maximise the quality and depth of your published outputs. Remember that you can build into your application a dedicated period of leave in which you work on writing up your project findings, and that this period will still count towards the accumulation of semesters required for an application to the institutional leave scheme. And the benefits of collaborating with a co-investigator, and/or with a Postdoctoral Research Assistant, can only enhance your work. Having a major research grant will make it easier to promote and disseminate your research.
20. Whilst quality is by far the most important factor in contributing to maximising research impact, do not underestimate the value of ‘good publicity’; regularly giving papers at key conferences (but be careful when selecting conference venues and ensure that they have a high reputation in your field); for further advice on ‘publicity’, see Section 5 below. Building a reputation takes a long time and is achieved incrementally. Little things like this will, over a period of time, pay rich dividends.

# GUIDANCE ON CITATIONS AND BIBLIOMETRICS

One of the key ways of enhancing the academic impact of one’s work is to increase the number of times it is read and cited by other researchers. This note sets out some guidelines on the significance of citations to publications and some suggestions for improving the Faculty’s citation performance. Citations to published work can come from a variety of sources such as newspaper articles and even patents but for the purposes of this note the discussion will be confined to the references researchers append to their published papers to indicate earlier work which is in some way significant for their own. The main concern here will be the growing use of citations as an indicator of research impact[[1]](#footnote-1) and hence, ways in which we can increase Manchester’s performance on this dimension. The relevance of this note will be more immediate for those in social sciences than for those in arts subjects because citations are normally derived from journal articles rather than books or chapters within edited works and the former are better covered in the databases. However, the growth of electronic publication means that citation to books and book chapters is becoming more common. The European Science Foundation has been developing a [European Reference Index for the Humanities](http://www.esf.org/research-areas/humanities/research-infrastructures-including-erih.html) to try to address the inadequacy of the [Arts and Humanities Citation Index](http://ip-science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=H), but it, too, has been criticised.

## Why Citations are Important

Many will contest the validity of bibliometric/scientometric[[2]](#footnote-2) analyses of citations but the fact is they are already widely used and institutionalised. In the Times Higher University ranking lists, high citation rates in the Arts and Humanities at Manchester have recently surpassed those of our rivals, and have made a significant contribution to the University’s overall position in these tables. The Treasury’s [Ten Year Investment Framework](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/%2B/http%3A/www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/7/8/bud06_science_332v1.pdf) for Science and Technology 2004-14 which underpinned Research Council funding used the UK’s relative citation performance as its first measure of performance; the Research Excellence Framework uses citations to a limited extent in the sciences as a measure of research quality; the Shanghai Jiao Tong [Academic Ranking of World Universities](http://www.arwu.org/) (which is formally part of this University’s objectives) awards 60% of its scores to three bibliometric indicators. The University independently commissions work on our bibliometric performance based on our share of the world’s most highly cited papers. In addition, citations, where appropriate, are used as a promotion criterion.

The use of these measures is more than an academic exercise, increasingly they will be used both directly and indirectly to drive funding decisions. Importantly for arts and humanities, they can, if judiciously used, provide us as individuals with valuable insights into the relative impact our research outputs are having among our peers.

## Sources and Guides

Two reasonably clear guides to using bibliometrics (and some of the limitations) are:

a) [The use of bibliometrics to measure research quality in UK higher education](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Documents/2007/Bibliometrics.pdf) institutions a report by Evidence Ltd for UUK (tailored to the UK situation); and

b) [White Paper – Using Bibliometrics](http://wokinfo.com/media/mtrp/UsingBibliometricsinEval_WP.pdf), produced by Thomson Reuters.

This firm is the producer of the most widely used citation database, known also as the [ISI Web of Knowledge](http://apps.webofknowledge.com/UA_GeneralSearch_input.do?product=UA&search_mode=GeneralSearch&SID=X2UzXwVwQC1D7ORn1he&preferencesSaved=) and Web of Science (which includes the [Social Sciences Citation Index](http://ip-science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=SS)). Apart from Web of Knowledge there are two other main sources used for bibliometrics, [SCOPUS](http://www.scopus.com/scopus/home.url) – an Elsevier product, and [Google Scholar](https://scholar.google.co.uk/). All are freely available at the University. Scopus claims a wider coverage than ISI and a more Eurocentric outlook. Google Scholar is in many ways more useful for social science and arts and humanities because it picks up more citations from conference papers, official reports etc but on the other hand it is not drawing upon a peer reviewed database. A useful analytical tool for producing individual profiles from Google Scholar can be freely downloaded. It is called [Harzing’s Publish or Perish](http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm). If using this be sure to uncheck irrelevant references by people with the same name (known to bibliometricians as homonyms!).

## Principal Measures Used and Benchmarks

Many indicators can be derived from bibliometrics but the two most important are:

*Publication count* or total number of publications – this counts the total number of publications in a given list of journals, normally those in the ISI database (which is itself mainly based upon those journals which receive the most citations (high Journal Impact Factor). This is used for the Shanghai rankings. Papers in the Social Science Citation Index receive a double weighting compared to those in the Science Citation Index to reflect that fact that fewer outputs are produced in our subjects.

*Citations per paper* – sometimes described as the ‘crown indicator’, this calculates the average number of citations per paper, or the distribution of these citations, for a given institution, country etc. To allow for the fact that there are very different populations of researchers in different fields, and for the accumulation of citations over time, this is usually normalised by dividing citations per paper by the average impact of all papers in the given field in the year of publication. Normalisation also differentiates by paper *type*, measuring reviews against other reviews and original research articles against their equivalents.

Some RAE/REF panels in the past have used Journal Impact Factors as shorthand for assessing the quality of papers published in those journals. Quoting ISI’s Journal Citation Reports which lists Impact Factors, this is defined as follows:

“The journal Impact Factor is the average number of times articles from the journal published in the past two years have been cited in the JCR year. The Impact Factor is calculated by dividing the number of citations in the JCR year by the total number of articles published in the two previous years. An Impact Factor of 1.0 means that, on average, the articles published one or two year ago have been cited one time. An Impact Factor of 2.5 means that, on average, the articles published one or two year ago have been cited two and a half times. Citing articles may be from the same journal; most citing articles are from different journals.”

In fact an impact factor is a poor tool for analysis of individual papers as a high impact factor may be driven by a few papers attracting a very large number of citations.[[3]](#footnote-3) Conversely 48.0 percent of social sciences articles and 93.1 percent of articles in arts and humanities journals are never cited.[[4]](#footnote-4) On the other hand most highly cited papers (possibly 90%) are published in the top 10% of journals by impact factor.

Inspection of impact factors tells us that the ‘hurdle’ to be in the upper echelons is quite low for most Faculty subjects. Hence, the highest impact factor for a sociology journal is 3.338, rising to 5.113 over 5 years (*American Journal of Sociology*). For business the *Academy of Management Journal* scores 5.017 and 6.029 respectively. The numbers fall away fast – number 10 in Sociology scores 1.577/2.366 respectively.

On the other hand the most highly cited researchers score very highly indeed. Among our iconics we can see for example:

**Nelson RR** and Winter S, In Search of Useful Theory of Innovation *Research Policy* 6:1 1977 pp 36-76 **375 citations on WoS,**

Rothschild M and **Stiglitz JE**, Increasing Risk .1. Definition, Journal *of Economic Theory* 2:3 pp 225-243 1970 **1,109 citations on WoS**

# Improving Citation Performance

Against this background what can be done to improve citation performance? The following is a list of possible actions and comments on these.

**General Actions to Improve Research Performance**

1. **Improve the papers.** This is perhaps a statement of the obvious but must top any list. The actions we have been discussing such as internal peer-mentoring, and the use of promotions and PDRs to encourage researchers to shift the trade-off from quantity to quality are all relevant here. The change in behaviour sought is not drastic[[5]](#footnote-5) but rather saying that 5 good papers is better than 8 less good ones so spend more effort on each.
2. **Be strategic in thinking about readership.** Choice of scope of paper, title, keywords and journal can influence likelihood of citation. For further guidance, see Section 4 above.
3. **Target people likely to cite work**. Many leading academics, especially in the USA, send copies of their publications to leading researchers in their field (for example the people they themselves are citing). This is cheap and easy with the advent of pdfs and since these people are likely to publish in leading journals they may be a future source of citations (as well as potential future referees). A similar argument supports increasing visibility by making presentations at large international conferences and pursuing other networking opportunities. This provides one justification for support of such activities.
4. **Co-author papers, especially with overseas collaborators.** Co-authored papers tend to attract more citations. One explanation is known as the “two home crowds effect”. The size of the crowd may also make a difference –collaboration with the USA may have a greater impact than with other countries. Again this a part of normal career strategy – impressing people sufficiently that they wish to work with you is a basis for co-authorship and those earlier in their careers can gain in visibility and credibility by publishing with a leader in the field. From a career management point of view it is normally advisable to have some single authored outputs to prove independence.

**Specific Actions to Influence Citations**

1. **Ensure that the papers are found**. It is already a mandatory University rule that all publications must have the words ‘University of Manchester’ as a part of the address and we should all make sure that, when our work is published, whether in journal article form, or as a book, this information is incorporated within the relevant ‘author details’ section of the publication. Our bibliometric contractors think we may be losing up to 20% of citations through mis-addressing.
2. **Cite colleagues’ papers**. Self-citations may be discounted in some analyses but we can take advantage of our size here – we are more likely to have people doing related work. While no-one would suggest that we tell people who to cite we could improve the internal visibility of papers to colleagues and make bibliographic details easily available to facilitate citation by colleagues.
3. **PURE: Use the University’s digital repository to make the papers more visible**. We are required to record all publications in PURE (and where permissible to upload them). This helps ensure that those seeking papers on a topic find them in the first place. Open source papers are more highly cited, at least in the short to medium term. <https://pure.manchester.ac.uk>
4. **Open Access**: Publish in Open Access outlets (Research Councils are now beginning to require this for projects that they fund). See relevant section below for access to the university’s guidance on Open Access
5. **Edit journals or special editions –**editors (and sometimes their colleagues) are more highly cited.
6. **Websites and emails:** The more links there are to your journal, from a range of websites, the higher it will appear on search engine results**.** If you have an account on academic networking and sharing sites such as **Academia.edu** and **Mendeley** or a professional network such as **LinkedIn**, do include a link directly to the journals. Use your **email signature** to tell people about the journal, linking to the current table of contents.
7. **Social Media, blogs and discussion lists:** If you have any accounts on Twitter or Facebook use them to share details of your journal’s latest articles and new issue releases. If you have your own blog**,** that can also be a really useful forum for drawing attention to your work.Many disciplines have active listservs(email discussion lists). If you are a member of any check with the list administrators whether you would be permitted to post tables of contents when new issues are published.
8. **Switch efforts from book chapters to journal articles**: Monographs continue to have high status but the situation for chapters in edited collections is less clear, unless the editor and contributors are of a very high standing in the field.

**Afterword**

It is important to keep a sense of perspective. The purposes of publication are to advance knowledge by communicating high quality research to peers and others on the one hand and to achieve social, economic or cultural impacts on the other. Citations are never an end in themselves but a successful citation strategy can help to build both the reputation and the resources to achieve the underlying objectives.

# OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING AND AUTHOR ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPTS (AAMs)

*Depositing Author Accepted Manuscripts with the Library:* ***REF POLICY***

In order to be eligible for the REF, all publications with an ISSN must have their Author’s Accepted Manuscript (AAM) deposited with the library *within three months of acceptance.* This REF 2021 protocol is effective as from from 01.04.16.

Full details on how to deposit AAMs with the library can be found here, along with more general information on Open Access at the University -:

<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/using-the-library/staff/research/services/open-access-at-manchester/>

*General Open Access Information*

Some research funders have revised their policies on OA following the government’s acceptance of the Finch Working Group’s recommendations. Of particular note is the new Research Councils UK (RCUK) OA policy, which requires that all peer-reviewed research papers which acknowledge Research Council funding and are submitted for publication from 1st April 2013 be made OA. [RCUK Open Access Policy](http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/openaccess/)

It is important to note, the scholarly communication landscape will remain complex and changing for the foreseeable future. There are still details to be resolved in connection with the implementation of the RCUK policy at the University. Furthermore HEFCE are still consulting on the adoption of OA requirements for REF exercises post 2014. Some important doubts and qualifications in a debate sponsored by the British Academy: <http://www.britac.ac.uk/openaccess/debatingopenaccess.cfm>

GENERAL OA FACT SHEET

1. The University is committed to ensuring as wide an audience as possible can access and read the outputs of its research and scholarship. The University supports the principles of OA and the efforts of its researchers to disseminate their research findings as widely as possible.
2. The University affirms that its academic researchers retain the freedom of choice to decide the content, form and outlet for publishing their research findings and are best positioned to do this. Furthermore, the University will use the intrinsic merit of the work (exhibited by academic rigour, innovation and level of scholarship) and not the publishing outlet, when making quality judgements.
3. The University attaches equal support to all credible, practical and sustainable means of achieving OA.
4. The University supports Green OA (where the author agrees for a version of the published work to be made freely available via an institutional or discipline-specific repository) and Gold OA (where the publisher makes the published work freely available and may apply an Article Processing Charge (APC) to cover publication costs).
5. Manchester PURE <https://pure.manchester.ac.uk> is the University's institutional repository. It supports all University affiliated researchers and enables them to agree for their published works to be made freely available via the Green OA route.
6. The University will monitor and report the adoption of Green and Gold OA by its researchers. It will work towards applicable targets and report compliance levels in line with funder requirements.
7. Research Councils UK’s (RCUK) new OA policy requires researchers to publish any peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings, which acknowledge Research Council funding, in outlets that comply with the policy. The policy supports both Green and Gold OA routes. RCUK recognises a 5 year transition period to achieve full compliance and expects the University to achieve a minimum of 45% compliance in the first year of operation post 1st April 2013. Compliance targets rise to at least 50% in year 2 and are subject to review subsequently. As long as it complies with the RCUK policy, the choice of the route to OA remains with the researcher and University.
8. The University is in receipt of a block grant to meet the costs of APCs for Gold OA publishing from RCUK and the Wellcome Trust. RCUK funds have been allocated to Faculties according to the proportion of direct staff costs attributed to RCUK funded research. The University will use these funds to support researcher's requests to pay APCs until they are exhausted. Choices to pay APCs exist especially where hybrid journals are the publishing outlet and the payment of an APC is optional. Discussions are on-going in Faculties to agree the best way to facilitate these decisions.
9. The University will pay the publishers’ APCs where block funding is available from a research funder and remains available. The University will pay APCs for both hybrid OA journals (where only some articles are OA and payment of an APC is optional) and full OA journals (where all articles are OA).

Details of the approach by which researchers may request payment of an APC from block funds remain to be worked out and once resolved will be communicated in full. The University Library will manage OA block funds and is working with University research and professional support staff to ensure the request and payment of APCs neither hinders the publishing process nor unduly burdens researchers while being aligned with funder and financial requirements.

1. Academic publishers continue to develop new OA outlets and alternative APC payment options. The Library is investigating publisher-institution APC payment deals which serve to reduce costs and maximise the value of allocated funds. The Library will publicise such deals to researchers where appropriate.
2. The scholarly communication landscape will remain complex and changing for the foreseeable future. There are still details to be resolved in connection with the implementation of the RCUK policy at the University. Furthermore HEFCE are still consulting on the adoption of OA requirements for REF exercises post 2014. The University Library is committed to providing researchers with accurate and up to date information and guidance in this area, both in the form of a dedicated support service and online self-help materials.

**IMPACT BEYOND ACADEMIA**

There are two broad definitions of the term ‘impact’ as it relates to academic research. The first, academic impact, has been discussed above (see p. 20). The second, the impact of research beyond the academic research community – often referred to as societal and economic impact – is covered in this section.

1. **Support structure for impact in SALC**
	1. **Dedicated support posts for impact**

The School’s dedicated support for non-academic impact consists of:

* Associate Director for Research Impact and Knowledge Exchange: **Professor Yaron Matras** (yaron.matras@manchester.ac.uk) – see also role profile on p. 8.
* Knowledge Exchange and Impact Officer, based in the School’s Research Office: **Lucy Stone** (lucy.stone@manchester.ac.uk, tel. 61723, Samuel Alexander Building A22)

The Associate Director and Knowledge Exchange and Impact Officer provide guidance and support in the following main areas:

* Impact planning for external research grant applications (see section 5 below)
* Planning for, and preparation of, impact case studies for the next REF (see section 6 below)
* Funding for impact and knowledge exchange projects, including SALC and external funds (see section 7 below).
	1. **SALC Impact Hubs**

In 2015/16, the School designated four existing clusters of activity and expertise in impact, knowledge exchange and engagement as Impact Hubs. The four Impact Hubs are: The Martin Harris Centre for Music and Drama, Multilingual Manchester, the John Rylands Research Institute and the Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute. Bringing together researchers and specialist support staff, these clusters have a wealth of experience of working with wider audiences and non-academic organisations, as well as extensive networks beyond the School and University. Their research interests and engagement activities span a wide range of disciplines.

The Hubs act as very visible clusters of knowledge exchange and impact in the School. They can facilitate access to existing external networks and audiences for SALC researchers who are seeking to establish or extend the reach of knowledge exchange activities. They can, additionally, offer support with venues, communications and marketing to researchers who wish to hold externally-facing events.

This enhanced support for impact will enable the School and its researchers to: i) develop robust and plausible impact plans for external funding applications, ii) develop strong impact case studies for the next REF and iii) further enhance the School’s significant contribution to social responsibility commitments.

1. **Context**

Societal and economic impact has been the subject of intense debate across the higher education sector and beyond for several years. The idea that academic research should be of interest and relevance for organisations or communities beyond higher education is certainly not new. What is relatively new, however, is the inclusion of non-academic impact as a criterion in the mechanisms that drive the distribution of UK public funds for research.

Since 2009, those seeking funding from the UK Research Councils have been required to include plans for engaging with non-academic audiences during the life of their research project. Although impact is not the primary criterion for the assessment of proposals, applicants are required to submit a considered plan for work in this area. In 2014, meanwhile, the non-academic impact of research conducted across the sector was assessed for the first time as part of the Research Excellence Framework (formerly RAE). The outcomes of the REF are used to inform the allocation of research funding to higher education institutions.

The rationale for the inclusion of societal and economic impact in research funding allocation rests largely on notions of public accountability. RCUK invests approximately £3bn of public funds in research annually. Over the past decade, the sector has come under increased pressure to justify such investment in research by providing more evidence of how it delivers benefits beyond higher education.

The impact agenda, as this broad set of research policy developments became known, has been controversial. Critics argue that the focus on creating and demonstrating non-academic impact from research threatens to disadvantage those disciplines with least scope for application and/or commercialisation, thus limiting and devaluing curiosity-driven research. Those in favour argue that this concern with non-academic impact is critical in raising awareness of the many and varied benefits that academic research brings to society and the economy. In this context, a key audience for the message is government itself.

It is important to note that the University of Manchester has placed research with impact beyond academia at the heart of its *Manchester 2020* strategic plan (<http://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/vision/>). This plan maps out the University’s three key goals: i) world-class research, ii) outstanding learning and student experience and iii) social responsibility. Research with impact – that is, research that makes a difference to communities beyond the University, locally, nationally and globally – is a key priority linking the goals of world-class research and social responsibility.

1. **What is non-academic impact?**

Non-academic impact was once understood in relatively narrow terms, as a direct contribution to UK economic growth (e.g. commercialisation of intellectual property, spin-out companies) or to the development of public policy. As such, it was considered to be an unattainable or irrelevant goal for many researchers in arts and humanities disciplines.

As society faces new challenges as a result of increased migrations and population diversity, however, the study of languages and cultures has a greater role to play in public policy. Moreover, in recent times understanding of the term ‘impact’ has widened to encompass the benefits associated with collaborations and forms of external engagement that are much more familiar to many arts and humanities researchers. In this sense, impact is already central to what many researchers do.

RCUK differentiates between ‘academic’ and ‘economic and societal’ impacts. The latter is defined as ‘**the demonstrable contribution that excellent research makes to society and the economy**’ (<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts/>). Three broad categories of societal and economic impact are identified: i) fostering economic performance in the UK and globally, ii) increasing the effectiveness of public services and policy and iii) enhancing quality of life, health and creative output.

It is recognised that the nature of impact varies within and across disciplines. Funding bodies do not favour one particular type of impact over another. It is also recognised that what constitutes ‘impact’ in any given research field is necessarily an open question; the effects and benefits of a piece or programme of research may be indirect and unforeseen, extending beyond expected audiences and external partners.

Notwithstanding the above, the following list, developed by the REF 2014 panel responsible for assessing impact in the arts and humanities, is a useful indicative set of non-academic impacts arising from research in these fields:

* Generating new ways of thinking that influence creative practice.
* Creating, inspiring and supporting new forms of artistic, literary, linguistic, social, economic, religious, and other expression.
* Contributing to innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products or services.
* Contributing to economic prosperity via the creative sector including publishing, music, theatre, museums and galleries, film and television, fashion, tourism, and computer games.
* Informing or influencing practice or policy as a result of research on the nature and extent of religious, sexual, ethnic or linguistic discrimination.
* Research into the languages and cultures of minority linguistic, ethnic, religious, immigrant, cultures and communities used by government, NGOs, charities or private sector to understand and respond to their needs.
* Helping professionals and organisations adapt to changing cultural values.
* Contributing to continuing personal and professional development.
* Preserving, conserving, and presenting cultural heritage.
* Developing stimuli to tourism and contributing to the quality of the tourist experience.
* Influencing the design and delivery of curriculum and syllabi in schools, other HEIs or other educational institutions […] for example through the widespread use of text books, primary sources or an IT resource in education.
* Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation.
* Contributing to a wider public understanding of basic standards of wellbeing and human rights conceptions.
* Informing or influencing the development of expert systems in areas such as medicine, human resources, accounting, and financial services.
* Influencing the methods, ideas or ethics of any profession.
* Providing expert advice to governments, NGOs, charities and the private sector in the UK and internationally, and thereby influencing policy and/or practice.
* Engaging with and mediating between NGOs and charities in the UK and internationally to influence their activities, for example in relation to health, education and the environment.
* Contributing to widening public access to and participation in the political process.

(REF 2014, *Panel criteria and working methods*, pp. 144-145, <http://www.ref.ac.uk/>)

Non-academic impact is achieved by some form of communication, engagement or collaboration between academic researchers and organisations, communities or individuals beyond academia. RCUK and other funders refer to this diverse set of practices and activities as ‘knowledge exchange’ (KE). The term acknowledges and valorises the two-way flow of ideas between academic researchers and non-academic partners that often characterises such practices and activities.

Knowledge exchange activities may develop from formal or informal networks and partnerships linking academic researchers with non-academic organisations or colleagues in other sectors. They may also take place via funded projects, placements or partnerships such as Impact Acceleration Account projects and Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (see section 7 below).

Public engagement activity is an important pathway to impact beyond academia for many researchers in arts and humanities disciplines. Researchers wishing to engage the public in their research may find it useful to draw upon the many resources available for public engagement (see section 9 below). It should be noted that the term ‘public engagement’, when used in relation to higher education, is sometimes understood as a set of practices and concerns extending beyond research and its impact. Public engagement may be concerned with engaging and involving the public in activities linked to learning and teaching, for example. Where researchers wish to consider public engagement as a way of encouraging or facilitating research impact beyond academia, their activities must clearly draw upon original research.

Finally, it is important to note that when identifying and recording non-academic impact, it is not enough to describe the ways in which research has been disseminated or communicated or the types of knowledge exchange activity that researchers have undertaken. These processes are vital as the mechanisms through which impact is realised. However, they do not constitute impact in and of themselves. Impact relies upon a demonstrable effect, change or benefit beyond academia emerging from these processes.

1. **Who should be thinking about impact?**

As noted, non-academic impact now has an important place in the UK research and funding landscape. Its importance is unlikely to diminish. The University of Manchester’s commitment to research with impact, as part of its goals for world-class research and social responsibility, has also been noted. The recognition afforded to impact at the University is further demonstrated by the fact that impact is now one of the four criteria for promotion of academics (alongside research, teaching, and management and leadership).

Given these considerations, all SALC researchers are encouraged to explore the potential relevance and value of knowledge exchange and impact for their own work. The School recognises that knowledge exchange and impact activities may demand a considerable investment of time from academic staff and it endeavours to provide support and reward as appropriate. The School also recognises that not all research has the same potential for impact and that not all academics will pursue research with impact at every stage of their career.

New academics, in particular, may wish to discuss plans or ideas for knowledge exchange and impact with their Research Coordinator and/or another senior colleague. More senior academics are encouraged to consider working in collaboration with new academics and more junior colleagues in order to share expertise and experience. They may wish to do this by expanding research clusters already engaged in knowledge exchange or engagement activities and/or by considering joint bids for funding (see section 7 below).

1. **Impact planning for external research grant applications**

Not all funders and schemes require applicants to include plans for non-academic impact when seeking funding for research. Please check the guidelines for your chosen funder and scheme and, if in doubt about the requirements, contact the School Research Office for guidance.

As noted above, however, applicants for RCUK (including AHRC and ESRC) awards are required in almost all cases to submit a plan for promoting the impact of their work beyond academia. Impact is also assessed as part of some Horizon 2020 schemes. Elsewhere, the British Academy Mid-Career Fellowship scheme (<http://www.britac.ac.uk/british-academy-mid-career-fellowships>) aims to encourage public understanding and engagement with humanities and social sciences research, as well as to support academics in pursuing excellent research projects.

Researchers who are beginning to plan a grant application with a requirement for non-academic impact are encouraged to contact the Knowledge Exchange and Impact Officer and Associate Director for an early discussion of the project. Assistance with draft impact plans can also be provided at any stage of bid preparation.

* 1. **RCUK**

While the primary criterion for the award of Research Council funding is research excellence, RCUK is committed to encouraging funded researchers to consider the potential for non-academic impact arising from their work. RCUK states that an acceptable Pathways to Impact statement is ‘an essential component of a research proposal and a condition of funding’ (<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts>). It is important, therefore, to include adequate time for impact planning during the bid development process.

Two parts of the RCUK application address the question of non-academic impact: the Impact Summary (up to 4000 characters) and the Pathways to Impact statement (up to 2 sides of A4).

In the *Impact Summary*, applicants are asked to respond to the following questions:

* Who might benefit from this research?
* How might they benefit from this research?

Applicants should identify potential users or beneficiaries of the research beyond academia. They are encouraged to address this question broadly and to include as many groups, individuals, organisations or communities as might reasonably be expected to benefit from the research. Beneficiaries might include: organisations in the public sector, third sector or private sector; cultural organisations; policy-makers; international, national or local government; the wider public.

In answering the second question, applicants may wish to consider: What might users or beneficiaries take or learn from the proposed research? How might the research enhance the work, practices or opportunities of others? How might the training provided to project researchers (e.g. RAs) go on to benefit other sectors? Both direct and indirect benefits should be considered.

In the *Pathways to Impact* statement, applicants should describe what they will do to realise the potential benefits identified in the Impact Summary. The activities described may include events, workshops or seminars to engage groups and individuals beyond academia, as well as plans for communicating with non-academic audiences. The precise nature and scale of the proposed activities will vary according to the project; impact activities should be reasonable and realistic within the context of the project.

RCUK makes the following general statement regarding the recommended characteristics of Pathways to Impact statements:

A clearly thought through and acceptable Pathways to Impact statement should:

* be project-specific and not generalised;
* be flexible and focus on potential outcomes;

Researchers should be encouraged to:

* identify and actively engage relevant users of research and stakeholders at appropriate stages;
* articulate a clear understanding of the context and needs of users and consider ways for the proposed research to meet these needs or impact upon understandings of these needs;
* outline the planning and management of associated activities including timing, personnel, skills, budget, deliverables and feasibility;
* include evidence of any existing engagement with relevant end users.

(<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts>)

Additional tips for writing a strong Impact Summary and Pathways to Impact statement:

* Be specific: identify particular groups, individuals, organisations or communities with whom you would like to engage. Where you are making new contacts, begin this work as early as possible.
* Consider how you might make use of existing networks, communication channels, engagement programmes and resources, both at the University of Manchester and beyond. Sometimes it is more effective to make use of what is already there than to start afresh. For example, by contributing to an existing blog/platform you might reach a much wider and established readership than by starting a new blog attached to a research project.
* Interpret the requirements broadly and creatively. Keep in mind that non-academic impact extends beyond commercial exploitation and public policy.
* Think about how you could establish two-way communication with your non-academic audiences or users, including the public. How might responses to your research from users, beneficiaries or the public feed back into the research process?
* Consider how you will monitor and evaluate your impact activities during the project. Who will be responsible for monitoring and evaluation? What will the mechanisms be for measuring impact? What kind of data will you collect to help demonstrate your impact (e.g. website views, visitor numbers, questionnaires etc.)? Will there be any scope to change direction or adapt your plans if an impact or engagement activity doesn’t work?
* Think about who would be best placed to plan, coordinate and deliver impact activities.
* Consider any training requirements. You may wish to include training for RA(s) or other members of the project team.
* Remember that impact plans need be feasible and appropriate within the research project you are undertaking. Think about what is realistic and deliverable.

It is recognised that in some circumstances applicants will be unable to identify potential beneficiaries or impacts outside academia. In these cases, the Impact Summary and Pathways to Impact statement remain mandatory. An explanation of why it is not possible to identify potential beneficiaries and impacts must be included.

|  |
| --- |
| **Further information*** AHRC impact pages (including links to case studies and evaluation guidance)<http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/research/impact/>
* ESRC Impact Toolkit<http://www.esrc.ac.uk/research/impact-toolkit/>
* University of Manchester guidance on Pathways to Impact and building impact into the research process<http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/services/rbess/impact/pathways-to-impact/>
 |

* 1. **Horizon 2020**

Many calls under the Horizon 2020 programme require consortia to include plans for impact. Impact is assessed alongside ‘excellence’ and the ‘quality and efficiency of the implementation’ of such bids.

Impact planning for Horizon 2020 differs from the process for RCUK grants insofar as funding calls may define the desired impact(s) in advance in the relevant work programme. While RCUK applicants are asked to explore potential impacts and plan activities that will help to realise them, applicants to such calls under Horizon 2020 must describe how their proposed project would contribute to the expected impacts as already defined in the call for proposals.

The content of impact plans for Horizon 2020 varies according to the bid. Applicants seeking advice on a bid should contact the Knowledge Exchange and Impact Officer as early as possible in the preparation process.

|  |
| --- |
| **Further information** * University of Manchester guidance note on impact in Horizon 2020 – available via <http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/services/rbess/impact/>
 |

1. **REF impact**
	1. **Overview**

In 2014, non-academic impact was assessed in the REF for the first time. Impact made up 20% of each unit’s overall quality profile. Each submitting unit produced a number of impact case studies to demonstrate how research in the unit had led to impact(s) beyond academia and a statement (impact template) describing the unit’s approach to enabling impact and its future strategy. The REF assessed impact case studies according to two criteria: reach (the breadth or spread of the impact) and significance (the intensity of the impact). Impact will be assessed again in REF 2021 (see section 6 c below).

* 1. **REF 2014 results and analysis**

REF 2014 generated nearly 7,000 impact case studies from higher education institutions across the UK. Most of these documents are publicly available via an online database (<http://impact.ref.ac.uk/CaseStudies/>).

SALC made submissions to 9 Units of Assessment: Archaeology, Modern Languages and Linguistics, English Language and Literature, History, Classics, Theology and Religious Studies, Art and Design, Music and Drama. In total, 28 impact case studies were submitted. The School’s results were very strong in this area, with 91% of the impact submitted in the impact templates and case studies judged to be 4\* (outstanding) or 3\* (very considerable).

The School’s own analysis of the REF 2014 impact results in arts and humanities disciplines, at Manchester and beyond, has highlighted a number of general issues and recommendations to inform future practice:

* The best and most persuasive case studies were often based on research in which engagement with constituencies outside the research community played an integral part from the beginning. Building external engagement into research projects from the earliest stages is likely to lead to greater impact.
* Established, sustainable partnerships and networks involving academics and non-academics are crucial. Such partnerships and networks may start small and grow over time. They should be valuable and relevant for academic and non-academic partners alike.
* Where case studies documented public engagement with research (e.g. via exhibitions or performances), it was useful to include clear and specific details about public responses. In some submissions, case studies devoted space to anonymised individual responses. Researchers working on future impact case studies should consider how best to go about collecting evidence of public responses to their research.
* More generally, attention needs to be paid to the quantity and quality of evidence collected to support claims of impact. Evidence should also be collected throughout the research project and/or knowledge exchange programme rather than solely retrospectively.
* Some subject areas observed that the strongest case studies tended to be based on the work of a research group or cluster rather than on the work of an individual. The shared resources (intellectual, time, networks) allowed for the creation of richer narratives. Elsewhere, examples of strong impact case studies based largely on the work of one researcher were identified. The most effective approach is therefore likely to depend on disciplinary and local contexts.
* The strongest impact strategy statements made a convincing argument that impact was embedded and fully supported in the unit/department’s research culture. Impact case studies were, then, examples of projects that had flourished in this environment rather than serving as standalone pieces of work.
* External grant funding can be extremely beneficial for impact. It provides researchers with the necessary time and resources to plan and engage in effective knowledge exchange activities.
	1. **The next REF**

In July 2016, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy published an [independent review of the REF](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/research-excellence-framework-review). The review, led by Lord Stern, examined the benefits and problems of the REF in its recent form and made a series of recommendations for future REF exercises. In relation to impact, the Stern review noted a number of problems associated with the process for impact assessment in the 2014 exercise. The review was, however, very supportive of the principle of assessing impact in the REF and regarded its inclusion as ‘one of the success stories of REF2014’ (p. 21).

The next REF will take place in 2021. In 2016/17, the four UK HE funding bodies undertook a consultation on the arrangements for REF 2021. Initial decisions were published in September 2017. The funding bodies propose to maintain consistency with the process for assessing impact in 2014 in many areas. There are also some plans for change, including an increase in the weighting of impact to 25% in REF 2021.

Given the long development period for impact, SALC has already begun its preparations for the next REF. The Associate Director for Research Impact and Knowledge Exchange and the Knowledge Exchange and Impact Officer are working with research coordinators across the School to identify likely future impact case studies. Researchers who go on to lead impact case studies for the next REF will receive support and advice with drafting case studies and gathering evidence.

As noted above, analysis of the last REF has indicated that it is important to gather robust and detailed evidence for impact claims. Researchers involved in impact and knowledge exchange activities, and particularly those likely to be involved in a case study for the next REF, are encouraged: i) to consider now how they might best evidence future impact claims and ii) to collect relevant evidence and indicators of impact throughout their projects and activities rather than seeking to do so only retrospectively. Pure, the University’s research information system, can be used for recording knowledge exchange and engagement activities, as well as for storing evidence to support developing impact case studies.

|  |
| --- |
| **Further information** * Information about REF 2021, including consultation and initial decisions on REF policy <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/ref2021/>
* REF 2014 website (includes submissions and results) <http://www.ref.ac.uk/>
* SALC impact case studies <http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/research/impact/>
* Pure guidance and training <http://staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/pure/>

*See also the resources listed in section 9 below.* |

1. **Funding for impact**

There are now a number of funding streams at School, Faculty and institutional level for knowledge exchange and research impact. Broadly, these schemes aim to:

* Support researchers wishing to engage with organisations or constituencies beyond the University, in order to meet strategic objectives for research and social responsibility;
* Nurture partnerships and projects with likely impact beyond academia in order to ensure that the University is prepared for future REF exercises.

Externally, the AHRC Follow-On Funding scheme (see 7 d) offers funded researchers the opportunity to undertake additional knowledge exchange and impact activities.

Researchers who are interested in one or more of the funding opportunities outlined below are encouraged to contact the Knowledge Exchange and Impact Officer for further guidance. Support for applications is available.

* 1. **SALC Impact Support Fund**

As part of the School’s commitment to maximising the impact of its research beyond the academy, the SALC Research Committee created a dedicated Impact Support Fund in 2015. The Fund supports engagement, collaboration, partnership building and knowledge exchange activities that bring together SALC researchers and non-academic partners and audiences.

The 2017/18 Impact Support Fund will have a particular focus on providing support for the development of impact case studies for REF 2021. The call is open to all SALC researchers but priority will be given to those who are leading or participating in activities that are contributing to a planned impact case study for the next REF. A total of £10,000 is available for the call. The maximum award will be £1,500.

For further details, please contact lucy.stone@manchester.ac.uk. The closing date for applications is **29 September 2017**.

* 1. **Humanities Strategic Investment Fund (H-SIF)**

Funding for impact is offered via the Faculty’s H-SIF call, under the ‘Creating impact from excellent research’ category (see the [HumNet H-SIF page](http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/humnet/our-services/faculty-research-office/research-funding-opportunities/internal-opportunities/hsif/)). Please contact the School Research Office or lucy.stone@manchester.ac.uk to enquire about upcoming calls.

* 1. **ESRC Impact Acceleration Account (IAA)**

The ESRC has awarded the University of Manchester over £1m (2014-2019) to fund knowledge exchange activities through the Impact Acceleration Account.

The aims of the IAA are to:

* Increase knowledge exchange through staff exchanges/placements between the University and external user organisations;
* Align external partners and academics strategically to extend collaboration, shape the research agenda, and influence policy and practice through relationship building;
* Provide flexible and innovative opportunities for researchers to translate research into practice;
* Provide training, workshops and tools development to extend the University’s culture of engagement into new and innovative areas.

Schemes are available for staff exchanges/placements, relationship building, research into practice projects and short rapid-response projects. IAA proposals must be submitted with the support of one or more external partners. It is expected that external partners will demonstrate strong commitment to the project.

Applicants do not need to hold/have held ESRC funding in order to apply for an IAA award. However, IAA proposals must have a clear basis in completed/current research within the ESRC remit. See <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/funding-and-guidance/applicants/suitable-research.aspx> for ESRC disciplines and joint AHRC and ESRC subject coverage. Interdisciplinary projects are eligible but such projects must have a major social science component.

The ESRC IAA is open for applications in 2017/18. Please contact the SALC Research Office or lucy.stone@manchester.ac.uk for details.

|  |
| --- |
| **Further Information** Overview of the ESRC IAA, including case studies and a scheme leaflet <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/collaborate/business-engagement/knowledge-exchange/collaboration-funding/esrc/> |

* 1. **AHRC Follow-On Funding for Impact and Engagement (FoF)**

This scheme is open to researchers who hold, or who have previously held, AHRC funding. It offers researchers the opportunity to undertake engagement activities with non-academic audiences and users, based on their funded research.

The scheme aims to:

* Allow researchers to explore unforeseen pathways to impact during a funded project or following completion of the project;
* Enhance the benefits of AHRC-funded research beyond academia;
* Encourage and facilitate interactions between arts and humanities research and external user communities.

Non-academic audiences and user communities include, but are not limited to: business; third sector organisations; the heritage sector; public policy audiences; public audiences.

Suitable areas of activity include, but are not limited to: public engagement; active dissemination of research to new audiences; commercialisation.

Please note that the scheme does not support the continuation of research activity.

The scheme offers up to £100,000 for projects lasting a maximum of 12 months. Researchers may also apply for smaller awards of up to £30,000 for shorter or higher risk activities (e.g. exploring new partnerships for knowledge exchange or testing the feasibility of an idea).

|  |
| --- |
| **Further information** * AHRC – overview of FoF scheme<http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/funding/opportunities/current/followonfunding/>
* AHRC funding guide – detailed information about eligibility and applications<http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/funding/research/researchfundingguide/followonfundingscheme/>
 |

* 1. **Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTPs)**

The Knowledge Transfer Partnerships scheme is a UK-wide programme that promotes the transfer of knowledge, research insights and skills from HEIs/research organisations to businesses and other organisations outside academia. The scheme is coordinated and funded primarily by Innovate UK, the UK’s innovation agency, but involves participation from 12 other funding organisations, including the AHRC and ESRC.

A KTP is a three-way partnership. It involves an academic, a business partner (a private sector, public sector or third sector organisation) and a project associate, who is usually a recent graduate or postgraduate. The associate is employed by the HEI but based at the business, where s/he works on the KTP project and receives supervision from both the business and the academic.

KTPs offer benefits for all three partners:

* For the associate, a KTP provides an excellent training and career development opportunity.
* For the business partner, there are likely benefits around the enhancement of staff skills, problem-solving or increased creativity within the organisation and, depending on the nature of the KTP, increased profits and/or job creation.
* For the academic, the partnership may enhance current research or open up new research questions or collaborations and/or lead to significant impact beyond academia.

Funding arrangements may vary according to the project and business partner. Typically, Innovate UK would fund around two thirds of a project where the project involved a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME), with the business partner meeting the remaining third. In the case of a project involving a large company, the costs would typically be divided equally between Innovate UK and the company. Where a project is closely aligned with the research interests of a Research Council, the Research Council may also contribute to the project funding.

The University of Manchester Knowledge Exchange Team (part of the University’s Business Engagement service) provides full and dedicated support for KTP applications.

There are regular deadlines for submission. Success rates are high: currently more than 80% of applications nationally are successful.

|  |
| --- |
| **Further information** * Innovate UK - KTPs<http://ktp.innovateuk.org/>
* AHRC – support for KTPs, including criteria<http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/innovation/knowledgeexchange/ktp/>
* Support for KTPs at the University of Manchester – Knowledge Exchange Team<http://www.manchester.ac.uk/collaborate/business-engagement/knowledge-exchange/transfer-partnerships/>
 |

* 1. **Simon Industrial and Professional Fellowships**

Simon Industrial and Professional Fellowships offer opportunities for individuals who are employed outside the University of Manchester, or who are self-employed, to undertake a fixed-term placement within the University. Fellowships will usually be tenable for a period of 4-12 weeks.

SALC researchers/groups seeking to work in association with a colleague from an external organisation for a short period (e.g. for capacity building, business engagement or knowledge exchange) may wish to consider this scheme.

|  |
| --- |
| **Further information** <http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/research/simonhallsworth/about/industrial/> |

1. **Tips for impact, engagement and knowledge exchange**

The following tips have been gathered from academics with experience of knowledge exchange, working with external partners and producing impact case studies:

* Think carefully about language when communicating with non-academic audiences and partners.
* Flexibility and speed are often needed. Many organisations work more quickly than universities – don’t expect external partners to work to your timetable.
* Researchers must be prepared for the decontextualisation of their research when findings are taken up and used in other sectors. Sometimes findings are interpreted in unwelcome or hostile ways.
* Think carefully about getting involved in impact and engagement activity. It is rewarding but also time-consuming.
* Contributing to policymaking is often about helping with crisis management; success in influencing policy is often based on being able to offer the ‘right’ findings at a crucial moment.
* Be aware that organisational cultures vary. The priorities of external partners may, on occasion, come into conflict with principles of academic freedom.
* Even when research does influence policy, there is no guarantee that the policy itself will be successful; there is often no simple success story.
* There is no uniform strategy for engaging with cultural organisations; there are always different needs to negotiate on both sides.
* Researchers should ensure that they are able to give something to the partnership as well as to gain from it in their work. Relationships need to be mutually useful.
* Be sensitive to the professional, political and financial circumstances of partner organisations.
* Involve partner organisations from the outset; understand what partners want.
* Researchers should work to identify the right colleagues in partner organisations, both to initiate and sustain the project and to make sure that all the correct approvals and authorisations are in place.
* Ideally, academic/non-academic partnerships should not stop when there is a public output or impact created; engagement and impact should feed back into research.
* Don’t see impact as a distraction from research, but as a way of enhancing research.
* Start small, but be ambitious: good projects and case studies often involve sustained collaboration with a range of partners and stem from a broad research base. Be aware that it will take time to build up these networks.
* Impact is a long-term game, but researchers need to be willing to capitalise on opportunities when they arise.
* Collaborate with academic colleagues on impact projects; help train more junior colleagues; seek out training if you need it.
* Work out what change is realistic and what would count as evidence to demonstrate your contribution.
* Make the narrative connection between your original research and the impact; keep refining the story; be able to answer the “so what?” and “why does it matter?” questions.
* Think about how to use social media effectively.
* Consider how to record your activities and how to measure the impact of your work. Discuss evaluation and impact with external partner organisations: what kinds of data do your partner organisations already capture? What plans do you need to put in place in order to capture new data?
1. **Resources and further information**

	1. **Resources for impact - University of Manchester**
* University of Manchester StaffNet portal for research impact
<http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/services/rbess/impact/>
* University of Manchester, *Research impact: top tips for involving stakeholders in research* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5IVN8xnc91g&feature=youtu.be>
* University of Manchester, *Research impact: top tips for communicating and pitching research to non-academic audiences*
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0kSVoNRIgj0>
	1. **Contacts, services and initiatives - University of Manchester**
* Public and Community Engagement at Manchester – blog and resources, including guidance for evaluating public engagement activities
<http://www.engagement.manchester.ac.uk/index.html>
* Faculty of Humanities Business Engagement Support Team: provides assistance in linking researchers and their ideas with external organisations. ‘Business’ refers to engagement with the private, public and third sectors.
<http://www.manchester.ac.uk/collaborate/business-engagement/>
* Policy@Manchester: an initiative created to showcase the contribution of University of Manchester researchers to public policy development. Resources and blog platform.
<http://www.policy.manchester.ac.uk/about/>
* UMIP: Intellectual Property and commercialisation services
<http://umip.com/>
	1. **Other resources – external**
* AHRC, *Partnership Working in the Arts and Humanities: A Guide to Good Practice*
<http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/research/readwatchlisten/filmsandpodcasts/partnershipworkinginartshumanities/>
* National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement – guidance and resources
<http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk>
* Fast Track Impact – resources and practice guides
<http://www.fasttrackimpact.com/>
	1. **Resources for impact case study development**
* **REF 2014 Impact Case Study Database**: <http://impact.ref.ac.uk/CaseStudies/>
Impact case studies submitted to the last REF. Search by key word, impact type, discipline etc.
* **Engagement@Manchester** recorded discussions and associated resources: <http://www.engagement.manchester.ac.uk/resources/engagement/past_events.html>

In particular, see:

* REF PE impact lessons / ‘Public engagement can lead to impact’ - Analysis of public engagement in REF 2014 and ideas for developing a strong case study (25 January 2017)
* ‘Evidencing Public Engagement Impact’ - Contributions from researchers who submitted public engagement impacts to the last REF (21 October 2015)
* **National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement,** ***Engaging publics with research: Reviewing REF impact case studies and templates***
<https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/news/role-public-engagement-ref>
Asks ‘What does an excellent case study featuring public engagement look like?’, with response based on analysis of the 2014 submissions. Also explores three public engagement ‘storylines’ (enlightenment and empathy; social innovation; social action) that often structure accounts of research, engagement and resulting impact in REF case studies.
* **Fast Track Impact**, **‘How to write a winning research impact case study’:** <http://www.fasttrackimpact.com/single-post/2015/10/16/How-to-write-a-winning-research-impact-case-study>
Blog post from Professor Mark Reed (16 October 2015)
* **Hefce, Vertigo Ventures & Digital Science, *Collecting Research Impact Evidence: Best Practice Guidance for the Research Community***<http://www.vertigoventures.com/research-impact-evidence>
Reviews evidence submitted to the last REF, with advice on best practice.
* **Public Engagement at Manchester** – **collection of guides and toolkits, including evaluation techniques:** <http://www.engagement.manchester.ac.uk/resources/guides_toolkits/>
* **Public Engagement at Manchester – training**:
* Beginner’s Guide to Evaluating Public Engagement
* Masterclass in Evaluating Public Engagement

Check Training Catalogue at <http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/staff-learning-and-development/> for 2017/18 course dates and booking.

**APPLYING FOR EXTERNAL FUNDING FOR RESEARCH**

The following information and advice is adapted from presentations given at a number of SALC grant-bidding workshops (we run these on a regular basis) and is not intended to be comprehensive.

WHY RESEARCH GRANTS?

## Of benefit to school/department

### Fully Economic Costed (FEC) grants bring significant income; the funding we receive from REF (and before that, RAE), covers well under half of the 40% of our time we allot to research over a year

### They bring prestige (REF submissions greatly enhanced; research income is one of the key metrics for REF)

## Of benefit to team

### They generate critical mass

### They fund equipment and other resources

### They inject new blood and revitalise the research culture

## Of benefit to individual researcher

### They provide support for project (a postdoctoral researcher brings one whole extra body)

### They stimulate new ideas through collaboration

### They free up time; you can distribute research time costed into a grant unevenly over the funding period, building in 100% leave elements

### They greatly enhance your career progression (as part of rolling programme)

# GENERAL TYPES OF RESEARCH GRANT

## Individual Research Fellowships –vs- Team-based Research Projects (Team can mean Principal Investigator (PI)+ Co-investigator(s) (Co-I), or PI + Co-I + Postdoctoral Research Assistant(s) (PDRA)

## Large –vs- Small grants (schemes available cover projects costing from as little as 3-4K, to as much as 5 million; obviously, as a general rule, the more expensive the more competitive)

## Response mode –vs- Programme/Thematic (most big research councils have both a response mode scheme in which we request funding for projects dealing with topic generated by us, and various thematic schemes in which applications are solicited to address themes considered important by the councils and by their government funders)

## FEC –vs- Non FEC (Most research council grants are now costed to take account of all expenses, including those involved in the time spent on the project by the PIs and the Co-Is and all the infrastructure costs associated with running a grant. However, the research councils often fund only 80% of these costs, not 100%. Some grant schemes, for example, those of the Leverhulme Trust, do not involve full economic costing and will fund only replacement posts for the PI and any direct costs, such as travel)

# AHRC

The AHRC (Arts and Humanities Research Council) is the main external funder of research in our school: <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/funding/>

## AHRC Schemes

### Research Grants – standard route: for projects with fEC between £50,000 and £1,000,000 for up to 60 months. (The budgets can be constructed to include built-in research leave semesters)

### Research Grants – route for early career researchers: for projects with fEC between £50,000 and £250,000 up to 60 months. Aims the same as for standard route, but PIs must meet additional eligibility criteria (either within 8 years from PhD or within 6 from first academic appt.). The success rates are higher for these.

### Follow-On Funding - route for researchers seeking to enhance the non-academic impact of previously completed (or ongoing) research funded by the AHRC. Funds of up to 100K are available to support impact activities.

### Knowledge Transfer Schemes – support collaborative activities between academic and non-academic partners; under-subscribed; could dramatically improve REF performance under ‘impact’:

#### ‘The AHRC aims to create opportunities and incentives that increase the flow, value and impact of world class arts and humanities research from academia to wider non-academic, public and private sectors, and to embed a culture of KT across all its programmes’

* Leadership Fellows Scheme - provides funding for researchers seeking to devote between 50% and 100% of their time to undertake research over periods of 6 to 18 months via the standard route, or 6 to 24 months via the early career route. Funding of £50,000 to £250,000 (100% FEC) can be requested for both standard and early career applications. These fellowships have a strong emphasis on strengthening leadership capacity and capability and are intended to support projects of research and leadership which cannot effectively be supported through routine provision of sabbatical or other forms of research leave commonly funded through QR.
* Research Networking scheme - designed to enable the development of ideas by researchers across disciplines, by establishing new research networks or running workshops, seminars or similar events.
* Strategic Initiatives which address issues of intellectual and wider cultural, social or economic urgency that the Council considers are best supported by concentrated and coherent cross-disciplinary collaborations (‘Translating Cultures’, ‘Science in Culture’ and ‘Digital Transformations’ are current AHRC highlight themes; ‘Connecting Communities’ and ‘Global Uncertainties’ are run jointly with ESRC). They are deliberately framed in the broadest, most inclusive fashion to maximise their reach to the A&H research community. The sums of money available are often much larger than for the other schemes

# AHRC - Remit

### ‘No precise definition of the subject domain of the arts and humanities is possible. There are inevitably overlaps and border territories that are shared with other award-making bodies … Disciplines and areas of study are continually evolving … It is not possible to define what falls within the arts and humanities by reference to the methodologies used or by reference to the subject matter …the Board takes into account whether the research questions, the wider context in which those questions are located, as well as the methodologies, can most plausibly be considered as falling within the arts and humanities … In areas such as cultural and communication studies …the stance is that if the focus is on artistic or creative practices, history, languages, literatures, or on the study of texts or images, then it falls within the arts and humanities’

### A joint statement by AHRC and ESRC on interfaces between social sciences and humanities is available on AHRC website

### The AHRC definition of research stresses research processes rather than outcomes

### ESRC

# The ESRC funds research in the social sciences. Like the AHRC, it has a range of schemes, including both response mode and thematic. SALC researchers in disciplines like History, Linguistics, Media Studies and Area Studies have been successful in applying to ESRC schemes.

## ESRC Remit (taken from the website): <http://www.esrc.ac.uk>

### Anthropology. ESRC is the primary funding body for anthropology. There are overlaps with the AHRC in areas of study relating, for example, to creative and performing arts, history, languages, law, literature, and religious studies.

### Area Studies. The AHRC and the ESRC share responsibilities for work that may come under the designation of area studies. Which of the two bodies is the more appropriate depends on whether the research questions or problems to be addressed, the wider context in which those questions or problems are located, as well as the methodologies to be adopted, can most plausibly be located in the arts and humanities on the one hand, or the social sciences on the other.

### Communications, Cultural and Media Studies. As with area studies, which of the two bodies is the more appropriate depends on whether the research questions or problems to be addressed, the wider context in which those questions or problems are located, as well as the methodologies to be adopted, can most plausibly be located in the arts and humanities on the one hand, or the social sciences on the other.

### Librarianship and Information Science. The AHRC shares with the ESRC responsibility for research in information studies. The AHRC supports studies concerned with the practice and techniques of information and knowledge management as they relate to librarianship, archives and records management, information science and information systems, storage and retrieval as well as research into information use and users in specific organisational environments. The ESRC has an interest in the broader socio-economic context of information use and policy, information flows within and between organisations, and the shaping, use and potential of information and communication technologies. The ESRC also supports research on knowledge management and on forms and structures of knowledge.

### Linguistics. The AHRC shares with the ESRC responsibility for the support of research in linguistics. The AHRC focuses on support where research questions bear on the structure, history, theory, description and application of language and languages. The ESRC focuses on support for areas of applied linguistics, computational linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and interdisciplinary social science research involving linguistics.

### LEVERHULME TRUST

### The Leverhulme Trust is an independent charity which supports research in the UK.

# Full details of its schemes are available at its web site: [www.leverhulme.ac.uk](http://www.leverhulme.ac.uk) The Leverhulme Trust schemes cover a broad spectrum of disciplines (including Arts and Humanities) and operates mainly in response mode. It offers support for research projects (allowing for the hiring of PDRAs) and research fellowships (for early career and advanced researchers), but its grants are not subject to fEC.

# BRITISH ACADEMY

## The British Academy has a range of schemes for which arts and humanities researchers are eligible: <http://www.britac.ac.uk>

* British Academy Mid-career Fellowships – Provides funds to dedicate time to a project and to develop a distinct research profile for those within 15 years of the award of their Doctorate.
* BA/Leverhulme Small Research Grants – ideal for summer fieldtrips/archive visits, perhaps to act as preparation for a larger bid (max. £10,000)
* Postdoctoral Fellowships – a scheme for early career-career researchers offering three years of dedicated funding enabling ECRs to complete a substantive project
* Skills Acquisition Awards – for ECRs to work with a mentor at a major research centre to acquire specialist skills
* BA/Wolfson Professorships – a prestigious fellowship for senior scholars in any field

The BA also offers a range of schemes to enhance the international mobility of scholars.

HORIZON 2020

This is the EU’s new framework research programme (replacing Framework 7). It allows for large, collaborative bidding for projects carried out in consortia of universities across Europe. Regular calls for applications have made beginning since December 2013 under three pillars: Excellent Science, Industrial Leadership and Societal Challenges. The last of these includes two themes - Societies and Securities -which allow for Arts and Humanities-led projects designed to address issues such as Heritage and European Values and Identities. Arts and Humanities contributions are encouraged to projects addressing themes under the other pillars, too, however. It is vital to be part of a network of collaborators from institutions in other European nations as a precursor to making a bid.

In addition, Horizon 2020 is an umbrella for schemes run by the European Research Council (ERC). Whilst allowing for large sums of money to be applied for, these tend to be geared more towards the individual researcher and place less emphasis on meeting societal challenges (research excellence is their primary criterion). They include:

- Starter Grants

- Consolidator Grants

- Synergy Grants

- Proof of Concept Grants

For an introduction to and overview of Horizon 2020, see <http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm>

# APPLYING FOR GRANTS: SOME GENERAL TIPS

Examples of successful grant applications across most competitions can be downloaded from a SALC website:

<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/staffintranet/research/successful-research-grants/>

## Check terms of scheme and eligibility rules carefully. Think carefully and creatively about definition and scope of themed initiatives

### What you want to do may fit more easily within the framework of these initiatives than you think

### Talk through your ideas

## Time is of essence

### Allow up to a year of planning in two phases: expansion (ideas, drafts) and refinement (self as critical referee)

### You should expect to go through at least 5 drafts

### IT teams will require good period of notice (NB: Technical Appendices need to be completed for AHRC applications)

## Also timing

### Ensure that project comes at right time in your research ‘cycle’

### Ideally, make it part of a programme for the future which will generate further proposals

## Lay the ground

### Pump-priming schemes

### Build in impact strategy from very beginning; check definition of impact

### Demonstrate institutional support (e.g. training programme)

## Quality of research remains the overriding criterion on which proposals judged

## assessment panels consist of people like us, not AHRC officials

## More attention paid to track records now

## Collaboration and interdisciplinarity more than just ‘buzz words’; adding value (more than sum of parts); challenging paradigms

## Use seminar series; away days; group brainstorming sessions as seedbeds for ideas

## Begin with side of A4 with notes under headings (WHAT, WHY, HOW, WHO)

## Allot regular timeslot each week to work on developing proposal

## Use suggested AHRC subheadings in Case for Support to guide planning: Objectives, RQs, Context, Theory, Methods, (intellectual) Outcomes (not same as physical Outputs); Dissemination (including Outputs)

* Digitisation projects (electronic critical editions; databases) also allowable under some schemes

## Costing, Peer Review and institutional signatures

### Research Office will do the costing, but you need to allow time for this, and for peer review (at least 4 weeks)

### HoS and others may also needs to sign off

## Do homework on budget

### Make sure you cover all costs you will need to carry out research

### Be realistic about the FEC-funded time you will require; doesn’t have to be equal throughout the project lifetime

### You must justify all costs in ‘Justification of Resources’ statement

### RSM will rely on you to indicate what you need support for and why

## If collaboration envisaged, allow for practical problems

### How will relations/communication between different universities be coordinated?

### Where will RA be based?

### Check on long-term availability of all named researchers

## Plan carefully for role of PDRA (who will account for major part of budget)

### Why do you need a PDRA? How does the project gain from his/her participation?

### Explain how s/he will be inducted into the project and how his/her contributions will develop during the course of the award period

## Critical readers

### Make use of mentor at every stage; allow time to incorporate suggestions from peer reviewers

### Take seriously any internal peer review process

### Get as many different readers as you can find

## Contingency plans for ‘failure’

### What will you do if your application is unsuccessful?

# Attributes of a Good Application

## Graphically pleasing

## Spell-checked

## Up-to-date references

## Careful citations

## Ambitious and exciting, but realistic

## Clear, detailed timetable and list of milestones

## Clear Formulation (Context, Goals, RQs, Theory+Method, Outcomes, Dissemination; Project Management); weight each section appropriately (context should not dominate the Case for Support)

## Make sure you link each section; show clearly how the methods chosen will enable you to answer questions posed; key outcomes to objectives

## Robust (flexible)

## Comprehensible to academics in other fields

## Grounded in existing research (value of prior, pump-priming funding)

## Coherent research group

## Role of participants is clear

## Clear career pathway for PDRA

## Value for Money: Contribution to field must be substantial and you should highlight ‘value added’ benefit of collaborations

## Convincing Impact Strategy (Academic and User)

## Credible Pathways to Impact Plan

## Clear distinction between significance to scholarly field and impact on research users

## AHRC now tend to use ‘impact’ less and ‘public benefit’ more

## Not every proposal has to have impact; no penalty for ‘blue-skies’ research without it, but expectation that those that have impact potential exploit it

## ‘Pathways’ term recognises that precise impact can’t be predicted; emphasis on process and strategy

## New section on previous experience of impact activities

## Establish links with potential users; secure prior expressions of interest; be as precise and concrete as possible; avoid bold unsubstantiated assertions

## One’s own students cannot count as ‘research users’; teaching materials for more general use can.

Help with writing grant applications may be available from one of the School’s 2 Grant Writers. Please contact the Research Director as: roy.gibson@manchester.ac.uk

# SCHOOL PROCEDURES FOR GRANT APPLICATIONS: PROCEDURES (INCLUDING PEER REVIEW):

1. We are expected by the Research Councils, and required by Faculty, to have a formal and robust **peer review process** in place for any external funding applications that we submit worth **over £100K**. This is in order to ensure that the funding bodies are not burdened with processing large numbers of premature or low-quality applications. A more informal peer review process is available for bids under £100K. In both cases, from the individual applicant’s viewpoint, peer review is the very best way of improving the quality of the proposal. From the School’s and Faculty’s perspective, it is the most important tool with which to maximise success rates, and thus our external research income.
2. The School has a formally constituted Peer Review College to review bids of £100K and over. For bids under £100K, all members of the School are requested and required to act as peer reviewers, if asked: reading and evaluating other people’s grant applications is one of the best ways of improving one’s own future applications.
3. As soon as any colleague has a firm idea about a research grant application of whatever size or nature s/he should inform the divisional research coordinator who will be able to give preliminary guidance and advice (for those divisions which are maintaining full departmental structures, it is the departmental research coordinator who will perform this role). Work on the best large grant applications normally starts 6 months or more prior to the point of submission. In bids of **over £100K**, colleagues will be assigned a peer mentor via their research co-ordinator and the School Research Office. Such bids may also be able to benefit from the input of the School Grant Writer: research coordinators will advise on this possibility after contacting the Research Director.
4. Once the research coordinator and the individual have agreed on the timing of the submission, the Head of Division should be consulted on the feasibility of an application at this stage from the divisional point of view.
5. When the Head of Division has approved the intention to apply, the School Research Office should be notified, with a clear indication of the scheme deadline where applicable (the Research Office will need **at least 4 weeks**’ notice for applications under £100k and a much longer time period for applications over £100k in order to cost the project budget, arrange for sign-offs, and ensure all internal and external procedures are followed – this can vary from 5 weeks to 3 months’ notice). Please check with the Research Office on specific timeframes to turnaround applications over £100k.
6. When a completed draft application (all components, including Je-S form, budget, Justification of Resources, Pathways to Impact, other attachments) is ready, the Research Coordinator should be contacted. S/he will arrange via the Research Office for formal peer review of **bids over £100K** by a member of the School Peer Review College. In **bids under £100K**, the research co-ordinator will arrange for informal peer review. This will often be undertaken by someone from within the same division, but if the Research Coordinator feels that the relevant expertise lies outside his/her division, then s/he is encouraged to select the most appropriate peer reviewer from within the School. The Research Coordinator may choose to do this informal peer review him/herself and will, in any event, look through all applications.
7. Ample time must be given to the research coordinator and College peer review / School peer reviewer to process the application (the Research Office will not be able to organise peer review of draft applications submitted fewer than 14 days before a scheme deadline). Out of respect for the Research Coordinator, the Research Office, and the peer reviewers, and in the interests of the applicant, this principle must be observed. Applying for grants needs careful planning, well ahead of time. *Technical expertise provided by the IT team will need several weeks of advance notice.*
8. A standard school template will be used for all peer reviews undertaken by the School Peer Review College. All peer reviewers, College or School, must be given ample time to produce their reviews (at least one week).
9. College Peer Reviews will be returned to the School Research Office and School Research Director, together with a clear indication of whether the application is (a) ready to be submitted, (b) in need of further work, or (c) premature. The Research Director or Research Coordinator will feed back comments to the applicant as appropriate.
10. If the draft application for a bid of under 100K is deemed to require further work, the Research Coordinator can use his/her discretion as to whether more peer review is required when the second draft is complete, but s/he will still need to write to the Research Office to confirm that the application is now ready for submission.
11. The School Research Director will read and comment on all grant applications of over £1 million, supported by a convened panel or peer reviewers.
12. Peer review for large grant schemes may well be organised at the Faculty level, and according to Faculty deadlines and procedures.

**POLICY ON RESEARCH GRANT ‘BUY-OUT’**

**Research buy-outs policy: applicable to all FeC grants starting after 1 August 2014**

Buy-outs funded by research council (including EU) FeC grants in which core staff time costs are included in the budget as ‘Directly Allocated’ (DA) are managed by the school in a way which balances the needs of subject areas to buy in replacement teaching and the costs to the School of running grants.

**Key buy-out principles**:

1. The Head of School **must** approve all buy-outs, and is able to either withhold buy-out funding where it is seen as unneeded, or to approve additional funds to hire temporary lecturers when staff absence cannot be covered adequately by hourly-paid staff. Decisions on approval of buy-out funding will normally be taken by the HoS at the point of award, though Heads of Division may want to discuss the issue with the HoS prior to the submission of a bid. For this reason it is very important that you discuss your plans with your HoD before you start writing your grant bid, so that s/he can both advise you and, if needed, discuss the matter with the HoS well in advance.
2. The School allocates fixed sums to cover the costs of hourly-paid teaching staff for buy-outs on FeC grants. They are based on an annual figure of £25,000 FTE, which is applied on a pro rata basis depending on the size of the buy-out specific to the particular year. A typical buy-out of 20% over 3 years would therefore attract £5000 per year, whereas one of 10% would attract £2,500, and so on, up to the £25,000 maximum. Grants which cover the teaching period (September-June inclusive) rather than the whole calendar year are treated for buy-out purposes as year-long.
3. Buy-outs are calculated by converting the total annual commitment in hours entered in the grant application into a percentage of the 1650-hour working year as expressed in WAM: eg. a project commitment of 495 hours annually equates to an approximate 30% reduction in overall WAM workload (495 divided by 1650). Successful applicants will therefore receive significant alleviation from teaching and administration duties but should bear in mind that the overall WAM workload already includes within it an allowance for research time.
4. Grants which are FeC-costed, and where we are not applying directly for teaching replacements, but where the core staff time costs are budgeted as ‘Directly Incurred’ (DI), will be treated analogously to non-FeC costed Leverhulme Fellowships. Divisions will receive funds to cover the cost of a replacement lecturer at point 6.5 on the Lecturer A scale. This affects British Academy Mid-Career Fellowships, AHRC Leaderships Fellowships (including the Early Career variant) and the European Research Council Starting, Consolidator and Advanced Grants. Those portions of an AHRC Leadership Fellowship involving a 50% rather than a 100% commitment will be treated on a pro rata basis: i.e. divisions would receive half of the cost of a replacement lecturer for such periods. Please note that the ‘savings’ made on these grants are incorporated into the ALC budget, since the PIs remain on the School’s Core baseline at full salary, and since the AHRC pays only 80% of the FeC value.

#

# SCHOOL POLICY ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH LEAVES (SABBATICALS)

Research leave serves the major functions of providing time for successful research in a research-led university, and of providing a window through which external research funding may be attracted. It both develops the career of an individual and satisfies the University’s policy objectives, including that of research excellence. On both these counts it is imperative that it is granted to staff who can use it effectively at a level consonant with the goals of the University and the research strategy of the School. The fulfilment of these criteria is a necessary trigger for research leave, but it is not a sufficient one. The School Research Committee needs to be persuaded that such a leave, if granted, would not have a negative impact on the ability of other colleagues in the Division not on leave to fulfil their own research goals.

**In support of the premises above, the following policy has been established**:

**1. UNIVERSITY RESEARCH LEAVE**

1. Each permanent member of the academic staff of the School is entitled to apply for 1 period of University Research Leave, normally after 6 periods of teaching (including those completed on temporary or probationary contracts at the University of Manchester, and also including periods of maternity leave (cf. 4.1)). A ‘period’ may be either a semester or a year, but a pattern based on semesters is to be regarded as the norm. Part-time staff will have normal entitlement.[[6]](#footnote-6) A rota will be kept by heads of division, in conjunction with the Research Office.
2. This entitlement to apply may be varied as to timing by up to 2 semesters (prior to or following the sixth) in the management interest. Such variation should be regarded as unusual. Variation by one semester at the request of the candidate may be approved in exceptional circumstances, for example where it is necessary to take advantage of permissions to do fieldwork or for similar reasons; in such cases, it is expected that an early leave will be balanced by a commensurately later leave thereafter.
3. Approved examples of outcomes from a period of IRL include work on or completion of: journal articles, chapters of a book, a book, major research grant applications, scores, exhibitions (etc.). Please consult your UoA co-ordinator for further advice. In addition, major progress on an Impact Case Study may constitute all or part of an outcome for an IRL application. The ICS must be recognized and approved by the Associate Director for Research (Impact).
4. Failure to submit a satisfactory report (i.e. a report deemed not to have met the proposed objectives) at the end of the period of research leave and to complete appropriate research publications (or to deliver other equivalent outputs) shall normally be a bar to the granting of the following period of University Research Leave. See paragraph 7, below. Entitlements to leaves beyond that will be subject to careful scrutiny of the candidate’s track record up to the point of application (see point 5.4 below).
5. Those on teaching-only and research-only contracts are not eligible for consideration for leave.
6. Those granted University Research Leave/Externally Funded Leave will be expected to continue to supervise their research students (or make alternative arrangements acceptable to the School’s Postgraduate Committee); to continue to serve on PhD panels (in person or remotely), except by agreement with the HoD; and to be available to discuss teaching and administrative duties relevant to the first semester after a return from leave. There is no obligation to continue to serve on the SALC Peer Review College.
7. Those on leave should make it clear to the School where they will be during the leave period.
8. The expectations outlined in 7 and 8 above do not apply to those on unpaid leave.
9. If the need arises for any variation to the content of a leave, made after approval has been given, permission must be sought from the Director of Research, via the divisional research coordinator. In general, applicants are advised to be realistic about what they can achieve during the course of a sabbatical, and to discuss this with their divisional or departmental research coordinator.
10. In keeping with the SALC policy on grant buy-out, a candidate may, after consultation, use some or all of his/her period of institutional leave to work on outputs relating to an externally funded research grant. This must, however, be agreed in advance with the relevant Head of Division and specified within the sabbatical application. If the grant is awarded after a leave application has been approved, a formal request to use the sabbatical in this way must be made to the Head of Division and Director of Research.

**2. EXTERNALLY FUNDED RESEARCH LEAVE**

1. University Research Leave may be prolonged by external funding in a manner to be agreed by the candidate and the Research Committee on the terms offered by the funder.
2. Such external funding may also be applied for (with the support of the head of division) at times other than those indicated by leave entitlement, where the funder does not require a matching period of institutional leave. In such cases, heads of division must be satisfied that the external funding achieved is adequate to the costs of replacing the member of staff for the period in question. Such external funding must normally be sufficient to cover the entirety of the member of staff’s duties, not just teaching hours – i.e. it must enable the appointment of a full-time temporary teaching fellow.[[7]](#footnote-7) When approving applications for such external funding outside the normal rota, due regard must be paid to the effect on other members of staff, the teaching programme, and the balance of responsibilities.
3. No application for external funding will be acceptable unless it is notified to the Chair of the Research Committee, and has the support of the head of division. For cases of dispute, see below, paragraph 8.
4. As stated in the University Leave Policy, periods of externally-funded leave *will* contribute towards future entitlement to institutional leave, subject to the limit that "the amount of such time that can be counted towards eligibility is normally restricted to one period in seven" (University Policy). (Periods of sick leave or maternity leave contribute in full towards future entitlement.)

(<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=7>)

**3. UNPAID LEAVE FOR RESEARCH**

1. Unpaid leave is the only means of total buyout from all University duties which is available in the absence of external funding.

1. Full buyout leave will involve the forfeiture of 100% of salary for the period for which leave is sought. The University will not normally contribute employers’ costs (including USS) during the period of absence, and provision for this will have to be made in the buyout or by arrangement within the School if the Head of School and head of division agree to waive this requirement.
2. Unpaid leave for research can only be granted with the support of the head of division and the approval of the Head of School. It is not a contractual entitlement.
3. Partial unpaid leave is not normally a possibility, and will only be considered in exceptional circumstances.

**4. LEAVE FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN RESEARCH**

These matters are dealt with in accordance with University policy.

**5. APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES**

1. Potential applicants should take the opportunity of the PDR system to discuss ways in which the University Research Leave scheme might be appropriate to their career development and how it might be extended by externally-funded research leave, and to obtain assistance in developing their proposals. Advice may also be sought from the divisional Research Coordinator.
2. A rota of eligibility to apply is kept by the Division, in consultation with the research office. Each year during May, the research office sends Memo 1, above, to heads of division. Applications for University Research Leave should be made in the academic year penultimate to that in which entitlement falls.[[8]](#footnote-8)
3. When agreement is reached in principle about eligibility to apply, the research office sends Memo 2 to the relevant members of staff.
4. The candidate then applies for University Research Leave, using the Research Leave Application Form. The application is submitted by e-mail to the research office, where it is logged and prepared for transfer to the head of division. For each candidate for leave within each division, the research office provides the head of division with the application, a copy of the previous application for research leave, plus the report on the previous period of leave (assuming this was granted and taken). The head of division, together with the research coordinator and such other staff as the division deems appropriate, makes an initial assessment of the application. This group considers the proposals for leave, both in their own terms and against the track record of the applicant, taking due account also of the teaching programme.
5. If further information is required from the applicant, it should normally be sought by the research coordinator at this stage.
6. The research coordinator then passes the materials to the School Research Director, together with a recommendation from the division. Here might be included the case for any variation in the semester in which leave is taken, or other local reasons for an unusual application.
7. A subcommittee of the School Research Committee scrutinizes the leave applications, paying particular attention to any identified by the divisional groups as requiring consideration. All applications are given formal approval by the School Research Committee at its December meeting, but most cases will not require close scrutiny or discussion.
8. If approved, the research leave is taken at the time agreed.
9. If, despite point 5 above, the Research Leave Subcommittee feels that further correspondence with the applicant and/or the division is necessary, this is done through the divisional research coordinator.
10. The School’s Research Support Manager will write to successful applicants confirming the period of leave.

**7. REPORT**

7.1 Those granted periods of University Research Leave and Externally Funded Leave must submit a report to the Director of Research at the end of the period of leave (i.e. on the first day of the semester following the period of leave), indicating the extent to which the objectives outlined in their application have been fulfilled. This will be considered by the School Research Leave Subcommittee which may request further information, or confirmation of the completion of incomplete outputs, before finally approving reports. Failure to submit a satisfactory report will ultimately constitute grounds for the refusal of the following leave. The Research Support Manager will write to relevant colleagues at the end of the period of leave (whether that is the end of the institutional leave or of matching externally funded leave) to request submission of a report. Reports written for external funding bodies may simply be copied for the purposes of report to the School.

**8. CASES OF DISPUTE**

8.1 Where there is disagreement between a colleague and his/her head of division about any matter relating to the granting of research leave, and attempts to resolve the matter within the division have not been successful, the case may be made to the Head of School directly by the colleague, who may include a statement of support from any senior colleague. The head of division must be informed by the colleague of his/her intended application, and should write to the Head of School stating his/her objections and, where possible, making an alternative proposal. The Head of School will consider each case on its merits. His/her decision will be binding.

# RESEARCH ETHICS

**All applications** should now be submitted through the University’s new ethical application portal:

<https://submission-ethicalreview.manchester.ac.uk/ActivityForm/Index>

SALC is committed to developing and supporting the highest standards of research. The *Research Ethics Guideline* resource has been created in order to maintain these high academic standards and associated codes of good research practice. The research portfolio within SALC covers a wide range of fields and perspectives and research within each of these areas places responsibilities of a differing nature on staff (whether as researchers or supervisors) and students subject to course, level, focus and participants. The aim of the *Research Ethics Guideline* is to assist in assessing these factors.

The SALC Research Ethics procedures are designed to ensure that student and staff research projects receive a review proportionate to risks presented by the ethical issues raised by the research proposal. In the case of student research projects, it is expected that supervisors will fully engage with the ethics review process, using the guidance here to assess which form of documentation is required and ensuring that disciplinary norms are adhered to in all instances. The supervisor is responsible for assessing the level of risk with the student and signing off on the appropriate documentation (UREC forms for high risk, SALC Ethics Template for medium risk, and the SALC Ethics Template for low risk).

Please note that in cases of undergraduate students undertaking research involving human subjects, the supervisor/tutor is required to assist with completion and to validate the form on behalf of the students. For group work or class projects a single form can be completed by the supervisor/tutor for the entire project. Undergraduate projects must only fall under the low risk category outlined here, unless the supervisor would like to make a case for a student to be granted permission for a higher risk project (for example, using photography/video of human subjects or conducting research in the homes of friends/family). In this case, the supervisor should still fill in this document but add an explanatory text outlining the justification. These cases should be forwarded to the SALC Research Ethics Committee for consideration and dispensation may be granted. All undergraduate ethics documentation should be held and filed by the supervisor.

For further guidelines on ethics procedures see:

 <http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/salc/research/research-ethics/>

**Information for staff research projects and ethical approval procedures**

**⚫** For **all projects requiring ethical approval**, staff should select **UREC Review on Question A5** in order to complete the UREC form. This should be done irrespective of levels of ethical approval sought. ALL high, medium and low level **staff projects should be applied for using the UREC form**.

**Stage 1: Review**

The School recognises four levels of *review* to be considered by student researchers (in consultation with their supervisors) before completing any documentation:

1. Ethical issues arising from research that does not involve contact with human participants can be considered by referring to disciplinary norms, making use of internal review within subject areas where appropriate;
2. Ethical issues arising from research with adults in a public setting, or with children (if carried out in an accredited setting such as a cultural institution, school or youth club and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care), on non-contentious topics may be categorised as *low* risk through completion of the SALC Research Ethics Low risk form. Low risk projects do not need to be reviewed by the SALC ethics committee. The categorisation of student research projects as low risk requires certification by the supervisor.
3. Research with adults and research with children (the latter carried out in an accredited setting such as a cultural institution, school or youth club and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care) that does not comply with the low risk criteria above but does not require research participants to provide personal and sensitive information likely to lead to significant levels of distress, and that presents a minimal level of risk to researchers and/or research participants, may be categorised as *medium* risk and can be considered within the framework provided by the SALC Research Ethics Template. Medium risk projects will be reviewed by the SALC Research Ethics Committee.
4. Research that involves contact with vulnerable or dependent human participants, requires research participants to provide personal and sensitive information likely to lead to significant levels of distress and/or presents more than a minimal level of risk to researcher or research participants is classed as *high* risk and must be reviewed by the SALC Research Ethics Signatory and will then be forwarded to the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) for approval. Please note that approval timings on projects requiring UREC assessment will require an additional month following SALC committee dates.

For all the above categories, it is the responsibility of the supervisor to ensure that all procedures relating to disciplinary norms are followed by their research students. Supervisors are expected to take this element of their role seriously, to familiarise themselves with the relevant policies and procedures, and to ensure that their students follow them.

A separate **fieldwork risk assessment** must be completed if your research takes place off-site even if it does not involve human subjects. A risk assessment identifies risks associated with activities the researcher and/or research participants are engaging in, and associated travel to areas inside and outside of the UK. It also outlines how the researcher will manage these risks.

**Stage 2: Assessing ethical risk levels**

The School has determined three levels of *Ethical Research Risk* that require review, each of which has a number of associated criteria with implications for the degree of ethical review required.

**High risk:** The research focuses on groups within society in need of special support, is carried out in an unstable or volatile setting, involves non-standard methodologies or approaches, presents risks to the personal safety of the researcher or research participant beyond what is normal in the setting, or where there is a possibility the research may be distressing to the researcher or research participant in one or more ways. If any aspect of your student research can be described within this frame of reference, please select **UREC Review for Question A5**, in order to proceed to the **UREC form**. Please remember to add your supervisor as the Co-PI (**in Section B**) to enable you to request their signature at the end of the form. Further information on types of approval required for certain categories (e.g. NHS patients or prisoners) can be found on the SALC Ethics intranet pages.

<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/staffintranet/research/researchethics/further-information/>

<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/postgraduateresearch/researchethics/further-information/>

**High risk research can be described as research that involves *one or more* of the following:**

* Research that engages children under 16 outside of a cultural institution that has been accredited to work with children and young people, school, youth club, or other accredited organisations; Adults or children with learning difficulties; Adults or children who are unable to self-consent; Adults or children with mental illness; Those who could be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the researcher; Prisoners or young offenders; Any other group who can be regarded as vulnerable or dependent; NHS patients.
* Research that takes place in an international setting that the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office advises against ‘all or all but essential’ travel to.
* Research that addresses themes or issues in respect of participant’s personal *experience* which may be of a sensitive nature and that therefore may involve any risk of psychological damage or distress to the subject (or the subject’s family).
* Research that cannot be completed without data collection or associated activities which place the researcher and/or participants (or any third party) at physical risk or serious inconvenience.
* Research that requires participant informed consent and/or withdrawal procedures which are not consistent with accepted practice.
* Research that involves primary data collection on an area of public or social objection (e.g. terrorism, paedophilia).
* Research that involves the necessary deception of research participants.
* Research that makes use of video or other images captured by the researcher, and/or research study participants, where the researcher cannot guarantee controlled access to authorised viewing.
* Research that will take place in locations where first aid and/or other medical support or facilities are not available within 30 minutes.
* Research that may involve the researcher operating machinery, electrical equipment, or workplace vehicles, or handling or working with animals at the research location(s), for which they are not qualified, and where a qualified operative or handler is not available to act as supervisor.
* Research that takes place in, or involves transport to and from, locations where the researcher’s lack of familiarity combined with potential threats in that context may put them at personal risk.
* Research that involves the administration of drugs or use of invasive or semi-invasive procedures, involve the use of tissue from living subjects or the cadavers of or tissue from the recently dead, other than bequeathed cadavers and tissue obtained in the normal course of necropsy.

**Medium risk:** The research engages adults and/or children (the latter in an accredited setting such as a cultural institution, school or youth club and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care), follows standard procedures and established research methodologies, is carried out in a public setting that does not present risks to the researcher or research participants beyond what is normal in that setting, and does not require research participants to provide personal and sensitive information likely to lead to significant levels of distress (the research topics are either not contentious or sensitive, or a reasonable person would agree the topic is of legitimate interest and may result in distress in *rare* instances). If your research can be described as medium risk, please select **Division/School Review for Question A5**,**’School of Arts, Languages and Cultures’ for Question D5.2**, **‘None of the Above’ for Question J1** and **‘Medium Risk’ for Question J2** in order to proceed to the SALC Medium Risk Ethics form. Please remember to add your supervisor as the Co-PI (**in Section B**) to enable you to request their signature at the end of the form.

**Medium risk research can be described as research that does not contravene or conflict with *any* of the following:**

1. Research that engages adults and/or children (the latter in an accredited setting such as a cultural institution, school or youth club and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care) who are able to give informed consent in a way that accords with accepted practice.
2. Research that does not involve vulnerable or dependent groups.
* Research that does not require research participants to provide personal and sensitive information likely to lead to significant levels of distress (research where the topics are either not contentious or sensitive at all, or where a reasonable person would agree the topic is of legitimate interest and may result in distress in *rare* instances);
1. Research that involves primary research with participants inside the EU or an international setting that is not on the list of countries/regions that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office advises against ‘all or all but essential’ travel to.
2. Primary research conducted in a public space or building (e.g. the high street, the University campus, a school building).
3. Research that will take place in locations where first aid and/or other medical support or facilities are available within 30 minutes.
4. Research that is a review/evaluation involving topics that may be of a sensitive nature, but that are not personal to the participants.
5. Research that is carried out within normal working hours or at a time convenient to participants.
6. Research that makes use of video or other images captured by the researcher, and/or research study participants, where the researcher is able to guarantee controlled access to authorised viewing.

**Low risk:** The research engages healthy adults or children (the latter in an accredited setting such as a cultural institution, school or youth club and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care) who are able to give informed consent in a way that accords with accepted practice.

The research follows standard procedures and established research methodologies, is carried out online or in a public setting that does not present risks to the researcher or research participants beyond what is normal in that setting, and does not require research participants to provide personal and sensitive information likely to compromise them, or to lead to distress (the research topics are not contentious or sensitive, such as asking about religious beliefs, sexual preferences, political views or illegal activities, or a reasonable person would agree the topic may only result in distress in *extremely* *rare* instances).

If you are a postgraduate student and your research can be described as low risk, please select **Division/School Review for Question A5**, **‘School of Arts, Languages and Cultures’ for Question D5.2**, **‘None of the Above’ for Question J1** and **‘Low Risk’ for Question J2** in order to proceed to the SALC Low Risk Ethics form. Please remember to add your supervisor as the Co-PI (**in Section B**) to enable you to request their signature at the end of the form.

**Please note**: that low risk applications are not assessed by the ethics committee, however, you will be emailed a ‘receipt’ confirming we have received your application, so please keep this for your records.

**Low risk research can be described as research that fits with the following criteria (as applicable):**

1. Research that engages healthy adults and/or children (the latter in an accredited setting such as a cultural institution, school or youth club and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care) who are able to give informed consent in a way that accords with accepted practice.
2. Primary research on professional practice with participants in professional roles conducted in their work setting.
3. Research that engages participant groups limited to peers, colleagues, family members and friends and that is not of a contentious or sensitive nature.
4. Research that does not involve vulnerable or dependent groups.
5. Primary or practice research conducted in a public space or building within normal working hours or at a time convenient to participants (e.g. the high street, the University campus, a school building).
6. Research that will take place in locations where first aid and/or other medical support or facilities are available within 30 minutes.
7. Market research (i.e. the research may involve data collection from the general public approached or observed in public locations for the purposes of market investigation but does not involve the gathering of personal data).
8. Primary research using a questionnaire completed and returned by participants with no direct contact with the researcher, where the topic is not sensitive or personally distressing.
9. Research that involves primary research with participants inside the EU or an international setting that is not on the list of countries/regions that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office advises against ‘all or all but essential’ travel to.
10. Research that does not involve the collection of video/photographs of research participants.

**Supporting documents** may include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires, draft interview topic guides, participant information sheets and consent forms, insurance declaration form and risk assessments, depending on the research methodologies employed.

**Insurance information**

For low and medium risk projects that answer ‘yes’ to any of the insurance questions we will log these and send them to the insurance office for completion at the end of the academic year. You are able to start your research without prior approval from the insurance office. If your research is conducted in areas of the world that are regarded as risky you need to complete the appropriate Risk Assessment Forms and in some cases might need approval by the Insurance Office.

Only UREC applications that are deemed ‘high risk’ and where the research is conducted abroad **and** has a medical content, **or** where there is a “yes” in **any** of the other insurance boxes will need prior approval from the insurance office before the research can be carried out. You must then wait for an official email from the insurance office before starting your research.

Please contact salc.ethics@manchester.ac.uk if you have any queries about insurance.

**What to do next**

Agreement to proceed with research at each of these levels is provided by an appropriate University Research Ethics Committee (UREC), the SALC Ethics Committee, or by the supervisor/tutor respectively.

**⚫** For **low risk student projects**, please select **Division/School Review for Question A5**, **‘School of Arts, Languages and Cultures’ for Question D5.2**, ‘**None of the Above’ for Question J1 and ‘Low Risk’ for Question J2** in order to proceed to the SALC Low Risk Ethics form. Please remember to add your supervisor as the Co-PI (in Section B) to enable you to request their signature at the end of the form.

**⚫** For **medium risk student projects**, please select **Division/School Review for Question A5**, **‘School of Arts, Languages and Cultures’ for Question D5.2, ‘None of the Above’ for Question J1 and ‘Medium Risk’ for Question J2** in order to proceed to the SALC Medium Risk Ethics form. Please remember to add your supervisor as the Co-PI (in Section B) to enable you to request their signature at the end of the form.

**⚫** For **high risk student projects**, please select **UREC Review for Question A5**, in order to proceed to the UREC form. Please remember to add your supervisor as the Co-PI (in Section B) to enable you to request their signature at the end of the form.

**⚫** For **staff projects**, please select **UREC Review for Question A5**, in order to proceed to the UREC form. Please remember to add your supervisor as the Co-PI (in Section B) to enable you to request their signature at the end of the form.

If you have any queries about your specific project, please email the SALC Ethics Team: salc.ethics@manchester.ac.uk

# FRAMEWORK FOR RESEARCH COLLABORATION[[9]](#footnote-9)

Fully updated Faculty Guidance on the Governance of Research Institutes, Centres, Groups and Networks can be found at: <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=32881>

1. **BACKGROUND**
	1. Research collaboration, formal and informal, is strongly encouraged in SALC. In today’s research environment, with the increasing emphasis on securing non-QR funding for research, and on meeting grand societal and intellectual challenges requiring the application of knowledge and expertise from multiple perspectives, collaboration within and across disciplinary boundaries is essential.
	2. The traditional ‘lone scholar’ model which retains some currency in the arts and humanities community, and which still generates some of our most successful, world-leading research, will continue to be supported and nurtured. However, it is widely recognised that this model, on its own, is not equipped to meet the ‘grand challenges’. Moreover there is a question over the extent to which that model ever prevailed in its romantic, ‘ideal’ form (‘lone scholars’ rarely operate entirely without recourse to the input of others in their field).
	3. Research collaboration can take different forms. Groupings of researchers may be established on an informal or a formal basis and can serve a variety of purposes. In order for the School to present a clearly structured and coherent account of its research profile and strategy, it needs to be consistent in the way that it describes and manages these groupings.
	4. Among the kinds of groupings that SALC wishes to promote are research networks, research centres, and research clusters or groups. However, it is to be emphasised that there is no implied hierarchy of groupings, and that the use of one term does not necessarily accord a grouping more or less prestige or ‘clout’ than another; two of the most successful and high-profile groupings led from within SALC are HCRI (<http://www.hcri.ac.uk/>) and the Romani Project (<http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/>). The world reputation enjoyed by these groupings is attributable to the activities they conduct and the research they produce, not the names categorise and describe our collaborative research such that they become completely meaningless, and that we create a confusing and chaotic impression to the outside world.
	5. SALC is an unusually large and extremely diverse school (with 350 academic staff in 17 very different disciplines ranging from Music, through Archaeology to Linguistics). It is to be expected that there should be rather more groupings of all kinds than in other, more homogeneous, schools. Moreover, when deciding upon the scope and meaning of terms like ‘centre’, we need to have some regard to differences in the respective funding environments in which the arts, the social sciences and the sciences operate, and to how such terms are used in the arts and humanities community beyond Manchester. A complete and rigid conformity of usage across the entire University is likely to be unrealistic and undesirable.
	6. The purpose of this document is to introduce a more consistent and structured framework for research collaboration in the School, to generate a set of working definitions for research groupings in SALC, and to put in place some simple procedures for the establishment and monitoring of the most formally constituted of them – research centres.
	7. The framework itself was devised by a working party of the School’s Research Committee, approved by the full committee, and endorsed by the Strategy, Policy and Resources Committee, chaired by the Head of School.
2. **DEFINITIONS**
	1. The definitions on which the framework is based draw loosely on the guidelines on research centres published in a Faculty White Paper in 2009. These guidelines are presently under review. It is understood that there will always be a certain degree of overlap between the definitions, and that they are not necessarily mutually exclusive.
	2. Research groupings exist for a variety of purposes and cover a wide range of different kinds of activity. The loosest of these is the **Network**, which aims to give an identity to a distributed activity or common interest and to facilitate the flow of information about seminars, lectures, funding opportunities etc. between its members, sometimes, though not always, as incubators for projects. Networks often have relatively large memberships (of 10 people or more, sometimes up to 50-60) spread across multiple schools; they can have a broad, disciplinary focus (‘European Studies’, for example), or a more thematic orientation (‘Migration and Diaspora)’
	3. A **Research Group** has a narrower focus on a specific topic or set of issues but operates in an informal mode, consisting of a small group of researchers (4-8 may be typical) within a single disciplinary area, or spread across several areas. It may meet regularly, or on an occasional basis, to exchange ideas relating to a shared intellectual agenda, or to plan grant applications, conference activities, or other initiatives. It may well serve as an incubator for a more formally constituted centre. It operates autonomously from School structures and is not expected to report or account for its activities.
	4. A **Project** is based around a series of large, linked, grant awards, held in parallel, or in sequence, by a single PI with or without Co-I support. It serves as a forum in which staff associated with the grant projects, whether by virtue of their contracts, or owing to shared interests, can review progress on project-related research, exchange ideas, discuss project dissemination and impact strategies, initiate new activities, and generate ideas for further grant applications. It may serve as an incubator for a more formally constituted research centre.
	5. A **Research Centre** has a formal status within the School and will be required to account for its activities in an annual report to the Research Committee. It will play an important role in implementing and communicating key aspects of the School’s research strategy. It will serve several of the following purposes:
		1. To be a vehicle for promoting and branding research and knowledge exchange to staff and to the outside world[[10]](#footnote-10)
		2. To facilitate formulation and implementation of particular areas of School research strategy
		3. To provide a structure to secure and manage external funding in a specific area of research
		4. To facilitate cross-discipline, cross-School and cross-Faculty working including the possibility of focussing on a shared challenge or problem
		5. To provide a supportive environment for research staff and PGR students
		6. To provide a critical mass of cognate researchers
	6. When considering whether a grouping meets the criteria for the centre designation, the School will look for the following minimal attributes:
		1. A critical mass of staff with a track record of collaboration around a set of cognate research interests (normally this would be between 5 and 15 people)
		2. A well-focused intellectual agenda
		3. The capacity to make a major contribution to implementing one or more aspects of, or highlighted themes within, the School research strategy
		4. A history of activities which belong clearly to the group and which go beyond that of organising regular seminar and lecture series and/or disseminating news and information (this may include, but is not restricted to, multiple successful grant applications; a closely linked postgraduate programme; the hosting of a series of visiting professors and/or postdoctoral fellows; a range of prominent research impact and knowledge transfer initiatives)
	7. The term **Research Institute** is under review and is currently reserved for entities with a higher (i.e. supra-School) level of governance to reflect an association with iconic appointments. At present, there are two such institutes housed within SALC: The Humanitarian Conflict Response Institute and the John Rylands Research Institute.
3. **PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING RESEARCH CENTRES**

Proposals for the establishment of Research Centres should initially be submitted to the SALC Research Committee and include the following:

• Proposed full name of the Centre

• A description of the research objectives and the programme of work through which they will be achieved, including details of the measurable outputs to be delivered and against which its effectiveness may be assessed in due course. This should include an indication of how the Centre aims to become an internationally recognised leader in the field and publish in the most prestigious outlets.

• List of the principal academic staff to be involved in the work of the Centre with their area(s) of expertise, evidence of the international research standing of the proposed Director and senior researchers involved, and a description of their expected roles in developing the Centre.

• Evidence of a shared identity of the group and ability to work together in developing research.

• An account of the benefits to the School, with particular reference to the added value in research.

• Details of any external funding obtained, contract research staff and postdoctoral fellows employed, and doctoral students supervised, by members of the group over the previous five years.

• Details of relationships with other research groupings or activities.

• An explicit explanation of the public engagement activities and strategy of the Centre

• An annual budget of expected income and expenditure, including anticipated external sources of support.

The SALC Research Committee will then consider the proposal in the light of the School’s research strategy and resources, and make a recommendation to the School Policy and Resource Committee (SPRC). Only Research Centres that have been formally approved by the Research Committee and SPRC are SALC Research Centres.

1. **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**
	1. SALC groupings other than Research Centres have no formal requirement to report to the School Research Committee, though they are encouraged to keep relevant divisions, and the School as a whole, aware of their activities and achievements.
	2. SALC Research Centres should submit an annual report on their activities on the template provided by May 31st each year (see below). A working group of the Research Committee will consider reports in June and July and a summary of the reports will be forwarded to SPRC and the Faculty Research Strategy Committee each September.
	3. Many, if not all, research centres have a limited ‘shelf life’ and in a dynamic intellectual environment, it is fully to be expected that they will after a period of time become inactive, to be replaced by newer configurations. Where no report is submitted, or if the activities described no longer correspond to the criteria set out in 2.6 above, the centre in question will be asked to either revisit its status, or to bring its current level and mode of activity into line with the criteria.
	4. University recognised Institutes and Faculty Research Centres will report to the Research Committee at a suitable time in line with University and Faculty reporting dates.

# SALC AND FACULTY RESEARCH STRATEGY AND THEMES

The School of Arts, Languages and Cultures works to a research strategy plan, which it submits for approval each year to the Faculty of Humanities, and updates on an annual basis. The essential features of the current plan are as follows:

The School's research interests are in the fields of human cultures, languages, beliefs and institutions. Its work embraces the material, visual, linguistic, textual, social and performative dimensions of human society, past and present, and as such fosters a rich interdisciplinary research culture led by world-renowned scholars with a diversity of expertise, from analysts to creative artists, from formal linguists to cultural critics, from historians to cultural theorists. In terms of its chronological focus, our research ranges from pre-historic times, through the classical and medieval periods, to the contemporary era. Our research articulates the University’s research strategy and concern with global challenges in a number of ways, notably through our expertise in Humanitarianism and Conflict Response and in endangered languages, and in our expertise in geographical areas such as the Asia and the Middle East, as well in as our world-renowned specialisms in gender and sexuality and in the role of religion in contemporary and past societies.

The units which make up the School have an outstanding research profile as demonstrated by the fact that two of those units (Spanish, Portuguese & Latin American Studies and Russian) were ranked top in their subject area in the UK, following the results of the government’s Research Assessment Exercise in 2008, and English Literature and Music 2nd). Overall, more than 50% of our research was rated ‘world leading’ or ‘internationally excellent’. Such is the continuing breadth and quality of our research that in REF 2014 we have made submissions to all of the following subpanels: (1) Modern Languages and Linguistics, (2) Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology, (3) English Language and Literature, (4) History, (5) Classics, (6) Theology and Religious Studies, (7) Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory, (8) Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts.

Our current staff includes two Academicians of the Academy of Social Sciences, a Fellow of the British Academy and Fellow of the Danish Academy and we are home to a number of international Research Centres. We are leading the field in developing practice-based research, while intellectual activity in the School has a well-established history of bringing benefit to the community beyond academia. Each of the major research areas reflected in the School has exerted influence within the community of users, locally in Manchester, in the UK as a whole, and internationally, and the impact our research has achieved spans the categories of influencing policy making and advising government agencies, enhancing cultural life through work with Manchester’s rich cultural assets, contributing to community cohesion and fostering linguistic diversity, shaping public opinion through the media, and supporting the UK’s cultural and heritage industries.

The research income from grants within the School reveals some impressive track records, and some stunning successes at large grant capture (Cooper, Dreyfus, Gatrell, Hutchings, Matras, Pormann, Thompson). A particularly encouraging recent development is our ability to attract grants from outside the UK research councils and we have had some recent successes at obtaining grants from the European Research Council and other bodies. But in general terms, the School is reliant on a number of serial ‘big hitters’ and we aspire to foster a more wide-spread culture of grant-application.

There are currently over 470 doctoral students registered across the full range of subjects in the School. Our recruitment and management of high-quality PGR students has been enhanced by the creation of the Graduate School (both physical and virtual). We have developed an impressive record in research training and professional skills training, currently being delivered and developed through the cross-disciplinary doctoral programme: artsmethods@manchester. We aim to increase the participation of our PGRs within the broader research culture of the School. After the successful bids for the AHRC-funded NWC Doctoral College led by Manchester and the AHRC-funded Centre for Doctoral Training in Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages and Cultures as a non-leading partner, we are working on setting up the pathways that involve SALC, and running the first studentship competition for entry in September 2014. The Graduate School is also developing both an outward-facing web profile of the research being undertaken at this level and is facilitating a lively virtual postgraduate community through a variety of on-line interactions between research students. In addition to disciplinary and interdisciplinary doctoral programmes, the School has a growing cohort of Professional Doctorates devised to enable cultural practitioners to undertake advanced research on aspects of professional practice and policy. The Graduate School is developing models for Social Responsibility within research by running an H-SIF funded Researchers in Residence scheme for PGR students. The Graduate School also runs the School GTA training scheme and has had input into the development of a FoH policy on GTA training.

The main goals are as follows:

1. We have targeted an excellent outcome for REF 2014, hoping to end up in the top 5 nationally for several of our disciplines and the top 10 for all of them. Now that our work for REF 2014 is complete, and in anticipation of future research assessment exercises, the School will develop robust and effective means of maintaining and further improving the quality of individual staff research. This will be achieved through the introduction of a research mentoring system for all staff and of annual monitoring meetings between staff and divisional research coordinators based on an agreed school template and around clear targets for publications, through increased scrutiny of research potential in new staff appointments, through initiatives designed to raise awareness about the importance of citations, and through workshops on research impact and publication strategies. We will also work towards the extension of our peer review college for grant applications to cover the selective reading of research outputs.
2. At the level of School research strategy, ALC has set up a research strategy working group, part of whose remit is to identify key areas of strength and propose ways of bolstering them, prioritising those which contribute to addressing Faculty and University research and social responsibility challenges, and to work towards the insertion of new, ALC-led challenges into the Faculty Portfolio. These include, but are not limited to, Science-Arts Synergies; Digital Humanities; Mediating Conflict; Socio-Cultural Consequences of Migration; Sustaining the World Language Eco-System, Urban Space and Culture. In this context, we have rationalised the overall number of research centres and institutes in the School, set clear criteria for the creation of new ones, and will be working to establish at least one more major ALC centre of research excellence on a par with the HCRI. Particular attention will be paid to the supporting JRRI in its next phase of development, and to emerging initiatives in the areas of Archaeological Sciences, Citizen Media and Palestine-Israel Studies.
3. Also important to the process of increasing the presence of research in the Arts at Manchester will be our efforts to build on our links with Manchester’s cultural assets (Cornerhouse, the Royal Exchange Theatre, Contact Theatre, Manchester Museum, etc). This will be vital to ALC’s research impact agenda and will be led by the Institute for Cultural Practices, and by CIDRAL, in close collaboration with the External Relations directorate. The successful launch of phase 2 of the JRRI complements these efforts, enabling the School to become an international centre for original research based on the library’s rich holdings. The JRRI will likewise be at the forefront of ALC’s broader internationalisation strategy which will be further advanced by consolidating existing links with China and East Asia within Music, English & American Studies, and the Centre for Chinese Studies, and by a policy of encouraging the appointment of leading international visiting fellows from these and other regions.
4. The success of our research strategy rests on the degree to which we can exploit new interdisciplinary synergies resulting from the creation of the School. In its next phase of development, we see a key role for CIDRAL in promoting such synergies and enhancing grant capture, particularly in areas of SALC where such capture is unrealistically low. We will improve our successfully launched Research Networking Fund aimed at helping SALC researchers to establish new, interdisciplinary concentrations of research activity addressing key, strategic objectives. The improvements to the mechanism are intended to better align these objectives with the primary research questions and challenges engaging our very best researchers ‘on the ground’. Working across institutional boundaries, we will aim to increase our contributions to the N8 consortium of northern universities and to capitalise on our participation in the Phase 2 LBAS consortiums.
5. We aim to enhance the intellectual environment of the school by attracting more postdoctoral researchers (targeting international schemes such as the Marie Curie Fellowships), and more high-profile visiting professors
6. We will devote maximum attention to improving our record in earning external research income. A multi-pronged strategy will involve amongst other things: (a) using a systematised approach to research intelligence in order to seek out new sources of funding (including government agencies in China and elsewhere; philanthropic organisations; those areas of the business community with which we have prior links); (b) establishing a searchable database of staff research interests; (c) securing more European funding (by encouraging applications to research network schemes and by building a database of existing links with European partners); (d) setting 3-yearly research income targets for each division monitored via annual meetings with the Research Director; (e) supporting research pilot projects through the ALC Research Support Fund; (f) encouraging staff to apply for research grants through an incentivising FEC buy-out policy; (g) running regular, practical grant bidding workshops and School Research Away Days on specific topics such as ‘Horizon 2020’; (h) continuing to monitor and improve our peer review college and grant application evaluation template and guidelines.
7. Looking to the next REF, we will raise the profile of, and improve performance on, SALC research impact beyond the academy. To this end, we have established a SALC impact working group and will produce a comprehensive SALC research impact strategy which will commit us to undertaking, amongst other things, (a) to appoint a director for academic impact and knowledge exchange to take forward the School’s impact policy in collaboration with key School and Faculty stakeholders (b) to analyse systematically the ‘Pathways to Impact’ sections of all successful RCUK and EU grant applications submitted over the previous 5 years; (b) to extend SALC external partnerships in collaboration with External Relations and CIDRAL directors, and through sharpening the focus on the activities of the ICP, Multilingual Manchester, and other facilitators of research impact; (c) to identify, explore and prepare potential future impact case studies for all SALC UoAs; (d) to embed a sense of the importance of impact throughout the SALC research environment through a series of workshop events, and by stressing the need to build KT and KE activities into the planning stages of all research projects.

For PGR students we will improve the student experience by: continuing to develop the Graduate School (physical and virtual); integrating PGR students more fully within the research culture of the School; ensuring that PGR students working as GTAs are treated and paid fairly in accordance with Faculty and University guidelines; training our GTAs to a high standard; providing opportunities for supervisors to share best practice. We aim to recruit high quality students and will therefore take a lead in the AHRC NWC DTC and continue to develop our pathways within the ESRC NWDTC, as well as CEELBAS. To build on the interdisciplinary research strengths of SALC, we will offer two new interdisciplinary programmes. We will take measures to improve PhD completion rates and reduce the number of examination results of B(iii) and below, by offering completion support for third year and submission pending students from outside the supervisory team and ensuring that problems are identified early through the progression review process. We aim for our graduates to be excellently prepared for the job market, both within academia and outside.

 *KPIs demonstrated by:*

1. 75% of SALC research outputs and at least 70% of our research impact to be rated 3\* or higher in REF 2021.
2. Introduction of a systematic research and research impact monitoring system for individual staff, supported by:
	* a peer review college targeting selected outputs at pre-submission stage
	* identifiable mechanisms for facilitating user impact, to include School impact advisory group and discipline-specific initiatives such as Multilingual Manchester
3. Establishment of at least one major new SALC research centre/institute with full impact potential.
4. Inclusion of at least one new SALC-led theme among Faculty research challenges.
5. Successful launch of phase 2 of the John Rylands Research Institute
6. Increase in numbers of international visiting professorships and independently funded postdoctoral fellows.
7. Maintaining overall level of research council income and increasing research funding from European, philanthropic and industry sources.
8. Embedding AHRC Doctoral Training College along with a stake in two Type B consortiums (if successful), and development (both virtual and physical) of the Graduate School.
9. Securing a high proportion of studentships within the two AHRC consortia as well as the ESRC NWDTC.
10. Improved PRES results; better completion rates and fewer B(iii) and below recommendations.
11. Increased engagement with eProg.
12. A significant number of PhD graduates securing employment that requires doctoral-level qualifications and winning prizes (internally and externally).

The School Research Strategy is aligned with that of the Faculty of Humanities, which currently has the following priorities in relation to research:

Our vision for Research in Humanities is to provide an environment and infrastructure that attracts, develops and rewards world-leading researchers who deliver a research portfolio which is internationally recognised and includes leading research that addresses major societal challenges that span the humanities and sciences. We will endeavour to provide a supportive culture that encourages researchers to develop from being excellent to being among world-leaders and to have the freedom and resources to break new ground and work across interdisciplinary boundaries. This includes nurturing and training doctoral students to become leading professionals and academics who make significant contributions in their chosen fields throughout the world.

1. Further improvement in research quality, impact and income growth;

2. Re-profiling and diversifying our teaching programme portfolio in response to changes in patterns of demand, and further enhancing student experience;

3. Diversifying income sources;

4. Advancing the Social Responsibility agenda by making a significant contribution to addressing the major challenges of the 21st century, and by producing graduates who

exercise social leadership and citizenship;

5. Fostering excellence through investment in staff, and in management and leadership capability, measured by a more performance-orientated culture;

6. Transforming our external profile and reputation through investment in communications, marketing and web presence;

7. Transforming the operational effectiveness of the Faculty through systematic process improvement.

• We will improve the quality of our research outputs and expect to raise the proportion of our research outputs graded as 3\* or above from 62% in the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) to be 75% or higher by the next REF assessment (expected in 2021);

• We will continue to develop and evidence our research impact building from the REF2014 impact case studies baseline results (Our REF2014 target was that at least 70% of our impact case studies would be rated at 3\* or above);

• We will increase our research income, diversify the funding sources from which we seek research funding and raise the percentage of academic staff submitting successful

research bids;

• We will continue to improve the academic standing and impact of our research, to be reflected in rises in field-specific citation rates and improved standing of Humanities subjects in international league tables;

• Building on our success in being part of the largest English Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Doctoral Training Centre (DTC), we will seek to establish an Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) DTC of commensurate status, and seek to be amongst the best performers within the Russell Group in terms of Doctor

• **Priority one:** Increase Research Grant and Contract income generation and diversify funding sources. 2013-14 target was an increase in RGC income of 9% from £14.4m in 2012-13 (forecast) to £15.7m in 2013-14 and to increase the proportion of RGC income from non-UK funding sources.

• **Priority two:** Effective preparation for REF2021 and longer-term enhancement of our research quality. Target to achieve 70% of outputs and impact cases assessed at 3\* or above in REF 2021.

• **Priority three:** Continue development and communication of Humanities’ research thematic priorities and activities to demonstrate an exciting portfolio of established and emerging activities. 2013-14 target was to improve standing of our research as captured by the Shanghai Jiao Tong (for social sciences only), QS, THE and FT Business School Global rankings.

• **Priority four:** Develop and evidence our research impact within and beyond academia. 2013-14 target was to improve citation rates, to ensure that 13% of publications fall in the top 10% of cited papers in their field.

• **Priority five**: Increase recruitment of high-quality PGR students and improve completion rates across the Faculty. 2013-14 target was to increase Faculty completion rate by 10 per cent (from 61.5% in 2011/12).

# SCHOOL RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS: *ARTSRESEARCH* AND SALC RESEARCH NEWSLETTER

Each semester the School publishes an electronic Research Newsletter with information about current and external research funding schemes, and other important information about internal school research processes upcoming calls for bids to, procedures and deadlines. It includes a link to a full set of scheme deadlines managed at Faculty level.

The School also publishes a research bulletin, *ArtsResearch*, twice a year. Its purpose is to showcase some of the best and most interesting research being carried out in the School by researchers at all levels, from doctoral student to senior professor, to celebrate recent grant awards and major publications and to provide examples of ways in which our research is influencing the world beyond academia. Suggestions for items to include in the next issue are welcome at all times (please send them to Ed Salter in the Research Office).

**APPENDIX: VISITING SCHOLARS**

**1. CRITERIA FOR VISITING SCHOLARS**

Heads of Division, in consultation with Divisional Research Co-ordinators, may apply either Criteria A or Criteria B according to Divisional needs and priorities:

*Criteria A for the admission of visiting scholars*

- Scholars must speak English to a standard competent for academic research

- Scholars must hold a teaching and research position at a recognized HEI

- Scholars must have research interests close to an identified member of staff

- Scholars must acquire the agreement and co-operation of the identified member of staff to act as research mentor

*CrIteria B for the admission of visiting scholars*

- Scholars must speak and write English to the accredited and certified standard required for PG students whose first language is not English

- Scholars must have a PhD, hold a teaching and research position at a recognized HEI, and have a track record of publication in recognized journals or with recognized publishers

- Scholars must have research interests close to an identified member of staff (and where the library has relevant holdings)

- Scholars must produce a detailed plan of research for their time in Manchester

- Scholars must acquire the agreement and co-operation of the identified member of staff to act as research mentor

**2. TRIAL CHANGES TO THE ADMISSION OF VISITING SCHOLARS**

These changes will be trialed in 17-18 by the Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies for potential roll-out to the School in 18-19.

**Increase in fees**

Fees are due to change from the 1st August 2018 with an increase of £600 to £3000 per year. The change in fees will affect the following applicants:

* Completely new applicants - fees will be calculated (pro rata) depending on the date they start their visit (for example, for applicants wishing to start their visit in June/July – they will pay 2 months of the current fee and then the remaining months will be calculated from the new fee)
* Applicants who have requested to change their invitation letter will be required to pay the new fee (as above, to be calculated pro-rata)

**Note:** Applicants who have already been approved (and who have their invitation letter) and are due to arrive will not be required to pay the higher fee even if they are arriving from August 2018.

**Admin fee to be introduced**

We are planning to introduce an ‘admin fee’ for any applicant who requests a change to their letter once they have received the official copy. The proposed fee is £150 per request which will be added onto their bench fee when they arrive.

Any change requests must be run through the host who will need to check the following:

* If the request is reasonable – i.e. not too far ahead in time (within 12 months)
* Capacity of the month/date they wish to change to
* Any issues with the date (i.e. is it during the holiday periods)

The RO will keep track of any requested changes and extra fees to be added on once the visitor has arrived. Any issues or complaints made by the visitors should be run by the host first.

**Refunds**

If anyone requests a refund for being wrongly charged (i.e. they are supposedly being sponsored by the China Scholarship Council) we will need to follow the following steps:

* Check their invitation letter/application to see if we have missed the detail
* Ask to see proof of their CSC sponsorship (ie letter)
* Request an invoice to be sent to the CSC
* Wait before the transaction is showing from the CSC before requesting the refund to be paid

**Other issues/actions to note:**

* Visits must be a minimum of 2 months. These will be assessed by the host on a case by case basis and in particular cases, the fee may be reduced depending on the circumstances (i.e. during university holidays/closure dates).
* If an applicant wishes to change their visiting date which is past the 12 month period, they must re-apply to the RO as processes/fees are subject to change
* If an applicant is declined, they will not be referred to another department or school
1. Citations do not measure research quality directly as there may be many reasons for citing a paper, including negative citations – stating that the findings are wrong. However, it is normally accepted that they measure impact, in that other researchers demonstrate their awareness of the research by citing it and peer reviewers of the citing papers accept the validity of the citations. Furthermore, some arguments for the use of citation impact to distribute funding are based on the strength of the correlation between citation performance and other mechanisms used to assess quality directly, notably peer review. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Bibliometrics and scientometrics are the terms used for the study of publication-based and other indicators of research. They have a variety of uses including for example the mapping of emerging fields or patterns of international cooperation but our main concern here will be with ‘evaluative bibliometrics’ – the use of these techniques to assess performance. There is an extensive literature on the limitations of citation analysis including challenges to its accuracy (eg wrong addresses, misspelt names etc.), and biases (US bias, English language bias, greater tendency to cite reviews and methodology papers than original findings, excessive citing of editors etc). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Other criticisms of impact factor include the lack of field and article-type normalisation. So journals featuring significant proportions of review articles in populous subject areas will tend towards higher impact factors. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Eugene Garfield I had a dream about uncitedness… [http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/commentaries/tsv12(14)p10y19980706.pdf](http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/commentaries/tsv12%2814%29p10y19980706.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Not least because the number of papers in ISI Journals drives our score in the Shanghai JiaoTong ARWU Index. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Someone on a 50% contract who teaches for six semesters at 50% of the time, with the teaching spread across both semesters, then maybe awarded leave for one semester, which, of course, continues to be 50% of the time (and salary). However, in cases where someone on a fractional contract does all his/her teaching in one semester, with the other semester free of teaching, to keep with the spirit of the scheme leave entitlement would normally take the form of a 50% reduction in the teaching load for that year. This might mean teaching a half load across the full semester, or teaching for half the semester. The specific arrangement would have to be agreed with Head of Division. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. It is not a requirement that such an appointment be made, but that the available money be sufficient for it. A division might choose to spend the money on a larger number of teaching hours, to compensate for the loss of other activity from the colleague on leave, rather than to make a single appointment. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. That is, those identified in June 2013 will be considered for institutional leave in 2014-15. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. For example, the Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies (CTIS) has served as a vital means of packaging and presenting the School’s work in translation and related areas such that it functions as an international magnet for MA, PhD and Visiting Scholar applications, and for professionals seeking training in the field. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)