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- Founded in 1451
- 2nd oldest University in Scotland (4th UK)
- 6,000+ Staff
  - 2000 Researchers
- 26K Students
  - 6K PGs
- In top 1% of world universities
- 94th in THE 2015 Rankings
- In the UK's top 10 earners for research
- Rated 3rd in the UK for international student satisfaction
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Introduction

The University’s ambition as stated in its strategic plan, “Building on Excellence” and Research Strategy 2006-2010 is to be one of the world’s Top 50 research intensive universities.

In 2005 the Government announced its intention to replace the existing RAE with the Research Excellence Framework (REF), an assessment based on metrics, including bibliometrics in the form of citations to papers. HEFCE states that:

‘The REF will consist of a single unified framework for the funding and assessment of research across all subjects. It will make greater use of quantitative indicators in the assessment of research quality than the present system, while taking account of key differences between the different disciplines. Assessment will combine quantitative indicators - including bibliometric indicators wherever these are appropriate - and light-touch expert review. Which of these elements are employed, and the balance between them, will vary as appropriate to each subject.’ [1]

Following a recent consultation HEFCE have decided that future assessments will include some form of metrics-based assessment, including bibliometrics, as well as peer review for all (not just STEM) subjects.

The University recognises that research publications, as one of the main outputs of research, are a key asset. As such, they should be managed in a way that ensures that they provide maximum value both to individual members of the academic community, whose research output they represent, and collectively to the institution. The academic community has an essential role to play in the generation and publication of research publications while the University has an important role to play both to support and assist academic staff, and as the curator of the assets.

Objectives

The objectives of this policy are:

- To increase the visibility of research publications produced by staff employed by or associated with the University of Glasgow
- To ensure that research outputs are prepared and curated in a way which helps maximise the value that they have for the university in terms of the external use of bibliometric data e.g. league tables, post-2000 RAE

Approach

1. The University will maximise the impact of University publications in bibliometric analyses by ensuring that all research outputs are accurately recorded as being produced by University of Glasgow staff. There is some lack of consistency in the addresses used by authors.

The following addresses are examples of this. Taken from the Web of Science, one of the preferred bibliographic tools for the REF, these addresses appear on recent publications by University academic staff:

- PWE Glasgow Cardiacs; Poa Gr, Glasgow; Lanark; Scotland
Research Excellence Framework

The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the new system for assessing the quality of research in UK higher education institutions.

The results of the 2014 REF were published on 18 December 2014.

The research of 154 UK universities was assessed

They made 1,911 submissions including:
- 52,061 academic staff
- 191,150 research outputs
- 6,975 impact case studies

The overall quality of submissions was judged, on average to be:

- 30% world-leading (4*)
- 46% internationally excellent (3*)
- 20% recognised internationally (2*)
- 3% recognised nationally (1*)

REF 2014 - key links

2014 REF Results and submissions
Evaluation of the 2014 REF
REF Manager’s report (March 2015)
Panel overview reports (Jan 2015)
EDAP’s report on equality and diversity (Jan 2015)
Key facts leaflet about the REF

REF impact case studies

A searchable online database and an initial analysis of REF impact case studies are available.
Allocation of £2 Billion per year of research to UK universities

The four UK higher education funding bodies allocate about £2 billion per year of research funding to UK universities. They aim to support a dynamic and internationally competitive UK research sector that makes a major contribution to economic prosperity, national wellbeing and the expansion and dissemination of knowledge.
The REF is a process of expert review, carried out in 36 subject-based units of assessment (UOAs).

**2011-2012 Preparation**

The UK funding bodies appointed the REF expert panels, consulted the sector and published the criteria and guidelines for the exercise.

**2012-2013 Submissions**

Each institution decided which UOAs to submit in, and prepared their submissions. Submissions were made by 29 November 2013.

**2014 Assessment**

Expert panels – comprising 898 academics and 259 research users – reviewed the submissions. The results were published on 18 December 2014.
An Embedded Repository
Embedding is about…

• Being stitched into the fabric of the institution
  – Culturally, Technically, Holistically
• Adding Value [for the]
  – Researcher, Funder(s), Institution, UK Plc
• Re-using Metadata and Content
  – REF, Research Profiles, Interoperability, crosswalks and metadata schema
• Reducing Duplication
  – Ingest, workflows, reporting
• Exploiting new opportunities
  – Data mining, business intelligence, KPI’s, Analytics, “stickiness”, visibility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abadir, Prof Karim (1)</td>
<td>Abalat, Dr Amaya (33)</td>
<td>Angelopoulos, Dr Konstantinos (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abayye, Dr Daniel (1)</td>
<td>Albayrak, Professor Tahir (1)</td>
<td>Angerson, Dr Wilson (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbas, Miss Hamera (4)</td>
<td>Alberdi, Dr Maria (4)</td>
<td>Angus, Dr Allan (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, Ms Daisy (4)</td>
<td>Albertsen, Mr Andreas (2)</td>
<td>Angus, Dr Margaret (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdelrahman, Dr Tamer (4)</td>
<td>Alcock, Dr Stephen (2)</td>
<td>Anker, Dr Thomas (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdurahman, Dr Azmil (10)</td>
<td>Alcorn, Dr Des (1)</td>
<td>Annand, Dr John (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdulllah, Dr Zuraidah (1)</td>
<td>Aleksanyan, Dr Mark (6)</td>
<td>Annandale, Dr Ellen (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdurrahman, Mrs Nadia (2)</td>
<td>Alekseev, Dr Alexander (2)</td>
<td>Anopa, Ms Yulia (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abernathy, Mr Matthew (37)</td>
<td>Alexander, Miss Anne-Marie (3)</td>
<td>Anthony, Dr Diana (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhayawansa, Dr Subhash (1)</td>
<td>Alexander, Miss Claire (4)</td>
<td>Anthony, Dr Ian (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abid, Mr Kamran (3)</td>
<td>Alexander, Dr Craig (28)</td>
<td>Anwar, Ms Shazma (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham, Dr Sheela (7)</td>
<td>Alexander, Prof Heather (1)</td>
<td>Apfelbeck, Dr Beate Anna (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrams, Professor Lynn (22)</td>
<td>Alexander, Mrs Laura (2)</td>
<td>Appelbe, Mrs Shirley (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acedo, Dr Francisco (1)</td>
<td>Alexander, Dr Marc (32)</td>
<td>Appleby, Professor Roger (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acha, Prof Enrique (47)</td>
<td>Alexander, Mr Michael (164)</td>
<td>Appleton, Ms Kim (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acharya, Ms Mrudu (2)</td>
<td>Alfani, Dr Guido (14)</td>
<td>Appleton, Dr Richard (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achcar, Dr Fiona (8)</td>
<td>Ali, Mr Arshad (1)</td>
<td>Arafat, Dr Sachi (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acosta-Serrano, Dr Alvaro (13)</td>
<td>Ali, Mr Asif (2)</td>
<td>Aragon Camaras, Dr Gerardo (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair, Dr Richard (3)</td>
<td>Ali, Dr Myzoon (24)</td>
<td>Aranday-Cortes, Dr Elihu (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Dr A K M (49)</td>
<td>Ali, Prof Nabeel (2)</td>
<td>Arapakis, Mr Ioannis (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Ms Aileen (11)</td>
<td>Alibou, Dr Vincent (4)</td>
<td>Archibald, Dr David (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Mrs Berit (4)</td>
<td>Alivernini, Mr Stefano (3)</td>
<td>Ardehal, Mr Jamaleddin (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Dr David (2)</td>
<td>Allam, Dr Mohamed (3)</td>
<td>Arendt, Ms Maja (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Professor Carol (37)</td>
<td>Allan, Dr Carole (1)</td>
<td>Arizpe, Dr Evelyn (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Miss Christine (1)</td>
<td>Allan, Mr David (1)</td>
<td>Armengaud, Dr Patrick (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014
• Internal REF exercise
• Enlighten used as the platform to carry out this exercise
• Used modified version of the RAE add-on software developed by the University of Southampton for RAE 2008
• Significantly increased staff engagement with Enlighten – which has continued beyond the exercise
• Laid the groundwork for using Enlighten for REF2014
Selected Items: Mr William Nixon

For information on how to use this system please see the "Guidance for Staff" [PDF]

Listed below are all of your publications held in the institutional repository, Enlighten. This list has been generated from Enlighten using your GUID. **If the list is incomplete, you can refine this search using the “refine search” button at the bottom of the screen.** You can either search by your author/editor name or by the title of the output to produce a more complete list.

If REF-eligible outputs are missing please contact us at deposit@lb ula.ac.uk with the details and Library staff will add them.

Please select your four best outputs by clicking on the “add” option next to the output.

Once you have selected your four items, please click on the “edit info” option next to each publication and complete the information requested.

**REF2014 Eligibility**

Only academic staff whose primary employment function is research or research and teaching will be eligible for submission.

Teaching only staff will not be eligible.

Research assistants and research fellows will be eligible only by exception (in the comparatively few cases where they have a sufficiently strong personal research record).

**Therefore, only staff on “research and teaching” contracts and staff on “research only” contracts specifically identified by their College need complete this proforma.**

Please note:

1. You should complete this information if you currently hold a “research and teaching” contract
2. You should complete as much information as possible, even if you do not have four outputs to select

For further information on the REF and Mini-REF, please see the University’s REF webpages

**Advice on Output Selection**

Guidance on how to select your top four outputs is available in Information for Staff

**Note:**

- Where your outputs are co-authored by GU colleagues, you may wish to consult with those colleagues before making your selection.
- Where a publication has multiple authors, you should be able to demonstrate that you made a clear, distinctive and significant contribution to that output, particularly where it is co-authored by another member of staff. Please justify this contribution in your “Further Details” statement.

Selected Items:

Selection Details: Mr William Nixon

Go back to the Select Items page to continuing selecting items.

Use this page to provide additional information about the selected item.

For further information on the REF and Mini-REF, please see the University's REF webpages.

For information on how to use this system please see the "Guidance for Staff" [PDF]

Selected Item:


Further Details

Please provide a short statement detailing why you have selected this output, including its intellectual influence within the academic sphere and/or actual or potential use beyond the academic sphere [100 words maximum]:

Supporting text

Self Rating

Please assess the quality of this output using the proposed rating scale for the REF [4*, 3*, 2*, 1*, Unclassified]. Your assessment will be taken into account by the College Assessment Panel when it undertakes its formal assessment:

Please select...
1*
2*
3*
4*
Unclassified

Order of Preference

Of your four best outputs, please rate this publication in order of preference [1 = favourite, 4 = least favourite]:

Please select...
1
2
3
4
Key success factors

- Comprehensive (metadata) coverage
- Single Sign On (GUID) in place
- Additional functionality for selecting records (IRRA)
- Impact and Esteem data
- Reporting options (Word and Excel)
- Devolved REF Administrators
- Staff “impersonation” options
Are you ready for REF 2014?

The EPrints team prides itself on developing innovative features that align closely with the needs of the EPrints user community. In the UK, universities and other research organisations are preparing for the next national research assessment exercise, known as REF.

EPrints repositories have a potentially important role to play in institutions’ responses to the requirements of REF. Our new REF2014 plugin has been specifically designed to help institutions manage their REF1 data (staff details) and REF2 data (research outputs).

The REF2014 plugin has been developed in concert with the University of Glasgow. After successful testing with early adopters the plugin is now available on files.eprints.org and via the EPrints Bazaar for one-click installation for those using the latest version of EPrints.

The REF2014 plugin is free to all organisations running EPrints. In addition to developing the plugin EPrints Services is now offering a REF2014 support package which includes training, fine tuning of the plugin to complement your EPrints setup and technical support until the end of the REF submission process. For further information please call EPrints Services on 01872 870464.

Feature Overview

Assign staff to UoAs and manage REF1 data
Assign each eligible staff member to a Unit of Assessment (UoA), and enter REF1 data.

Assign UoA champions
Assign UoA champions responsibility for checking and verifying the outputs selected by staff in one or more UoAs.

Select outputs
UoA champions can select outputs on behalf of any staff member in their assigned UoA(s). You also have the option to allow each staff member to select their own outputs.

Rate and qualify selections

Over 1200 staff and 5700 selections (cumulative)

Building on the work of the MiniREF

MiniREF selections migrated to REF plugin

EPrints services very responsive

Last modified/date added

Introduced Units of Assessment

Work very closely with College Research Offices

REF Reports run via Access (by UoA and College)
Library’s role

- Prioritising REF2 selections added to repository
- Updating selections for REF compliance
- Ensuring papers were linked to staff for selections
- Making selections on behalf of staff
- Providing InCites citation reports (metrics)
- Providing College level reports on outputs (in Excel)
• Citation data used by 11 panels to inform their decisions
• Library supplied citation data from InCites to relevant panels during MiniREF
• Citation data provided complementary check in addition to peer review
• Enlighten held Scopus and WoS citation counts (for comparison) for REF selections
• Articles and conference proceedings* accepted from 1st April 2016 will need to be open access in order to be eligible

• No need to pay – exceptions available

• Accept embargo of 12 months for science, technology and medicine and 24 months for humanities subjects

• Credit in ‘environmental component’ for making other outputs open access

“author’s final peer-reviewed manuscripts must have been deposited in an institutional or subject repository on acceptance for publication”
Policy for open access in the post-2014 REF

Executive summary

Purpose

1. This document sets out the details of a requirement that certain research outputs should be made open-access to be eligible for submission to the post-2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF). This requirement will apply to journal articles and conference proceedings accepted for publication after 1 April 2016.

Key points

2. The policy states that, to be eligible for submission to the post-2014 REF, authors’ final peer-reviewed manuscripts must have been deposited in an institutional or subject repository on acceptance for publication. Deposited material should be discoverable, and free to read and download, for anyone with an internet connection. The requirement applies only to journal articles and conference proceedings with an International Standard Serial Number. It will not apply to monographs, book chapters, other long-form publications, working papers, creative or practice-based research outputs, or data. The policy applies to research outputs accepted for publication after 1 April 2016, but we would strongly urge institutions to implement it now.
Independent review of the role of metrics in research assessment

We are reviewing the role of metrics in the assessment and management of research. This affects anyone with a professional interest in research assessment and funding.

What is metrics-based research assessment?

Metrics is the quantitative analysis of scientific and scholarly research outputs and their impacts. Metrics include a variety of measures and statistical methods for assessing the quality and broader impact of scientific and scholarly research.

About the review

We are managing the independent review of the role of metrics in research assessment and research management. The review builds on a previous pilot exercise run in 2008-9.

It explores the current use of metrics for research assessment, drawing on evidence from a wide range of sources. It is considering the robustness of metrics across different academic disciplines, assessing their potential contribution to the development of research excellence and impact within higher education.
• Continue providing panel members with bibliometric and other data to support peer review judgments;
• Increase sophistication of information provided;
• Provide more quantitative data to all panels, but leave them to decide how much (if any) is used.

James Wilsdon, REFlections, April 2015
Assessing progress towards implementation of the HEFCE OA policy for the post-2014 REF

By Neil Jacobs on April 10, 2015

With the date at which HEFCE’s policy on open access in the next REF comes into force just under a year away (1st April 2016), now seems like a good time to ‘temperature test’ how much progress has been made across the sector to address this and to consider if there may be opportunities to do more to support institutions in this area.

To help Jisc and other stakeholders understand in a deeper way what the ‘on the ground’ challenges are for institutions in implementing the policy, Jisc has commissioned Rob Johnson of Research Consulting to undertake a short, focused study to assess progress towards meeting HEFCE’s requirements and clarify a critical path for potential support activities over the next 12 months.
“Alt” is German for “old”  
It’s time to stop talking about metrics in terms of “alternative” metrics.

Todd A. Carpenter  
Executive Director, NISO  
@TAC_NISO  
March 30, 2015
Direct measurement of a 27-dimensional orbital-angular-momentum state vector


Full text not currently available from Enlighten.

Publisher's URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ncomms4115

Abstract

The measurement of a quantum state poses a unique challenge for experimentalists. Recently, the technique of 'direct measurement' was proposed for characterizing a quantum state in situ through sequential weak and strong measurements. While this method has been used for measuring polarization states, its real potential lies in the measurement of states with a large dimensionality. Here we show the practical direct measurement of a high-dimensional state vector in the discrete basis of orbital angular momentum. Through weak measurements of orbital angular momentum and strong measurements of angular position, we measure the complex probability amplitudes of a pure state with a dimensionality, d=27. Further, we use our method to directly observe the relationship between rotations of a state vector and the relative phase between its orbital-angular-momentum components. Our technique has important applications in high-dimensional classical and quantum information systems and can be extended to characterize other types of large quantum states.
Next Steps

- Ensuring comprehensive publication coverage
- Depositing full text papers in line with next REF
- Capturing all our Open Access data in Workflow
- Linking our repositories together (Enlighten)
- Exploring new Research Performance Indicator(s)
- Implementing Altmetric Institutional Explorer
- Minting DOIs for theses
- Assigning ORCIDs & matching with WoS (via Enlighten)
Thanks for your attention