Guidelines for Academic Staff Research & Innovation Time

Introduction

Strategy 2020: Building Success and the associated Academic Strategy: 2020, set out clear ambitions around the University's objective to grow research and innovation activity. A number of associated trajectory Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) have been identified and published in the University Corporate Plan. Schools are responsible for implementing targeted action plans, in order to meet the University's annual research and innovation (R&I) KPI targets. The Dean of School and the School Director of Research are responsible for ensuring that the School achieves its Research and Innovation KPIs.

In order to achieve the challenging R&I targets, we need to change the culture within Schools so that R&I is placed firmly at the core of academic activity. Schools should have a long-term R&I plan, which matches the overall goals of the University and shows how the School will contribute to meeting the KPIs associated with those goals. This plan must be cascaded to individual academics to provide a line of sight for every individual from their own personal objectives through to the School (and thereby University) objectives.

Central to any plan will be the resource the School allocates to R&I activity. Each School is expected to allocate a proportion of their staff time resource to undertaking R&I as per the Academic Workload Framework 2016 (AWF), which is recorded for TRAC purposes as Edinburgh Napier University funded research and other activity. In order that academic staff can deliver on R&I objectives it is essential that staff with R&I deliverables are given effective time to undertake this work. **There is no assumption that all staff will receive an allocation of research time. Any member of staff receiving an allowance will be expected to commit to the delivery of an agreed set of KPIs in exchange for an allocation of research time.** This will require careful management during MyContribution reviews.

This document sets out a process for the allocation of R&I time within Schools in order to promote transparency and equality for the academic community whilst proactively utilising the MyContribution meeting cycle in pursuit of the School's R&I KPIs.

This document has been developed in association with a number of other policies aimed at ensuring quality R&I time is available to all staff and improving research outputs, quality and activity. This document should be read in conjunction with the Staff Charter and Academic Workload Framework 2016 (AWF).

Research & Innovation Time

To produce quality research outputs requires concentrated time. Single hours dedicated to R&I which are spread throughout the week are unlikely to result in quality research outputs and therefore should be considered as ineffective use of time. When allocating R&I time to an individual it is important that the time be allocated in usable blocks. The norm would be whole-days, however in some instances half-days may be effective. To achieve effective use of time, staff will need to work collegiately around sharing teaching, timetabling and managing student access.

The AWF allows a maximum of 0.25 FTE in Edinburgh Napier-funded research-time allocated to staff in any one year and similar for Other time (for example for commercial related activity). This is sufficient to address the majority of Napier-funded research-time allocations, however if more than 0.25FTE across the year is requested then this must be dealt with through the School sabbatical scheme. All staff are required to do a minimum of 0.2FTE teaching related activity in any one year.

In some situations One day per week across the academic year is equivalent to 0.2FTE allocated to research, which if grouped together would account for 9 weeks full-time research (assuming a 44 working week year). Therefore managers and academics should consider what would be more effective to achieve agreed objectives, block time or longer thinner time.

Within the 0.25FTE restriction allocations of 1 day per week throughout the year through to one trimester completely free would be achievable. It is the responsibility of the member of academic staff to determine which format of Napier-funded research-time will be most effective and to work with their colleagues (Head of Subject, line manager and teaching teams) to ensure that this can be achieved. Freeing up a complete trimester will require re-allocating workload into other trimesters. Trimesters one and two may be more difficult to free up due to normal teaching, whereas trimester three for many staff should be achievable and of course the research block can straddle trimesters, for example taking into account exam/marking periods if team teaching allows. Annual leave impinges on all trimesters.

Sabbaticals

Sabbaticals are defined as period of Napier-funded research time (or Other time) greater than 0.25 FTE in a year and are open to staff on all of the Academic Pathways. Longer periods of R&I time provides an opportunity for staff to create, maintain and develop links to the benefit of their research and teaching and to enhance the national and international profile of their teaching and research. The School Sabbatical Scheme should be used in conjunction with externally funded leave schemes where possible.

Sabbatical leave should not be regarded as a right in itself and is at the discretion of the DoS and DoR, based on school objectives, priorities and resources. Sabbatical applications must contribute to School objectives.

Research and Innovation should be widely defined to embrace laboratory research, whether of an individual or collective nature, fieldwork, involving the gathering of data and liaising

with outside professional bodies, library-based research, the writing up of research projects in a form suitable for publication and knowledge exchange or enterprise and professional activity. This definition includes research leading to the preparation of applications to outside grant-awarding bodies for substantial research grants.

Staff on sabbatical will be relieved of all administrative duties at School and University level, with the exception of those tasks related to the supervision of research postgraduate students, and the conduct of externally funded research and innovation projects. Research Sabbatical Leave should not impose undue burdens on students, colleagues, or on the University generally.

The School is responsible for ensuring that satisfactory cover is available during the research sabbatical period, however we expect that individuals applying for a School sabbatical will do so having fully considered how their teaching and administrative work will be covered and having discussed cover options with their Head of Subject Group in advance of the application. We envisage that applicants will adopt a collegiate and reciprocal approach to Research Sabbatical cover, drawing on the benefits of team teaching arrangements. For example 2 or 3 colleagues thinking of applying might agree to cover for each other's teaching when one is on research sabbatical leave. In making decisions on which semester to apply for Research Sabbatical Leave, priority should be given to semesters when applicants have lighter teaching loads/workloads to help reduce 'cover' requirements.

Where teaching assistance is bought in to cover the research leave period of an academic member of staff this cost will be met by the School unless external funding has been secured to cover this cost.

If a member of staff falls sick during a period of Research sabbatical leave agreed under the University Scheme, the period of research sabbatical leave will not normally be extended. The absence will, however, be taken into account when considering the subsequent Research Sabbatical Leave Report, particularly where expected outputs have been adversely affected by the absence.

School R&I Plans – Setting & Monitoring Research KPIs

Effective use of academic staff resource is central to changing the culture and achieving the objectives, therefore is it imperative that the Director of Research communicates the School R&I plan with the Heads of Subject and line managers, and agrees the apportionment of R&I KPIs across the subject groups in the School.

The allocation of time and the resultant KPIs expected from each subject group is then the responsibility of the Heads of Subject in discussion with the academic line managers through individuals' PDR and MyContribution meetings.

It is the responsibility of the DoR (working with HoS and line managers) to ensure that sufficient objectives are set through the MyContribution objective setting cycle to meet the School's objectives and that these objectives are effectively monitored to ensure that the overall School KPIs are delivered. It is anticipated that staff with a research focus, e.g. Professors will be given a research allocation, however there will be clear expectations of deliverables as discussed in the Principles for Research Allocation below.

DoRs in discussion with the HoS might decide to select certain individuals to allocate specific targets (with associated resource) based on the individuals' role and research profile if they determine this will be the most effective way of meeting the School KPIs. For example individuals with a successful track record of obtaining funding may be selected to win additional funds over and above others to ensure targets are met. This must be balanced holistically across the School to ensure the development ECRs.

To assist DoRs in the development of their respective research plans and with the annual objective setting process, the Research and Innovation Office will provide Schools with meaningful research data and targets, broken down at School-level and progress to date against these targets. Ongoing progress against these targets will be reported through the University Research and Innovation Committee.

REF related Targets (to the next REF exercise in 2021 and beyond)

- All academic staff should develop a long term research plan which should be updated annually and should take into account their planned position for the next REF. The plan should cover:
    - The general research area and direction of their research
    - Research funding plans to support that research (which is likely to evolve over time) but should include applications planned for the following year.
    - The number and quality of research outputs planned/expected and timescales with clear line to REF.
    - The number of impact case studies to be developed
    - Esteem measures to be targeted
    - PhD student completions
- At the MyContribution meetings, these objectives should be discussed in the round, including where staff are to date in relation to their targets; which targets the academic

can deliver in the following year (or contribute to for major deliverables); and how much time should be allocated to support the delivery of the targets.

- For research outputs with co-authors (grants/publications etc) in the University, academics will only receive a shared allowance for the output which should be agreed in advance between the authors based on their contribution.

Research Income Targets (for the following two academic years):

- Due to the duration of time from developing a research application, through submission, award and project start to recognising this as research income (spend against the project), research income targets must be managed on a minimum of a two year rolling process.
- At Q3, RIO will provide Directors of Research with information to assist with their planning, including targets for the following two years, current position against those targets based on awarded projects and submitted projects and the gap to be met for each year. They will also provide targets for amount of funding which should be applied for to achieve the gap based on previous track record of success, along with individual's success record and an per person target for applications based on the individual's role (Prof, AP, Lecturer). This is provided for guidance and it is the responsibility of the DoRs to use the information in allocating targets to academics.
- The research income target for any forthcoming year will be challenging to improve substantially, by the time of PDR for that year. These targets should have been addressed the previous year, however there may still be a shortfall. Therefore the DoR will need to develop a plan for short turnaround research funding to meet any gap for the forthcoming year and appropriate targets agreed with relevant academics.
- The target for the following year will therefore be the primary focus of planning at PDR.
- To ensure Schools meet their research income targets, responsibility for the targets must be owned by the individual academics in the schools and therefore must be included as part of their objectives agreed through the MyContribution process.
- The personal development reviews take place around June, therefore Directors of Research must have a plan in place for sharing with their school, which Subject Heads and line managers manage during the process. It is assumed that the PDR will cover the academic year September to August, therefore objectives set in June one year will not be fully reported on until end August the following year – this must be clear in the objective setting and measuring of those objectives. With the summer being the quietest teaching time it is important that this period is used effectively in line with workload and staff charter guidelines.
- As the objectives set in a PDR will commence September of that year, any grant funding objectives will be unlikely to impact on the research income for that year, unless they have been identified as short turnaround funding by the DoR and would require appropriate monitoring.
- All grant funding objectives set through the PDR should be entered into Worktribe by the individual academic by the 1st September to allow for forecasting and monitoring of the planned grant applications.

Commercial Targets (for the forthcoming year and beyond)

- At Q3 RIO BE team will provide the DoRs the targets for commercial activity in the School for the following year.
- Any known projects contributing to the targets of the following year will be provided, and any shortfall to meet the School target.
- The DoR should have a clear plan for how the CPD and consultancy targets will be met, including any repeat business through for example CPD.
- In consultation with the Heads of Subject, staff should be identified that will deliver the commercial targets and appropriate objectives and resources allocated.

Key principles for resource time allocation & associated deliverables

The School research plan should be widely communicated in advance of the MyContribution meeting cycle.
Allocation of research time should be transparently and fairly apportioned based on a set of agreed research activity criteria (key deliverables). Resources should not be allocated simply according to job title, role or seniority but must be linked directly to outputs. However, staff with a role that suggests a research focus such as a Professor on the Research Pathway would be expected to have a research allocation and deliver accordingly against that allocation.

Allocation of research time should be prioritised against an agreed scale.

- DoRs must ensure that staff with externally funded projects (with or without DA costs) are adequately resourced to ensure the project can be delivered. This time is paid for externally (is additional to Napier-funded research-time) and must be honoured in the staff workload.
- Any externally funded projects without DA costs for the PI or Co-Is must be top-sliced from any School Napier-funded research-time prior to allocation of the Schools Napier-funded research-time for other activity across the school
    - For research projects with PI and Co-Is within the University – the academics will receive an allocation of contribution as described in the project and approved in Worktribe, therefore DoRs must check the allocation requested when approving projects as this is in effect agreeing Napier-funded research time allocation.
- Any sabbaticals approved by the DoR and DoS must next be deducted form the School's Napier-funded research time.
- Remaining School Napier-funded research time can then be used to ensure School KPIs are met through individuals' MyContribution objective and resource allocation.

In order to receive an allocation of Napier-funded research time, staff must deliver against an agreed set of core research KPIs, managed through the MyContribution meeting cycle and recorded through the Worktribe research management system.

The allocation process of research time should have full buy-in from the Dean of School, Subject Heads and Directors of Research in line with the Staff Charter, and be clearly communicated to all academics and managers in advance of the MyContribution objective setting cycle.

The allocation model should take account of the need for succession planning by investing resource into researchers at all stages of their career, including Early Career Researchers or new starts.

Research Deliverables (research KPIs)

Napier-funded research-time should be allocated to staff members based on their anticipated contribution to the Schools' research activity over the forthcoming 12-month period. This should be clearly articulated through their personal long-term research plan and MyContribution objectives.

There is a range of potential deliverables associated with research and innovation and the priority associated with each of these will vary between schools depending on the school strategy. However Research and Commercial income and high quality outputs (generally publicaitons) should be top priority for all schools. The key deliverables are therefore:

- Conference / journal paper at level 3* or above
- A research monograph (authored, co-authored)
- Grant applications
    - The size of funding will vary between schools and the amount of funding expected should vary across roles (Prof, AP, L). For example we might expect a Prof to average £75k/yr awarded on an ongoing basis.
    - All grant applications to be eligible as a deliverable must first be approved by the School Quality panel peer review mechanism to ensure the quality of applications submitted. We must not reward ticking boxes, quality is essential.

Other related outputs which enhance research reputation (for example, conference presentations, seminars, unpaid secondments or fellowships, policy briefings, the membership of research funding consortia) will strengthen requests, but are not in themselves sufficient outputs to support a request for research allocation.

These measures should be agreed at the discretion of the Dean of School; Head of Subject and Director of Research, recognising that the KPIs may vary across Schools or subjects disciplines, but must be managed to ensure school targets are achieved. The deliverables should conform to the School research plan.

The Director of Research in consultation with the Heads of Subject (in agreement with the Dean of School) should determine the proportion of time associated with the expected key deliverables for the School, this should be made transparent across the school. Contribution to R&I activity should be commensurate to the individuals' career stage. (A level 3 Prof might be expected to deliver more than an ECR, in exchange for the same allocation of time on certain activities).

A suggested model is as follows:

- 1/2 day per week of protected research time should result in one of the above listed key deliverables within the 12 month period.
    - Therefore, one full day per week of protected research time would result in a minimum of two of the above deliverables within the 12 month period.
- When monitoring objectives and to ensure fairness and transparency, it is important that there be no double counting between time allocated for different R&I related activities

such as PhD student and Napier-funded research-time or externally funded research time. For example, getting a publication on the back of a PhD student's research takes more time than normal supervising allocation but someone with a PhD student will find it easier to get a publication in 1 day per week than someone without a PhD student, therefore this must be considered in the allocation and objective setting. Similarly having an externally funded project will make it easier to get a publication in a 1 day a week allocation than without.

The Worktribe Research Management System should be used to effectively manage staff members' projected deliverables through bid development and via the output repository. Once an individual's objectives have been formally agreed, grant applications (bids in development) must be entered to Worktribe by the beginning of September.

Proposed Process for allocation of Napier-funded research-time:

Sabbatical Applications (Mar-April)

Any staff who would like to request more than 0.25FTE in any one year to undertake R&I activity must complete a sabbatical application form detailing the case for support by the end of March. Sabbatical applications will be considered by the DoS and DoR during April and will determine how many sabbaticals can be supported in the coming year. The time allocated to sabbaticals will be deducted form the School's overall Napier-funded research-time.

Pre MyContribution objective setting Meetings (May – June)

- Dean of School (with input from Head of Subject and DoR) confirms the overall ball-park allocation of protected research time available for the School (including that for sabbaticals and that for allocation during MyContribution meetings).
- Dean of School, Head of Subject and DoR agree the appropriate KPIs / R&I deliverables for their respective Schools (or subject area), aligned to their R&I plan.
- Dean of School, Head of Subject and DoR agree the deliverables expected for the research time allocations in the school. (Commensurate to career stage).
- DoRs communicate the above decisions to managers responsible for conducting MyContribution meetings.
- Staff in the School are invited to request an allocation of protected research time (normally 1 day per week) in advance of their MyContribution meeting. The communication should include information on the expected research deliverables in exchange for requested, protected time.
- The DoR with the Dean of School is responsible for calculating the total value of requested research time across the School and for ensuring sufficient research allocation is available to meet targets. Where request for allocation exceeds the available Napier-funded research-time available, the DoR should work with line managers to identify the best solution, which allows targets to be met in a fair and transparent manner. This may mean some people do not get a requested allocation of Napier-funded research-time and will not be expected to deliver the associated KPIs. Staff in this position who do go on to deliver towards the School targets should be rewarded with time in the following year.

MyContribution objective setting meetings (July – Aug)

- During the MyContribution objective setting meetings the line manager and staff member should discuss the request for protected research time in the context of the key deliverables and other workload commitments. Line managers should have a clear view of what Napier-funded research-time can be allocated to whom.
- The staff member is responsible for populating their research activity within Worktribe as a means of monitoring performance against deliverables.

MyContribution Interim Reviews

- The interim review meetings, along with other regular meetings with the line manager should be used to assess progress against the agreed deliverables.

Appendix 1: Sabbatical Application Guidelines

Applications to the School Sabbatical Scheme will only be considered if they demonstrate that the leave will be used to undertake a clearly defined piece of distinctive and excellent R&I activity with identifiable and substantial R&I output(s) consistent with the School and University's Academic Strategy.

Applicants for sabbatical should address each of these criteria in their applications. In deciding whether to recommend the approval of an application for research leave, the Dean of School, with advice from School Director of Research, should consider the extent to which the application addresses the following questions, in the light of the career stage of the applicant, and in addition to any supplementary School criteria:

1. Can the applicant demonstrate evidence of an excellent record of research achievement commensurate with their career stage, including the effective conduct of independent research, publication, success in developing research proposals which attract external funding, and initiative in developing knowledge exchange activities over the period since the last research leave ended?
2. Can the applicant demonstrate a track record of recruitment and successful supervision of PhD students, commensurate with their career stage?
3. Were the planned objectives of any previous period of research leave met?
4. Will the research leave lead to substantial research outputs; for example,
    - Will the proposed research activity lead to the completion of internationally excellent substantial research publications (e.g. monographs, journal articles); is there a clear plan to publication in the proposal?
    - Have any requests for external funding been made in conjunction with this proposed research activity? Will a component of the planned research leave include the preparation of proposals for funding for future projects, to be undertaken at the end of the applicant's research leave period?
    - Are there other substantive and valuable research outputs that will be achieved?
    - Has the research proposal effectively presented clear pathways to impact?
5. Is the plan for the research given in sufficient detail in the application? Is the planned research commensurate with the period of leave requested?
6. Can the work of the applicant be satisfactorily covered during the period of leave?

Outputs which are considered eligible for the School Sabbatical Scheme should be inline with deliverables expected for allocation of Napier-funded research-time (or equivalent for Other activity)

Research resources are distinct from the resource implications of being granted a sabbatical. They are defined here as the resources necessary for the actual conduct of research, for example, travel and subsistence expenses, conference fees, library fees, research support, and so on. The applicant must show that he or she has identified appropriate means of covering these research resources. Applications to the School Sabbatical Scheme should state whether the conduct of the research in question is dependent on the success of supporting applications for research resources.

Appendix 2 - WAF extract re R&I time allocation

1.3.2 Research

1.3.2.1	**Research (R)** is a core activity. It comprises: • research – refer to the definitions in the Frascati l • fieldwork, laboratory, studio, desk/library work; • management of projects, informal discussions, p • recruitment and supervision of research staff; • attendance at conferences, seminars and societ connected with specific research projects; • production of research reports, papers, books; • training and supervision of PGR students includi methodology, review of drafts and preparation of examining; • collaboration with other academic departments o above; • outreach where research is the underlying activit through a Teaching Company Scheme or Knowle TRAC follows the definition used by the Higher Educati in the Finance Statistics Return guidance: • Research is to include research and experimenta of research, below, is taken from the 2002 Frasc 'Research and Experimental Development (R&D) co undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increas including knowledge of man, culture and society and knowledge to devise new applications. R&D is a ter

[11] Frascati Manual 2002: ISBN 978-92-64-19903-9

	activity. They come under the research sponsor category of 'institution own-funded' research. However, in the time allocation data, time spent on research (or teaching) that is not considered by the institutions to be necessary for its mission or research strategy should not be recorded; d) Does not include scholarship activity; this can form part of the Support activity for Research, but could equally be Support for Teaching.
1.3.2.2	Research is categorised into eight research sponsor types, summarised below (sub-sections 1.3.2.3 to 1.3.2.6). A research sponsor type is a group of sponsors that are similar in nature. It is not an individual research sponsor organisation. The word 'sponsor' is used in TRAC to denote the funder – external or internal. Where a Research project is funded by a consortium of organisations (public and non-public) the costs will need to be attributed proportionally between research sponsor types. Proxies could be used, e.g. attribution pro rata to the direct costs funded by each sponsor. However, where a research project is only partially funded by a sponsor and the remainder is institution own-funded, all of the academic time is attributed to the research sponsor type represented by the external sponsor through the time allocation process. However, the costs are allocated pro-rata to the external sponsor and institution own-funded categories. Academic time is only attributed to institution own-funded if there is no external sponsor of that project.
1.3.2.3	**Institution own-funded** – This covers work that is not carried out to the direction of an external sponsor (the work may or may not be on specific research projects). The work could be funded through Funding Council block grant or other initiatives, or from an institution's general income (e.g. interest, endowments, or surpluses from other activities). It could include speculative 'blue skies' research undertaken to investigate the potential of ideas before preparing grant or contract bids; or for publication. It must be expected to lead to an external research output (publication, conference presentation, etc.). If this research is done primarily in support of teaching, it is classified as CPD/Scholarship and is allocated to support for teaching.
1.3.2.4	**Postgraduate research (PGR)** – This covers the training and supervision of PGR students including training in research methodology, review of drafts and preparation of theses, and external examining. The costs include: • scholarships and bursaries (a direct cost of Research); • any other direct costs incurred by the institution on behalf of PGR students (e.g. travel and subsistence, consumables, stipends); • the indirect costs and estates costs associated with the PGRs themselves; • the time of the supervisor in PGR training and development • the indirect costs and estates costs associated with this supervision time.

1.3.2.5	**External research grants and contracts:** • Research Councils, as defined in the HESA Finance Statistics Return guidance. • OGDs: UK central government bodies / local authorities, health and hospital authorities, as defined in the HESA Finance Statistics Return guidance. • European Union (EU) government bodies: research grant and contract income from all government bodies operating in the EU, including the European Commission, as defined under Column 8 in Table 5 of the HESA Finance Statistics Return guidance. • Charities: UK-based charities. (This is irrespective of their classification or recognition in any Research funding method operated by a Funding Council.) • Industry: all other organisations, including (as defined by the HESA in the Finance Statistics Return guidance): – EU-based charities, EU industry and EU other;
	– UK industry, commerce and public corporations; – other overseas – non-EU-charities, non-EU-industry and non-EU-other (other than those specifically mentioned above); – other sources.
1.3.2.6	**Recurrent research income from the Funding Councils** – the eighth category. No costs are recorded against this category.

1.3.3 Other

1.3.3.1	**Other (income-generating activity) (O)** is a core activity. It relates to activities that generate income or could potentially generate income. It comprises: • consultancy that is contracted to the institution and carried out during institution time, including advisory work, journal editing and feasibility studies; • other services rendered, including routine testing and non-research clinical trials (i.e. activities not covered under the definition of Research in the Frascati Manual); • work carried out through trading/commercial companies that is not teaching or research; • technology transfer work if remunerated through the institution (e.g. directorships of start-up companies and/or consultancy contracts for the companies) – if it is not remunerated then it should be categorised as Support to Other; • outreach (where the outreach activity is not teaching or research); As well as the costs of academic time, costs attributable to Other activities include: • residences, catering and conferences; • goods or services sold to students, staff or external customers. These might include printing or reprographics; • trading activities including non-Teaching and non-Research activities in commercial companies, spin-outs (subsidiaries), retail services such as shops.
1.3.3.2	**Other (Clinical Services)** (O(CS))– a sub-category of Other used by institutions with medical or dental schools. It includes services provided to the NHS under knock-for-knock arrangements by academic departments of clinical medicine and dentistry (to be reattributed to T, R, O and S).

1.3.4 Support

1.3.4.1	**Support (S)** is not a core activity. It is carried out in support of the three core activities of T, R and O. Support time is often categorised into several areas to assist both in the recording of the academic staff time and its subsequent allocation (as part of indirect costs) to T, R and O. Five areas of Support are described below: Support for Teaching, Support for Research, Support for Other, general management or institutional Support, and scholarship/professional development.

1.3.4.3	**Support for Research** includes: • drafting and redrafting proposals for new work and supporting bids to external bodies (where bids involve a significant amount of speculative research, that element can be attributed to institution own-funded Research); • quality assurance;

	• peer review; • refereeing papers; • publicity for research facilities and opportunities. Again this might also include scholarship/professional development and other Support to Research (which are covered below) such as: • advancement of knowledge and related skills which directly contribute to the academic's research work; • unpaid work advising government departments or committees; • unpaid work for professional bodies or agencies in relation to research matters; • institute and academic department committee work supporting Research; • blocks of time in other institutions on research exchange schemes.
1.3.4.4	**Support for Other** includes: • drafting and re-drafting proposals for new work and supporting bids to external bodies for consultancy and other services rendered (where bids involve a significant amount of speculative research, that element can be attributed to institution own-funded R); • negotiating contract terms and conditions with external bodies; • technology transfer work that is not private, nor undertaken commercially by the institution (e.g. supporting patent applications, licence negotiations, formation of start-up companies).