

Annual Research Plans for 2021-22

Guidance on the Content of Your ARP

V2.1

Contents

Introduction	2
Who does not need to complete a full ARP – and what should they do instead?	2
Who does need to complete a full ARP in RADAR?	2
Guidance for those who are completing a full ARP for 2021/22 in RADAR.....	3
Review Process.....	3
Impacts of Covid-19 on Research	5
Before You Start Your ARP in RADAR.....	6
Completing the 2021/22 ARP Form On Radar	6
Your Annual Research Plan.....	7
Section 1: Personal Details.....	7
Section 2: Research Profile, Focus and Expertise	7
Section 3: Update on Objectives in Previous ARPs.....	7
Section 4: Your Best Completed Research Outputs.....	8
Section 5: Research Projects.....	12
Section 6: Forthcoming Outputs.....	13
Section 7. Current PGR students:.....	14
Section 8: Research environment:.....	14
Section 9: Research impact achieved or planned:.....	15
Section 10: Longer-term research plans:.....	15
Mitigating Circumstances	16
Further Guidance	16

Introduction

The past year has involved unprecedented challenges, and we recognise the impact this has had on people's ability to undertake research as planned. Consequently, Research and Enterprise Committee agreed that Annual Research Plans (ARPs) would not be required this year for the majority of academic staff who already have allocated research time.

Who does not need to complete a full ARP – and what should they do instead?

Anyone whose previous ARP resulted in Normative research time or Emergent researcher status is not required to submit a full Annual Research Plan for 2021/22. Instead, their current research time allocation will be carried over into the forthcoming academic year.

Instead of submitting an ARP, those who are carrying Normative or Emergent status into 2021/22 are requested to complete a less detailed summary of any research they were able to undertake in 2020/21, and their planned research for 2021/22. This information will be gathered via an online survey, which **should be completed by 31st July 2021**. The purpose is to:

- generate an institutional record of the research undertaken in 2020/21, to inform planning and future reporting, and enable an assessment of the extent to which Covid-19 has affected research
- provide you with an opportunity to plan your research priorities for the year ahead, in order to get the most value from the time you will have for research.

Although we are seeking a lot of same information as in a normal ARP, we are not looking for the same level of detail. The priority is that you are able to communicate the key points, rather than providing an extended narrative account.

Unlike a normal ARP, this outline summary and plan will not be peer-reviewed or result in a new time allocation.

The survey is available at: <https://gsa-surveys.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/research-summary-plan-2021-22>

If you do not currently have research time or complete ARPs, and you do not seek research time in 2021/22 either, then you do not need to complete the survey or the ARP form in RADAR. It would instead be appropriate to arrange planned time for any necessary academic scholarship with your line manager, as appropriate.

Who does need to complete a full ARP in RADAR?

The following staff are requested to complete and submit an ARP for 2021/22 in RADAR by the revised deadline of 21st June 2021¹.

- those who currently have Enhanced research time, and wish to continue on that basis
- anyone seeking a change of research time status
- academic staff seeking scheduled time for research who have not completed an ARP before (e.g. new members of staff).

¹ Unless approved mitigating circumstances apply – see [Mitigating Circumstances](#)

Guidance for those who are completing a full ARP for 2021/22 in RADAR

The rest of this document provides guidance on the content of your ARP for those completing a full plan for academic year 2021/22, in RADAR.

Since 2015/16, Annual Research Plans (ARPs) have been an important element of GSA's Activity Planning processes. Research time allocated to your ARP (for those completing one) will be factored into your activity planning for the next academic year (2021/22)

All FT or PT staff with an academic contract (0.2FTE or greater, teaching and research or research only job role) are entitled to submit an ARP, although doing so is not mandatory.

Your Annual Research Plan should be submitted using the online form on the GSA research repository, RADAR. For guidance on how to use the submission system, please see *How to Complete Your Annual Research Plan in RADAR*, available at <http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/4881/>.

As in previous years, you should deposit completed outputs in RADAR before including them in an ARP. Reviewers will exclude from their assessment any completed output that you describe in your ARP if it is not available in RADAR.

Review Process

For ARPs submitted by 21st June, we aim to confirm results and provide feedback by 31st July.

The review process has been revised for 2021/22. ARP review will be undertaken by staff who were actively involved in the assessment of outputs for GSA's REF 2021 submission. This group (comprising REF Planning Group and a small number of additional GSA peer reviewers) has developed a consistent and sophisticated approach to assessment during the past year, and has gained a great deal of insight into research at GSA, across our disciplines. Their involvement will ensure that the ARP review process is more consistent and thus equitable for all staff. Each ARP will be reviewed by two reviewers and moderated via a chaired panel, as before. One of the two reviewers will summarise the feedback, to ensure that concise feedback can be issued more promptly and reliably.

Due to the smaller pool of reviewers, it is possible that an individual's ARP will not be reviewed by someone from their own School or specific field of research (a change to our practice in previous years) prior to the moderation panel. We are confident, however, that following our REF preparations, all reviewers understand and are familiar with the range of research that is carried out across GSA, and the context in which it is undertaken, as they have reviewed a high volume of research from across GSA and discussed it collectively. Nobody's ARP will be reviewed by their line manager or anyone else with a potential line-management conflict of interest, as in previous years.

Based on the review panel's assessment, you will be recommended for 'emergent' time, 'normative time', 'enhanced time' or 'no research time' for academic year 2021/22. For a member of staff in a standard teaching and research role, a 'normative' or 'emergent' outcome corresponds to around 20% of their hours, and 'enhanced' to around 40%. This should be scheduled at times as agreed with your line manager as part of activity planning; it is not unusual to arrange periods of more concentrated research time at certain points of the year, and periods when teaching takes precedence due to the demands of the academic calendar.

Enhanced (40%)

Those recommended for enhanced research time must have demonstrated both an accomplished

research track record (including work completed to a high standard) and quality of proposed projects and outputs that significantly exceeds the norm (in terms of quality, scale and scope). The standard should be exceptional. The review panel should be confident (based on track record and confirmed details of relevant support for forthcoming work) that the researcher has the ability to deliver what is proposed. Enhanced time is not intended as an indicator of status or seniority, a permanent or automatic state, or 'reward' for past accomplishments. It is essentially pragmatic, to facilitate the production of substantial, very high quality examples of research that will improve GSA's research reputation, influence and environment.

Note that for the minority of staff whose job roles already stipulate that they should be spending at least 40% of their time undertaking independent research (rather than being directed to deliver other people's research programmes), there is nothing to gain from requesting Enhanced rather than Normative research time. The norm – for that role – is already at least equivalent to Enhanced time, and receiving an Enhanced ARP outcome will not result in additional research time.

Normative (20%)

To qualify for Normative research time, staff must present a convincing plan for good quality research outputs and/or projects, articulated as such, plus evidence of completed outputs and projects that have been undertaken competently and independently, and which meet the definition of research. Most established, active, experienced academic researchers should be able to make a case for normative time, if they follow the guidance in this document and demonstrate that the work they are doing constitutes research of a suitable standard. For teaching and research staff, a Normative ARP outcomes should result in around 20% of contracted hours being allocated for research. For those who are already in more research intensive roles, Normative corresponds to the time available within their role to undertake independent research.

Emergent (20%)

The review panel may allocate Emergent research time if a member of staff convincingly demonstrates the ambition, motivation and potential to undertake independent research, but the work presented in the ARP is either:

- not yet of the necessary quality
- does not yet indicate sufficient experience or track record of undertaking independent research
- *or* does not clearly constitute research, as presented and articulated in the ARP.

Those who receive this outcome are likely to include early career researchers, such as recent post-docs in the early stages of developing their own research programme – but also potentially more established members of staff, who may have significant experience in teaching, scholarship, creative practice or knowledge exchange, but who would benefit from further time and support in order to realise the academic research potential of their work. Some in this group may not have entered the profession via a conventional academic pathway. Where a high proportion of completed and planned outputs cited in an ARP are substantially based on students' work (particularly if below research student level), staff may also be allocated Emergent research time. Staff identified as Emergent Researchers have priority access to GSA mentoring schemes, and will benefit from training and development sessions and resources targeted at people with their level of research experience and track record. Emergent researchers are expected to 'graduate' to normative research status within around 3 years, or move to No Research Time.

No Research Time (0%)

ARP authors who have demonstrated limited understanding of research, or minimal evidence that they have undertaken or intend to undertake research, are unlikely to have provided adequate justification for research time. Those who do not complete the ARP form to the required standard, or who appear to have made very little effort to justify and explain the research content of their work, may not qualify for research time. If there is very little evidence that research of an appropriate scope and standard for an academic member of staff has been undertaken or is (seriously) planned (and appears feasible), the individual may not qualify for research time.

Outcomes

Researchers will be notified when their ARP outcome and feedback is available to view on RADAR (it will be published at the end of their completed ARP). Heads of Schools, line managers and convenors of each School's Research and Enterprise Sub-committee will also receive notification of ARP outcomes in their areas.

If ARPs are submitted late due to [Mitigating Circumstances](#) (where the circumstances allow), deadlines for review and communication of outcomes will be agreed with the staff concerned and their line managers, so that they can plan accordingly.

Impacts of Covid-19 on Research

We are conscious that the period since March 2020 has been (and continues to be) challenging for everyone at GSA, and that the effects of the pandemic have affected many people's ability to carry out all of the research that they had planned to do in 2020/21. This will be taken into account in this year's ARPs process, and staff will not be penalised for being unable to undertake planned work in 2020 or 2021 because of the pandemic. In that regard, please note the following:

- Use 'Update on Objectives in Previous ARPs' (Section 3, see below) to indicate if/how plans outlined in your previous ARP were affected by the pandemic. If they were delayed due to lack of time or access to resources as a result of Covid-19-related disruption, you need only note that here, and don't need to submit a separate Mitigating Circumstances form.
- Try to explain the nature of any such impacts in your ARP without disclosing sensitive personal information, but if you feel you need to, then do so by submitting a mitigating circumstances form to HR instead, rather than in the ARP itself.
- If you will be unable to submit your ARP by the deadline of June 21st due to the impacts of the pandemic, then submit a mitigating circumstances form to HR request an extension.
- The mitigating circumstances form is available from the Annual Research Plan section of the Research and Enterprise intranet:
<https://gsofa.sharepoint.com/sites/intranet/ProfessionalSupport/ResearchEnterprise/Pages/ARPs.aspx>
- When describing projects and forthcoming outputs in sections 5 and 6, please note if these have been delayed, disrupted or adapted in response to the pandemic.
- If you last submitted an ARP for 2019/20, you are likely to have pre-pandemic activities to report on.

Before You Start Your ARP in RADAR

You can save yourself time and effort if you complete the following steps before you create a new ARP for 2021/22 in RADAR:

- Create or update the Research Profile section of your RADAR homepage ('Edit Profile' button) *before* you create a new ARP. If you do so, section 2 of your ARP form will be automatically pre-populated for you.
- Make sure that any *completed* outputs that you intend to highlight in your ARP have been entered as research outputs into RADAR. This is essential. Please do so as soon as possible, for the RADAR team have a large volume of work to manage in the approach to and aftermath of REF 2021.
- Read this document in full for guidance on the content you should provide in each section of the ARP, before you complete it.
- Read the accompanying document, *How to Complete Your Annual Research Plan in Radar* <http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/4881/>, for technical guidance on how to use the online form for drafting and submitting your ARP. This also includes instructions on how to use a previous ARP as a template for your new one.
- If you would prefer to draft your ARP offline before you copy it to RADAR, a Word template is available for this purpose at <http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/6042/>

Completing the 2021/22 ARP Form On Radar

First, log-in to RADAR (radar.gsa.ac.uk), go to your Homepage section, and create a new ARP for 2021/22. Before you start to complete the form, make sure you are familiar with all of the sections, and the information that we are asking you to provide in each. By planning ahead, you can avoid having to repeat information in multiple sections. The sections, described in this document, are as follows:

Section 1. Personal Details

Section 2. Research Profile, Focus and Expertise (based on your existing Research Profile in RADAR)

Section 3. Update on Objectives in Previous ARP (also note pandemic-related disruption here)

Section 4. Best Completed Research Outputs (focusing primarily on the last three years)

Section 5. Research Projects (current, forthcoming)

Section 6. Forthcoming Outputs

Section 7. PGR Supervision

Section 8. Research Environment

Section 9. Research Impact, Achieved or Planned

Section 10. Longer Term Research Plans (and training and development needs)

Remember to save your work regularly using the 'Save and Return' button. (Note that clicking the 'Next' page button on each page does not automatically save the content of the current page.)

Your Annual Research Plan

Section 1: Personal Details

Guidance notes:

- For 'Year', select '2021/22'.
- Please provide your name, job title, School and the amount of time that you are employed to work at GSA, expressed in terms of full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.6 FTE = 3 days per week).
- 'Current allocation of research time' corresponds to the outcome of your last ARP. (**Note:** If you did not submit an ARP for 2019/20 or 2020/21, then select 'No Time', and explain your ARP track record in Section 3; if this is your first ARP; the system won't allow you to leave this as 'unspecified'.)
- 'Research time requested' is the amount of research time you hope to be awarded in 2021/22.
- Those (such as Fellows) in academic roles that already involve research, project delivery or impact as the main duties – rather than teaching – should request 'normative' time, denoting the norm for their type of contract. The ARP will not result in even more time for research if that is already your main job; but the outcome could recommend more time for the researcher to work independently on their own research projects, rather than carrying out another researcher's programme.

Section 2: Research Profile, Focus and Expertise

The purpose of this section is to give reviewers an overview of your research interests and experience. Note that if you have already completed the Research Profile section of your RADAR Homepage (see '[Before you start your ARP](#)', above), that information will automatically appear in this section of your ARP. Any subsequent edits you make here will not appear in your public RADAR profile. If you create your ARP before you have created a RADAR Profile, then the section will be blank and you will need to add new content.

The purpose of this section is to give reviewers an overview of your research interests and experience, by way of introduction. This will allow them to consider how the details in the rest of your ARP relate to your field and expertise. We do not require more information than you would choose to include on your public profile.

Section 3: Update on Objectives in Previous ARPs

In this section, you should provide a clear, concise summary of your progress towards any objectives described in your last ARP(s) – particularly in the Planned Outputs and Projects sections. You do not need to provide a detailed narrative account, particularly of any outputs or activities that you will describe fully in later sections of this form. A list of relevant items, with a short note on progress will be sufficient. You can also note if your plans have changed (perhaps an opportunity arose to get involved in a new project), or if unforeseen challenges hampered your progress.

You should also use this section if you need to provide information on how COVID-19 has affected your

ability to undertake research as previously planned (see ‘[Impacts of Covid-19 on Research](#)’, above). The review panel will factor this information into their assessment of recent work.

If this is your first ARP (or the first for several years) note any relevant research you have undertaken during the last two to three years.

Section 4: Your Best Completed Research Outputs

From the outputs that you have listed in RADARs, please select those that you consider to be the best examples of your research, with the emphasis on those that were completed (or first made publicly available) in the past two to three years. There is no minimum or maximum number, but we certainly do not encourage you to include more than eight (which could result in a RADAR error). Any outputs described in this section that have not also been added to RADAR will not be fully considered by reviewers.

Guidance notes:

Which Outputs to Include

- This is one of the most important sections of your ARP, since arguably only your completed work can give a reliable indication of your track record, the quality of your research activities and your potential to complete planned research.
- In this section, we are looking for what you consider to be the best *research* outputs that you have completed, with an emphasis on the past two to three years.
- Any Outputs that you include in this section must have been deposited in RADAR, and must include the RADAR ‘Output ID’. This will enable peer reviewers to click through to the full description of the cited Output on RADAR. (The Output ID is the four-digit number that can be found in the ‘Details’ tab of your deposited output on RADAR.).
- If you include a completed output in your ARP without first adding it to RADAR, the reviewers will essentially exclude it from their assessment. (The only exception is if you need to use an output field to explain a body of work, see ‘Practice Research’ below.)
- You should also add to RADAR any outputs you’ve completed since your last ARP, even if you choose not to feature them in this section of your new ARP. Reviewers will consider your RADAR page as well as your ARP.
- The maximum number of completed outputs that the ARP form will accept is eight, although you certainly do not need to include that many. Use your judgement. Reviewers are more interested in quality and potential than in quantity.

Describing Your Outputs

- You should provide a description (up to 300 words) of each of your completed outputs. The purpose is to clearly articulate the nature and context of the research enquiry and outcomes to reviewers.
- We are not primarily interested in how other aspects of the work are worthy of note, except as they relate to the research content of the output, which you should explain as clearly as you can within the word limit.

- If your output is a journal article or conference paper, the abstract will be a good starting point. But any type of output can be included, as long as it is an example of research.
- You should also explain your own contribution to the output. If the output was jointly authored or produced, which aspects were you responsible for? What proportion of the (research) activity and outcomes does that represent? If you co-authored the output with your students (e.g. PhD or Masters students), please explicitly state this.
- Finally, please briefly note some factual details to help reviewers understand the nature of the output, specifically:
 - Was it peer reviewed, and if so in what form?
 - For applicable types of output, note the journal title, publisher etc. (with full details in the corresponding RADAR entry)
 - If it is a textual output, what is the word count and format (e.g. journal article, book chapter, book review, comment piece – and where was it published)?
- Reviewers will expect your work to meet the REF definition of research, which is: **a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared**. It is your responsibility to show how each of those elements applies to your output, in order to demonstrate that it represents a good example of academic research.
 - A process of investigation or inquiry can be demonstrated with reference to research questions, strategy and methodology.
 - New insights should add to academic knowledge, in a form that other scholars can engage with. It should have the potential to provide (part of) the evidence or theoretical knowledge base that contributes to future research in the field.
 - Other scholars can only respond to your work if they know about it, so you must explain how you have disseminated it appropriately.
- Having established that the output represents research, reviewers will consider its quality, in terms of **originality, significance and rigour**.
 - **Originality** (in this context) is the extent to which your output can be shown to have made a new and original contribution to knowledge and understanding in the field. What insights, critiques or knowledge have you contributed that other researchers have not previously?
 - Such originality could take a variety of forms, for example: new arguments or forms of expression, interpretation and insight; engagement with new or complex problems, or combinations of problems; development, or novel application, of innovative research methods or techniques; generation and analysis of new data; advancement or critique of theory, or paradigms; new forms or methods of creative practice that are original in imaginative scope and meaning; new archival evidence that you have researched and interpreted within an appropriate contextual and theoretical framework; the application of theories or knowledge to new contexts; incremental development of previous research; work involving insights generated from working with specific populations using a particular methodological approach.
 - To demonstrate originality, it is necessary to indicate how the work relates to relevant existing knowledge and approaches – it is not enough merely to assert that the work is novel or original. A common weakness in ARPs is a failure to effectively

indicate the academic context or explain how the research responds to or is informed by prior research, theories and methods, or demonstrable knowledge gaps. Relevant and informed background scholarship must be in evidence.

- **Significance** should be understood as the extent to which your work has influenced (or has the potential to influence) knowledge, scholarly thought and/or practice in relevant fields. For instance, can you show that it has become a point of reference for subsequent work by others, or stimulated discussion in your subject area?
- **Rigour** is the degree to which the work demonstrates intellectual coherence and integrity, as well as robust and appropriate (and ethical) theories, methodologies, concepts, sources and analyses that ensure the reliability and robustness – and potential reproducibility or transferability – of the findings.

Aim to provide the following information in the description of your outputs:

- Output type
- Nature of your contribution (if co-authored or co-produced)
- Word count, type of publication and name of journal/publisher (for textual outputs)
- Details of any peer review process
- Contextualisation of the research, the field in which it is situated
- Research questions explored or investigated
- Methodological approach
- Findings (potentially including issues identified for further research)
- How they were disseminated (in addition to through the creation of the output itself, if applicable)
- The contribution made to relevant academic and scholarly fields

‘Practice Research’

If you undertake and disseminate research through (or about, or in) creative practice, you need to be able to place it in context and explain how it contributes new insights and knowledge. That is, articulate the research field(s) on which it draws and to which it contributes, the research questions it explores and seeks answers to, the reasons why you took a particular methodological approach, the outcomes of the research and what conclusions they allow us to reach, how those contribute knowledge to the relevant field of research, how they have been disseminated appropriately to others seeking to engage with that knowledge, any impacts the research had on others, and where the research enquiry might lead next. For the purposes of an ARP, creative practice in and of itself does not self-evidently equate to research, even though it is likely to be intellectually engaged and informed by theory – you have to be able to demonstrate the research dimension of your work. While this can be challenging, it is a fundamental skill that you need to develop in order to build a successful research career in this mode.

Think about the communication of research in other academic fields: the focus is on the context, questions, experiments, findings and conclusions, and not, say, the researcher as individual

practitioner, or the qualities of the publication in which they are presented. We are looking for an analogous way of communicating research involving art and design practice – but one which is appropriate to our disciplines. The research itself may not take a linear or sequential form, and questions and findings may emerge through the act and process of creating work, but you should be able to articulate the research enquiry and outcomes, even if to some extent you must do so retrospectively. The research (more than the researcher) needs to be to the fore in any explanation, so the narrative may differ from descriptions of you and your work used in other contexts (please avoid copying and pasting directly from other sources, without modification, unless they articulate research). Try to avoid merely asserting the research significance of the work, too, without making a reasoned case, supported by evidence.

Your research enquiry might not be fully reflected in an individual output (artwork, design, exhibition, written work etc.), but through a range of projects and outputs over time, with common (and evolving) themes and sets of questions running through them. For exercises such as REF, you would have to prepare an illustrated document to present and explain such bodies of work; GSA's practice research template provides guidance and a suggested format, and is available at <http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/5649/>. You do not have to use this template for your ARP (you can if you have the time and inclination, but it is not a trivial task), but you might find the structure helps you to reflect on and organise your material. If it would help you, you can use one of the 'Best Completed Research Output' fields in section 4 to explain how the individual outputs that you've included in the ARP represent a collective body of research.

Don't assume that the end product or output necessarily represents the culmination of your research or the best representation of it – your research enquiry might relate more closely to your methods and processes, for instance. Also, think about whether the subject of your research is something other than your creative discipline, even if your methodology involves investigating it through that discipline. You could be an artist who researches community engagement through art practice, for example, or a designer who investigates patient experience in healthcare through design practice.

Consider the following:

- What are you trying to achieve, as a researcher?
- What is your research about? Are there enduring questions (and subsidiary questions)? Essentially, what are you trying to find out through your work, and why? And what would finding out achieve?
- Can you define the specific fields or disciplines you are working in? What are you investigating within those fields?
- How does your work relate to the research of others working in relevant fields, and what differentiates it from theirs? What are you therefore contributing to that collective field of thought, or theory or practice?
- Which of your projects test your questions, and how?
- With what outcomes or conclusions?
- Can you show that your methods are rigorous, ethical and appropriate to the questions?

To put this into wider context, consider how the Frascati Manual defines research, and what it has to say about creative practice. The [Frascati Manual](#) is an OECD document which sets out international standards for defining and classifying research and ‘experimental development’ (the ‘R&D’ spectrum of activities), for the purposes of collecting and reporting statistical data. It is an important reference document for government bodies and research funders, although its perspective is arguably skewed towards science and technology and the approach of particular countries, and aspects of its definitions are contested by some in certain fields, including the arts. Nevertheless, it is instructive to consider how research is conceptualised by such organisations, and to think about how that might relate to our work in art, design and architecture. For an activity to be classified as research, according to Frascati, it must meet five criteria:

- To be aimed at new findings – to be (demonstrably) novel
- To be based on original, not obvious, concepts and hypotheses (creative)
- To be uncertain about the final outcome
- To be undertaken systematically – in a planned way, with records kept of the process followed and the outcome
- To lead to results that could possibly be reproduced (transferable and/or reproducible)

Here is what Frascati says about ‘artistic expression’:

Artistic performance is normally excluded from R&D. Artistic performances fail the novelty test of R&D as they are looking for a new expression, rather than for new knowledge. Also, the reproducibility criterion (how to transfer the additional knowledge potentially produced) is not met. As a consequence, arts colleges and university arts departments cannot be assumed to perform R&D without additional supporting evidence. (p65)

Similarly, Frascati does not consider design to automatically constitute R&D, even though it may play an integral role in an R&D process. Here, a key question is whether the role of design meets the ‘novelty’ and ‘uncertainty’ criteria in this definition of research, if undertaken by skilled designers with clear and feasible goals. The example given is that designing a standard building does not involve major uncertainty about the final outcome, whereas a more innovative and uncertain building concept may involve R&D to resolve the uncertainty.

While we may disagree with some of this, it is incumbent on us to make the alternative case convincingly, and to generate that ‘additional supporting evidence’ robustly.

OECD (2015), *Frascati Manual 2015: Guidelines for Collecting and Reporting Data on Research and Experimental*

Section 5: Research Projects

Please provide details of any research projects in which you are currently involved, and indicate your role. Please include relevant projects that are already being undertaken (‘Live’), proposals that have been submitted (‘Pending’) or new projects and proposals that you are actively planning or preparing (‘Development’).

Guidance notes:

- In this section, we are interested in well-defined and articulated activities that address explicit

research questions, are positioned in relation to relevant fields and employ an appropriate methodology. You should also have a plan for undertaking the research. Please explain these points in your description.

- Use the 'Status' drop-down menu to indicate if each project is underway ('Live'), awaiting a response to a grant application or equivalent decision ('Pending') or a new projects or proposal that you are actively planning or preparing, e.g. grant application being written ('Development').
- State your role and level of contribution, and the identity of the project lead (if it is not you).
- Provide details of any partners with whom you are collaborating.
- Where applicable, give details of any research funding awarded or applied for.
- Provide details of project timetables and indicate any work you intend to undertake during the forthcoming ARP period (summer 2021 to summer 2022).
- Please do not include details of completed projects in this section. The results of completed projects should be reflected in either your Completed Outputs or Planned Outputs sections.
- Do not include details of very early stage, speculative or aspirational project ideas in this section, as reviewers will be unable to assess these. Ideas for future research projects that you are not yet actively developing should be included in Section 10 instead.
- If your current or pending projects have been affected by Covid-19 in 2020 or 2021, indicate that here.

Section 6: Forthcoming Outputs

Please describe any planned research outputs that you will work on or complete during the forthcoming ARP period (mainly 2021/22). Please indicate if there is already a confirmed route to dissemination (e.g. paper accepted, publishing contract awarded, exhibition date and venue confirmed).

Guidance notes:

- In this section, you should emphasise outputs that you will be working on in the forthcoming ARP period, and those that are completed and due to be published or to otherwise enter the public domain for the first time in 2021/22.
- See 'Describing Your Outputs' in Section 4 above: most of the same criteria apply to your forthcoming outputs, although findings and conclusions may be less clear at this stage if you are still working on them. Just as with Completed Outputs, it is your responsibility to articulate how the forthcoming output constitutes research, and to provide details that will enable reviewers to assess potential originality, significance and rigour.
- Indicate if there is already a confirmed route to dissemination -- e.g. paper accepted, target journals identified, publishing contract awarded, exhibition date and venue confirmed.
- State expected dates of completion/publication.
- Include details on peer review, output type and (for textual outputs) word count etc..
- Earlier stage, speculative or aspirational ideas for future outputs should be included in Section 10 (Longer Term Research Plans).

Consider what is realistically achievable if you are to focus on achieving the highest quality that you can at this stage in your career (given your other responsibilities and FTE) – even if that entails focusing on

only one or two projects and/or outputs.

Section 7. Current PGR students:

Give details of current supervised Doctoral or MPhil students and their current status (if applicable)

Guidance notes:

- Add details of any current PhD, MPhil or MRES supervision duties at GSA.
- If you are not currently involved in supervision, leave this section blank.

Section 8: Research environment:

Summarise your recent and planned contributions to the research environment at GSA and in other academic contexts.

Guidance notes:

- Summarise recent and planned contributions to the research environment at GSA and in the wider academic research sector.
- As in section 3, a concise list of relevant activities and achievements, with accompanying notes, will be acceptable.

In terms of **GSA's research environment**, please note if you have undertaken activities such as giving or organising talks, acting as a research mentor, participating in research committees, contributing to REF preparations, undertaking internal peer review and PhD supervision etc.

In terms of the **external research environment**, please note if you have undertaken any activities such as the following, and indicate the year in which the work took place (or will do):

- Editorship of journals (please specify if referring to special editions)
- Peer review for journals, book publishers or conferences
- Conference chair or organising committee
- UKRI Research Council peer review college, or peer review for other grant funding organisation
- Membership of subject associations or academic bodies (e.g. CHEAD, Cumulus, Association of Art Historians etc.). Please specify any responsible positions held (e.g. committee membership)
- Responsible roles (e.g. trustee, Board member) with other organisations (e.g. cultural, charitable, civic, industry)
- Residencies or fellowships
- Invited keynotes, lectures or performances (as distinct from papers selected for conferences through peer review)
- Prizes or awards received (or other indicators of recognition and esteem)
- External examination of research students, or supervision of research students at other institutions.
- Other

Section 9: Research impact achieved or planned:

If applicable, please give details of any demonstrable examples of impact arising from your research, e.g. beneficial change to individuals, groups or organisations beyond academia.

Guidance notes:

Use this section to tell us about any notable impact or engagement activities that you have completed (and briefly note the outcomes), or are planning.

By engagement, we mean the appropriate dissemination of research to different audiences – particularly non-academic groups – and any actions taken to help them understand and respond to the work (e.g. through media coverage, presentations at events, workshops, reports or guidance materials produced for industry or public bodies etc.)

By impact, we mean a resulting effect on, change or benefit to people who engaged with your research – what was the difference that your research made, and what evidence do we have for that beneficial change? Research impact can be defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia. It includes (but is not limited to) an effect on, change or benefit to:

- The activity, attitude, awareness, behaviour, capacity, opportunity, performance, policy, practice, process or understanding
- Of an audience, beneficiary, community, constituency, organisation or individuals
- In any geographic location, whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.
- It may also include the reduction or prevention of harm, risk, cost or other negative effects.
- But, for our purposes, it does not include impacts on research or academic knowledge within the higher education sector, or on teaching practices or programmes at GSA.

Please indicate where you hold records providing evidence of the impact (or could obtain evidence).

As in section 3, a concise list of completed and planned activities with accompanying notes will be acceptable.

Section 10: Longer-term research plans:

Please describe your longer-term research plans and aspirations for the period after summer 2022. Be as specific as possible, and indicate when you aim to complete your objectives.

Guidance notes:

This section is important to GSA and the reviewers, who are interested in your potential research trajectory, and the implications for GSA's research environment, culture and achievements. Evidence that you are thinking seriously about your longer term research plans may help to justify investment in your time to undertake research.

Include longer-term research plans and aspirations for the period after summer 2022. What are your ambitions for your future development as a researcher, over the subsequent three to five years? For example: research projects you hope to undertake and complete, grants you aim to apply for, publications you intend to write (and for whom), or artefacts you plan to produce (but which are at a more embryonic stage than those included in earlier sections). Also consider people or organisations you would like to collaborate with, forms of experience that you hope to gain or roles you aim to hold (e.g. peer reviewing, editorships).

If you wish, include a note on any development, mentoring or training needs.

Be as specific as possible, and indicate when you aim to complete your objectives.

For earlier career researchers, you might find it helpful to consider the Researcher Development Framework materials that are available via GSA's subscription to Vitae <https://www.vitae.ac.uk/researchers-professional-development> . You will need to register individually, using your GSA email address.

Vitae's advice to researchers is to set goals that are: explicit, with a clear focus, expressed as succinctly as possible; inspiring and framed positively, to provide motivation; measurable, so that you can track progress; challenging, so that you can stretch yourself; and with a defined timetable for short-to-medium term objectives.

Mitigating Circumstances

Use the mitigating circumstances form to inform GSA of recognisably disruptive or unexpected events beyond your control that have:

- Significantly impaired your ability to undertake research
- Significantly impaired your ability to complete your ARP form by the deadline.

Note that if you wish to report disruption to your ability to undertake research caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, please do so in Section 3 of the ARP form (see above), rather than submitting a mitigating circumstances form – unless you need to disclose sensitive personal information, in which case you should use the mitigating circumstances form.

The mitigating circumstances form is available on the Research and Enterprise section of the Staff intranet in the Annual Research Plans section.

<https://gsofa.sharepoint.com/sites/intranet/ProfessionalSupport/ResearchEnterprise/Pages/ARPs.aspx>

The form should be sent to HR. HR will then recommend a course of action to Research and Enterprise – such as a submission extension – without sharing any sensitive information.

Further Guidance

Guidance on how to submit outputs to RADAR and complete your ARP on RADAR is available from the RADAR Help and Contact Information page at: <http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/contact.html>

For guidance on how to use the submission system, please see *How to Complete Your Annual Research Plan in RADAR*, available at <http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/4881/>

These may be updated from time to time, so please check for additional information periodically.