

## University Committee for Research, Impact, Partnership and Engagement (UCRIPE)

A meeting of the University Committee for Research, Impact, Partnership and Engagement (UCRIPE) was held on Wednesday 02 February 22 from 10.00 am to 12.00 noon via MS Teams

**Present** Professor Dominik Zaum, Pro-Vice Chancellor Research and Innovation – DZ [Chair]  
Professor Robert Gilchrist, Research Dean for Heritage and Creativity – RG  
Professor Carol Wagstaff, Research Dean for Agriculture, Food & Health – CW  
Dr Anne-Marie Van Dodeweerd, Head of Research Services – AMD  
Caroline Knowles, Head of Research Communication & Engagement – CK  
Dr Anthony Atkin, Senior Impact Development Manager – AA  
Wanda Tejada, (REF) and Research Planning Manager - WT  
Dr Carol McAnally, Head of Business Relationships and Commercialisation - CMc  
Professor Len Shaffrey, Professor of Climate Science, NCAS – LS  
Ann Morgan, Executive Administration Manager, VCO – AM

### 22/01 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Dr Susan Matos, Director Knowledge Transfer Centre - SM

### 22/02 Minutes of the previous meeting and update on actions

The minutes were approved as a correct record and the action list was reviewed.

21/07/03 The changes to the revised terms of reference have been agreed. Now complete.

20/11 Public Engagement Strategy - Ongoing

21/07 To consider the structure and agenda reporting processes - Ongoing

21/10/01 Structure approach to an induction to UCRIPE – Carry forward.

Other items to be removed.

### 22/03 Matters arising

There were no matters arising not covered under 22/02.

### 22/04 Strategy

#### 22/04/01 Update on Research Public Engagement strategy

The committee received a paper from CK for information and comment. The committee was asked to consider progress on the development of a plan for Public Engagement

with Research. CK drew the committees attention to the comparator analysis and questions for discussion in section 4 of the paper.

The following comments were noted:

- Discussions with other institutions have shown that those who do this well have been doing it for a long time with funding, resources and support from UKRI.
- There are blurred boundaries between engagement with the community/public but we need to better define the focus and purpose of our public engagement. We need to focus on research engagement rather than more general community engagement. The diagram in the document is very useful in this regard but we need to ensure the paper reflects that.
- Overlap between this the PER strategy and the Impact Strategy will need to be considered.
- Including working examples with possible links to case studies in the document would make the strategy less abstract.
- UKRI is trying to ensure a public understanding of research and public involvement in the research agenda. This needs to be reflected in our strategy – how do we ensure a fully engaged process with different public audiences and a mutual benefit.
- HG spoke about the Engaging Environment Project which engaged the public with environmental science research. This had 2 escalators – with training and capacity on both sides. In extreme citizen science the researcher is just one part of the community involved in a project.
- Is this is public engagement already reflected in the objectives or do we need a section that talks about the different types of audience transparently.
- LS commented that being clearer about audiences might help with the messy boundaries challenge and allows us to pick up on the point of valuing this type of work.
- How do we agree a thematic approach? There is tension between a public engagement platform that provides support to all within our available resources versus focusing efforts on themes which are prioritized over others.
- Given there is a need to identify priority themes how do we identify them, and what impact does this have on inclusivity.
- Is an option to focus on different mechanisms structured around activities rather than themes? E.g. festivals.
- A matrix would be helpful to demonstrate the types of audiences, they types of engagement, a map of activities/audiences that we already have to draw on. This could help focus effort and create and understanding of the audiences and possible pathways. CK to look at how we could do this and create a framework for activity and approach.
- We are not currently at the stage to confirm what resource is needed. Consideration to be given to appointing a role in this area.

CK will work on the framework and draw in some case studies, a matrix of activities/audiences and circulate to the working group in 4-6 weeks. CK will ask for ideas and input. The draft document will be tabled at the next meeting of UCRIFE.

**Action : CK**

#### **22/04/02 Update on impact strategy work**

The committee received a verbal update from AA. The Impact Strategy will be going back to UCRI in a few weeks' time. It is currently being revised following the UCRI meeting in January. AMVD, CW, AA are adjusting the Strategy to reflect that feedback before it goes back to UCRI.

The Impact Strategy will then be brought to the next UCRIFE meeting for feedback from this committee.

**Action: AA**

## **22/04/03 Strengthening Business-Focused Research**

The committee received a paper from DZ noting the following:

- The paper was presented to and discussed by UEB in December 2021, and that UEB has endorsed the proposed direction of travel.
- The changes in the funding context, and the university's performance with regard to business-focussed and funded research.
- The need to discuss the proposals for re-orienting the priorities with regard to business-focussed and funded research.
- The further work that implementing these proposals requires, including the actions proposed for UCRIFE, and the need to agree a way to advance these.

The following comments were noted.

- We are now seeing this start as a programme of work. There is a shift in the funding environment using public funding to leverage private investment. It is important to work with business and involve them in research programmes to unlock funding and demonstrate economic benefit.
- The proposal is to focus most effort on a smaller number of themes rather than supporting a breadth. Key principle could be 80% effort and resource is dedicated to 20% of research areas. This would suggest focusing the majority of effort on 4-5 areas. These should be identified on the basis of external opportunities and existing strength.
- This committee is a good place to bring together how we create a more business focused research culture and to consider how to refine the priority areas.
- This will be a long term process to develop skills and relationships.
- There is a need to map out a more business focused research culture and how we support that should come back to this committee.
- It was agreed it would be helpful to bring together all that we already do in KTC, it would be helpful to inform from a user perspective and also to consider any need for skills development.

The committee was supportive of the proposed approach.

It was agreed that CMc and LS would do a stock take of our current mechanisms. This would help understand the breadth of what is already happening and where the gaps might be. CMc and LS may also bring in HBS and other members of CMc's team. This could be based on the circulated table and the KEF statements.

**Action CMc/LS**

**22/05**

## **Projects and programmes portfolio**

### **22/05/01 Update on Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) and Knowledge Exchange Concordat**

The committee received a written update from CMc for information.

The following comments and reflections were noted:

- The history of the Industrial Strategy and what now sits within the Commercial Function.
- An update on the development of the Commercial Strategy.
- The KE Concordats have been driven by separate organisations and the Government is recognizing the contribution that Universities are making. It should help lower barriers for external people to engage with Universities.
- Very helpful to have an overview of how we are using HEIF.
- Once we are further ahead with strategies then further work can be done to support the Concordat.
- New terms of reference will help capture wider activity.
- Teaching and Learning is also included and so better connection into those types of activities are required including CQSD and Careers.
- A wider group will need to be pulled together for the next submission and there is a need to focus on a few areas and prioritise so that we are not trying to everything at once.

22/06

Any Other Business

It was noted that the papers for this committee had been circulated at very short notice. There was a request that this be addressed for future meetings.

## SUMMARY OF ACTIONS (13/10/2021)

Item	Action	Owner	Completion date	Status
20/11	Public Engagement – develop a research public engagement strategy to be signed off by summer 21	AA/CK/RG/DZ	Summer 21	Ongoing
	To circulate revised ToR to UCRIFE and governance prior to the next meeting	DC	Autumn 21	Complete
21/07	To note future agenda item: To discuss the process for HEIF	DC	02 Feb 22	ongoing
	To consider the structure of the agenda and reporting processes	DZ/DC	Autumn 21	ongoing
21/10/01	To share KEC strategy and the update around objectives and provide a list of projects tabling commitments and time scales, to be uploaded to the UCRIFE Teams site.	SM/CM	Autumn 21	ongoing
	To meet with HG to talk about a structured approach to an induction to UCRIFE	DZ	Autumn 21	ongoing
22/04/01	To produce a PER framework to include a matrix of activities/audiences and circulate to the working group in 4-6 weeks. The draft document will be tabled at the next meeting of UCRIFE.	CK	Summer 2022	Ongoing
22/04/02	To bring the Impact Strategy to the next UCRIFE meeting for feedback.	AA	Summer 2022	Ongoing
22/04/03	To produce a stock take of current mechanisms relating to business-focussed and funded research.	CMc	Summer 2022	Ongoing