Planning and Strategy Office

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

A meeting of the University Committee for Research, Impact, Partnership and Engagement was held on Thursday 23 June 2022 at 11am via Teams.

Present:

Professor Robert Gilchrist, Research Dean for Heritage and Creativity – RG
Professor Carol Wagstaff, Research Dean for Agriculture, Food & Health – CW [Chair]
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
Tasha Easton, PSO – TE [Secretary]

Apologies were received from Professor Dominik Zaum, Dr Anne-Marie Van Dodeweerd and Dr Susan Matos.

22/07   Minutes from the last meeting

The minutes of the last meeting, held on 2 February 2022, were agreed as a correct record.

22/08   Matters arising

20/11 Public Engagement
CK gave an update on this later in the meeting. Action ongoing.

21/07 HEIF
This would be added to a future agenda. Action ongoing.

21/07 Agenda and reporting
The secretary would discuss the agenda structure and reporting processes with the Chair. Action ongoing.

21/10/01 KEC strategy
Due to recent structural changes, it was agreed that this action could be closed. Thought would be needed as to what to put in place once the merger between KEC and RES had settled down. CMc had been in discussion with DZ about various activities and where the focus of activity might be going forward.

21/10/01 Induction to UCRIPE
DZ was still due to meet with HG to discuss an induction onto UCRIPE. Action ongoing.

22/04/01 PER framework
CK had circulated a matrix to discuss later in the agenda. The Framework would be circulated at the next meeting. Action ongoing.

22/04/02 Impact Strategy
On agenda. Action closed.

22/04/03 Stocktake of current mechanisms
On agenda. Action closed.

22/09 **Strategy**

a) Update on Consultancy at Reading
CMc reported that they had a new IP management system (WellSpring) and were currently migrating across to this new system. This would allow the consultancy form to be moved onto the system and be automatically recorded. In addition, consultancy is currently split between contracts and legal services – there were discussions about simplifying this and having one process and one form, as well as one consultancy contract.

The development of a new system allowed the University to think about ensuring the process was robust – right from an external approaching an academic to how the finances are input to ensure that consultancy activity was monitored. As part of this, a signposting webpage would be developed which would act as a repository for academics to use regarding consultancy.

A paper on this would be brought to the next meeting.

ACTION: CMc

CK added that following the migration of webpages from Active Education to Sitecore, she would be submitting an article to the Staff Portal to signpost staff to intend to research pages.

It was agreed that CMc would set up a meeting with WT/NH to discuss how the consultancy system fits alongside the potential CRIS and Individual Expectations work.

ACTION: CMc

b) Research Public Engagement Strategy
It was reported that the final draft of the strategy was not yet complete, but that a matrix that would be used as an appendix had been circulated. A final draft of the Strategy would come to the next UCRIPE in October.

ACTION: CK

CK ran through a presentation on the progress of the Strategy:

- She had completed a survey of comparator universities and agreed the aims and definitions. Work continued on the drivers and benefits, audiences, links to the Impact Strategy and what the priorities were.
- There was a desire to offer training and learning for the public as well as researchers, but this was a long-term goal.
- There were many benefits of public engagement with research (PER) – to inspire and stimulate curiosity, challenge current thinking, opportunities to be open about research and funding, building a trust and appreciation of universities, learning from different people/transferable skills.
- The Committee considered who the audiences were by activity, although it was noted that some activities did not fit into any category (such as practice research). Commercialisation and spinouts can span multiple areas and it would be useful to capture this somewhere.
- It was queried whether different types of engagement were considered equal (e.g. a large company vs a small focus group), for example in the promotion process. This would be considered as part of the action plan.
- It was noted that under the definitions of boundaries and intersections, community engagement could be beyond local, as national and global activity was taking place. It was suggested to reverse the order of the headings on this slide (PE, KE, then CE).
- A number of strategic areas were considered and would be discussed further by the Working Group. It was noted that these should align with existing strategic goals in other strategies, such as Research, Commercialisation, Impact and PE Strategies.
- Once the strategic aims had been established, the action plan could be developed further.

CK agreed to share the slides via Teams for everyone to consider further.

ACTION: CK

CK agreed to discuss with the Working Group how the different strategies fit together and what the priorities were for each, along with who is leading each area to ensure that the aims of the various strategies dovetail.

ACTION: CK

c) <u>Impact Strategy</u>
The Committee received and noted the Research Impact Strategy, which covered the period 2022-28. This sat as part of the wider Research Strategy, with the aim to systematically strengthen the impact of our research and embed the generation of impact from research in our research culture. There were 4 distinct objectives to meet these aims.

The Strategy intended to help simplify what impact was and how to engage from an early stage. RES were currently trialling how this could be implemented and were starting to discuss this document with Impact Development Managers.

It was noted that it was expected that Research Division Leads own the Impact Strategy, even if there was an Impact Lead for the division. Thought would need to be given as to how to encourage RDs to consider problem orientated research. The pilot work in Archaeology may help with this. RDLs have not yet realised that they will be expected to

lead on this - AA will work on this. In addition, it was noted that there were a number of new RDLs and that this may be a tricky transition. It was agreed that a formal launch of this was needed with RDLs. The suggestion from the Committee was to use the Autumn RDL Community of Practice meeting to have a more focused activity around delivering the Impact Strategy.

ACTION: For discussion with DZ

It was agreed that CK would reword the section that implied RDLs could appoint an Impact Lead to lead on this.

ACTION: CK

It was agreed that it would be helpful to develop an Implementation Plan for the Strategy so that progress could be monitored.

It was queried what the role was of innovation and interdisciplinarity. Innovation could be interpreted in a number of ways - ideas can be innovative but not useful which is why it had not been included explicitly in this document. The focus was on getting researchers to think about the use of their research at an early stage.

It was agreed that AA would revisit the implementation plan and send to UCRI and it would be seen at the October meeting of UCRIPE.

ACTION: AA

d) Strengthening Business Focused Research
    It was noted that there was a reduction in industry funding coming into the University. Engagement with business was important, and there were good examples of activity, such as the CineValley project. CW added that DZ was looking at developing a subject-focused business incubator on campus.

e) Business Engagement for Research and Innovation
    LS provided an overview paper on business engagement for research and innovation, which was not a strategy, but a stocktake of where the University is and how it thinks about BE.

    BE was a priority in the UKRI strategy and as part of the UK R&D roadmap. BE at the University spanned across companies, regulators and policymakers. It was noted that there were two broad areas of activity for BE – collaborative R&I and co-developing and co-producing outputs.

    It was queried how this work dovetailed with that of Bill Kilgallon and what different elements could be drawn together to develop a more entrepreneurial mindset.

    It was agreed that the next steps would be to think about funding and co-developing projects. It was agreed that this paper would be circulated more widely, and that a full paper on BE would be provided at the next UCRIPE meeting.

ACTION: LS

22/10 Projects and programmes portfolio

Update on HEIF funding

An update on the HEIF funding was noted. The HEIF accountability statement had now been updated with new activity.

RG queried whether it would be useful to find out more about the projects funded by HEIF and how they link to the relevant strategies. It was agreed it would be useful to showcase some of the work in future meetings to better understand what the work comprises and what could be learnt from it. CMc agreed to review current projects and work with TE/DZ to add 10-minute presentations to future agendas.

ACTION: CMc/TE/DZ

22/11 Policy

There were no policy matters to discuss.

22/12 Any other business

None.

22/13 Dates of future meetings

Wednesday 19 October, 9.30-11.3

Wednesday 25 January, 10-12

Wednesday 17 May, 9.30-11.30

ACTIONS

Minute	Action	Who	When	Status
20/11	Public engagement – develop a research public engagement strategy	AA/CK/ RG/DZ	October 2022	Ongoing
21/07	Future agenda item: To discuss the process for HEIF	TE	October 2022	Ongoing
21/07	To consider the structure of the agenda and reporting processes	DZ/TE	October 2022	Ongoing
21/10/01	To meet with HG to talk about a structured approach to an induction to UCRIPE	DZ	October 2022	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.	CK	October 2022	Ongoing
22/09a	A paper on Consultancy at Reading would be brought to the next meeting.	CMc	October 2022	Ongoing
22/09a	It was agreed that CMc would set up a meeting with WT/NH to discuss how the consultancy system fits	CMc		Ongoing

	alongside the potential CRIS and Individual Expectations work.			
22/09b	CK agreed to share the slides via Teams for everyone to consider further.	CK	ASAP	Done
22/09b	CK agreed to discuss with the Working Group how the different strategies fit together and what the priorities were for each, along with who is leading each area to ensure that the aims of the various strategies dovetail.	CK		Ongoing
22/09c	The suggestion from the Committee was to use the Autumn RDL Community of Practice meeting to have a more focused activity around delivering the Impact Strategy.	CW/TE/DZ	Autumn 2022	Ongoing
22/09c	It was agreed that CK would reword the section that implied RDLs could appoint an Impact Lead to lead on this.	CK		Ongoing
22/09c	It was agreed that AA would revisit the implementation plan and send to UCRI and it would be seen at the October meeting of UCRIPE.	AA	October 2022	Ongoing
22/09e	It was agreed that this paper would be circulated more widely, and that a full paper on BE would be provided at the next UCRIPE meeting.	LS	October 2022	Ongoing
22/10	CMc agreed to review current projects and work with TE/DZ to add 10 minute presentations to future agendas.	CMc/TE/DZ	2022-23	Ongoing