

University Committee for Impact, Partnership and Engagement (UCRIPE)

Wed 13 October 21 from 10.00 am to 12.00 noon

Present: Dominik Zaum (Chair) (DZ), Roberta Gilchrist (RG), Carol Wagstaff (CW), Anne-Marie van Dodeweerd (AMD), Anthony Atkin (AA), Hilary Geoghegan (HG), Carol McAnally (CMA), Wanda Tejada (WT) and Dawn Cobbold (Secretary)

21/06 Welcome and apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Darren Browne, Susan Matos and Caroline Knowles.

21/07 Governance

21/07/01 Disclosure of Interests

There were no disclosures of interests to report.

21/07/02 University of Reading corporate Risk Register 2021 to 2022

DZ noted that Risk 4 should act as a reminder for UCRIPE: Research and Innovation "Failure to sufficiently exploit the development of economic and social impact from our research and enterprise activity".

21/07/03 Terms of Reference

In light of recent changes, DZ requested UCRIPE to review the Terms of Reference. The vacancy for an academic member was about to be advertised. It was agreed that the overall membership of UCRIPE would remain unchanged.

There was a discussion about the key objectives during which it was noted that:

- It was important to grow a research culture fully inclusive of impact.
- An element of strategy should be included.
- A reference should be made to partnerships.

Following the discussion, the key objectives were agreed as follows:

1. Monitor implementation of the Impact strategy and supporting development of impact culture across research.
2. Support implementation of public engagement plan.
3. Support KE and commercialisation elements of research strategy.
4. Support development of research partnerships.

There was a discussion about the Terms of Reference, and changes were noted as follows:

- No 1: A reference to the implementation of the KE concordat should be included.
- No 3: Reference should be made to UCRIPE having oversight in terms of strategic partnerships.
- No 6: To achieve a general oversight, exemplars should be categorised and used i.e. HEIF, RETF and BOISP.
- No 8: The wording should be changed to reflect that UCRIPE had oversight of the HEIF strategy that governed funding, rather than individual projects.

Following the discussion, changes to the Terms of Reference were agreed as follows:

1. To oversee the University's submission to KEF **and implementation of the KE concordat.**
3. To monitor the development and maintenance of the **University strategic partnerships.**

6. **To monitor implementation of the impact strategy including the use of supporting resources and funding that supports our impact pipeline, i.e. HEIF, RETF, BOISP.**
8. **To oversee HEIF funding** in line with the Research and Innovation Strategy, and the University HEIF strategy.

It was noted that UCRIFE reported directly to UBRI. The monitoring of responsible innovation and consultancy to enable partnership working and impact delivery was discussed. DZ stated that it was important when looking at strategy to put in place monitoring mechanisms and proposed regular activity reports to UBRI. DZ highlighted the importance of being business focussed noting that the leverage of additional research funding required closer engagement with business. It was agreed that the process for HEIF would be discussed at a future UCRIFE meeting. DZ proposed to consider the structure of the UCRIFE agenda and reporting processes going forward.

Actions:

- **DC to circulate revised ToR to UCRIFE and governance prior to the next meeting**
- **DC to note future agenda item: To discuss the process for HEIF**
- **DZ/DC to consider the structure of the agenda and reporting processes**

21/08 Minutes of the last meeting held on 20 May 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2021 were approved as a true record.

21/09 Matters arising from the minutes (not covered elsewhere on the agenda)

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

21/10 Strategy

21/10/01 Updates:

❖ **Consultancy at Reading**

CM reported that the KTC had taken over the management of the process in May 21. The KTC mailbox was now the point of contact for all consultancy at Reading. Moving forward the big barrier was around the concept of “statement of work”. The major next step was the communications plan which had been delayed due to web migration.

DZ was pleased to see the development of the process. CM commented that the number of enquiries was down on previous years and was low compared to comparative groups; this would be explored. There had been positive feedback about the process.

❖ **KEF and HEIF**

AMD noted that Research England (RE) and Office for Students (OfS) had stated their intention to use HEIF for the period 2020 to 2025, with no modifications. The allocations had not yet been fully confirmed. For the first time since 2006, RE and OfS would be conducting a consultation to review funding methods for HEIF. There were some conversations around KEF and measuring KE performance. KEF was user testing new dashboards.

❖ **KE Concordat (KEC)**

CM gave an update on KEC. The work had been commissioned by RE to deliver a process. The purpose would be to capture contribution and share best practice with reviewers looking at different concordats. Each HEI would receive a full reviewers report plus a summary. Noting that this was a pilot year, CM commented that there was no indication as to whether the KEC would go live. The key decision would be deciding the best way to take the feedback forward.

There was a discussion about the distinction between core and extra funding. It was noted that the majority of the allocation was spent on posts, in both academic and professional services. UCRIFE agreed that it would be helpful to see how the KEC overlapped with impact and to have a comparative perspective about how other

institutions utilised their funding in relation to research. AMD noted two potential additional single year HEIF grants of around £75k each. DZ proposed a longer-term strategic planning item at the next meeting and requested CM/SM to share the 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. As a new member of the committee, HG noted that it would be useful to have an induction into the themes covered in UCRIFE, such as HEIF funding.

Action:

- **SM/CM 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.**
- **DZ to meet with HG to talk about a structured approach to an induction to UCRIFE**

❖ **Research Public Engagement strategy**

CK had provided a paper on the progress of the Research Public Engagement strategy. The group would meet again in mid-November to give further input following which the plan would be brought back to UCRIFE for discussion and approval. Comparator work was to be done.

❖ **Impact Strategy work**

AA reported that the Impact Team had spent time exploring and improving their understanding of problems to help with the delivery of the Impact Strategy linked to the Research Strategy and the wider University Strategy. Putting problems at the centre of the approach to impact had proven useful as a core concept to be embedded in the Impact Strategy going forward. The aim would be to use problem statements to draw activity together to resolve and to evaluate, enabling researchers to undertake different kinds of impact generated activity and enable a collective narrative. The draft Impact Strategy would be reviewed by UCRI before returning to UCRIFE.

There was a discussion during which concern was expressed around framing the strategy for areas that might not be identifying big global challenges in terms of their research. As such, it was felt that there was more work to be done and that we may not yet be at the point of identifying a coherent problem statement. It was suggested that a productive point of entry would be to identify the right partnerships. It would be a gradual development process with an emphasis on collective ownership of these problems. AA confirmed that this would be addressed through the delivery of the strategy. The importance of ensuring that impact was an integral part of research was highlighted. It was suggested that it would be helpful to include an introduction to the strategy around what impact would look like and how it would be embedded in the University and Research Strategy.

21/11 Projects and programmes portfolio

21/11/01 BOISP Programme review

DZ presented the end of programme review of the Building Outstanding Impact Support Programme (BOISP) to UCRIFE for comment, alongside the response from UCRI. The key recommendation was to develop the impact strategy, to take impact beyond REF and embed in the research culture.

The review was discussed, and the following points were noted:

- It was useful to see the evaluation of the programme and the recommendations and lessons about Public Engagement.
- It was important to ensure that impact was embedded as an integral part of the research process going forward.
- The need for greater flexibility and transparency of funding was highlighted. Due to the nature of the work with external partners, there would be a potential underspend on individual projects. It was hoped that moving forward, with a more generic approach to impact as part of research, there would be more

flexibility to switch between funds and operate a continuous draw down on finance. This would allow people to take research forward in more imaginative ways.

- Going forward with the next impact strategy a key issue to address would be supporting workload management and the principle of funding academic time.

21/12 Policy

There were no items to discuss.

21/13 Any other Business

There were no items of any other business.

21/14 Date and time of next meeting

The next meeting would take place on Wednesday 02 February at 10.00 am. The focus of the meeting would be HEIF.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 11.45 pm

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS (13/10/2021)

Item	Action	Owner	Completion date	Status
20/02	Propose the name of UCRIP and Engagement to the UEB for their approval	DW	May 20	complete
20/08	Impact Culture to meet to discuss the presentation and scope any potential help from MCE	AA/CK	May 20	complete
	Overtaken by impact strategy			
	Impact culture post REF take findings from presentation to UCRI	DZ / AA	2021	complete
20/11	Public Engagement – develop a research public engagement strategy to be signed off by summer 21	AA/CK/R G/DZ	Summer 21	complete
	To share the KEF presentation with committee	SM	asap	ongoing
21/04	To prepare PE data to be used at the UEB away day	SM	asap	complete
	Schedule a meeting to put together work plan for the next UCRIPE meeting in October	CK/HD	asap	complete
	To circulate revised ToR to UCRIPE and governance prior to the next meeting	DC	Autumn 21	ongoing
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 UCRIPE Teams site.	SM/CM	Autumn 21	ongoing
	To meet with HG to talk about a structured approach to an induction to UCRIPE	DZ	Autumn 21	ongoing