Innovation and Enterprise Committee
Thursday 8th October 2020 at 3:00pm

Minutes

Present members:
Dr Celia Caulcott (Chair); Professor Bas Aarts; Mr Jerry Allen; Dr Mark Altaweel; Ms Karen Barnard; Mr Ileyas Benmouna; Professor David Bogle; Ms Jane Butler; Professor Rachel Chambers; Dr Martin Davies; Dr Jane Kinghorn; Ms Natasha Lewis; Mr Roger de Montfort; Mr Jim Onyemenam; Dr Anne Lane; Dr James Phillips; Professor David Price; Dr Rokia Raslan; Dr Amelia Roberts; Dr Karen Sergiou; Professor Alan Thompson; Professor Thomas Voit; Dr Kathryn Walsh; Dr Sally Wilson

Attendees:
Ms Lydia Harwood, Strategy and Policy Manager, UCL Innovation and Enterprise
Ms Harriet Lilley, Executive Assistant to the Vice-Provost (Enterprise) and Departmental Manager, UCL Innovation and Enterprise
Mr Guy Van Koetsveld, Design Lead, Research and Innovation Support Transformer

Apologies:
Professor Christoph Lindner
Professor David Lomas

Officer:
Ms Rachel Port

Part I: Preliminary Business

1.   Welcome from the Chair

1.1.   The Chair welcomed members to the inaugural meeting of this newly established formal standing committee and noted that:

   a. Council had approved the establishment of this committee that would report upwards to Academic Committee.
   b. This was the first ever formal standing committee in the area of innovation and enterprise in UCL's governance structure.
   c. The formation of the committee was especially important in light of increasing government policy and requirements for institutions in these areas.

d. It was considered that Innovation and Enterprise was an exciting area of work as it allowed for research findings to translate into change for the good of both the economy and society.

e. The committee had been set up with a wide membership given the broadness of the areas.

2.   Declarations of interest

2.1. No interests were declared.

3.   Innovation and Enterprise Committee Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership (Paper 1-01)

3.1. Innovation and Enterprise Committee (IEC) approved its terms of reference and constitution and membership for 2020-21 session.

Part II: Items for Discussion

4.   Update on arrangements for KEF and review of narratives (Paper 1-02)

4.1. Dr Kathryn Walsh, Director of Knowledge Exchange Policy and Practice, introduced the update on the arrangements for the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF). The key points made were:

a. The first edition of the KEF was due to be published later in 2020. It was largely metrics based, using a variety of existing data returns. There was the option to submit narrative material to provide additional context.

b. The metrics involved seven different "perspectives" intended to describe a broad spectrum of knowledge in exchange activities.

c. It was intended that the metrics would be presented in chart alongside other institutions in UCL's cluster group.

d. The data was not yet available for all metrics. However, there had been an initial attempt at modelling by Wonkhe.

e. An initial view of some of UCL's comparator group showed UCL's strengths but the data was incomplete. Also, the research partnerships authorship data had not yet been supplied.

f. There were two "perspectives" where there was not felt to be appropriate metrics available in the areas of "Local growth and regeneration" and "Public and community engagement". Two draft narrative statements had been prepared to focus on activities on these areas with input from across the UCL community.

4.2. The following points were made in discussion:

a. It was suggested that the narratives could be strengthened by mentioning the work of UCL's three Biomedical Research Centres (BRCs), especially

in relation to Patient and Public Involvement and Engagement (PPIE). The numbers of patients treated throughout clinical trial activity could be included.

4.3. IEC:
   a. Approved the draft KEF narratives and UCL's return would be submitted to Research England next week.

5. Update on developments in government policy for Innovation and Enterprise (Paper 1-03)

5.1. Dr Kathryn Walsh gave an oral update report on current government policy initiatives relevant to innovation and enterprise (or knowledge exchange as it is referred to within UK policy). The key points made were:

   a. Commitment to the Knowledge Exchange Concordat (KEC) was required in order to receive Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) funding.
   b. Institutions had been asked to sign up to a "Development year" in which they would be required to carry out a self-evaluation process and generate an action plan.
   c. The templates and associated guidance for the self-evaluation and action plan were not expected to be published by Research England later this month.
   d. Despite that, it was anticipated that the self-evaluation work would need to get underway from November 2020 until Easter 2021 with a view to submission in Summer 2021.
   e. In light of the current lack of guidance, expertise from the UCL community was sought in designing the self-assessment process.

5.2. The following points were made in discussion:

   a. The Chair considered that dedicated funding in the area of innovation and enterprise would mean increased accountability for institutions.
   b. The Higher Education Business and Community Interaction Survey (HEBCIS) had been a 20 year longitudinal study that was important to government in investing in innovation and enterprise in higher education institutions (HEIs).

5.3 IEC:
   a. Invited any members interested in helping with the self-assessment process to contact the Director of Knowledge Exchange Policy and Practice.

6. Innovation and Enterprise development programme – the I&E Toolkit

6.1. Dr Kathryn Walsh gave an oral report on the development of the Innovation and Enterprise (I&E) Toolkit. The key points made were:

  a. The Toolkit had been developed at the request of the Faculty Vice-Deans (Enterprise).
  b. The high take up of the Toolkit, even throughout development, showed that there was real demand for training in the areas of innovation and enterprise amongst staff.
  c. The Toolkit landing page links to various other policies and procedures but also revealed where gaps in training existed. Feedback on the Toolkit from participants would also be used to help identify training needs.

6.2. The following points were made in discussion:

  a. There was high demand from academics for the Toolkit and that it be made available online.
  b. It was suggested that this work could be supported by UCL Organisational Development to align with their existing training programmes.
  c. Training should be targeted to specific audiences. It was felt that more advice was required for research students as well as for new academic staff.
  d. New staff would not be required to undertake the training as part of their mandatory training requirements.

7. UCL Policy updates (Paper 1-04)

7.1. Dr Kathryn Walsh gave an update report on a range of UCL policy changes and associated supporting activities. The key points made were:

  a. It would be a requirement of the KEC that UCL could demonstrate that it had appropriate policies in place to support one of its key strategic priorities to "promote and embed an effective culture of innovation and knowledge exchange across UCL".
  b. The new policy on Disclosure of Conflicts and Declaration of Interests was approved by Council in June 2020. Work was being undertaken with UCL's Information Services Division to build the system into the existing MyHR system, while the associated training module was under development.
  c. It was intended that the new system would launch later this month and significant communications would occur in November to reach the UCL community.
  d. The intention was that the training be mandatory and this request would be considered at the MyLearning Governance Board later this month.
  e. Dr Walsh invited feedback from IEC on ways to create a culture shift in consideration of the importance of this area, and other policies and

processes for staff that could be used to require the undertaking of training in this area.

7.2.   The following points were raised in discussion:

a. Members discussed possible ways to ensure that staff did complete the training if it could not be added to UCL's mandatory training requirements for staff.
b. It was suggested that it be included in the annual UCL staff appraisal process. Within the NHS, staff had to undertake modules on various policies and procedures as part of their appraisal process.
c. Clear messaging about why staff should undertake the training was important and it was suggested that UCL Human Resources and UCL Organisational Development might be able to help in this regard.
d. It was considered that creating a culture shift would take a long time.

7.3.   IEC:
a. Agreed that the issue of making training mandatory in relation to UCL's Disclosure of Conflicts and Declarations of Interest policy be referred to UCL's Research Operations Group for consideration.

8.   Learning from Industry and Economy 'Bronze' group (COIN) – next steps and recommendations (Paper 1-05)

8.1.   Dr Martin Davies, Director for Innovation Partnerships, introduced the report on the work of the COIN group. The key points made were:

a. The Aquamarine Bronze 5.3 and Sapphire Bronze 3B groups set up in March 2020 under UCL's crisis management structure in response to the current coronavirus pandemic. The groups were stood down in June 2020.
b. The groups' remit were to track how UCL partners were responding to the pandemic and what longer term patterns of behaviour were likely to emerge in industry and the economy that UCL should be aware of, and to which new research and innovation projects could be directed.
c. The group met with over 20 external organisations and collected over 40 research and innovation challenges and opportunities. The group prepared 11 proposals for action of which 2 had been fully implemented and a further 8 were assigned to project leads elsewhere at UCL and were in progress.
d. Based on discussions, it was concluded that UCL would continue to face increasing demand for its services from a broader and often less 'research sophisticated' range of stakeholders. UCL's traditional partners might require more focused partnership arrangements rather than broader based strategic partnerships.

e. The shifting pattern of demand for UCL expertise was likely to present UCL with specific challenges around demand management, capacity, efficiency, intellectual property and income.

f. In recognition of interest across UCL in the meetings and the effectiveness of the process, Innovation and Enterprise would continue to hold meetings under the title 'Challenge-Orientated Innovation Network' (COIN).

8.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

a. UCL Careers would be interested to link with the COIN group. Any other IEC members were welcome to join COIN meetings if they wished.

8.3 IEC:
a. Endorsed the next phase of COIN meetings.

9. Update on implementation of Research and Innovation support transformer (Paper 1-09)

9.1. Guy Van Koetsveld, Design Lead, introduced the update on the implementation of the Research and Innovation Support Transformer (RIST). The key points made were:

a. The core team now consisted of the Design Lead alone and this lack of resources was being addressed with the RIST co-sponsors and UCL's TOPS team to identify support for the development of the RIST from November onwards. In the meantime, an Executive Director was being recruited.

b. It was intended that the Business Partner pilot be extended into 2021.

c. The intention behind the operating model for the RIST was to provide seamless support for academic projects across research and innovation.

d. In terms of business requirements, some 68 individual requirements had been identified and a significant number of those were "must" or "should" for the development of the RIST.

e. In light of the above, it was noted that the costing and pricing for all activity types was required and that all projects needed to be accounted for in external reporting.

f. The development of online training for the RIST was being considered by UCL's Research Operations Group.

g. The focus was currently on working through the technical requirements to develop solutions.

9.2. The following points were made in discussion:

a. In relation to the costing and pricing for the RIST, it was considered that the intellectual assets and property needed to be considered.

b. Discussions were underway about work for the next six months of the project and on different streams. However a number of technical issues required IT solutions to be developed.

c. In light of the lack of resources for the development of the RIST, faculties would need to be informed about the extension of the pilot and to manage their expectations.

9.3. IEC:

a. Proposed that the Design Lead go back to faculties about the development of the RIST pilot and to manage expectations in light of reduced resources.

b. Proposed that an update on the RIST be considered at the next IEC meeting.

10. Update on the Development of an interim UCL Innovation and Enterprise Strategy (Paper 1-06)

10.1. Dr Kathryn Walsh gave an update on the development of the interim I&E strategy. The key points made were:

a. The current strategy "Transforming knowledge and ideas into action" would expire in 2021 and require revision. However, it would be difficult to develop a new strategy as the new UCL Provost would take up his post in January 2021 and government guidance in the area of innovation and enterprise (knowledge exchange) was due to be issued in the New Year. Therefore, it was intended that a light touch refresh be undertaken.

b. All UCL's Faculty Vice-Deans (Enterprise) had been consulted about the current strategic priorities, to assess their current relevance and highlight areas that required further attention.

c. The current strategic priorities would be revised in the updated strategy and a broader view of engagement with students beyond employability would be included. This was needed as the Office for Students was keen for student involvement in innovation and enterprise.

10.2. The following points were made in discussion:

a. It was suggested that the charitable and clinical sectors might be included in the revised strategic priorities.

b. UCL was keen to work with all its partners and at all levels.

c. It was suggested that the third draft priority be redrafted to make explicit that embedding a variety of approaches through which students could participate in innovation and enterprise applied to students at all levels, not just at doctoral level.

d. Consideration was given to place as a cross-cutting theme, given its importance in current policy.

10.3. IEC:
   a. Proposed that student requirements in the updated Innovation and Enterprise strategy be discussed with its sabbatical officer members.

Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information

11. Update from UCL Innovation and Enterprise Funding Committee 2019-20 (Paper 1-07)

11.1. IEC received the update report from UCL Innovation and Enterprise Funding Committee on its activities in 2019-20 session.

12. KPMG Internal Audit Review of UCL Data Quality (HE-BCI) (Paper 1-08)

12.1. IEC received the KPMG Internal Audit report on its review of UCL Data Quality (HE-BCI). The overall assessment was of 'significant assurance' (green) and the review made two low priority recommendations.

13. Dates of next meetings

13.1. The dates for meetings of Innovation and Enterprise Committee in 2020/21 were as follows:

- Thursday 4 February 2021 at 2.00pm
- Thursday 13 May 2021 at 2.00pm.

Ms Rachel Port
Secretary to Innovation and Enterprise Committee
January 2021