Research, Innovation and Global Engagement Committee

Wednesday 9th March 2022, 2:00pm
Video-conferencing meeting on MS Teams

Minutes

Present Members:
Dr Paul Ayris (Acting Chair); Professor Lynn Ang; Mr Jeremy Barraud; Dr Matthew Blain; Ms Sarah Chaytor; Mr Andrew Cooper; Professor Janet Darbyshire CBE; Professor Carsten Gerner-Beuerle; Ms Megan Gerrie; Ms Claire Glen; Mr Alex Hall; Professor Stephen M. Hart; Mr Richard Jackson; Professor Kate Jeffery; Dr Jane Kinghorn; Ms Amy Lightstone; Ms Viktoria Makai; Mr Benjamin Meunier; Mr Martin Moyle; Mr Ciaran Moynihan; Ms Aloma Onyemah; Professor Cheryl Thomas QC; Mr Nicholas Tyndale; Dr Kathryn Walsh; Professor Andrew Wills

Apologies:
Professor Ibrahim Abubakar, Professor David Bogle, Professor Stephen Caddick, Mr Simon Cane, Mr James Davis, Professor Jacqui Glass, Professor Jennifer Hudson, Professor Sam Janes, Ms Sarah Lawson, Dr Nick McNally, Mr Derfel Owen, Professor James Phillips, Professor David Price, Professor Deenan Pillay, Professor Geraint Rees, Dr Francesca Scotti, Professor Nigel Titchener-Hooker, Ms Kirsty Walker

In attendance:
Dr Magda Morawska [for Minute 22]
Professor Mark Tewdwr-Jones [for Minute 21]

Officer:
Ms Rachel Port

Part I: Preliminary Business

17.   Welcome

17.1.   Dr Ayris would act as chair for the meeting in the absence of Professor Price who was unwell. Dr Ayris welcomed all members to the meeting.

18.   Minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2022

18.1.   RIGEC approved the minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2022 [Minutes 6-16, 2021-22].

19.   Matters arising from the Minutes

19.1. Arising from Minute 6.2, University Management Committee (UMC) had

membership.

d. **Sustainability**: UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) and other funders were looking into how to incorporate sustainability in their activities by, for example, considering whether those submitting bids for research grant funding should address sustainability goals as part of their application.

e. It was hoped that UCL would be able to have input into UKRI discussions and it was intended that the Director of Sustainability would produce a paper on how RIGEC could provide assistance in this area once the guidance from UKRI was clearer.

f. **Research Excellence Framework (REF) results**: In response to a query about how to guide faculties and departments on communicating the REF results to their respective areas, it was noted that a Working Group led by the Director of RIGE Communications was working on this and would contact faculties and Vice-Deans for Research in due course.

g. The UCL REF Manager would attend the next RIGEC meeting to talk through the results. A more detailed analysis and work around lessons to be learned would follow over the next year.

h. **Russia and Ukraine**: The Research and Innovation Services Directorate were concentrating their efforts on activities related to Russia and Ukraine in light of the current invasion.

i. **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)**: In response to a query around translating EDI initiatives across UCL, it was noted that part of the partner renewal process for UCL Partner Biomedical Research Centres covered equality and inclusivity but widening participation in those centres remained an issue.

j. Issues around capturing data on protected characteristics also posed a barrier in translating EDI initiatives across UCL.

21.   Relationship Management (Paper 3-08)

21.1. Professor Mark Tewdwr-Jones, Chair of the UCL Task and Finish Group on Relationship Management introduced

e.   The three categories were a general indicative summary and were not intended to be exhaustive of all types of activities. Some were one directional whilst others worked in several directions.

f.   Some work on identifying priority external stakeholders had already been undertaken in UCL for specific purposes but it was considered that questions of prioritisation were a senior management matter.

g.   The Group found it unfeasible to map out all the relationships with external agencies due to the many thousands of relationships that already existed at UCL. It did not consider that the number of external agencies was necessarily problematic.

h.   The challenge for different parts of UCL for relationship management related to four issues: (i) potential movement of an external organisation from one category to another; (ii) presence of the same external organisation in different categories that was led by different individuals or departments between different categories; (iii) identifying how to navigate external relationships and their internal managements thought institutional structure and relevant expertise across UCL; (iv) requirement for risk assessment, compliance, due diligence, cost and data sharing issues to be factored into discussions about developing external relationships.

i.   Many of the above issues were compounded by the time taken by individuals external to UCL in
appropriate entry point.

j.   The Group identified a number of existing sources of information and databases relating to external research and innovation relationships. However, it was unclear if they were kept up-to-date and the issue of database ownership presented a challenge.

k.   Given the size of UCL and the complexity of different categories of relationships, it was considered that no single system would be suitable to cover all possibilities.

l.   The Group took evidence from divisions across UCL that had implemented a Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system and found that there were advantages and disadvantages of using this system.

m.   The Group proposed that an incremental approach would be a suitable way forward to managing research and innovation partnerships with external stakeholders, through the development of a mini-CRM system for specific parts of UCL.

n.   The cultural change required to adopt and use a CRM system was noted. Several members of the Group had volunteered their own divisions for early pilots for CRM relationship management, should it be adopted.

21.2.   The following points were raised in discussion:

a.   The ownership of relationship management at UCL was unclear. RIGEC considered that if it were centrally co-ordinated, it could potentially cancel opportunities, but that it could be placed with work on engagement led by