



## Research, Innovation and Global Engagement Committee

Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> 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 Makaj; 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 approved RIGEC's further revised terms of reference and constitution and membership.
- 19.2. Arising from Minute 8.1f, it was proposed that an update be sought on the translation of high level budgets from the Spending Review into allocations that were distributed to individual organisations.<sup>1</sup>
- 19.3. Arising from Minute 8.2d, it was noted that UCL Communications and Marketing were still in the process of finalising the London Economics Review report into UCL's economic and social impact and the RIGEC Secretary would be notified when it had been published.
- 19.4. Arising from Minute 8.3, Professor Graeme Reid would attend the July meeting of the Committee to give a further update report on the implications arising from the government's Budget and Spending Review announcement report.

## Part II: Matters for Discussion

### 20. Evolving issues and impact on the Research, Innovation and Global Engagement areas

- 20.1. The Chair invited members to raise any evolving issues in their respective areas of work that might impact on research, innovation and global engagement. The following points were raised in discussion:
  - a. **Open Access E-textbooks:** In light of the pandemic, UCL Press had developed an Open Access e-textbook platform to deliver textbooks and learning materials to taught-course students.
  - b. UCL Library Services were working with colleagues in developing e-textbooks to support their own courses. Three textbooks had already been commissioned and a further twelve were being considered. UCL Press had already published one Open Access e-textbook.
  - c. UCL's model was considered innovative as it was the first fully Open Access University Press in Europe to launch such a publishing programme.

---

<sup>1</sup> Subsequent to the meeting, it was reported that the Government's funding guarantee relating to Horizon Europe had been extended. The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy announced on 14 March 2022 the allocation of its research and development budget to its partner organisations through to 2024-25 at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/beis-research-and-development-rd-partner-organisation-allocation-2022-to-2025/beis-research-and-development-rd-partner-organisation-allocation-20222023-to-20242025>.

- 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 the Group's report on its work. The key points made were:
  - a. The Group conducted its work in 2021 and was tasked to look at research and innovation relationships across UCL and how to manage them.
  - b. There was concern that UCL did not have a single framework for managing these relationships and relied on uncoordinated local solutions and systems and ad hoc responses to external enquiries. This could lead to confusion and mixed messages as well as missed opportunities.
  - c. The Group comprised of 20 members of staff consisting of academic and professional services staff.
  - d. The Group identified three categories of institutional relationship: (i) pre-existing ongoing, that could be characterised as 'critical'; (ii) incremental, that could be characterised as 'selective'; and (iii) infrequent emergent, that could be characterised as 'informal'.

- 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 finding the 'right' person to contact and the 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

the Vice-President (External Engagement). It was also relevant to the Office for the Pro-Provost (London) who coordinated local partnerships.

- b. It was suggested that a Community of Practice for relationship management was needed.
- c. Another suggestion was for the development of a checklist for individuals to know at what point to share their contact with a relevant person at UCL.
- d. Members felt that a more joined up approach for relationship management was needed to avoid UCL missing opportunities.
- e. The challenge of sharing external relationships that were personal ones of PIs was noted.
- f. Consideration was needed over how UCL was perceived externally as a high number of external partners tended to contact the same people at UCL.
- g. In terms of moving forward, RIGEC noted the challenges around how to deliver the Group's recommendations.

21.3. RIGEC:

- a. Endorsed the recommendations in the Working Group's report.

**22. New UCL Code of Conduct for Research (Paper 3-09)**

22.1. Dr Magda Morawska, Research Policy and Governance Officer, introduced the update report on the consultation for the new UCL Code of Conduct for Research. The key points made were:

- a. The draft revised version of the UCL Code of Conduct for Research had been produced and a UCL-wide consultation on the draft was launched last session.
- b. The consultation survey received 251 responses covering all faculties. The initial results showed that the majority of responses were positive and that the research roles and the expectations were clear and relevant.
- c. The consultation revealed that almost 50% of respondents had never read the current Code and 20% of those were not previously aware of the Code.
- d. The responsibilities in the revised Code had been split into two categories of mandatory requirements ('You must') and recommended standards ('You should'). It appeared that the definitions of 'should' and 'must' caused confusion for some and further guidance would be sought from the Advisory Group on how to address this.
- e. It was intended that the final version of the revised Code would be prepared next term with a view to it being approved at the June meeting of RIGEC and be published ahead of the start of the 2022-23 session.

22.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

- a. Members expressed concern over the 50% who had not read, and were therefore potentially not following, the current Code. It would be important

- to ensure that there was increased awareness amongst staff and students of the revised version.
- b. It was intended that an interactive website be created for the revised Code rather than the document being simply placed on a webpage.
  - c. Members also considered that the 251 survey responses was very low compared to the number of staff and students at UCL, and so the responses should be treated with caution and that requirements and/or standards that worked should not be changed.
  - d. In relation to ensuring staff and students read the Code, it was noted that it was needed for new starters and Early Career Researchers (ECRs) but it was difficult to engage experienced academic staff. One suggestion was that the Code might be embedded as a core reference in modules around research and academic practice as the go-to guidance for students as well as staff.
  - e. In ensuring that those who read the revised Code enacted its requirements and standards, the Director of EDI would welcome the opportunity to be involved in work on its behavioural aspects.
  - f. In terms of the ‘musts’ and ‘shoulds’ used in the Code, both the UCL branches of the Trades’ Unions and HR could provide advice on the wording.
  - g. The Chair expressed his thanks to Dr Morawska for all her work in developing the revised version of the Code.

### **23. UCL Press Expansion (Paper 3-10)**

- 23.1. Dr Paul Ayris, Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections and Open Science (LCCOS)) introduced the proposal for the expansion of the UCL Press infrastructure to meet growing academic and student need within UCL. The key points made were:
- a. UCL Press (<https://www.uclpress.co.uk>) was established in 2015 and was the first fully Open Access University Press in the UK.
  - b. UCL Press had achieved considerable success in its monograph, journal and e-textbook publishing programmes.
  - c. It had also achieved incredible download figures with the book titled “How the world changed social media” authored by Professor Danny Miller, UCL Anthropology, being downloaded over 500k times in over 244 countries.
  - d. The new UKRI policy announced in 2020 required Open Access on publication for articles and conference papers submitted on or after 1 April 2022. It would also require Open Access no later than 12 months after publication for monographs, book chapters and edited collections published on or after 1 January 2021. The UKRI policy would inform the Open Access policy for the next REF exercise and the need for monographs to be made available Open Access represented a huge change.

- e. With its present staffing complement of ten staff (commissioning and publisher support posts), UCL Press was unable to expand any further to meet demand without an increase in its staffing budget.
- f. The financial resources sought to develop the infrastructure in UCL Press covered staffing, production or marketing costs and income would be generated from publication charges from authors external to UCL.

23.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

- a. It was noted that while the Faculties of Arts and Humanities and Laws had been the first in line to bring monographs to be made available Open Access, UCL Library Services intended to reach out across UCL to invite further expressions of interest.

23.3. RIGEC:

- a. Approved the proposal for funding for the expansion of UCL Press for onward submission to UMC, subject to further letters of support being obtained by the Pro-Vice-Provost (LCCOS).

### **Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information**

#### **24. Report on 2021 Early Career Researchers (ECRs) development meetings between Faculties and UCL Doctoral School (Paper 3-11)**

24.1. RIGEC received the above report.

#### **25. Research Misconduct Allegations Screening Committee – Revised Terms of Reference (Paper 3-12)**

25.1. RIGEC approved the revised terms of reference for the Research Misconduct Allegations Screening Committee.

#### **26. Date of the next meeting**

26.1. The next meeting of RIGEC would take place on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022 at 10:00am on MS Teams.

26.2. This would be the final meeting to be chaired by Professor Price who would be succeeded in his role as Vice-Provost (Research, Innovation and Global Engagement) by Professor Geraint Rees with effect from 16<sup>th</sup> May 2022.

Ms Rachel Port, Governance Manager: Research Integrity, Secretariat, Office of General Counsel  
April 2022