

# UNIVERSITY OF YORK

## Senate

### PARTNERSHIPS, ENTERPRISE AND ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Matters for note by Senate arising from the meeting of Partnerships, Enterprise and Engagement Committee on 25 January 2022

#### 1. Terms of Reference

The Committee recommended for approval the draft Terms of Reference. It was clarified that the Committee name included both Engagement and Enterprise, in recognition of the scope of work. The Committee remit remained focused on these areas, and as such GSA and APSG were not included in the membership. The work of the Committee was in identifying leadership opportunities and enabling the engagement of future leaders, however it was acknowledged that the Committee was not the only place in the University in which such activity was taking place.

A few minor changes were requested, which would be implemented prior to submission to Senate. Further comments would be picked up outside the meeting.

#### 2. Oral report on the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public

The Committee received an oral report on recent developments from the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) review of Public Engagement at the University. The following points were noted:

- (a) University involvement with the NCCPE had arisen through previous work as part of the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF), in which the development of a narrative statement on public and community engagement had prompted further consideration as to how work in such areas might be optimised.
- (b) The NCCPE had thus far conducted a document review of relevant policies, as well as a staff survey (with 84 respondents) and a series of interviews with 41 staff members [REDACTED]. A small working group had been established to act as advisors and critical friends on the project. The next meeting of the working group would take place on 15 March.
- (c) The NCCPE review had identified three domains of public engagement: (i) reputation and brand, (ii) academic practice and (iii) social responsibility. There was also a focus on public good in the intersection of these areas. The upcoming meeting of the working group would discuss recommendations for these areas and prioritise further actions. An action plan would then be developed in alignment with the KEC.

A paper would be presented to the Committee at the next meeting to provide further detail on the work.

#### 3. Action Plan for the Implementation of the Knowledge Exchange Concordat (KEC)

The Committee endorsed the action plan for the implementation of the Knowledge Exchange Concordat. It was noted that the University approach was to identify develop areas and map these onto the KEC aims and objectives, using the KEC as a framework for institutional goals. The six key themes identified in the KEC were already pertinent to work ongoing across the institution, and the focus for York was on building a comprehensive response covering all areas.

The Committee noted the role of the KEC in building a culture to support knowledge exchange activity and in monitoring such activity. Members were asked to notify the Associate Director (Impact) Research, Innovation and Knowledge Exchange, of any individuals or activities that would benefit from inclusion in the action plan. It was agreed that tying in the KEC work to training on offer across the institution was important.

#### **4. HEIF Annual Monitoring Statement for 2020-21**

The Committee approved the HEIF Annual Monitoring Statement for 2020-21. The Statement was a high-level summary intended to highlight the value added to the University through HEIF funding. Further comments would be directed to the Associate Director (Impact) Research, Innovation and Knowledge Exchange..

#### **5. Oral Report on the Audit of University Partnerships**

The Committee received an oral report on the audit of University partnerships. The following points were noted:

- (a) There had been a longstanding commitment from Audit Committee to conduct an audit of partnerships of all types across the University. PwC were involved in conducting an audit of due diligence and risk management processes at York. The University was working with PwC to ensure the audit process was as useful and constructive as possible.
- (b) Further discussion about the scope of the audit – specifically the alignment with collaborative teaching provision – would be picked up outside the meeting, as would conversation with colleagues as to the most effective routes to establishing partnerships.
- (c) It was acknowledged that the appropriate management of due diligence concerns was difficult, for example in the case of work arising from informal conversations at conferences and overseas. These legal, ethical and reputational dimensions would need to be fully considered.
- (d) Understanding and engagement from the academic community was essential to ensuring effective partnerships, and as such the communication of such initiatives needed to be fully assessed. It was important that the communication of key information be relayed in a helpful and non-burdensome manner; the efficacy of such processes could be considered as part of the ongoing audit.

It was clarified that further information regarding the scope of the audit would not be brought back to the Committee for further discussion.

#### **6. HEBCIS Data for 2020-21**

The Committee received for information a report on HEBCIS data for 2020-21. The following was noted:

- (a) Much activity had not taken place or had been limited by the ongoing C-19 situation, for example on-campus residential visits. It was not yet clear how University of York performance compared to other institutions.
- (b) It was clarified that the data used in the report was drawn directly from Aggresso, and so the accuracy of reporting was influenced by the quality of this data. The Committee recognised that there was room for improvement in the use of secondary data. There was work underway to ensure systems were adequately connected. Recommendations would be made over time, and a broader dataset shared in due course.
- (c) The preponderance of NHS and health research taking place at York meant such research comprised a large part of the data presented in the report; the Committee suggested that it would be useful to see a version of the report without health research included.
- (d) There was difficulty defining CPD activity in HEBCIS, particularly in capturing CPD activity where it is a component of another grant, however it was important not to lose sight of such work. The University had always followed the provided definitions strictly, however there was scope to further refine the area.
- (e) It would be beneficial to link the HEBCIS data with the work of the PwC Partnerships audit, noted above.

#### **7. UK Shared Prosperity Fund**

The Committee considered a report on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF). The Shared Prosperity Fund was the successor to European funding sources following the departure of the UK from the EU. The aim of the paper was to identify opportunities and bid for these in the most optimal manner. It was

clarified that further information as to the specifics and structure of the funding would be available once the prospectus was released in February. It was noted that State Aid was no longer available.

It was requested that the Head of Economic Development speak with the Head of OPPA to coordinate activity, and that the recommendations be phrased in a gender-neutral way.

## **8. Other Business**

(a) In the course of Committee introductions, three themes emerged:

1. Providing strategic leadership;
2. Informing and engaging the research community, making decisions in support of the University Strategy or 2030; *and*
3. Identifying opportunities to add value to the University, both in terms of business involvement and cultural/heritage work.

(b) It was noted that members had been selected for the insight and experience they could bring to Committee business, and that the establishment of UPEC was an opportunity to embed knowledge exchange and impact within the culture of the institution more broadly.

(c) Professor Sarah Thompson had had her term as Associate Dean (Research) for the Sciences extended, and the role had been expanded to include business and industry engagement.

(d) The PVC-Partnerships & Engagement would act as co-investigator for the ESRC Centre for Vulnerability and Policing, in support of the national engagement aspects of the work. The Centre provided an opportunity to consider new, innovative ways of working with partners. The team involved in the Centre would be invited to UPEC.

(e) One of the eight transformational initiatives noted in the University Strategy for 2030 centred on building industrial engagement, and this was an area the University currently fell behind the sector in. Work on this area focused on developed a framework for such activity, with the aim of increasing the range of partnerships and, as a result, meeting industrial income targets.

**PROFESSOR KIRAN TREHAN**  
**22/04/2021**

**MS ZOE CLARKE**