Knowledge Exchange Concordat – Action Plan Year 1

Owner: Head of Knowledge Exchange, contact L.Wallace@napier.ac.uk

Useful links: KE Concordat Self-evaluation / gap analysis template - Co-developed and fully populated. KE Concordat Self-evaluation Survey - fully populated

5 x Priority Actions for implementation in academic year 2022/23

Establish a set of solution-based workstreams involving academic, professional and student representatives:

Workstream 1 - KE Communications

Remit: Develop internal comms plan promoting the institution's priorities and support for KE, including its value and purpose. Raise awareness of our institutional values to existing and future partners. Continue embedding the Innovation Hub as a means of external communication.

Workstream 2 - KE Policies, Processes and Governance

Remit: Embed the outcomes of the RIE process review and develop appropriate guidance to address gaps. Review institutional guidance on KE reward and recognition and workload. Develop metrics and performance indicators to monitor and report progress. Integrate HEBCIS into the KE planning process. Introduce robust post-project evaluation processes. Clarify accountability and ownership of process.

Workstream 3 - KE Students

Remit: Develop an approach to student KE (acknowledging differing requirements of RPG/TPG/UG students) encompassing volunteering, entrepreneurship, internships, placements. Reframe KE to make it meaningful to students.

➤ Workstream 4 - KE Training and Development

Remit: Aligned to the actions of the Career Development for Researchers Action Plan, review the existing training provision for KE and to develop a suite of training and materials that will build skills / knowledge in academic, student and professional services staff. Explore potential for sharing or accessing training provision with external partners.

Workstream 5 - KE Partnership

Remit: Develop a proactive approach for prioritising external partnerships and for growing strategic and mutually beneficial partnerships across all departments of the University, including international partnerships, as well as public engagement.

Establish processes and policies for external engagement and management of partnerships including clear access routes and access to our specialist facilities. Explore the use of a CRM tool for more strategic account management and to develop best practice

- ✓ The information presented is underpinned by qualitative and quantitative feedback received during the year 1 Self-evaluation and Gap Analysis exercise.
- ✓ In developing the remit and activity of each Workstream, it is recommended that Workstream members review the full Self-evaluation template here and quantitative summary here.
- ✓ It is envisaged that the remit of the Workstreams should also include further liaison with key stakeholders including external partners, beneficiaries and / or students to implement practical solutions.
- ✓ Correlation with other University initiatives / Sector Concordat action plans should be considered by each Workstream to avoid duplication.

Scoring Scale:

- 1= Not at all (or not visible)
- 2= Somewhat (not consistently)
- 3= Mostly (consistently)
- 4= Fully (embedded and visible)

8 GUIDING PRINCIPLES: WHERE WE WANT TO BE:	WHERE WE ARE NOW: EXAMPLES OF OUR STRENGTHS:	WHERE WE ARE NOW: AVERAGE SCORE	GAPS: (POLICY/AWARENESS/PRACTICE)	ACTIONS/REMEDIES	WHAT WILL SUCCESS LOOK LIKE (MEASURES)
Knowledge exchange is a recognised part of the overall institutional strategy We have a clear understanding of the institutional role and the purpose of KE Staff, students and external organisations understand the aims and priorities of the institution's senior leaders	 University Strategy Shaping our Future: Driving Distinctiveness, widely consulted on and approved in 2020, with regular reporting to University Court An explicit Transformational Action to launch a new Innovation Hub as a critical vehicle to realise our KE ambitions Core Research & Innovation strategy sets out KE ambitions and objectives, widely consulted on, then launched at the beginning of 2021 and reports through RIC and Academic Board The University Innovation Fund UIF Plan is reported to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) but not regularly reported on/updated within the institution, as this is based on predicted outcomes. Enabling strategies: Learning and Teaching Strategy SOPHIE estates project – KE space University Strategy and Priorities #4 on external engagement Key Performance Indicator (KPI) targets for priority modes of Knowledge Exchange: Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTPs), Consultancy and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) 	2.1	 Inconsistent understanding on role and purpose of KE KPIs inappropriate / unclear Lack of awareness in what / how to do KE Accountability / oversight and planning for KE is unclear More could be done to engage students with all aspects of KE 	1.1 Simplify and translate Strategy into meaningful language 1.2 Develop an underpinning / enabling strategy for all 'engagement' activities 1.3 Develop a programme of structured communication which engages all stakeholders (staff, students and externals) 1.4 Embed / prioritise KE in planning process and identify responsible owners 1.5 Initiate a Student-specific KE workstream to develop an approach to Student KE	Increased understanding of the KE strategy measured through annual KE Concordat survey mechanisms
PRINCIPLE 2: POLICIES AND PROCESS Clear policies on all types of KE which are understood and operationalised. A good mutual understanding of how we value KE activity.	Policies accessible via staff intranet Launch of new Consultancy & Commercial Activity Framework to encourage and incentivise staff RIE Process review occuring	2	 Despite policies in place, there is a lack of awareness and engagement Need to introduce central and reliable reporting processes to capitalise on KE opportunities / client demand 	2.1 Embed and monitor the outcomes of the RIE process review exercise 2.2 Enhance staff intranet pages 2.3 Enhance externally facing webpages (innovation hub) to include easy access to policies	Increased awareness and engagement with policies and processes measured through annual KE Concordat survey mechanisms.

	 Support from Business Development Relationship Managers (BDRMs) in the Business Engagement Team within Research Innovation Enterprise (RIE) office Central University Innovation Panel guidelines and process Process of spin out arises through the Central Innovation Panel Scotland has a suite of contract templates agreed across all universities Student Futures - Employer Engagement Team Bright Red Triangle School Employer Engagement Teams Graduate Apprenticeships RIE Public Engagement Manager School Public Engagement Champions Public Engagement Strategy approved by Research & Innovation Committee Use of strategic funds for PE activity. Public Engagement web pages 		Lack of appropriate KPIs to monitor engagement activity Need to improve cross-departmental communication processes to share contacts and enhance engagement	2.4 Develop structured programme of training and development to increase understanding of policy/process 2.5 Establish appropriate, sector led, KPIs to monitor operational success 2.6 Explore CRM (client relationship management) system for structured contact sharing	Increased operationalisation of new policies measured through use of consultancy framework Improved reporting mechanisms – measured through increased availability of data
Build effective relationships by having clear routes to access information and expertise developed to suit the needs of a wide range of beneficiaries	 "Contact us" functionality via Innovation Hub. New IH@napier.ac.uk mailbox - reply to enquiries within 48 hours A first pass Client Engagement Framework (CEF) has been developed (quick quotes) RIE guidelines on the Research Process A stakeholder mapping and communications plan has been developed for all our critical stakeholders Appropriate project checks/due diligence is carried out as part of our research process 	2.1	Need to improve cross-departmental communication to share incoming contacts and improve engagement Need to improve awareness of 'what we do' and 'what we can offer' in context of KE The Innovation Hub will be pivotal	3.1 Standardise training for 'first point contacts' 3.2 Explore CRM system for improved client management 3.3 Continue Innovation Hub implementation and introduce an evaluation phase to adjust accordingly	Increased engagement measured through Innovation Hub traffic /user statistics and client feedback
PRINCIPLE 4: WORKING TRANSPAREI Make sure that our partners and beneficiaries understand the ethical and charitable regulatory environment, including E&D	Communication with partners/benefactors takes the form of conversations (with BDRMs) and contracts External website currently holds details on what we expect in IP ownership	2.8	Internal ethical processes are well- established, but the Innovation Hub will be pivotal as a mechanism for external access to this information and to promote transparency with our partners	 4.1 Continue Innovation Hub implementation promoting external access to published materials / policies 4.2 Develop programme of training and development including info sharing / seminars for external partners 4.3 Develop policy/ process for 'responsible innovation' 	Increased access to policies and regulations measured through Innovation Hub user statistics

PRINCIPLE 5: CAPACITY BUILDING Staff and students are developed and trained appropriately to understand and undertake their roles and responsibilities in the delivery of successful KE.	 IP policy, PE Strategy, Open Access Policy, Research Repository are accessible Ethical approval is built into all preaward processes, via Worktribe workflow There is a mechanism in place for declining work that does not meet the University's standards and is perceived to carry risk Established Research Data Management procedures incorporate risk assessment Online live and asynchronous training and development on being an ethical researcher, and doing research with integrity Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers implemented through the HR Excellence in Research Award and Action Plan KE training programme delivers collaborative training sessions for researchers Entrepreneurs in Residence provide mentorship/guidance/training BRT support for entrepreneurship Experienced RIE staff (some accredited) Ring-fenced RIE budget for training and development and professional memberships 	1.7	KE is not visible in the induction process Examples of KE are not visible or easily identifiable The training programme / offering could be clearer, more targeted and more defined The relationship / liaison between academic and PS support could be strengthened and better aligned to match local expertise	5.1 Include KE in the induction programme 5.2 Improve access to simplified KE information via staff intranet to enable staff / students to understand and access KE 5.3 Utilise the Innovation Hub to showcase real examples / role models for KE which are relatable 5.4 Implement the Concordat to support career development action plan 5.5 Develop structured programme of training and development for staff and students 5.6 Consider mentorship programmes	Visibility of KE in University induction programme. Expanded KE training and development programme measured through uptake / enrolment to sessions and post training evaluation feedback
PRINCIPLE 6: REWARDS AND RECOGN	 NITION				
We recognise and reward the achievements of staff and students who perform high quality KE activities	 Enterprise pathway in the <u>Academic promotion criteria</u> with specific indicators New consultancy and commercial activity framework Above and Beyond award categories – R&I, Innovative, Partnership, Enterprise Bright Red Sparks Competition External KE Awards MyContribution strategic objectives 	1.8	 Current indicators are considered to be inappropriate The current enterprise pathway is not fit-for-purpose, nor well promoted Current KPI metrics are too narrow /restrictive Project evaluation mechanisms are lacking, therefore so are post-project measures of success Workload allocation planning needs to more meaningful to reflect the full portfolio of activity 	 6.1 Review enterprise pathway – recognising 'enterprise' spans all pathways 6.2 Better communicate / showcase what successful KE looks like (role models) 6.3 Introduce tangible metrics/ benchmarks 6.4 Explore alternative progression and reward mechanisms for academic, PS staff and students 6.5 Reinvest income 6.6 Explore WAM process and improve transparency and monitoring processes 	Improved recognition measured through increased application and success rates for promotion Increased range of appropriate benchmark / metrics co-developed with stakeholders

	 Principal's Updates — Principal's View, newsletters to Alumni, lay court members, funders etc, external stakeholders event/presentation School Newsletters The Bones and press clippings Impact Magazine & Bright Red Triangle publications Impact webpages Annual Report Workload Allocation Model (AWF see 8.3 Commercial and Enterprise activities) 				Improved monitoring of WAM allocations through transparent mechanisms measured through improved inclusivity data
PRINCIPLE 7: CONTINUOUS IMPROVE Strive to share best practice with our peers and have established processes for learning from this	 Engagement with external partners in developing the Innovation Hub (IH) has provided feedback on our services Complaints procedure is in place External Rep on IH Steering Board (Court Member) BDRM team have formal sessions with Court Members IP stage-gated process involves external reviewers and Court members on panel Court Members on F&P Committee which reports on financial performance of KE activity Close links with SE who provide us with feedback on our emerging spin outs. BDRMs maintain comms during a project and feedback client comments. Memberships of ARMA; Praxis Aural; UIF & RCDG spin out group; UIF SME groups; CBI; Chamber of Commerce; CEED. Actively use Scottish Enterprise for support with emerging spin outs Host institution for East of Scotland KTP centre Liaise with Innovate UK Knowledge Transfer Network Some engagement with University Industry Innovation Network - Head of BE & IPC attended 	2	 Client feedback mechanisms are inconsistent / ad hoc Formalised project evaluation mechanisms are lacking, therefore so are post-project measures of success PS is limited in the degree to which they can engage in external forums due to resourcing issues The sector could do more to share best practice 	7.1 Explore CRM client management system (incl. feedback) 7.2 Improve internal communication flow e.g. Committee meeting outcomes / discussions 7.3 Introduce formalised post-project evaluation mechanisms	Routinely available client feedback accessible on request and appropriately shared, measured by an increase in volume of feedback available

	Head of Research Governance is a member of <u>RCAT</u>				
Undertake regular monitoring and review of our strengthening KE performance using this concordat and through regional, national or international benchmarks to inform execution of a programme of continuous improvement so that KE becomes more effective.	 KE Update is a standing item at University Research & Innovation Committee Court members form part of Finance & Property Committee Performance against strategic KPIs (incl. KE) reported to Court MyContribution objective setting and performance reviews Early and pro-active commitment to the KE Concordat through development of an action plan Significance of KE Concordat project is supported through Principal level sponsorship 	1.8	 Lack of CRM system restricts ability to evaluate Metrics / benchmarks need to be more defined – HEBCI review Formalised project evaluation mechanisms are lacking, therefore so are post-project measures of success 	8.1 Explore CRM client management system (incl. feedback) 8.2 Explore and introduce appropriate, sector-led benchmarking metrics (incl. non-financial) 8.3 Enhance internal reporting aligned to HEBCI 8.4 Introduce formalised post-project evaluation mechanisms	Introduction of appropriate KE metrics, with evidence of reporting / review by Senior Committees Introduction and consistent implementation of a post-project evaluation template.