

Engineering Professors' Council
Minutes of the RIKT Committee meeting
held on 5th February 2024 via Zoom

Present

Johnny Rich (JR), Ion Sucala (IS - Chair), Sarah Peers (SP), Crina Oltean-Dumbrava (COD), David Hughes (DH), Adrienne Houston (AH), Rob Deaves (RD), Steve Magowan (SM) and David Brown (DB)

With

Stella Fowler (SF), Rhian Todd (RT) and Lisa Chilcott (LC)

Apologies

Tanya Vladimirova (TV) and Andy Alderson (AA)

1.	<i>Apologies and welcome: handover of chair</i>	
	<p>Apologies received as above were NOTED.</p> <p>IS thanked AA for serving as chair of the committee. IS said he hopes to thank AA in person at the next meeting.</p>	
2.	<i>Minutes of last meeting held on 17th October 2023</i>	
	<p>"Draft" watermark to be removed from the 17th October 2023 minutes and reloaded to website. Action: RT</p>	2402-01
3.	<i>Matters arising and items not elsewhere on the agenda</i>	
	<p>JR said maybe we could have a webinar on Research Integrity. AA asked if Jeremy Watson (UCL) should be invited to attend the next RIKT meeting. JR agreed and said he would discuss with John Mitchell.</p> <p>JR said John Mitchell has not yet caught up with Jeremy Watson so this is an ongoing action.</p> <p>IS asked the committee if an invitation for new committee members should be issued. JR said there should be a list of requirements with a tight deadline. The committee discussed and decided the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solid track record of industry collaboration - Early career academics - From devolved nations - PSOB membership <p>JR suggested we ask applicants to meet a minimum of one of the requirements. RT to issue an invitation to the membership stating when the next RIKT meeting will take place and say applications will be reviewed then. A deadline for applications should be 4 weeks prior to the next meeting. Action: RT</p> <p>IS asked which part of the EPC would be responsible for adopting positions on professional recognition. JR said that would be the EES committee so he would raise it at the next meeting. Action: JR</p>	<p>2310-05</p> <p>2402-02</p> <p>2402-03</p>

4.	<i>Discussion of the Nurse Review</i>	
	<p>At the last meeting AA requested all committee members view the recording of the Nurse Review presentation, the report and the science framework from DESIT.</p> <p>COD said she has applied for Horizon grants. Everyone recognises the benefits of being members and we should encourage colleagues to apply for grants. IS asked if the committee should have a role in encouraging the community to look for opportunities. JR said he thinks our role is to be a conduit of information rather than directive. IS agreed and said he was thinking more guidance and updates. RD asked if we have any guidance on Horizon for our members? JR suggested a committee member write a blog about how to apply for Horizon funding. JR asked COD if she would be interested in writing about her experience. COD said she would prepare a draft and would welcome comments/additions from the committee so it becomes a common view. Action: COD</p> <p>JR suggested '10 tips on applying for Horizon funding'. JR said this could be published on the website then committee members can use the discussion function to comment. JR asked LC to alert the committee when the blog is published. Action: LC</p> <p>JR said he had noted a number of things James (Wonkhe) had talked about.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - QR funding – is this approach correct? - Culture and industry – clash of cultures between academia and industry. Can the two talk to each other? - Manifestoes – trade off between being an international super power in research and the levelling up agenda. - Relevance of the science framework <p>DB said that is right regarding the question of levelling up – take small areas of excellence and make them larger. There is a great deal of scope for that. DB said the way forward for fluidity between academia and industry is to convince colleagues that there is career merit in 'hopping over the fence' at points in ones career. RD asked if we have had any engagement with manifestoes. JR said no but he has attended discussion and feedback events. JR said RAEng and the National Engineering Policy Centre are putting together a one pager to inform manifestoes.</p>	<p>2402-04</p> <p>2402-05</p>
5.	<i>Discussion of PGR</i>	
	<p>Appendix A had been circulated to the committee. IS asked for comments. IS said he thinks it is too vague. JR said he would be interested to know if that was a general view. DB said there was an important point around better training for supervisors – maybe something for the EPC to do in that regard. IS said he thinks it lacks an action plan. COD said the best way encourage industry to support PGR is to engage them with the supervisory team. SM said he had a number of PG students who worked in industry – engage the industry supervisor formally who then sees the benefits and filters back. IS asked if this could be included in the Enterprise Collaboration Toolkit as potential tools for knowledge transfer? SP said when looking through the report for references to engineering, she found EDI for engineering and fiscal sciences. Is there anything this committee can do with that? One big problem is that not all industries are aware of EDI issues. JR said we do not have an EDI committee but there are a number of toolkits. There is a project regarding neurodiversity which could be a place to start an EDI toolkit. JR said John Mitchell is trying to get funding for a H&S toolkit and Security toolkit, but EDI is up there in terms of priority. SP said we should highlight why diversity is important not just from an ethical point of view but also diversity for</p>	

	innovation. JR asked SP if she would write something that might be a component in a future toolkit.	
6.	<i>Enterprise Collaboration Toolkit: follow up and next steps</i>	
	JR said we have too much work for the resources we have. At last month's Board Retreat there was support for toolkits going forward. JR will take to the Board a proposal of what is needed in terms of resources to take these ideas forward. We would need some support internally to oversee the expansion of the toolkit. JR said DB's work so far has not been forgotten and will be progressed as soon as possible. IS said he may be able to find resources at Exeter but we need to be clear on direction. IS said he will discuss this further at the next Board meeting. JR and IS will discuss this next week.	
5.	<i>Horizon scanning and other business</i>	
	None.	
8.	<i>Date of next meeting</i>	
	RT to circulate a doodle poll for a meeting end of April/early May and for September. Action: RT	2402-06

Action log

Reference	Agreed action	By
2402-01	"Draft" watermark to be removed from minutes and reloaded to website	RT
2310-05	John Mitchell to invite Jeremy Watson to an RIKT meeting to discuss a webinar on research integrity with JR.	JR
2402-02	RT to issue an invitation for applications to join the committee to the membership stating when the next RIKT meeting will take place and say applications will be reviewed then. A deadline for applications should be 4 weeks prior to the next meeting.	RT
2402-03	IS asked which part of the EPC would be responsible for adopting positions on professional recognition. JR said that would be the EES committee so he would raise it at the next meeting.	JR
2402-04	COD to draft a blog '10 tips on applying for Horizon funding'	COD
2402-05	When COD's blog is published, LC to alert the committee for comments via the discussion function.	LC
2402-06	RT to circulate a doodle poll for a meeting end of April/early May and for September.	RT