Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) Consultation 2019

Page 1: Introduction

Q1. Introduction If you would like to view the questions included in this consultation before submitting your response, an export of the questions for reference purposes is available on the Research England website here: https://re.ukri.org/documents/2019/summary-of-kef-consultation-questions/ Please return to this online version to submit your response. Responses to this consultation are invited from any organisation, group or individual with an interest in knowledge exchange. If you would like to save a copy of your response, please choose 'print response' on the last page of the survey. We regret that we won't be able to accommodate requests to download and send individual responses submitted. The responses to this consultation will be analysed by Research England, we will consult with the Knowledge Exchange Framework Technical Advisory Group and the Knowledge Exchange Framework Steering Group. We will commit to read, record and analyse responses to this consultation in a consistent manner. For reasons of practicality, usually a fair and balanced summary of responses rather than the individual responses themselves will inform any decision made. In most cases the merit of the arguments made is likely to be given more weight than the number of times the same point is made. Responses from organisations or representative bodies with high interest in the area under consultation, or likelihood of being affected most by the proposals, are likely to carry more weight than those with little or none. We will publish an analysis of the consultation responses. We may publish individual responses to the consultation in the summary. Where we have not been able to respond to a significant material issue, we will usually explain the reasons for this. Additionally, all responses may be disclosed on request, under the terms of the relevant Freedom of Information Acts across the UK. The Acts give a public right of access to any information held by a public authority, in this case UK Research & Innovation. This includes information provided in response to a consultation. We have a responsibility to decide whether any responses, including information about your identity, should be made public or treated as confidential. We can refuse to disclose information only in exceptional circumstances. This means that responses to this consultation are unlikely to be treated as confidential except in very particular circumstances. For further information about the Acts see the Information Commissioner's Office website, www.ico.gov.uk or, in Scotland, the website of the Scottish Information Commissioner www.itspublicknowledge.info/home/ For further information relating to UK Research and Innovation's Privacy notice, please visit https://www.ukri.org/privacy-notice/ The deadline for responses to the KEF consultation is midday on Thursday 14 March 2019. Please direct any queries to Sacha Ayres, Senior Policy Adviser, Knowledge Exchange at KEPolicy@re.ukri.org or 0117 931 7385.

Tick here to agree and continue to consultation.

Page 2: Respondent details

Q2. Please indicate who you are primarily responding on behalf of:

Other (please specify):
Learned Society

Page 3: Contact details user

Q3. Please provide the name of your organisation
British Academy of Management

Q4. If you would be happy to be contacted in the event of any follow-up questions, please provide a contact name and email address.
Dr Ashley Thomas Lenihan, Head of Policy & Engagement, British Academy of Management policy@bam.ac.uk

Page 6: KEF purpose

Q8. Do you consider that the KEF as outlined will fulfil its stated purposes? To provide universities with new tools to understand, benchmark and improve their performance. To provide business and other users with more information on universities. To provide greater public visibility and accountability.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
To provide universities with new tools to understand, benchmark and improve their performance.				X			
To provide businesses and other users with more information on universities.				X			
To provide greater public visibility and accountability.				X			

Q9. Please provide a commentary in relation to your scores above. (400 word limit)

The British Academy of Management (BAM) is the leading authority on the academic field of management in the UK, supporting the community of scholars in this field and engaging our international peers. We have over 2000 members, more than three-quarters of whom are based in British institutions.

We welcome the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) for its role in rightly placing an emphasis on the importance of knowledge exchange on a level with that currently given to research and teaching. This should help to underpin many of the broad ranging knowledge exchange (KE) activities – be they business school-based or provided through other faculties – that universities are already undertaking. Business schools routinely undertake a wide range of KE activities that have a high impact on local business and local economies, many of which are voluntary.

We also welcome the KEF for its intent to contribute to the environment of emerging tools through which universities may better understand, benchmark and improve their knowledge exchange capacity and relationship to their communities, while also helping to raise their profile and accountability. As outlined in our response to questions 7 and 13 below, however, we are concerned that the current KEF metrics focus almost exclusively on those forms of knowledge exchange that have been remunerated or are monetisable, missing many of the important KE activities universities undertake in relation to their local and national communities.

The Business and Management community has enormous potential to drive academic-business engagement beyond current levels. It will be important, however, to ensure that as the KEF is adopted, business and management disciplines are properly incorporated into KE activities undertaken by all university faculties. This would help to ensure a business approach to KE is taken in conjunction with an enhanced and wider base of skills and knowledge, while also enhancing the potential for more strategic academic-business engagement.

Page 7: Aims and overall approach of the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF)

Q10. Overall approachThe KEF consultation document describes the overall approach as being an annual, institutional level, largely metrics driven exercise, although noting that narrative will have an important role. More background may be found in the report summarising the recommendations of the technical advisory group. Do you consider this overall approach to be appropriate?

Somewhat agree

Q11. Please provide a commentary in relation to your scores above. (400 word limit)

We recognise the KEF will be mainly metrics driven from seven perspectives including, for example, how universities engage in research partnerships, and how they work with business and the public/third sector. We feel it very important that this framework is (and remains) manageable and does not place a heavy administrative burden on universities. However, as mentioned above and below, we believe strongly that the KEF will need to find a way to take account of 'non-paid' KE activities, such as voluntary or community-based activities. KE takes place in a variety of ways and in a wide range of domains – and a more comprehensive way of assessing this contribution is therefore needed.

Page 8: Clustering

Q12. Please indicate your degree of support for the following aspects of our clustering approach.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
The conceptual framework that underpins the cluster analysis.							X
The variables and methods employed in undertaking the cluster analysis.							X
The resulting make up of the clusters, i.e. the membership.							X
That the overall approach to clustering helps Research England to meet the stated purposes of the KEF and ensures fair comparison.							X

Page 10: Perspectives and metrics

Q16. Perspectives Research partnerships Working with business Working with the public and third sector Skills, enterprise and entrepreneurship Local growth and regeneration IP and commercialisation Public and community engagement Taking into account the overall range of perspectives and metrics outlined in the consultation document, do you agree or disagree that a sufficiently broad range of KE activities is captured.

Somewhat agree

Comments:
Many universities with a focus on business and management do well on the majority of the 7 perspectives outlined above, receiving a high number of funding awards, with many having research that has (and will continue to have) a positive impact on the UK's economic infrastructure and local and national industrial strategy goals. Business schools also routinely undertake a wide range of voluntary KE activities which have a high impact on local business and local economies. However, we are concerned that – across the seven perspectives – the current KEF metrics focus almost exclusively on those remunerated or monetisable forms of knowledge exchange. Our concern is that this misses many of the important KE activities that universities undertake in relation to their local and national communities, and that these metrics should therefore be expanded to include these and/or be used in conjunction with more qualitative supporting narratives in a manner that does not increase the administrative burden for universities.

Q17. Taking into account the range of metrics outlined in the consultation document, please indicate whether you consider that they adequately represent performance in each of the proposed perspectives.

Research partnerships	50% support
Working with business	50% support
Working with the public and third sector	50% support
Skills, enterprise and entrepreneurship	50% support
Local growth and regeneration	50% support
IP and commercialisation	50% support
Public and community engagement	50% support

Page 11: Supplementary narrative

Q25. Do you consider it appropriate for HEIs to provide narrative text to support the metrics in perspectives that don't currently have fully developed metrics?

Agree

Q26. Public and community engagement narrative Overall, is the guidance on the provision of narrative text for this perspective clear.

No opinion

Q28. Local growth and regeneration narrative Overall, is the guidance on the provision of narrative text for this perspective clear.

No opinion

Q30. The role of further narrative or contextual information We welcome responses on what other types of narrative or contextual information would be helpful. You may wish to consider, for example: Should the HEI or Research England provide other narrative information? How should we use other contextual information, such as information on local economic competitiveness described in section 5 of the cluster analysis report? Would other perspectives benefit significantly from further narrative information? Would the benefit of adding further narrative information be outweighed by the burden of doing so?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
Overarching institutional statement - provided by the HEI							X
Overarching institutional statement - provided by Research England							X

Page 12: Visualisation

Q31. Visualisation Please indicate your level of support for the proposed method of comparison and visualisation. (A link to a video walkthrough of the KEF visualisation is available here.)

Each of the seven perspectives is to be given equal weighting.	50% sup port
Metrics under each perspective are to be normalised and summed.	50% sup port
The performance of each HEI is to be expressed in a radar chart in deciles, relative to the mean average decile of the peer group.	50% sup port
Perspectives are not intended to be aggregated into a single score.	50% sup port
Narratives are to be presented alongside the metric score, making it clear that metrics in the two perspectives of public & community engagement and local growth & regeneration are provisional, and should be read in conjunction with the narratives.	50% sup port
Visualisation is to be delivered through an interactive, online dashboard which will allow exploration of the data underlying the 'headline' results in various ways.	50% sup port