

Measuring and managing impact at the University of Manchester

Luke Georghiou Vice-President Research and Innovation HEPI conference: Assessing impact, rewarding excellence: REF 2014 and beyond 22 November2011

Nb Includes material by Prof David Clarke

Impact in our vision and strategy



- Our work must have an impact beyond academia and yield economic, social and cultural benefits whenever the opportunity arises
 - Key relationships
 - Manchester heritage
 - Creating and demonstrating impact
 - Commercialisation
 - Societal challenges and social responsibility

Individual incentives

- Parity of esteem with curiosity-driven research for impactgenerating, translation and knowledge transfer activities in promotion and PDR
 - applied research and development includes transfer of intellectual property into the wider economy; translation of research findings into clinical solutions; development of innovation; research and consulting relationships with companies, government departments and other public bodies; and the enrichment of the wider culture ...
- Training & development
 - from doctoral training, through new academics programme and beyond
- Outside work policy often seeding institutional links
 - register of interests to manage potential conflicts of interests likely to arise
- Radical IP policy
 - generous share to originators : 85% to originators up to first £1m plus any re-invested into research, then 50% to originators
- Investment
 - Proof of principle and venture funds (eg UMIP Premier Fund).

Rolling Research Profiling Exercise

Data base of all research-active staff

(E Scholar repository) supporting annual reporting and assessment of:

- Research outputs
- Research expenditure
- Research student supervision
- Social & economic impact including patenting, licensing, creation of spin-out companies, securing venture capital investment, policy development, public engagement, social responsibility, global health *etc*

Impact types by faculty



Ability to deliver impact also rests in organisational competences

- Working with business and other non-academic partners requires:
 - Mutual trust and mutual benefit
 - Professional interface
 - Recognition and management of differences
- Works best in context of long-term strategic or 'broadband' relationship
 - Reduction of transaction costs
- Hidden but vital competence
 - Ability to configure multiple disciplines in seamless interdisciplinary configurations to solve business and societal challenges
 - Key rationale for critical mass and economies of scope

Why commercialise?

- We aim to commercialise the intellectual property that we generate
- Our motives
 - To fulfil a public mission (economic and social impact) by ensuring that our work is commercialised
 - National and regional
 - To attract the best academics
 - High correlation between academic excellence and achievement of impact
 - To at least break-even on University cash invested

Infrastructure is important

- CTF and incubator build cost c£45M stateof-the-art clean rooms for wet chemistry/biotech
- Mixed model University spin-outs, corporate & small private companies as tenants
- Very strong IP negotiation and management presence, licensing expertise
- On campus presence of venture capitalists
- Business School presence for market strategy
- Innovation Cafe and Innovation Restaurant
- Enterprise courses, conferences, staff and student business competitions and networking
- Entrepreneurs/Designer-in-Residence
- Also award-winning Science Park on 4 sites with over 100 science and knowledge-based tenants







Commercialisation – how to benchmark?

Manchester

- Research spend
- IP disclosures
- Proof of principle projects
- Spin-outs
- Licences
- Venture funding (3rd party)
- Major equity exit events
- Originator share
- UMI³ share & license sales
- UMI³ cost

- £190M per annum
- 350 per annum
- 30 per annum
- 5 per annum
- 40 per annum
- ✤ £27M per annum
- 2 per annum
- ✤ 85% (50% after 1st million)
- £3.6M per annum
- ✤ £1.3M

Most measures heavily dependent upon assumptions and some prone to manipulation Our KPI choice is amount of 3rd party funding



Univ Manchester & Imperial College Mass-produce consistently high quality quantum dots for consumer products and biomedical applications (Prof Paul O'Brien): £4.1M private equity funds





Bladder weakness, affecting 1 in 3 women electronic tampon stimulating the pelvic floor muscles, 84% women improved in a few weeks (Prof Jackie Oldham): £5m VC



Dysphagia: affecting about 50% of stroke patients - stimulating the brain to improve swallowing (Dr Shaheen Hamdy): £6m VC



Advanced Biomedical

Healthcare acquired infection trace detection for hospital surfaces (Dr Harmesh Aojula): £570k NIHR SBRI, £2.5m VC



C. difficile

Living with REF Impact Assessment

- For UoM over 250 case-studies in play
- Some key challenges
 - Identification
 - Especially of impacts where key players departed
 - No systematic organisational memory
 - Comprehension
 - Getting academics to understand the detailed criteria
 - Verification
 - Assembling credible supporting evidence
 - Uncertainty
 - No track record on how criteria will be interpreted or how "reach and significance" translate in to a scale across hugely different cases
 - Unclear boundaries eg is it enough to demonstrate impact on a policy or should the policy also be evaluated?
- A new stretch for modified peer review
 - But do the underlying assumptions of peer review hold?

Closing observations

- Universities themselves are the main vector for achieving impact
 - Provide the necessary strategic integration
 - Better placed to take risks and innovate
- Public bodies should provide resources and incentives but not seek to direct or micro-manage
- The drive for impact needs to be embedded in the values of individuals but also managed effectively at all levels of the institution
- Metrics have a central role but better benchmarking is needed
- REF Impact assessment is a test and a hurdle but should not dominate what we do