

Demystifying academics to enhance university-business collaborations in environmental science

We thank the two *Geoscience Communications* reviewers (R1 & R2) for their thoughtful comments. We have also received an internal review from a Social Science (Human Geography) colleague at Loughborough (R3). This is formal in the sense that it was written and submitted for university evaluation purposes. Thus, in the spirit of open review, we also provide these comments and responses to them. However, to avoid any conflict of interest, this is given lower precedence than *Geoscience Communication's* external reviews.

Main responses:

- R1 & R2 would like to see more clearly how the figure of *up to* 0.5 days per week for industrial collaboration derives from the data. We have added a pie chart as suggested by R1, and a longer critical discussion of how the figure arises from the various data sources along with the uncertainty in this estimate as suggested by R2 is now in Sect 6.1.1.
- R1 & R2 suggest a partial restructuring of the manuscript. As suggested by both, we have removed the material on international interest from where it is interlaced with the main text, and created a new section at the end as proposed by R1. The Introduction is simplified and focussed on defining the academic research question, with the insurance sector case study now in its own section.
- R3 would like a less tentative tone about the novelty and significance of the methodological design and new conceptual model. This has been done.
- Extra context and information has been added in a number of places (e.g. on UK environmental scientists' current engagement with industry for R1), but this is kept as succinct as possible to prevent the manuscript lengthening too much.

We have responded individually and in detail to all the other comments (e.g. minimizing forward referencing, decoupling ~50h/wk from <0.5 days and the conceptual model). Reviewers' comments are in grey, with responses in black. Line and page numbers in responses (e.g. P4L7) correspond to the revised text, and a Word document with track changes is also provided for ease of evaluation. Individual comments are identified by reviewer and comment number where necessary (e.g. R2C5).

Reviewer 1 – Dr Richard Westaway

Summary

This is a thoughtful and well written paper that attempts to shed light on both what motivates and constrains a typical UK-based early- to mid-career environmental scientist, and uses this intelligence to help understand how industry-university collaborations might be enhanced. The co-authors draw on their first-hand experiences, supplemented by carefully selected textual data and the outcomes of a participatory workshop. Perhaps most usefully, the paper presents two lists of practical and short-term measures through which industry practitioners can develop a relationship with an academic partner and vice versa.

> Thank you.

General comments

1. Context: The paper gives no real context in terms of how (UK) environmental scientists currently engage with industry partners (i.e. collaborate, receive funding), both in terms of proportion (how common it is) and typical time commitment (how much time is dedicated). Such an assessment, even if brief, would provide a useful illustration of the current situation. While I am not aware of any references that have directly collected such data, there may be other (perhaps more quantitative) strategies that provide a sufficient proxy measure (e.g. proportion of NERC grants awarded that have included industry partner, proportion of published papers in a specific discipline that include industry partner as co-author or industry funding), perhaps with direct approaches to the academics in question to gather a ballpark estimate of 'average' time commitment. Some 'top-down' assessment such as this would provide an interesting (and hopefully corollary) counterpoint to your current largely 'bottom-up' approach.
> As R1 recognises, data to evidence engagement between researchers and industry are not collated in any readily accessible form; we contacted both NERC's 'Innovation' and 'Evidence' teams to establish this more

firmly. The best summary might be Dowling's 2015 study (points 17-25), which had sufficient resources to commission an analysis of all REF case studies, and to question all UK universities for data, but even then were able to draw what are really very limited conclusions from the 12,240 case collaborations reported to them i.e. collaboration is 'very patchy' and, tentatively, that there are a some companies that are very active in building research collaborations with universities whilst a large number collaborate in a relatively restricted way with universities. [P6L10](#)

> In terms of time commitment (i.e. time dedicated to impact), the results of work reported in this manuscript offer some initial information.

> By creating a separate section on the insurance sector, and re-ordering the material previously in the Introduction, we present what little context is currently known from the government/NERC side (i.e. Dowling [2015] and Goff [2015]) whilst placing it in the context of an overview of how environmental science is used and produced at the moment by the insurance sector. [P5L31-P6L7](#).

> In summary, we agree with the reviewer and Dowling (2015) that a better understanding of the collaborative landscape in the UK is desirable, and look forward to seeing research into it, although that will be a substantial undertaking.

2. International perspective: The paper attempts to include an international perspective on many of the issues covered, but I felt at times that this disrupted the main narrative of the paper. I would suggest that the occasional paragraphs discussing international perspectives are removed; I do not believe this would impact on the quality of the paper as it is evidently and usefully a UK-focussed account. Alternatively, there could be a dedicated section towards the end of the paper that provides all international perspectives in one place (rather than them being dispersed through the paper).

> R1 agrees with part of comment from Reviewer 2 [R2C1]. Throughout the paper, the international perspective has been moved to a separate section at the end of the discussion (new Sect. 7) [P31L12](#). This section now highlights the global applicability of the results and discusses where there may be differences to the UK system. An emphasis on Australia arises because it, like the UK, is at the forefront of integrating impact into the university sector, and because the limited academic work in this area is focussed on Australia.

3. Part-time academics: The environmental scientist persona is (implicitly) a full-time post. While the majority of UK academics are full-time, there is a small but significant proportion of academics that work part time (~33%, see <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/18-01-2018/sfr248-higher-education-staff-statistics>). Part-time researchers would be expected have a reduced range of responsibilities commensurate with their reduced hours, but this might be expected to limit their time available for industrial collaboration to an even greater extent than for full time staff. It would be useful if you could provide a brief commentary on the additional issues surrounding part time academic contracts, and if they were considered as part of this study?

> Thank you for this comment. 'full-time' added to the abstract to make the 0.5 days/week figure explicit, and a brief commentary about scaling this to part-time staff has been added in Sect. 6.1.1, although the issues around part-time contracts were not within the scope of this study. Note that the lead author is part-time (0.8 FTE).

[P19L1](#)

4. (Conceptual) pie chart of time constraints: On p17, lines 23-28 you discuss prioritisation of time and that adding a new task requires discarding of an existing one. I feel this could be a very useful concept more widely in your discussion of time constraints. An academic does not have an endless list of tasks (as your table perhaps implies), but rather has finite time (i.e. a pie chart) that must be prioritised into different activities (segments of the pie). It would perhaps be informative if you were able to present the information shown in Table 1 as a pie chart, at least conceptually, with different segments representing the competing demands on an academic's time. This should illustrate more clearly how only 0.5 days per week are available for industrial collaboration, or how finding time for new collaborations necessarily requires other tasks being reduced in time or omitted.

> Thank you for this suggestion. We have added a pie chart relating to Table 1 (new Fig. 3) in the discussion in order to more clearly illustrate how only up to 0.5 days per week are available for industrial collaboration. [P18](#)

5. Access to published work: On p20, lines 1-5 you advise industrial practitioners to check "that there isn't already an answer to your question in the research literature?" From my experience, this has been (and remains) a barrier between industry and academic research as industrial practitioners in many fields do not routinely have access to academic journals behind paywalls. This both prevents them reading about new science and also reduces their incentive to get work published (as their peers would not necessarily see or benefit from it). The rise of open access publishing is changing this, but some discussion of the how the traditional academic publishing model can create a divide between universities and industry might be helpful in this context.

> We have added slightly to the text so that we now explicitly acknowledge that access to publications may be a barrier (P21L30), but since we link to a way around this we prefer to avoid extending the text significantly with a discussion on the traditional academic publishing model.

6. Academic impact – improved methods/data/results: On p21, lines 15-33 you outline some of the types of impact that can be demonstrated. A notable omission from this list is how academic involvement can improve the methods/data/models/results being used by industry practitioners. Although this ultimately may lead to increased profitability, the other benefits of such improvements (e.g. time savings, reputational benefits) are such that I believe it deserves to be listed as a specific impact in your list. In your insurance setting, examples might include improvements to the flood model, baseline topography or property database being used to assess properties at risk.

> The provision of improved ‘operational utility’ (e.g. via data and tools) is now included in the first bullet point here, with this term taken from industry terminology used in Sect. 6.3 (P23L9). We have also added *operational utility* as a separate bullet point at the end of the list (P24L1), giving the types of evidence that may be effective for these impacts that are also pathways to impact (Reed, 2018). We have also included a reference in Sect. 6.3 back to this list (P29L17), and included *reputational enhancement* for full consistency between the sections (P23L31).

7. Academic impact – time lag: There is no discussion of the fact that while a published paper can be ‘recorded’ immediately, there is often considerable time-lag before other impacts can be properly assessed (e.g. time to implement changes across a business, time to (re)train staff, time to quantify cost savings), which can be hard to reconcile with in some cases relatively short term academic decisions/appraisals/funding/etc.

> Whilst there is no extended discussion of this, it is designed into our practical hints and tips (i.e. Sect 6.3), noted explicitly at the end of the first paragraph (P26L20) there and bullet on *co-design of a research proposal*. Many assessments or appraisals of impact are initially focussed on ‘potential impact’ in recognition of the common time lag of impacts from research. In order to limit the size of the manuscript and because it does not alter the overall findings of the paper, we respectfully propose that we do not add anything more about this.

8. Motivation of industry: There is little commentary of what industry are looking for from collaboration with universities. Although the stated purpose of the paper is to give insights from the academic’s perspective, it is hard/impossible to divorce this completely from the motivations and needs of industry. From my experience, the nature of industry requirements in some cases can be (perceived as) such that there is limited appetite for research scientists to engage, even if they did have the time (e.g. low-risk non-innovative solutions, short time timescales, pressure to produce results).

> We agree that it is hard to divorce industry motivations from the paper’s stated purpose of giving insights from an academic’s perspective. The paragraph and second bullet pointed list in Sect 6.3 provides a list of suggestions on the ways that research scientists can support risk practitioners, which we feel provides some insight into the motivations of industry (P29L8). In addition, before publication, we intend to add a link to an upcoming briefing note ‘Funding Science for Natural Hazards Insurance’ that we are currently finalizing, which reports data to outline the process of decision-making in (re)insurance sector using environmental science, and so starts to provide understanding on what industry want. This addition will provide a link to the reader who wants to find out more about industry motivations it P5L25.

9. Institutional-scale responses: The paper generally focuses on collaborations that are established and maintained at individual-scale. However, there are university/department-scale responses that are intended to facilitate industrial collaboration (e.g. dedicated ‘industrial liaison officers’ such as www.bristol.ac.uk/engineering/ilo/academics/, industrial-funded academic positions, funding institutional facilities, etc). It would be good to have some discussion of if and how such initiatives influence or change the papers’ findings.

> Thank you for this suggestion. We have used it to improve the last paragraph before Sect 6.3.1, where other responses were mentioned before. P30L30

Specific comments

10. p3, line 4: I would suggest that it is “knowledge” that is produced rather than “science”. Accepted, changed. P6L9

11. p4, line 26-28: It is not clear to which reference the gold/puzzle/ribbon classification is being attributed (Lam 2011 or Stephan and Levin 1992). Text altered to clarify. P3L16

12. p7, line 28: Suggest that sect 2.1.2 does not start with a question. I suggest this question is either simply deleted or rephrased into a statement. Rephrased. [P9L25](#)
13. P9, line 5: “a guide for academics to their academic partner” – it is not clear to me what this statement means? Apologies. This is a typo. Changed to “a guide for academics to their business-sector partner” [P10L30](#)
14. p11, line 29: “..only a sub-part of this.” This is tautologous; I suggest “subset” or “part” The OED defines ‘subpart’ as ‘*a subordinate part of something*’. In this instance we are referring to a part of a part, so believe our usage is correct. However, this reviewer’s suggestion [R1C4] to use pie chart (new Fig. 3) clarifies this better than dwelling on linguistic subtleties. Hyphen removed in line with OED usage. [P10L11](#)
15. p13, line 1: “.., then winning...” – This would read better as “.., followed by winning...” Changed. [P13L8](#)
16. p16, line 2: “trusting” – This is perhaps better described as “trust-based” Changed. [P16L6](#)
17. p16, line 14: “65-89% of university scientists...” – this seems are very precise range, which stands out all the more as it starts the paragraph. It might be better to state a more descriptive range here, e.g. “At least two thirds...” or “As many as 90%...” Changed. [P17L1](#)
18. p17, line 3: “...days and days to sit, gazing around and pondering...” – this feels too colloquial. Perhaps “...significant ‘thinking time’...” or “...time to engage in deep thought on blue sky research questions. Accepted. This phrase originates in an earlier version of this work intended to communicate to stakeholders, adding ‘colour’ and directly counteracting potential stereotypes about academics having ‘spare’ or ‘free’ time. This is now stated directly. [P17L20](#)
19. p18, line 5: “...from tight expectations...” – “strict” or “rigid” might be a better word than “tight” here. Text amended. [P19L29](#)
20. p18, line 14-15: “Thus, there is some need for continuity, which may be perceived as ‘pet projects’ by industry. – It is not clear what is meant by “pet projects” and no further explanation is given? And why is this a problem? A contrary perception is that it creates world leading scientists in their specific field. Term clarified and explanation added. [P20L8](#)
21. p19, line 8: “...a scale they could otherwise only dream of?” – Rather colloquial. Suggest “...a scale not > x otherwise possible?” Thank you. Changed. [P20L32](#)
22. p23, line 5: “buy a post-docs time” – Colloquial. Suggest same phraseology used as on p13, line 2 (“by funding a post-doctoral researcher”). Thank you. Changed. [P13L9](#)
23. p24, figure caption: “...and 3 main motivations after ‘gold’ discounted are in italics” – I do not understand what is meant here? I can only see two further motivations in italics (‘utility’ and ‘altruism’). I would like to see how ‘puzzle’ and ‘ribbon’ map onto these relationships too. The italicization of the words ‘Curiosity’, ‘Career’ and ‘Impact’ has been increased to make them clearer. The mapping between the terminology in the figure and Lam’s (i.e. ‘puzzle’ and ‘ribbon’) is given in Sect. 6.2, and has now been added to the figure. Also, the caption has been expanded to better explain the figure and allow it to be understood better standing alone from the main text. [P24](#)
24. p24, line 9: See comment 13. Sentence split in to two to improve readability. [P26L13](#)
25. p26, line 11: While I agree with the sentiment, “Brilliant!” is not the best way of starting/explaining this step. Can this be reformulated as a statement/sentence (e.g. “While this is perhaps the ideal scenario for many academics, the sums....”). Rephrased in line with R1’s suggestion. [P28L14](#)
26. p27, line 14: “Ways research scientists might provide support to their risk practitioner partner:” – I am not clear whether this is meant to be a sentence (in which case it should be reworded) or a section heading (in which case it needs re-formatting) Changed to full sentence. [P29L14](#)

Technical comments

27. “ise” or “ize”: There is some inconsistency between these two spellings though the manuscript. “ise” now used throughout.
28. p4, line 26: Punctuation needs correcting “...into , ‘gold’...”. Fixed. [P3L17](#)
29. p13, line 4: Missing “are” between “outcomes” and “also”. Added [P13L11](#)
30. p14, line 5: Missing apostrophe after “academics”. Added, but here intention is to refer to each individual academic, so placed before s.
31. p14, line 9: Should be “nor” rather than “or”. Changed
32. p16, line 13: Delete apostrophe. No apostrophe on P16L13, so assumed referring to P17. Apostrophe is to show possession of a view of multiple people (i.e. co-authors), and is retained.
33. p21, line 6: “UK’s 7 yearly” should be “UK’s 7-yearly”. Changed [P22L32](#)

Reviewer 2 – Prof. Anson Mackay

The study provides a model and pathway to increase academic participation in industry, by outlining (i) a detailed analysis of the time constraints of an early career academic, and (ii) a set of incentives that might encourage this academic to work with industry.

1. The first part of the study provides an overview (for I assume a potential collaborator in industry) of working conditions and time constraints of a typical academic. I have some reservations, however; overall it could be more succinct, not include links to out of date or wrong information, and not perpetuate poor practise in academia.

> More succinct: The first part of the study provides the evidence to create an overview of working conditions and time constraints for a typical academic. This (i) allows an improved model of academic behaviour to be described, with the purpose of (ii) creating a typology of driver to explain *why* particular actions within collaborations may be useful. If such a study already existed, this one could be more concise; this research gap is now more clearly described in the Introduction [P3L9-34](#). The wording has been considered throughout to make the text as succinct as possible.

> Out of date or wrong information: The ‘wrong’ information was purely auxiliary to one argument, and has been removed (see below), and the out of date link (i.e. HEFCE) was the only official one available at the time of submission even if we were aware it would be soon out of date. This has been replaced. [P14L15](#)

> Poor practice: We did not intend to appear to advocate poor practice, and have clarified the manuscript in this respect (see specific responses below)

The second part lays out how people in industry can try and work with academics, with a view to looking at ways to make collaborations of interest to academics and fruitful. This part of the manuscript is well written and more successful in terms of communicating the potential synergies between industry and academia.

> Thank you.

However, the emphasis of risk between any collaboration is weighed towards the academic rather than the industry partner. For example, P26, Fund blue skies research. The conclusion here seems to be that to fund a PhD is risky for the industrial partner as there is a “chance of failure”. Blue-skies research by its very definition is risky, and joint PhD students are one of the best ways to link industry and universities together, as is recognised by many UKRI initiatives e.g. the Industrial Doctoral Centres funded by the EPSRC, NERC Industrial Case Students, NERC Industrial Strategy Innovation Placements etc.

> We agree that this bullet point is not the place for the comment about PhD students. It has been moved to the bullet on project co-design, where we have also included some UKRI initiatives. [P28L15](#), [P28L30](#).

But my main concern with the manuscript as a whole is with the figure of 0.5 days per week, calculated to be the amount of time an “efficient and effective” academic could set aside to work with industry. The figure really just appears, and is not based on a critical analysis of the empirical data as far as I can tell (although seems to be derived from Table 1). Also, it is based on the authors accepting that working a 50h+ week is acceptable, which I challenge below.

> We have adapted the manuscript to clarify that the figure of 0.5 days is not at all based on a 50+ hour working week. 0.5 days is a fraction, with the hours worked only used to establish time pressure (e.g. [P17L20-24](#)).

> The figure of 0.5 days per week does originate from the empirical data in Table 1 (21 participants synthesizing objective data), combined with data supporting and literature evidence of a time-limited working environment, and the evidence drawn from the cohort of 17 academic co-authors. The 0.5 days figure has been removed from the results, and an expanded analysis of how this arises is now in the Discussion (Sect. 6.1.1). We now clearly state that the 0.5 days is an evidence-based yet indicative maximum figure. [P17L31](#) At the end of Sect. 6.1.1, we now clarify that this is an estimate. [P19L6](#).

> New Fig. 3 has been added to assist in clarifying the <0.5 days figure. [P18](#)

2. Overall, the article could be more focussed on just the UK system, and just on the environmental and geosciences. A summary of the extent of existing academic-industry collaboration would be helpful, and how the geosciences / environmental fields contribute to this. This would give some needed background as to the extent of the issue. Throughout the manuscript, examples to e.g. international centres or practises are given, but these are far too few and not comprehensive, so their added value is low, and only detracts from the key

take home message about UK collaborations.

> The article is now focussed on the UK system. In line with a suggestion of Reviewer 1 [R1C2], international implications and applicability are now separated and considered at the end of the Discussion (new Sect. 7). Information on the extent of academic-industry collaboration which was in the Introduction is now given in the new Sect. 2 'Case study: Insurance sector' including a recent NERC view. P4L1. We do not explicitly limit the first half of the study to environmental science any more than it is already because Reviewer 3 [R3C3b] recommends retaining generality and the existing literature on academic behaviour is not clearly partitioned this way (i.e. by subject).

3. The article could discuss more implications of the current external drivers for research and teaching, such as REF and TEF. NSS is mentioned on P13, and TEF once on P14, but the URL given is now out of date as HEFCE no longer exists. REF impact is mentioned, but that this is such a significant driver of potential collaboration between academics and industry, it is a missed opportunity not to discuss this more.

> TEF is now mentioned 4 times, REF 12 including explicit mentions of Impact Case studies, and KEF twice, with some of these in a short discussion of the conceptual model in the context of these current internal drivers in Sect. 6.3 P25L9. In the discussion (Sect. 6.2.2) REF is still introduced in a section discussing impact as a motivator of collaboration, but we have strengthened the statement slightly to "[REF is] a key mechanism to encourage effective collaboration". P22L25

> Furthermore, implications of external drivers for research and teaching (albeit NSS & TEF/REF not explicitly mentioned) are central to the methodology (see bullet 1 in Sect 4.1). A key simplification used in this work is that appraisal criteria and job specifications are taken as a distillation of these external factors, explicitly interpreted by universities into a form that directly relates to the behaviour of academics (e.g. P8L4-5).

> The out of date link (i.e. HEFCE) was the only official one available at the time of submission even if we were aware it would be soon out of date. This has been replaced P22L10. A more up to date link about impact has been added to Sect 6.2.2 as well.

Also, I would personally like to have seen greater consideration of equality and diversity issues related to potential collaboration with industry; not only do these considerations tie into employment structures such as days or hours worked per week, but also have implications for potential funding sources, e.g. if your department has Athena Swan recognition etc.

> As a part-time worker (0.8 FTE), who took shared parental leave recently and participates equally in childcare, the lead author (i.e. Hillier) has some interest in diversity and equality issues. For instance, this afternoon work on this response was not possible as 1 small child needed to be collected from nursery and looked after. However, this is at a tangent to the main focus of the manuscript, so we have only added limited further consideration of it (P19L1-5) although it would make an interesting and important follow-up study.

> We have altered the manuscript so that it better articulates our view of how collaborations might in the presence of life outside work (e.g. Sect. 3, P19L6-14), and now hopefully do not give the impression that we condone poor practice.

> We note that numerous issues exist with respect to encouraging collaboration in the context of diversity and equality. For instance, personally, it is frustrating that NERC's innovation placement schemes are effectively inaccessible to academics with young families as placements away from home are practically not possible. However, we feel that to treat this adequately would require proper focus, perhaps with additional data collection, and so is best placed in a future manuscript.

4. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of GC?

Yes – successful communication between academics, industry and business is an essential component of universities contributing to the economic wealth of the country. However, I would have liked to have seen a stronger case being made for the need for this knowledge. UK universities are arguably very successful in collaborating with industry and business, and while tensions for time will always exist, is this really new? Comments such as those on P3, Lines 17-18, starting "By better understanding..." are fine, but this study is aimed at early career scientists, who may not yet be "world-leading"; this is an important distinction in terms of expectations of knowledge, resources etc.

> Please see response to comment 5 below to justify the novelty of, and need for, the work. The reasons for targeting early-career scientists is given in the 'Environmental Scientist Persona' section, but we believe that the eventual products of "by better understanding" (i.e. the practical tips in Sect 6.3) are likely to be more widely applicable.

5. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

The study from the outset suggest that the novel concept, or unknown parameter, is how academic workloads and incentive structures may act as a barrier to industrial- academic collaborations. Given the success of university – industrial collaborations in the UK already, I wonder if the first really is a barrier.

> Although there is clearly a level of success of university-industry collaborations, pressure on academic time is established as a barrier (e.g. ranked 3 of 10 in Fig. 12 of Dowling, 2015).

It could be in the geosciences / environmental sciences, and maybe that needs to be explored a bit more deeply than university-industry collaborations in general. The wealth of existing training schemes, placement schemes, success of spinout companies, contributions of UK academia to GDP etc all suggest that issues with time constraints are well known but already workable with.

> As we note (see also response below) time constraints are well-known as a barrier, and there are evidentially/anecdotally barriers to collaboration in the geosciences (e.g. with insurance where NERC issued a directed call for a KE Fellow to help bridge the gap between science and industry). What is less well known (and not academically reported on) is exactly *how* the barrier operates or ways to overcome it. This paper tries to understand the barrier's operation, and by doing so is able to propose practical suggestions to work around it. The statement, which in a sense is a crux of this study, "...there has been limited attention devoted to the exact nature of barriers facing academics. . ." needs to be evidenced. Some quick on-line searches shows that there are numerous studies looking at the barriers academics face in terms of forging university-industry links. In fact, research intensive universities will have whole teams dedicated to addressing these challenges.

> The offending sentence has been modified. [P3L6](#)

> This sentence was an inadvertent overstatement, created during re-writes and perhaps associated with an over-complex structure for the introduction. 'Exact nature' was originally written to link to investigating the exact nature of how motivations interact with incentive structures in the context of understanding how impact integrates into an academics work life, leading to practical tips to surmount barriers; this link was then broken.

> The research gaps (i.e. (i) how impact fits with models of motivation, and (ii) exactly how time acts as a constraint in a context of motivations/appraisals) are now more clearly positioned in the paragraphs immediately following (P3). These are followed through the paper e.g. into the conclusions [P33L6](#)

6. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?

I do have some issues with aspects the methodology undertaken. The study paints a picture of a 'typical' early career academic at the Senior Lecturer (SL) scale of their career. This is based on 10 job adverts (which I think is rather low).

> The study uses 10 job adverts and 10 sets of appraisal criteria, which are then melded with and contextualised by the knowledge and experience of 17 academic co-authors and 21 participants at KEN workshop (albeit with some overlap between these sets as noted in the paper), in total providing information from 36 universities even if only participants/co-authors current positions considered. Although obviously less than internet-based questionnaire surveys (e.g. Abreu, 2009; Bothwell, 2018), this compares well with the well-regarded social science studies in the literature about academic motivations; for instance, 35 interviews from 5 universities + online questionnaire (Lam, 2011), 1 university (Cadez, 2017), 25 interviews at 1 university (Harland, 2018), 30 collaborations (Frietas, 2017).

> Regarding Table 1 in particular, we argue that the emergence of a robust signal in itself indicates that 10 adverts is sufficient in the context of scrutiny from participants and co-authors. [P9L23](#)

However, some aspects of the methodology are either wrong, or not reflective of the rapidly changing academic environment today. For example, on P7, lines 18-20, the authors link to some generic guidance to job descriptions. However, The information given here is wrong and very out of date. The link provided is for academic-related (AR) jobs: these are staff categories that were once seen to support academic workings, but are now viewed as professional services (PS), i.e. careers in their own rights. Whether termed AR or PS, the guidelines linked to here are not for the academic (teaching and research) jobs being discussed here.

> Noted, accepted and deleted, removing the impression that this additional justification gives (i.e. that some aspects of the methodology are wrong or not reflective).

The following two points are more picky I suppose, but potentially important in understanding the expectations of an early career academic at the SL level.

7. First of all, I don't agree with the conflation of appraisals and promotion criteria. Appraisals are designed for academics to set out aims and objectives for undertaking their job on an annual basis, and to have discussions as to whether these have been met. Promotion criteria on the other hand request for feedback on one's reputation for mainly research and (teaching) scholarship, so to bring the two together is not particularly helpful as they work on very different timescales.

> In the manuscript there was occasionally a lack of careful distinction between the use of appraisal and promotion criteria. Usage through the manuscript has now been modified where necessary to avoid conflating the two terms.

> Overall, in the experience of the 17 academic co-authors, the purpose of a progressive and useful appraisal system is to set aims and objectives that assist an academic to develop in their job role (i.e. working towards promotion), with both keying into universities wider objectives for obvious reasons. Thus, assessment of promotion criteria, put into the context of our experience of appraisals, provides a useful semi-objective basis (i.e. Table 2) for understanding academic motivations.

> The start of Sect 4.1.2 has been modified to lay out more clearly the rationale for our approach. [P9L27](#)

The study suggests that appraisals are "a relatively new phenomenon", but they are not; they have been undertaken at universities for over 20 years.

> "relatively new" has been removed. [P9L26](#). We used the term 'relatively' literally. They have been used at universities for 20 years, in comparison to estimates of 50-70 in industry e.g.

<https://www.peoplehr.com/blog/index.php/2015/03/25/a-brief-history-of-performance-management/>.

Moreover, they are certainly not undertaken to "judge" (P7, line 31).

> When a grade (e.g. 'very good') influencing discretionary remuneration is given, or when at the other end this (ultimately) is underpinned by the existence of a performance management process, it is difficult to escape the view that an element of judgement is common. Text modified [P9L29](#).

Second, the study is based around academics at the SL level, but suggests on P9, line 29 that this is equivalent to the North American Associate Professor (AP), but I would argue that AP was more equivalent to Reader, where a UK academic is recognized for their world-leading research, as would someone be in the States on being awarded tenure and AP. For a SL, teaching and scholarship plays a stronger role in evaluations.

> For clarity, in line with suggestions from R1, this international aspect has now been placed in a separate section at the end of the manuscript (Sect. 7). Also, in this academia's seniority classification is now omitted for in favour of a definition of <10 years to avoid any conflict with the main text.

8. For me, more problematic, is "de facto expected" number of hours an SL is expected to work at week, up to 50 hours or more. It describes working 10h days or working at weekends as "respectable length". These practices are greatly at odds with moves to have greater equality and work-life balance that reflects the needs for academics having caring responsibilities, to have a life outside of academia, and to minimize stress and mental health issues. The study goes on to state that the ideal person "is in good mental health" and are "efficient and effective" in their approach to research, to the point that "they would not remain in their position if they were not" (P10, lines 1- 2). This is patently nonsense – academics are not removed from their jobs on the basis if they are efficient or not. For me this gives the impression that the model being developed - for a person to devote 0.5 days a week to collaborate with industry - will not work if an academic does not want to, or cannot work, a 50h week, or miss time with families at weekend, or experience any kind of mental health issues etc. These factors are not trivial – they have important implications for diversity and equality issues, and personally, I would question the value of such a model from the outset.

> The intention was never to give the impression that an academic cannot work with industry unless working 50+ h/week. The Environmental Scientist Persona section (Sect. 3) has been altered to remove the assertions contested by the reviewer. Indeed, if anything we sound a distinct note of caution about simply working more hours at the end of our analysis (Sect. 6.1.1) "*A convincing (self-)justification is likely therefore needed well before any official appraisal*" [P19L12](#).

> It is outside the scope of this paper to explicitly condone, or otherwise, UK academic workloads or management practice. We have adapted the text in Sect. 6.1.1 and ensured that we remain close to the observational data.

> Neither our conceptual model (Sect. 6.2) nor recommendations (Sect 6.3) did, or now do, advocate what might be considered bad practice (e.g. working at weekends) e.g. [P19L6-14](#).

> The model we present (Sect. 6.2) is not dependent upon, or related to expectations of length of working week. It incorporates time-pressure (Sect. 6.1.1), but the reviewer is not questioning the presence of this. How an

academic may, or may not, choose to free up 0 to 0.5 days per week is up to them; the key point for a practitioner is that some effort will have to be made to do this e.g. P25L23.

> To avoid confusion over ideal vs idealised, we have clarified (Sect. 3) that we are discussing an idealised/model/illustrative person. P6L21 We do not comment on what an “ideal” scientist may or may not be. The model persona is ours to select characteristics for, and we wish from them to remain “efficient and effective”, but to account for R2’s opinion we have softened their mental health to “reasonably good” and raised their demands for work life balance by removing “at least some”. P7L14, P7L20.

> We have removed the comment “they would not remain in their position if they were not” as debating/justifying this would detract from the points in the paper. However, we note that many universities have yearly appraisal systems (e.g. ‘Performance and development review’) with performance management processes associated with them. Also, see various comments in Boswell (2018).

9. Finally, the assumption that [P13, line 20] “PhD students can be an effective means to generate publications in a time-limited university environment” is not one that I or any academic I know would condone, and has no place in modern day academia.

> This has been re-phrased P13L26.

> We admit that the brevity used here may make this sound mercenary and inappropriate. Clearly, in good practice the student’s needs are paramount. But, this does not discount the clearly and frequently observed pattern that good, well-supported students produce papers; indeed they are expected to – e.g. NERC’s approach to ‘Research Excellence’ as a means to assess DTPs relies heavily upon PhD students’ publication production (<https://nerc.ukri.org/about/whatwedo/engage/engagement/dtpevaluation/crac-dtp-report/>). And, it is difficult to believe that this is not a factor in motivating scientists to spend more time supporting and engaging with PhD students than they otherwise might.

> A counter-case is provided by social science (e.g. Human geography) where co-publication is rare for cultural reasons. From anecdotal evidence talking to colleagues from various institutions, these colleagues often find it much harder to justify spending significant time with students as there is little returning benefit in terms of the key metrics by which they are assessed.

10. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

Not really. The conclusion seems to be that an efficient and effective academic can probably find 0.5 days a week to collaborate with industry, but I question the data and assumptions that this is based upon. It seems to me that this figure is a qualitative amount that the academics in the cohort suggested that they may be able to find, out of their already busy schedules. Which is fine, but this does not seem to be derived from a critical analysis of what a SL does on a day to day basis.

> Please see response to comment 1 for R2 above, detailing how the manuscript has been amended to more clearly explain how the indicative figure of *up to* 0.5 days was derived (Sect 6.1.1). Based on addressing these comments, we now feel that there is a clear link between the critical analysis of the data and the conclusions of our study.

11. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

I think so.

> No response needed.

12. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

The title mentions “business”, but in the manuscript refers mainly to “industry”

> Noted, and changed to ‘business’ throughout. The origin of our use of ‘industry’ for a ‘business’ that does not actually make things originates in practitioners’ usage typical of the term ‘insurance industry’ e.g. Dixon *et al* [2017].

13. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

This was fine.

> Thank you.

14. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?

I thought that the Introduction, setting the scene etc could be much more succinct.

> The Introduction is now shorter, focussing only on framing the academic question.

Many times the manuscript refers the reader to future sections as justification of what is being stated, but this made reading of the paper difficult, as you have to keep going backwards and forwards to find out what is being referred to.

> Forward referencing of sections has now been minimised, for instance within in *'Environmental Scientist Persona'*, which has been moved forwards in the manuscript to assist this. Forward referencing is retained where its purpose is to clarify the upcoming structure of the paper (e.g. in the introduction), or where arguments are necessarily interconnected within the discussion.

15. Is the language fluent and precise?

Overall it is fine. But there were a few tropes that could be avoided, such as P17, lines 2-3 "So, this work confirms that an academic with days and days to sit gazing around and pondering is a myth. . .". This suggests a misunderstanding of how an academic may approach their writing, rather than just doing it. Writing does require thinking and pondering, for days, sometimes weeks or months, so I'm not really sure what is being got at here.

> Accepted. This phrase originates in an earlier version of this work intended to communicate to stakeholders, adding 'colour' and directly counteracting potential stereotypes about academics having 'spare' or 'free' time. This is now stated directly. [P17L20](#)

16. Are the number and quality of references appropriate?

These look fine.

> Thank you.

Reviewer 3 – Dr James Esson (Loughborough i.e. 'internal')

1. Abstract/Summary/Introduction

1a) Originality

The language could be more assertive in parts to better signal the original aspects of the study, particularly re the conceptual framework ('tentatively posit' is overly cautious).

> Changed to 'propose'. [P2L9](#).

The abstract does indicate that the study involved an original empirical data set, but it is not clear what if anything is innovative about the approach – this would be a nice addition but difficult to do given word constraints.

> This innovative aspect of the work was (and is) flagged at the end of the Introduction, but is now highlighted more strongly in the Methods section. It is not included in the abstract to retain the flow of the text and clarity of the main messages, however it is now included the conclusions ([P32L25](#)).

1b) Significance

The aim and implications of the paper are clear in the abstract and intro.

> Thank you. Not action needed.

The opening sentence needs refining in the former, but the message is broadly on point.

> We believe the opening sentence in the abstract is suitable, and have not altered it.

As mentioned above, the development of a new conceptual model and the implications of the findings are mentioned in quite tentative language in the abstract. I would encourage the author to be a little bolder about the originality and significance of the framework.

> The language in the abstract is now less tentative (e.g. [P24L21-23](#)), and the utility of the model w.r.t the practical suggestion is now more clearly signposted in Sect 6.2.3. The novelty and utility of the new conceptual model are now also raised in the conclusions ([P33L16-18](#)).

Also, more could be said about what people will/should do differently as a result of this research (abstract).

> The last line of the abstract has been amended to indicate where behaviour changes may arise. [P2L11](#)

1c) General point – The introduction is too long and should perhaps be separated to make two sections (intro and literature review)

> The Introduction has been divided into *'Introduction'* and *'Case study: Insurance sector'*. [P4L1](#)

2. Research Design/Methods

2a) Originality

The study adopts a mixed-methodology informed by an action research approach (content analysis, interviews and workshop discussion). Given that the author demonstrates the originality of the research in the introduction, the novelty of the research design is downplayed somewhat, and 'pragmatism' and time efficiency are even stated before effectiveness as reasons for the approach taken. This might be true, and most academics have no doubt been in a similar position, but I would not encourage the author to emphasize this. Rather, it would be better to draw attention to the alignment between the aims, methodology and methods used, and the innovative elements of this approach.

> Methods are now described in the Methods section by more directly aligning them to project aims ([P7L31](#)), and this is briefly noted in the Conclusions.

2b) Significance

If the paper achieves the impact the authors anticipate, it will become primary or essential point of reference in this area. As indicated above, the current tone does not reflect this. Or put differently, the significance of the research design is downplayed which is odd given that some aspects are highly novel (e.g. the Environmental Scientist Persona).

> The highly novel research methodology is now downplayed less in the Abstract, Methods and Conclusions (see comment immediately above).

2c) Rigor

The research design and techniques of investigation and analysis are explained clearly and thoroughly. Particularly attention is paid to ethical concerns, potential limitations and biases. This is done sensibly, in that it demonstrates integrity and rigour, while avoiding raising concerns about the appropriateness of the research design and validity of associated findings.

> Thank you. No response necessary.

3. Discussion/Conclusions

3a) Originality

Yes, the findings of the research and the wider implications are clearly stated. The discussion provides a new conceptual framework and associated recommendations to inform practice.

> Thank you. No response necessary.

3b) Significance

A strong case is made as to why the article enhances understanding and/or practice, and the implications of this for university-business collaborations in STEM subjects as well as the social sciences.

> Thank you. No response necessary. See [P24L27-30](#)

> The case for the global reach of these implications could be qualified slightly to better reflect the Euro, North America and Australian focus of the article. A case could be made that these issues are likely to, or are already, occurring in what we could call 'emerging economies'.

> The case of international applicability is now in its own section (Sect. 7), and the reviewers suggest of a distinction between developed and emerging economies has been incorporated. [Also see R1C2 and R2C2].

3c) Rigor

There is clear intellectual coherence and alignment between the aims, methodology and the findings.

> Thank you. No change needed.

I would recommend having a few more citations in the conclusion to support the more general claims being made e.g. "It is well established that most scientists are driven by curiosity not additional personal financial reward" (see also XXX; XXX).

> In the style we adopt, few citations are needed within Conclusions, but some have been added where appropriate.

Demystifying academics to enhance university-business collaborations in environmental science

- ¹John K. Hillier, ²Geoffrey R. Saville, ³Mike J. Smith, ⁴Alister J. Scott, ⁵Emma K. Raven, ²Jonathon Gascoigne, ⁶Louise J. Slater, ⁷Nevil Quinn, ⁸Andreas Tsanakas, ⁹Claire Souch, ¹⁰Gregor C. Leckebusch, ¹¹Neil Macdonald, ¹²Alice M. Milner, ¹³Jennifer Loxton, ¹⁴Rebecca Wilebore, ¹⁵Alexandra Collins, ¹⁶Colin MacKechnie, ¹⁷Jaqui Tweddle, ¹⁸Sarah Moller, ¹⁹MacKenzie Dove, ²⁰Harry Langford, ²¹Jim Craig
- ¹⁰ ¹Geography and Environment, Loughbrough University, Loughborough, LE11 3TU, UK.
²Willis Towers Watson, 51 Lime Street, London, England EC3M 7DQ, UK.
³School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, PL4 8AA, UK.
⁴Dept. Geography and Environmental Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK.
⁵JBA Risk Management, South Barn, Broughton Hall, Skipton, North Yorkshire, BD23 3AE, UK.
- ¹⁵ ⁶Dept. Geography, University of Oxford, OX1 3QY, Oxford, UK.
⁷Dept. Geography and Environmental Management, University of the West of England, Bristol, BS16 1QY, UK.
⁸Cass Business School, City, University of London, 106 Bunhill Row, London EC1Y 8TZ, UK.
⁹AWHA Consulting, 67 Worcester Point, Central Street, London, EC1V 8AZ, UK.
¹⁰School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK.
- ²⁰ ¹¹School of Environmental Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 7ZT, UK.
¹²Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX, UK.
¹³School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH93JW, UK.
¹⁴Dept. Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3SZ, UK.
¹⁵Centre for Environmental Policy, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, UK.
- ²⁵ ¹⁶Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Wallingford, OX10 8BB, UK.
¹⁷School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, AB24 2TZ, UK.
¹⁸Dept. Chemistry, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK.
¹⁹Walker Institute, University of Reading, UK.
²⁰Dept. Geography, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S10 2TN, UK.
- ³⁰ ²¹OasisHub, 40 Bermondsey Street, London, SE1 3UD, UK.

Correspondence to: John Hillier (j.hillier@lboro.ac.uk)

Abstract. In countries globally there is intense political interest in fostering effective university-business collaborations, but there has been scant attention devoted to exactly *how* individual scientists' workload (i.e. specified tasks) and incentive structures (i.e. assessment criteria) may act as a key barrier to this. To investigate this an original, empirical dataset is derived from UK job specifications and promotion criteria, which distil universities' varied drivers into requirements upon academics. This reveals the nature of the severe challenge posed by a heavily time-constrained culture; specifically, a tension exists between opportunities presented by working with [business](#) and non-optional duties (e.g. administration, teaching). Thus, to justify the time to work with [business](#), such work must inspire curiosity and facilitate future novel science in order to mitigate its conflict with the overriding imperative for academics to publish. It must also provide evidence of real-world

changes (i.e. impact), and ideally other reportable outcomes (e.g. official status as a business' advisor), to feed back into the scientist's performance appraisals. Indicatively, amid 20-50 key duties, [typical full-time](#) scientists may be able to free up to 0.5 days/week for work with [business](#). Thus specific, pragmatic actions, including short-term and time-efficient steps, are proposed in a 'user guide' to help initiate and nurture a long-term collaboration between an early- to mid-career environmental scientist and a practitioner in the insurance [sector](#). These actions are mapped back to a tailored typology of impact and newly-created representative set of appraisal criteria to explain *how* they may be effective, mutually beneficial, and overcome barriers. Throughout, the focus is on environmental science, with illustrative detail provided through the example of natural hazard risk modelling in the insurance [sector](#). However, a new conceptual model [of academics' behaviour](#) is developed, [fusing](#) perspectives from literatures on academics' motivations and performance assessment, which we [propose](#) is [internationally](#) applicable [and transferable between sectors](#). Sector-specific details (e.g. list of relevant impacts, 'user guide') may serve as templates [for how people may act differently to work more effectively together](#).

Key words: University-business collaboration, impact, innovation, knowledge exchange, job specification, appraisal criteria, risk practitioner, catastrophe modelling, insurance sector, [reinsurance](#).

1 Introduction

Political interest is increasing in converting research excellence into commercial success (e.g. Dowling, 2015; Evans, 2016; Mowrey and Nelson, 2004) and societal impact (e.g. Reed, 2018). Thus, the idea of the 'entrepreneurial university' is [gaining popularity](#) (e.g. Etzkowitz, 2003; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997); it is argued both that universities might be fundamentally transforming into engines of economic growth (e.g. Feller, 1990; Florida and Cohen, 1999), or that there is a convergence to a hybrid where differences between scholarly and industrial activity become blurred (e.g. Owen-Smith, 2003). However, university-business collaborations could produce better outcomes through improved flow (a.k.a 'diffusion') of science innovation into policy and decision-making practice (Dowling, 2015; e.g. Rogers, 2003). This applies even in nations (e.g. UK, Australia) that rank relatively highly in the 'Global Innovation Index' (Dowling, 2015; Dutta et al., 2017; Evans, 2016). So, debate continues about how to incentivise, deliver, monitor, and support such a change. This, and a political desire to see collaborations be more productive, is attested to by 14 reviews and studies in the UK on this topic in the last 12 years (see Dowling, 2015).

[Effective](#) university-business collaboration requires mutual understanding (e.g. Dowling, 2015), and developing this demands investment of time and effort. Scientists would benefit from a greater appreciation of business drivers, needs and constraints, and we propose that [business](#) (e.g. insurers) would be aided by understanding the answer to two questions: What motivates academics to do specific work? And, reciprocally, what might constrain them? By demystifying the motives of

John Hillier 12/11/18 15:53

Comment [1]: R3C1a

John Hillier 12/11/18 16:09

Comment [2]: R3C1b

university scientists, this paper aims to make it easier to develop collaborations that are feasible and produce timely outputs, illustrated with a case study of the insurance sector.

In academic debate, models such as 'diffusion' (e.g. Rogers, 2003; Scott et al., 2018; Ward et al., 2009) are used to understand how science may be better deployed in business and the cultural, institutional and individual barriers to this, but there is incomplete understanding of the exact nature of barriers facing academics, motivations to surmount them, and coping strategies to do so.

D'Este and Perkmann (2011) review the recent literature on university-business interaction including both informal (i.e. collaborative) modes (Grimple and Fier, 2010; Link et al., 2007) and more heavily studied routes (i.e. patenting, licensing, spin-off companies) (Bercovitz and Feldman, 2006; e.g. Carayol, 2003; McMillan Group, 2016). Collaboration is the most frequent channel for interaction (D'Este and Patel, 2007; Perkmann and Walsh, 2007) including joint 'pre-competitive' research that is often subsidised by public funding, heavily directed contract research of immediate business relevance, and consulting. Regarding such collaboration, a small number of studies describe *what* academics' motivations are, compiling sizeable lists (e.g. Dowling, 2015). Studies delving deeper to understand these motivations are rare. For most UK academics, the driving incentive to interact with business is to further their research (D'Este and Perkmann, 2011). Drawing together three earlier concepts (e.g. Stephan and Levin, 1992), Lam (2011) divides motivations into 'gold' (i.e. personal income), 'puzzle' (i.e. knowledge/curiosity) and 'ribbon' (i.e. funding/reputation), finding that a great majority of practicing university-based scientists are motivated by the latter two traditional rewards. The role of impact as a motivator has not been considered, neither has a good understanding been developed of why motivations may or may not be able to express themselves as actions.

As a mirror of motivations, it is possible to look at constraints upon academics. Like business, university science is a complex landscape and the views, requirements and motivations of its actors (e.g. universities, individual academics, funding bodies) are not homogenous (e.g. Evans, 2016; Lam, 2011). Conventional wisdom suggests that Intellectual Property (IP) and cultural differences are key barriers to collaboration (Abreu et al., 2009; Lambert, 2003), and this is still borne out to some extent by studies such as Dowling (2015) that consulted a variety of stakeholders (e.g. universities, SMEs, Trade Associations) in which only 10-15% of the input was from scientists themselves. Studies that consulted only university-based scientists as individuals (24,443 respondents in total), however, disagree strongly and rate these factors as relatively unimportant (Abreu et al., 2009; D'Este and Perkmann, 2011; Evans, 2016). These suggest limitations on time in a scientist's working day as an important (e.g. Evans, 2016; Lazarsfeld-Jensen and Morgan, 2009), and perhaps the overriding (Abreu et al., 2009), constraint on university-business collaboration. Speculatively this will dominate an academic's decision making, framing actions whatever their motivations and desires may or may not be, but whilst this factor has been identified it has not yet been explored in detail with respect to impact.

John Hillier 14/11/18 23:02

Comment [3]: R2C5

John Hillier 13/11/18 09:30

Comment [4]: Paragraphs re-ordered to match to research questions i.e. What motivates academics to do specific work? And, reciprocally, what might constrain them?

John Hillier 13/11/18 09:27

Comment [5]: R1C11

5 Part of generating viable [business](#)-university collaboration is that for work to actually proceed strategic and policy-level drivers must align with the incentive structures and [constraints upon](#) individual scientists [and their motivations](#). These, sometimes conflicting, [drivers](#) are the main subject of this paper. The study's novelty is [three](#)-fold. Firstly, direct and innovative data collection methods (Sect. [4](#)) allow a broadly based (i.e. multi-university) and yet detailed view; consequently, a first synthesis in this context of academics' day-to-day duties and career-defining aspirational targets can be provided (Sects. [5.2](#), [5.3](#)). Secondly, individual academics' performance evaluation has been only recently explicitly considered with respect to the research-teaching dipole (i.e. Cadez et al., 2017; Harland and Wald, 2018), and it fills a research gap by incorporating impact to this tensioned relationship. By investigating the day-to-day demands (i.e. micro-politics (e.g. McAreevey, 2006)) upon an illustrative [hypothetical](#) scientist it gives insights into the pressures on their time (Sect. [6.1](#)), and uses aspirational targets that govern their appraisal (Sect. [6.2](#)), to add detailed and diagnostic understanding of *why* actions are prioritised. [From this, a new](#) conceptual model [combining an academic's duties and motivations](#) is developed (Fig. [4](#)). Thirdly, pragmatic suggestions for specific actions to initiate and nurture a collaboration are proposed (Sect. [6.3](#)). These are mapped back to appraisal criteria (Table 2) and impact typology (Sect. [6.2.2](#)) (Reed, 2018) to explain *why* actions may be effective, mutually-beneficial, and overcome the barriers that may be deterring scientists from working with [business](#).

20 This work is differentiated by framing it for a [business](#) practitioner who engages with environmental science. Namely, the *what* and *why* that motivate university scientists are presented with the ultimate aim of conveying *how* a scientist might be pragmatically supported to effectively initiate and nurture collaborations with a [business](#) practitioner to the mutual benefit of both parties: in other words, to provide a 'user guide' for practitioners. To this end, theory (e.g. Amsterdamska, 1990; Latour, 1987; Rogers, 2003) is kept brief, and specific examples are favoured over generalities where possible. One way it focuses is by only considering the varied (e.g. work-life balance, teaching, promotion) and multi-level (e.g. government, university) drivers as they affect the persona of a hypothetical illustrative environmental scientist of ≤ 10 years faculty experience at a UK university (see Sect. 3). A second way is limiting illustrative, sector specific detail to that for risk practitioners and [\(re\)insurance](#).

30 Data and analysis are based within the environmental science discipline, but aspects of the analysis may be applicable more widely (e.g. social science, engineering) with caution, and the practical guide for risk practitioners in [\(re\)insurance](#) (i.e. Sect. [6.3](#)) may serve as a template [for how people may act differently to work more effectively together](#).

2 Case study: Insurance sector

The insurance sector (see Ch. 2.3 of Mitchell-Wallace et al., 2017) consists of entities that hold risk themselves (i.e. insurers, reinsurers and other financial institutions), companies who provide tools or advice to help them do so effectively (i.e. brokers, consultants, 'vendor' model companies), and regulators. Natural hazards (e.g. flood, earthquake, tropical cyclone) present large risks; illustratively, \$386 billion damage accrued to insured assets alone in 2011 (Von Peter et al., 2012). Risk is commonly quantified using natural hazard risk assessment models called 'Catastrophe Models' (see Mitchell-Wallace et al., 2017). Catastrophe models are vital in defining and implementing the financial mechanisms (e.g. reinsurance, catastrophe bonds) used to build resilience to the natural hazard risks, and there is a flow of peer-reviewed environmental science into them. However, inter-model differences exist (e.g. \$13-72 billion for hurricane Maria in 1997 (KCC, 2018)). Thus, there is significant commercial interest in implementing the latest science to build the most realistic risk models. For example, the tendency of extra-tropical cyclones impacting Europe to cluster in time (i.e. occur in groups) (e.g. Vitolo et al., 2009) has been included, and better understanding the tentative indicators that flood and wind damage tend to co-occur (e.g. Hillier et al., 2015; De Luca et al., 2017) is ranked as a current priority for this peril by insurers in a survey for the Lighthill Risk Network (Dixon et al., 2017).

With a few exceptions (e.g. Collette et al., 2010), much of the research and development to create risk models (e.g. RMS, AIR, SwissRe, JBA Risk Management) is undertaken in-house and typically applies selected knowledge from previously published peer-reviewed research, rather than generating new knowledge. This peer-reviewed environmental science is primarily generated in universities. However, quantifying benefits of direct collaborations with university-based scientists (e.g. to make a business case) is non-trivial, especially as a company might have >50% of technical staff qualified at MSc or PhD level and commercial risk models are well-established. More widely, in practice few (re)insurers feel that they have the ability to directly approach academia to question choices made about research applied in models or to keep abreast of the latest findings. Thus, a partial barrier to co-working and knowledge exchange (KE) directly between university scientists and practitioners (i.e. collaboration) exists, although its origins may be complex; further evidence for a partial barrier comes from the views of practitioners (Hillier et al., 2018). Challenges to collaboration vary by stakeholder (e.g. university, academic, business) (e.g. Abreu et al., 2009; Dowling, 2015). For instance, business-relevant questions can be listed by insurers (Dixon et al., 2017; Lighthill Risk Network, 2016), but it can be hard to translate industrial needs into research questions that are precise enough for scientists to be able to answer and intriguing and novel enough for scientists to want to prioritise answering them.

The National Environmental Research Council (NERC), part of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), sees environmental hazards as an important, averaging £12.8 million per year investment in this area (Goff, 2015). Indeed, the insurance sector

John Hillier 15/11/18 21:50

Comment [6]: R3C1e, R2C2 – A separate section has been created to simply the introduction and give extra background on existing work between environmental scientists and industry in the case study.

Existing text has been re-ordered.

John Hillier 15/11/18 21:18

Comment [7]: This is a briefing note in the final stages of preparation (i.e. will be finalised in the next 2-3 weeks), and a link/full reference will be added if this paper is accepted.

John Hillier 26/11/18 15:23

Comment [8]: R1C1

and catastrophe modelling (i.e. of natural hazard risks) were highlighted in this 2015 report, with a number of recent initiatives directed at the insurance sector or accessible to it;

- 2017 - NERC, DFID, ESRC: 'Building resilience to natural disasters using financial instruments' £2 million
- 2018 - Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund: 'Next Generation Services Research Programme' (Accountancy, Legal Services, Insurance) £20 million.
- Annually – 'Innovation Placements' scheme. ~£1 million.
- Over 5 years - UKRI Future Leaders Fellowships. £900 million.

Thus, both business and the university sector are seeking effective (i.e. mutually beneficial) pathways from the production of scientific knowledge in universities to pragmatic implementation, overcoming barriers. This said, if insurance mirrors other UK business sectors collaboration are 'very patchy' and, tentatively, there are a some companies that are very active in building research collaborations with universities whilst a large number collaborate in a relatively restricted way. (Dowling, 2015).

By better understanding what motivates academic researchers, it should be possible for business to forge synergies more readily with world leading scientists. This will directly assist new and existing insurance sector initiatives (e.g. Willis' Research Network and AXA's research fund) as they strive to most effectively access cutting-edge research to drive innovation, and it will also facilitate the building of inter-personal business-university relationships that are the key to effectively accessing government-funded initiatives (e.g. Dowling, 2015).

3. Illustrative Environmental Scientist Persona

To focus this work and give specific insights, a model persona was created to represent an illustrative university-based environmental scientist. A typical university-based job including both research and teaching duties is assumed. Fellowships won in open competition (e.g. NERC, Royal Society) allow a scientist to focus on a stated work programme (e.g. in research or knowledge exchange), but are prestigious owing to their relative scarcity. Government funded Research Centres exist (e.g. British Geological Survey in the UK), but staff are required to undertake applied and income generating work alongside fundamental research. In some countries there are institutions intended purely to do research (e.g. GFZ in Germany), but this is not so in the UK.

Our research scientist has \approx 10 years experience at faculty level. This is regarded as early- to mid- career (e.g. see <https://www.egu.eu/ecs/>), and contains the transition from Lecturer level (L) to Senior Lecturer (SL) level in the UK system; permanent positions (i.e. not fixed-term contracts) typically start at L, then progress through SL and 'Reader'/'Associate Professor' to 'Professor' (e.g. Broch et al., 2017; Wikipedia, 2018). This stage is ideal to have established a research track

John Hillier 26/11/18 13:12

Comment [9]: R1C10

John Hillier 27/11/18 07:52

Comment [10]: R1C1

John Hillier 22/11/18 16:50

Comment [11]: R2C8

John Hillier 13/11/18 12:52

Comment [12]: Paragraph moved.

record yet still be flexible, and be actively seeking to initiate new long-term relationships. Thus, it is a type of person who, whilst not yet deeply engaged in KE, a risk practitioner is perhaps most likely to encounter and want to initiate and nurture a long-term relationship with.

5 Critically, this hypothetical individual's core research and scientific identity involves improving understanding of physical processes (e.g. physics, atmospheric science, geology, hydrology). As such, they can likely make a genuine contribution to risk assessment models for natural hazards. Also importantly, this scientist is assumed to have a genuine and significant interest in impact (i.e. real-world change; also see Sect. 6.2.2), working directly with business, and has at least some work that is of interest to insurance or reinsurance in natural hazards. Their level of experience of KE could vary, depending on background (e.g. KE Fellowship, grants, worked in business), and they may or may not have done reading (e.g. Reed, 2018) or training in impact. Thus, whilst they are primarily judged on scientific research, and KE cannot be their core business, it is assumed that any barrier here is in factors (e.g. KE skills, time) other than willingness to try.

15 Our research scientist is assumed to be effective, efficient and hardworking, and to have a desire for both a successful career continuing with their university and work-life balance. At work, in line with the great majority of academics, this person is motivated by career (i.e. funding/reputation) but ultimately by the 'puzzle' (i.e. knowledge/curiosity) (Lam, 2011; Stephan and Levin, 1992) (see Sect. 1). If they were more interested in the 'gold', they may start a spin-out company rather than engage in the type of joint-collaboration considered here, for example.

20 Finally, it is assumed that this person is in reasonably good mental health, although mental health is a serious issue in the sector with a notable self-reported negative impact of work for over half of UK academics (Bothwell, 2018), and is a 'rational actor' that in the main responds logically to their internal and external motivations and drivers (e.g. performance appraisals) (Cadez et al., 2017; Grendon, 2008; Harland and Wald, 2018; Moya et al., 2015).

4 Methods & Ethics

25 4.1 Methods

The persona of a typical, impact inclined, early- to mid-career UK academic (see Sect. 3) was used to focus and constrain the scope of the work. This approach is innovative, and an effective mechanism for achieving the study's aims, in particular ultimately deriving specific guidance for practitioners. The overall approach draws upon ideas of reflexivity (e.g. Bostrom et al., 2017) and action research (e.g. Denscombe, 2010; Kemmis et al., 2013); i.e. academics and practitioners considering their work environments, and participating together to solve a problem to produce guidelines for effective practice. Within this, a mixed-methods approach was used to meld objective data with the knowledge and experience of two cohorts of

John Hillier 22/11/18 16:50

Comment [13]: R2C8

John Hillier 22/11/18 16:52

Comment [14]: R2C8

John Hillier 15/11/18 08:53

Comment [15]: R3C2a – Methods now described by more directly aligning them to project aims.

university-based environmental scientists, effectively assimilating a diversity of views of and external drivers for teaching, research and engagement with business. Three sources were used to create the evidential base for this work.

- *Freely available textual data* (i.e. job specifications and promotion criteria). These present a university's pre-considered distillation of requirements and aspirations, from multi-level and varied internal and external drivers (e.g. student expectations, national government policy), against which a UK academic will typically be assessed; these may deviate from actual practice. This is a new approach in this area of research.
- The *first-hand experience of a cohort of 17 academics (environmental scientists) and five business-based co-authors*. This is a direct bridge to actual practice, therefore complementary, and un-mediated (i.e. no interposed social scientist). These data provide a view of tasks/criteria filtered through the perception of university-based environmental scientists, and are thus biased. However, the bias is appropriate for this study; perceptions of tasks/criteria are illuminating when forming an understanding of the motives of those doing the perceiving. Whilst this is an innovative form of data collection, working as co-authors is valid and appropriate in this particular instance as this is a familiar, natural and pragmatic mode of engagement for these contributors. Unlike participants in most studies, a pre-existing document is no barrier to offering criticisms and suggesting changes - indeed, quite the opposite is typical. Where doubt existed with respect to comments, three semi-structured interviews were used to clarify meanings. Co-authors were selected by two means: (i) on the basis of likely interest in the research from Hillier's network, and (ii) by volunteers from a list of attendees distributed well in advance of the workshop (see below).
- *A workshop* at NERC's Knowledge Exchange Network (KEN) meeting, 26th June 2018 in Glasgow. The session analysed the textual data. Six participants were from business. The 21 university-based environmental scientists comprised seven faculty (i.e. permanent contracts), 11 post-docs and one PhD student, with varying levels of industrial experience. Eleven participants are also co-authors.

In total, even only taking participants and co-authors current institutions, data pertaining to 36 of the UK's 164 universities were collected. Details of the methodology are given below with respect to the two questions central to this investigation: What motivates academics to do specific work? And, reciprocally, what might constrain them?

4.1.1 Investigating time as a primary constraint

A primary constraint upon collaborations is self-reportedly the time available in an academic's working week (e.g. Abreu et al. (2009), see above). Thus, a pertinent question is: What do research scientists in universities do? More specifically: What are the duties and responsibilities of a scientist? What are they required to do? Data to answer these provide necessary context to understand competing pressures placed upon them as these day-to-day tasks frame what a scientist can do, whatever their underlying desires and motives may or may not be.

Thematic analysis (e.g. Dowling, 2015) was used to build a list of representative, illustrative expectations from the detailed specifications in 10 job adverts (Table 1). Initial review was by Hillier, with Table 1 updated and adapted in light of two rounds of comments from the 17 academic co-authors before the workshop; experience-based context and caveats surrounding Table 1 in Sect. 5.2 are a synthesis of these comments. Finally, at the workshop, participants rated the statement 'Table 1 is, on balance a fair representation of demands on a UK academic' using a 5-point Likert scale. Thus, duties in Table 1 are derived with the intention of providing a fair level of comparison with expectations within specifications in their number and scope, although some are amalgamated or split here when compared to individual job profiles.

As a crosscheck, participants at the workshop also replicated Hillier's assessment of how often each bullet point in Table 1 was explicitly present in each job specification. The 10 groups of 2-3 participants had one specification, and were instructed to interpret 'explicitly' as they wished.

Arguably, whilst giving a university's considered view on requirements, the tasks in job specifications may deviate from actual practice. Both the workshop and use of 17 co-authors mitigates this limitation, and allow a legitimate view on it to be given.

To obtain 10 job adverts, a non-exhaustive search protocol was used, but one that effectively offers random and objective selection with respect to the information sought; specifically, the adverts used are the first 10 hits from a device located in the UK for the search 'job description university lecturer' on the Google search engine on 16th May 2018. Only job specifications for advertised posts taken directly from universities' sites were used (i.e. not agencies or career advice sites). Taking the search results in descending order, 18 were required to find ten such results. Ten is a relatively small sample of 164 UK universities, but is sufficient for key themes to robustly emerge (see Table 1).

4.1.2 Investigating performance appraisal as a substantive motivator

A second area of interest is how research scientists in universities are motivated, and in particular how this might be influenced by how they are assessed in their employment. Appraisals (e.g. annual performance review) are now ubiquitous in universities (e.g. Costa and Olivera, 2012; Su and Baird, 2017). Appraisal criteria pertain to strategic aims and aspirations of each university distilled into a form applicable to individuals, and are typically designed to motivate an academic to develop in their job role (i.e. towards promotion) although an element of judgement is common (e.g. a classified outcome such as 'very good' might be given). As such, the co-authors' experience is that appraisal criteria are strongly aligned with promotion criteria, at least sufficiently that with an appropriate process an indicative set of appraisal indicators may be derived from promotion ones. These indicative appraisal criteria then provide a useful semi-objective basis (i.e. Table 2) for understanding academic motivations. The last step in the analysis is necessary as indicative appraisal criteria are not

John Hillier 15/11/18 12:30

Comment [16]: R2C6

John Hillier 14/11/18 21:12

Comment [17]: R1C12 – Now rephrased so not a question.

John Hillier 26/11/18 11:57

Comment [18]: R2C7 – use of word.

John Hillier 15/11/18 16:33

Comment [19]: R2C7 - Modified to more clearly lay out the rationale for our approach

typically public domain whilst promotion criteria commonly are in the UK. Note these criteria that reflect a longer time-scale and differ distinctly from tasks at the day-to-day (i.e. operational) level in Table 1.

For Sect. 5.3 thematic analysis was used to build a list of representative and illustrative appraisal criteria from currently applied, freely-available guidance on promotion to Senior Lecturer (see Sect. 3) from 10 UK institutions (Table 2). Initial analysis was by Hillier, with Table 2 reviewed and adapted in light of two rounds of comments from the 17 academic co-authors before the workshop; experience-based context and caveats surrounding Table 2 are a synthesis of these comments.

Word clouds were generated to assist understanding; Fig. 1 contains all relevant text from the specifications, whilst Fig. 2 contains words perceived as significant by the workshop participants. Participants considering a set of criteria highlighted 1-5 snippets of ≤ 5 words in each of the four main areas (i.e. Research, Teaching, Enterprise/Impact, Administration/Teaching). Whenever categorization in the documentation was different from the main area in Table 2 (e.g. 'Managing People' or 'Pastoral Care'), participants judged which of the four areas to identify the contents with.

UK promotion criteria were obtained from all relevant hits of the 190 returned for a search of 'university academic appraisal criteria' on the Google search engine on 1st May 2018 using a device located in the UK.

4.1.3 Pragmatic suggestions for collaboration

The ultimate aim of this work is to suggest *how* an environmental scientist might be pragmatically supported to collaborate effectively with business practitioners. Views here are based on the experience of all 22 co-authors.

4.2 Limitations & Biases

In addition to the limitations and biases discussed above, two others exist, but do not invalidate the work.

- *Bias to the sub-set of environmental scientists participating in this research* i.e. participants and co-authors are inclined towards knowledge exchange (KE). Accepted, but this is the scope of the study (i.e. experience broadly aligns with the persona used).
- *Focus on an illustrative academic persona* (Sect. 3) precludes considering all variants, but sets a basis for future studies.

Many potential avenues are not explored e.g. KE for social scientists where understanding the processes of relationship building and better collaboration can be 'core business'. Equally, a full-scale guide for academics to their business-sector partner is out of scope.

4.3 Ethics

Data collected at the workshop was undertaken in accordance with good practice, and clearance was given by Loughborough University's departmental ethics co-ordinator. Contributors to the manuscript were under no obligation to become co-authors.

5 Results

5.1 Hours worked

Faculty level participants at the workshop self-reportedly work a mean of 47.9 hours per week, ranging from 38-70, normalised to 1 full-time equivalent (FTE) where part time. They worked during 18.3 weekends per year on average, with a range from 3-40. These data for UK university-based environmental scientists with an inclination for KE are broadly consistent with the experience and practice of the 17 academic co-authors.

The result gives a view on the spare capacity within an academics' typical week, and so it is pertinent when considering time pressure as a constraint on collaboration (i.e. in Sect. 6.1.1).

5.2 Duties of research scientists in universities

Table 1 illustrates the main duties expected of a typical UK university-based early- to mid-career environmental scientist, namely of \lesssim 10 years faculty experience. There are 22 tasks based on thematic analysis, roughly commensurate with the median of 28 'key' or 'main' duties and responsibilities in the job specifications analysed; the range is 15-52 tasks. The consensus of the 17 academic co-authors is that this, including the time allocation, broadly reflects our experience of UK universities. Similarly, in the workshop more than twice as many participants agreed as disagreed (12 vs. 5) with the statement that '*Table 1 is, on balance a fair representation of demands on a UK academic*'. Notable details from the table and experience-based caveats of the academic co-authors to it are reported below, including extra detail from the original job specifications where it is useful.

[TABLE 1 HERE]

Teaching will readily expand beyond 2-days a week on average if permitted to by the researcher, as will administrative duties, and this load is spread unevenly throughout the year; it is common for little research (including impact) to be possible in term times, with a real chance that none is possible for 1-2 months during a busy term (i.e. if an imbalance in teaching load between terms exists). This effect becomes severe if programmes or modules need to be rewritten or restructured, which can take hundreds of hours whilst other demands do not lessen.

Duties occurring in most job specifications (black type in Table 1) are all time-consuming requirements. However, in the experience of the academic co-authors those with low numbers of occurrences are also ubiquitous (e.g. reviewing funding bids and papers written by others) and illustrate the numerous other activities a researcher is simply expected to find time for (e.g. see Lazarsfeld-Jensen and Morgan, 2009). Several activities to show leadership outside the university are also usually required. Examples of such roles include journal editing, sitting on panels assessing funding bids, treasurer for learned societies (e.g. British Society for Geomorphology), external examiner at other universities, sitting on government committees, working with funding bodies to define future research directions, and outreach (e.g. Pint of Science <https://pintofscience.co.uk/>). Note that a scientist's own, hands-on research activity (i.e. doing it rather than managing it) forms a relatively small part of the 2-days per week allocated to 'Research', and impact (a.k.a. innovation, consultancy or KE) is only a subpart of this.

Professors and Readers are also usually expected to undertake more substantive management roles (e.g. Head of Department, lead of a Doctoral Training Centre, Admissions Tutor, Programme Director). Other requirements are sometimes reduced to account for such time commitments, and the workload models used to measure and allocate such activities are often controversial (e.g. Lazarsfeld-Jensen and Morgan, 2009).

These day-to-day tasks show that scientists have an array of competing demands upon their time, and so they frame what a typical university-based scientist can do, whatever their underlying desires and motives may or may not be. In summary, a highly time-limited environment is indicated, as discussed in Sect. 6.1.1. Thus, these results provide necessary context to understand what specific work our illustrative scientist will or will not be able to do, and why (see Sect. 6).

5.3 Criteria used to assess research scientists in universities

Table 2 is an indicative set of appraisal criteria for an early- to mid-career UK academic, derived from thematic analysis of promotion criteria to Senior Lecturer. On balance, and taken as an illustrative realisation of a more complex totality, these are a fair representation of criteria used to frame yearly appraisals in the experience of the 17 academic co-authors.

Of the four main areas (i.e. Research - R, Teaching - T, Enterprise/Impact - E/I, Leadership/Administration - L/A), all but E/I are always present as a main heading within the criteria (Table 2). E/I is a main heading in only 3 of the 10 institutions (30%), although detailed examination of the documents reveals that criteria relating to E/I are pervasively present in all UK institutions. This is consistent with the knowledge and experience of the 17 academic co-authors.

[TABLE 2 HERE]

To be viewed as acceptably meeting expectations, good performance in at least 2 of the 3 traditional categories (i.e. R, T, L/A) is typically required in the UK; this is based on co-authors' experience and examination of the criteria documents. Word clouds below directly display an impression of key aims from the underlying text (Fig. 1), and how the aims were perceived by academics at the workshop (Fig. 2). Notable elements of the word clouds are summarised in the sections below (Sects. 5.3.1-5.3.4), accompanied by explanation based on the co-authors' experience and reading of the underlying texts; a summary of the aspirational criteria used to assess UK academics precedes this.

In short, publishing novel science in peer-reviewed journals is the overriding imperative, followed by winning funding to facilitate publications (i.e. by funding a post-doctoral researcher). Teaching and Administration/Leadership are obligatory. Pervasive pressure (i.e. criteria) exists to undertake Impact/Enterprise work, in whichever diverse form, but in practice it remains lower in priority, is not usually obligatory, and is best engaged in if reportable outcomes are also aligned with other drivers.

Thus, these results give an indicator of how our illustrative scientist may respond (e.g. in terms of prioritization) to time pressure within the work context in the presence of impact requirements, discussed in section 6.1.1, and direction from funding bodies discussed in section 6.1.2.

5.3.1 Research

Key words for promotion to SL show the need for a sustained high-quality research record (i.e. publications), and funding (Fig. 1a). Academics' perceptions focus on these even more dramatically (Fig. 2a). These are again repeated in our illustrative, representative profile (Table 2), but this also includes an emphasis on PhD supervision, and reputation. These may appear disparate, but in the experience of the academic co-authors are strongly bound together.

A university scientist's international reputation is built almost entirely on novel, high quality, well cited peer-reviewed publications (i.e. journal papers); these evidence a research profile and incomplete (i.e. unpublished) work is of little value. Funding must be underpinned by related publications, with some flexibility to take moderate steps in new directions driven by curiosity, and provides the resources (e.g. post-docs) to create excellent publications. Whilst PhD students' development and needs are paramount in their supervision, a well-supported student can often (i.e. is typically well-advised to) co-publish with their supervisor, which is also to that academic's benefit in a university environment where time to conduct their own hands-on research is limited.

John Hillier 15/11/18 16:39
Comment [21]: R2C9

5.3.2 Teaching

Key words for promotion to SL show the need for significant student-focussed teaching of quality (Fig. 1b). Academics' perceptions also include an emphasis on development, design or innovation, and a 'HEA-Fellowship' is present (Fig. 2b). The illustrative, representative profile (Table 2) adds context, such as for the 'HEA-Fellowship'; in the UK a professional qualification with a body such as the Higher Education Academy (HEA) is required to evidence attainment in teaching. Also, Table 2 explains 'develop'; this could be of new module (e.g. a set of ten lectures and practical sessions) or programmes (e.g. a new 'Global Environmental Risk' BSc), although there is an expectation of innovative and stimulating modes of delivery (e.g. experiential, problem-based learning, integrating tablets). In the experience of the academic co-authors, student satisfaction is important in practice as measured internally by module or programme feedback and externally by the National Student Survey (NSS, <https://www.thestudentsurvey.com/>).

'Research-led' teaching based upon a scientist's core research is required, but the teaching does not feed back into the scientific research. However, teaching is typically the main source of university funding (Universities UK, 2016), and is monitored in the national Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) assessment (<https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/teaching/what-is-the-tef/>), so this is not typically optional (see Sect. 5.2). The expectation is to design, maintain and deliver customised material that exceeds that to be found in textbooks, increasingly based on the academic's own published interests as a degree proceeds.

5.3.3 Enterprise / Impact

Enterprise occurs frequently as a key word within promotion criteria for SL (Fig. 1c), but neither academics' perceptions from the workshop (Fig. 2c) nor our illustrative, representative profile (Table 2) are able to focus on specifics. Examination of the underlying criteria and words used to generate the clouds show that this is due to the range of possible activities here.

The academic co-authors' experience indicates that, whilst of increasing importance, Enterprise or Impact activity is only considered of value if it generates income to fund future research or is suitable for a Research Excellence Framework (i.e. REF, <https://re.ukri.org/research/research-excellence-framework-ref/>) Impact Case Study, and ideally facilitates or inspires better curiosity-led research. This said, pressure to engage in impact-related work is pervasive in the UK from institutions and funders.

5.3.4 Leadership / Administration

Key words for promotion to SL show the need for evidence of contributions to the Department/School and University (Fig. 1d), whilst academics' perceptions highlighting that this includes leadership and leading externally (e.g. driving national and international initiatives, promoting a university's brand) (Fig. 2d). The descriptors in our illustrative, representative profile

John Hillier 15/11/18 13:18

Comment [22]: R2C1

(Table 2) are more explicit stressing leadership, success and innovation. Outreach (e.g. public talks, 6th form summer research experience) is encouraged, but is essentially optional, and delivery of all standard administrative tasks (e.g. research team management, undergraduate module leadership) is taken as read. L/A will not get an academic short-listed for a job or promotion, but evidence of competence in this is required for them to actually get it.



5

Fig. 1: Word clouds summarizing promotion criteria for 10 UK universities at Senior Lecturer level in the 4 main assessment headings a) Research b) Teaching c) Enterprise/Impact d) Leadership/Administration. Minimum frequencies vary from 2 to 5 to give 20-30 words displayed. Sizes according to rank.




Fig. 2: Word clouds summarizing the workshop participants' perceptions of promotion criteria for 10 UK universities at Senior Lecturer level in the 4 main assessment headings a) Research b) Teaching c) Enterprise/Impact d) Leadership/Administration. Minimum frequencies of 2. Sizes according to frequency.

6 Discussion

Successful university-business collaboration requires mutual understanding, built upon shared vision and long-term [trust-based](#) personal relationships (e.g. Dowling, 2015). In building collaborations [business](#) practitioners will be assisted by understanding the answer to two questions: What motivates academics to do specific work? And, reciprocally, what might constrain them? [Specifically, this work adds insight into why motivations arise and how exactly time constraints manifest themselves in behaviours in the presence of impact requirements.](#) This discussion provides a window into the motives of university-based research scientists that, in addition to practitioners, will be highly relevant to a number of academic colleagues, university administrators and policy makers.

Constraints on collaborations are considered first, in Sect. [6.1](#). Then, environmental scientists' motivations are discussed in Sect. [6.2](#), culminating in [an improved](#) conceptual model of academics' motivations (Fig. [4](#)). Section [6.3](#) considers the practical aspects of building a [business-university](#) collaboration based on a 1-to-1 relationship, [with a focus on environmental science and the insurance sector](#); an illustrative, non-exhaustive list is proposed of pragmatic suggestions for short-term and time-efficient activities that have reportable and mutually-beneficial outputs for both an academic and a risk practitioner in order to build the long-term trusting relationship needed for collaboration.

John Hillier 12/11/18 14:08
 Comment [23]: RIC16

6.1 What constrains scientists' working with **business**?

Two-thirds or more of university scientists have a prime interest in research rather than teaching (Abreu et al., 2009; Cavalli and Moscati, 2010). However, teaching-related work is not optional (Sect. 5.3). This leads to a conflict for limited time between teaching and research (Sect. 5.3), which is widely reported (Arnold, 2008; Gendron, 2008; Harland and Wald, 2018; Moya et al., 2015), even if the consequences of this continue to be debated - see the summary in Cadez et al. (2017). For an environmental scientist, work with **business** is based upon their science and this study shows that for workload purposes this typically falls within time allocated to research (Table 1). This section expands the debate by incorporating impact into this tensioned research-teaching relationship. Specifically, it considers the influence of time pressure due to workload factors (Sect. 6.1.1), the role of funders (Sect. 6.1.2), intellectual property (Sect. 6.1.3), and academics' need for a coherent track record (Sect. 6.1.4) as potential constraints upon university-business collaboration.

6.1.1 Time pressure

A self-reported mean of 47.9 hours/week is worked by the sample of UK-based environmental scientists involved in knowledge exchange (Sect. 5.1), which is consistent with larger studies. The Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey of 100 academics (2004 to 2012) (Teichler et al., 2013) describes a self-reported mean workload of ~48 h/w, with 45-50 h/w in the UK, and is supported by recent data from 2,000 UK academics (Bothwell, 2018). This time at work sets the boundary conditions for accomplishing the 15 to 52 distinct 'key' or 'main' tasks required of a university-based scientist, in addition to which there is an expectation to do numerous other tasks to support their academic reputation, internal visibility and external profile (Sect. 5.2). It is also the case that UK academics often work at weekends, and yet feel under pressure to do more (Sects. 5.1 & 5.2; Bothwell, 2018). Thus, even working ~50 hours per week, it is evident that there is time pressure for a typical university-based scientist in the UK; i.e., there is no spare (i.e. previously un-allocated) time. With the presence of time-pressure established, it is now useful to proceed on the temporary assumption that any impact-related work will be substituted into an academic's typical hours and consider what fraction of time might be made available for collaborations with **business**.

Table 1 reports a ratio of approximately 2:2:1 for R:T:L/A in the UK, with the nature of the need to juggle these demands described in Sect. 5.2. These ratios are entirely consistent with the CAP survey (Teichler et al., 2013), making Table 1 widely relevant. The ratios also align with the co-authors' view of the UK system giving ~2 days/week for all research-related work although, critically, the introduction of Enterprise/Impact in addition (Tables 1 & 2) and pervasive pressure to act on this (Sect. 5.3) has increased the difficulty of the time-management challenge amid competing demands.

Table 1 adds clarity to what is covered by 'Research' within the categorisation used here. Specifically, it includes impact-related work as well as numerous other tasks (e.g. PhD supervision, preparing funding bids, grant-related administration) that

John Hillier 12/11/18 17:24

Comment [24]: RIC17

John Hillier 15/11/18 16:42

Comment [25]: RIC18, R2C15

John Hillier 26/11/18 16:46

Comment [26]: R2C1 – Clarification of the origin of the figure of 0.5 days/week in the two paragraphs below, so that transparency allows readers to form a better view on the uncertainty within this figure.

might not immediately be thought of by business practitioners when considering an academic doing research. Each of these 10 illustrative main duties is multi-faceted. For instance, 'own hands-on research' conducted by the academic includes elements such as reading articles, modelling, programming, learning any new skills required, and writing journal articles. We do not argue that this categorisation is the only one possible, or that the tasks itemised are prescriptive. Indeed, a number of alternative tasks that could be prioritised and substituted in for any individual academic are reported in Sect. 5.2. However, the view of the 17 academic co-authors and workshop participants is that Table 1, distilled from job specifications, is on balance a fair representation of the demands on a UK academic. To wit, key elements are present and the number and magnitude of tasks form a suitable basis for an evidence-based, indicative view of time that might be available for impact-based work.




Fig. 3: Potential time availability for collaboration with business, in the context of other duties, of a typical early- to mid-career UK academic. Time available is divided between Teaching, Research and Administration 2:2:1 (see main text), and then an academic's own hands-on research, writing and impact-related work are only 3 of 10 tasks within 'Research', giving 0.2 days/week for each task assuming an equal distribution.

Fig. 3 summarises the logic behind an estimate of up to 0.5 days/week. A ratio of 2:2:1 for R:T:L/A leads to 2-days per week for 'Research'. Then, an equal distribution of time between the 10 tasks within this category implies ~0.2 days/week for impact-based work. This is moderated by the knowledge and experience of the 17 academic co-authors, assimilating the relative priority that must be given to the tasks in light of assessment criteria (Sect. 5.3). Without some special circumstances to buy out an academic's time (e.g. KE Fellowship), for some co-authors 1 h was a limit, and not even that in term time. The experience of others is that, with determination, it is possible to preserve 1 day/week for the totality of the three tasks related to hands-on research (see Fig. 3). Ultimately, the co-authors' consensus is that, if strongly prioritized (i.e. intermediate term benefits clearly identified), 0.5 days/week was a ceiling to what might be possible. This said, readers can review the evidence (e.g. Table 1, Fig. 3) and form their own view.

John Hillier 14/11/18 20:30
Comment [27]: Figure to better explain derivation of <0.5 days/week R2C1. Figure suggested by R1C4.

Recent data (2016-7) show that 33.1% of UK academic staff are part-time (HESA, 2018). Consideration of additional issues surrounding part-time contracts is beyond the scope of this work, but it is expected that responsibilities will reduce commensurately with reduced hours. If the range of responsibilities is reduced, and the challenge of non-scalable tasks (e.g. yearly appraisal) is tackled, time to collaborate with business may be similar to full-time staff. However, if time is simply spread more thinly, the potential time to collaborate will be reduced accordingly.

John Hillier 26/11/18 16:49

Comment [28]: RIC3

In short, the critical new observation is an estimate that an efficient and effective full-time academic might retain about 1 day per week in which to do their own 'hands-on' research; of this up to 0.5 days could be committed to business (e.g. insurance sector) focused implementation (i.e. impact) without case-specific negotiation (e.g. for a KE Fellowship). Prioritization is key, and without expanding working hours, any choice to do something is inevitably a choice to discard an opportunity of less potential value; often, an impact task will be competing directly against the little curiosity-driven research that is possible. A convincing (self-)justification is likely therefore needed well before any official appraisal. With any expansion of hours, impact-related work could readily be competing against time with family or children, or weekend recreational activities (e.g. see Bothwell, 2018).

John Hillier 26/11/18 16:49

Comment [29]: R2C1

As Teichler et al (2013: p99) note, the presence of stringent time constraints is certainly not unique, and applies equally to other high-skilled jobs (e.g. in the insurance sector). So, taking a positive view, mutual understanding of the nature of each other's time-pressured work environments might be a point of commonality and help in building trust-based personal relationships between academics and practitioners within business.

6.1.2 Direction from funding bodies

Ultimately, the topics, scope and even existence of environmental science research are set by funding bodies. Funders may be government (i.e. UKRI, NERC) or business (e.g. Willis Research Network, AXA Research Fund). Government funding may be either specific to particular projects through grant bids or to particular funding 'calls', with eligibility potentially restricted to certain topic areas, geographic locations or the status of the applicant. Conversely, if a business is prepared to fund a particular topic then there is a good chance it will get done. It is also notable that UKRI funding now typically incentivises collaboration with business, discussed below (Sect. 6.2.2).

6.1.3 Intellectual Property

Dowling et al. (2015: p27) review the barriers to university-business collaboration (e.g. identifying partners inside insurers (Abreu et al., 2009)). One notable barrier comes from any rigidity in expectations about knowledge ownership and exclusive use (e.g. Dowling, 2015). If expectations are too strict, this presents a fundamental mismatch between creating benefit for society directly by publishing (i.e. not supporting the profits of one company) and supporting the public only indirectly via tax of increased revenue or better (re)insurance products. Ultimately, university-based environmental scientists cannot

John Hillier 13/11/18 15:01

Comment [30]: RIC19

compromise on publication. Illustratively, a compromise is to use post-project embargo periods for publications or data (e.g. 6-12 month) (Drex1, 2016; e.g. Morris et al., 2011; Moulin, 2018; UKRI, 2018b), perhaps explaining relatively low levels of concern amongst individual academics about this issue (i.e. Abreu et al., 2009). The insurance sector is a multi-national illustration that these considerations are similar across the globe but also that solutions exist (see below).

6.1.4 Track Record

Globally, international reputation is important both directly in appraisals (e.g. Table 2) and obtaining funding and requires a track record in specific activities (Sect. 5.3.1). Thus, there is some need for continuity in research themes, which may be perceived as a pursuit of 'pet projects' by business; this term voices frustration felt in business when an academic appears to use a collaboration as a vehicle for pursuing an existing blue-skies project without deviation to accommodate business needs.

John Hillier 13/11/18 15:13

Comment [31]: RIC20

6.2 What motivates research scientists to do specific work?

The majority of new knowledge that could be used by business (e.g. insurance sector - see Sect. 2) is published by university-based scientists in journals. How can practitioners best access and harness this existing knowledge, and work with these researchers to answer new questions as they arise? With basic needs met (see Olsen, 2004), additional personal financial reward (i.e. 'gold') is of low importance to the great majority of researchers (e.g. Abreu et al., 2009; D'Este and Perkmann, 2011; Evans, 2016; Lam, 2011), who do little or no consultancy work; so, for a risk practitioner, it doesn't matter how much you might be able to pay them to work with you. Persuading the world's best researchers to work with you requires a deeper understanding of what motivates most academic researchers, so this section considers why academics' motivations arise and what governs their relative dominance.

The findings of this study (Sect. 5), and experience of the co-authors, leads us to propose impact as a notable addition to prior models (e.g. Lam, 2011) (see Sect. 1). Broadly speaking therefore, after 'gold' there remain three types of inter-linked motivation (i.e. Fig. 4) influencing our illustrative research scientist. Each of these presents an opportunity for a risk practitioner.

1. *Curiosity and creativity* (a.k.a 'puzzle' (Lam, 2011)): By temperament, given unlimited time and funding, academics would simply study whatever interests them most for the satisfaction of a puzzle solved in an innovative way. How can you frame your needs in a way that will pique the curiosity of researchers, challenge them and give them opportunities to conduct creative, original and publishable work?
2. *Impact*: Some academic researchers want to make a positive impact upon society (Reed, 2018) (i.e. 'altruism'), whilst others are intrinsically motivated by the act of working with business itself (i.e. 'utility'). How will working with your company give these researchers a unique opportunity to make a difference that is significant and meaningful, and at a scale not otherwise possible?

John Hillier 13/11/18 15:14

Comment [32]: RIC21

3. *Career* (a.k.a 'ribbon' (Lam, 2011)): Increasingly, generating such benefits in the real world is now rewarded, with some contribution to winning research funding and promotion (see Sect. 5.3). How can you provide evidence of impact from research that can be used by researchers in evaluation exercises?

5 These drivers are considered below.

6.2.1 Curiosity and creativity

Curiosity is a major driver for most researchers (e.g. Lam, 2011), who want to be at the cutting edge of their discipline. The excitement of discovering something new can be addictive, even when the breakthrough seems elusive, and many researchers are motivated by the intellectual endeavour required to overcome the challenges that stand in their way.

10 Sometimes the journey is as rewarding as the destination, as researchers are forced to engage with new disciplines and ways of thinking in their pursuit of creative solutions. Also, the challenge of coming up with new solutions to old problems should not be forgotten.

15 The **findings** of this study (Sect. 5) in no way contradict existing views of creativity and curiosity. Fundamentally, curiosity is the seed from which all academic publications grow, and publications remain central to international academic reputation and appraisal (see Sect. 6.2.3). However, the results reveal the bounds (e.g. time around other duties) in which curiosity must operate. This effectively limits the utility of vague, unconstrained or highly-speculative curiosity; such tasks are unlikely to rise to the top of a list of pending actions. It is therefore important to focus and formulate questions that are precise enough for the scientist to be *able* to answer, and intriguing and novel enough for scientists to *want* to prioritise answering them.

20

So, how can a practitioner (e.g. in insurance **sector**) tap into this set of motives?

- Rather than simplifying the nature of the challenges you need to address, can you explore the complexity of the challenge, and ask 'why' questions that cultivate your own sense of curiosity in the challenge as something to be understood, not just solved.
- Before engaging with academic researchers, have you checked that there isn't already an answer to your question in the research literature? Google Scholar has made it easier than ever before to access published research. Use what you learn from your reading to put your question into the context of what is already known, and explicitly articulate what is not yet known; this is an ideal way of both identifying an academic researcher and framing your approach to them. Alternatively, **if time or access to publication is a barrier, you might engage with an academic so as to use such a** scoping exercise as a mechanism for collaboration building: **detail on useful approaches to this is in** Sect. 6.3.

25

30

John Hillier 14/11/18 20:47
Comment [33]: RICS

- Consider what unique opportunities you can give to a researcher who loves the creativity of what they do. Can you expose them to new ways of working or thinking, introduce them to colleagues who ask challenging questions or expose them to methods used in the business world to drive original thinking and innovation?
- Actively promote (e.g. host events, provide needs-based rationale to pursue) multi-sector collaboration, which opens new avenues for innovative research (e.g. across traditional subject boundaries)

6.2.2 Impact

'Impact' is a term used to describe the influence that underlying research has outside academia (Reed, 2018). In the UK government bodies, i.e. NERC and HEFCE (HEFCE, 2015) now merged into UKRI (<https://www.ukri.org/>), define impact broadly as '*An effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life*' [although definitions vary in detail \(e.g. https://www.ukri.org/innovation/excellence-with-impact/\)](https://www.ukri.org/innovation/excellence-with-impact/)

Some academic researchers, especially in applied disciplines such as environmental science, have trained because they intrinsically want to make a positive impact upon society (Reed, 2018); i.e. 'altruism'. Alternatively, we assert that others, including a group of the co-authors, are motivated by the act of working with **business** itself, assisting pragmatic implementation and being useful in that way; illustratively hearing '*we can use this*' or '*that'd be really valuable*' energises these academics. This may be dubbed 'utility'. Whatever a scientist's exact internal motivations, however, the findings of this study (Sect. 5), highlight that impact work must align with other demands of time such as research and teaching that are currently considered more important for the role of an academic and for promotion; this is despite the recognition of impact in job descriptions and promotion criteria.

This research also demonstrates that for a research scientist's job, it is critical to be able to evidence impact, demonstrating benefit from their research (e.g. behaviour change, competitive advantage in business, attracting foreign investment, new or changed policy); without evidence it is **of very limited** use to them for appraisals. In the UK impact is being driven into the appraisal structure by the government funding councils' inclusion of Impact Case Studies in their assessment of research excellence (REF), and whilst an administrative burden **this is a key mechanism used** to encourage effective collaboration.

All funding proposals to the UK Research Councils require the creation of an impact summary describing who will benefit from the research and pathways to impact describing the approach that will be taken to deliver these impacts. Although traditionally weighted significantly lower than scientific excellence, one recent large funding scheme (the £4.7 bn Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund) weights impact only slightly less than excellence, and in another (the £1.5 bn Global Challenges Research Fund) it is the main objective (UKRI, 2017, 2018a); thus, applications to the funds require credible, significant and far-reaching impact for proposals to be fundable. The importance of impact is also growing in the UK's 7-yearly appraisal of

John Hillier 15/11/18 13:29

Comment [34]: R2C3

John Hillier 26/11/18 12:15

Comment [35]: R2C3

research across the Higher Education sector, now accounting for 25% of institutions' scores and significantly affecting league table rankings and income (i.e. REF2021 <http://www.ref.ac.uk/>).

5 | Within the insurance sector, we propose that types of impact and supporting evidence might include the following, although which is most important varies by a practitioner's role (e.g. broker, research manager, model developer). [The list draws upon published material](#) (Reed, 2018: Ch 22) [and experience of insurance sector amongst the co-authors](#).

10 | 1. *Cost savings* (e.g. saving on reinsurance), or *increased profit* or an increase in turnover (e.g. by better pricing) where the research made a significant contribution to decision-making [and operational utility \(e.g. data, tools\)](#) that led to the benefit. Economic benefits such as these may be evidenced via

a. financial records (these can be clearly marked for the eyes of reviewers only and redacted for any public record)

b. reports in [the mainstream media](#) or [business](#) publications (e.g. Insurance Times), ideally stating the change or difference that has been made and linking this to the research

15 | c. a testimonial letter describing the nature of the benefit in the risk practitioner's own words, and how it arose from work with the researcher

20 | 2. *Improved strategic decision-making* e.g. entering a new partnership or geographic region based on evidence from the research. Decision-making impacts like these may be captured in strategic documents and agreements; citing the published research in these documents makes it easier for researchers to claim impact. Otherwise, testimonials are widely used to evidence this sort of impact

25 | 3. *Capacity-building impacts such as new skills* or business capabilities generated via internal training courses by researchers based (at least partly) on their research; evidence for this could include the amount of training conducted, feedback from participants ideally indicating the effect the training has on their work, or any publicly available white paper, policy document, professional newsletter or blog stating the advantage gained through the research

30 | 4. *Understanding or awareness impacts* such as uncovering the scale or urgency of a problem, perhaps of a peril (e.g. clustering of extra-tropical cyclones (e.g. Vitolo et al., 2009)). There may be no solution to the problem at present, such as for flood-wind interdependency (e.g. Hillier et al., 2015; De Luca et al., 2017), but awareness may have an impact in itself, and in time lead to further impacts. Evidence could relate to recognition in blogs or [business](#) awards (e.g. Lloyds' Science of Risk Prize).

5. [Reputational enhancement differentiating a company from its competitors. This is non-trivial to evidence, even internally within a business, so testimonials may be the only way to evidence this sort of impact.](#)

John Hillier 15/11/18 22:49
Comment [36]: Response to RIC6

John Hillier 15/11/18 22:50
Comment [37]: RIC6

6. *Improved operational utility* where research has provided better inputs (e.g. data, methods or theories) with which to build better models or more robust views of risk. Evidence for impacts like these that are also pathways (e.g. to cost savings) may be captured via mentions or citations in policy documents or technical documentation.

John Hillier 26/11/18 11:33

Comment [38]: RIC6

6.2.3 Career

5 Tenure with its guaranteed job security (Adams, 2006) was legally abolished in 1988 by the UK government (Enders, 2015; Legislation, 1988). This opens up university research scientists to a much greater steer by appraisals (e.g. Costa and Olivera, 2012; Su and Baird, 2017) and via promotion criteria that are the universities' distillations of institutional and external policy expectations (Sect. 5.3).

John Hillier 12/11/18 16:41

Comment [39]: International perspective moved to separate section at end of discussion. RIC2, R2C2.

10 A main finding here (i.e. Sect. 5) is that national level policies to incentivise impact (i.e. REF and funding, Sect. 6.2.2) have now entered into the everyday consciousness of UK academics, with pervasive pressure to engage in impact-related work from institutions and funders; whilst enterprise and impact have propagated to be main headings in only 3 of the 10 institutions considered, all promotion documents contain criteria relating to E/I. In response, many academics now pursue impact to align with institutional requirements. Notably however, in terms of time-allocation and duties, impact-related work
15 is one task amongst many (i.e. Table 1, Fig. 3) and is likely only considered of value if it generates income to fund future research or is suitable for a REF Impact Case Study. Evidentially, in practice, it also remains subservient in importance to research and teaching, thus it is wise and perhaps critical for work with business to facilitate or inspire better curiosity-led research (see Sect. 6.2.1). Lastly, to complete the contextual picture, it is necessary to understand that only a minority of UK academics are required to be heavily involved in KE (e.g. Reed, 2018); with ~1 REF case study per 10 academics, required
20 involvement is roughly 20-30% of researchers.

Based upon the data in Sect. 5, Fig. 4 presents a new simplified model of the task facing an early- to mid-career university-based environmental scientist on the teaching and research pathway most commonly available. Firstly, it develops on existing models in that it integrates literatures on motivation (D'Este and Perkmann, 2011; Freitas and Verspagen, 2017; Lam, 2011) and evaluation (Cadez et al., 2017; Grendon, 2008; Harland and Wald, 2018; Moya et al., 2015), building upon a view based around a teaching-research dipole and older (i.e. pre-impact emphasis in UK) ideas (Hughes et al., 2008). This integration sheds light on why these motivations arise. Secondly, it is modified to include work with business (i.e. Impact and the two intrinsic motivations behind this identified in this study ('utility' and 'altruism', Sect. 6.2). Given that neither government (i.e. UKRI) view nor REF vary notably between academic sectors (e.g. environmental science, social science, engineering) we propose that the model is widely applicable. The model's utility here is that it is a framework that gives insight into why particular modes of engagement proposed later (i.e. Sect. 6.3) might be successful instead of languishing incomplete.
25
30

John Hillier 15/11/18 11:23

Comment [40]: R3C1b

John Hillier 26/11/18 12:07

Comment [41]: R3C3

Publishing novel science in peer-reviewed journals is an academic's overriding imperative (e.g. Hattie and Marsh, 1996), followed by winning funding to facilitate publications (i.e. by funding a post-doctoral researcher). Publications (bold box and arrows on Fig. 4) are the critical appraisal measure as they demonstrate success in research and they underpin teaching, impact, career (i.e. promotion, mobility, or simply retaining a job), reputation and future funding bids (Sect. 6.1.4). 'Funding', or more generally resources (i.e. PhD student time, post-docs, income), is an important appraisal criterion as it indicates reputation and the ability to undertake research, but is significant to an academic as a career measure in its own right. Research itself is marked in a light type font (Fig. 4) as it is ascribed little value until published. Impact is light as its influence upon an academic's assessment (i.e. career) is still relatively limited, although research and impact promotion pathways are now possible at some universities. REF and TEF, and soon KEF (i.e. Knowledge Exchange Framework <https://re.ukri.org/knowledge-exchange/knowledge-exchange-framework/>) assess UK universities in research, teaching and KE. So, impact may gain weight as KEF is brought in although it is unlikely to exceed REF or TEF in importance. However, it is key to note that all three assessments are ultimately underpinned by peer-reviewed publications of original work. With REF this is direct, TEF is driven by research-led teaching, and KE and impact are required to be tied back to published outputs. Thus, even fully buying out an academic to do impact with substantive funding (e.g. a two year KE Fellowship) does not currently reduce the model's applicability for a scientist wishing to remain in academia.

The entrepreneurial route directly between research and impact (Fig. 4) is indicated with a dashed line as it is relatively uncommon (Lam, 2011), and the arrow from impact to funding is thin to reflect the current relative influence it has on the magnitude of resources. Teaching and Administration/Leadership are obligatory, but will not get a scientist short-listed for a job so are not focussed on in Fig. 4, even if they are required to actually obtain the job. Motivations detailed in Sect. 6.2 are in italic typeface, whilst the main headings into which duties and appraisal criteria fall are in normal.

The important thing for a risk practitioner to recognise is that if an academic already under substantial time pressure (Sect. 6.1.1) wishes to engage with business, their only solution is to be effective and efficient, and prioritise carefully to select what they will not do; and, usually the only flexible element is their own research (e.g. see Boswell, 2018). Thus, such real-world impact must inspire curiosity and provide some way of better doing new science (e.g. ideas, access to novel data, resources, a PhD student), at least in the longer-term; see Stokes' (1997) dynamical model including 'use inspired basic research' for theoretical context (e.g. Cantisani, 2006: Figs. 2 & 3). If this feedback exists, the academic might be able to find up to about half a day per week, but such a large time sacrifice would need substantial incentives (Sect. 6.1.1).

John Hillier 26/11/18 12:06

Comment [42]: R2C3

John Hillier 14/11/18 09:06

Comment [43]: R2C8

Many conceptual models of the knowledge exchange process exist (e.g. see Jacobson et al., 2005; Ward et al., 2009). No particular one is assumed, although cyclic, iterative and two-way elements are recommended.

5 Below we propose two illustrative, non-exhaustive lists of pragmatic suggestions for time-efficient activities that have reportable and mutually-beneficial outputs in order to build the long-term trusting relationship needed for collaboration between an academic and a risk practitioner. Each suggestion includes an explanation of *why* the activity has benefit/utility to justify time spent on it, mapped back to appraisal criteria (Table 2) or an impact typology (Sect. 6.2.2). Obvious relationship-building and maintenance activity is assumed; e.g. short chats over a coffee, telephone calls, passing on interesting items (e.g. an [article](#) or newspaper clipping), and mutual tolerance of unavoidable busy periods (e.g. [see](#) Sect. 5.2).

10 The following list details ways in which risk practitioners can support an academic partner, including a brief commentary on how and why benefits emerge. Square brackets e.g. [2] indicate mapping to criteria by which academics are assessed in Table 2. Suggestions are not ordered as their relative utility will be case specific.

- 20 • *Write letter of support/engagement on a research grant [application](#)* [4]. A useful relationship building measure, and will be best when projects are co-designed. They are required for UK funding applications, but if sought at the last minute after limited discussion it often remains unclear why the insurer should prioritise this action (i.e. what the benefits of the work might be), potentially leading to mutual frustration. In contrast, a timely discussion leading to a letter of support which indicates the scale of potential impact of the research to the industrial partner, and details pathways to it (e.g. specific committees, regulatory compliance requirements, or internal initiatives), would significantly strengthen a research grant application.
- 25 • *Offer a place on an advisory panel, committee, or similar* [8,9 and potentially 3,4]. Even with a non-disclosure agreement in place, this could be useful to an academic on many fronts; a role title enhances their CV/annual appraisal, even a small remuneration (e.g. ~£1,000 across a year) looks good as an income source from [business](#). Furthermore, as such monies are undesignated they are ideal to buy a little of a research assistant's time (e.g. a PhD student) to do a pilot study; these greatly help when writing funding bids for substantive money, ultimately leading to publications. If the academic were also able to say the advice stemmed from a published paper, this would be evidence of impact outside academia, particularly with a supporting statement (e.g. '*advice on earthquake clustering was provided, drawing on X's recent publications, contributing to an evaluation of two catastrophe models of [natural hazard risk](#)*'). On both sides, it is another chance to meet, talk, and build a relationship.
- 30 • *Request a few (e.g. 1-3) days consultancy* - e.g. commenting upon a [catastrophe \(i.e. natural hazard risk\)](#) model's documentation [8,9 and potentially 3,4]. The money and impact benefits are as above. This is likely a loss leader

for the academic, but is something useful that is safe, will happen, and is measurable and reportable. In some ways this is the mirror of the literature review that they can do for you when written into a project grant (see list below).

- *Provide access to data* - [9 and first step to 3,4] to allow a novel insight into a scientific problem; this could be very useful for the academic and pique their curiosity, but will likely need significant funding to fully use. This said, a data-driven pilot study could be of immediate use to the risk practitioner and also give a strong core to an academic's bid for funding.
- *Offer grant funding for 'innovation' or highly applied work*, either directly (e.g. AXA's research fund) or via government funding that requires an industrial lead (e.g. Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund, Innovate UK) [4,8,9]. This is good for an appraisal's funding metric, and can provide a means of moving towards evidence of impact outside academia, but it is unlikely to produce highly-novel, inventive, cutting-edge scientific research. So this is useful either in the relatively short-term (1-3 years) or in parallel with blue-skies funding, but is insufficient alone in the longer-term for the scientist.
- *Fund blue-skies research* [3,4]. This is an ideal scenario for many academics, and is done by a number of organisation (e.g. Willis, AXA) but, the sums are relatively large as with full economic costing in the UK a post-doctoral research assistant for the 2-3 years needed to make a post attractive to a good candidate costs ~£200,000. External funding lowers costs, but also reduces control over the topic and scope of the work (i.e. funder's requirements) and whether work will be funded or not.
- *Collect evidence of impact* [9]; impact is diverse, and evidence not onerous to obtain (see Sect. 6.2.2). Creating an Impact Case Study for the REF exercise can win internal (i.e. university) investment in the form of time or money, freeing the academic to pursue further research or develop this strand of impact.
- *Co-design a research project for external funding* [3,4,9]. Impact designed in at a project's inception (e.g. Reed, 2018) can inspire world leading science and publications in the highest-impact journals, with ideas and inspiration possible from all parties. However, preparatory conversations over time are needed to ensure there will be novel insights into the underpinning physical processes at work as well as real-world impacts. Early in a collaboration this may take substantial time (e.g. 6-12 months). It is important to note that the impact and novel science do not need to come at exactly the same time or from precisely the same task; i.e. distinct outcomes particular to both risk practitioner (see below) and academic (e.g. publications) should be separately identified. Ultimately, even if both scientist and practitioner are time-limited, co-design in an established relationship can be efficient i.e. a route to better research, faster (e.g. Amabile et al., 2001). UKRI funded options range from a PhD studentship (e.g. via CASE awards), or KE Fellowships or Innovation Placements to NERC standard grants or Global Challenges funding calls (see Sect. 6.2.2.).
- *Ask them to provide training* [9] - If a clear fit exists, paying an academic to provide in-house training is a good way to get to know them, which the academic can justify in the same way as consultancy.

John Hillier 14/11/18 21:14

Comment [46]: R1C25. Rephrased.

John Hillier 13/11/18 15:56

Comment [47]: R1C1 – PhD comment replaced.

John Hillier 15/11/18 23:00

Comment [48]: R2C1 – moved PhD comment and added UKRI initiatives.

- *Provide access to training, expertise (e.g. actuaries) or networks* - primarily a mechanism to maintain contact and alignment, since academics are typically proficient at obtaining these already.

Although apparently a counterpoint to the main theme of this article, aimed at risk practitioners, an illustrative list of actions a university scientist may take to support their risk practitioner is given below; it may assist practitioners new to the role of collaboration with academics or as an aid to give to an academic new to collaborating with insurers.

In this spirit, it is worth giving a precis of motivations within this industrial sector. As individuals, it is notable that practitioner's motives are mixed, with curiosity (i.e. the 'puzzle') and family common drivers, not just the 'gold' (see Sect. 6.2, (Lam, 2011)). Whilst insurers ultimately require increased profitability, and approaches to quantify this to create a business case for collaboration are mixed and varied, three main routes exist; training, operational utility (e.g. data, tools), or reputational enhancement. The latter works by differentiating the company from its competitors (i.e. more accurate risk assessment through better science), providing arguments for retaining existing clients, and opening doors to new clients that sales teams can follow up. In (re)insurance this can be more important than harvesting and protecting IP generated in collaborations.

The following list is of ways research scientists might provide support to their risk practitioner partner. These are mapped to the typology of impact (i.e. practitioner benefit) in Sect. 6.2.2 using square brackets e.g. [2] and include a brief commentary on how and why benefits emerge. Suggestions are not ranked as utility will be case specific.

- *Undertake a literature review* e.g. comprehensive review of what is known about risks in an emerging peril-region such as Africa [4]. This is a safe (i.e. low risk), early stage deliverable if included into funding bids. It will appear least like a burden to the academic if the subject is novel (i.e. publishable) and a likely impact (e.g. pending strategic decision) has been identified. It is time-efficient for the practitioner.
- *Deliver new research-based science* in the form of concepts or theories that can be implemented by the practitioner to operational advantage ahead of competitors, e.g. by engaging with the scientist in a co-designed project as the work progresses [1]. Feed-in could be by modifying a company's 'own view of risk', or by some adaption to their natural hazard risk process/model (e.g. catastrophe modelling). When exploring ideas or methodological improvements at the cutting-edge (i.e. higher-risk), collaboration can be a low cost alternative for a practitioner as if sufficient novelty exists a substantial fraction of the cost might be supportable through public funding.
- *Develop a spreadsheet-based 'decision support tool'* [1]. Although this is too basic for most (re)insurance users, it may be appropriate for some of their clients.
- *Provide training sessions* [3]. See list above.

John Hillier 14/11/18 22:10

Comment [49]: RIC8 – Before publication, we intend to add a link to an upcoming briefing note 'Funding Science for Natural Hazards Insurance' that we are currently finalizing.

John Hillier 13/11/18 15:18

Comment [50]: RIC26

John Hillier 21/11/18 13:01

Comment [51]: RIC6

- *Create software tool (e.g. in R-shiny)* associated with a statistical model developed during research [1,2,4]. Such accessible, interactive visualisations can raise awareness amongst internal management or external clients of saleable new functionality or product opportunities. Some practitioners encourage dissemination as supplementary material to a journal article.
- *Develop a simplistic exposure-based natural hazard risk model* (i.e. catastrophe model) of just sufficient complexity to illustrate a particular scientific insight (e.g. Royse et al., 2014). The rationale is similar to the software tool.
- *Provision of expert advice* to an internal/external committee or decision-making group, perhaps *ad hoc* input on the latest science [2,4,5]. This is time-effective for the practitioner, and aligns with the academic's interests (see above).
- *Contributions to business forums / conferences* (e.g. of RMS, AIR, Aon, Oasis) on co-designed work highlight a practitioner's engagement with the latest science [4,5].
- *Produce footprints for a catalogue of historical events* [1]. This is perhaps the easiest aspect of a catastrophe model for environmental scientists to contribute to. Other elements (e.g. vulnerability functions, stochastic event sets) either require sensitive data (i.e. claims) or to be fully benchmarked against business standards before they could be operationalised.
- *Invite the practitioner to give a guest lecture (e.g. to undergraduates), seminar, or training* [5]. A potentially enjoyable experience, an opportunity to discuss collaboration possibilities, and provides contact with students (e.g. PhD) who may apply for jobs with the company in future.

20 These lists are not, and do not attempt to be, exhaustive (e.g. *short placements* of ≤ 1 week). The key is open, honest and continual interaction based on an appreciation of motives, which may help to bridge frustrating gaps. Currently, provision of hazard footprints illustrates this; business asserts a need for accessibility (e.g. on OasisHub) in a business data format, and yet it is difficult for a researcher to prioritise doing this on only the speculation that impact may happen. With concrete and specific plans for creating and collecting detailed evidence of impact in place within the insurer, the academic may readily see the value in sacrificing research to do the work. Alternatively, a brief session to advise a consultant paid to undertake the work may be all that can be justified (e.g. see Moulin, 2018: p47) .

30 More widely we note workshops (e.g. Dixon et al., 2017), brokerage events (e.g. for funding calls), industrially funded initiatives (e.g. Willis' Research Network, JBA Trust), the use of distinct and separate middle people as translators/facilitators (e.g. consultants, NERC's KE Fellows), and institutional-scale university responses (e.g. 'Business Liaison Officers'). These might support engagement established and maintained at the individual level, but they sit along side rather than altering the findings of this work as ultimately they must be consistent with the motives of the individual academics whose 'core business' remains researching environmental science. We also note that longer (i.e. ≥ 1 week) placements for either party (i.e. academic or practitioner) may also be valuable but entail an extended absence from the

John Hillier 15/11/18 22:48
Comment [52]: Improved in response to RIC9

employer and work environment (e.g. as described in Sect. 5) and are thus out of scope of these collaboration-building recommendations as they are more substantial and costly undertakings (i.e. requiring buying out an academic's time) and will likely come later in a relationship. Similar applies to large UKRI funded initiatives (e.g. large grants, fellowships, Knowledge Transfer Partnerships).

6.3.1 Summary of pragmatic ways to nurture collaboration

A trusting long-term relationship is vital, but has to start somewhere. In brief, a mixture of short-term steps (<1 year) to initiate a relationship, building toward longer-term and more substantive targets and outputs (1-5 years), is suggested. The ideal is mutual-benefit at each stage; even if consultancy and giving advice are not what is ultimately critical to a university-based scientist (i.e. subject-leading publications), most are patient in developing towards this (e.g. industrial relationship and funding bids). The advice may act as a template, a basis to design guides in other industrial sectors.

7. International Applicability

Since (re)insurance businesses are typically multi-national, and academic motivations (e.g. funding, publications) are similar internationally, the advice on initiating collaborations is not UK specific as it only assumes a pre-existing motivation towards impact. Internationally, Australia's Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) exercise in 2018 (i.e. <http://www.arc.gov.au/era-2018>) is now partnered by an Engagement and Impact Assessment (EI, <http://www.arc.gov.au/engagement-and-impact-assessment>), providing a well-documented example of the growing weight given to impact in a number of economically developed countries. In terms of a conceptual model of the framework in which academics work (Sect. 6.2.3), all indications are that the UK is usefully representative. The Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey of 100 academics (2004 to 2012) (Teichler et al., 2013) describes a self-reported mean workload of ~48 h/w across 18 countries, remarkably consistent with the 45-50 h/w in the UK and in line with Australia, which is about mid-spectrum (Fig. 17 of Coates et al., 2009). With 65-89 % of university scientists, depending upon country, having a prime interest in research rather than teaching (Abreu et al., 2009; Cavalli and Moscati, 2010), the UK is also typical in this. The CAP survey (Teichler et al., 2013) also reported teaching as 38-46% of work hours, and ratios of research to teaching in a range of countries (e.g. UK, Finland, Portugal) are near parity. Furthermore, the literatures on motivation (D'Este and Perkmann, 2011; Freitas and Verspagen, 2017; Lam, 2011) and evaluation (Cadez et al., 2017; Grendon, 2008; Harland and Wald, 2018; Moya et al., 2015) from which our model developed are international (i.e. Netherlands, New Zealand, North America, Slovenia, Spain, UK). As such, we suggest that the conceptual model proposed in Sect. 6.2.3 has global applicability and transferability, or is at least a suitable basis for future discussion; a key variant will be the strength of the impact-career link. Our conceptual model's applicability may be limited as academic systems vary by country (Cavalli and Moscati, 2010; Coates et al., 2009). However, in general, tenure with its guaranteed job security (Adams, 2006) has declined

John Hillier 16/11/18 00:08

Comment [53]: To improve flow in the main text, and preventing the lower availability of data outside the UK weakening the UK analysis, consideration of the international applicability of the study has been set in a separate section.

R1C2 and R2C2.

This allows the international case to be better made as it is more self-contained - R3C3b.

(e.g. in the USA), or been eliminated entirely (e.g. UK) (Finkelstein, 2010; Huisman et al., 2002). In Germany a job-for-life remains, but since the 1980s in the UK and Netherlands, university staff are employed by their institution and not the state (Enders, 2015). This opens up [many international](#) research scientists to a much greater steer by appraisals (e.g. Costa and Olivera, 2012; Su and Baird, 2017) and via promotion criteria.

The need to juggle R, T and L/A demands has been reported for Australian institutions (Coates et al., 2009; Lazarsfeld-Jensen and Morgan, 2009). Interestingly, Australian Professors work 52.2 h/w, more than SLs at 46.4 h/w with the difference made up by research. In other words, with other things (i.e. T, L/A) non-optional, a stronger staff profile appears to be created by working more hours to do research (Coates et al., 2009), [although this is likely detrimental to academics and institutions](#) (Lazarsfeld-Jensen and Morgan, 2009); e.g. 100% of 91 Australian academics reported working weekends, 43% of these in the 37-48 weekend per year bracket. [So Australia is perhaps an even more extreme example than the UK. A number of co-authors](#) have worked as academics in other countries (e.g. Germany, South Africa, USA), and all work closely and openly with international collaborators. [Their experience supports the view that academic behaviours are](#) similar outside the UK, except that institutional pressure for impact is usually lower; however, such pressures are developing (e.g. in Australia, Germany). [So, this paper may be of interest in understanding the trajectory of the academic environment in a number of nations.](#)

8. A final comment: evidence of impact in practice

This paper in itself provides an illustration of the practicalities involved in creating benefit for an academic via evidence-based impact; even if you do change behaviour after reading it, no feedback into items of concrete value to the academic co-authors (i.e. appraisal, REF Impact case study) is possible without evidence. And, how will the university-based scientist find out if they are not told? Please remember that *Raising Awareness* is classed as impact (Reed, 2018) (Sect. 6.2.2), and even a 1-2 line e-mail to the authors (j.hillier@lboro.ac.uk) noting this and potential plans (e.g. *'I might now consider using an academic for internal training'*) would class as evidence.

9. Conclusions

[Based on an innovative mixed-methods approach, and using an original empirical dataset,](#) the main findings of this work are about the nature of the severe challenge posed by the heavily time-constrained culture of today's universities. [Specifically, exactly how individual scientist's workload \(i.e. specified tasks\) and incentive structures \(i.e. assessment criteria\) may act as a key barrier to university-business collaboration. Two initial conclusions are that](#)

John Hillier 27/11/18 07:49

Comment [54]: R3C3c – Added citations where appropriate.

- Amid a raft of 20-50 key duties, typical full-time university-based scientists may be able to free up to 0.5 days/week for work with practitioners (i.e. impact activities) in sectors such as (re)insurance.
- Given the time limitations on both parties (e.g. academics and practitioners), it is necessary to establish coping strategies and determine pragmatic steps to secure initial traction and to build a relationship.

5 Insights are also obtained into why academics' motivations arise and what governs their relative dominance, and into how exactly time constraints manifest themselves in academics' behaviours in the presence of impact requirements. Importantly, a tension is shown to typically exist between exciting curiosity-driven opportunities in university-business collaboration, and workload. Thus, to justify the time to collaborate with business, the work must inspire curiosity and facilitate future cutting-edge and world class science in order to mitigate the conflict with an academic's overriding imperative to publish. It must also provide evidence of real-world changes, and ideally other reportable outcomes (e.g. official status as an insurer's advisor), to feed back into the scientist's performance appraisals. It is therefore important to focus and formulate questions that are precise enough for the scientist to be able to answer, and intriguing and novel enough for scientists to want to prioritise answering them.

10 New understanding is encapsulated in an improved conceptual model (Fig. 4) of the inter-relationships between day-to-day key duties, performance assessment, and longer-term motivations and aspirations in an academic job. The main developments of this are

- Inclusion of impact into a tensioned relationship, i.e. building on models that only considered a teaching-research dipole.
- In addition to career (a.k.a. 'ribbon' (Lam, 2011)), desire to work with business and be useful (i.e. 'utility') and to aid society (i.e. 'altruism') are identified as intrinsic drivers for undertaking impact-related work.
- Using the data to integrate separate literatures on academic motivation and evaluation, the utility of which is that it sheds light on why these motivations arise and the relative magnitude of their influence on academic behaviour.

15
20 Finally, we have shown that a variety of pragmatic short-term (<1 year) steps can be proposed for *a la carte* use to initiate and nurture a relationship. Based upon the understandings gained from the analysis, explanation is provided as to how these mitigate the dis-incentives within today's academic environment, align with business needs, and contain the potential for mutual benefit at each stage. These are designed to build toward longer-term and more substantive targets and outputs (1-5 years), with detail specific to environmental scientists and risk practitioners provided.

25 More widely, the discussion provides a window into the motives of university-based research scientists that, in addition to practitioners, will be highly relevant to a number of academic colleagues, university administrators and policy makers. The

John Hillier 16/11/18 02:19

Comment [55]: R2 – Clear reference back to novelty (i.e. research gaps) identified in the introduction.

[model and recommendations are](#) derived from UK data but [are likely of interest internationally](#) (e.g. Australia, Europe), [although this is a question](#) for future study.

Data availability

5 Metadata (e.g. web links) for the 20 sets of documents for UK job specifications and promotion criteria are given in Supplementary Material, but are not supplied for copyright reasons. Personal data for the KEN participants is not provided or retained, but derived data are given within the manuscript (i.e. Table 1) or as supplementary material i.e. for the word clouds (Figs. 1,2).

Author contributions

10 JH designed the study, led data collection and undertook initial drafting of the manuscript. All authors contributed observational, experience-based data about academics' behaviour and/or [\(re\)insurance-based practice](#), and to the writing of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

15 JH was funded by NERC grant NE/R003297/1. We thank the attendees at NERC's KEN workshop in June 2018 for participating. [Prof. Mark Reed's](#) comments much improved an early version of this manuscript, as did [Dr James Esson's](#) on a later version. [We are grateful to Dr Richard Westaway and Prof. Anson Mackay for their thoughtful and constructive reviews of this work.](#)

20

References

- Abreu, M., Grinevich, V., Hughes, A. and Kitson, M.: Knowledge Exchange between academics and the business, public and third sectors, https://www.jbs.cam.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/centre-for-business-research/downloads/special-reports/specialreport-knowledgeexchangeacademics.pdf, 2009.
- 5 Adams, M. L.: The quest for tenure: Job security and academic freedom, *Cathol. Univers. Law Rev.*, 5(1), 67–97, 2006.
- Amabile, T., Patterson, M., Mueller, C., Wojcik, J., Odomirok, P. W., Marsh, M. and Kramor, S. J.: Academic practitioner collaboration in management research: a case of cross-profession collaboration, *Acad. Manag. J.*, 44(2), 418–431, 2001.
- Amsterdamska, O.: Book Review: Surely You Are Joking, Monsieur Latour!, *Sci. Technol. Human Values*, 15(4), 495–504, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/016224399001500407>, 1990.
- 10 Arnold, I. J. M.: Course level and the relationship between research productivity and teaching effectiveness, *J. Econ. Educ.*, 39(4), 307–321, 2008.
- Bercovitz, J. and Feldman, M.: Entrepreneurial universities and technology transfer: A conceptual framework for understanding knowledge-based economic development, *J. Technol. Transf.*, 31(1), 175–188, 2006.
- Bostrom, M., Lidskog, R. and Uggla, Y.: A reflexive look at reflexivity in environmental sociology, *Environ. Sociol.*, 3(1), 6–16, 2017.
- 15 Bothwell, E.: Work-life balance survey 2018: long hours take their toll on academics, *Times High. Education* [online] Available from: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/work-life-balance-survey-2018-long-hours-take-their-toll-academics> (Accessed 6 July 2018), 2018.
- Broch, L., Rasilla del Moral, I., Ajoha, R., Afonso, A., Ianni, A., Walker, N. and Muttarak, R.: United Kingdom, Academic Career Structure, [online] Available from: <https://www.eui.eu/ProgrammesAndFellowships/AcademicCareersObservatory/AcademicCareersbyCountry/UnitedKingdom> (Accessed 20 May 2018), 2017.
- 20 Cadez, S., Dimoviski, V. and Groff, M. Z.: Research, teaching and performance evaluation in academia: the salience of quality, *Stud. High. Educ.*, 42(8), 1455–1473, doi:10.1080/03075079.2015.1104659, 2017.
- 25 Cantisani, A.: Technological innovation processes revisited, *Technovation*, 26, 1294–1301, 2006.
- Carayol, N.: Objectives, agreements and matching in science-industry collaborations: Reassembling the pieces of the puzzle, *Res. Policy*, 32(6), 887–908, 2003.
- Cavalli, A. and Moscati, R.: Academic Systems and Professional Conditions in Five European Countries, *Eur. Rev.*, 18(S1), S35–S53, 2010.
- 30 Coates, H., Dobson, I., Edwards, D., Friedman, T., Goedegebuure, L. and Meek, L.: The attractiveness of the Australian academic profession: a comparative analysis, Melbourne, Vic. LH Martin Institute, Univ. Melb. Aust. Coun. Educ. Res. Educ. Policy Institute., pp39 [online] Available from: <http://hdl.handle.net/11343/28921> (Accessed 25 May 2018), 2009.
- Collette, A., Leith, N., Daniel, V., Bellone, E. and Nolan, D. S.: Using Mesoscale Simulations to Train Statistical Models of

- Tropical Cyclone Intensity over Land, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 138, 2058–2071, doi:10.1175/2010MWR3079.1, 2010.
- Costa, B. E. and Olivera, M. D.: A multicriteria decision analysis model for faculty evaluation, *Omega*, 40(4), 424–436, doi:10.1016/j.omega.2011.08.006, 2012.
- D’Este, P. and Patel, P.: University-industry linkages in the UK: What are the factors determining the variety of interactions with industry?, *Res. Policy*, 36(9), 1295–1313, 2007.
- D’Este, P. and Perkmann, M.: Why do academics engage with industry? The entrepreneurial university and individual motivations, *J. Technol. Transf.*, 36, 316–339, 2011.
- Denscombe, M.: *The Good Research Guide: For Small-Scale Social Research Projects*, 4th ed., Open University Press., 2010.
- 10 Dixon, R., Souch, C. and Whitaker, D.: European windstorm: Needs of the insurance industry, in <http://www.stormworkshops.org/workshop2017.html>, Reading, UK. 21-23 June 2017., 2017.
- Dowling, D. A.: *The Dowling Review of Business-University Research Collaborations.*, 2015.
- Drexl, J.: Designing competitive markets for industrial data - between proprietisation and access, *Max Planck Inst. Innov. Compet. Res. Pap. No. 16-13*, 2016.
- 15 Dutta, S., Lanvin, B. and Wunsch-Vincent, S.: *The Global Innovation Index 2016: Winning with Global Innovation*, <https://www.globalinnovationindex.org/userfiles/file/reportpdf/gii-full-report-2016-v1.pdf>, 2017.
- Enders, J.: Explainer: how Europe does academic tenure, *Conversat.* [online] Available from: <https://theconversation.com/explainer-how-europe-does-academic-tenure-43362> (Accessed 28 May 2018), 2015.
- Etzkowitz, H.: Research groups as “quasi-firms”: The invention of the entrepreneurial university, *Res. Policy*, 32(1), 109–
- 20 121, 2003.
- Evans, D.: Academics do want to engage with business, but need more support, *Conversat.*, 2016.
- Feller, I.: Universities as engines of R&D-based economic growth: They think they can, *Res. Policy*, 19(4), 335–348, 1990.
- Finkelstein, M. J.: Diversification in the Academic Workforce: The Case of the US and Implications for Europe, *Eur. Rev.*, 18(S1), S141–S156, 2010.
- 25 Fish, R. and Saratsi, E.: *Naturally Speaking... A Public Dialogue on the UK National Ecosystem Assessment. Final Report.* CRPR., University of Exeter, Exeter, UK., 2015.
- Florida, R. and Cohen, W. M.: Engine or infrastructure? The university role in economic development, in *Industrializing knowledge: University-industry links in Japan and the United States*, pp. 589–610, MIT Press, Cambridge., 1999.
- Freitas, I. M. B. and Verspagen, B.: The motivations, institutions and organization of university-industry collaborations in
- 30 the Netherlands, *J. Evol. Econ.*, 27, 379–412, 2017.
- Gendron, Y.: Constituting the academic performer, *Eur. Account. Rev.*, 17(1), 97–127, 2008.
- Goff, F.: *NERC Impact Report*, , 32, 2015.
- Grendon, Y.: Constituting the Academic Performer: The Spectre of Superficiality and Stagnation in Academia, *Eur. Account. Rev.*, 17(1), 273–278, 2008.

- Grimple, C. and Fier, H.: Informal university technology transfer: A comparison between the United States and Germany, *J. Technol. Transf.*, 35(6), 637–650, doi:10.1007/s10961-009-9140-4, 2010.
- Harland, T. and Wald, N.: Vanilla teaching as a rational choice: the impact of research and compliance on teacher development, *Teach. High. Educ.*, 23(4), 419–434, doi:10.1080/13562517.2017.1395408, 2018.
- 5 Hattie, J. and Marsh, H. W.: *The Relationship Between Research and Teaching: A Meta- Analysis*, *Rev. Educ. Res.*, 66(4), 507–542, 1996.
- HEFCE: REF 2014: Key facts, [online] Available from: <http://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/pubs/keyfacts/> (Accessed 28 May 2018), 2015.
- HESA: Higher Education Staff Statistics, 2018.
- 10 Hillier, J. K., Macdonald, N., Leckebusch, G. C. and Stavrinides, A.: Interactions between apparently primary weather-driven hazards and their cost, *Env. Res. Lett.*, 2015.
- Hughes, T., O'Regan, N. and Wornham, D.: The credibility issue: closing the academics/practitioner gap, *Strat. Chang.*, 17, 215–233, 2008.
- Huisman, J., de Weert, E. and Bartelse, J.: Academic Careers from a European Perspective, *J. High. Education*, 73(1), 141–160, 2002.
- 15 Jacobson, N., Butterill, D. and Goering, P.: Consulting as a strategy for knowledge transfer, *Milbank Q.*, 83(2), 299–321, 2005.
- Jordan, A. and Huitema, D.: Policy innovation in a changing climate: sources, patterns and effects, *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 29, 387–394, 2014.
- 20 KCC: 2017 Hurricane Season: Review and Analysis, KCC WHITE Pap. [online] Available from: <http://www.karenclarkandco.com/news/publications/> (Accessed 16 July 2018), 2018.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R. and Nixon, R.: *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*, Springer., 2013.
- Lam, A.: What motivates academic scientists to engage in research commercialization: 'Gold', 'ribbon' or 'puzzle'?, *Policy Res.*, 40, 1354–1368, 2011.
- 25 Lambert, R.: Lambert review of university-business collaboration, final report, HM Treasury, London, UK., 2003.
- Latour, B.: *How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*, Harvard University Press., 1987.
- Lazarsfeld-Jensen, A. and Morgan, K. A.: Overload: the role of work-volume escalation and micro-management of academic work patterns in loss of morale and collegiality at UWS: the way forward, ISBN 978-0-9806500-0-6, pp67 [online] Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269279442_Overload_the_role_of_work-volume_escalation_and_micro-management_of_academic_work_patterns_in_loss_of_morale_and_collegiality_at_UWS_the_way_forward (Accessed 28 May 2018), 2009.
- 30 Legislation: Education Reform Act 1988, ISBN 0 10 544088 4, pp302 [online] Available from:

- <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40/contents> (Accessed 25 May 2018), 1988.
- Lighthill Risk Network: Key Research Themes & Challenges, [online] Available from: <https://lighthillrisknetwork.org/research-priorities/> (Accessed 28 May 2018), 2016.
- Link, A. N., Siegel, D. S. and Bozeman, B.: An empirical analysis of the propensity of academics to engage in informal university technology transfer, *Ind. Corp. Chang.*, 16(4), 641–655, 2007.
- De Luca, P., Hillier, J. K., Wilby, R. L., Quinn, N. W. and Harrigan, S.: Extreme multi-basin flooding linked with extra-tropical cyclones, *Env. Res. Lett.*, 2017.
- McAreevey, R.: Getting Close to the Action: The Micro-Politics of Rural Development, *Sociol. Ruralis*, 46(2), 85–103, 2006.
- 10 McMillan Group: University Knowledge Exchange (KE) Framework: good practice in technology transfer, Rep. to UK High. Educ. Sect. HEFCE [online] Available from: http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/27123/1/2016_ketech.pdf (Accessed 9 July 2018), 2016.
- Mitchell-Wallace, K., Jones, M., Hillier, J. K. and Foote, M.: *Natural Catastrophe Risk Management and Modelling: A Practitioner's Guide*, Wiley, Oxford, UK., 2017.
- 15 Morris, S., Pitt, R. and Manathunga, C.: Students' experiences of supervision in academic and industry settings: results of an Australian study, *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, 37(5), 619–636, doi:10.1080/02602938.2011.557715, 2011.
- Moulin, J.: Innovation-oriented cooperation of Research Infrastructures, ESFRI Scr. [online] Available from: http://www.esfri.eu/sites/default/files/u4/ESFRI_SCRIPTA_VOL3_INNO_single_page.pdf (Accessed 9 July 2018), 2018.
- Mowrey, D. C. and Nelson, R. R., Eds.: *Ivory tower and industrial innovation: University-industry technology before and after the Bayh-Doyle Act*, Stanford University Press, Stanford., 2004.
- 20 Moya, S., Prior, D. and Rodriguez-Perez., G.: Performance-based Incentives and the Behaviour of Accounting Academics: Responding to Changes, *Account. Educ.*, 24(3), 208–232, 2015.
- Olsen, M.: Exploring the relationship between money attitudes and Maslow's hierarchy of needs, *Int. J. Consum. Stud.*, 28(1), 83–92, 2004.
- 25 Owen-Smith, J.: From separate systems to a hybrid order: Accumulative advantage across public and private science at Research One universities, *Res. Policy*, 32(6), 1081–1104, 2003.
- Perkmann, M. and Walsh, K.: University-industry relationships and open innovation: Towards a research agenda., *Int. J. Manag. Rev.*, 9(4), 259–280, 2007.
- Von Peter, G., Von Dahlen, S. and Saxena, S.: *Unmitigated disasters new evidence on the macroeconomic cost of natural catastrophes.*, 2012.
- 30 Reed, M. S.: *The research impact handbook*, 2nd ed., 2018.
- Rogers, E. M.: *Diffusion of innovations*, 5th ed., Simon & Schuster, London, UK., 2003.
- Royse, K., Hillier, J. K., Wang, L., Lee, T. F., O'Neil, J., Kingdon, A. and Hughes, A.: The application of componentised modelling techniques to catastrophe model generation., *Environ. Model. Softw.*, 61, 65–77,

- doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.07.005, 2014.
- Scott, A., Carter, C., Hardman, M., Grayson, N. and Slayney, T.: Mainstreaming ecosystem science in spatial planning practice: Exploiting a hybrid opportunity space, *Land use policy*, 70, 232–246, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.10.002, 2018.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. L.: *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD., 1997.
- Stephan, P. E. and Levin, S. G.: *Striking the Mother Lode in Science: the Importance of Age, Place and Time.*, Oxford University Press., Oxford, UK., 1992.
- Stokes, D.: *Pasteurs Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*, Brookings Institution Press., 1997.
- Su, S. and Baird, K.: The association between performance appraisal systems, work-related attitudes and academic performance, *Financ. Acc. Man.*, 33, 356–372, doi:10.1111/faam.12128, 2017.
- Teichler, U., Arimoto, A. and Cummings, W. K.: *The Changing Academic Profession - Major Findings of a Comparative Survey*, Springer, London, UK., 2013.
- UKRI: Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund: for research and innovation, [online] Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/industrial-strategy-challenge-fund-joint-research-and-innovation> (Accessed 28 May 2018), 2017.
- UKRI: Global Challenges Research Fund, [online] Available from: <https://www.ukri.org/research/global-challenges-research-fund/> (Accessed 28 May 2018a), 2018.
- UKRI: RCUK Policy on Open Access and Supporting Guidance, [online] Available from: <https://www.ukri.org/funding/information-for-award-holders/open-access/open-access-policy/> (Accessed 9 July 2018b), 2018.
- Universities UK: *University funding explained*, Universities UK Publications, London, UK., 2016.
- Vitolo, R., Stephenson, D. S., Cook, I. and Mitchell-Wallace, K.: Serial clustering of intense European storms, *Meteorol. Zeitschrift*, 18(4), 411–424, doi:10.1127/0941-2948/2009/0393, 2009.
- Ward, V., House, A. and Hamer, S.: Developing a framework for transferring of knowledge into action: a thematic analysis of the literature, *J. Heal. Serv. Res. Policy*, 14(3), 156–164, 2009.
- Wikipedia: Academic ranks in the United Kingdom, [online] Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academic_ranks_in_the_United_Kingdom (Accessed 28 May 2018), 2018.

Table 1: Illustrative expectations (i.e. the duties) of a typical early- to mid-career UK academic, based on a thematic analysis. Numbers in brackets (e.g. [7]) indicate the number of occurrences within 10 job specifications. Square brackets [] are for analysis by the lead author, and curved brackets () from the workshop, which agree well (i.e. $R^2 = 0.77$). Grey text distinguishes items not in the majority of job specifications.

Category	Tasks
1. Research (2 days/week)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networking (e.g. internal to international), seminars, and unfunded initial studies to define and initiate potential projects [8] (9) • Preparing external funding bids, building multi-institutional teams including external stakeholders (e.g. insurers) [9] (10) • Competing for internal funding (e.g. for PhD students or pilot studies) [0] (1) • Management of any funded grants (e.g. finances, line management of researchers) [4] (4) • PhD supervision [7] (4) • Reviewing papers and funding bids written by others [2] (2) • Presenting at and organizing conferences (e.g. designing & implementing sessions) [5] (3) • <u>Own</u> hands-on research, including learning any new skills required and any associated reading of journal papers [10] (8) • Writing <u>own</u> (or co-authored) peer-reviewed journal articles [9] (9) • <u>Own</u> impact-related work [6] (3)
2. Teaching (2 days/week)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate large-group teaching in lectures, practicals, field classes etc including design and delivery of all material, maintenance of an electronic learning system and all student contact (e.g. discussions, e-mail queries, formative feedback). [10] (8) • Undergraduate skills-based tutorials, dissertation supervision, pastoral care and follow-up contact (e.g. job references) [7] (8) • Setting and marking of assessments (e.g. exams, fieldwork exercises) [8] (8) • Postgraduate level teaching, mirroring the undergraduate requirements. [7] (6) • Pedagogical research or self-reflection to innovate teaching delivery (e.g. creating simulation tools for interactive interludes during lectures) [8] (7) • Continuing Professional Development courses relating to teaching [3] (1)
3. <u>Leadership/</u> Administration (1 day/week)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As convener of taught modules, logistics (e.g. rooms, equipment, personnel). [5] (5) • Various contributions to departmental functions; illustratively, recruitment (e.g. open days), committees (e.g. teaching and learning, strategic planning), PhD student related (e.g. progress review and examination). [8] (8) • Sundry (e.g. appraisals, expenses) [2] (3) • Skills training (e.g. project management, recruitment skills) [3] (2) • Typically, also a significant administrative role (e.g. Admissions Tutor, Programme Coordinator, Health & Safety Officer) [9] (6)

Table 2: Indicative set of appraisal criteria for an early to mid-career research scientist based in a UK university, as distilled from promotion criteria to Senior Lecturer [in the context of co-authors and workshop participants' experience](#). Percentages indicate the relative occurrence of the categories as main headings within the [publically available promotion](#) criteria.

Category	Indicative examples
Research [100% i.e. 10 of 10 sets of criteria]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Role model of good practice in PhD supervision, with successful completions 2. Established international reputation 3. Evidence of a strong, independent research profile and programme (e.g. excellent and sustained record of publications) 4. Successful in securing external grant funding
Teaching [100%]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Fellow of the Higher Education Academy (i.e. attain teaching qualification) 6. High-quality and well-received delivery of stimulating and distinctive undergraduate and postgraduate level teaching, 7. Innovations in delivery, or leading in policy and practice, or strategic developments (e.g. to programmes)
Enterprise/Impact [30% i.e. 3 of 10]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Consultancy, or other income-generating work (e.g. starting a spin-off company, exploring atypical funding opportunities) 9. Engagement with the wider world (e.g. collaboration, media, policy) that has significant and demonstrable impact (e.g. suitable for a REF Impact Case Study).
Leadership/ Administration [100%]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Leading internally and developing leadership outside the institution 11. Sustained success and innovation within a significant managerial/administrative role