Survey response for the United Kingdom

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for the United Kingdom to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at https://stip.oecd.org/resgov.

Contact:
Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org;
Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org.

Abbreviations and acronyms

BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
BIS	Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
CST	British Council for Science and Technology
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate Change
DEL	Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEFCW	Higher Education Funding Council for Wales
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
HMT	Her Majesty's Treasury
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
PSREs	Public Sector Research Establishments
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
RCUK	Research Councils UK
REF	Research Excellence Framework
SFC	Scottish Funding Council
SME	Small and medium-sized enterprise
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
UK	The United Kingdom

Survey of public research policy

Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the **scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations** for a) HEIs and b) PRIs?	a and b) In the United Kingdom, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy decides on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of project-based funding of research and innovation for HEIs and PRIs.
c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on **scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national importance**, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, etc.).	c) Missing answer.
(This question does not refer to who sets overall science, technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.)	d) *Changes over 2005-16* The Prior to 2016 the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills was in charge of setting these priorities. The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) have merged to form the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). The mandate of the newly created BEIS also includes energy agendas (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2 and B1).
d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)?	
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Responses A2 and B1.	

Q.1.2. Who allocates **institutional block funding** to a) HEIs and b) PRIs?
(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)

c) Who allocates **project-based funding** of research and/or innovation for HEIs and PRIs?
(Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.)

d) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)?
e) What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?

f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)?

a) Regional funding councils allocate institutional block funding to HEIs, that is, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) and the Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland (DEL) (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2015, pp. 111-117; Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, 2016; Department for Employment and Learning, 2016).

b) While most Public Research Institutions in the United Kingdom are incorporated in HEIs, separate Public Sector Research Establishments (PSREs) exist. They receive their institutional block funding by the Cabinet Office of the Government of the UK (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4

c) Project-based funding of research and/or innovation is provided by agency Innovate UK and seven government Research Councils; the councils' umbrella organisation is Research Councils UK (RCUK) (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2015, p. 111).

d) HEIs and PRIs can apply for European Union funding by the European Commission and the European Research Council.

e) Missing answer.

f) Innovate UK (which is the operating name for Technology Strategy Board) is an independent body since 2007. Before it was part of the former Department of Trade and Industry. Innovate UK reports to the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS).

References:
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response C4.
Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (2015), Performance-based funding and performance agreements in fourteen higher education systems, Enschede, pp. 111-117. Available at: http://www.utwente.nl/cheps (Accessed: 18 October 2016).
Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (2016), Available at: https://www.hefcw.ac.uk/home/home.aspx (Accessed: 22 October 2016).
Department for Employment and Learning (DEL) (2016), Available at: https://www.delni.gov.uk/front (Accessed: 22 October 2016).

Q.1.3. Do **performance contracts** determine funding of a) HEIs?

Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)

b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?

c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?

d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?

e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?

f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?

g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?

h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs?

(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)

a) In the United Kingdom, models of public research funding for HEIs differ from region to region. Institutional funding for research is entirely performance based while the allocation of block grants for teaching is based on student numbers.

Scotland
In Scotland, performance contracts ("Outcome Agreements") exist. They are a three year contractual arrangement between the Scottish Funding Council and individual HEIs. Outcome agreements were introduced by the SFC in 2011. They set out what individual colleges and universities are expected to deliver in return for their funding from SFC.

b) They bind 50% of institutional funding of HEIs in Scotland.

c and d) The outcome agreements set annual targets about the priority areas which individual institutions will work on. In 2014–2015, there were four main areas in which institutions set targets:
– Opportunity: Admission targets for students from articulation routes; increase in participation in evening degree programmes; development of a contextual admission system for particular postcode area students; university-college collaboration projects for higher national diploma graduates; number of fully funded student places for students from specific target groups.
– Innovation: Relative research grant and contract income; share of UK competitive research council income; knowledge exchange in particular focal areas; use innovation vouchers for particular science to business collaborations; utilisation of European Structural Investment Funds to develop research capacity.
– Graduates employable and Enterprising: Number of first degree qualifiers; number of undergraduate entrants in STEM courses; development of an on-campus "employability and enterprise hub"; development of an employability award as part of an alumni mentoring programme; replace of master thesis by a work-based projects.
– Sustainable institutions: Operating surplus/deficit as share of total income; total university income; non-SFC income as share of total income; notional energy emissions per student full time equivalent (FTE); introduction of carbon management plan (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2015, pp. 120-122).

e and f) Missing answer

g) In the United Kingdom, institutional block funding is allocated under the Research Excellence Framework (REF). See response 1.3 for a discussion. REF was introduced in 2014 and replaced the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2015, p. 111; Home: REF 2014, 2016).

England
In England, funding of HEIs is not subject to performance agreements and there are no performance contracts (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2015, pp.111-113). Instead, the main tool for the government to steer research at universities are grants by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). The HEFCE block grant is allocated to HEIs on the basis of a mixture of formula and

specific allocations. The teaching part of this grant is driven by student numbers (and is currently reducing to a total of one-fifth of the historical level), while the research element is largely performance-driven (see description of the Research Excellence Framework above) (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2015, (p. 111).

h) The Research Excellence Framework (REF) replace the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in 2014.

References:
Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (2015), Performance-based funding and performance agreements in fourteen higher education systems. Enschede. pp.111-122. Available at: http://www.utwente.nl/cheps (Accessed: 18 October 2016).
Annual Tuition Fee Data for Full Time Courses at UK Institutions (2016). Available at: https://www.timeshighereducation.com/sites/default/files/Pictures/web/w/c/k/annual-tuition-fee-data-for-full-time-courses-at-uk-institutions-2013-2014-01.jpg (Accessed: 22 October 2016).
Research Excellence Framework 2014 (2016), Available at: http://www.ref.ac.uk/ (Accessed: 22 October 2016).

Q.1.4. Who decides on the following key **evaluation** criteria of HEIs and PRIs?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?

h) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs?

a to c) With regard to HEIs, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) sets criteria for evaluation and monitors performance of HEIs on behalf of all UK higher education funding bodies for block funding for research activities. Such evaluation procedures are part of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C6; Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2015, pp. 111-112).

d to f) The UK Government has an evaluation framework set by the Treasury to compare investment spending across a range of different government areas (the Green Book). Government also provides a range of guidance to support broader evaluation activities (the Magenta Book). The Treasury updated the Magenta and the Green Books in 2011 (HM Treasury, 2011; Great Britain and Treasury, 2003).

h) The Research Excellence Framework (REF) replace the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in 2014.

References:
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response B12_a;
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response C4.
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response C6;
Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (2015) Performance-based funding and performance agreements in fourteen higher education systems. Enschede, pp. 111-112, Available at: http://www.utwente.nl/cheps (Accessed: 18 October 2016).
Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (2015) Performance-based funding and performance agreements in fourteen higher education systems. Enschede. p. 113, Available at: http://www.utwente.nl/cheps (Accessed: 18 October 2016);
HEFCE (2016), REF Impact, website, Available at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/REFimpact/ (Accessed: 04 November 2016).
HM Treasury (2011), The Magenta Book: Guidance for Evaluation, p. 136, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/220542/magenta_book_combined.pdf (Accessed: 22 October 2016);
HM Treasury (2003), The Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government : Treasury Guidance. London: TSO, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/220541/green_book_complete.pdf (Accessed: 22 October 2016).

Q.1.5. Which **recent reforms** to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important?

Missing answer.

Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

Question	Response
Q.2.1. a) Is there a **Research and Innovation Council**, i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either? – provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports); – and/or oversee policy evaluation; – and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies); – and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines); – and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint cross-ministry preparation of budgetary allocations)? b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees? c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?	a and b) The British Council for Science and Technology (CST) is the main research and innovation council; it decides on policies supporting framework conditions of innovation. CST started its operations in 2005. It is a non-departmental (non-ministerial) public body that advises the Prime Minister on strategic science and technology policy issues through regular meetings (four times a year). Additional advisory services are provided through sub-groups. The Council's remit is to advise the Prime Minister on strategic science and technology policy issues that cut across the responsibilities of individual government departments, taking a medium to longer-term approach (Schwaag Serger, S., Wise, E. and Arnold, E., 2015, p. 53). c) Missing answer.
References: Schwaag Serger, S., Wise, E. and Arnold, E. (2015) National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance. Verket för innovationssystem – VINNOVA, p. 53, Available at: http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (Accessed: 19 October 2016). Council for Science and Technology (2010), 2005 Meeting Summaries, Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/content/20130705044602/http://www.bis.gov.uk/cst/business/meetings/2005-meeting-summaries (Accessed: 19 October 2016).	
Q.2.2. With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's **mandate** explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice?	a to e) The Council's mandate includes policy coordination, preparation of strategic priority setting and joint policy planning, evaluation of policy implementation, as well as provision of policy advice concerned institutions may or may not implement. Its main role is to advise the Prime Minister on the strategic policies and framework for: sustaining and developing science, engineering, technology and mathematics (STEM) in the UK, and promoting international co-operation in STEM; encouraging the practice and perception of STEM as an integral part of the culture of the UK; promoting excellence in STEM education; making more effective use of research and scientific advice in the development and delivery of policy and public services across government; promoting STEM-based innovation in business and the public services to promote the sustainable development of the UK economy, the health and quality of life of UK citizens, and global sustainable development (Council for Science and Technology, 2016).

References:
Schwaag Serger, S., Wise, E. and Arnold, E. (2015) National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance. Verket för innovationssystem – VINNOVA, p. 53, Available at: http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (Accessed: 19 October 2016).
Council for Science and Technology (2016), Terms of Reference, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/council-for-science-and-technology/about/terms-of-reference (Accessed: 19 October 2016).

Q.2.3. With reference to Q.2.1, **who formally participates** in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts	a to j) Government officials, funding agency representatives, local and regional government representatives, HEI representatives, PRI representatives, private sector, civil society and foreign experts formally participate in the Council. Background information The members of the Council are government officials, funding agency representatives, local and regional government representatives, HEI representatives, PRI representatives, private sector, civil society and foreign experts. They are appointed by the Prime Minister, in line with guidance from the Office of the Commissioner for Public Appointments. CST invites non-members to join sub-groups to advice on specific pieces of work.

References:
Schwaag Serger, S., Wise, E. and Arnold, E. (2015) National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance. Verket för innovationssystem – VINNOVA, p. 54, Available at: http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (Accessed: 19 October 2016).
Council for Science and Technology (2016), Membership, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/council-for-science-and-technology/about/membership (Accessed: 19 October 2016).

Q.2.4. With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) **staff** and/or its own b) **budget**? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available. c) From 2005-16, were any **reforms** made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period?	a) Missing answer. b) The Council does not have its own budget. c) Missing answer.

References:
Schwaag Serger, S., Wise, E. and Arnold, E. (2015) National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance. Verket för innovationssystem – VINNOVA, p. 54, Available at: http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (Accessed: 19 October 2016).

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral **STI strategy** or plan? b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan?	a and b) Our Plan for Growth: Science and Innovation (2014) is the main STI strategy in the UK (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response A2; Treasury, 2014, p. 5).
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response A2. HM Treasury (2014) Our Plan for Growth: Science and Innovation, p. 5, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/387780/PU1719_HMT_Science_.pdf (Accessed: 22 October 2016).	

Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?
 a) Specific themes and/or **societal challenges** (e.g. Industry 4.0; "green innovation"; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed?
 	
   – Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations, etc.)
   – Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0)
   – Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change)
   – Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science)
   – Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility)
   – Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development)
 b) Specific **scientific disciplines** and **technologies** (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?
 	
   – Agriculture and agricultural technologies
   – Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies)
   – Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies)
   – ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy)
   – Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems)
 c) Specific **regions** (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)
 d) **Supranational** or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)
 e) **Quantitative targets** for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)
 f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?
	a and b) Our Plan for Growth: Science and Innovation (2014) addresses the following specific themes and/or societal challenges (no order of preference): nurturing scientific talent; investing in our scientific infrastructure; supporting research; catalysing innovation; participating in global science and innovation (Treasury, 2014, p. 5).
	
	 Our Plan for Growth: Science and Innovation (2014) addresses the following specific scientific research, technologies and economic fields (no order of priority): big data and energy-efficient computing; satellites and commercial applications of space; robotics and autonomous system; synthetic biology; regenerative medicine; agri-science; advanced materials and nano-technology; energy and its storage (Treasury, 2014, p. 17).
	
	 c) With regard to the specific regions, the Smart Specialisation Strategy for England (2015) and the Smart Specialisation Advisory Hub and the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) design regional strategies (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response F3). The Smart Specialisation Strategy for England (2015) addresses the following specific scientific research, technologies and economic fields (no order of preference): aerospace; automotive; life sciences; offshore wind; oil and gas; nuclear; information economy; agri-tech; professional business services; and construction (Smart Specialisation in England, 2014, p. 2).
	
	 d and e) Missing answer.
	
	 f) The strategy "Our Plan for Growth: Science and Innovation" was introduced in 2014, the Smart Specialisation Strategy for England was introduced in 2015

References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Responses A2, F3. Smart Specialisation in England (2014). Publications, p. 2, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/436242/bis-15-310-smart-specialisation-in-england-submission-to-european-commission.pdf (Accessed: 22 October 2016). Treasury (2014) Our Plan for Growth: Science and Innovation, pp. 5 & 17, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/387780/PU1719_HMT_Science_.pdf (Accessed: 22 October 2016).	
Q.2.7. What **reforms** to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?	Missing answer.

Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies

Question	Response
Q.2.8. Does **inter-agency joint programming** contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy? *(Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.)*	In the EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, the UK stated that inter-agency programming is in place.
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response B6.	
Q.2.9. a) Is co-ordination within the **mandate of agencies**? b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period?	a and b) Missing answer.
Q.2.10. What **reforms** of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?	Missing answer.

Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

Question	Response
Q.3.1. a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in **Research and Innovation Councils**? *(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)* – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) – HEIs/PRIs and/or their associations b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in **council/governing boards of HEIs**? *(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)* – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations)	a) Representatives from private sector, civil society, HEIs and PRIs participate as formal members of the UK Council for Science and Technology taking part in the formulation of national STI priorities (Council for Science and Technology, 2016). b) Representatives from HEIs and PRIs participate as formal members of council/governing boards of HEIs taking part in the decisions on strategic issues informing thematic and scientific priorities of HEIs, e.g. the University of Cambridge (University of Cambridge, 2016) and the University of Oxford (University of Oxford, 2016).

References:
Schwaag Serger, S., Wise, E. and Arnold, E. (2015) National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance. Verket för innovationssystem – VINNOVA, p. 54, Available at: http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (Accessed: 19 October 2016).
Council for Science and Technology (2016), Membership, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/council-for-science-and-technology/about/membership (Accessed: 19 October 2016).
University Oxford (2016), Members of Council, Available at: http://www.council.ox.ac.uk/people (Accessed: 22 October 2016).
University of Cambridge (2016), Council Membership, Available at: https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/Pages/members-listing.aspx (Accessed: 22 October 2016).

Question	Response
Q.3.2. a) Are there **online consultation** platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. e.g. open data, open science)? c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?	a and b) There are numerous online consultation platforms in place in the United Kingdom and some of them deal with issues connected to the activities of HEIs and PRIs, e.g. the Scottish Government Consultation Hub (Citizen Space, 2016); apprenticeship standards (Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Citizen Space, 2016); schools that work for everyone (Department for Education Consultation Hub, Citizen Space, 2016); learning disability and autism (NHS England Consultation Hub, Citizen Space, 2016). c) Missing answer.

References:
Scottish Government Consultation Hub - Citizen Space (2016). Available at: https://consult.scotland.gov.uk/ (Accessed: 22 October 2016).
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy - Citizen Space (2016). Available at: https://beisgovuk.citizenspace.com/ (Accessed: 22 October 2016).
Department for Education Consultation Hub - Citizen Space (2016). Available at: https://consult.education.gov.uk/ (Accessed: 22 October 2016).
NHS England Consultation Hub - Citizen Space (2016). Available at: https://www.engage.england.nhs.uk/ (Accessed: 22 October 2016).

Question	Response
Q.3.3. Which **reforms** to consultation processes have proven particularly important?	Missing answer.

Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
Q.3.4. Who decides about **allocations of institutional block funding** for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? *(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)*	a and b) HEIs and PRIs themselves decide about allocations of institutional block funding to internal teaching, research and innovation activities.

References:

Data on institutional autonomy is based on a survey conducted by the European University Association between 2010 and 2011 across 26 European countries. The answers were provided by Secretaries General of national rectors' conferences and can be found in the report by the European University Association (Estermann et al., 2015).

Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association, p. 30. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016.

European University Association (2016). University Autonomy in Europe (Webpage). Retrieved from http://www.university-autonomy.eu/, accessed 19.09.2016.

Question	Response
Q.3.5. Who decides about **recruitment** of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? *(National/regional level: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)* Who decides about **salaries** of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs? *(National/regional level: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)* Who decides about **reassignments** and **promotions** of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs? *(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)*	a and b) In the United Kingdom, both HEIs and PRIs themselves decide about recruitment of academic staff (Estermann et al, 2011, p. 38; Further and Higher Education Act, 1992; Science and Technology Act, 1965). c and d) With regard to the decisions about salaries of academic staff at HEIs and PRIs, national guidelines exist but they are not binding and in practice salaries for most academic staff are set by the institutions themselves (Estermann et al, 2011, p. 41; Further and Higher Education Act, 1992; Science and Technology Act, 1965). e and f) With regard to the decisions about reassignments and promotions of academic staff at HEIs and PRIs, institutions are essentially free in this respect (Estermann et al, 2011, p. 42; Further and Higher Education Act, 1992; Science and Technology Act, 1965).

References:
Estermann et al (2011) University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard, pp. 38-42, retrieved from
http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2 (Accessed 19.09.2016)
Further and Higher Education Act (1992), retrieved from http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1992/13/contents (Accessed 17.10.2016)
Science and Technology Act (1965), retrieved from http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1965/4 (Accessed 08.10.2016)
European University Association (2016), EUA University Autonomy in Europe: United Kingdom, Available at:
http://www.university-autonomy.eu/countries/united-kingdom/ (Accessed: 19 October 2016)

Q.3.6. Who decides about the **creation of academic departments** (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. **technology transfer offices**) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? *(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)* Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g. **spin-offs**) and **industry partnerships** at c) HEIs and d) PRIs? *(National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)*	a and c) HEIs are free to decide about internal academic structures and the creation of legal entities and industry partnerships (European University Association, 2016; Estermann et al, 2011, p. 24). b and d) Missing information for PRIs.

References:
European University Association (2016), EUA University Autonomy in Europe: United Kingdom, Available at:
http://www.university-autonomy.eu/countries/united-kingdom/ (Accessed: 19 October 2016).
Estermann et al (2011) University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard, p. 24, retrieved from
http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2 (Accessed 19.09.2016)

Q.3.7. Who earns what **share of revenues** stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?
   – HEI
   – Research unit / laboratory within HEI
   – Researchers
 	
c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs?
	a) Institutions are free to set schemes themselves in line with the Lambert toolkit (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response F5; Lambert Toolkit, 2016).
	
	The shares vary greatly from institution to institution, e.g., Imperial College shares for revenues from IP as well as from other research services are as follows: For the first 50K researcher 75%, department 12.5%, and university (technology transfer office) 12.5%; between 50K and 200K researcher 50%, department 25.0%, and university (technology transfer office) 25.0%; over 250K researcher 25%, department 37.5%, and university 37.5% (Imperial College London, 2015). Regarding regulations, e.g., the University of Oxford allows 30 days a year for the holding of outside appointments and the conduct of outside work but approval by the head of the department is needed (University of Oxford, 2015).
	
	b) Missing answer.
	
	c) HEIs can decide themselves about student admission and student numbers since 2014 (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response H4).

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response F5.

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for the United Kingdom. Response H4.

University and business collaboration agreements: Lambert Toolkit (2016), Available at:
https://www.gov.uk/guidance/university-and-business-collaboration-agreements-lambert-toolkit#model-research-collaboration-agreements (Accessed: 22 October 2016).

University of Oxford (2015), Revenue Sharing from Licensing [web page], retrieved from http://isis-innovation.com/university-members/commercialising-technology/ip-patents-licenses/revenue-sharing-licensing/ (Accessed 17.10.2016)

Imperial College London (2015), Intellectual Property Policy, retrieved from http://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/research-and-innovation/research-office/public/College-IP-Policy-public-access-[pdf].pdf on 17.11.2015 (Accessed 17.11.2015)

Q.3.8. Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research?	Missing answer.