# Consultation on reporting collaborative doctoral provision

## Background

The [COLPROV](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eCOLPROV.html) field was originally specified for the C14051 Student record as a required field to capture cases ‘where the student has a funded (or partially funded) place as part of a Doctoral Training Partnership or Centre for Doctoral Training at the provider’. Following problems raised by HEPs regarding this field, it was made optional for C14051, and HESA led a working group to investigate and propose amendments, in time for the C15051 Student record. This group, comprised of staff from HE providers, Funding Councils, RCUK and HESA met once and has refined a proposal, which we are now consulting upon. At the core of the proposal is a revised purpose: *to capture all cases where there is a formal collaborative arrangement to provide doctoral education for a student or students*. This could include anything from a large Doctoral Training Partnership or Centre for Doctoral Training, to a student on a Knowledge Transfer Partnership, or a *co-tutelle du thèse* or other joint supervision agreement for a single student.

We have identified two scenarios which could include formal joint supervision:

1. **Concurrent collaboration or joint supervision**

This is where a student is being supervised by supervisors at more than one provider at the same time. Only one provider should be returning the student’s data.

1. **Sequential collaboration**

This is where a student starts with one provider, and then moves to a different provider to continue their studies. For example these could be student who study for a 1 year MRes followed by 3 year PhD, or those who join a collaborative PhD programme however the lead university is not determined until after year 1.

Each collaborative provision scenario requires a different approach to reporting in the HESA Student record.

Impacts on the Student record would be as follows:

1. **Concurrent collaboration or joint supervision.** This is where a student is being supervised by supervisors at more than one provider at the same time. Only one provider should be returning the student’s data.

All other fields and entities stay as they are.

Use the current [REFData.COLPROV](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eCOLPROV.html) field to record the other provider(s) involved in joint supervision (who are not returning the student).

Use the [REFData.UOAPCNT](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eUOAPCNT.html) to record the percentage of time in Units of Assessment.

Both of these fields will continue to sit on the [REFData entity](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eREFData.html).

Guidance is needed for the [COLPROV](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eCOLPROV.html) field to explain the coverage (i.e. *joint* supervision only, not specifically DTPs/DTCs).

The description of the REFData entity may be updated. It is not considered to be worthwhile to rename the REFData entity due to the unnecessary burden it would cause, however it is likely that this will be considered again during the next major review.

It is expected that the same provider will return the student for the duration of their studies (save for a formal transfer of provider), and providers will have checks in place to ensure that this is the case.

1. **Sequential collaboration.** This is where a student starts with one provider, and then moves to a different provider to continue their studies. For example these could be student who study for a 1 year MRes followed by 3 year PhD, or those who join a collaborative PhD programme however the lead university is not determined until after year 1.

Four new fields and one new valid entry.

This method would allow a provider to pass the reporting responsibilities on to another provider after their own involvement ceases – particularly in cases such as the 1+3 year examples.

An extra valid entry in [RSNEND](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eRSNEND.html) code, perhaps labelled something like “Transferred out due to collaborative supervision arrangements”.

Guidance needed for the use of this code – i.e. only for where the registration responsibilities of returning the student to HESA has been transferred. *No* other uses of this code are allowed. Would be validated to only apply to PGR students with [COURSEAIM](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eCOURSEAIM.html) = D00 ‘Doctorate degree that meets the criteria for a research-based higher degree’.

**Reporting for the first provider**

Two new fields: UKPRNTO and TRANSFERTODATE.

UKPRNTO field to record the UKPRN of the provider that the student is transferring to. This *must* be used with the new [RSNEND](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eRSNEND.html) code above.

A date field TRANSFERTODATE to record the date the transfer happened (clear guidance will be needed about exactly when this date needs to be, as it will need to align with the new field TRANSFERFROMDATE below).

These two fields are then used by the first provider, to indicate where a student has gone to, and therefore who is taking over the responsibility of reporting them.

**Reporting for the second provider**

Three new fields: UKPRNFROM, TRANSFERFROMDATE and PREVNUMHUS.

UKPRNFROM field (or similar name) to record which provider a student has come from. This should be returned in the first year that the student is reported by the second provider.

A date field TRANSFERFROMDATE to record the date the transfer happened (clear guidance will be needed about exactly when this date needs to be, as it will need to align with the new field TRANSFERTODATE above).

Statutory Customers have indicated they would like to see a new field to record the [NUMHUS](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eNUMHUS.html) used by the previous provider to act as a second check and allow validation where students switch mid-year.

These three fields are then used by the second provider, to indicate where a student has come from, and therefore indicate who they are taking over the responsibility of reporting them from.

**Further details, and impacts on other fields**

The above fields (UKPRNTO, UKPRNFROM, TRANSFERTODATE, TRANSFERFROMDATE and PREVNUMHUS) will sit on the Instance entity. Names might be slightly different, but they will do for now to demonstrate our proposal.

The coverage for all above (5 fields, one code in [RSNEND](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eRSNEND.html)) will be for PGR students only, as the [COLPROV](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eCOLPROV.html) field is.

They must be returned together, i.e. UKPRNTO with TRANSFERTODATE, and UKPRNFROM with both TRANSFERFROMDATE and PREVNUMHUS.

The [HUSID](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eHUSID.html) must be retained when a student moves provider, in order to facilitate linking.

Guidance is needed for the five new fields and new code to explain the use clearly. Guidance also needed on any [HUSID](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eHUSID.html) / [NUMHUS](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eNUMHUS.html) / Continuity guidance documents. Therefore most (if not all) guidance referring to DTPs and DTCs specifically should likely be removed, as this is probably causing confusion for providers.

[COMDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eCOMDATE.html) must also be consistent across both providers. Allowances would be made in Continuity validation to allow the second provider to report an instance with a [COMDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eCOMDATE.html) in a previous year.

An [Entry Profile](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eEntryProfile.html) will be required from the second provider. This is because HESA is not a signatory to the data sharing agreements between the providers, and so would not have assurance that allowing the second provider to see Entry Profile data from the first provider, would be in line with the requirements for fair processing under the Data Protection Act.

An [ENDDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eENDDATE.html) will have to be supplied by the first provider to close the instance and the new [RSNEND](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eRSNEND.html) code used to indicate that the student will now be reported by a different provider.

The first provider can close down the Instance for a student and interim awards can be made where required. If the award is delayed then the provider can keep returning the student as dormant until it is confirmed.

Note: this may mean that they won’t supply an [ENDDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eENDDATE.html) when passing responsibilities for reporting over to a new provider, as [ENDDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eENDDATE.html) should reflect when the award for PGR students is approved. Instead existence of UKPRNTO / TRANSFERTODATE should be used to identify these situations.

Otherwise we will need to allow the new [RSNEND](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eRSNEND.html) code to be returned without an [ENDDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eENDDATE.html).

[ENDDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eENDDATE.html) and TRANSFERTODATE would not need to be the same, though we expect in a number of cases they would be.

Validation would be added to ensure a student was only returned as dormant after a TRANSFERTODATE was submitted (and [MCDATE](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=14051&href=a%5e_%5eMCDATE.html) was before or equal to TRANSFERTODATE).

Guidance for closing down an Instance needs checking – these would need to refer to closing down of Instance at one provider instead.

If a student then moves again and returns to the first provider, the first provider could reopen the original instance, with the ‘handshake’ simply happening the other way around.

**General comments on these proposals**

We are considering having some kind of stand-alone ‘collaboration guidance’ document which is not field specific, to help providers understand the mechanics of this.

Reporting in this way means a provider could return both concurrent collaboration and sequential where needed. Also multiple moves (for sequential collaborating) could be recorded if needed. These should also work for non-standard years as well.

We are looking at new methods of validation for this.

The Funding Councils have indicated that these data are required and will be used to refine funding and reporting algorithms. The details of how these changes would work have not yet been confirmed. It has been agreed that cases where a student crosses country borders, will be included in these refined algorithms.

**Worked examples of the proposed new data items**

Below are a number of scenarios outlining the relationship between the data items at various stages of the collaborative programme. Please review the examples and consider whether these are workable and whether there are any potential issues that you anticipate. It would also be helpful to consider whether there are any pathways not covered by these scenarios.

There are also some general questions at the end of the worked examples for your consideration.

**Example 1 – concurrent supervision**

A student studies in a formal, collaborative arrangement where there is concurrent supervision. Poppleton University is providing the majority of supervision (70%) with Poppleton College responsible for the remaining 30%. The student is studying on a programme with a standard year structure (i.e. all activity is contained within the reporting period). There is no taught element to the course. The supervision responsibilities change in the second year with Poppleton College increasing their share.

As the example is illustrative only the first two years of the programme are included. Poppleton University would return the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | HUSID | NUMHUS | COMDATE | COURSEAIM | MODE | COLPROV (1) | REFUOA (1) | UOAPCNT (1) | COLPROV (2) | REFUOA (2) | UOAPCNT (2) |
| Year 1 | 1234567890123 | 1 | 1 August 2015 | D00 | 01 |  | 01 | 70 | 22222222 | 01 | 30 |
| Year 2 | 1234567890123 | 1 | 1 August 2015 | D00 | 01 |  | 01 | 60 | 22222222 | 01 | 40 |

Poppleton University is the lead provider and is responsible for reporting the student to HESA. Poppleton College would not return the student. The COLPROV (1) field is left blank as it is not necessary to report your own UKPRN. The UKPRN of Poppleton College is reported in the second occurrence of the COLPROV field.

If there was a split of 50/50 supervision of a student between two HE providers in the UK, then the providers involved would need to agree which one was reporting the student. If there was a split of 50/50 supervision with a HE provider in the UK and a HE provider overseas, or 50/50 supervision with a partner in industry, then the HE provider (in the UK) would need to return the student.

1. Poppleton College would not include this student in their HESA return and all activity would be reported by Poppleton University. Do you anticipate any problems with this treatment for example 1?

**Example 2 – concurrent supervision**

A student is studying on a PGR programme that will have joint supervision however in the first year all supervision is through Poppleton University. In the second year there is concurrent supervision and a formal arrangement between Poppleton University and Poppleton College to share supervision.

As the example is illustrative only the first two years of the programme are included. Poppleton University would return the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | HUSID | NUMHUS | COMDATE | COURSEAIM | MODE | COLPROV (1) | REFUOA (1) | UOAPCNT (1) | COLPROV (2) | REFUOA (2) | UOAPCNT (2) |
| Year 1 | 1234567890123 | 1 | 1 August 2015 | D00 | 01 |  | 01 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Year 2 | 1234567890123 | 1 | 1 August 2015 | D00 | 01 |  | 01 | 60 | 22222222 | 01 | 40 |

1. Poppleton College would not include this student in their HESA return and all activity would be reported by Poppleton University. Do you anticipate any problems with this treatment for example 2?

**Example 3 – concurrent supervision with a partner in industry**

A student is studying on a PGR programme, with Poppleton University, where there is concurrent supervision with a partner in industry (4003) for the second year.

As the example is illustrative only the first two years of the programme are included. Poppleton University would return the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | HUSID | NUMHUS | COMDATE | COURSEAIM | MODE | COLPROV (1) | REFUOA (1) | UOAPCNT (1) | COLPROV (2) | REFUOA (2) | UOAPCNT (2) |
| Year 1 | 1234567890123 | 1 | 1 August 2015 | D00 | 01 |  | 01 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Year 2 | 1234567890123 | 1 | 1 August 2015 | D00 | 01 |  | 01 | 60 | 4003 | 01 | 40 |

The concept of a Unit of Assessment is not applicable to industry partners (i.e. REFUOA (2) related to COLPROV (2) in the example above), therefore there are a couple of options here:

1. report the Units of Assessment which is most closely aligned with the student’s subject of study.
2. report no Units of Assessment for the industry partner.

The first of these approaches would apply where the student's supervisor is not currently employed by, or was not employed at the time of the most recent REF by, the reporting provider, or the student's supervisor was not allocated to a Unit of Assessment as despite being employed by the reporting provider at the time of the most recent REF, they were not eligible for selection. This would also include partnerships with HE providers overseas.

1. Do you anticipate any difficulties in completing the Units of Assessment field for an industry/HE overseas partner on this basis in example 3? Would you prefer to return Units of Assessments based on option 1 or 2?
2. Do providers have any difficulties getting hold of Units of Assessment data from partner providers?
3. Do you anticipate any other problems with this treatment for example 3?

**Example 4 – sequential collaboration**

A student studies their first year of a 1+3 course at Poppleton College (provider A, UKPRN: 22222222) before transferring to Poppleton University (provider B, UKPRN: 11111111) for the final 3 years to complete their PhD. The course years are contained within the HESA reporting period.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Provider | HUSID | NUMHUS | PREVNUMHUS  | COMDATE | COURSEAIM | MODE | ENDDATE | RSNEND | UKPRNTO | TRANSFER TO DATE | UKPRNFROM | TRANSFERFROM DATE | QUAL |
| Year 1  | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Aug 2015 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2  | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Aug 2015 | D00 | 63 | 1 Nov 2016 | NEW | 11111111 | 31 July 2016 |  |  | M01 |
| Year 2 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Aug 2015 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  | 22222222 | 31 July 2016 |  |
| Year 3 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Aug 2015 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 4 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Aug 2015 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 5 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Aug 2015 | D00 | 63 | 1 Dec 2018  | 01 |  |  |  |  | D00 |

1. Do you anticipate any problems with this treatment for example 4?
2. In the example above provider A has to return the student in the second year as dormant, as the interim award was awarded after the student finished studying. How often are interim awards like this delayed at providers?

**Example 5 – sequential collaboration**

A student studies their first year of a 1+3 course at Poppleton College (provider A) before transferring to Poppleton University (provider B) for the final 3 years to complete their PhD. The course years are **not** contained within the HESA reporting period.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Provider | HUSID | NUMHUS | PREVNUMHUS | COMDATE | COURSEAIM | MODE | STULOAD | ENDDATE | RSNEND | UKPRNTO | TRANSFER TO DATE | UKPRNFROM | TRANSFERFROM DATE | QUAL |
| Year 1  | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2  | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 40 | 1 July 2017 | NEW | 11111111 | 31 Dec 2016 |  |  | M01 |
| Year 2 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 60 |  |  |  |  | 22222222 | 31 Dec 2016 |  |
| Year 3 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 4 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 5 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 40 | 31 Apr 2020 | 01 |  |  |  |  | D00 |

As shown above, the Instance.STULOAD would be reduced in year 2 with each provider only reflecting the activity related to the students activity with them. Over the duration of the 4 years we would expect the STULOADs to sum to approximately 400 (or 4.0) in this example.

1. Do you anticipate any problems with this treatment for example 5?

**Example 6 – sequential collaboration**

A student studies for one year at Poppleton College (provider A) for the equivalent of an MRes before moving to Poppleton University (provider B) to complete their PhD. The student then takes a break in their studies during their third year of their four year programme. All bar the final year of study are non-standard and span HESA reporting years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Provider | HUSID | NUMHUS | PREV NUMHUS | COMDATE | COURSEAIM | MODE | MCDATE | ENDDATE | RSNEND | UKPRNTO | TRANSFER TO DATE | UKPRNFROM | TRANSFERFROM DATE | QUAL |
| Year 1  | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2  | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  | 1 July 2017 | NEW | 11111111 | 31 Dec 2016 |  |  | M01 |
| Year 2 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  | 22222222 | 31 Dec 2016 |  |
| Year 3 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 73 | 1 Jan 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 4 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 1 Jan 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 5 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 6 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  | 31 Apr 2021 | 01 |  |  |  |  | D00 |

Note: MCDATE is applicable for providers in England and Northern Ireland only.

1. Do you anticipate any problems with this approach for example 6?

**Example 7 – sequential collaboration**

A student studies for one year at Poppleton College (provider A) for the equivalent of an MRes before moving to Poppleton University (provider B) to complete their PhD. The student decides to take a break in their studies during after completing their first year with Poppleton College but before actively resuming study at Poppleton University. The student eventually resumes study in October 2017. Statutory Customers have indicated that the student should be reported by Poppleton University as a dormant student during the break in the student’s study.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Provider | HUSID | NUMHUS | PREV NUMS | COMDATE | COURSEAIM | MODE | ENDDATE | RSNEND | UKPRNTO | TRANSFER TO DATE | UKPRNFROM | TRANSFER FROM DATE | QUAL |
| Year 1 | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2  | A | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 1 July 2017 | NEW | 11111111 | 31 Dec 2016 |  |  | M01 |
| Year 2\* | B | 1234567890123 | 1 |  | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 63 |  |  |  |  | 22222222 | 31 Dec 2016 |  |
| Year 3 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 4 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 5 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 6 | B | 1234567890123 | 2 | 1 | 1 Jan 2016 | D00 | 01 | 31 Apr 2020 | 01 |  |  |  |  | D00 |

In the second year, the second provider would return the student as MODE = 63. They would not need to return the student as MODE = 73 and would also not need to return a MCDATE as the student has only just started with them. Validation relating to MCDATE will be revised to allow these specific circumstances (i.e. collaborating providers) to be returned (this is likely to identified be where UKPRNFROM and TRANSFERFROMDATE fields exist).

1. Do you anticipate any problems with this approach for example 7?

**Example 8**

Where provider A has funding from another provider (B) as part of a DTP arrangement but the students are registered with provider A we do not believe that this constitutes joint supervision and therefore would not be captured in the proposed new fields. This is not a franchise arrangement either so we do not believe it would have any impact on the TINST and PCOLAB fields. Assuming that there is no joint supervision then provider B’s role would not be reflected here.

**General questions for providers:**

1. How burdensome would it be for providers (who pick up students from others) to return the NUMHUS used by the first provider?
2. Would providers prefer to return an extra field with the previous NUMHUS (PREVNUMHUS), or return the same NUMHUS from the first provider in your NUMHUS field?
3. The examples above have currently been written to consider the 1+3 year programmes (examples 3 to 7) to be reported as one programme of study. However SFC would be content to consider these as two separate programmes and therefore two separate instances. This would require consideration and guidance for any cross-border collaborations if the reporting methods were different. We would welcome your views on this. Which method of reporting would providers prefer (particularly providers in Scotland)? Would it be preferable to maintain a common approach to data throughout all the administrations in the UK?
4. Are the any other scenarios with this type of reporting that we have not included above?
5. Does the proposed model risk affecting collaborative arrangements between partners?

Please select one: Yes / No

Please provide more details supporting your answer above.

1. Is the percentage split between supervisors: a) practical, b) a reasonable proxy for load?
2. What would be the overall impact of implementing these changes?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very high | High | Moderate | Low | Very low |
| What would be the overall benefit of making these changes?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What would be the overall effort involved in making these changes?  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. When would you anticipate being able to implement these changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | C15051 | C16051 |
| Concurrent collaboration or joint supervision |  |  |
| Sequential collaboration |  |  |

1. We would welcome any further comments you have on these proposals. Particularly any benefits from improved accuracy of data, and in terms of efforts, consider action of the likely timescales.

**Thank you for completing this consultation survey.**

**Your responses will help us to improve the Student record.**

**If you have any questions about this consultation, please email the Collections Development team at** **collectionsdevelopment@hesa.ac.uk****.**