

Consultation on changes to the HE-BCI survey

Overview

This consultation seeks views on how HESA can ensure it has the data required to perform its functions, and how that data can be collected in a way that is proportionate. By 'proportionate' we mean that the requirements that we place on higher education (HE) providers are necessary to perform our functions under the [statutory frameworks](#) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/about/what-we-do>> we operate.

This consultation is the final set of change proposals created by HESA's [review](#) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/innovation/records/reviews/he-bci-major-review>> of the Higher Education – Business and Community Interactions (HE-BCI) survey. This review aims to improve the robustness of guidance and definitions, and modernise approaches to collecting data on existing concepts from the 2023/24 record onwards. As a part of this we are also proposing a one-off collection of a UK-wide Spin-out Census, in 2024 covering the period from 2012. We plan to issue a final report from the review and indicate future plans for our work on knowledge exchange data in July 2024.

The priority areas we have established for the HE-BCI review are as follows:

- Commercialisation
- Geographic granularity
- Social and cultural interactions
- Equality, diversity & inclusion (EDI)
- Staff and students as agents of knowledge exchange (KE).
- In-kind contributions

We have already pre-announced changes to [guidance relating to in-kind contributions](#) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/innovation/records/reviews/he-bci-major-review/consultations-data-experiments/in-kind-consultation-outcomes>>, following a previous consultation. The draft guidance relating to Table 1 is included in this document for completeness. This will be reiterated in a Notification of Changes to be issued after this consultation closes.

As part of the review we have conducted a variety of investigations. Review activity has included two evidence-gathering surveys and a previous consultation on in-kind contributions, data experiments, an academic seminar, development of a logical relational data model and participation in a wide range of other discussions and events. Input from the sector in these activities have been especially helpful to create a more informed collection design for consultation. This activity has led us to an appropriate point of closure for the review, which will be in July 2024.

We are grateful to our colleagues at the University Commercialisation and Innovation Policy Evidence Unit (UCI) at the University of Cambridge for their role in advising, critiquing, and offering design suggestions for the collection of commercialisation data, supported by Research England's national metrics development programme. We have also worked alongside our project board comprising our statutory customers that are the main users of the HE-BCI data in funding and regulation, to establish requirements and refine proposals. We thank all those who have contributed to and encouraged this work – any errors or gaps that remain are ours.

In line with feedback we have gathered over the review, we have made some specific proposals for enhancement of data gathering, driven by two factors. First the implications of some proposed definitional improvements would require a change in data collection approach. Second, we are responding to a desire and policy need among stakeholders for enhanced data regarding the commercialisation of IP, and particularly to improving data on spin-out companies. Again in line with feedback received to date, we have also focussed on improving guidance across the collection.

Purpose of the consultation

This consultation is to obtain feedback on the proposed approach(es) to changing the HE-BCI survey, and also the conduct of a one-off Spin-Out Census. They have been developed in collaboration with Research England, the Office for Students in England, the Department for the Economy in Northern Ireland, the Scottish Funding Council and the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales. Our primary focus is on the clarity and implementability of these proposals.

Through sharing your views, you will assist us in determining what information would be most appropriate to compile and make available, in order to be helpful to our statutory customers. Some of the proposals might create burdens of change in the short term, which lead to lower-burden data collection in future, as well as higher-value outputs – we are keen to gather your perceptions of burden so we can factor this in to our implementation, and pay due regard to reducing burden where we can. We are also particularly interested in finding out what would be helpful to HE providers when we come to publish data, as there is an opportunity to have formative input into the development of the proposed "spin-outs register" and other data products that could be usefully created from our proposals.

The information you provide will help us refine our proposals, and to issue a Notification of Changes detailing new requirements for data collection for the forthcoming HE-BCI data collections. Changes and implementation timescales will be published in early June 2024.

What is the timetable for this consultation?

This survey opens on 4 April 2024 and closes on 16 May 2024. Responses from the consultation will be considered by the review project board (comprised of our statutory customers) and HESA to form recommendations for changes to the metrics captured by the record, along with an implementation timetable. This information will be released as soon after the planned consultation closes as possible, currently planned for early June 2024, prior to the planned closure of the HE-BCI review in July 2024.

Please also note the proposed rapid timetable for conduct of the Spin-out Census, covered later in this document.

Responses will also be useful in the longer term for wider work where short-term changes to HE-BCI would not be appropriate at present.

Who should respond to this review?

All stakeholders are welcome to respond to this consultation, which is particularly focused on HE providers with KE activity. Since the proposals could affect current data collection and recording practices, we are particularly interested in receiving official whole-organisation views on these proposals.

Our goal is to improve the data to support policy analysis and development, and to support our statutory customers with data that meets their policy and funding needs. We are also aware of keen interest from researchers and practitioners for better data and evidence in KE to improve understanding of the health of innovation systems. The data design presented here is the result of a programme of design and development work. We are grateful to all those who have assisted us in this process. We are keen

to understand the implementability of the proposals for HE providers, to gather views on the balance of benefits and burdens in the proposal, and to hear perspectives on improvements that could be made to the proposals.

How to respond

Please submit a response via our [online consultation hub](#) </service-development/consultation-on-changes-to-the-he-bci-survey> . We can also accept responses in other formats. Email policyandresearch@hesa.ac.uk for details, or alternatively, call our Liaison team on 01242 388 531.

Data processing notice

Responses to this survey will be used to support the review of the HE-BCI survey, and will be used in analysis, documentation, and communications in connection with that activity.

We may share your survey responses with statutory customers, sector bodies, or other organisations involved in this activity, which in this case also includes staff in the University Commercialisation and Innovation Policy Evidence Unit at the University of Cambridge (UCI) (as national advisors to Research England). In such cases we will share your response together with the name of your organisation, however we will not disclose your name or email address to organisations we share responses with.

Please see our privacy notice for consultations at: <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/about/website/privacy#016> <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/about/website/privacy#016>

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name

2 What is your email address?

(Required)

3 What is your organisation?

(Required)

Please select only one item

- English provider
- Scottish provider
- Welsh provider
- Northern Irish provider
- Other organisation
- Sector group/body
- Not applicable

4 What is your organisation name?

(Required)

5 What is your job role within the organisation?

6 In what capacity are you responding to the survey?

Please select only one item

- To provide an official response on behalf of a higher education provider, organisations or representative group
- As a current, recent or prospective student or staff member at a higher education provider
- In an individual capacity as an associate or employee of a higher education provider, organisation or representative group
- In any other individual capacity
- Prefer not to say

7 Does your organisation currently submit to the Higher Education Business and Community Interaction survey?

Please select only one item

- Yes
- No

Introduction to the HE-BCI record

In our proposal, the introduction to the HE-BCI record has been revised to generally update the terms used. For example, we are now using the term 'provider' in full and examples have been more contemporary to make it clearly applicable to the current collection. The principal funding and related bodies references have also been clarified.

More detail has been added to the "Record specific detail" section. The rationale for inclusion of this section is as follows:

The current record specific detail section is limited and does not help to frame the purpose of or rationale for the survey.

HE-BCI is a data collection pertaining wholly to KE, but this is not stated clearly or defined in the current documentation. Inclusion of a definition offers users a better understanding of the purpose of the survey.

The definition of KE from the KE Concordat was the most commonly used definition by providers in our evidence gathering survey.

Providing this focus to the collection sets a reference standard for the type of information we might wish to include or exclude from the survey in future.

More detail has been added to the "Data collected" section, because it is good practice to specify at a high level the types of data to be found in the collection. This helps users who are new to the data to understand the scope and purpose of the record. The current approach saying it has a part B and A does not provide anything useful. The proposed summary gives an outline of the main conceptual areas collected in the survey.

1 of 2
Automatic Zoom

HE-BCI record 2023/24 – Introduction - Proposed

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

Context

1. The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) has been established to undertake data collection and analysis about higher education to provide consistent information about higher education throughout the UK. HESA is a co-regulated sector agency, providing statutory services for the four governments and related bodies of the UK, but owned and funded by higher education providers. For England these arrangements were enshrined in the Higher Education and Research Act 2017 with HESA appointed as the Designated Data Body (DDB).
2. HESA has the responsibility for integrating statistical data collection across all publicly funded higher education providers in Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England. The record has

8 To what extent do you agree with the proposals to change the introduction?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

9 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to the introduction.

Coverage of the HE-BCI record

In our proposal, the coverage of the HE-BCI record has been revised to generally update the terms used throughout the collection. For example, we are now using the term 'provider' in full and the definitions list has been alphabetised to make it easier to navigate (Other important terms that are used in only one table are defined in the guidance relating to that table).

Some of the general wording has been updated to make it more consistent across other HE-BCI guidance but also across terms used in other HESA records. For example "full economic costing" in the Finance record and "academic employment function" in the Staff record.

The definitions section of the Coverage statement has been revised for clarity, some points to note on these changes include:

Academic staff. This definition rests on an understanding that staff status "depends upon the existence of one or more contracts of employment between the HE provider and the individual and/or the liability of the HE provider to pay Class 1 National Insurance contributions for that individual (see the [HM Revenue and Customs website <http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/index.htm>](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/index.htm) for further guidance)." Links to definitions section of the Staff record have been added to support consistency between the HESA records.

Research. A link has been added to make it explicit that this is the HMRC definition (i.e. not Frascati).

SMEs. Although the EU definition is mentioned unattributed in part on gov.uk and in the Small Business Enterprise and Employment Act (2015) nowhere on the gov.uk estate offers a comprehensive explanation of the SME definition. We therefore propose remaining aligned to the EU's technical definition until such time as the UK government moves out of alignment. Links have been added, including to the user guide which thoroughly covers this ground.

1 of 7
Automatic Zoom

HE-BCI record 2023/24 - Coverage of the record – Proposed

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

- [Purpose of the Higher Education - Business and Community Interaction \(HE-BCI\) record](#)
- [Scope of the HE-BCI record](#)
- [Uniformity of returns and audit](#)
- [General guidance for the HE-BCI record](#)
- [Definitions](#)

1. The HE-BCI record is collected in line with statutory requirements from all HE providers in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, and in line with statutory requirements from all approved (fee cap) providers in England. These requirements are as detailed

10 To what extent do you agree with the proposals to change the coverage?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

11 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to coverage.

Table One

Proposals for a substantial update to guidance for Table 1 were made in a previous consultation on in-kind contributions to collaborative research. We announced the summary of responses and the decisions we made with our statutory customers about this, in September 2023. Aside from minor grammatical updates, the text presented here is a full implementation draft of the text that was decided following that consultation. Although presented for the first time here in its entirety as a complete guidance page to Table 1, there is no substantive difference between this text and the text we notified in September 2023. It is therefore presented for completeness and confirmation.

One consequential update has been made since, to update an example. Current example 1 under sub-head 1d has removed "e.g. lottery funding", because the National Lottery Heritage Fund and The National Lottery Community Fund can be returned as public funding, but the guidance referenced lottery funding being non-public.

1 of 11Automatic Zoom

HE-BCI record 2023/24 - General guidance on Table 1: Research related activities - Proposed

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

Table 1 provides analysis of collaborative and contract research.

Head 1: Collaborative research involving public funding

1. Income should be returned for research projects which have public sponsorship (grant in aid from a government or public body) to support research performed in collaboration with at least one other non-academic organisation (collaborator).
2. 'Collaborative research' must involve:
 - grant-in-aid from at least one public body, and

12 Please provide any information you wish to tell us about the changes to table one.

Table Two

In our proposal, the guidance for table two has been revised to generally update the terms used, for example, we are now using the term 'provider' instead of 'organisation', and paragraph numbers have been included for consistency with other guidance pages.

Head 1 guidance now clarifies that consultancy for other higher education providers to support their core mission of teaching and research should not be included.

Head 2 guidance has been restructured to make it clearer to understand.

Example 4 has been removed due to lack of clarity about how this is applicable. This has now been replaced with a new example.

Head 3 guidance has included a reference to our investigations of a range of policy issues surrounding degree apprenticeships.

We have removed the exclusion of Masters programmes in Head 3 from "Post-qualification CPD activity (e.g. programmes aimed at up-skilling healthcare professionals)".

This is due to examples of Masters programmes being presented which are only available to professionals in the industry as part of their entry requirements. (For examples, see: [Enhanced Professional Practice, MSc / PGDip / PGCert – Swansea University](https://www.swansea.ac.uk/postgraduate/taught/health-social-care/enhanced-professional-practice-msc-pgdip-pgcert/#entry-requirements=is-expanded) <https://www.swansea.ac.uk/postgraduate/taught/health-social-care/enhanced-professional-practice-msc-pgdip-pgcert/#entry-requirements=is-expanded> , [Advanced Practice in Health Care, MSc / PGDip - Swansea University](https://www.swansea.ac.uk/postgraduate/taught/health-social-care/advanced-practice-in-healthcare-msc-pgdip/#entry-requirements=is-expanded) <https://www.swansea.ac.uk/postgraduate/taught/health-social-care/advanced-practice-in-healthcare-msc-pgdip/#entry-requirements=is-expanded>).

1 of 7
Automatic Zoom

HE-BCI record 2023/24 - General guidance on Table 2: Business and community services - Proposed

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

1. Table 2 provides analysis of business and community services, with heads 1 to 3 focusing on the different areas of consultancy, facilities and equipment related services, and courses for business and the community.
2. The definition of an SME is given in the Coverage statement of this record.
3. Income for the use of the HE provider's consultancy services, facilities and equipment, and courses should be returned in this table, rather than income received for capital purchases such as equipment and facilities.

13 To what extent do you agree with the proposals to change table two?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

14 Please complete your provider’s burden assessment for changes table two.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to table two.

Table Three

The guidance for table three has been revised to generally update the terms used, for example, we are now using the term 'provider', acronyms have been written in full, and hyperlinks have been updated. Overall this page has been restructured for better understanding and flow of the guidance.

In paragraph two, we propose to change 'direct economic and social impact' to 'local growth'. Queries have been received where the regeneration field is viewed as a proxy for local growth, so we hope this resolves some confusion around socially beneficial projects.

In paragraph three, "regeneration income" has been amended to "regeneration funding" to be consistent with other terms, and the sentence expanded to address a query about which income to report (it should be the income received during the reporting period).

A new paragraph has been added to clarify that interactions between HE providers should not be reported here.

In paragraph 8, we have matched language used elsewhere in the guidance about the types of public funding that should not be included.

1 of 2
Automatic Zoom

HE-BCI record 2023/24 - General guidance on Table 3: Regeneration and development programmes - Proposed

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

1. Regeneration is a set of activities that reverse economic, social and physical decline in areas where market forces will not do this without support from government. ([DCLG, 2008, p6](#)).
2. Table 3 provides analysis of regeneration income. Regeneration funding is an important way for HE providers to invest intellectual assets in economic, physical and socially beneficial projects. HE-BCI counts regeneration as a proxy for local growth.
3. Regeneration funding should be returned as income received from the allocating body during the reporting period.
4. Only funding received for the purpose of regeneration (as defined in paragraph 1) that

16 To what extent do you agree with the proposals to change table three?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

17 Please complete your provider’s burden assessment for changes table three.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to table three.

Table Four

Our proposals around commercialisation are the only area where we are proposing a change to data collection practice – on spin-outs. Our core proposal is to assemble a national list of university spin-outs, to provide a recognised robust evidence base for these firms. This will serve a variety of needs, and we have evidence that it would be valued by a range of stakeholders. Many users purchase licenses to commercial databases, but these suffer from a variety of drawbacks, from opacity about their methodology and completeness, to cost barriers that limit their use. More light is needed on this important area of interactions between HE providers, businesses and the community. Our interactions indicate that there is a hunger to establish a resource that brings together data that the sector already holds in silos, and a willingness to support this effort.

An open resource published freely would better serve the sector's needs. There is already a well-formed policy need for this data in England by Research England to provide a [register of university spin-outs](https://www.ukri.org/publications/spinouts-review-implementation-of-the-government-response/) <<https://www.ukri.org/publications/spinouts-review-implementation-of-the-government-response/>> as described in the government response to the [independent review of university spin-outs](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-university-spin-out-companies) <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-university-spin-out-companies>> (discussed in more detail below), and we want to ensure a data resource is available to support policy in all nations of the UK. Our goal is therefore to gather comparable data across all home nations to provide a consistent basis for both sector and policy uses. Secondly, the national list would provide sufficient information to identify the firms in other databases, and the aim is to enable the production of higher quality spinout data than the estimations currently collected in HE-BCI.

Approach

Our proposed approach to this is in two parts: first an additional Spin-out Census data collection in summer 2024 to establish a common baseline and achieve a valuable data resource quickly (for which see the following section). This collection will provide information about currently active firms, which will be used to supplement future HE-BCI collections. Subject to investigations using the new data, we anticipate this might mean only new spin-outs would then need to be collected, with updates to all other active spin-outs then gathered from other data sources (timescale to be determined). However, it could be the case that the best approach is to collect complete information about new spin-outs, and also to collect updates for all other active spin-outs from HE providers. Under this latter scenario we are interested to understand HE providers' views on the optimal approach to collecting details in Head 5. In this table we could collect only new spin-outs, with updates to data on all other active spin-outs to be gathered in a similar but separate table. Alternatively, we could permit updates to data on all other active spin-outs to be submitted in addition to that for new spin-outs, in Head 5. Alternatively, we could require complete data for all active spin-outs to be returned, in addition to new ones in Head 5. If we did not collect updates for all active spin-outs in Head 5, we would likely need to present a similar manner of collection for this information, within the HE-BCI return.

Second a new Head 5 in Table 4(a) of HE-BCI that gathers item line data about spin-outs, in order to robustly identify them in wider datasets. This proposal for new data collection is not merely additive. Our aspiration is to use data from the new Head 5 to obviate the need for data collection in Heads 4(ai) and 4(aii), including the estimations, which we know to be a burdensome task. Subject to investigations using the data, these data items are expected to become unnecessary in future. We anticipate they could be phased out for the 2025/26 collection year, subject to the confirmation of an appropriate approach to data linking, alternative sources for data being made available, and any changes needed to outputs verified with users (including HE providers and our statutory customers). Until this point is reached, we will continue to collect aggregate data in Head 4.

This approach therefore aims to provide a significant reduction in data collection burden on HE providers, alongside an increase in data quality, by both reducing the number of types of spinout data to be collected and potentially aiming to remove the need to return the full population of active firms in every annual collection. It is our understanding that the variables proposed below for collection as part of this approach, are in many cases already collated and necessary to enable the return of data in the current HE-BCI approach.

In line with this change, we have re-written the guidance for Table 4 completely. Key changes are highlighted below.

Key changes

Table 4 now includes a far more precise set of definitions for the terms “spin-out” and “start-up” and related issues of ownership and coverage. We have clarified when public funding should and should not be returned. We have supplemented these improvements with a bank of new examples that implement these definitions. Our proposals now situate spin-outs in a more coherent framework than previously. We have drafted definitions in such a manner that they are inclusive of a wider variety of firms that are exploiting IP from research, regardless of disciplinary background, corporate form, or social purpose.

Nulls are now permitted in addition to figures on income from IP. We have more rigorously defined a spin-out, and made it easier to judge whether a firm should be categorised in this way. We have also defined the start of a spin-out as being the point of foundation, thereby taking into account the possibility that an already-registered company might become a spin-out by transferring-in IP. Other improved aspects of the definitions offered make it easier to determine the end of the spin-out, and how to treat changes to company structure. We have also clarified what we understand by the concept of “ownership” which is a factor that bears on coverage and categorisation in the record.

Shortcode: factbank

Factbank Title: Proposed new data items

Factbank Content:

In Head 5 (which has been split-out into a separate Table 4(a) for ease of presentation) we have introduced new data items within the following categories which will enable robust identification of specific firms:

Identification – up to seven data items to help identify the spinout unambiguously in other data sources. These variables are necessary for handling large numbers of spin-outs. We anticipate that the majority of spinouts will only require four data items to be submitted.

Typology – a single variable that enables the spin-out to be classified as a social enterprise.

Creation – the incorporation date (registration) and foundation date (when IP is transferred-in) of the spin-out. We appreciate these will not always be the same. These will help identify the spin-out in other data sources, and the foundation year in particular is important to ensure reasonable comparisons can be made between HE providers.

Origins – narrative information about the nature of the IP being exploited by the spin-out, which helps with making fair comparisons of spin-out performance and deal terms between sectors. We also seek data on the departmental background to the IP, to support comparisons and best practice.

Ownership during reporting year – these allow us to attempt a replication of the longstanding typology of spin-outs in HE-BCI, and also to develop a new typology, and understand key trends.

Additional notes and major milestones – helps us understand the reasons why a HE provider ceases to report a spin-out, and to identify firms with highly accelerated trajectories. Notes help us understand any unusual or notable features of the spin-out, where relevant. This aids fair comparison, and enables us to avoid misidentification in the case of spin-outs that relocate.

For completeness, we have deemed a number of data points to be highly valuable, but have rejected consulting on them at this stage, mainly from a desire to minimise any additional burden caused by these proposals. These include data on individual founders, including identifiers and personal characteristics that would enable better understanding of diversity, equality and inclusion in spin-outs; more detail on other collaborators from the HE sector; and information about the character of support provided to the spin-out by the HE provider. We may explore these further in the future development of the approach.

An issue has arisen around the treatment of know-how within the context of spin-outs. Know-how can be thought of as “information, skill or expertise (for example, processes, methods, techniques, drawings, data or a compilation) that is generally confidential and separate from proprietary intellectual property rights such as patents, copyright or design rights.” Know-how is not strictly a form of property in its own right, although it is often treated as a form of intellectual property. It may be more accurate to describe know-how as information (particularly technical information) that may be protected under the law of confidence. Know-how can arise in many forms and may be held by a particular person or company.

Given this, we propose that ventures should also be treated as spinouts in cases where they are built primarily around commercially exploiting know-how which has emerged from research originating within the HE provider, is legally protected, and where the university has the rights to exploit it.

Plans for dissemination

Our outline plans for dissemination are as follows. First, we believe the data proposed in the “identification”, “typology” and “creation” sections of Head 5 would be of widespread and generic value to a broad group of stakeholders, and we propose to incorporate most of it at item-line level alongside the UKPRN and some other provider-level information in a new table in our HE-BCI Open Data publication. Second, we anticipate that data drawn from the “origins”, “ownership during reporting year”, and “exit” sections of Head 5 is of a more sensitive character, and we would therefore only make such data available under licence for the purposes permitted in our agreements with providers (see “categories of onward use of data” within <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/support/provider-info> <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/support/provider-info>> for details).

In addition, there is also a third category of data which would be created or derived using data collected across multiple fields in Head 5 e.g. categorisations or typologies. We are unsure yet whether these would be classed as sensitive, as this depends on the nature of the input data. Nevertheless, sensitivities will be rigorously assessed before determining the appropriate means for disseminating. As a minimum, the entire dataset would be shared under licence with HESA’s statutory customers, and also to support research by UCI (as national advisors to Research England). A key objective is to support the creation of a “Spin-out Register” and sharing of sensitive categories of data under license is an essential element in achieving this.

We also anticipate a potential demand for some aspects of this data to be shared through Jisc’s Tailored Datasets and Heidi Plus services, and we are keen to understand provider attitudes to this. During the consultation period we will also be engaging with stakeholders directly to develop this approach, in addition to seeking information through your consultation responses.

1 of 15
Automatic Zoom

HE-BCI record 2023/24 - General guidance on Table 4: Intellectual property (IP) - Proposed

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

1. Table 4 provides more detailed analysis of intellectual property (IP), which the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) describes as “creations of the mind, such as inventions; literary and artistic works; designs; and symbols, names and images used in commerce.” Income from all IP agreements from all types of IP should be included in Table 4.
2. Disclosure is the point at which academic staff disclose their idea through a formal process with the prospect of seeking protection. It is good practice to record the date of disclosure

19 Do you agree that the definition of a spin-out given in the Table 4 guidance is clear and implementable?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

20 Are there any firms that you consider to be spin-outs, and which you believe you would be unable to report under the proposals? Please give specific examples and state your reasons.

21 Do you agree with the proposal that ventures should also be treated as spinouts in cases where they are built primarily around commercially exploiting know-how which has emerged from research originating within the HE provider, is legally protected, and where the university has the rights to exploit it?

Please select only one item

- Yes
- No

22 If you answered “No” in the previous question, please can you provide further details on why not?

23 For the collection of new and all other currently active spin-outs, would you regard it as optimal to:

Please select only one item

- Collect only complete information on new spin-outs in Head 5 of HE-BCI, and provide updates to information about other active spin-outs, where relevant, in another manner within HE-BCI
- Collect both complete information on new spin-outs and updates for other active spin-outs where relevant in Head 5 of HE-BCI
- Collect complete information about both new and all other active spin-outs in Head 5
- Something else

24 Please provide further detail on the reasons for your response to the previous question.

25 Do you agree with the general approach we outline for the dissemination of data?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

26 If you answered "Disagree" or "Strongly disagree" in the previous question, please can you provide further details on why not?

27 We are keen to avoid creating perverse incentives for HE providers to not return data on certain companies where the information is perceived to be sensitive or commercially confidential for a time. This would reduce data quality. Do you agree that the dissemination approach outlined above would be sufficient to allay most concerns on this point?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

28 Please give your reasons and contextual information for the previous answer if you have remaining concerns, and please suggest adaptations that we could make to increase confidence among HE providers in returning full data.

29 What further observations do you have on our outline dissemination approach? Please provide any insights that would help us make our outputs using this data valuable to you.

30 Please complete your provider’s burden assessment for changes table four.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to table four.

Spin-out Census data collection

Our proposed first stage to the new approach to collecting data about spin-outs comprises of a one-off spreadsheet-based exercise based on Table 4(a) Head 5 to produce a comprehensive list identifying spin-outs. This collection would cover all active spin-outs during the reference period 01-08-2012 to 31-07-2023, including those spin-outs that were founded and became inactive during the reference period. This time-period permits reasonable estimates of survival rates to be formed, and also ensures granular data precedes major events that we conjecture might have been disruptive to spin-out activity (for example, Covid-19). We will seek data from all publicly-funded HE providers in Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and all providers registered in the fee cap section of the OfS' register in England. Recognising that this collection may not be relevant to all HE providers in the constituency, those without spin-outs would be asked to confirm this through a brief formal "nil-return" process. A quick-start guide will be available to support providers, including what to do if the provider has no spin-outs. We will utilise the HESA Data Collection System and provide Liaison and Training support for this collection.

As mentioned above, the HE-BCI major review was named in the [Independent Review of University Spin-out Companies](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6549fcb23ff5770013a88131/independent_review_of_university_spin-out_companies.pdf) in November 2023. This Independent Review stated the need for "more data and transparency on spin-outs through a national register of spin-outs...", and recommended that HESA must "present solutions to improve the reliability of data on spin-outs" through the HE-BCI review. The UK government has [accepted](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/655e0bf7046ed400148b9e34/independent_review_of_university_spin-out_companies_government_response.pdf) these recommendations, highlighting HESA's plans to consult on the new data needed for a national register of university spin-outs. In addition, Research England's [implementation plan](https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/RE-220224-RE-CL-2024-02-SpinoutsReviewImplementationPlan.pdf) names HESA to request data for the national register by mid-2024.

We are therefore proposing a data collection to be conducted during summer 2024. This will enable data to be produced in time to meet the UK government's needs for analysis to support a "stock-take" of spin-outs. Although the proposed timescale for the Spin-outs Census data collection is relatively rapid to support the policy need, this has a number of advantages, in that it will still be shaped following consultation responses, and provides an opportunity to evaluate any collection difficulties with the adopted approach prior to implementation in HE-BCI. We have designed the approaches to work in harmony, so we are as far as possible avoiding duplication. By undertaking this activity separately we avoid making major systems changes for ourselves and HE providers that will apply for a single year only. We will also be in a position to create a valuable information resource rapidly to meet user needs. Data that we collect in the Spin-out Census can then be amended and added-to in future iterations of HE-BCI, reducing the on-going cost and burden of management in annual HE-BCI collections.

This list will be published as a new publicly-available Open Data resource comprising basic information about each university spin-out that allows it to be identified in other data sources, and therefore source further high quality spinout data whilst minimising data collection from HE providers. The list of spin-outs will be supplemented with analysis and research, with the following goals for publication over the coming months and years:

Information collected but not included in the Open Data to be used to create enhanced analysis and new modular data products that support a wide range of statutory customer needs. These include analysis of spin-out survival rates and the development of new ways to classify types of spin-out.

Independent estimation of current employment, current turnover, and external investment received for all active spin-out firms, with the goal of removing the burden of compiling this information from HE providers for HE-BCI.

To enrich and improve the published HE-BCI data over time using analysis of the non-Open spin-outs data and utilising linked data made possible by the spin-outs inventory.

To make available a sector-owned data source (including data items not part of the Spin-outs inventory, and enrichments based on research and experimental development of the data) under license terms through familiar dissemination channels and protocols managed by Jisc.

Directly supporting government policy with the data and evidence needed to support policy on spin-outs.

A sample spreadsheet collection instrument and associated draft guidance are available within this consultation.

The central information benefit of conducting this exercise and the collection of historic (no longer active) firms is that we will be able to produce a time-series of spin-out survival rates over the past decade. It responds to a pressing policy need in the immediate term and can be updated over time, forming a powerful ongoing evidence base for policymakers.

Our approach to data collection in the Spin-out Census uses the same revised definition of a spin-out as in the proposals for Table 4.

Approaches to data collection delivery

We have considered a number of options to approaching the collection of this data, with Option 1 being our proposed approach. However, for completeness in demonstrating our development work to date, we have set out alternative Options 2 and 3, and a discounted Option 4.

In developing these options we have considered what we know about the likely burdens on HE providers. Although our new definition of spin-outs is wider than the old definitions for spin-offs (both those with some HE provider ownership and formal spin-offs, not HE provider-owned) they are close enough that we can use already-submitted data on spin-offs as a general guide to the volume of data we anticipate the Spin-out Census will capture. Analysis of HESA's [Open Data](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/business-community/ip-and-startups) indicates that we should expect to collect between 4,000 and 5,000 lines of data in total across the whole UK-wide dataset. The dataset is very right-skewed: on the one hand a majority of HE providers are likely to have no or a handful of spin-outs, while on the other hand a small number of HE providers have likely generated the large majority of spin-outs. Of the 223 HE providers we anticipate asking to return data, slightly more than half are likely to be in a position to submit a "nil return" as they probably do not have spin-outs. We expect around 40 HE providers to return more than 25 lines of data, with around 11 of these returning more than 100 lines. We expect the remaining 70 or so providers to be asked to return between one and 25 lines of data. While we do not underestimate the cost involved for provider staff engaging with, investigating and assembling this dataset, we anticipate the above numbers offer some reassurance about the relatively small scale of the dataset we are assembling overall, and the varying materiality of the request for providers with different levels of spin-out activity.

UKPRN
 Provider name
 Submission date
 Submissions number

Spin-out Census C22036 collection instrument <user_uploads/k-1.-spin-out-census-c22036-collection-instrument.xlsx>

Shortcode: factbank

Factbank Title: Option 1

Factbank Content:

In Option 1 the proposed data items in the Spin-out Census data collection incorporate most of the same data items as in Table 4(a) Head 5:

Identification - up to seven data items to help identify the spin-out unambiguously in other data sources. These variables are necessary for handling large numbers of spin-outs. We anticipate that the majority of spin-outs will only require four data items to be submitted.

Typology - a single variable that enables the spin-out to be classified as a social enterprise.

Creation – the incorporation date (registration) and foundation date (when IP is transferred-in) of the spin-out. We appreciate these will not always be the same. These will help identify the spin-out in other data sources, and the foundation year in particular is important to ensure reasonable comparisons can be made between HE providers.

Origins – narrative information about the nature of the IP being exploited by the spin-out, (which helps with making fair comparisons of spin-out performance and deal terms between sectors. We also seek data on the departmental background to the IP, to support comparisons and best practice.

Ownership during reporting year – these allow us to attempt a replication of the longstanding typology of spin-outs in HE-BCI, and also to develop a new typology, and understand key trends.

Major milestones – helps us understand the reasons why a HE provider ceases to report a spin-out, and to identify firms with highly accelerated trajectories. This aids fair comparison, and enables us to avoid misidentification in the case of spin-outs that relocate.

Additional notes - allows HE providers to offer additional information about the firm. This can help support fair comparison, and may indicate data points that it would be valuable to capture in future.

In addition to these data points, **Option 1** of the Spin-out Census data collection also seeks the following categories of information:

Ownership at foundation – these variables allow us to attempt a replication of the longstanding typology of spin-outs in HE-BCI, and also to develop a new typology, and understand key trends over time.

Inactive spin-outs during the reporting year — these data items allow us to produce a time-series , which incorporates spin-out survival rates over a long period of time.

The timetable for **Option 1** of the Spin-out Census will be in summer 2024 as follows:

Data capture and collation from April 2024 for period 01 August 2012 to 31 July 2023

Data collection system opens by 25 July 2024

Commit date 22 August 2024

Nil return confirmation date 22 August 2024

Data quality checking period 22 August 2024 to 12 September 2024

Final commit 19 September 2024

Sign-off 26 September 2024

We acknowledge that the proposed timescale for the Spin-outs Census data collection is relatively rapid, and understand the capacity pressures HE providers are under. However, we understand that there is a significant policy need for the creation of a spin-out register before the end of the year, to ensure consideration of the topic by government, funders, and other stakeholders is underpinned by an improved and robust evidence base.

Shortcode: factbank

Factbank Title: Option 2

Factbank Content:

We are therefore also presenting an **Option 2**. This creates a reduced Spin-out Census conducted using the same collection timescale as for Option 1, which would gather the following reduced list of data items on all active and newly registered spin-outs in 2022/23, and spin-outs founded since 2012/13 that are no longer active:

Identification – up to seven data items to help identify the spin-out unambiguously in other data sources. These variables are necessary for handling large numbers of spin-outs. We anticipate that the majority of spin-outs will only require four data items to be submitted.

Typology – a single variable that enables the spin-out to be classified as a social enterprise.

Creation – the incorporation (registration) year only.

This information is the minimum amount needed in order to deliver a rudimentary spin-out register by the end of 2024. The same additional data points highlighted in option 1 would then need to be collected with the same coverage during the HE-BCI C23032 collection period (normally November 2024 – February 2025), in order to fully complete the spin-out register, in addition to data return in Table 4(a) Head 5. This would have the effect of deferring some of the information compilation burden from summer 2024 to autumn/winter 2024, but retain the burden of interacting with a collection during summer 2024. Compiling and returning historic information twice (at different levels) over a short period seems likely to increase complexity and burden for providers.

Option 2 does not, however, meet all of the policy needs we perceive or all priorities set out. **Option 2** is also, on its own, unable to support much of the valuable analysis about the contributions that the HE sector makes through spin-outs, so the likely benefits for both analysis and simplification of data returns would be deferred to the second half of 2025, or perhaps reduced entirely.

The previously discussed benefit of re-presenting this Census data for the addition of new spin-outs and updates in HE-BCI would be limited (as there would be a lot of missing data) and there would be some duplication between the Spin-out Census and Table 4a of HE-BCI, making reporting complex in that year.

Shortcode: factbank

Factbank Title: Option 3

Factbank Content:

Option 3 would see the Spin-out Census data collection shift to the autumn of 2024. We would collect the full set of variables listed under Option 1 during the following timeframe:

Data capture and collation from April 2024 for period 01 August 2012 to 31 July 2023

Data collection system opens by 29 August 2024

Commit date 26 September 2024

Nil return confirmation date 26 September 2024

Data quality checking period 26 September 2024 to 24 October 2024

Final commit 24 October 2024

Sign-off 31 October 2024

Option 3 defers the collection to autumn. This timetable is potentially optimal for data collection delivery. However, this option does not sufficiently meet the user, including government's, policy needs in a timely way.

Shortcode: factbank

Factbank Title: Option 4

Factbank Content:

Our final option, **Option 4**, which we have discounted, would involve running the Spin-out Census at the same time as the 2023/24 HE-BCI collection, on the normal timetable between November 2024 and early February 2025. This option does not meet government's current user requirements.

Option 4 appears to defer the burden of information compilation with the effect of introducing additional work during the usual HE-BCI collection period. The issues of additional work at this time and duplication between the Spin-out Census and Table 4a would be unavoidable and would add complexity to reporting, collection management, and quality assurance. Demand for data is strong enough that **Option 4** might not forestall alternative approaches to data collection by the government or by funders, during 2024 – potentially displacing rather than deferring burdens.

We have therefore discounted **Option 4** on the basis of current information about its insufficiency for meeting user needs and the likely impact on providers. It is listed here for completeness, only. We are however, still presenting **Option 4** in this consultation for completeness, and to gauge provider's views.

Between **Option 1** and **Option 2** there is a difference in the scope of data to be collected, only, with the summer timetables being identical. The balance between benefit and the distribution of burden is very different between these two options, and we are keen on understanding views from providers and others on our approach. **Option 3** has an autumn timetable which gives HE providers longer to prepare, but may clash with other activity as this is often a busy period for HE providers. It is suboptimal from a policy perspective, and the delay it introduces for the establishment of a spin-out register and useful analysis being undertaken is around three months – with likely release dates deferred into the winter of 2024/25. In our view **Option 4** is the most problematic option from both a policy and collection management perspective, for both HESA and providers.

HESA has resources in place to pursue all options. **Our view is that the optimal course of action is to pursue Option 1.**

Plans for dissemination

Our outline plans for dissemination of data from the Spin-out Census data collection are as follows. First, we believe the data proposed in the “identification”, “creation”, and “typology” sections would be of widespread and generic value to a broad group of stakeholders, and we propose to incorporate most of it at item-line level alongside the UKPRN and some other provider-level information in an openly available ad hoc official statistic (under options 1 and 2, this would take place in autumn 2024).

Second, we anticipate that data drawn from the “origins”, “ownership at foundation”, “ownership during reporting year”, and “exit” sections is of a more sensitive character, and we would therefore only make such data available under licence for the purposes permitted in our agreements with providers (see “categories of onward use of data” at <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/support/provider-info> <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/support/provider-info>> for details). In addition, there is also a third category of data which would be created or derived using data collected across multiple fields in Head 5 e.g. categorisations or typologies. We are unsure yet whether these would be classed as sensitive, as this depends on the nature of the input data. Nevertheless, sensitivities will be rigorously assessed before determining the appropriate means for disseminating. As a minimum, the entire dataset would be shared under licence with HESA's statutory customers and to support research by UCI (as national advisors to Research England). A key objective is to support the creation of a “Spin-out Register” and sharing of sensitive categories of data under license is an essential element in achieving this.

We also anticipate a potential demand for some aspects of this data to be shared through Jisc's Tailored Datasets and Heidi Plus services. During the consultation period we will be engaging with stakeholder groups directly to develop this approach, in addition to seeking information through consultation responses.

1 of 17
Automatic Zoom

Spin-out Census C22036

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

Introduction to this collection

1. The Spin-out Census seeks to create a comprehensive list of all currently active spin-out companies from Higher Education, and spin-outs that were previously active over the past decade. This one-off collection provides the first stage of an improved approach to data collection on spin-outs, to assemble and maintain a national database list of university spin-outs which provides a recognised robust evidence base. This will allow linking to other data sources principally for policy development, delivery, and evaluation purposes; official statistics improvement; and research. This collection will establish a common framework for understanding spin-out companies, and provide a resource and asset that is available to users under established frameworks operated by Jisc.

32 Do you agree that the definition of a spin-out is clear and implementable for the Spin-out Census?

Please select only one item

- Yes
- No

33 What is your confidence you can submit the data required for Option 1 (full Spin-out Census data collection in summer 2024)?

Please select only one item

- We have no confidence
- We have confidence we could submit some of the data required
- We have confidence we could submit all of the data required

34 Please provide information on any additional barriers you would face with Option 1 (full Spin-out Census data collection in summer 2024)?

35 Please indicate your preferred option(s) for data collection for the Spin-out Census by indicating your first and, (if desired) your second and third preference below:

	1	2	3
Option 1: full Spin-Out Census data collection in summer 2024. <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Option 2: a reduced Spin-out Census in summer 2024, and the additional data points in Option 1 collected during the HE-BCI C23032 collection period (November 2024 – January 2025). <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Option 3: full Spin-out Census collected during autumn 2024. <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

36 What are your reasons for selecting the answer you gave in the previous question? Please let us know what views you have on the proposed approaches, including our discounted option 4.

37 Do you agree with the general approach we outline for the dissemination of data?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

38 What further observations do you have on our outline dissemination approach? Please provide any insights that would help us make our outputs using this data valuable to you.

39 Please complete your provider's burden assessment for Option 1 of the Spin-out Census data collection.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

40 Please complete your provider's burden assessment for Option 2 of the Spin-out Census data collection.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

41 Please complete your provider’s burden assessment for Option 3 of the Spin-out Census data collection.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

42 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the historic spin-outs data collection.

Table Five

We are proposing to pause data collection on Table 5 whilst we conduct further work into the area.

Responses from our evidence gathering survey and attendees at the HE-BCI logical data modelling workshops highlighted that submitting to Table 5 is burdensome, and the table is not fit for purpose. Table 5 has also raised questions for us about the quality of data reported. We are therefore seeking provider's views on the data currently collected in Table 5, and our proposal to pause data collection.

Alternatively, if providers do not support this pause we will continue to collect data and in this case are proposing the following changes:

The guidance has been restructured for better flow, and additional paragraph numbers have been included for consistency with other guidance pages.

Guidance on staff time has been expanded across sub-heads that time committed to the preparation of events should not be included.

Following the results of the evidence gathering survey, the guidance has been expanded to allow social and cultural interactions held in non-provider owned spaces to be reported.

New examples have been created under sub-heads 1(a)-1(d) in line with these proposed changes. New examples have also replaced the old examples under sub-head 1e guidance, following similar queries being raised with the Liaison team.

1 of 4
 Automatic Zoom

HE-BCI record 2023/24 - General guidance on Table 5: Social, community and cultural engagement: designated public events - Proposed

Version 1.0 Produced 2024-04-04

1. Table 5 should include analysis of social, community and cultural events intended for the external community. It is designed to measure the impact of activities where financial income is an inappropriate proxy for impact.
2. Impact should be returned through attendee numbers and academic staff time.
3. HESA recognises that it is not generally practical to gauge the ultimate impact of public events, although it seems reasonable to assume that events would be attended only if they

43 Do you use the data provided in Table five?

Please select only one item

- Yes
- No

44 If you answered Yes to the previous question, please provide more information on how you use table five data.

45 To what extent do you agree with the proposal to pause data collection on table five?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

46 If we pause data collection for Table five, when should this be implemented?

Please select only one item

- 2023/24 (C23032)
- 2024/25 (C24032)
- Not applicable

47 Please complete your provider's burden assessment for pausing data collection on table five.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

48 To what extent do you agree with the proposals to change table five?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

49 Please complete your provider's burden assessment for changes on table five.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

50 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to table five.

New fields in the template

We have updated the language in Table 4. The term "spin-off" has been replaced with "spin-out" throughout. We have relabelled "Formal spin-offs, not HEP owned" to "Other spin-outs". We have changed the column head for number of new-registered firms within the reporting period to reflect the planned use of foundation year for spin-outs, while retaining the use of the year of registration for start-ups and social enterprises.

We have created numbered column references for Heads 4 and 5 to make these easier to reference quickly.

We have proposed changing Table 4 Head 3 to accept NULL as an alternative to a figure. Following a positive response in the evidence-gathering survey, we found most HE providers can distinguish between no income and no source of potential income in Table 4 Head 3. We are therefore updating this section of the data collection instrument to accept a NULL in addition to figures of zero or greater.

We have created a new Head 5, and for ease of use we have moved this to a separate worksheet (titled Table 4(a)). This Head collects information about individual spin-outs.

51 To what extent do you agree with the proposal to collect additional data on spin-outs?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

52 Please complete your provider's burden assessment for changes to collect additional data on spin-outs.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

53 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to collect additional data on spin-outs.

Template

Please find below a copy of the whole template with all the changes already discussed included.

Proposed data collection instrument <user_uploads/i-1.-proposed-data-collection-instrument.xlsx>

1 of 7
Automatic Zoom

2023-23 HEBCI Higher Education - Business and Community Interaction Survey		Version
Provider name:		Current
URL/ID:		Warning
Country:	A	
HECTU:	22032	

Some of these rules are exemplified by switches applicable to individual providers.
 For information on current exemptions please contact Institutional Liaison:
 Email: liaison@hesa.ac.uk
 Telephone: 01242 388 531
 Help for completing the return and COMMIT-stage validation can be found at:
[General Guidance to Tables and L2-5/6/7-tables validation](#)

HEBCI: The HE-BCI Survey template is split over separate worksheet tabs with one table per tab. All five tables must be completed.

HEBCI Specific Rules	
Rule number	Rule description
Q4.C22032.32045	Discontinue and patents filed by or on behalf of the HEPI: Number of new patent applications filed in year Overseas Subtotal must not be greater than the current year's value
Q4.C22032.32046	Discontinue and patents filed by or on behalf of the HEPI: Number of patents granted in year Overseas Subtotal must not be greater than the current year's value
Q4.C22032.32050	Discontinue and patents filed by or on behalf of the HEPI: Cumulative patent portfolio Overseas Subtotal must not be greater than the current year's value
Q4.C22032.32051	Licence numbers: Total number (non software) Overseas Subtotal must not be greater than the current year's value
Q4.C22032.32052	Licence numbers: Total number (software only) Overseas Subtotal must not be greater than the current year's value
Q4.C22032.32053	IP income: Subtotal Overseas Subtotal must not be greater than the current year's value
Q4.C22032.32054	Public events: Other must be specified in box below if a value is entered
Q4.C22032.32055	Public events: Other must be specified in box below if a value is entered
Q4.C22032.32056	Collaborative research involving public funding: UKRI (except Research England), Royal Society and British Academy. If a significant amount contribution must also be returned
Q4.C22032.32057	Spin-off activity: each reported number of spin-offs must not be greater than 5 (current year)
	Discontinue and patents filed by or on behalf of the HEPI: Number of patents filed by an external party naming the HEPI as a co-applicant or a

54 To what extent do you agree with the proposals to change the HE-BCI template?

Please select only one item

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

55 Please complete your provider’s burden assessment for changes to the HE-BCI template.

Guidance on how to provide your score

Please refer to the image below for guidance on how to provide your score.

Burden assessment summary assessment for setup and run

Text version for Setup:

0: No impact

1-3: Almost no change to processes or systems. Can be fitted into business as usual against a known release window. Limited training or guidance required.

4-7: Minor to medium changes to systems and processes. Difficult to resource. Date for go-live sub-optimal. Requires bespoke training.

8-10: Significant change to systems and/or processes. Detrimental impact on ability to do other activities. Cannot be serviced from existing capacity. Release date very challenging. Requires training / re-skilling.

Text version for Run:

0: No impact

1-3: Business as usual (BAU). Operated through processes and systems. No discernible impact on current operating model.

4-7: Increased resources. Sustained opportunity cost. Complexity in planning. Requires specialist support.

8-10: Sustained increased resources required. Conflict with other business priorities. Cannot be systemised - lots of manual checking. Requires subject matter expert (SME).

[Download the full burden assessment guide \(PDF\)](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Burden%20Assessment%20Guide.pdf>>

	0	1-3	4-7	8-10
Setup <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

56 Please provide any contextual information to support your above answer, or any alternative approaches you think should be considered, about the changes to the HE-BCI template.

Closing feedback

57 Do you have any other comment on the collection method of the HE-BCI data?

58 Do you have any other comments about this consultation?