

Cyngor Cyllido Addysg
Uwch Cymru
Higher Education Funding
Council for Wales

Cwrt Linden
Clos Ilex Llanisien
Caerdydd CF14 5DZ
Ffôn 029 2076 1861
Ffacs 029 2076 3163
www.hefcw.ac.uk

Linden Court
Ilex Close Llanishen
Cardiff CF14 5DZ
Tel 029 2076 1861
Fax 029 2076 3163
www.hefcw.ac.uk

hefcw

Cylchlythyr

Circular

Third Mission Funding Arrangements 2010/11 to 2012/13: Consultation

Date: 30 October 2009
Reference: W09/35HE
To: Heads of higher education institutions in Wales
& key stakeholder organisations
Response by: 11 January 2010
Contact: Name: Teresa Cooper
Telephone: 029 2068 2304
Email: Teresa.Cooper@hefcw.ac.uk

HEFCW's current three year cycle of third mission funding ends on 31 July 2010.

This circular sets out for consultation options for the continuing support of the sector's third mission activities for the academic years 2010/11 to 2012/13.

It also gives notice of a workshop to be held on 4 December 2009, the outcomes of which will also feed into the consultation process.

This document is available online, in large print, Braille, on CD and on audio CD and cassette. Should you or someone you know require this in an alternative format, please contact us on (029) 2068 2280 or email info@hefcw.ac.uk.

Noddir gan
Lywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Sponsored by
Welsh Assembly Government



Introduction

1. This circular:
 - Summarises impacts accruing from the third mission (3M) activities of higher education institutions (HEIs) and the way in which they are currently being funded;
 - Considers funding options for the support of future 3M activities over the academic years 2010/11 to 2012/13;
 - Announces a consultation event to be held on 4 December 2009; and
 - Invites written responses to be submitted on the issues raised in this consultation by 11 January 2010.
2. This consultation document is being sent to all higher education institutions in Wales and a range of stakeholders within and external to the Welsh and wider UK higher education (HE) sectors.

Background

3. HEFCW defines third mission activities as those that 'stimulate and direct the application and exploitation of knowledge to the benefit of the social, cultural and economic development of our society'. In June 2004 HEFCW became the first UK HE funding body to establish a dedicated stream of core funding in support of such activities.
4. The Third Mission (3M) Fund currently stands at just over £6.3 million per annum. It is now in a second three year cycle, which will close at the end of the 2009/10 academic year. An independent evaluation of the first cycle (2004/05 to 2006/07) was recently undertaken by Innovas Consulting Ltd and the University of Salford and their conclusions and recommendations have been factored into this consultation. Reference:
http://www.hefcw.ac.uk/documents/publications/external_reports_and_studies/3%20mission%20fund%20full%20report%20Oct%2009.pdf

Context

5. In the current economic climate the whole UK HE sector faces major challenges over funding and the expectations of governments and publics. As the CBI recently observed in *Stronger Together: Businesses and universities in turbulent times*, 'business as usual is not an option in the current economic environment' and difficult choices lie ahead. Reference:
http://highereducation.cbi.org.uk/uploaded/CBI_HE_taskforce_report.pdf

6. Within Wales, the *Review of HE in Wales* led by Professor Merfyn Jones has emphasised the need for the sector to demonstrate more effectively 'results for Wales in response to its investment, in line with its strategic outcomes'. If monies are to continue to be invested in HEIs in general, and for 3M activities in particular, the ability of institutions to demonstrate the return on that investment will weigh heavily in funding decisions by the Assembly Government and the Council.

Performance to date

First Cycle

7. The evaluation of the impact of the first 3M fund cycle (2004/05 to 2006/07) concluded that institutions had made 'a positive and growing contribution to the economic and social well-being of Wales'.
8. Between 2004/05 and 2006/07 HEIs received £12m from the 3M Fund. They used this as core funding from which to secure over £400m from public and private sector sources to support a wide range of 3M activities. Over the first cycle, every £1 provided by HEFCW generated a further £38. If we add the additional £22.5 million provided over the same period to HEIs by the Assembly Government's Knowledge Exploitation Fund (KEF) (see paragraph 14 below), institutions still levered around £16 for every £1 from the Welsh public purse. Over the first cycle HEIs also increased by nearly 50% their income from 3M activities as reported in the annual UK-wide HE-Business & Community Interaction Survey (HEBCIS). Income rose from £120m in 2004/05 to £179m in 2006/07, or nearly 49%.
9. Innovas/Salford also found that the first 3M Fund cycle saw 'a dramatic expansion in the volume of [3M] activity reported'. As the tables at **Annex A** show, this performance compared favourably with that in England and Scotland over the same period in terms of both absolute numbers and impact on the host region.

Second Cycle

10. We are now in the final year of a second three year 3M Fund cycle (2007/08 to 2009/10). While it is too early for any independent evaluation of this cycle, it is clear that the sector has continued to grow its contribution to the economic and social well-being of Wales. This is evidenced by the snapshot of third mission performance captured in the latest HEBCIS presented at **Annex B**. This shows that in many key areas Welsh HEIs continue to punch above their nominal 5% UK weighting and to outperform many other parts of the UK.
11. Just as important is the manner in which these high levels of performance are sustained and developed. As Innovas/Salford reported, 'there is evidence of considerable learning at the institutional level arising from the first cycle of 3M funding'. For example, HEIs' current 3M strategies reflect a

‘progressive sharpening of the commercial dimension of [their] 3M activities’ and a ‘growing concentration on a smaller number of activities where key strengths exist’. However, probably the most significant development in strategic terms has been the emergence of collaborative 3M strategies, which ‘constitutes a significant break with existing practice elsewhere in the UK’. Details of these collaborations are at **Annex C**.

12. Nevertheless, the picture is not uniformly positive. In particular, Wales does not perform well in relation to the commercialisation of intellectual property (IP). Innovas/Salford found that over the first 3M Fund cycle income from consultancy, facilities and facilities-related services and IP ‘either stood still or declined’. In the latest HEBCIS, while Welsh HEIs accounted for 5.5% of all new patents filed by HEIs in 2007/08, they still account for only 4% of the cumulative patent portfolio and less than 2% of total income from IP and 4.5% of consultancy income. The *Review of Commercialisation in Welsh HE*, led by Simon Gibson in 2007, identified examples of ‘systemic weakness’ in relation to this agenda. In October 2009 the final report from the National Assembly for Wales’ (NAW) Enterprise and Learning Committee’s (ELC) inquiry into *The Economic Contribution of HE in Wales* also recommended that HE ‘needs to change its approach to IP’. Reference: <http://www.assemblywales.org/cr-ld7730>
13. There are also still issues over the extent to which HE’s contribution to economic and social well-being is promoted to, and recognised in, governmental and wider public circles – although this is now starting to be addressed by a more proactive public engagement on the part of HEIs (including Welsh success in securing UK-wide funding for the establishment of a *Beacon for Excellence in Public Engagement*). The NAW’s ELC report recommended ‘a culture change in the language used – words such as “investment” in and “return” from funding HE, as opposed to references to expenditure and costs’. However, as both that report and Innovas/Salford emphasise, there is still more to be done by universities in making themselves even more accessible and responsive to key stakeholders - especially those in business, and SMEs in particular. As Innovas/Salford concluded, the 3M activity of HEIs ‘could have a wider impact which would influence stakeholders at all levels if better contextualised’.

Current 3M funding scenario

14. The 3M performance of Welsh HEIs cannot, nor should be, attributed solely to the support institutions receive from HEFCW’s 3M Fund. The very title ‘Third Mission’ implies that this activity derives from, and is about further capitalising upon, their fundamental First and Second Missions of teaching and research. In addition, the HEFCW’s 3M Fund has always been deployed strategically alongside parallel and complementary income from the Welsh Assembly Government – in the first cycle via KEF (see paragraph 8 above), and in the current cycle the Academic Expertise for Business (A4B) Programme. Within this *dual-support* system, HEIs use core funding from

HEFCW to provide resources and infrastructure for their 3M delivery, while the competitive monies from A4B largely support specific projects and are tied to targeted outputs, governed by European funding rules. Between 2007 and 2013, A4B will deliver some £50 million in support of HE and FE knowledge transfer and exploitation activity

15. The 3M fund currently stands at just over £6.3 million and in the current cycle has been allocated each year as follows:

	£*
Allocated as foundation funding (£100k per HEI)	1.2m
Allocated by formula	3.9m
Reserved for bid-based, collaborative activity	1.0m
Total	6.1m

** Figures exclude annual GDP uplifts*

16. All institutions receive a common level of foundation funding, which is currently £100k per annum. Apart from the £1 million reserved each year to support the bid-based collaborative activity described above, the rest of the funding (ca. £3.9m) is allocated on the basis of a formula that is designed to:

- a) provide a measure of third mission activity potential and capacity building by using staff full time equivalents (FTEs) as a proxy for institutional size, and
- b) reward performance by utilizing a range of indicators that take account of both income (output) and non-income (outreach) activities.

17. The £3.9m is divided equally across the above two components. However, within the rewarding performance component, a higher weighting is attached to non-income generating (ie outreach activities). A more detailed description of how the formula monies are currently allocated is provided at **Annex D**.

18. Allocations are released to HEIs on the basis of a satisfactory third mission strategy, which is submitted to HEFCW at the outset of each three year funding cycle. Delivery is monitored via the annual monitoring statements submitted to HEFCW as part of its ongoing strategic planning interactions with the sector.

Funding comparisons

19. Before taking A4B funding into account, and reflecting also the number of HEIs in Wales relative to its size, Innovas/Salford suggest the current mean core 3M funding level per HEI in Wales is low by UK standards:

Current Mean Core 3M Funding

England	£861,000
Scotland	£1.131m
Northern Ireland	£1.3m
Wales	£554,000

20. However, after taking A4B funding into account, the mean figure per HEI in Wales rises to £1.3m. Nevertheless, since A4B ends in 2013, Innovas/Salford recommend that Wales' 'critical reliance on the dual-support system' should be strategically reviewed in order 'to avoid placing Welsh HEIs at a significant competitive disadvantage within the wider UK context' in the longer term.

Issues for Consultation

Issue 1 – Further embedding 3M

21. Our analysis of institutions' first 3M strategies, submitted in 2004/05, raised questions over the extent to which the sector's impact on economic and social well-being was being consciously promoted as part of institutions' strategic agendas.
22. By the time HEIs submitted their second 3M strategies in 2007, the picture had changed dramatically – with some institutions even calling for a re-naming of the agenda on the basis that *third mission* implied *third place*, below the teaching and research missions. Furthermore, whereas in 2004 only two HEIs in Wales had a Pro-Vice Chancellor or equivalent directing their 3M activities, by 2007 this was the norm. Moreover, most of the strategies demonstrated how HEIs' 3M agendas linked with their teaching and research agendas and overall strategic direction.
23. Our analysis of HEIs' second 3M strategies noted that while most HE senior managers and governors appeared to recognize the centrality of 3M impacts within research and teaching activity, not all academic staff were equally engaged in 3M activity. Every 3M strategy either explicitly or implicitly alluded to a need to increase numbers of academic staff participating in 3M activities. Several HEIs noted their intention to use 3M funds for incentives/resources to engage more staff in 3M activities and the *Strategic Insight Programme* (see Annex C) was a product of this same desire.
24. Two years on, Innovas/Salford have reported that while '3M is integrated in the strategy of HEIs and recognised among academic leaders at the

highest level....the degree to which it is embedded and accepted as a core responsibility in the wider institution is still questionable'. They went on to conclude: 'The embeddedness of 3M activities within HEIs is limited. This is particularly the case among academics, who sometimes remain exclusively attached to teaching and research. The existence of such views also questions the legitimacy of those academics that engage in 3M activities'. On a UK-wide scale, Keith Harmann, Deputy Director of the Council for Industry and Higher Education (CIHE), in a September 2009 address at *Research & Development 2009: Meeting the Global Economic Challenge* called for a new 'framework for action' to move academics on from a culture of 'teach, tell and publish' to an ethos in which outreach beyond academia becomes core to all research, teaching and learning activity. Reference: <http://vitae.ac.uk/researchers/1528-117381/Research-Development-2009-Meeting-the-Global-Economic-Challenge.html>

Consultation question 1 – How can HEFCW most effectively support HEIs in their intentions to deepen and broaden their efforts to embed an ethos of wider engagement beyond academia across all the activities of the institution?

Issue 2- Size of and need for continuation of HEFCW's 3M Fund

25. As mentioned in paragraph 20, A4B has a finite time span. This is also true of other European funding streams that HEIs currently call upon in the delivery of their 3M strategies and it does raise a question about the longer term basis of overall 3M funding in Wales. This is a matter that HEFCW will wish to discuss further with the Assembly Government. However, one way to address it would be to increase HEFCW's 3M funding, although this would probably be at the expense of other funding.

Consultation question 2 – do you think HEFCW should increase core 3M funding, even if at the expense of other funding?

26. Alternatively, it is arguable that in the light of the extent to which the 3M agenda is already embedded in HEIs' strategic thinking at the highest level (see paragraph 24) we no longer need to ring fence core 3M funding. Instead, the 3M allocation could be transferred into teaching and research, reflecting an expectation upon HEIs to adopt a holistic approach in which third mission activity is embedded in teaching and research strategies. Put another way, we could consider increasing the expectation that teaching and research allocations be more explicitly linked to the demonstration of HEIs' impacts on economic and social well-being.

Consultation question 3 – have we reached the point where we no longer need to ring-fence core 3M funding? What would be the advantages and/or disadvantages of its removal?

Issue 3 - Alternative funding options

27. If we do maintain a separate stream of 3M funding, we need to consider its nature and deployment. Currently 3M funding arrangements include a common level of *foundation funding*. This was originally introduced to help HEIs build a basic infrastructure/capacity to develop and deliver a coherent 3M strategy. By the end of the present cycle in 2009/10, all HEIs in Wales will have had six years of foundation funding.
28. It is arguable that we should now focus less on capacity building and more on embedding participation in 3M delivery more broadly across HEIs. Current strategies show how far most HEIs in Wales have travelled in terms of establishing teams of specialist knowledge transfer and/or commercial services staff. The greater challenge now lies in encouraging increased numbers of academic staff to contribute more fully to their institutions' 3M strategies. It is therefore arguable that in the next cycle we should replace provision for a common level of foundation funding with a commitment to guarantee a minimum allocation for HEIs to use as each sees fit in support of 3M delivery. A possible level for this allocation might be £150k.

Consultation question 4 – if we maintain a separate stream of 3M funding should we replace the common level of foundation funding with a guaranteed minimum funding allocation? If so, is £150k a reasonable level?

29. If a separate 3M Fund is maintained, we also need to consider the balance between formula and competitive elements, and their relation to the operation of the 3M Fund thus far in support of social and cultural impacts.
30. In the consultation exercise that preceded the present funding cycle the view was offered that the formula element in the funding methodology was weighted too much in favour of HEIs' impacts on economic rather than social well-being. The Innovas/Salford report also argues that the current formula does not adequately 'capture the application of 3M funding in terms of social and cultural indicators'.
31. When the 3M Fund was established, in order to minimise the data collection burden on institutions, we agreed that data for the formula component would be collected from already available sources. The HEBCIS continues to be the only vehicle for the collection of data in respect of impact on social well-being. However, HEBCIS indicators are limited to the numbers of academic staff days allocated to and numbers of attendees at the following types of free and chargeable events:
- Public lectures
 - Performance Arts (music, dance, drama, etc)
 - Exhibitions (galleries, museums etc)
 - Museum Education
 - Other

32. Given that no other social and cultural indicators are likely to emerge in the near future, it is perhaps time to look at other ways of recognising 3M activities in support of social impact. Doing this through a different approach to the allocation of teaching and research funding has already been broached in paragraph 26. Alternatively, we could allocate a greater proportion of 3M funding via a bidding process, with encouragement to institutions to submit collaborative bids in order to achieve economies of scale and scope, and to improve overall regional coherence.
33. Generalising away from social and cultural impact, an increased bidding element, especially if slanted towards collaborative bids, could also enable funding to be aligned to a more coherent delivery of specific Welsh Assembly Government policy imperatives, such as skills and employability, or to addressing collectively those areas of the 3M agenda where performance in Wales is perceived as relatively weak (see paragraphs 12-13).

Consultation question 5 - if we maintain a separate 3M funding stream, should we alter - and on what basis - the current balance between formula and bid-based allocations?

Consultation question 6 – should any bid-based monies continue to be restricted to collaborative bids?

Issue 4 – Demonstrating better the return on investment in HE

34. Third mission funding is designed to stimulate engagement beyond the academic community and the exploitation of the sector's first and second missions to the benefit of social, cultural and economic development. It is also, as we have recalled, only one of a number of funding sources that include other HEFCW funding streams, a range of other Assembly Government sources, and other income that HEIs earn locally, nationally and internationally. Attribution of the specific return from 3M investment is therefore inherently difficult.
35. However, a further challenge to HEIs is the imperative increasingly to be able to demonstrate effectively the return on public investment in them. The increasing evidence in 3M strategies of linkage between the full range of activities pursued by HEIs is consistent with this concern, and it also paints an encouraging picture.
36. We continue to need a transparent and justifiable basis on which to allocate 3M funding (unless we decide to discontinue it altogether), and on which to render account for it. But should not a key part of the allocation process continue to be the submission of 3M strategies that explicitly show how each HEI intends to demonstrate in a coherent way its overall

approach to engagement and exploitation, across at least all public funding sources?

Consultation question 7 – what is your view of the value to HEIs of demonstrating in a coherent way, within 3M strategies, their overall approach to engagement and exploitation, across at least all public funding sources?

37. The seven consultation questions are summarised at **Annex E**.

Timetable

38.

Action	Date
Consultation workshop to be held in Cardiff or Newport (venue to be determined)	4 December 2009
Deadline for submission of written consultation responses to HEFCW	Monday 11 January 2010
Consultation outcomes discussed by HEFCW's Research, Innovation & Engagement (RIE) Committee	26 January 2010
RIE Committee's recommendations submitted to the Council	12 March 2010
Circular reporting consultation outcomes published	By 19 April 2009
New 3M strategies to be submitted (if requested)	By 31 August 2010
New 3M funding arrangements commence	October/November 2010

Further information/responses to

39. For further information, contact Teresa Cooper (tel 029 2068 2304: email Teresa.Cooper@hefcw.ac.uk).
40. Written responses should be submitted no later than Monday 11 January 2010 and addressed to Sheridan Nott , HEFCW, Ilex Close, Llanishen, Cardiff, CF14 5DZ .

Annex A

Comparison of Change in Third Mission Activities between Wales, England and Scotland (2004/5 – 2006/7)

Measure	Welsh HEIs	English HEIs	Scottish HEIs
Increase in the number of CPD days delivered	269%	22%	60%
Increase in the number of patent applications	151%	10%	16%
Increase in the number of business start-ups	43%	54%	36%
Increase in the number of SMEs accessing HEI consultancy	34%	23%	109%
Increase in the number of attendees at free events	24%	46%	1%

Source: HE-BCI survey

Comparison of the Impact of Third Mission Activities in Wales, England and Scotland during the first cycle: 2004/5 to 2006/7

Measure	Wales	England	Scotland
No. of CPD days delivered per 1000 economically active persons	60	140	30
Percentage of the number of patent applications by HEIs in their country	10%	10%	13%
No of business start-ups out of every 1000 in their country	26	8	6
No of consultancies offered per 1000 SMEs in their country	15	10	5
No of attendees at free events per 1000 of population in each country	30	25	24

Source: HE-BCI Survey.

Headline Performance Indicators for Wales from 2007/08 HEBCIS

- 6.2% of UK income from collaborative research involving both public funding and business funding, and 13.9% of UK income from regeneration and development programmes.
- 6.2% of all UK consultancy contracts with small and medium sized enterprises.
- 5.5% of all new UK patents filed in 2007/08.
- 15% of all UK spinouts and start-ups in 2007/08.
- 5.7% of all employees in active spinout firms generated by UK HEIs (and share of turnover from these companies is also increasing year on year).
- 9.5% of new UK graduate business start-ups in 2007/08
- 10.2% of UK graduate start-ups that have lasted 3 or more years and 10.8% of all associated employment.
- 6.8% of all CPD (continuous professional development) and CE (continuing education) learner days delivered by UK HEIs in 2007/08.
- 30% of all academic time invested in chargeable public engagement activities in 2007/08.

Collaborative activity currently supported via 3M fund

1. Current funding arrangements are supporting five 3M strategies from individual HEIs, plus three collaborative strategies. One of these collaborations builds upon a recent *strategic alliance* between the two institutions concerned and another takes forward into a new dimension an existing *Research and Enterprise Partnership*, including the development of a regionally-focused skills centre - <http://absc.bangor.ac.uk/>. The third collaboration, however, brings together three co-located but very mission-different HEIs in a strategic partnership that is designed better to identify with and serve local communities and businesses, while at the same time targeting new inward investment into their region of Wales - <http://www.swwhep.ac.uk/en/projects/dragoninnovationpartnership/>.
2. Current funding arrangements are also supporting three project-based 3M collaborations. These include a *Food Industry Skills Project* - <http://www3.uwic.ac.uk/English/UWICBusiness/WorkingTogether/Pages/FoodIndustrySkillsProject.aspx> - that is unique in the UK. It was developed in direct response to research into food industry high-level skills shortages conducted by *Improve*, the sector skills council (SSC) for the food industry, and aims to boost the flagging numbers of qualified food scientists working in Wales' £9 billion food manufacturing industry. The project brings together HE, FE and business sector partners. Another project, the *Strategic Insight Programme* - <http://www.siprogramme.org.uk/> - enables academics to undertake short term placements in the public, private or third sectors in order to improve their understanding of business needs. A recent extension to this project is also funding placements for business people within HEIs.

Third mission funding methodology 2007/08-2009/10

The allocations at Annex D are comprised of foundation funding plus formula funding. The total funding available for these two elements is broken down as follows:

Foundation funding (£100k per HEI)	£1,200,000
Formula funding	£3,900,000
Total	£5,100,000

The funding allocated through formula is further broken down into funding allocated in relation to:

Potential and Capacity Building	£1,950,000
Rewarding Performance (income related)	£780,000
Rewarding Performance (non-income related)	£1,170,000
Total formula funding	£3,900,000

Details of the how the allocations have been calculated within each of these three elements are shown below.

Potential and Capacity Building

Individual institutional allocations are calculated pro rata to the FTE of professional and academic staff, described below:

Measure	Description	Source
Staff FTE	FTE of managerial, academic, professional, technical and administrative staff with an active contract in the academic year (includes HESA activity codes 1 to 4A). Atypical staff are excluded.	HESA new individualised staff record 2005/06

Rewarding Performance - Income Related

Individual institutional allocations are calculated pro rata to the sum of four income related measures, described overleaf:

Measure	Description	Source
Contract research income	Total value of contracts	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 1b
Income from intellectual property rights	Total revenues (including sale of shares in spin-offs)	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 4c
Income for regeneration	Total income for regeneration	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 3
Income from collaborative research activity	Total income from collaborative research activity	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 1a

Rewarding Performance - Non-income Related

The total allocation available for this element of the formula funding is split equally between 11 measures, giving a total allocated for each measure of £106,364. Within each measure, individual institutional allocations are calculated pro rata to the total of the measure. Allocations for each measure are then summed for each institution to get individual institutional allocations. The 11 measures are described below:

Measure	Description	Source
Number of engagements with KEF	Number of current active training consortia and Technology Transfer Networks engaged with as lead or partner plus SME development grants obtained and number of Higher Level Skills projects.	KEF, as at March 2007
Number of graduate start-ups	Total number of active firms	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 4d
Number of licences	Total number of non-software plus software licences	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 4b
Number of active spinouts (excluding graduate start-ups)	Total number of active firms including spinouts with some HEI ownership, formal spinouts not HEI owned and staff start-ups (excludes graduate start-ups)	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 4d
Number of contracts - consultancy	Total number of consultancy contracts	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 2a
Number of contracts - facilities and equipment related services	Total number of facilities and equipment related services contracts	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 2b
Number benefiting from GO Wales Scheme	All GO Wales beneficiaries, including placements, up to December 2006	GO Wales phase 2, as at December 2006

Number of businesses engaged in GO Wales	All businesses, including SMEs and larger companies, engaged with GO Wales, up to December 2006	GO Wales phase 2, as at December 2006
Number of outgoing exchange students	Number of outgoing students on ERASMUS/SOCRATES programmes	HESA student record 2005/06
Number of industrial placements	Number of students out on an industrial placement	HESA student record 2005/06
Total learner days - CPD/CE courses	Total learner days of CPD/CE courses delivered	HEBCIS survey 2005/06, Table 2c

Summary of consultation questions

1. How can HEFCW most effectively support HEIs in their intentions to deepen and broaden their efforts to embed an ethos of wider engagement beyond academia across all the activities of the institution?
2. Do you think HEFCW should increase core 3M funding, even if at the expense of other funding?
3. Have we reached the point where we no longer need to ring-fence core 3M funding? What would be the advantages and/or disadvantages of its removal?
4. If we maintain a separate stream of 3M funding should we replace the common level of foundation funding with a guaranteed minimum funding allocation? If so, is £150k a reasonable level?
5. If we maintain a separate 3M funding stream, should we alter - and on what basis - the current balance between formula and bid-based allocations?
6. Should any bid-based monies continue to be restricted to collaborative bids?
7. What is your view of the value to HEIs of demonstrating in a coherent way, within 3M strategies, their overall approach to engagement and exploitation, across at least all public funding sources?