

ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Submission to the Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration

Summary

- In the past 10 years there has been a marked increase in the level and scope of interactions between higher education and business in the UK. These activities have come to be seen as a third strand in the missions of higher education institutions, in addition to teaching and research. Nevertheless they play, and should continue to play, a relatively small part in the work of HEIs, in comparison with teaching and research.
- There are many different kinds of interactions between higher education and business. These range from technology transfer and research collaboration to contributing access to education, supporting small and medium size enterprises and meeting regional skill needs. The proportion of institutions with a strategic plan for business support is increasing. Across the sector enhancing the ability of students to make the transition from higher education to the workplace comprises a key element in university-business interactions.
- The amount of public funding allocated to support and develop higher education-business interaction – the so-called ‘third stream’ of funding – has increased significantly in recent years. But the money available from the government to support ‘third stream’ activities is very small relative to the funding for teaching and research. Institutions’ ability to provide incentives and career development for staff engaged in this area is likely to remain limited without a significant increase in funding.
- The 2003 white paper *The future of higher education* proposes that the English regional development agencies have a formal role in the distribution of the Higher Education Innovation Fund. But the AUT is concerned about the lack of accountability and experience of these newly created bodies. The white paper also proposes a network of around 20 Knowledge Exchanges, ‘which will be exemplars of good practice in interactions between less research-intensive institutions and business’. But the AUT would not want to see knowledge transfer activity concentrated in teaching-only institutions.
- The knowledge and ideas of university staff are key drivers of university-business interactions. For these interactions to flourish it is vital to have mutual trust and respect, and awareness of relevant good practice, but comparatively little attention has been paid to this.
- A recent AUT survey showed a significant minority of academic and academic related staff was involved in university-business interactions, but the amount of time spent on such activities was still small in comparison with mainstream activities of teaching and research.
- Respondents to the survey pointed out conflicts of interest between academic freedom and commercial confidentiality. Clear sector level guidance on best practice is needed on issues such as length of confidentiality periods and the right to publish the findings of

research or consultancy. Contracts between universities and sponsors need to reflect this best practice.

- Respondents identified a conflict between the goals and interests of academics and of businesses. While academics were interested in knowledge for its own sake, business partners were chiefly interested in the commercial relevance of research. Both sides of the partnership need to be clear about their priorities and aims. Institutions should provide potential partners a clear statement of their values and priorities – particularly relating to institutional autonomy and academic freedom – and how these apply to university-business interactions.
- Respondents drew attention to the conflict within higher education institutions between the public agenda of an institution – as expressed in its mission statement and corporate planning documents – and the financial realities of life in higher education, particularly concerning the need to achieve a high rating in the Research Assessment Exercise. Greater provision of recognition and reward for staff involved in economic related activity, in terms of remuneration, release from other duties, promotion and staff development, would help to ease these tensions.
- Universities also need to pay closer attention to the ethical dimension of commercial funding. We recommend that Universities UK establish a working party to explore best practice in relation to commercial sponsorship, ethics and academic freedom. This working party should include representatives from the trade unions and professional associations.
- The AUT believes that universities should ensure that their policies on university-business relations require open contracts, effective conflict of interest guidelines, and clear control of any academic policy implications of such arrangements by the academic board. Universities should reject contracts that have inappropriate strings attached.
- The AUT believes that there is now a strong argument for the creation of an independent adjudicator to consider complaints from staff of interference in their academic freedom or other complaints currently heard by the Visitor in the chartered institutions.
- The AUT strongly upholds the traditions of institutional autonomy and academic freedom. Academic activity needs to be undertaken in an open, collegial environment; decisions concerning academic issues should be made by the university senate in an open, transparent manner. Private sources of income should not interfere with a higher education institution's autonomy or the freedom of its staff to conduct research, to disseminate their research findings, and to teach.

Overview

1. The Association of University Teachers is the largest higher education trade union and professional association. The AUT represents over 46,000 lecturers, researchers, library, computer and administrative staff in universities and colleges across the UK, the majority of whom are in the pre-1992 institutions. We welcome the opportunity to respond to the questions posed by the Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration.

2. In the past 10 years there has been a marked increase in the level and scope of interaction between higher education and business in the UK. These activities have come to be seen as a third strand in the missions of higher education institutions (HEIs), in addition to teaching and research, and have become a significant element in the activities of universities and their staff. Nevertheless higher education-business interactions are rightly in a minor league – compared with mainstream teaching and research – in terms of university priorities, and in terms of the amount of staff time spent on them, and in terms of the proportion of university income and expenditure they account for.

3. In making this submission to the Review, the AUT's principal concern is to represent the needs and interests of our members in the context of this increase in business-university interaction, and to consider the implications of these interactions for higher education institutions. Our comments therefore relate particularly to issues of best practice and barriers to strengthening university-business relations. Our particular concerns are that while universities proclaim the importance of business-related activities, there is little recognition or reward for staff involved in this area. In addition, university-business activities create a number of tensions for staff which need to be resolved, particularly relating to academic freedom, the conflicting goals and priorities of universities, academic staff and businesses, and the ethics of research sponsorship by business. University-business interactions should not undermine institutional autonomy and academic freedom; decisions by higher education institutions relating to business interactions should be open and transparent.

Introduction

4. There are many different kinds of interactions between higher education and business. These range from technology transfer and research collaboration – which are particularly marked in higher education institutions with a higher level of research intensity – to contributing access to education, supporting small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and meeting regional skill needs, which are more marked in institutions with a lower level of research intensity.¹ Institutions with a higher research intensity tend to focus particularly on business sectors/clusters in science, medicine, engineering and technology; institutions with a lower research intensity are particularly active among not-for-profit organisations and in the public sector.²

5. Even in the space of one year, from 2000 to 2001, the proportion of institutions with a strategic plan for business support which was developed and being implemented rose from 36% to 47%.³ In 1999-2000, UK institutions reported there was a total of 303 spin-off companies with some HEI ownership which were active and had survived at least three years; the following year (albeit with a greater number of institutions reporting), that number had increased to 425. Estimated turnover of active firms with some HEI ownership increased from £98m to £162m.⁴

6. HE-business links are not just about research and knowledge transfer. Across the sector enhancing the ability of students to make the transition from higher education to the workplace comprises a key element in university-business interactions. Enhancing employability covers a wide area, including work experience, improved careers services, acquiring transferable skills and developing commercial awareness.⁵

7. In terms of staff directly employed in the commercialisation offices of higher education institutions, there was a 12% increase in their number between 1999-2000 and 2000-01. In 2000-01 there were on average 12 full-time equivalent staff employed in the commercialisation offices of institutions with a higher research intensity, compared with around 8 FTE staff on average in institutions with medium and lower research intensity.

Funding

8. The amount of public funding allocated to support and develop higher education-business interaction – the so-called ‘third stream’ of funding – has also increased significantly in recent years. In England, the government introduced what was originally known as the Higher Education Reach Out Fund in 1999, for which:

‘Particular objectives should be the encouragement of work experience; the transfer of knowledge, including in particular the transfer into SMEs; and the promotion of higher education/business interaction and employability through other appropriate measures.’⁶

9. For 1999-2000, £11m was allocated under what became known as the Higher Education Reach-Out to Business and the Community (HEROBC) Fund.⁷ This was 0.2% of the total recurrent grant and fees for higher education in England for 1999-2000. By 2005-06, the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF, which includes the HEROBC Fund) will receive £90m, which is 1.3% of total planned recurrent grant and fees for England for that year. In allocating funding for the period covered by the government’s 2002 spending review, the Secretary of State for Education and Skills said:

‘... HEIF should now be broadened, so that in the new round the scheme has an increased emphasis on supporting non-research intensive university departments in developing both knowledge transfer and skills development. It should support institutions in reaching out to business, to the regional and local economy, and the wider community.’⁸

10. In Scotland, the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council introduced in 2001-02 the Knowledge Transfer Grant, to provide the sector with a long-term funding stream to support knowledge transfer activities. The budget for the grant will be £6.5m for the academic year 2003-04. The grant replaced the previous Professionalisation of Commercialisation grant. According to SHEFC: ‘The aim [of the grant] is to increase the scale and rate of exploitation of the outputs from higher education - research, knowledge, skills, expertise or ideas - particularly where this is likely to generate economic, educational, social, healthcare or cultural benefits for Scotland.’⁹

11. In Wales, the Higher Education Economic Development Fund was introduced in 2002, to support knowledge transfer. The Higher Education Funding Council for Wales sees the HEED fund as ‘the precursor of a substantial third stream of permanent funding to be set

alongside those already existing in support of teaching and research'.¹⁰ Under the HEED fund, £3.1m was allocated to Welsh HE institutions in 2002-03.

12. Despite this increase in funding for knowledge transfer, the money available from the government to support 'third stream' activities is extremely small relative to the funding for teaching and research. Institutions' ability to provide incentives and career development, for staff engaged in this area is likely to remain limited. It is therefore likely that university-business interactions will remain a relatively minor priority for higher education institutions and their staff, without a significant increase in funding for this area. The AUT feels it is right for university-business interactions to remain a relatively minor part of what HEIs do. We emphasise that additional funding should be new money, not money sliced off existing grants for teaching and research.

The 2003 White Paper

13. The 2003 white paper, *The future of higher education*, acknowledged the importance of university-business interactions in England's regional economies, but said: 'Much of our current performance is based on knowledge transfer from cutting-edge, internationally competitive research. This is important. But we must also make sure that businesses can access all the rest of the knowledge and expertise held by the HE sector.'¹¹

14. Following on from that, the white paper has given the English Regional Development Agencies, from 2004-05, a formal role in how the Higher Education Innovation Fund is distributed. The AUT supports attempts to strengthen regional partnerships between universities and bodies such as RDAs and the local Learning and Skills Councils. However, we do have some concerns about the accountability and representativeness of RDAs. For example, who will monitor their activities and how can universities and their staff influence them? The RDAs in England are newly created bodies, and will need time to establish themselves and their strategies for regional economic development, particularly in relation to higher education. The AUT cautions against an overly interventionist approach by the RDAs to higher education institutions.

15. In addition, the white paper proposes to create a network of around 20 Knowledge Exchanges, 'which will be exemplars of good practice in interactions between less research-intensive institutions and business'.¹² The AUT welcomes the Knowledge Exchanges. However, we would not want to see knowledge transfer activity concentrated in teaching-only institutions. It makes no sense to fund institutions to transfer knowledge that they have played no part in creating. Knowledge transfer is not a separate activity from research but operates most effectively when it flows naturally from the research that underlies it. Despite the extra funding for knowledge transfer, there is a danger that the effect of the government's policy of further research selectivity will be to weaken the knowledge transfer capacity of the sector as a whole. We also note that the new money is dependent on a further round of bidding. This will mean additional bureaucracy for a sector already choking with numerous 'accountability burdens'.

Staff

16. The knowledge and ideas of university staff are key drivers of university-business interactions. For these interactions to flourish to the benefit of universities and businesses – as well as society and the economy in general – it is vital to have mutual trust and respect

based on a realistic understanding of the core values, practices and priorities of both sides. It is the aim of this submission to provide a perspective on these interactions based on the perceptions and experiences of members of university staff, and to work towards what constitutes best practice in this area.

17. It should be noted that university-business interactions are not spread evenly across the sector. Some areas of science, engineering and technology – such as biotechnology and medicine – have been more attractive to the business community in terms of investment than others, while the arts, humanities and social sciences, although accounting for a large proportion of research activity in higher education, feature less prominently in these interactions. So in terms of barriers to interactions, the varying level of involvement by business with higher education means that some staff will have significantly more opportunities for getting involved with business than others.

18. To date the ‘official’ literature on university-business interactions – for example the various surveys of higher education-business links conducted for the higher education funding bodies and government departments – has paid relatively little attention to the issue of what constitutes good practice. While a report for the HE funding councils in 1998 asked questions about barriers to establishing working relationships with industry, subsequent reports have not directly addressed these issues.¹³ This is despite the conclusion of the 1998 report, *Industry-academic links in the UK*, that:

‘successful collaboration is founded upon mutual trust and shared goals with industrial partners, clearly expressed.’¹⁴

19. Where staff concerns are addressed, the emphasis in this body of literature tends to be on incentives for involvement in university-business interactions; wider issues, including ethics, academic freedom and integrating business links with teaching and research, are not raised. The most recent report for the funding bodies on university-business links indicates that the human resource strategies of higher education institutions are becoming more geared towards recognising interaction with business as part of the activities undertaken by university staff. Between 2000 and 2001 there was ‘a modest trend towards greater incentives for staff to engage with business, although the majority rating is still ‘some incentives in place’.¹⁵ In response to the question ‘How would you rate the level of incentives for your staff to engage with industry and commerce?’, 57% of institutions agreed with the statement: ‘Some incentives in place, but with some barriers remaining. Typically policy may be generally supportive but there is a lack of understanding across the institution. Promotions committees still take a narrow focus on research even though guidance suggests industrial collaboration is valued equally.’ The previous report, covering 1999-2000, found that 48% of institutions agreeing with this statement. In 2000-01, only 6% of institutions agreed with the statement: ‘Strong positive signals given to all staff to encourage appropriate levels of industrial collaboration. Incentive procedures well established and clearly understood and applied.’

20. Recent publications by Universities UK and the Association for University Research and Industry Links – such as *Optimising consultancy* (2001) and *Managing intellectual property* (2002) – include guidance on areas such as risk management, private consultancy, procedures for approving interactions, use of an institution’s resources, dealing with potential conflicts of interest, costing and pricing, contracts and so on. Broader issues such as the ownership of intellectual property, and the ability to publish the results of research where a sponsor is involved, are also touched on, but without indicating what might constitute best practice in

terms of upholding academic freedom and the right to publish the results of research and consultancy. *Managing intellectual property* also touches on the values and priorities of universities and businesses that partners need to understand¹⁶ – this is helpful, but could be extended to cover academic collegiality and the nature of academic freedom.

AUT survey of academic and related staff

21. In response to the growth of university-business interaction, the AUT undertook in 1999 a survey (which included members and non-members) of the extent of the involvement of academic and related staff in these links, and their views about them.¹⁷ A significant minority of academic and academic related staff reported involvement in university-business interactions, but the amount of time spent on such activities was still small in comparison with mainstream activities of teaching and research, and there appeared to be little incentive for staff to get involved in this area.

22. Around one-third of respondents said their work had involved developing links with local or regional businesses, or providing services for them. Around one-quarter of academic respondents reported involvement in developing business ventures or income generation activities outside their main responsibilities of teaching, research and administration; a similar proportion reported contact with a science park, business incubator unit, or innovation centre at their institution. More than half of the respondents reported no involvement in activities related to the economy outside their mainstream responsibilities; at the other end of the scale, 7% reported spending five or more hours a week on these activities.

23. There appeared to be little incentive for staff to engage in ‘third stream’ activities. Of those engaged in business links, the majority thought such activities would not aid their career development; only 12% reported that these activities had resulted in promotion or a discretionary payment award. Academic respondents said their teaching was more likely than their research to benefit from business-linked activity; one-quarter said their research linked to the Research Assessment Exercise suffered to some extent because of business-linked activities.

24. In general, respondents to the survey indicated a positive attitude to economy-related links. There was widespread agreement that universities should make their services accessible to businesses; opinion was more split over whether economy related activities should be considered part of the mainstream responsibilities of academic and related staff. A majority of respondents felt their institution should be involved in the work of regional development agencies, and felt their institution should take employers’ needs into consideration in planning courses; opinion was more divided about customising degrees for particular businesses.

Dealing with conflicts

25. A number of actual or potential conflicts relating to involvement by academic and related staff in economy related activities were reported by respondents to the AUT survey. These issues need to be addressed if best practice in university-business interactions, from the staff perspective, is to be ensured, and if barriers to interactions are to be overcome.

- **Publication and confidentiality**

26. Respondents pointed out conflicts of interest between academic freedom and commercial confidentiality. The strong tradition among academics of early, widespread and unfettered publication of the results of research was often seen to be at odds with the desire by commercial sponsors of research to delay – or even suppress – publication. Respondents' comments (in italics) included:

“If you find things that they [the sponsors] don't actually think are correct ... or they don't agree with, or they don't feel present the right sort of image of what they were intending, then those results are not going to see the light of day.”

“Getting anything out into the public sector is ... difficult if it's sensitive, they [the sponsors] just don't want to know.”

“If you've got links with firms, you can't stand back and make criticisms of that firm and expect your career prospects to be rosy.”

27. Clear sector level guidance on best practice is needed on issues such as length of confidentiality periods and the right to publish the findings of research or consultancy. Contracts between universities and sponsors need to reflect this best practice.

28. The recommendations and guidance on sponsored university research, provided in June 1992 by the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (now Universities UK), provide useful advice on the key issue of academic freedom. These recommendations – or something similar – should be incorporated into university-business contracts. The CVCP recommended that:

- ◆ universities agree to sponsors seeing the publication prior to its issue and having the right to delay for a specified period, not more than 12 months;
- ◆ in exceptional circumstances the sponsor may be able to negotiate a longer delay period with the university but only after presenting a compelling case and also with the agreement of the research staff involved;
- ◆ under no circumstances should the university allow the sponsor the right to delay publication for an unrestricted period of time.¹⁸

• **University-business understanding**

29. Respondents identified a conflict between the goals and interests of academics and of businesses. Some respondents felt disappointment that businesses were not interested in methodological - and other - issues raised by a piece of research. While academics were interested in knowledge for its own sake, business partners were chiefly interested in the commercial relevance of research.

“Many academics feel that the reason they are on earth is to publish and be damned. And that's all they are interested in – many of them are not interested in licensing that technology.”

“There is going to be a conflict between the academic who is doing the research that particularly interests them that can't necessarily be applied.”

30. One potential resolution to these conflicts would be for both sides of a university-business partnership to be clear about their priorities and aims in a partnership to develop greater awareness of where the other partner is 'coming from'. Institutions should provide potential partners a clear statement of their values and priorities – particularly relating to institutional autonomy and academic freedom – and how these apply to university-business interactions.

- **Conflicting priorities within institutions**

31. Respondents to the AUT/IOE survey drew attention to the existence of a conflict within higher education institutions between the public agenda of an institution, as expressed in its mission statement and corporate planning documents, and the financial realities of life in higher education. In particular this related to institutions saying they supported academic-industry links, particularly at the local and regional level, while the 'hidden agenda' of institutions was that activities which counted towards a high Research Assessment Exercise rating – and thereby high research funding – were what really counted. One respondent said:

“We are struggling with a system which has got slightly out of kilter with some of its professed aims ... the pressure of things like the RAE ... an interest in working with employers, particularly on teaching matters, would not be supported by our current structures – by our current appraisal structures – these kinds of things can make it very difficult.”

32. Although the rules governing the RAE have become more inclusive in terms of what can be submitted in the exercise, the tension still exists. Greater provision of recognition and reward for staff involved in economic related activity, in terms of remuneration, release from other duties, promotion and staff development, would help to ease these tensions.

Ethics and research sponsorship

33. Universities also need to pay closer attention to the ethical dimension of commercial funding. During the last few years, there have been a number of notorious examples of corporate sponsorship, most famously the decision by Nottingham University to accept £3.8m from British American Tobacco to set up an International Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility. The AUT has been encouraging a discussion with our members on this issue, for example, by promoting the new Missenden Code of Practice on Ethics and Accountability.¹⁹ However, we believe that the vice-chancellors need to become involved in the debate. We recommend that Universities UK establish a working party to explore best practice in relation to commercial sponsorship, ethics and academic freedom. This working party should include representatives from the trade unions and professional associations.

34. The AUT believes that universities should ensure that their policies on university/business relations require open contracts, effective conflict of interest guidelines, and clear control of any academic policy implications of such arrangements by the academic board.²⁰ Universities should reject contracts that have inappropriate strings attached. Academic boards should have a mechanism to review contracts with academic conditions attached and should periodically review other research contracts to ensure that they are not in violation of the academic integrity of the institution.

35. In addition, the AUT believes universities should have as part of their research policy a clear provision forbidding 'no disclosure' research contracts that give a corporate sponsor a

veto over the publication of the research results, although universities should permit a brief period of confidentiality in order to allow the patent process and/or commercialisation to begin. Universities should refuse research contracts that carry a proviso that the university may not develop other research in the same field of expertise used in a particular contract without the approval of the original private contractor, since this suggests the suppression of contradictory research findings. Universities should reject commercial arrangements which prohibit adverse comments by members of the university about their commercial partners.

36. University research policy should also state that whenever university researchers make research findings which suggest that the health or safety of members of the public is endangered, they should inform their administrative superior and the responsible public authority in as timely a way as possible. It may be argued that this is already a legal requirement but it should, in any event, be reiterated in the university policy. The policy should also state that, if the authorities do not act in a timely way to deal with research findings indicating a threat to public health or safety, the researcher has the right and duty to make the problem public and that no commercial considerations should impede that right, although in the case of medical research, the privacy of patients should be respected as far as possible.

37. In our submission to the government's 2003 higher education white paper, we said: 'Academic freedom has come under great pressure over recent years, partly as a result of the increased pressures on university staff to raise money through collaboration with commercial interests, something that the White Paper seeks to extend. The AUT believes that there is now a strong argument for the creation of an independent adjudicator to consider complaints from staff of interference in their academic freedom or other complaints currently heard by the Visitor in the chartered institutions. The independent adjudicator for staff would have a similar role to the student adjudicator and would cover all higher education institutions.'

Governance

38. In addition to the four main consultation questions, the Lambert Review was asked to 'ask business for its views on the present governance, management and leadership arrangements for higher education institutions, and their effectiveness in supporting good research and knowledge transfer and providing relevant skills for the economy'.

39. The AUT strongly upholds the tradition of autonomy for higher education institutions. We believe that higher education institutions should be run in an open and transparent manner, with clear arrangements for accountability. Academic endeavours, including university-business interactions, should be undertaken on an open, collegial basis. Private sources of income should not interfere with an HEI's autonomy or the freedom of its staff to conduct research, to disseminate their research findings, and to teach.

40. To protect the autonomy, diversity and stability of HEIs, the internal governance of all HEIs should be embodied in individual Charters or Acts of Parliament. Charters provide principles of organisation which maintain independence whilst fostering participation by people from outside the HEI, and by staff and students, in internal government. The Association recommends that the Charter and Statutes of HEIs should embody the general requirement that HEIs conduct their business in an ethical manner. There should be an annual ethical audit of the HEI.

41. The Senate should make decisions on all academic matters, and should have the right to comment on any matter which has implications for the academic activities of the HEI. The Council (or Court) has responsibility for making overall financial decisions concerning the HEI. This ensures both the protection of the academic endeavour, and open scrutiny of the work of the organisation.

42. The membership of the HEI's main executive body, the Council (or Court), should adequately represent all the diversity of interests which are served by the institution, with no undue dominance by any one particular interest. There should remain a majority of lay members on the Council. These should include representatives of the professions, business, industry, trade unions, educational interests and local government, whose composition should reflect the composition of the national and local community, and the principles of equal opportunities. The method of appointment or election of Council members should be transparent and fair, and should be specified in the Ordinances and Regulations of HEIs.

Association of University Teachers

April 2003

Endnotes

¹ HEFCE, *Higher education-business interaction survey 2000-01*, March 2003/11, p 10

² op cit, p 13

³ op cit, p 11

⁴ op cit, p 34

⁵ Harvey L., W. Locke, and A. Morey (2002) *Enhancing employability, recognising diversity: making links between higher education and the world of work*, London: Universities UK and CSU.

⁶ Department for Education and Employment, 8 December 1998, grant letter to Higher Education Funding Council for England, para 29

⁷ HEFCE, *Higher Education Reach-out to Business and the Community Fund: Invitation to apply for special funding*, 99/40, June 1999, para 10

⁸ Secretary of State for Education and Skills, 22 January 2003, grant letter to Higher Education Funding Council for England, para 19

⁹ SHEFC, HE/24/01, para 2

¹⁰ ELWa, W03/03HE, para 10

¹¹ DfES (2003), *The future of higher education*, Cm 5735, para 3.4

¹² DfES (2003), *The future of higher education*, Cm 5735, para 3.7

¹³ The survey questionnaires, which form the basis of recent reports such as HEFCE 98/70 (*Industry-academic links in the UK*), HEFCE 01/68 (*Higher education-business interaction survey*), and HEFCE 2003/11 (*Higher education-business interaction survey 2000-01*), are completed by institutions, and are primarily concerned with quantitative information on interactions. In fact only the questionnaire for the 1998 report asks institutions about barriers to establishing working relationships with industry.

¹⁴ HEFCE 98/70, p 61

¹⁵ HEFCE, *Higher education-business interaction survey 2000-01*, March 2003/11, para 53

¹⁶ p 49

¹⁷ AUT/Institute of Education (2000), *Academic and academic related staff involvement in the local, regional and national economy*, London: AUT/IOE.

¹⁸ CVCP (1992), *Sponsored University Research: Recommendations and Guidance on Contract Issues*, London: CVCP.

¹⁹ For a summary of the Missenden Code, see <http://www.missendencentre.co.uk/docs/MissCode.pdf>

²⁰ This section is based on the code for Commercialisation, Research and Academic Freedom, developed by the Association of University Staff of New Zealand; see Donald C Savage, 'Academic Freedom and Institutional Autonomy in New Zealand Universities', in Crozier, R. (ed.) *Troubled Times - Academic Freedom in New Zealand*, 2000, Paterson North, NZ: Dunmore Press, pp. 121-2.