



The All-Party Parliamentary **University Group**

University APPG weekly update

29 May – 9 June 2023

A regular digest of House of Commons, House of Lords, and higher education sector business.

If you would like more information on parliamentary business, or advice on engaging with Parliament or a parliamentarian, please contact:

Tom Lewis | appug@universitiesuk.ac.uk | 0207 419 5424

Click on the items in the Table of contents to go straight to debates, answers, forthcoming business, etc.

Contents

Parliamentary business	3
Statutory Duty of Care – Westminster Hall debate	3
Science and Technology Superpower – Grand Committee	6
Forthcoming business	9
Education Oral Questions	9
DSIT Oral Questions	9
Written Questions	11
Kathleen Stock	11
Students: Loans	11
Arts: Vocational Education	12
Higher Education: Finance	12
Higher Education: Workplace Pensions	13
Immigration Controls: Equality	13
Overseas Students: Visas	14
Sudan: Students	15
Refugees: Sudan	15
Sector News	16
Graduate Outcomes data and statistics 2020/21	16
Prof Arif Ahmed announced as OfS Director	16
Free School Meals outcomes – HEPI report	17
Labour approach to tuition fees	18
Petitions Committee statutory duty of care survey results	18
Lessons from Australia for the regulation of English higher education – HEPI policy note	19
Horizon Europe Guarantee extended	20

Parliamentary business

Statutory Duty of Care – Westminster Hall debate

On Monday 5 June, a petition relating to a statutory duty of care for higher education students was debated in Westminster Hall.

Nick Fletcher MP (Conservative) opened the debate by outlining the findings of a survey of the petitioners in which approximately half of students felt their university was “unsupportive”. He asked why universities were not implementing guidance on information sharing and suicide safer universities, and questioned why some universities were notifying students of their dismissal by email. Finally, he asked why universities were not coming together to spread best practice. He went on to outline calls to actions for several groups. He said society needed to better prepare young people in the years before they attend university, that universities must try harder and sign up to best practice guidance and that the government must use the levers available to them to urge universities to improve.

Paul Blomfield MP (Labour) highlighted that suicide rates are lower among students compared to the general population but noted that one suicide is one too many. He described the diversity of the student population but recognised that the focus of this debate was on the younger cohort of students. He noted the difficulties that young people experience in accessing support and that these were the same young people going to universities with pre-existing mental health difficulties. He highlighted that although many universities had not signed up to best practice guidance, responsibility for improving student wellbeing lies across different agencies and stakeholders. He was not convinced that a duty of care would achieve the aims the petitioners desired. Nevertheless, there needed to be clear expectations upon universities to ‘up their game’ consistently across the sector. It should not be a one-size-fits-all solution, given the diversity of the student population but there should be consistent expectations for universities to reduce student suicides. He called on the Minister to consider the other factors contributing to the mental health crisis facing young people and ensure support was available to tackle this crisis.

Rt Hon Kit Malthouse MP (Conservative) observed a culture-change among universities. He described them as ‘transactional’ places rather than communities, which had led to more defensive responses to tragic events. He noted a ‘lack of kindness’ and human connection in the sector’s response, often retreating into bureaucratic and process driven arguments.

Mary Kelly Foy MP (Labour) said that the current general duty of care was unclear and did not provide parents with peace of mind. She asked the Minister for clarity on what the unintended consequences of a statutory duty of care were and to ignore the advice of officials to not implement a duty of care.

Helen Grant MP (Conservative) highlighted significant confusion in what students and parents believe there to be in terms of a statutory duty of care over students' wellbeing and what exists in legislation. She said that the law as it stands, offers limited protection to students. She highlighted Universities UK's work in helping to improve pastoral care and support for students. However, she said there was no requirement for universities to sign up to the Student Minds' Mental Health Charter. A statutory duty of care would set the bar, improve standards, and outline what might be reasonably expected of universities, whilst upholding student autonomy. It would remove ambiguity and set legal norms that strike a balance between students and teaching institutions and bring the UK in line with the US and Australia.

Tim Farron MP (Liberal Democrat) said universities were wrong to push back on introducing a duty of care, because the majority of students are young people living away from home for the first time and experiencing disruption from the Covid-19 pandemic. However, he acknowledged it was not all the responsibility of universities to resolve this and that they were filling gaps in services that Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) had not been able to deliver.

Matt Western MP, Shadow Minister for Higher Education, expressed concerns about the examples of universities notifying students of their dismissal by automated emails. He also noted the financial pressures facing students, which was contributing to poor mental health. He said there was merit in pursuing a 'support excellence framework', similar to the REF and TEF which would create a need to understand the quality of provision among providers. He agreed with Debbie Abrahams MP's suggestion that there should be a named advocate who can be notified if there were concerns about the mental health of a student. He recognised the time, money and support devoted by universities to support student mental health but noted the significant gap in expectations of students and the services that universities could offer. He highlighted inconsistencies in adopting best practice guidelines and implored UUK to investigate this as a matter of priority. He welcomed the government's attempts to encourage providers to sign up to the Mental Health Charter by September 2024 and urged the government for more investment in CAMHS and the integration of universities' services into their local mental health trust.

Rt Hon Robert Halfon MP, Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships, and Higher Education outlined the government's approach: funding and resourcing vital services and spreading and implementing best practice. He said he had written to all universities to sign up to the Mental Health Charter by September 2024. He believed that providers could meet this challenge but if they did not, the government would ask the Office for Students (OfS) to examine the merits of a new registration condition for mental health which would be subject to the same sanctions as other registration conditions. He said he was working with Prof Edward Peck, the Student Support Champion to identify four areas of further action:

- 1) Identify students at risk early, before they reach crisis point.
- 2) Establish a University Student Commitment with more compassionate academic processes to support students facing assignments or course dismissal.
- 3) Share existing reviews of previous cases to ensure everyone can learn from these tragic events.
- 4) Share best practice more widely.

The Higher Education Mental Health Implementation taskforce, chaired by Prof Edward Peck, will report directly to the Minister. It will publish an interim plan before the end of the year, and by May 2024 it will follow up with a final report on how the sector will publicly report on progress measures.

The Minister said he shared the petitioners aims to protect students and prevent future tragedies. However, he did not consider a statutory duty of care an effective intervention. He was concerned that it would create a one size fits all approach. A general duty of care already existed alongside further protections in law (e.g. the Equality Act 2010). Furthermore, a new legislative requirement was not needed when the sector was making progress on a voluntary basis. He also noted that there was no consensus on which set of interventions would be most effective. He said he would not hesitate to ask the OfS to introduce a new condition of registration if the sector did not make sufficient progress and will not 'close the door' to legislating on this issue in the future.

You can [watch the session](#) here and [read a transcript](#) here.

Science and Technology Superpower – Grand Committee

On Wednesday 7 June, the Lords Grand Committee considered the Science and Technology Committee report: “Science and technology superpower: more than a slogan?”

Baroness Brown of Cambridge (Crossbench) outlined the report’s findings, saying that the Committee had found strong consensus that science, technology, and innovation had a key role to play in delivering economic growth, improving public services and providing strategic international advantage. However, the Committee had raised concerns over the delivery of a science strategy, saying the rhetoric around “becoming a science superpower by 2030” was vague and had led to unclear priorities.

Several Peers asked about the government’s strategic approach, with the establishment of the Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT) and the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC).

Lord Krebs (Crossbench) highlighted that the government had published eight different strategies for science with 25 priority areas. He suggested the main problem was the lack of long termism – something that was vital for scientific discovery. Lord Rees (Crossbench) echoed this point and said that universities and research required governance by a bipartisan consensus.

Responding on behalf of the government, the Minister for Science, Innovation, and Technology, Viscount Camrose, said that his department would provide long-term strategic coherence in policy and strategy for science and technology. He also noted that by the end of 2023, DSIT would publish an update setting out progress made and the further action that must be taken to become a science and tech superpower by 2030. The Minister also confirmed that the NSTC would remain a Cabinet Committee following the recent changes, with the Prime Minister as Chair.

Baroness Brown criticised the lack of a joined-up international approach, highlighting that the UK remained out of Horizon Europe and high visa costs and complex processes risked the UK’s reputation as a destination that welcomes top international science talent and as a desirable partner in international collaborations. This was compounded by the urgent need for scientists, technologists and engineers, trained domestically or welcomed from abroad.

Baroness Walmsley (Liberal Democrat) said that to achieve the government’s objective, the UK needed to be open to the “brightest and best” from abroad. She

said that this was not the case as the UK had the most expensive and unwieldy visa system among comparable countries, apart from Australia and New Zealand. Additionally, health surcharges for international researchers were a substantial disincentive. She said that the government had rejected the Committee's recommendation that health costs could be paid in annual instalments, suggesting that given the NHS already had to verify the eligibility of foreign visitors to use its services, it would not be too onerous to implement.

Lord Patel (Crossbench) said that new restrictions on dependants would also make the UK seem like an unwelcoming country. He also highlighted the cuts in Official Development Assistance (ODA) funding as another wrong signal for global cooperation. He proceeded to ask the Minister to publish a strategy for global partnerships in science and technology and to remove current immigration barriers.

Baroness Northover (Liberal Democrat) noted that Horizon Europe had not been mentioned at all in the 2021 Integrated Review, or its recent refresh, saying that this had not helped the fears that the Prime Minister was not convinced by the value of the programme.

The Minister responded by stating that the government wanted the UK to be the partner of choice for other leading science nations and to tap into the rising potential of emerging economies, citing a recent MoU with India on understanding research and innovation. On attracting international talent, he noted that the Science and Technology Framework presented a talent and skills vision for 2030 which included an immigration offer for talented researchers and innovators to come to the UK, including via the high potential route for recent graduates of top global universities.

Regarding Horizon, the Minister said that discussions had been held in good faith and hoped negotiations would be successful. He also reiterated that association was their strong preference, but that participation must be fair for the UK's researchers, businesses and taxpayers. Finally, he outlined the government's alternative Pioneer package, if the UK was unable to associate.

Lord Winston (Labour) suggested that there was an issue with loss of talent in research, saying that if only 20% of applications to UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) were working, that meant that 80% of scientists working in "really good universities" were not getting funded by a key body that was essential to their career. The Minister responded saying that UKRI was working to improve the experience of applying for funding through its Simpler and Better Funding programme.

Lord Rees noted the UK's high standing in international higher education rankings but said this was at risk from academia becoming less alluring. He said this was due to young people increasingly associating academia with precarity and undue financial sacrifices and the deployment of ever more detailed performance indicators to quantify outputs. Viscount Camrose said that UKRI was looking at how to support early career researchers through the New Deal for PGRs, and the results of their consultation would be published soon.

Baroness Walmsley spoke about challenges in domestic recruitment, highlighting the lack of routes for technicians, in particular. She suggested that higher-level apprenticeships could fill the gap and that apprentices should be given the financial support to enable them to move around the country to find an appropriate place. She said that the government's response to the Committee's recommendation had only amounted to 'small bits' of support.

Viscount Hanworth (Labour) said that universities were currently in "severe financial straits" and that this had impacted their staff, who have suffered severe erosions of their incomes and growing insecurity of their employment, leading to frequent industrial action. Combined with international talent leaving, this was discouraging research students to join the profession.

Viscount Hanworth proceeded to note the excellence of universities in pure research but said they had been less successful at applying it in practical contexts. However, the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) and the demands for practicality that had arisen within the Research Excellence Framework (REF) were attempting to address this.

Baroness Brown noted that there had been a recalculation of the proportion of GDP spent on R&D since the report was published, meaning the government's 2.4% target had now been met. She welcomed the government's acknowledgement that a stronger baseline did not change the underlying rationale for growing investment in R&D and encouraged them to adopt a new target. Viscount Camrose said that it was good news that the ONS had improved its methodology and that, as a result, the UK had moved above countries such as France. He also reiterated the Chancellor's recommitment in the most recent Budget to growing public spend to £20 billion per annum by 2024-25.

You can [watch the session](#) here and [read a transcript](#) here.

Forthcoming business

Education Oral Questions

On Monday 12 June from 2:30pm, Rt Hon Gillian Keegan MP, Secretary of State for Education, and her ministerial team will answer oral questions in the House of Commons. Relevant tabled questions include:

- What steps she is taking to resolve the industrial dispute with education trade unions. (Theresa Villiers MP, Conservative)
- Whether she has had recent discussions with her counterparts in the devolved Administrations on financial support for (a) school and (b) higher education students in the context of increases in the cost of living. (Marion Fellows MP, SNP)
- What recent discussions she has had with the Secretary of State for the Home Department on the potential impact of changes to the student visa route on the competitiveness of the higher education sector. (Angela Crawley MP, SNP)
- What steps she plans to take with the higher education sector to reduce the suicide rate for students. (Darren Henry MP, Conservative)
- What assessment her Department has made of the potential impact of tuition fees on the social mobility of young people. (Dr Philippa Whitford MP, SNP)
- What assessment she has made of the potential impact of increases in the cost of living on students. (Janet Daby MP, Labour)

You can [read the full list of tabled questions](#) here and [watch the session](#) here.

DSIT Oral Questions

On Wednesday 14 June from 11:30am, Rt Hon Chloe Smith, Secretary of State for Science, Innovation, and Technology, and her ministerial team will answer oral questions in the House of Commons. Relevant tabled questions include:

- What assessment she has made of the potential impact of the UK's departure from the EU on the science and technology sector. (Chris Stephens MP, SNP)

- What recent progress she has made on securing the UK's association to Horizon Europe. (Ben Bradshaw MP, Labour)

You can [read the full list of tabled questions](#) here and [watch the session](#) here.

Written Questions

Kathleen Stock

Sir John Hayes: To ask the Secretary of State for Education, if she will make an assessment of the implications for her policies on freedom of speech at universities of attempts to cancel an appearance at the Oxford Union by Professor Kathleen Stock; and if she will make a statement. [UIN 186006]

Claire Coutinho: The Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023 will place duties upon registered higher education providers, their colleges and students' unions to take steps to ensure freedom of speech.

Visiting speakers will be protected, and if they have suffered adverse consequences because of a breach of the duties of a provider, college or students' union, they will be able to make a complaint using a new free-to-use complaints scheme, which will be operated by the Office for Students.

Students: Loans

Ashley Dalton: To ask the Secretary of State for Education, whether she has made an assessment of the potential merits of increasing student maintenance loans above the planned 2.8 per cent given the current level of inflation. [UIN 186264]

Robert Halfon: Decisions on student support for higher education courses are taken on an annual basis and changes for the 2023/24 academic year were made through regulations laid in January 2023. The department has continued to increase maximum loans and grants for living and other costs on an annual basis, with a 2.3% increase for the 2022/23 academic year and a further 2.8% increase for 2023/24.

The government recognises the additional cost of living pressures that have arisen this year which have impacted students. On 11 January 2023 the department announced a one-off funding boost of £15 million to this year's student premium. There is now £276 million of student premium funding available this academic year to support disadvantaged students who need additional help. This extra funding will complement the help universities are providing through their own bursary, scholarship and hardship support schemes.

Furthermore, students who have been awarded a loan for living costs for the 2022/23 academic year that is lower than the maximum, and whose household income for the tax year 2022/23 has dropped by at least 15% compared to the income provided for their original assessment, have been able to apply for their entitlement to be reassessed.

Arts: Vocational Education

Damien Moore: To ask the Secretary of State for Education, what assessment her Department has made of the potential merits of establishing a national Technical University in England to focus on the teaching of technical arts. [UIN 186489]

Robert Halfon: The department is investing £300 million in capital funding to establish 21 Institutes of Technology across the country. Institutes of Technology are collaborations between employers, colleges and universities that provide access to industry standard facilities, focusing on meeting the needs of employers and learners in their specific local areas. That includes provision aimed at the creative industries across a diverse range of subjects including music production, animation & games design, 3D and graphic design, creative and media professions and Esports.

Higher Education: Finance

Caroline Lucas: To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, what assessment he has made of the impact of the decision not to provide Higher Education Institutions with additional funding support from 2024 on the financial sustainability of (a) individual Institutions and (b) the sector; if he will make it his policy to fully fund the costs to such Institutions of the Superannuation Contributions Adjusted for Past Experience discount rate; and if he will make a statement. [UIN186400]

Gareth Davies: In recognition of the cost pressure a potential increase to employer contribution rates would bring to existing departmental budgets, the Government announced on 30 March its commitment to providing funding for employers whose employment costs are centrally funded. Higher education (HE) providers are not covered by this commitment. To not provide financial support is consistent with the decision to not fund a similar Teachers' Pension Scheme cost increase in 2019.

Nevertheless, I do recognise that while the Office for Students' (OfS) annual report on financial sustainability finds that university finances generally remain in good shape, there remains a wide spread of financial performance across the sector. The

Department for Education and HMT recognise the importance of this issue and will continue discussions about the implications for HE providers. The Government will confirm its position on this issue in due course.

Higher Education: Workplace Pensions

Caroline Lucas: To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, what discussions he has had with the Secretary of State for Education on the costs to the higher education sector of participation in the Teachers' Pension Scheme; if he will make it his policy to work with the sector to develop financial mechanisms to help higher education institutions manage those costs in the long-term; and if he will make a statement. [UIN 186401]

Gareth Davies: In recognition of the cost pressure a potential increase to employer contribution rates would bring to existing departmental budgets, the Government announced on 30 March its commitment to providing funding for employers whose employment costs are centrally funded. Higher education (HE) providers are not covered by this commitment. To not provide financial support is consistent with the decision to not fund a similar Teachers' Pension Scheme cost increase in 2019.

Nevertheless, I do recognise that while the Office for Students' (OfS) annual report on financial sustainability finds that university finances generally remain in good shape, there remains a wide spread of financial performance across the sector. The Department for Education and HMT recognise the importance of this issue and will continue discussions about the implications for HE providers. The Government will confirm its position on this issue in due course.

Immigration Controls: Equality

Alison Thewliss: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether she plans to publish an equality impact assessment on the policies in her Written Ministerial Statement of 23 May 2023 entitled Immigration update, HCWS800.[UIN 186642]

Robert Jenrick: The package of measures we have introduced to reform the student route strikes the right balance between protecting the economic benefits students can bring to the UK whilst meeting the Government's commitment to lower net migration.

We consider our Public Sector Equality Duty in the development of all policy, and an Equality Impact Assessment was produced and considered in developing this package of reforms.

We regularly engage with a range of organisations to understand potential policy impacts, including with Universities Scotland and the Scottish Government. The Devolved Governments were informed of the publication of the Written Ministerial Statement on 23 May by way of a letter from Home Office Ministers.

The public rightly expects us to control immigration and ensure we have a system that works in the UK's best interests. and The Department for Education will lead the review of education agents.

We keep all our immigration policies under constant review to ensure they best serve the UK and reflect the public's priorities.

Overseas Students: Visas

Rachael Maskell: To ask the Secretary of State for Education, what assessment she has made of the potential impact of proposals for changes to visa rules for international students on the impact of international students and their dependants on (a) research, (b) science and (C) the arts in the UK. [UIN 186670]

Robert Halfon: The UK has been successful in delivering the government's International Education Strategy ambition of hosting at least 600,000 students per year by 2030, for two years running, and we expect that universities will be able to adapt to reduced dependant numbers.

Our offer to international students remains extremely competitive and we are committed to ensuring the UK remains a destination of choice for international students from across the globe. International students make a significant economic and cultural contribution to the UK's higher education sector, which is good for our universities and delivers growth at home. Those affected by these changes will predominantly be dependants of international students. Students coming to the UK to undertake postgraduate research courses will not be affected by the new restriction on dependents.

The Department for Education will work closely with the Home Office, the Department for Business and Trade, and across other government departments, to assess the impact of these changes on research, science and arts in the UK.

Sudan: Students

Feryal Clark: To ask the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, whether he has made an assessment of the potential merits of allowing medical students in Sudan to continue their training and education in the UK. [UIN 186568]

Will Quince: No assessment has been made. Students would need to apply to individual medical schools and meet their entry requirements, as well as meeting any United Kingdom immigration requirements.

Refugees: Sudan

Neil Coyle: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, what steps her Department is taking to support Sudanese (a) refugees arriving in the UK and (b) students and other visitors in the UK at the onset of the crisis. [UIN 186523]

Robert Jenrick: We are proud of our long-standing tradition of welcoming refugees and individuals in need through resettlement schemes and have welcomed over half a million people through safe and legal routes since 2015.

The UK currently operates several resettlement schemes which Sudanese nationals may be eligible for, including the UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS) and the Community Sponsorship Scheme. However, the UK had finite resources and is so not able to provide tailored humanitarian routes in every circumstance.

Sector News

Graduate Outcomes data and statistics 2020/21

On Wednesday 31 May, the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) published data on what graduates of 2021 were doing 15 months after graduating.

Key findings include:

- 82% of graduates were in employment or unpaid work.
- 78% of graduates from higher education providers were employed in high-skilled jobs.
- 53% in employment were earning more than £27,000.

Commenting on the data, Professor Steve West CBE, President of Universities UK and Vice-Chancellor of UWE Bristol, said: “UK universities are world-leading – equipping graduates with the skills to enter, thrive and progress in the workforce. This data confirms that during uncertain economic times, a degree continues to give a significant boost to a graduate’s employment prospects.”

You can [read the full data set](#) here and [read the UUK response](#) here.

Prof Arif Ahmed announced as OfS Director

On Thursday 1 June, the Office for Students (OfS) announced the appointment of Professor Arif Ahmed as the first Director for Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom.

The announcement confirmed that Professor Ahmed would take up the role later in summer.

Commenting on his appointment, Susan Lapworth, chief executive of the OfS, said: “Freedom of speech and academic freedom are essential underpinning principles of higher education in England. Arif’s appointment will ensure they continue to be robustly defended across the sector. Arif will bring an important academic perspective to the OfS’s work in this area and I am looking forward to working with him as we implement the new legislation.”

A Universities UK spokesperson said: “We welcome Professor Arif Ahmed to the important role of Director of Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom at the OfS. Universities take their responsibility to protect and promote both free speech and academic freedom seriously, and work hard to ensure that these concepts are understood by the whole university community.”

You can [read the announcement](#) here and [read Professor Ahmed’s op-ed in the Times](#) here.

Free School Meals outcomes – HEPI report

On Thursday 1 June, the Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI) published a paper on educational outcomes across different universities for students formerly eligible for Free School Meals.

The paper, sponsored by London South Bank University, showed:

- Institutions with a TEF Gold Award recruit significantly fewer Free School Meal pupils as a proportion of their overall intake compared to Bronze and Silver universities.
- Universities that recruit a smaller number of Free School Meal students have a higher entry tariff and are disproportionally more likely to receive a Gold award under the TEF. Not a single provider with more than 30% of their students having been eligible for Free School Meals was awarded a Gold in the TEF.
- There are no significant correlations between the proportion of Free School meal pupils and the size of any outcome gaps. Gold providers, despite having far fewer Free School Meal students, do not achieve comparatively better Continuation, Completion, Attainment or Progression for these students compared to Silver and Bronze providers.

Professor Antony C. Moss, author of the report, said: ‘This report shows that the heavy lifting on social mobility is not distributed equally across the higher education sector. Bronze and Silver TEF-ranked, lower-tariff institutions are doing far more to expand access to higher education, by recruiting the majority of disadvantaged students.’

You can [read the full report](#) here.

Labour approach to tuition fees

In a Times Red Box piece, published on Friday 2 June, the Shadow Secretary of State for Education, Bridget Phillipson MP, outlined Labour's framework for tuition fees.

The article acknowledges the potential of universities and describes the current tuition fees system as 'broken'. She describes how Labour's reforms would not increase government spending but deliver a 'better, fairer system' for graduates and universities.

Breaking down barriers to opportunity is a key theme in the article, particularly supporting students through the cost of living crisis.

You can [read the article](#) here.

Petitions Committee statutory duty of care survey results

Ahead of the Petitions Committee debate on a statutory duty of care for students in higher education, a survey was published by the Committee. The survey asked petitioners about their experiences of mental health support at university and their views on introducing a statutory duty of care for higher education students.

Key findings include:

- 86% of current students said they had suffered with poor mental health at university.
- 40% of students said that their university was 'unsupportive' or 'very unsupportive' of their mental health.
- 79% of parents or guardians of a current or former student said they 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' that the current mental health support for university students is adequate.

You can [read the full survey results](#) here.

Lessons from Australia for the regulation of English higher education – HEPI policy note

On Thursday 8 June, the Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI) published a new paper on the regulation of English higher education by Anthony McClaran, the Vice-Chancellor of St Mary's University, Twickenham, and a former Chief Executive of both the UK's Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Australia's Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA).

The paper notes that while there is opposition to the statutory regulation of higher education institutions, it brings clear potential advantages, including: clarity; a sanctions regime; recognition of the public purpose of institutions; accountability to democratic authorities; and protection for students and others.

The paper concludes with some possible lessons for England:

- Securing independence through checks and balances, with real accountability, not only because independence is a statutory requirement but because visible independence is essential to trust and therefore to the assurance of students, taxpayers, stakeholders and international audiences.
- Putting regulatory judgement through rigorous challenge, both inside the regulator's structures and beyond – this can go hand in hand with an approach which subjects proposed interventions to the tests of risk, proportionality and necessity.
- Recognising the role that a regulator can play in delivering sector-wide responses to the great thematic challenges that inevitably arise in institutions as large, complex and embedded in our society as higher education institutions.

Anthony McClaran, the author of the report, said: "In my time leading the main regulator of the tertiary sector in Australia, I saw how effective good statutory regulation can be. But it took a few years for Australia to reach its current situation, as there were initially concerns about regulatory burden, excessive bureaucracy and problematic communication – all of which we now hear from some in England."

You can [read the full policy note](#) here.

Horizon Europe Guarantee extended

On Thursday 8 June, the government announced an extension to the support provided to UK Horizon Europe applicants until the end of September 2023.

The guarantee will be in place to cover all Horizon Europe calls that close on or before 30 September 2023. Eligible, successful applicants to Horizon Europe will receive the full value of their funding at their UK host institution for the lifetime of their grant.

Successful awardees do not need to leave the UK to receive this funding, which will provide reassurance for future collaborations, and support UK researchers whether association is confirmed, or otherwise.

Rt Hon Chloe Smith MP, Secretary of State for Science, Innovation, and Technology, said: “This extension offers certainty to our world-class researchers that they will receive the support they need to continue their ground-breaking work, building on the over £1 billion in support awarded so far, while negotiations over association to Horizon Europe remain ongoing.”

Jamie Arrowsmith, Director of Universities UK International, said: “The latest Horizon Europe guarantee provides welcome certainty that UK researchers will receive funding from UKRI for any successful Horizon Europe bids to calls closing before the end of September... The agreement of the Windsor Framework opened the door to confirming full UK association to Horizon Europe, which remains our preferred outcome, and we urge UK and EU negotiators to reach a swift agreement.”

You can [read the full announcement](#) here.