

Response ID ANON-NHMS-54VM-2

Submitted to **Teaching Excellence Framework: Technical Consultation for Year Two**

Submitted on **2016-07-12 19:51:25**

Introduction

What is your name?

Name:

Paula Graham-Gazzard

What is your email address?

Email:

paula.graham@thead.ac.uk

What is your organisation?

Organisation:

Council for Higher Education in Art & Design

Please select the option below that best describes you as a respondent to this consultation

Organisation type:

Representative Body

Additional details (if required):

CHEAD is the representative body for the art, design and media higher education sector (HE ADM). Our mission is to contribute to the development of the Art, Design and Media community, its standing and stature as well as its engagement with the outside world. CHEAD provides a voice for and on behalf of HE ADM in the UK four nations advancing knowledge and understanding in the sector and promoting the sector's interests to others.

Consultation Questions (page 1 of 4)

Q1: Do you agree with the criteria proposed in Figure 4?

Not Sure

Question 1 further detail:

1.1: CHEAD broadly agrees with the criteria. However, there is insufficient clarity regarding how TEF levels will be differentiated, how the metrics proposed relate to the criteria and, thus, how performance will be measured in practice. Our member HEIs share a strong concern that the TEF should rely as much on qualitative data as metrics yet the qualitative submissions suggested often seem to lack rigour and it is not clear how much weight they will carry or whether they will only be considered in cases where the metrics offer borderline classification. We feel strongly that a robust, peer-reviewed, qualitative review should be an important part of the framework.

1.2: Our members also have deep concerns that student perceptions may be given too much weight in the TEF metrics. There is evidence that there may be an inverse relationship between successful learning outcomes and student satisfaction [a summary of relevant research can be found in "Do Student Evaluations of Teaching Really Get an "F"?" at Rice Centre for Teaching Excellence: <https://is.gd/UoEbPI>] and we feel it is crucial that more evidentially robust and objective methods are foregrounded.

1.3: Our members are concerned that contact time, retention, staff/student ratio, and class sizes are proxy measures which are far too restrictive in scope. Practice-based disciplines characteristically support extensive independent student activity in workshop and studio based work and we are concerned that over-reliance on proxy indicators will undermine our established and highly-successful creative practice-based teaching and learning and discourage 'risky' innovation in teaching and learning which is vitally needed in this period of rapid change. We are also concerned that the current NSS may bias responses and results relating to practice-based and other ADM pedagogies and strongly argue that there should be an adjustment in the data to correct this distortion which has been evidenced in the research of Susan Orr, Mantz Yorke, and Bernadette Blair [<https://is.gd/3s96iE>]. Engagement questions such as those included in UKES offers a more accurate indicator of effective stimulation and challenge in teaching and learning for the HE ADM sector.

1.4: We welcome a commitment to take account of diversity in students and subject areas in benchmarking. However, whilst there is emphasis on support for individual student needs, it is not clear how the metrics will capture the outcomes of systematic approaches and interventions supporting diversity in practice based learning and teaching. It is unclear how value added by teaching and learning will be captured in the metrics, a skills based standard test is likely not to be a good fit for art, design and media students or relate strongly to their career paths.

Q2: -

Q2a:

2.1: SOC coding is important in ensuring the integrity of the DLHE data. However, attention needs to be given to the relationship of vocational / non-vocational courses with graduate destinations. Furthermore, creative graduate patterns of employment frequently include an extended period of portfolio working with a low level paid job as part of the mix, if the graduate destination is defined solely by earnings this will not represent the graduate's contribution to the economy across the portfolio as a whole. Studies such as "Creative Graduates, Creative Futures" commissioned by CHEAD [<https://is.gd/k6vhTW>] show a characteristic portfolio career working across multiple jobs which may be unpaid or low paid, only stabilising over a 3 – 4 year period after graduation. It is crucial that the TEF metrics take account of this widespread characteristic of creative graduates. We would therefore cautiously recommend extending SOC from 1 – 3 to 1 – 4.

Not sure

Not sure

Question 2 further detail:

2.2: Current SOC codes do not accurately reflect creative graduate destinations in terms of the diverse and nuanced job titles in creative occupations. Currently, human judgements by HEIs in administering DLHE are required to achieve any degree of accuracy. A highly skilled employment metric might go some way towards resolving issues relating to the rapidly-evolving diversification of graduate employment in the creative sector and of creative graduates embedded in other industries but a more fine-grained and flexible approach to SOC coding is required. However, we do not know, at this time, how the revised DLHE will be structured and therefore it would be premature to commit to an approach or metric instrument which has yet to be defined.

2.3: We would also caution strongly against over-reliance on an exclusive use of salary and economic data. We would encourage the use of other impact data, including cultural and community engagement and value and would reference the work of Geoffrey Crossick in the AHRC Cultural Value project [<https://is.gd/v2H7v9>].

Q3: -

Not sure

Not sure

Question 3 further detail:

Our member institutions may be differently impacted so CHEAD will rely on our members' submissions. CHEAD does not support flagging significant differences between indicator and benchmark at this stage because it is extremely likely to cause perverse disadvantage to our members who are SSIs.

Consultation Questions (page 2 of 4)

Q4: Do you agree that TEF metrics should be averaged over the most recent three years of available data?

Yes

Question 4 further detail:

This may add burden in Scotland where quality review cycles do not synchronise with those of England. We would also flag various regional issues (including a 'London effect') with POLAR which will be dealt with in individual CHEAD member HEI's responses.

Q5: Do you agree the metrics should be split by the characteristics proposed?

Yes

Q5 further detail:

Q6: Do you agree with the contextual information that will be used to support TEF assessments proposed?

Yes

Question 6 further detail:

However, location benchmarking will be required to avoid perverse disadvantage to our member SSIs.

Consultation Questions (page 3 of 4)

Q7: -

Yes

Yes

Question 7 further detail:

The 15-page limit seems a fair balance between level of detail and administrative burden. However, many of our members have very strong concerns as to the relative weight of the submission compared to the weight given to metrics.

Q8: Without the list becoming exhaustive or prescriptive, we are keen to ensure that the examples of additional evidence included in Figure 6 reflect a diversity of approaches to delivery. Do you agree with the examples?

Not sure

Question 8 further detail:

8.1: We agree broadly with the examples in Figure 6 but feel that wider examples beyond NSS should be included along with evidence relating to staff satisfaction. Attention should also be paid to 'fit' with existing assessment regimes within individual HEIs.

8.2: We would also make the following points relating to the qualitative aspects of teaching, learning and environment:

- Indicators of teaching quality should assess the process of learning rather than the input or output of learning.
- When finalised these should form a limited, coherent, trusted set.
- Measures which can be 'gamed' such as contact hours should be avoided and contact time should not be a proxy for teaching quality.
- Indicators should reflect that teaching encompasses a broad range of activities including learning support and guidance, dissertation supervision and assessment.
- Examples should not be restricted to reflect only paid employment and should focus on employability and student wellbeing – graduate attributes.
- There should be measurement of student support processes and approaches, particularly in relation to support related to widening participation.

Q9: -

No

Not Answered

Question 9 further detail:

Commendations would provide no mechanism for the dissemination of good practice across the sector and it would be more profitable to focus on development of appropriate dissemination channels and methods. Commendations at institutional level would not provide useful information to students seeking information relating to specific subject areas.

Consultation Questions (page 4 of 4)

Q10: Do you agree with the assessment process proposed?

Not sure

Question 10 further detail:

Our members express general concerns that it is not possible to make a commitment to a framework which is, as yet, extremely vaguely defined. In particular, it is not clear by what criteria a panel may use to form its judgements or how levels of achievement might be differentiated.

Q11: Do you agree that in the case of providers with less than three years of core metrics, the duration of the award should reflect the number of years of core metrics available?

Not sure

Question 11 further detail:

Q12: Do you agree with the descriptions of the different TEF award ratings proposed in Figure 9?

Not sure

Question 12 further detail:

Again, there is inadequate definition on which to base a judgement.