Department for Business, Innovation & Skills

Teaching Excellence Framework Technical Consultation – Response Form

Name/Organisation:

Yvonne Morris MCLIP
Policy Officer
CILIP: the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals
7 Ridgmount Street
London
WC1E 7AE
Email: yvonne.morris@cilip.org.uk or Telephone: 0044 (0) 207 255 0629

Please tick the box that best describes you as a respondent to this consultation:

	Respondent type
☐	Alternative higher education provider (with designated courses)
☐	Alternative higher education provider (no designated courses)
☐	Awarding organisation
☐	Business/Employer
☐	Central government
☐	Charity or social enterprise
☐	Further Education College
☐	Higher Education Institution
☐	Individual (Please describe any particular relevant interest; parent, student, teaching staff etc.)
☐	Legal representative
☐	Local Government
✓	Professional Body
☐	Representative Body
☐	Research Council
☐	Student
☐	Trade Union or staff association
☐	Other (please describe)

Question 1 (Chapter 1)
Do you agree with the criteria proposed in Figure 4?

☐Yes   ☐No   ✓ Not sure

Please outline your reasons and suggest any alternatives or additions.

Library and information professionals are *part of* the delivery of teaching excellence and enable students to become independent learners, as well as contributing to more structured teaching and learning programmes. They have an essential role to play in each of the three aspects of the criteria and CILIP believes that the language that is to be reflected in the panel member guidance in figure 4 allows scope for this.

Teaching quality: "Evidence might include initial and continuing professional development for teaching and academic support staff, reward and recognition, promotion and progression opportunities, and the level of experience and contractual status of staff involved in teaching".

The development of qualified and knowledgeable staff throughout the institution, including both academic and other professional staff, will support and promote high standards of teaching. We agree with SCONUL that the above statement gives panels the opportunity to recognise the importance of professional development in relation to teaching for staff directly responsible for it and for those in support roles. Library and information professionals are both directly involved through the teaching of information literacy skills, and support teaching and learning through the development of physical and virtual spaces and collections.

Learning environment: There are references in this section to facilities and resources being both physical and virtual. We concur with SCONUL that this language provides potential for institutions to represent their diverse and multi-facetted learning environments.

We note that point 66 of the consultation indicates that the learning resources questions (16-18) from the NSS will not be included in the core metrics as the questions are under review. We welcome this review as we are aware that concerns have been raised (as set out in our response to the "Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice" consultation), however we hope that the review makes these questions applicable to the TEF exercise so that they can be included in the core metrics.

Student outcomes and learning gain: We support SCONUL's suggested changes, which are as follows:

Evidence may include input measures such as employer engagement in the curriculum, course accreditation by professional regulatory or statutory bodies*, the embedding of skills related to employability and independent learning in the curriculum,* and extracurricular activities designed to enhance employability and

transferable skills. Evidence may also include the impact of using methods such as Grade Point Average (GPA) to record students' achievement.

Skills related to employability are most valuable and effective when they are embedded in a student's academic experience and directly related to learning outcomes and that should be reflected here in the advice to panels.

Question 2 (Chapter 3)
A) How should we include a highly skilled employment metric as part of the TEF?

B) If included as a core metric, should we adopt employment in Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) groups 1-3 as a measure of graduates entering highly skilled jobs?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐Not sure

C) Do you agree with our proposal to include all graduates in the calculation of the employment/destination metrics?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐Not sure

Please outline your reasons and suggest any alternatives.

No comment

Question 3 (Chapter 3)
A) Do you agree with the proposed approach for setting benchmarks?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐Not sure

B)Do you agree with the proposed approach for flagging significant differences between indicator and benchmark (where differences exceed 2 standard deviations and 2 percentage points)?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐Not sure

Please outline your reasons if you disagree.

No comment

Question 4 (Chapter 3)
Do you agree that TEF metrics should be averaged over the most recent three years of available data?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐Not sure

Please outline your reasons and suggest alternatives.

No comment

Question 5 (Chapter 3)

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

☐Yes　　　☐No　　　☐Not sure

Please outline your reasons and suggest alternatives.

No comment

Question 6 (Chapter 3)
Do you agree with the contextual information that will be used to support TEF assessments proposed above?

☐Yes　　　☐No　　　☐Not sure

Please outline your reasons and suggest any alternatives or additions.

No comment

Question 7 (Chapter 3)
A) Do you agree with the proposed approach for the provider submission?

☐Yes　　　☐No　　　☐Not sure

B) Do you agree with the proposed 15 page limit?

☐Yes　　　☐No　　　☐Not sure

Please explain your reasons and outline any alternative suggestions.

No comment

Question 8 (Chapter 3)
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?

☐Yes　　　✓ No　　　☐Not sure

Please outline your reasons and suggest any additions or alternatives?

We are disappointed with the disconnect between what the panels are being encouraged to assess (figure 4) and what institutions are being encouraged to

submit (figure 6), namely around recognising the valuable contribution by professional services staff and the importance of virtual and physical places and learning resources for teaching and learning. We fully support SCONUL in the changes that they have recommended, which aim to bring the two sets of advice closer together. These are set out below:

Teaching quality: The following change is suggested:

Quantitative information relating to the qualification, experience and contractual basis of staff who teach *and professional staff directly involved in delivery and support of teaching and learning at their institutions*.

We feel strongly that the guidance on evidence should reflect the guidance given to panels and assessors and recognise the value of having professional services staff develop their expertise and gain recognition for their role in teaching and learning.

Learning environment: We are disappointed that none of the examples of evidence make reference to virtual or physical space or learning resources. The *place* in which a student's academic life takes place can have a profound and meaningful impact on modes of teaching and learning. We concur with SCONUL's advice regarding an amendment to one bullet point and three additional bullet points:

Quantitative information demonstrating proportional investment in teaching and learning infrastructure, including *investment in learning spaces (eg, the library) and resources*.

The extent, nature, and impact of pedagogically informed physical or virtual spaces, such as the library, in supporting teaching and learning.

Quantitative data demonstrating engagement with specialised learning resources and collections.

Qualitative evidence of impact which may include, for example, the narrative and experiential views of students about how their learning environment has supported their engagement with learning.

Question 9 (Chapter 4)
A) Do you think the TEF should issue commendations?

✓ Yes   ☐No   ☐Not sure

We agree that commendations would be a good way of recognising excellence and the personal contributions of committed staff.

B) If so, do you agree with the areas identified above?

☐Yes   ☐ No   ✓ Not sure

Please indicate if you have any additional or alternative suggestions for areas that might be covered by commendations.

We are concerned that the list of commendation areas lacks any reference to learning spaces and resources. We support SCONUL's recommend for an additional area:

Excellence in innovative spaces (virtual and physical), services and resources in supporting teaching and learning.

We are keen that the list of commendation areas includes learning support staff, especially librarians, as they are as important to teaching and learning as teaching staff. Again we support SCONUL in their recommendation that the following amendment is made to allow for commendation in this area:

Excellence in the support, reward and recognition available for teaching *and other professional staff with a role in supporting teaching and learning*.

Question 10 (Chapter 4)
Do you agree with the assessment process proposed?

☐Yes   ☐No   ✓ Not sure

Please outline your reasons and any alternative suggestions. The proposed process is set within a relatively tight timescale, reflected in the key dates included in Annex B. Responses should be framed within this context.

CILIP strongly recommend that professional librarians be included in assessment panels to ensure that the panels achieve a broad and holistic understanding of teaching at an HE institution.

Libraries and information services are an integral part of teaching and learning within higher education institutions and have a significant impact on the quality of the learning environment and learning outcomes. Academic librarians deliver services to support a variety of learning styles and activities, course delivery methods and attendance patterns thereby ensuring access to the UK and international knowledge base. As well as supporting teachers in the development of HE students as independent learners by incorporating information and digital literacies into the curriculum, many library and information professionals teach information skills, thereby making an invaluable contribution to the development of a workforce and citizenry that has the skills to think critically, learn, innovate and exploit new opportunities. A number of CILIP members have achieved professional recognition for their teaching practice and some have been awarded the HEA National Teaching Fellowship.

Teaching quality, learning environment, and student outcomes and learning gain are areas where librarians are well positioned to provide expertise and relevant experience in evaluating excellence. It is also a group with a strong history of using data to evaluate and improve services.

We concur with SCONUL that these voices should be included alongside those of academics, students and employers in a panel charged with assessing an institution's teaching excellence and we support the changes to the descriptions of the roles that SCONUL proposes:

TEF assessor: TEF assessors are experts in teaching and learning in a higher education setting *and may be drawn from academic and professional services staff (eg, librarians).* TEF assessors also include students. Their role is to assess TEF applications and agree provisional outcomes.

Specialist: Specialists are individuals with expertise in particular areas. This may include expertise *in the strategic development of teaching and learning spaces, services and resources,* widening participation or employer perspectives. Their role is to provide specialist input to the assessment process, further to that which may already be available through existing expertise of assessors.

TEF Panel: The TEF Panel is the decision-making body, led by the TEF Chair. Its members will be made up of assessors and specialists *and should include professional services staff in either of these capacities.* The role of the TEF Panel is to moderate and confirm provisional outcomes recommended by assessors. Not all assessors will be members of the TEF Panel but all Panel members will be assessors.

Question 11 (Chapter 4)
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?

☐Yes   ☐No   ☐Not sure

Please outline your reasons.

No comment

Question 12 (Chapter 5)
Do you agree with the descriptions of the different TEF ratings proposed in Figure 9?

☐Yes   ☐No   ✓ Not sure

Please outline your reasons and any alternative suggestions.

CILIP notes that the descriptors do not provide detail that would differentiate the definition of 'excellent' from 'outstanding', and we follow SCONUL in recommending that further descriptive language is included so that the ratings are more meaningful to those participating in the process. In addition to more descriptive titles, we suggest, that the categories themselves be more descriptive: Meets expectations, Exceeds expectations and Outstanding.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views.

We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply ✓

At BIS we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would you be happy for us to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

✓ Yes　　　　　☐No

BIS/16/262/RF