

Annex E
Development of TQI and the NSS: consultation response form

This form is available electronically with the main document at www.hefce.ac.uk under Publications/Circular letters. Completed forms should be e-mailed to tginss@hefce.ac.uk no later than **Wednesday 6 December 2006**.

We will publish an analysis of responses to the consultation. Additionally, all responses may be disclosed on request, under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act. The Act gives a public right of access to any information held by a public authority, in this case HEFCE. This includes information provided in response to a consultation. We have a responsibility to decide whether any responses, including information about your identity, should be made public or treated as confidential. We can refuse to disclose information only in exceptional circumstances. This means responses to this consultation are unlikely to be treated as confidential except in very particular circumstances. Further information about the Act is available at www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk

1. Respondent's name.....Tom Norton.....

2. Position.....Director of Internal Policy Development

3. Is this an:

- individual response? No
- or a response on behalf of an organisation? Yes

4. If responding on behalf of an organisation,

- please state the name of the organisation:

.....The 1994 Group.....

- and indicate the type of organisation below with an 'x':

	Higher education institution
	Further education college
	Student union
X	Other

Questions from Annex C: proposals for the future TQI site

The following is a response from the 1994 Group to this consultation, endorsed by the Chair of the Student Experience Policy Group and the Chair of the 1994 Group Board. In addition to this response individual 1994 Group members will present their own responses elaborating on the issues raised below.

Question 1: Do you agree that data should be presented at level 3 in the subject hierarchy, wherever possible?

Yes. The more detailed JACS level will enable more meaningful information to be available to the audience.

Question 2: Do you agree that the threshold for publishing NSS results should be lowered to a 40% response rate, and 20 students responding?

Yes. The data would still be statistically relevant whilst increasing the visibility of subject areas with low student numbers.

Question 3: Do you agree with the principle that data should be aggregated across years and/or subjects, where it is unavailable at level three using one year's data? Are there any options for aggregating data that should not be offered to users?

Whilst we would like all subjects to be represented, which would be helped by lowering the threshold (Question 2), we are concerned that aggregation may produce distorted information. With an aggregation across years there is a real risk of presenting a misleadingly out of date picture. If this measure is implemented it is essential that the methodology of aggregation should be made clear and obvious to users.

Question 4: Do you have any comments about the suitability of the proposed items for a summary of key data?

Overall, the Group is happy with the proposed items for a summary of key data. However, there are concerns from some members regarding the usefulness of item (d). The proportion of leavers in 'graduate' jobs is not a particularly useful indicator, for three reasons: firstly, the jobs that graduates have six months after graduation are not necessarily an indicator of the value of their degree during their working lives; secondly the proportion of leavers undertaking further study is equally important; and thirdly, the definition of 'graduate job' is currently the subject of widespread debate.

Also, some felt that item (e) should display the averaged response from questions 1-21, rather than question 22, the overall satisfaction score.

Question 5: Do you have any comments about the proposed student profile data?

The Group is happy with the student profile proposals as stated.

Questions from Annex D: TQI for higher education in FECs

Question 6: Do you have any views on whether the NSS or DLHE surveys should in principle be extended to include directly funded HE students in FECs?

n/a

Question 7: Do you have any comments on the options to present franchised students with the FEC's data, and also make it available with the HEI's data?

n/a

Question 8: Do you have any comments on the proposed approach for institutions to provide commentaries on the data?

n/a