November 2005

Summative evaluation of the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF)

Technical Appendices

A report to HEFCE by The Higher Education Consultancy Group and CHEMS Consulting

Contents

Appendix A: Terms of Reference

The key elements of the terms of reference as defined by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) for the evaluation were as follows:

'The overall intention of the evaluation is to provide information on the major benefits to the field of learning and teaching in higher education derived from the allocation of funding under the TQEF since 1999, within the context of a changing policy environment. This should include a mapping of the outcomes against the original and revised aims of the funding, where possible, and an assessment of the extent to which learning and teaching strategies have become embedded in institutions' corporate planning and practice.' (paragraph 19)

'The overall objective will be to evaluate the TQEF programme as a whole, not the individual strands of the programme, except to the extent necessary to assist with an overall evaluation.' (paragraph 22)

'It is envisaged that the evaluation will focus on three areas of work:
a) An analysis, using both quantitative and qualitative methods, of the activities, outputs and achievements of the funding in the light of its original brief and adaptation to a changing policy environment.
b) An assessment of the impacts, value and benefits of the funding programme, including indirect effects and unintended consequences.
c) A proposal for the types of evidence HEFCE may wish to collect in the future, in particular related to the long term impact on the student learning experience and the embedding of good practice within higher education institutions (HEIs).' (paragraph 23)

'In each of the areas due consideration should be given to the Better Regulation Review Group's recommendations on reducing unnecessary burden on HEIs (see http://www.dfes.gov.uk/hegateway/uploads/BRRG%20interim%20reprt.pdf).' (paragraph 24)

'The results of the evaluation should address the following issues:
a) Effectiveness ie the impact of the three strands of funding on:
  i.   raising the status of learning and teaching in the HE sector
  ii.   enhancing the quality of learning and teaching in the HE sector
  iii. enhancing the student learning experience
  iv.   initiating and supporting professional staff development
  v.   encouraging innovation and dissemination of good practice in support of high quality teaching and learning.
b) Sustainability:
  i.   the uptake of, and support for, initiatives and good practices in learning and teaching
  ii.   the extent to which those initiatives and good practices have been embedded within HEIs.
c) To what extent the initiatives in learning and teaching funded under TQEF have taken into account the following areas of national priority for HE:
  i.   widening participation

<ol type="i" start="2">
ensuring fair access to HE
maintaining and improving retention rates
employability of graduates and diplomates.

d) What have been, and remain, the main barriers to change in learning and teaching?

e) What, if any, additional burden has been imposed on HEIs by the requirements of the annual monitoring statements in relation to TQEF?

f) Unintended consequences, spin-offs and intangible benefits.' (paragraph 25)

Appendix B: Institutional Case Study Reports

Case Study 1

The HEI

1   Mid-size post-Robbins university, strong on research and relationships with industry, commerce and the professions. One National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS) award two years ago. Part of one current Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning (FDTL) project.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The main planks of the overall LTS have been to: raise the profile of learning and teaching (L&T), promote Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILT) membership and encourage continuing professional development (CPD) (including a mandatory work-based course for probationary staff); establish an L&T Development Fund to promote accessibility, innovation and excellence; increase the involvement of students in enhancing L&T; enhance the quality of higher education (HE) in further education (FE).

3   Within this range, TQEF funds have been used to date primarily for the L&T Development Fund, although the emphasis in the use of TQEF funds is now moving to the creation of a central L&T Enhancement Office (see below) and work on personal development plans (PDP) for students. Staff development work is now supported by Professional Standards funding. The proportion of total expenditure on the L&T strategy represented by TQEF funding is difficult to assess within this moving picture given that there is also a mixture of central and departmental funding applied to it.

4   Before 2000, L&T had been addressed as part of the corporate strategy. The TQEF initiative provided an opportunity to reflect more deeply, focus the LTS strategy, raise the profile of L&T and gave leverage for implementation.

5   The periodic reiteration of the LTS required by HEFCE has helped by refocusing attention on the evolving status and needs of L&T. HEFCE monitoring has not been burdensome.

6   Departments bid for projects to the L&T Development Fund. The L&T Committee assesses the bids and makes the awards. Funding is generally not used to buy out staff time, the work being undertaken alongside other responsibilities, but to provide facilities or specialist assistance. A high proportion of projects have been in the e-learning spectrum. The process is serviced by the Quality Support Office, and projects submit an evaluation to the L&T Committee. Project reports go on a web-site and there is an annual Innovations Day, an Innovations Prize and a Mentoring Prize.

7   The L&T infrastructure is currently changing quite markedly. The new L&T Enhancement Office reporting direct to the pro vice-chancellor (PVC), will bring together work on e-learning, the role of the Quality Support Office and the staff development function, with the aim of integrating their work more closely than hitherto. Educational developers have recently been identified in each department, who have access to a small amount of funding to encourage the

exchange of ideas on L&T. The current two proprietary virtual learning environments are to be discarded in favour of a single open-source platform.

8   It is recognised that, given the university's strong emphasis on research, the next Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) is likely to create a strong counter-pressure to the work done so far on raising the profile of L&T, and that more is needed to enhance reward and recognition of teaching and to signpost a distinctive career track for very good teachers to professorial level. Promotion criteria are currently being reviewed with this in mind.

9   There are no particular synergies with other strands of TQEF funding.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

10   Each department has a nominated Learning and Teaching Support Network/Higher Education Academy (LTSN/HE Academy) contact with the appropriate subject centre(s). The value ascribed to centres is variable; the university pays for staff to attend centre workshops and the feedback from these has been very positive. The generic centre was highly valued by the academic development staff, who have made 'a huge amount' of use of it. The databases of resources and projects are found particularly valuable, as are the networks and information packs. There is disappointment with its current invisibility.

11   The impact of the work of the NTFS fellow was initially internal, within his own department but not significant across the institution. Its influence has now expanded to involvement in several national projects and schemes where he felt well-supported by the vice-chancellor who helped secure additional resources for developments based on his work. It has also had a local impact in local schools in raising the profile of his subject.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

12   There are several factors coming together at this university which can be taken to suggest that teaching has been and is very effective. These are: a very positive institutional audit; very high retention rates; exceptionally high measures of student satisfaction; and evidence from employers which indicates that they value the qualities of its graduates.

13   It has therefore been difficult to mobilise energy and enthusiasm of staff towards institution-wide changes to enhance L&T. Within the highly devolved structure, the focus to date has therefore been rather on stimulating local improvements and innovations through the Teaching Development Fund. A consequence of this is that the resulting distributed pattern of developments, though linked to the broad themes of the L&T strategy and in some cases very successful in enhancing both effectiveness and efficiency of teaching, has been somewhat localised and fragmented and impact overall has been limited accordingly.

14   While the individual development projects are systematically evaluated, there has been no over-arching evaluation of the impact of these projects on L&T across the university. In terms of the overall culture, it is acknowledged that more needs to be done tangibly to reward and recognise teaching if attitudes are to change. While the new generation of lecturers is described as more positive in their attitude to L&T, the status of teaching is said to be still regarded at the departmental level as a poor relation to research.

15   The students' union has been able to bid to the Teaching Development Fund and has been successful with three projects, in training study skills, in peer delivery of training and in enhancing L&T in the university's partner FE colleges. The opportunity to be so involved is much appreciated by the student representatives.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

16   As indicated, the benefits of TQEF funding so far in terms of enhancement and innovation have been localised, as a consequence of the distributed development activity. The impact of staff development work, now transferred to the Professional Standards funding stream, has been concentrated on work-based training of new staff and offering workshops and training opportunities to current staff, which tend to be taken up by those who are predisposed to improve their teaching.

17   Some projects were identified as offering models of replicable development eg: a research observatory (used as a means of learning research methods and now operated jointly with another HEI); a remodelling of the first year of one course introducing mini projects, virtual learning environment support and problem-based learning. A material proportion of projects have addressed the enhancement of quality in terms of efficiency (including the use of staff time) as much as effectiveness.

18   The LTS is moving into a new phase of consolidation and integration, by bringing together several related roles, emphasising more cross-cutting themes in projects supported by the Teaching Development Fund with the intention of scaling up successful projects. This is likely to ensure that changes are more widely-rooted. Nevertheless, until more is done to enhance reward and recognition of work in teaching, the institutional culture within departments is not likely to be widely receptive to change in L&T processes, given the evidence that can be adduced to suggest change is not required and can reasonably be resisted (see above).

19   The TQEF's work is much more welcome as a process than that of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), which drives up weak performance towards established standards, while TQEF provides opportunities for open-ended enhancement of performance. Nevertheless, QAA has been a markedly stronger driver of behaviour change institution-wide than TQEF. Professional associations are important in some subjects in validating the content of qualifications through accreditation, but have little influence on L&T practice. The university attaches high importance to the views of employers about students' qualities as shown in workplace attachments. Student feedback on satisfaction is also taken very seriously, and while it does not drive enhancement, it helps to identify underperformance in teaching.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

20   *Encouragement and reward*:   it is recognised that there is more to be done.
      Co-ordination and collaboration: development hitherto has been distributed and primarily department-based. The L&T infrastructure is now being integrated more closely to support more institution-wide development themes.
      Disseminating good practice: propagation of success will similarly benefit from greater integration of L&T support.
      Research and innovation: some significant and replicable innovation projects.
      Building capacity for change: this is the main purpose of the new L&T Enhancement Office.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

21   *Widening participation:* a corporate objective but not explicitly addressed by the use of TQEF funds.
Ensuring fair access to HE: a corporate objective but not explicitly addressed by the use of TQEF funds.
Maintaining and improving retention rates: these are already very high and it is therefore difficult to demonstrate significant impact from this high baseline.
Employability: no specific evidence, but this is a very high value within the university and this reflected in the attention paid to work placements and employer feedback.
Encouraging and disseminating good and innovative practice in support of high quality L&T: TQEF has definitely stimulated a diverse range of innovations and enhancements. Mechanisms are in place to evaluate and disseminate the results. Take-up is limited by the low perceived need for change.

Conclusions

22   In common with other institutions visited, there is evidence that this university is now moving from an initial phase of distributed innovation/development, based on energetic and enthusiastic individuals and groups of staff, towards a more centrally mediated model which enables the creation of more institution-wide impact and more integrated and balanced implementation, bringing together related functions of quality support, e-learning initiatives and staff development under the direction of the relevant PVC.

23   TQEF funding and the requirement to reiterate an LTS has certainly helped to focus thinking and stimulate activity to enhance L&T within the university. This institution is still facing something of an uphill battle to raise the level of attention given to teaching, not only because of the high value given to research and a highly devolved culture, but because currently all the available indicators of the outcomes of teaching are very positive. This appears to validate the position of those staff who choose to argue 'if it ain't broke don't fix it'. It is more necessary than usual here that the case for introducing changes in teaching is based on: very clear definition of the benefits aimed at (such as greater efficiency in use of resources, release of staff time, faster progression, easier access to learning opportunities, and equitable access to HE in FE); at least safeguarding current quality of learning outcomes.

24   An exceptional feature of the TQEF funded work at this institution is the engagement of the students' union (see above) in successfully bidding for three projects funded from the Teaching Development Fund. One of these was concerned with the delivery of HE in FE, itself a topic rarely tackled within the TQEF framework.

25   All those spoken to are entirely in favour of continuing with earmarked funding.

Case Study 2

The HEI

1   A large research-based university (45 subjects ranked 4 or above in 2001 RAE). It had an NTFS fellow in each of the first three rounds, and hosts subject centres. It has been awarded one Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) out of three bids. In FDTL 5 the university had one lead project and two partnership projects.

The Learning and Teaching and Strategy

2   A central thrust of the university's LTS has been to support flexible and student-centred learning especially through the use of ICT in projects. The Learning Development Unit (LDU), which is part of Information Services, was set up in 2000 to support the LTS submitted under TQEF. The LDU provides strategic direction and core capacity for this and the common, centrally managed virtual learning environment, with much of the specific implementation devolved into school-led projects. A further key institutional objective of the LTS was to establish performance in teaching as a recognised part of a developing career at the university. In the early years TQEF funding was used to enable staff to gain ILT accreditation and a PG Certificate was mandatory for all new academic staff. Although it is no longer mandatory, new staff have continued to enrol for it.

3   The overall effect of the TQEF initiative was described as shifting the earlier LTAS (dating back to 1997/8) from platitudes to performance measures and monitorable outcomes. Thus TQEF may be said to have accelerated the LTS from good intentions to implementation by providing a focus on outcomes and the resources to achieve them.

4   The application of TQEF funding is split between the central LDU, which is also supported by core funding, and school-based projects, which take up the majority of the TQEF funds. There are 31 current projects and 22 already completed. Each of the 20 schools has a Director of L&T whose role is primarily quality enhancement and review. Schools make proposals to LDU for projects that they wish to implement. The bids are not directly competitive, but are assessed and shaped in dialogue with schools against criteria such as the breadth of the theme, replicability, value for money, innovation, and effective dissemination. The process was described by project leaders in schools as 'LDU has guidelines and offers us coaching'. A claimed by-product of this process is the development of a critical mass of people capable of bidding externally for projects, leading in one case to LDU acquiring £750,000 in external funding by adapting the same procedures across 12 consortium members. The Education Development Committee guides, oversees and monitors these developments and reports to the Academic Board.

5   The resulting changes in practice are becoming embedded as mainstream behaviour. The use of web-based resources and e-learning in particular has been transformed. It proved difficult to establish what proportion of the overall LTS costs are now supported directly by TQEF funding because of the different funding streams, the devolved activity and the indirect costs carried by the university – there was broad consensus around a quarter of the total LTS activity now depending on TQEF funding. The HEFCE approach to TQEF is broadly welcomed and the reporting burden is not excessive.

6   While it is recognised that the next RAE will have an inevitable effect on institutional behaviours and the importance given to research, the university is working to show more profoundly how research informs teaching. The academic strategy, of which the LTS is a key part, now aims to clarify what qualities the university expects its graduates to show, what it does to make that happen, and how it is measured. This is expected to consolidate the importance of teaching within the university.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

7   There are no planned linkages between the strands of TQEF but there have been pragmatic links, and these reflect strong collaboration between the relevant central units. Thus the LDU works closely with the staff development unit (SDU), with Information Services (of which it is part), with the university's leading-edge educational technology R&D unit (supported by schools paying a membership subscription) and with HE Academy subject centres where appropriate. This provides a striking degree of integration of change activities across the organisational dimensions of people, technology and discipline. For example, former subject librarians are now known as academic support teams, involved in developing resources and course materials in partnership with academic schools for mounting on the institutional virtual learning environment.

8   The two subject centres are well integrated in the university and make presentations to the directors of L&T. One is located in a strong research department and is more widely recognised nationally than internally. It has strong links with secondary schools which is valuable for recruitment. The other is not based in an academic school and relates more strongly to the centre than to departments.

9   The work of the first round NTFS had internal relevance and was well disseminated. The second was less widely relevant to the university but successfully celebrated teaching in a strong research department. The third led to a CETL bid. (The view was expressed that the NTFS awards were initially effective in celebrating individuals, but have increasingly become competed for between institutions and are consequently losing their individual focus.)

Evidence of Institutional Impact

10   The main thrust of the LTS is towards supporting flexible learning across the university and the combination of central support and devolved innovation has generated a rich diversity of development projects, underpinned by a common ICT infrastructure and staff development programme. Attention is paid to the dissemination of good practice – there are clear guidelines for the evaluation of school-based projects and these focus on lessons learned and transferable good practice. Leaders of development projects meet four times a year to share ideas and identify themes across schools. The schools' directors of L&T and heads of academic programmes provide two further university-wide networks for disseminating experience. The LDU also produces an internal newsletter on L&T developments and opportunities to bid for funds internally and externally.

11   Given that the prime aim of the LTS is to support flexible learning especially through the use of technology, conventional indicators of improvement in the quality of L&T are not appropriate. There are no formal measures of the overall educational impact of the TQEF funding within the LTAS, though the evaluation of individual projects includes their impact on

learning outcomes. Nevertheless conversations with staff yielded the following impressionistic indicators:

a. Focus and effort have shifted from the task of teaching to improving the process of learning. As evidence of this, a greater number of LDU projects are concerned with student-centred projects than with teaching.
b. There has been a rise in the proportion of small group work.
c. Progression and completion rates are said to be improving, which is particularly pleasing during a period of expansion of recruitment.
d. There is a much wider range of learning opportunities, particularly those involving independent interactive learning and hands-on experience[1].

12   In terms of sustainability, the central view is that changed practices are becoming embedded and e-learning in particular has been transformed. There have been some recent changes to school infrastructures following the use of TQEF money to buy learning technology support staff time, which have in turn resulted in further efficiency in academic staff time. Continued funding is considered important to sustaining the momentum of these changes. Thus if TQEF funding were to cease, it is believed that continuing development and innovation would suffer. The Learning Development Unit in particular would be threatened.

13   Teaching has gained significantly higher recognition. A new grade of associate professor has recently been established, awarded on the basis of contributions to excellence in teaching. There are internal teaching fellowships (now funded by the Professional Standards stream of funds).

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

14   TQEF funding has provided the means to implement the good intentions expressed in the university's LTS, articulated before TQEF funds became available. The principal benefits have been in increasing the attention paid to the students' learning experience, a much wider range of learning opportunities, a higher profile for excellence in teaching, and an effective mechanism for disseminating good practice in L&T. As indicated above, progress so far is becoming embedded both in the technical infrastructure (common virtual learning environment) and in learning, teaching and assessment practices within schools. If TQEF funding were to fall away, the main threat would be to developmental momentum and effective central co-ordination through the LDU.

15   TQEF funding has contributed markedly to innovations and enhancements in the delivery of learning across all disciplines at this institution and to the status accorded to teaching. This is described as different from and complementary to the impact of the QAA process which is more concerned with a levelling up process of quality assurance and compliance with accepted standards but does less to stimulate innovation and enhancement. TQEF is felt to enable culture change more effectively than QAA processes. While the expectations of professional bodies have a varying degree of significance in influencing L&T, depending on the discipline involved, they are felt to be much less influential overall than either TQEF or QAA.

---

[1] *Nevertheless there is some evidence that overseas students paying full fees consider contact hours with a teacher as the primary measure of value for money.*

16   Students are becoming increasingly knowledgeable and discriminating about their learning experience and the voice of the customer is likely to grow as an influence on practice.

17   The institutional strand of TQEF funding has been the greatest contributor to these positive developments. The value of this TQEF money was described as 'far exceeding its monetary worth'. The subject strand, via the internally hosted centres and through advice and information from the external centres, has added value in some important specific areas. The individual strand has made the least impact of the three.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

18   The focus of the application of TQEF funds has been relatively narrow – i.e. mainly on enabling flexible learning supported by technology. Given that focus, considerable progress has been made towards the five aims.

19   *Encouragement and reward* of excellence in teaching has been formalised through the creation of the associate professor posts, and though the long-term career opportunities offered by these posts have yet to be demonstrated, they reflect in a salient way the higher value within the university's culture that is now placed on teaching, as do the internal teaching fellowships funded through the Professional Standards channel. Gaining ILT membership was financially supported initially and a PG Certificate was mandatory for all new staff. It is no longer mandatory, but numbers have not dropped, which is taken as an indication that individuals feel that a qualification in teaching is now part of the well-rounded academic profile.

20   The LDU has developed as a powerful mechanism for *co-ordination and collaboration*, across the schools, with other institutions and notably as an integrating factor across the other institutional services, ensuring that innovations are well supported by a scaffolding of staff development, technology and information services.

21   Given the relative autonomy of the schools, *disseminating good practice* is an important feature and several mechanisms have been put in place; the LDU itself having a central role through advice and guidance in project design and with a newsletter and the teaching conference (led by the SDU) for the past two years, in place of the former annual LDU open day), but dissemination is also decentralised to project leaders and schools' directors of L&T who are encouraged to network. At school level and university-wide there is a regular search for cross-cutting themes and development is now starting to shift from diversity towards convergence on the most fruitful innovations. Staff are encouraged to publish externally the outcomes of their projects.

22   The use of funds to encourage a wide range of school-based projects has stimulated *research and innovation.* The university has also established a unique educational technology innovations centre, funded partly by subscription from the schools and partly by providing research and consultancy to external clients. This provides a well-equipped development test-bed for innovative applications of technology.

23   The LDU is the main example of the university's *building capacity for change,* though there is concern that at a time when resources are increasingly stretched, the disappearance of earmarked L&T funding would be likely to threaten its continued existence as a central driver

and co-ordinator of change. Each school has its L&T strategy and the school-based directors of L&T are change agents now embedded within the organisational structure.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

24   The emphasis in the LTS on flexible and student-centred learning is directly supportive of both priorities of *widening participation* and *ensuring fair access* to HE. Success in maintaining and improving *retention rates* is subject to multiple drivers and cannot easily be attributed to any single factor. Nevertheless progression and retention rates are said to be improving at a time of wider recruitment, and it is reasonable to assume that the provision of more flexible and student-centred learning is one of the positive factors.

25   *Employability:* the LTS includes the broad aim of relating students' learning and development to their careers where appropriate. There is no particular strand in the deployment of TQEF funds which addresses this. Nevertheless, many of the schools' projects are designed to offer students interactive and hands-on experiences which are directly relevant to future employment. The increased use of ICT also raises their skill and confidence in the use of such technology in future employment.

26   Within the particular focus on flexible learning supported by technology, the university provides an excellent example of successfully adopting organisational structures and processes with the aim of encouraging and *disseminating good and innovative practice* in support of high quality L&T.

Conclusions

27   Substantial synergy has been achieved between the strands of TQEF within this university, not so much because of the nature of the TQEF initiative, but as a consequence of the way the institution has organised itself to make use of the resources available under the institutional strand. It has achieved a creative balance between a) central guidance and co-ordination, b) school-based innovation and development and c) a scaffolding of support from staff development, library and information services, and expertise in technology.

28   The distributed innovation and development of the past few years is beginning to generate pressure to convert the best of a rich seam of school-based projects, often designed for specialist cohorts, into mainstream activity. In order to scale up projects in this way, there may be a need for a new business model within the resource planning and distribution system, whereby the economic justification of further investment in selected projects can be demonstrated.

29   This institution acknowledges the signal benefit of having dedicated L&T funding via the TQEF and would be concerned if the funding were to cease or to be rolled up in general funding, since it believes this would be likely to threaten both consolidation of progress to date and the momentum of innovation and development that has been achieved.

Case Study 3

The HEI

1   A post-1992 institution with very strong commitment to widening participation and social inclusion. It had a TLTP project but no success with FDTL, NTFS or CETLs. It hosts a major Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) project. It has a strong record in QAA subject reviews. It has 12 departments and a staff development co-ordinator, but no L&T centre.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The strategy entitled *Establishing a New Learning Environment* covered the period 2002-2005. It sought to establish the institution as a community of learning and develop the graduate attributes of students. These objectives, which embraced purposes, pedagogy (including increased use of e-learning) and employability, were brought together under the new learning environment (NLE). The strategy celebrated success in widening participation and social inclusion, whilst acknowledging, and contextualising significant problems with retention. An important thrust of the NLE worked towards addressing that issue.

3   An NLE steering group, chaired by the vice-principal, was established, accountable to Academic Board. It oversaw, and was supported by, the work of seven institution-wide task groups on specific supporting themes, such as student retention, e-learning, learning through assessment, and enhancing employability.

4   In July 2004 an updated *Learning and Teaching Strategy 2004-2007* was adopted. This summarised the achievements of the preceding objectives and identified some areas where outstanding work remained before setting out the three key objectives and supporting activities and targets for the period 2004-2007. The Learner Experience Committee (which meets five times per year) took over the responsibility for monitoring implementation. The task groups were reformed to cover five themes: student support and retention; employability; assessment; staff and staff development; and pedagogy. Work also progressed on the institutional managed learning environment. The Dean of Students was allocated responsibility for the strategy.

5   The initial strategy included:

- recruitment of nine principal lecturers with academic leadership and/or quality roles
- three 0.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) learning and teaching fellows
- support for staff attaining ILT membership (about 30 per cent are members)
- launch of a learning and teaching innovation scheme
- an NLE section in the weekly all staff bulletin
- inauguration of a scheme for peer observation and review of teaching
- revised student induction and additional skills support.

6   Amongst the new key activities are:

- the appointment of three new learning and teaching fellows
- reduction in staff workload whilst undertaking the required Certificate course
- using PDP to promote reflective practice
- continuing the learning and teaching innovation awards scheme
- establishing an NLE web-site
- incorporating research and scholarly activity relating to L&T into PDP guidance
- articulating subject-based conceptions of the independent learner
- developing the model of practice-based learning
- completing a good assessment guide and distributing it to all staff
- further work on MLE and an enhancement of teaching accommodation.

7   The TQEF monies principally support the L&T fellows and the innovation awards. An annual L&T conference was launched in 2003.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

8   The institution has sought to create links with the ILT/HE Academy, especially through individual membership/registration. It has not been successful in attracting funding to lead an FDTL project. Nor has it had success in the NTFS. It is involved as a partner in one FDTL project. Staff are encouraged to use the outputs from the subject centres.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

9   The stocktaking which occurred before the development of the current L&T strategy mapped progress with objectives and attainment of targets. Considerable progress had been made with organisational change, the professional development of staff, changes to the course portfolio and physical improvements to the learning environment. The usage of the TQEF monies was viewed as advancing the goal of developing an institutional learning community.

10   Generally the continuity of topics in the revised task groups reflects their ongoing importance, and the need for further and sustained developmental work. In some instances, such as retention, it illustrates the complexity of the issue and the associated need for careful, targeted, varied and multi-stranded strategies and policies. The associate deans, principal lecturers and the learning and teaching fellow interviewed spoke of progress with initiatives, and illustrated impacts upon programmes, policies, practices and learning experiences.

11   Reference was made to the annual conference on learning and teaching as a means of showcasing innovations, and also to the fact that the peer review system had been refreshed. Indeed generally TQEF had provided an opportunity for reflection, deliberation and re-invigoration of several policies and strategies, in addition to the development of new ones. The HEI has had two rounds of small project awards which are used to stimulate and reward innovation: 10 small projects in the first round and four larger ones in the second round.

12   Internally, learning and teaching fellows are appointed for three years with half of their time bought out to undertake cross-institutional functions in relation to the L&T strategy. A sub-committee of the academic quality committee now acts as the intra-institutional forum for sharing and reflecting on good practice. The three associate deans now have a substantially revised cross-institutional role (previously it was a faculty function).

13   New staff are expected to undertake the PG Certificate in Learning and Teaching which is based in Education. Professional development of staff is becoming more formalised and will be shaped further by national developments on CPD standards.

14   An illustration of sharing of good practice has been in relation to student placements and work-related learning which is a major focus of learning programmes in the institution and a key strategic requirement. This includes strengthening efforts to improve pedagogy in e-learning and capitalise upon expertise in e-learning housed within the JISC projects. Overall the institution is working towards shifting the lexicon from teaching to learning.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

15   The main benefits have been:
- aided strategic developments
- fostered recognition through L&T fellowships, small awards and the L&T conference
- alignment to structural reorganisation and altered remits for posts of associate deans and a proportion of the principal lecturers
- lubrication of the work of the revised committee structure and the task groups
- unification via the clear strategic thrust of the plan.

Progress Towards the Original HEFCE 5 Aims for TQEF

16   *Encouragement and reward* demonstrated by the small awards, the annual conference and the competitive learning and teaching fellowships. Staff gaining membership of ILT received an honorarium.

17   *Co-ordination and collaboration* progressed through the structure of designated champions, the task groups and the academic infrastructure. Responsibilities and annual targets are clearly specified.

18   *Disseminating good practice* took place via the conference, the task groups and the connection of the action plans of departments to the overall institutional strategy.

19   *Research and innovation* was fostered by the small awards.

20   *Building capacity for change* operates at several levels, ie institutional, departmental and individual. The focus is on policies and practices. To further the latter aim the institution now devotes 2 per cent of departmental staffing budgets to targeted local staff development.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

21   The institution is already heavily committed to *widening participation and social inclusion* which is a main plank of its mission.

22   Sustained work is happening on maintaining and improving *retention* rates, although the challenge is a demanding and complex one.

23   The *employability* and characteristics of graduates is a central tenet of the institutional strategy and mission and has been so since before TQEF.

24   Through the champions and the small awards, efforts are made to *encourage and disseminate good and innovative practice*.

Conclusions

25   The institution is striving to use the TQEF monies to support and progress key aspects of the strategic philosophy and goals. It tries to align the use of other funds to maximise benefits and speed progress. It has clear goals and objectives and is committed to effective widening participation and social inclusion, by offering a wide range of students the opportunity to successfully study a higher education programme and subsequently move on to productive employment. Much of the strategy focuses upon the creation and operation of an environment which will assist the attainment of those goals. Earmarked TQEF funds are perceived as an invaluable lubricant.

Case Study 4

The HEI

1   A vocationally-orientated, post-1992 HEI with a good teaching record. It has achieved three National Teaching Fellowships, hosted two FDTL projects, and has bid successfully for a CETL.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   In 1995, library, media and IT were brought together to form Academic Services, including learner support, staff development and disability support. A learning design studio was added in 1998 to assist staff in the use of new technologies for learning and teaching. In the late 1990s (ie before TQEF) the university established a learning and teaching development initiative (L&TDI) fund, for development and innovation projects. Each school also appointed a head of learning and teaching. The TQEF initiative arrived at this point and proved timely in focussing and accelerating processes which were already under way.

3   The first TQEF-stimulated strategy (LTS) provided (in conjunction with a review of the university's strategic plan) the opportunity to make an environmental sweep of influences on

L&T, to articulate a clear direction for the development of L&T, and to identify areas where action was needed. Schools were given considerable autonomy to use delegated resources, within the broad strategy.

4   A similar review took place last year, and as a result a shift is taking place from school-led initiatives towards more consistent good practice (eg cross-school task groups have been established to drive forward university-wide themes, and the university is moving towards having a single university-wide virtual learning environment rather than several school-based ones as at present). This process of consolidation follows a period of school-based development and innovation (which has generated some excellent work and has led to a successful CETL bid) and is partly driven by tighter financial circumstances.

5   The main activities for which TQEF funds are used are: ensuring effective use of ICT and web-based materials to increase flexibility of learning opportunities; enhancement of the Learning and Teaching Development Initiative Fund; and engagement with the HE Academy.

6   The committee structure (L&T development committee, reporting to senate via the academic development committee) is the focus for driving the L&T agenda. It is serviced by PVC academic and academic services. The schools are broadly autonomous in implementing the strategy. They are required to produce an L&T plan, consistent with and feeding into the strategy. Each school has a head of L&T – a co-ordinating role rather than an executive post.

7   The discipline of developing the L&T strategy for review by HEFCE and the dialogue with the HE adviser are seen by the university as yielding value. The burden of reporting on L&T via the annual monitoring statement (AMS) is not considered excessive. The next RAE process is not expected to undermine the status now accorded to L&T across the university and within its culture, which has developed strongly in the last few years. Progress and promotion is not based on the conventional bi-polar measures of teaching and research, but on a tripod in which the individual is expected to demonstrate achievement in teaching plus one of either knowledge transfer (income-generating if possible) or research (which specifically includes pedagogical research). Pedagogical research has developed strongly and staff express their disappointment that it is still not recognised in the RAE.

8   The LTS is well integrated with other strategies – human resources through the embedding of staff development within academic services, widening participation through a central L&T focus on delivering flexibility (defined as 'reducing dependency of learning on time and place').

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

9   There is a remarkable degree of integration of work across the TQEF strands. For example, an FDTL 3 project at the university on group work assessment (which built on work originally funded as an internal L&T Development Initiative) has delivered well-received group work assessment tools, now disseminated gratis internally and externally, and has led to the FDTL project manager (newly appointed lecturer in 2001) achieving a 'rising star' National Teaching Fellowship in the last round. At the same time, this strand of work is central to the success of

the university's CETL bid. The relevant subject centre (not at this university) was represented on the FDTL project management committee, and the subject centre also assisted in preparing their CETL bid.

10   Similarly, the work of an earlier NTFS fellow at the university has been widely used across disciplines internally, and has been effectively disseminated externally through the relevant subject centre. Staff awareness of subject centres is now much better – though there is some variability in the value ascribed to them – one which started from scratch won high praise from a school head of L&T, so it appears to have caught up the advantage held by former e-Library centres.

11   Overall, the development of L&T in this institution is now well-rooted – as one head of school put it – 'the DNA is now established and will be replicated'. The use of ICT is now mainstream behaviour across schools and disciplines; it is no longer the province of the enthusiasts and there is a marked confidence among staff in talking about learning, teaching and pedagogical issues.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

12   Internal dissemination of good L&T practice within schools is led by the schools' heads of L&T. They operate through influence rather than authority, in an increasingly receptive culture. There is an annual L&T conference across the university. Hard measures of impact are difficult to find. The principal consequences have been:

- the number of academic staff actively involved in L&T developments and innovation (currently 40 and rising)
- all new academic staff encouraged to undertake an MA
- the high value given to teaching and to pedagogical research in performance assessment
- the widespread use of ICT to increase flexibility of delivery
- individual and institutional self-confidence gained through internal and external (NTFS, CETL) recognition of excellence in L&T
- increasingly effective bidding by staff for funding for L&T initiatives
- growing student expectations of variety in delivery of learning opportunities.

13   Indicators of quality improvement in L&T are equally hard to find[2]. Perhaps all that can usefully be said is that much attention is being given in this university to improving the learning experience of the students, increasing accessibility of resources, removing barriers to learning, and enhancing the validity and reliability of assessment. A proxy measure of L&T quality such as retention is unreliable because there are several other variable factors which are just as powerful in affecting retention rates. Retention overall is improving. Nevertheless, schools are now more alert to retention issues and attention is being given to identifying 'vulnerable' students at Level 1.

---

[2] *Largely because the concept of 'quality' in this context is elusive – absolute quality measured against some theoretical criterion of excellence? - fitness for purpose, in which case what purpose? (varying greatly with disciplines) - student satisfaction? - employer satisfaction?*

14   A feature of this university is the high level of attention given to HE in FE, with staff involved in helping to enhance the quality of L&T at foundation level in partner FE colleges and smoothing the transition into the university. This was mentioned by everyone seen and seems to reflect the general level of attention given to enhancing L&T.

15   The successful CETL bid is ascribed by the university in part to the general level of confidence in L&T developed through TQEF funding and specifically to experience gained through FDTL project funding and support from the relevant subject centre.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

16   The developments and associated benefits noted above cannot be solely attributed to TQEF funding. They indicate the broad consequences of implementing the L&T strategy stimulated by the TQEF initiative, with PVC academic, L&T committee and academic services as the unifying organisational focus for L&T initiatives, ICT, library and information support and staff development, bidding for and bringing together funding from several external strands and from the general funds of the university. TQEF funds the direct costs of less than a quarter of the total activity carried out under the university's LTS. Arguably, then, the most significant impact of TQEF funding has been in integrating and accelerating the development of L&T and enhancing its status in the university. The strong view across those seen is to retain the earmarking of TQEF funding for L&T.

17   In terms of comparative influence, TQEF funding is seen as having been the most important factor influencing the active development of L&T practice in the university, by providing the stimulus for a strategic review and consolidation of L&T across the institution and the funding for school-based experimentation and innovation. While the QAA process has an impact, it is tangential to the process of enhancing L&T practices – it can serve to disseminate good practice but does not stimulate enquiry and innovation. Pressure from peers and from ever more discriminating students is an increasingly important factor in causing individuals to reflect on and adapt their L&T practices.

18   Of the three TQEF strands, the institutional strand has had the greatest relative impact in this university, followed by the individual strand where the three NTFS fellows have been widely influential internally both directly by their work and indirectly as role models, as well as raising the national profile of the university. The subject strand in the form of the subject centres is appreciated but its relative influence has generally been lower.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

19   *Encouragement and reward* has made very significant progress through the NTFS and internal awards for innovation and development. Criteria for promotion give prominence to teaching.

20   *Co-ordination and collaboration* has been very important through internal co-ordination through academic services of L&T development with ICT, library and information services, and staff development. Strong devolution of development work to schools has led to some

divergences (such as in the development of several different virtual learning environments) which are now being addressed. There have been reasonable levels of external collaboration through FDTL, NTFS activities, and the use of subject centres.

21   *Disseminating good practice has taken place internally* through school-based heads of L&T and the annual internal L&T conference. Externally, FDTL outputs were made freely available via the web and in print/CD. NTFS outputs were also disseminated externally.

22   *Research and innovation* has progressed as pedagogical research has become a valid and vital activity for a growing number of academic staff. School-based innovation has been strongly encouraged.

23   Consolidation within academic services has provided a strong mechanism *building capacity for change*. The need to develop and review the LTS has been taken as an opportunity to reflect on the strategic direction of L&T in the university and has provided both focus and direction.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

24   *Widening participation:* a key feature of the university and holding up well.
Ensuring fair access to HE is one of the key aims of using ICT to increase flexibility and remove barriers to learning.

25   *Maintaining and improving retention rates*: a complex issue. Retention rates overall are improving, and it is receiving increased attention to understand the underlying factors.

26   *Employability:* an implicit rather than explicit objective.

27   *Encouraging and disseminating good and innovative practice* in support of high quality L&T: now an established value in the university and staff are becoming increasingly confident in speaking and publishing to wider audiences.

Conclusions

28   This institution was visited as one of the case study institutions in the 2001 evaluation of TQEF. This led to some specific comparisons with the earlier visit:
- a marked increase in the confidence of staff in talking about L&T and pedagogical matters and in bidding for new development projects
- the value given to pedagogical research activity as a valid area for attention
- much higher staff awareness of and engagement with subject centres
- the shift from devolved, school-driven development and innovation to a more strategic focus on university-wide themes, based on the experimentation of the past three-to-four years
- the remarkable personal development of a diffident, newly appointed lecturer in 2001, now S/L with a successful FDTL project behind him, an NTFS Fellowship, instrumental in

a successful CETL bid, now a highly valued member of staff, able to see a developing career path and whose work is known and used across several schools

- the continued integration of the different L&T strands and funding streams under academic services.

29   Embedding of changes is proceeding well and a second-generation evolution may be occurring here – after a period of devolved experimentation and culture change across the schools, the university has reflected on the experience and given a more strategic, selective and focussed direction to the next phase of its LTS.

30   Synergy between the TQEF strands is remarkably high, and sustainability is also high – structures and processes and above all culture have adapted to support enhancement of L&T. TQEF funding is an important enabling factor, but the acquired momentum and institutional mindset mean that further progress is not crucially dependent on TQEF funds. Nevertheless, the university is strongly in favour of maintaining earmarked funding for TQEF, in order to retain leverage and focus.

Case Study 5

The HEI

1   A research intensive institution which has recently undergone a radical restructuring of its faculty/school structure and its decision making structures. This has had the effect of delegating much more authority to lower levels.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The current strategy is for the period 2002-2005 and a new one is about to be developed under the aegis of a new deputy vice-chancellor in charge of academic affairs. This will be written by dedicated Education staff in faculties and schools (in order to achieve their ownership) rather than being prepared by staff in the centre of the university. The university claims that it has started to modify its previous focus on research excellence alone, which led to less effort being devoted to improving the overall quality of teaching. A new corporate strategy makes this clear and stresses the importance of students to the university's mission.

3   The current LTS has nine strategic objectives which are:

- reorganisation of the academic structures with enhanced roles for 'change agents'
- integration of the strategies for widening participation, disability and race relations within the overall LTS
- reorganisation of the services that support students in their L&T on basis of inclusivity and student-centredness, including 'assistive technology' for disadvantaged students
- review of current learning, teaching and assessment methods being used and developing a strategy for change

- starting to implement the e-learning strategy
- linking this implementation to the overall ICT environment (through portals, management information system [MIS], timetabling, space allocation etc)
- implementing a human resources strategy for the professional development of all staff
- making faculties and schools responsible for quality monitoring and enhancement
- integrating the strategic planning framework, so that the LTS is related to human resources, information and financial resources through the new decision making structures.

4   The TQEF is seen as a valuable, though small, contribution to the university's overall policy of enhancing its L&T. It was a 'nudge of hard cash' which helped to 'gear up change and provided leverage'. The TQEF funding was used on two things: paying for learning and teaching co-ordinators (LTCs) in faculties and schools; and contributing to the implementation of 'assistive technologies' for students with disabilities in the library. The LTCs are seen as the central plank in the policy of getting change adopted within schools. The deputy vice-chancellor (DVC) academic benefited hugely from the advice of an LTC when head of a school (in helping to prepare for a QAA subject review) and this has influenced the emphasis on their role. All the other elements of the LTS have been funded internally.

5   A key part of the strategy was a reorganisation of the central support services for academic staff and various units were grouped together and brought into a new system of horizontal networks. Thus, the DVC chairs regular co-ordination meetings of all the deputy heads (Education) in the schools, the assistant deans (Education) in the faculties, all the LTCs, all the e-learning staff and all the library and related school support staff. The DVC is the chair of the university's education policy committee and has the help of the central education support service in servicing it. The TQEF funds have been held centrally at first but then allocated to schools and faculties to be used either on the LTCs or on other related staffing.

6   Although the current RAE is clearly important for the university, it is hoped that the new LTS will ensure that the momentum towards 'student-centredness' will not flag.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

7   The university has had one FDTL project, one NTFS fellow and two LTSN subject centres. There has not been much interaction between them and the LTS and they have had little local impact. The new DVC academic wants to improve the connections with the subject centres so that the university as a whole can benefit.

8   The NTFS fellow (2000) used his grant to produce an excellent database of teaching materials for his discipline which was shown to the relevant subject centre, but has not been adopted or publicised by them. It is however still used within the department where it was produced and has 137 registered users throughout the world. Sadly, no-one is adding materials to the database. The university has not had an NTFS fellow since 2000.

9   The central teaching support services have had good connections with the LTSN generic centre and have used the materials from the web-sites of some of the subject centres.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

10   Although the work of the LTCs is central to the university's LTS, it is hard to say what the impact of the TQEF funding has been, since it is just part of a larger process of getting teaching quality enhancement accepted as a core function. The university's new corporate strategy talks of educational performance in the same breath as research performance and a system of student questionnaires has been established to test how well staff are performing. The university has a declared aim of doing better in educational league tables. This is partly influenced by the advent of higher tuition fees. The work of the LTCs has been praised in a recent QAA audit report and they believe that the successful CETL bid was due to help provided by LTCs.

11   The LTS emphasised investment in staff development and no academic can now pass probation without having obtained a PG Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP), which has been accredited by the HE Academy. A hundred staff have completed this and 50 more are in the pipeline. Part of the process involves more senior staff acting as mentors or 'experiential witnesses', which has been found to benefit both parties.

12   The university has no indicators or measures that illustrate improvement of quality in teaching and cannot offer any of the statistics requested. Collecting such data is made difficult by the devolution of all activity.

13   One positive signal is that in some schools the LTC posts have been absorbed within the school budgets and the incumbents are classified as lecturers. The medical faculty pioneered this function before TQEF with medical education specialists and has needed little support for it, so the TQEF funds have gone to other related activities. Some LTCs are now giving lecturers the role of personal tutors for students and using them as an intelligence network on problems and student concerns. One faculty has established student progress committees.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

14   The TQEF has been an important element in the university's current change process, which would have gone slower without it. The LTCs mean that change can take place or be supported in the classroom rather than the committee. Overall this institutional strand has been of much greater value to the university than the other strands, which the university admits it has not made full use of.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

15   *In terms of encouragement and reward* a major change has been the adoption of special career paths within the single pay spine, which the university was the first to adopt. A career pathway for 'education' has been developed and the pinnacle of this is the title of university director of Education, a professorial level post (but without the professorial title), which sits at faculty level (where it is called assistant dean education). Three people have been given this title recently on the grounds of their contribution to teaching excellence. Were they to publish

internationally on pedagogy or educational issues, they could also earn the professorial title. In addition, one other person has been promoted to professor via the teaching pathway. Promotion to senior lecturer will be more common on these grounds. Another career pathway devoted to enterprise is being developed.

16   The new DVC academic is very keen on internal *collaboration and co-ordination* of developments in L&T quality across the university. This involves bringing together the central support services and the LTCs in regular network meetings to exchange good practice and lessons learned. There has been less emphasis on collaboration with external change agents such as the subject centres and although this has happened to some extent, it is acknowledged that more can be done. There is no central fund for promoting pedagogic *research or innovation* in teaching practice, although this role is part of the task of the LTCs.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

17   The LTS had an objective of integrating widening participation and improvement of access within the normal L&T activities and it is believed that this has happened as regards widening participation. The DVC academic has established a university-wide network to this end. In addition the TQEF Fund has directly contributed to improving access to learning resources for students with disabilities. A direct link between TQEF support and improved retention rates cannot be proved and the university already has a very good record in this respect.

Conclusions

18   If the TQEF funding was not earmarked, there is a distinct possibility that a similar sum would not be allocated to L&T through the internal mechanisms at various levels. This is particularly true at faculty levels where the usual establishment is for just two posts. Some of the LTC posts would not survive; however, some have already been absorbed by schools within their own budgets and are not at risk.

19   The university is half way through a process of introducing a change in culture; the TQEF funds have been a valuable additional support in that process.

Case Study 6

The HEI

1   The institution is a medium sized multi-faculty university with an ambition to be in the top decile of UK research universities. Its culture promotes research excellence, the improvement of which is its prime strategic goal. All staff are expected to be of 5 or 5* status in the next RAE. However, the university's second mission statement is 'to achieve and develop a reputation for teaching excellence and innovation that ensures a buoyant student intake in both quality and quantity'.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The current LTS (2002-2005) is based on two national priorities which recur in its activities: the encouragement of good practice in learning and teaching and enhancing the employability of students. The strategy has ten broad objectives, but has the TQEF's funds at its centre, since the strategy states: 'the generic university-level T&L objectives will be implemented using the resources allocated in the TQEF' and three distinct projects have been developed. The three, which have been pursued since 2002, are: identifying and disseminating good practice; enhancing the quality of education; and delivering and embedding learning technologies. All the university's strategies were produced under the aegis of the same vice–principal so that they are well integrated with each other.

3   TQEF funding (and a top-up of £60,000 from the recurrent grant) has allowed the university to strengthen its small central educational and staff development directorate (ESD), which had only three people, since it was given the job of managing the three TQEF projects. The timing of TQEF was fortuitous in this respect. The unit reports to the vice–principal (academic policy) and its activities are co-ordinated by a T&L quality enhancement group.

4   The current activities of the three posts funded by TQEF cover a wide range, including:

- support for a Certificate in Learning and Teaching
- bulletin on good teaching practice
- an annual lecture on T&L with prizes for good teaching practice
- supporting departments in quality enhancement
- introducing an online student feedback system
- developing online materials for e-learning
- promoting the quality of distance learning provision in line with the QAA Code.

5   The institution has always operated a decentralised approach to promoting quality enhancement as it believes that all should own quality through an intermediate tier at faculty level. It is not the culture for departments or faculties to have teaching ambassadors from a central support function.

6   The director of the ESD believes that TQEF has helped to transform the institution; without it the changes would not have happened, as the research-dominant culture was very strongly embedded. The activities of TQEF have raised the profile of L&T and introduced e-learning to a growing audience. It is now quite likely that the institution will absorb the salaries of the three TQEF-funded persons, but their related consumable costs may be harder to find. Since the vice–principal responsible for learning and teaching was responsible for the production of the institution's corporate strategy and human resource strategy, there has been no difficulty in ensuring that they are well-integrated.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

7   The institution has not had any FDTL projects nor any NTFS fellows. In the first few years of the NTFS some candidates were submitted, but they did not succeed. In recent years the

institution has made a formal decision not to bid any more, as it was found to be demotivating for the individuals concerned, when they were rejected after putting so much effort into their bid. It was hard for staff to meet some of the criteria such as the call for reflective practice.

8   Relationships with the generic centre and subject centres are mediated through the ESD and it is reported that there have been variable benefits to departments from the work of subject centres. However, the ESD found the generic centre to be a valuable resource and worked closely with it on one project. The institution has been awarded a CETL which is joint with another university.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

9   The positive evidence on impact from the head of the ESD (who has benefited most from the funding – and could therefore be expected to be in favour) was echoed by an academic dean in a faculty. That faculty has been involved in redesigning courses to promote key skills and in innovative work in e-learning. It has also pioneered an online student feedback questionnaire that is now being applied throughout the institution. The academic dean also reports that the culture within his faculty now accepts peer review of teaching practice (which it would have rejected earlier) and that staff are now evaluated (*inter alia*) on the feedback from their students' questionnaire responses.

10   Innovations in teaching are being identified by departments and placed on a central web-site as well as disseminated at an annual event for all staff. At this event the institution awards prizes for good teaching (which are funded by an external donor).

11   New academic staff are expected to take a PG Certificate in Academic Practice and in the last three and a half years 43 staff have achieved this and have become eligible to be registered practitioners; in addition over the same period 67 staff have completed a shorter Certificate course, run by ESD; this has not brought them any formal qualification as it has only half the credits of the PGCAP, but it is well regarded. The total number of academic staff development days attended has gradually risen over the last three years from about 600 in 2001-02 to well over 1,000 to date in 2004-05. Although there are no acknowledged indicators of improved teaching and learning, the culture has changed so that it is now seen as an important outcome, even though excellence in the RAE remains the dominant objective.

12   As regards changes in promotion criteria the institution has a medical school where three staff have recently been appointed professor on the basis of their excellence in scholarship rather than research. It is thought that other disciplines such as biology might well follow with a similar focus on the scholarship criterion. The institution has not yet adopted the national single pay spine, but when this happens, the 'scholarship' emphasis is likely to be part of a possible staff contract (for teaching and scholarship) in some disciplines.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF funding

13   TQEF has undoubtedly given learning and teaching a higher profile in the institution and has helped it to close the gap with others as regards the use of e-learning. It is estimated that

about 150 academic staff are now using e-learning to some extent with about 3,000 students. This is all driven by staff interest rather than student demand. Again, the key person behind these changes believes they would not have happened without TQEF funding. The other strands of TQEF have meant very little to the institution.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

14   The position as regards the five aims is as follows:
- The institution had a *reward* scheme for good teaching before TQEF started, but the strengthening of the ESD has given the scheme new focus and drive.
- There is very little in the TQEF activity that involves any *collaboration* with other institutions.
- *Dissemination of good practice* is a core element being funded by TQEF.
- *Research and innovation* in learning and teaching is not funded directly by TQEF, but the existing awards scheme for teaching does identify innovative methods and staff of the ESD have encouragement of innovation at the heart of their work.
- *Building capacity for change* is also part of ESD's work by helping to develop staff through staff development and one-to-one support.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

15   The employability priority of HEFCE is fundamental to one of the three projects in the TQEF funding in the institution in that developing web-based materials on key skills and employability is part of the programme. This is supported by staff responsible for activities under Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) funding and linkages with small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) being based in the ESD. The e-learning project of the TQEF funding aims to support the existing distance learning activities in line with the best practice in the QAA Code. This is developing online and multimedia materials for use of the institutional virtual learning environment by remote and campus-based learners.

Conclusions

16   The institution has used TQEF money to catch up with others in terms of spreading understanding of the need continually to improve and develop learning and teaching, as well as widening the use of e-learning materials. The change agents in the institution believe that TQEF funds have achieved 'significant change' which would not otherwise have happened, given the very strong emphasis by the leadership on research excellence. They feel that earmarking any future funding is important in order to continue further work, although three of the posts funded by TQEF are likely to be taken on by the institution's own budget.

Case Study 7

The HEI

1   This post-1992 university, with strong emphasis on teaching, have over half of its young entrants coming from under-represented groups and 42 per cent of its entrants are mature. The university's mission is to be a first class regional university with a priority 'to enable and encourage individuals to realise their full potential'.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The university prepared its first LTS in 1999, focussed on staff development and technology to support learning. The 2000-2005 strategy continued these two themes and added student support. The use of TQEF funds for the staff development theme comes to an end in 2005, while it continues to be supported by Professional Standards and human resources funding streams. A new LTS strand of support for pedagogical research is now evolving, encouraged by a successful bid for a CETL, while the technology and student support strands will continue to draw on TQEF funds. TQEF funding has undoubtedly accelerated, deepened and strengthened the LTS on which the university embarked in 1999.

3   The requirement by HEFCE of regular reiteration of the LTS has been welcomed by the university – the burden of reporting is not excessive and they would in fact have welcomed more critical challenge from the regional HE Academy to their plans.

4   There is central direction-setting with devolved responsibility for delivering the LTS. The bulk of the TQEF and other L&T funds are devolved to the ten schools. The dean of learning and teaching has a small central team, which together with the L&T committee annually sets strategic L&T objectives and targets for the ten schools. Each school has a co-ordinator for each of the three strands (staff, technology and student support) who drive the process of developing an action plan for the school to meet the strategic objectives and targets. The action plans are peer-reviewed across the schools, a process much valued by the co-ordinators because of the exchange of ideas. Implementation is monitored by the L&T committee.

5   The 2008 RAE is considered unlikely to have a major impact since excellence in research is not central to the mission of the university. This perspective is expressed as staff being expected, trained and supported to undertake and publish enough good quality research to sustain their careers as excellent teachers.

6   There is a fundamental linkage between the LTS and widening participation, which is central to the university's mission. Employability is less directly addressed although it is an important value within the university. The TQEF-funded staff development strand has evolved to take advantage of funding under the human resources and professional standards strategies, although the policy underlying the transition of these priorities has not always seemed coherent to the university.

7   To put the TQEF funding in context, it provided the initial resources for the LTS and stimulated the organisational infrastructure to plan and implement it. That infrastructure, now led by a dean which thus gives it significance and status, commands a budget for the university-wide LTS approaching £1.5m annually and rising, of which TQEF provides just under £200,000, the university provides £500,000, and the balance comes from professional standards and human resources funding streams and the new CETL. TQEF now funds less than 20 per cent of total LTS activities.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

8   Participated in consortia in FDTL 2 and 3. The importance of FDTL projects is acknowledged but does not seem to be a major factor in the implementation of the LTS. The university has hosted no subject centres, but staff and particularly the school-based co-ordinators have made regular use of the relevant subject centres, inviting subject centre staff to lead workshops and training sessions. The generic centre has been particularly valuable as a source of advice and reference to good practice and there is some regret that it seems to have lost its way recently.

9   The university is a strong exporter and disseminator of ideas and practice, having 'extensive and mature contacts' with a wide range of the subject centres as well as the Higher Education Academy. It publishes the outcomes from its project work annually and sends copies to all higher education institutions in the UK. In June 2004 at the ILT annual conference, 7.5 per cent of all papers and workshops were given by staff from the university.

10   The work of NTFS fellows elsewhere has not had a discernible impact on the institution and failure to achieve an award has been a disappointment. The first award in this university was in the 2003-04 round and the fellow is just starting work on his project, which is well integrated with the LTS. He will have a key role in developing a series of pedagogic research clusters across the university and this will support both the LTS and the new CETL.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

11   Given the profile of its intake, the university focuses on student-based measures of the success of its LTS. Thus in their first year, the number of students identified as high risk during induction has been reduced from 7.6 to 4.6 per cent by the end of semester 1. Increased utilisation of study support from 2001-02 to 2002-03 resulted in a 32 per cent rise in the numbers of students referred for support on a regular basis. Progression statistics from Level 1 to Level 2 rose from 81 per cent in 2000-01 to 90 per cent in 2002-03.

12   Retention is proving a complex area, where there is no easy correlation between L&T factors and retention levels, with losses of Level 1 students persistent at around 20 per cent. It is becoming clear from student exit surveys that, given the very wide participation profile of entrants, enhanced teaching quality is a necessary but not a sufficient factor in achieving higher retention rates.

13   It appears that the confidence of staff in their teaching role is growing – over the past three years, internal bids for funding innovation projects and awards have increased from a base of six, to nine and now to 19. A similar pattern of increasing bids for external resources e.g. to HE Academy is emerging. The recent award of a CETL is largely ascribed by the university to the strong L&T foundations that it has been able to develop by the use of TQEF funding.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

14   TQEF funding has enabled the creation of an infrastructure, processes and culture in which professionalism and innovation in learning, teaching and student support are key values. Underperforming staff are now subject both to peer pressure from colleagues to improve their teaching, and higher expectations from students who are becoming increasingly discriminating about the quality of the learning experience. Schools are now carrying this work forward. They are keen to build on the work done so far in embedding the LTS, by integrating their own LTS action plans with their school-based business plans.

15   The use of technology to support learning has taken root so that it is no longer the province of enthusiasts; it is now mainstream behaviour for the majority of staff. The university has had its own virtual learning environment since 1999.

16   Although TQEF funding is now a significantly smaller proportion of the total funds supporting this university's LTS, the common view among those interviewed is that it should continue to be earmarked for this purpose. They would resist any move to roll it up in general funding where it would lose focus and leverage.

17   The university believes that TQEF funding has been the primary driver and enabler of quality enhancement in its L&T. By contrast, the QAA process is a significant driver of compliance with quality assurance standards but does not of itself encourage enhancement and innovation. Professional body requirements are significant drivers of L&T practice in some disciplines. Increasingly, informed and discriminating students are becoming significant drivers of L&T quality.

18   The institutional strand has been the dominant provider of benefit to this institution, but it has come to appreciate the value of the subject-based strand through the subject centres. The individual strand has hitherto provided no benefits, but with its first NTFS fellow about to start work, the university expects to benefit significantly from it, since his work feeds directly into pedagogical research and practice in the institution and its new CETL.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

19   *Encouragement and reward:* a strong outcome of the institutional strand focussing on staff development as a key area. Internal innovation and excellence awards now mirror national types – rising star etc. The TQEF investment in this area is now migrating to the human resources and professional standards strands.

20   *Co-ordination and collaboration:* the subject centre network is valued by this institution and staff are active contributors to national events.

21   *Disseminating good practice:* Internal and external dissemination of good practice in L&T are now core values. The internal network of school-based co-ordinators is proving a good mechanism for interdisciplinary exchange of practice.

22   *Research and innovation:* internal innovation awards have encouraged staff and the number bidding for these is increasing as confidence develops. Pedagogical research is set to become the next priority area in the evolving LTS, funded by TQEF funds released by transferring the costs of staff development work to other funding streams.

23   *Building capacity for change:* the institution has created an effective structure for driving beneficial change in L&T, with a good balance between central direction setting and school-based implementation, which continues to respond to evolving priorities.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

24   *Widening participation:* central to the mission of the university and at the core of its LTS. TQEF funding has significantly enhanced work to this end, especially in student support.

25   *Ensuring fair access to HE:* progress in this area is implicit in the above, given the very wide entry profile to the institution.

26   *Maintaining and improving retention rates:* remains a problematic area (see above). Concentrated effort in this area has improved understanding to the point of recognising that there is no simple solution.

27   *Employability:* not directly addressed.

28   *Encouraging and disseminating good and innovative practice* in support of high quality L&T: significant institutional progress, including widespread adoption of technology as a tool to support L&T.

Conclusions

29   TQEF funds have provided the opportunity to create an effective organisational structure and processes to enhance L&T quality across the institution. Values and practices have become genuinely rooted and established. Taken together with the funding which has been committed or secured in the medium term and integrated within the L&T strategy, this permits some optimism about the sustainability of these developments.

30   There are some potential good practice lessons for the sector here in the way that LTS in this institution has had a far-reaching impact on the culture, expectations and practices of the staff, which has enabled the strategy to become genuinely embedded. Some key factors are:

- action-planning, resource management and implementation driven by schools, guided by central strategic objectives

- bringing all LTS-related funding and resources together under a dean of L&T
- the requirement for all new staff to undertake an in-service PG Certificate in their first year.

31   Both the national subject centres and their own new NTFS fellow are appreciated by the institution and integrated within their LTS – indicating some positive local synergy between TQEF strands.

32   In spite of the significant degree of embedding of the LTS, all levels consulted in the university feel it will be important to continue earmarking the TQEF funds in order to maintain focus and avoid their being diffused to meet general expenditure needs. The very positive response to the opportunity provided by TQEF funding in this institution is to a large extent the consequence of the already high value given to teaching within the university's mission. In that sense, the TQEF seed fell on fertile ground and has succeeded in delivering significant benefits in line with its aims. It would be dangerous to extrapolate similar progress in institutions where the ground is more stony.

Case Study 8

The HEI

1   This large post-1992 modern university has been restructured from faculties to schools. It has a strong teaching record, supported ILT membership. It has achieved two National Teaching Fellowships and successfully bid for a CETL and an FDTL project. The two NTFS fellows have a collaborative project track record dating back to the mid-1990s. Each school has an L&T strategy which aligns with the institutional one.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The current strategy is for the period 2003-2006. It is based around the inter-relationships of learning, the student experience, employability and the continuing development of students and staff. Responsibility for objectives is clearly identified. The university has a strong tradition in supporting learning and teaching. The current strategy provided a sharpened focus, closer alignment to mission, and stronger links between schools and the university and to a range of supporting initiatives.

3   As part of the restructuring each school has an associate dean (learning and teaching) who acts as a champion for learning and teaching. They provide key connections between the school strategies and plans and those of the university. Each chairs a cross-school topic based enhancement group. They also chair the L&T committee in their respective school.

4   TQEF funding was used to support:

- three posts of learning and teaching co-ordinators

- around 35 annual awards designed to encourage innovation in L&T (now funded from the human resources strategy)
- e-learning staff development to promote effective use of the virtual learning environment (Blackboard)
- a range of other initiatives described below, including development of a CPD programme
- a guide to effective study which is distributed to all new students.

5   Collectively these endeavours have assisted the university to progress the strategy which is underpinned by substantial core investment by the institution, notably through the posts of associate deans (L&T) which are slightly above principal lecturer level. Synergy is being achieved between the various strands. The successful bid for the CETL is tangible evidence. The university is proud of the success of the awards initiative. Most of the award winners receive £1,000-2,000 with two premier awards being worth £5,000. Impact upon student learning is a component of the judging for an award.

6   Many of the key players undertake multiple associated roles. For example the two NTFS holders are centrally involved in the FDTL project, the CETL and relevant enhancement groups. Part of the restructuring at the university entailed the creation of the learning and teaching support section. Previously there was a quality enhancement unit. The L&T support section reports to the PVC L&T, and works closely with the staff development manager in human resources.

7   In the previous faculty-based structure two of the current L&T co-ordinators held 0.5 FTE faculty L&T support roles. The shift to a small full-time support team has facilitated greater team working and more sustained cross-school interaction and support.

8   Recently the university has put in place clear career development routes based upon teaching, including opportunity for promotion to professor. The latter became operative last year and one such promotion has occurred. These developments arose from sustained efforts by a task group and successive loops of consultation on, and elaboration of, proposals prior to their final adoption by the university.

9   The university is committed to widening participation and has a raft of provision including collaborative provision with other partners. The L&T strategy deliberately seeks to integrate the key features of widening participation, human resources, estates and other detailed strategies, in order to provide a coherent and comprehensive focus and direction.

Linkage With Other Aspects of TQEF

10   Connectivity has been achieved between the two NTFS fellows, the FDTL project and the CETL. The work of the subject centres is promoted through various channels, such as the associate deans, the learning and teaching co-ordinators, the LTS, PGCAP, the staff development resource centre and the relevant enhancement groups.

11   The university has held an annual learning and teaching conference for many years. Now it primarily showcases the work of award winners and other internal initiatives but a core feature

of the event is the plenary sessions which are given by external speakers. A member of the HE Academy will be a plenary speaker at the next event.

12   The most recent work of the task group has been the articulation of a CPD model for the university, which will align with and translate into national developments in relation to professional standards for those engaged in supporting and providing learning and teaching in HE. To the institutional teaching fellowships, the annual conference, the awards and the revised criteria for promotion, the university has now added a new modular programme in academic practice. Thus staff can take any module from this programme as part of their ongoing CPD. They can also receive credit for work-based learning such as a project under the awards scheme. One NTFS fellow is also programme leader for this new programme. If staff wish further accredited opportunities it will now be possible to progress from certificate to diploma to masters and to a professional doctorate.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

13   Internal dissemination of good practice is led by the associate deans and the L&T co-ordinators. They are backed by a substantial number of award holders and by the members of the ten enhancement groups. Further support comes from the guides produced through learning and teaching web-sites, the annual L&T conference and several publications, and the resources available via the staff development resources centre.

14   There is clear evidence of effective promotion of the scholarship of teaching with award holders being expected to write short reports for dissemination and actively encouraged to produce published papers, which is happening. Students spoke enthusiastically of teaching innovations which they had experienced. Those had had a strong and motivational impact. They enjoyed the opportunity for work-based learning or the opportunity to exercise greater responsibility for their learning. An example of the latter was the students being asked to design an appropriate experiment. They reported substantial additional learning from that experience. These are encouraging beacons of innovation. That said, the particular examples did not generally typify the approach to L&T which the students had experienced.

15   The provision of e-learning workshops and support appears to have been successful with an encouraging level of adoption, albeit at varying levels of usage, of the virtual learning environment (Blackboard). Sixty-six e-learning workshops have been held since December 2004. Additionally there have been two e-learning forums. A one-day event was planned for May 2005. There is also a weekly programme of SD events organised by the LTS SD Advisor. A small central resource is available to support staff to present papers on e-learning at conferences. (This is additional to normal funds that can be sought via schools.)

16   The institution supported ILT membership. The university estimated that around 13 per cent of staff were members. Separately it was estimated that around 15 per cent of staff are currently engaged within the institution in the formal enhancement processes, groups and initiatives, although more are active at a personal or small group level in localised developments in L&T. All new staff are expected to undertake the PGCAP.

17   Whilst the university performs well on retention, this topic and the related one of the first year experience, is the focus of the work of a task group which links to several of the enhancement groups. Thus there is a clear commitment to sustained investigation and action. More generally the enhancement groups are dedicated to addressing key L&T issues such as assessment, diversity, flexible learning etc. They are expected to inform enhancement strategies and foster discussion on best practice.

18   The successful CETL bid, an institutional one, built upon accumulated expertise gained through earlier internally and externally funded projects and developmental work. A significant component of the case was the evidencing of capacity building (capability) and a record of successful and effective innovation.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

19   Not all of these benefits can be attributed solely to TQEF funding, but they do relate centrally to the institutional L&T strategy. A significant portion of the strategy has been funded by the institution. Human resources and professional standards monies have also been appropriately targeted towards progressing elements of the overall L&T strategy. The TQEF fund has influenced the pace and level of support available to some developments. With institutional resources under pressure, the availability of earmarked funding has helpfully enabled the PVC L&T to lubricate aspects of the overall strategy.

20   The strong view from everyone interviewed was that earmarked funding should be retained, preferably with at least a three-year strategic and operational cycle.

21   The university uses champions, facilitators and funding to promote and encourage reflection, changes to practice and innovative work. The funding and associated support enables the strategy of wider engagement and recognition, through awards, enhancement groups and other activities. That in turn fosters further dissemination of and discussion on good practice and innovation as others are brought into the communities of practice.

22   Cumulatively these actions and activities are allowing the university to extend quality enhancement work to complement existing strength in the quality assurance of L&T.

23   The institutional strand exercises considerable influence in the university. The two NTFS fellows are, and were, already widely engaged in QE activities but the NTFS awards have extended their networks, internal and external, and added greatly to their experiences and personal development. This has also led to new inter-institutional developmental activities and partnerships. The university seeks to maximise the opportunity to benefit from the work of subject centres.

Progress Towards the Original HEFCE 5 Aims of TQEF

24   *Encouragement and reward:* Very significant progress has been made through internal awards, revised promotion criteria and the formulation of a coherent plan for CPD.

25   *Co-ordination and collaboration:* The system of associate deans and enhancement groups supported by three L&T co-ordinators has strengthened co-ordination and encouraged collaboration. Good liaison exists between various groups/units responsible for L&T and staff development. The growing use of the virtual learning environment is also enabling and attracting collaboration. There is focussed external collaboration, e.g. with subject centres and through projects.

26   *Disseminating good practice:* This is facilitated by the annual L&T conference; awards (which are expected to report on dissemination); newsletters and publications; the enhancement groups; and the associate deans. External dissemination of innovative work is encouraged.

27   *Research and innovation:* The awards foster innovation. The scholarship of teaching encouraged. Revised promotion criteria recognise excellence in L&T as valid basis for promotion to professorship. The relatively recent post of associate dean (L&T) at slightly above principal lecturer level also contributes to building and supporting a climate of innovation. Programme validation seeks evidence of incorporation of research.

28   *Building Capacity for Change:* The ethos behind much of the strategy is the enhancement of the student learning experience. Encouraging innovation and providing supporting staff development is actively pursued as a means of enabling the progression of the strategy. Associate deans have an important role in building capacity for change. Awards are seen as an effective lever for change, and there is keen interest in applying for an award.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

29   All five elements are key features of the university's L&T strategy. This is reinforced through specific objectives and action plans and via the sustained work of the enhancement groups. The university, through a partner, offers 40 foundation degrees. It also offers other access entry routes. These endeavours feature in the plans of schools, in the work of the enhancement groups and will be topics for some modules in the CPD programme.

Conclusions

30   The university has set out an ambitious agenda in the L&T strategy. The TQEF funds have been a valuable additional source of support. As the process of change continues and some of the more recent initiatives, such as the CPD module, are implemented, there will be further pressures upon available resources (money, time and expertise). Valuable staff development and personal development is occurring and, if the strategy is maintained, that is likely to widen and deepen.

Case Study 9

The HEI

1   This HE college has undergone geographical consolidation and has a strong emphasis on teaching, pastoral and professional learning support. It has an NTFS fellow who leads a CETL project and which is a partner in a collaborative CETL. It is also a partner in an FDTL project.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The college expects staff to take an holistic interest in students. Whilst the sum earmarked via TQEF is comparatively small, it has enabled important opportunities to be progressed. The Learning and Teaching Strategy, 2002-2005, has six key objectives namely:

- to create a supporting learning environment
- to prepare students for employability
- to support and reward staff in developing learning and teaching
- to create a flexible learning and teaching environment
- to advance evaluation of the college's learning and teaching practices
- to develop new collaborative links in the delivery of learning and teaching.

3   The TQEF monies were allocated to:

- the appointment of teacher fellows
- e-learning support
- e-learning infrastructure
- student ICT skills development
- research and evaluation.

4   The college is progressing a shift towards more flexible provision. In support of that a new learning centre has been opened and a new learning and teaching model has been progressively introduced and adopted. Improvements have been made to the learning environment in older buildings. The post of director of learning and teaching co-ordinates, stimulates, facilitates and oversees quality enhancement. They have held an annual learning and teaching conference since 2002.

5   The college has supported staff seeking ILT membership/HE Academy registration. It also developed an in-house PG Certificate in Academic Practice for staff, leading to HE Academy accreditation.

6   The college adds significantly to the earmarked funding in order to progress the L&T strategy. Most of the earmarked funding has been spent centrally, such as on teaching fellows, the post of an e-learning advisor and the WebCT licence. When the e-learning post became mainstreamed, the money was spent on the post of an academic IT support officer who

provides targeted IT skills support for students. Part of the strategy is to use academics effectively and to use support staff for skills-based and technical roles.

7   There has been a major shift in the pattern of workloads. Previously, about 70 hours in a 200-hour 20 credit module involved direct teaching inputs. That has fallen to 14 hours with a corresponding growth in supported open learning (SOL) by students. This is seen as a massive culture shift in the institution. It is acknowledged that a lot of time is needed to prepare materials for supported open learning.

8   The college teacher fellowships are for two years and to date around 12 have been awarded. Fellows undertake projects to enhance student learning.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

9   The college actively promotes contact with subject centres (seen as a helpful resource). The director of L&T has strong links with the LTSN/HE Academy. There has been success in the NTFS scheme and in winning a CETL which are encouraging achievements for a relatively small institution.

10   There is a tier of staff at principal lecturer level who as part of their role are expected to progress and promote learning and teaching development within the schools. They access an array of resources including those developed by the subject centres. Heads of school also encourage connectivity with subject centres and generally spoke positively about them.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

11   A major thrust of the L&T strategy is to support flexible learning and revise the L&T model operating in the institution. Considerable progress has been made with both objectives. The excellent QAA report on health studies praised the placement component, thereby providing evidence of the effectiveness of the employability initiatives.

12   The scheme of teaching fellows is flourishing with growing competition for the award. A welcome consequence of the various initiatives is the emergence of a community of practice within the college. In 2003-04 there was external evaluation of the development of the L&T model. Generally students felt the model had helped them learn, although they were less positive about SOL. Teaching staff were more cautious about the new model, partly on logistical and partly on philosophical concerns. The evaluation made nine recommendations and these are now being addressed. Another evaluation is planned for 2005-06.

13   College managers perceive the whole L&T strategy as central to the future growth and development of the institution. It also fits closely with the academic thrust such as the partnerships with NHSU and development of foundation degrees.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

14   TQEF funding has lubricated progress with key elements of the L&T strategy. In a climate where resources are under pressure it has been a powerful enabling feature. Since some of the shifts envisioned in the strategy are substantial, there is a need for continuing nurturing and support. The funding has encouraged innovators and provided a modest, but crucial, level of additional targeted central support.

15   Students speak positively about their learning experience at the college, although effective adoption of SOL remains a challenging issue for staff and students. The college has sought benefit from each strand of TQEF funding. Whilst the success, to date, in the individual strand has been modest, it has had a powerful impact both on the career development of the individual and on the consequent contribution to the work of the college in relation to L&T.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

16   *Encouragement and reward:* the principal means in demonstrating this have been the teacher fellowships and the annual L&T conference. Some teacher fellows have successfully gained additional funding from other sources. As part of their duties principal lecturers play a role in progressing the L&T strategy within their school. Promotion to a readership or chair is possible via excellence in teaching, but to date that has not occurred.

17   Centrally the position of director of L&T and more locally the wider spread of principal lecturers assist *co-ordination and collaboration*. Likewise central support posts are specifically intended to assist academics to adopt flexible learning and the new model for L&T.

18   Within the college the annual L&T conference is seen as a vehicle for *disseminating good practice*. At the level of disciplines, reference to the work and resources of subject centres is intended to further that strategy.

19   The teacher fellowships encourage *innovation* and the outcomes can include contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning/pedagogical *research*.

20   The principal foci of *capacity building* have been in relation to the adoption and use of e-learning and the new learning and teaching model. In addition to the work within schools there is also a raft of college-wide staff development events and workshops related to these themes.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

21   The college is committed to, and has an effective record on, *widening participation and ensuring fair access* to HE. Indeed these concerns are a significant driving force behind key aspects of the L&T strategy.

22   The college meets its benchmark in maintaining and improving *retention rates*. Nonetheless it recognises that continued work is needed on these issues.

23   The academic profile of courses involves many which prepare students for various professions. Most of these degrees entail placements. Other partially skills-related developments are also perceived as reinforcing the commitment to *employability*.

24   The support for flexible learning provides a good example of organisational efforts aimed at encouraging and *disseminating good and innovative practice* in support of high quality.

Conclusions

25   Strategic use has been made of a relatively modest amount of earmarked funding. The college has a clearly articulated strategy and directs resources from various streams towards the related action plans and initiatives. At the heart of the strategy are some significant changes to culture and practice. These are being progressed steadily and sensitively. The overarching focus is the enhancement of the student learning experience.

Case Study 10

The HEI

1   This is a large multi-campus faculty-based post-1992 university. Each faculty is headed by a PVC/dean. Faculties have considerable autonomy for delivering the strategy. The institution has had success in the NTFS. It hasn't been successful with individual CETL bids, but has one successful joint bid.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The revised learning and teaching strategy and action plan dates from July 2002. It reviewed progress with the earlier strategy, considered changing contexts and factors, and made explicit links to other institutional strategies on, for example, widening participation, student support, equal opportunities, race equality, human resources and estates. The revised strategy was 'intended to inform and guide faculty learning and teaching plans and in turn be influenced by them'.

3   The aims of the strategy are to:

- ensure a high quality of educational experience for all students through the provision of high quality learning opportunities
- establish a reputation for the provision of excellent, varied, innovative and effective learning and teaching
- assure that the standards of the resulting qualifications of graduates can be confidently referenced to appropriate national/international comparators

- capture and disseminate innovatory learning
- promote the concept of lifelong learning by enabling students to develop the experience and skills necessary to achieve a high order of independent thought and action and to form a basis for future learning needs
- ensure that graduates are well-prepared for their personal futures and are in a position to add value to the organisation for which they work and otherwise engage
- promote within the staff of the university a commitment to imaginative and purposeful engagement with the learning needs of an increasingly diverse student body
- establish, by means of effectual operational and managerial arrangements, long-term capability in learning and teaching
- encourage research into learning and teaching and dissemination of its findings so as to contribute to a virtuous circle of improvement.

4   Each faculty has a learning and teaching committee (FLTC). Up until the end of 2003-04 the academic standards committee operated with a standing learning and teaching committee chaired by the university head of learning and teaching and which, *inter alia*, comprised a representative from each faculty. Reciprocally, a member of the learning and teaching unit (LTU) (6 staff) sat on each FLTC. From the commencement of 2004-05 a new learning and teaching committee reporting directly to the Academic Board was established, chaired by a dean.

5   The TQEF monies have primarily been spent on the establishment of the LTU and two schemes for learning and teaching fellowships. One scheme, the senior learning and teaching fellow (SLTF) route involves a three-year promoted post to principal lecturer equivalent. The other, not involving promotion, provides support for individual staff to undertake short-term project-based activities (learning and teaching fellow, LTF). About 150 hours of the time of each SLTF is devoted to faculty L&T work. They also provide enhancement support in their respective departments and contribute to pan-university special interest groups. That role is a particularly important strand uniting enhancement initiatives and support. There is now a critical mass of SLTFs (about 23). Initially many were already at senior lecturer level but more recently some younger/unpromoted staff have gained awards. Recipients believe that the title helps open doors within the institution.

6   The project strand is slowly gathering momentum. The monies provide some time release to enable awardees to progress agreed Faculty-based projects. At least one individual has had two separate projects funded and used these to progress studies around the scholarship of L&T, with linked quality publications. Thus the strand fits with the aims of the strategy.

7   The LTU is based in the academic division and the head of learning and teaching reports to the DVC. The LTU also has clear and close links with each faculty and with staff development. Senior core staff are reflecting upon the further development of the LTF scheme and it is likely that changes will be made to scheduling of the appointments and to terms and conditions.   One of the reasons is to stimulate higher levels of application now that the scheme has moved beyond the initial start-up phase. Two faculties make available small teaching innovation and excellence prizes. The special interest groups receive £5,000 in funding, subject to an agreed project plan.

8	The university is committed to SD and to CPD. A team has been appointed to develop a CPD framework. Current policy is that new staff undertake the PG Certificate. The intention is to move to a modular CPD framework with a strong L&T core. The aim is to launch the new framework by January 2006. The intention is that modules will cover a wide range of relevant roles, based around four core areas: L&T, research development, widening participation and academic enterprise. Professional standards monies are being used to fund the small core team developing this framework.

9	The LTU encourages innovators/champions to publish. An 'internal' publishing option is via 'Learning and Teaching in Action' which the LTU publishes. About three years ago it was decided to adopt best practice and implement a staff development forum as a mechanism to bring people together to share and reflect upon best practice. There is an annual programme for new programme leaders. The university has adopted WebCT and has (March 2005) over 16,000 users. Approximately 30 per cent of staff are users.

10	There is strong and widespread support for the value gained from TQEF monies and the need for continued earmarked funding.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

11	The university strongly supports the value of subject centres and actively encourages departments and staff to utilise the resources. Senior staff in departments/faculties are encouraged to engage with their SCs and some are members of relevant advisory committees.

12	The university has had two successes in the NTFS. The individuals spoke positively of the benefits to them, their discipline and projects. The university also seeks to use them as champions, subject to the inevitable constraints of time availability.

13	The institutional and subject strands are perceived as the most powerful and helpful. Given the devolved academic operational ethos of the university, harmonising and maximising the potential strengths of these two strands is an attractive option.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

14	Within faculties and across the university, webs on enhancement and innovation are developing and strengthening. Senior learning and teaching fellows often play a key role in these webs. There are now sufficient senior fellows to provide a broad base of champions/enthusiasts. The LTU provides key guidance and support. It works closely with fellows, with faculties and with the principal central committees to shape, steer, support and energise work linked to the main aims of the L&T strategy.

15	Students spoke positively of experiences of innovative approaches to L&T. Even where logistical problems had intervened, benefits in learning had accrued. Faculties are currently piloting various PDP schemes for students. These build upon work by some senior fellows

and other enthusiasts in faculties and are designed to ensure the skills and career development of students is founded in their degree studies. The skills agenda is also supported by a network of student support officers.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

16   The institution has an established tradition in relation to a strategy for L&T. That was revisited in 1999 when the VC was appointed and reconsidered in 2002 with the formulation of the current L&T strategy. TQEF monies have provided essential lubrication for key core components of that strategy. The central/devolved balance is facilitated by the establishment of the LTU, the nested structure of L&T committees and the cohorts of faculty-based senior fellows and L&T fellows.

17   The institutional and subject centre strands have been the principal contributors to developments, with the small number of NTFS award-holders within the institution providing additional expertise and external validation of progress with the institutional strategic objectives. The project strand of TQEF has possibly been the least effective.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

18   The two fellowship schemes are the most obvious manifestation of *encouragement and reward* for excellence and innovation in L&T.

19   The LTU and the structure of committees act as the principal means of *co-ordination and collaboration*. These are reinforced by the roles of deans and heads of school in promoting the aims of the strategy.

20   Internal publications, showcase opportunities, special interest groups, and the network of committees all play a distinctive role in *disseminating good practice*. Staff are encouraged to speak at conferences and to publish the fruits of their projects.

21   The LTU seeks to encourage pedagogical *research and innovation* principally via the two fellowship schemes.

22   Through these endeavours the university actively seeks to *build capacity for change*. In that, senior staff play crucial supportive and steering roles.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

23   *Widening participation* is emphasised in the L&T strategy and is a core feature of the mission of the institution. An array of detailed strategies are in place and being developed. The university has taken the lead in the development of a regional strategic alliance – a confederation of universities and colleges to promote access to HE programmes.

24   Maintaining and improving *retention rates* features in various projects, the work of some special interest groups and action plans at all levels in the institution.

25   *Employability* is a core feature of the strategy. Work is continuing to mainstream these activities, more closely integrate them into degree programmes, and provide a wider variety of possible experiences. One recent example has been students of Sociology undertaking projects for the regional police force.

26   The institution is committed to encouraging and *disseminating good and innovative practice* in support of high quality L&T, including taking full advantage of resources available from SCs.

Conclusions

27   The proposed framework for CPD should provide an opportunity to widen the scale and diversify the levels of engagement of staff in personal and professional development in support of the key aims of the L&T strategy. A new VC will join the university later this year. This may coincide with the likely stocktaking on progress with the existing strategy and articulation of the next phase.

28   The university devolves considerable operational autonomy to the faculties. In that sense many developments are either bottom-up or distinctively shaped by faculty perspectives. The university has used the strategy to guide and frame intended directions and developments, whilst accommodating localised variation/interpretation. The senior managers, the LTU, the network of committees and the senior fellows provide connectivity between the faculties.

Case Study 11

The HEI

1   The institution is a small specialist performing arts institution with a significant national and international reputation. Its TQEF funding is small although it makes a significant contribution to enhancement activities. Like other similar providers the majority of academic staff (70 per cent) are hourly paid specialists with a separate professional career. This leads to a number of issues which the learning and teaching strategy (LTS) seeks to address, including: harmonising teaching practice; sharing good practice; finding ways to communicate effectively to - and between - staff; ensuring take-up of staff development and support activities; and issues associated with the effective appraisal of teaching.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The initial LTS, which has since been revised, was limited in scope concentrating on staff development for academics and providing web-based support for students. The HEI judges that its implementation was a 'significant change mechanism'. As a result greater thinking has occurred about the principles underpinning teaching and learning practice, and there is now a greater commitment to the learning and teaching objectives which feature in the strategic plan.

3   A new LTS has been produced for 2002-2005. TQEF funding is closely integrated into the strategy, and a specific annex lists funded activities. As a small institution all funds are managed centrally by the vice principal concerned. Amongst other things the LTS seeks to identify the graduate attributes it is seeking to achieve (particularly important in the context of a mission to provide specialist professional training); and recognises linkages to other key strategies (for example, widening participation, human resources, and estates).

4   The view of the HEI is that TQEF funding has been central to the successful implementation of its strategy. Although funding is small in absolute terms, its symbolic importance has been significant in getting staff to recognise that external funding was available, and the HEI has been able to provide modest additional resources to achieve substantial gearing on TQEF funding. There is a satisfactory level of integration with other strategies; for example, part of the TQEF funding was used to pilot a revision of the existing staff appraisal system, and the implementation of the new system is now being taken forward by human resources money.

5   The approach generally taken by HEFCE in requiring LTS and monitoring TQEF through annual monitoring statements is generally regarded as satisfactory and not too intrusive. The iterative nature of the original submission of LTS was generally felt to be helpful. In fact, the HEI is anxious to collaborate with HEFCE more generally, and has hosted a recent visit by a senior officer to discuss a number of issues concerning management and future strategy.

6   The HEI has not been active in the RAE, but is considering its position in relation to 2008. It acknowledges that there is a chance that unless earmarked TQEF funding continues there is a danger of any increase in the current grant being diverted into research.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

7   By far the most important element of TQEF has been the institutional strand, and links with other elements have been weak. The work of the appropriate subject centre is known and it funds a project in the HEI. However, its general stance is perceived to be rather reactive. It is also geographically remote which has not aided contact. The casual nature of the academic workforce makes contact between staff and the subject centre problematic, and it is only realistic to see linkages being made by the small number of full-time staff.

8   So far as the individual strand is concerned, although the work of a fellow in the same discipline in another institution is acknowledged to have been helpful, the HEI has concerns about the operation of the individual strand. Because of its size it has only made one nomination for a fellowship for a candidate that it felt to be outstanding, but this was rejected in favour of someone from another institution who was generally felt to be much less deserving. As a result the HEI has concerns about the application process, and has therefore decided for the moment not to make any further nominations.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

9 Most of the evidence is qualitative, but impact is felt to be strong. The culture of the college has always been that staff have taken teaching seriously, but the highly individualistic nature of performing arts institutions means that institution-wide implementation has been weak. The activities funded by TQEF have therefore been able for the first time to encourage broad adoption in key areas.

10 The action plan for the use of TQEF funding identifies six areas each associated with very modest funding. All activities have been undertaken, but for some the evidence of institutional impact will only become available over time. For example, one area is to seek greater involvement of casual academic staff through their involvement in a key area of practice: the professional elements of student admission, and exploring how equitable processes can be found of assessing the potential of non-traditional applicants in a field where high levels of technical competence are required by all students for entry. If successful, the benefits of this scheme will not only be in introducing more equitable forms of student entry (and thereby linking with the widening participation strategy) but also in increasing the involvement of casual staff.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

11 In general the benefits have been significant: assisting in the production of a more focussed learning and teaching strategy; ensuring faster progress in implementing some of its key aspects; and providing a higher profile for learning and teaching. Without TQEF progress in these areas would have been much more difficult, particularly since in the early part of the TQEF funding period the institution was running a financial deficit and it is unlikely that money would have been spent on enhancing teaching in such circumstances.

12 Other relevant drivers have been a QAA audit two years ago for which the HEI undertook extensive preparation and which is widely considered to have been helpful. In addition other strong internal drivers were in place: a change of senior academic managers, and a move to new premises have all combined to enable the college to take a fundamental review of learning and teaching. It is these factors when combined with limited TQEF funding that together have created the conditions for substantial change.

13 Because it is a single subject institution, the complications of seeking change across a wide range of disciplines has not occurred. Instead the HEI is an interesting example of where modest earmarked funding when combined with other strong drivers has directly stimulated substantial whole organisational change.

14 Under current arrangements the changes that have taken place are felt to be sustainable and few require major resources to continue. However, the HEI acknowledges that a small institution is likely to be particularly vulnerable to changes in key senior staff, and as a result, efforts are being made to devolve more responsibility for aspects of implementation.

Progress Towards Meeting Original HEFCE Aims and Changed Priorities

15   Because of the nature of the institution, not all of the HEFCE aims apply. However, substantial linkage has been made in relation to widening participation and ensuring fair access to higher education. Whilst maintaining its traditions of supporting the highest form of professional practice, the HEI has embarked on a number of innovative approaches to widening access which are integrated with aspects of TQEF, particularly in relation to the selection processes for students. Employability is also a prominent feature of the LTS, although its importance to the HEI predates HEFCE's specification of it from 2002 as a specific purpose of TQEF.

Conclusions

16   Overall, this is an interesting case study of the benefits of a small amount of funding in a small institution where other drivers have come together to stimulate real advances in the way that learning and teaching are perceived. The real test of implementation will be over the next few years. Earmarking of future TQEF funds is strongly supported.

Case Study 12

The HEI

1   This large research intensive university with nine faculties has active local, regional and international inter-institutional partnerships.   It has won three FDTL projects, takes the lead in two CETLs, as is a partner in others. It is regularly successful in the NTFS. It also hosts two subject centres.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The HEI's LTS covers the period 2002-2007. The strategy has five main aims: to develop innovative programmes; to invest in the teaching infrastructure; to stimulate and support continued innovation in the delivery of learning and teaching; to develop new collaborative links in the delivery of learning and teaching; and to promote and reward excellence in the provision of learning and teaching. The institution uses a template to monitor implementation which specifies responsibilities and details timescales.

3   The LTS is built upon the success of schools and central support services in implementing earlier strategies, as evidenced by a strong track record in QAA audits and assessments.

4   The TQEF monies have been used to support a skills centre, the production of a learning and teaching bulletin (three times per year), an annual learning and teaching conference, lunch-time staff development sessions, and support for e-learning and innovative L&T projects. Around £20,000 is being allocated annually to each dean for faculty initiatives, from Developing Professional Standards money rather than TQEF.

5	Projects are expected to undertake an evaluation. Additionally, the university uses an evaluator to provide overarching comments. Evaluations cover: impact/influence on students; engagement with staff; local dissemination; and wider dissemination. The university has its own project-based teaching fellowship scheme. Recipients either get three-year funding for a project plus a personal honorarium or a smaller sum for a one-year project. Around six fellowships are awarded annually. Around 24 applications are received annually.

6	Formal project management software methodology was used to develop project proposals and is being used to track the progress of larger projects. Central support is provided to projects, such as via a learning technologist, and a staff development contact who also provides a conduit to other central services.

7	Project monies are paid in three instalments (40 per cent upfront, 20 per cent after the interim report, and 40 per cent after acceptance of the final report). In total about 30 projects have been funded, of which around five have been large projects.

8	Both research and teaching are deemed important. Both feature in promotion criteria alongside administration. Nevertheless in a research intensive institution many staff perceive excellence in research as the favoured route for promotion. The university has recently introduced teaching only contracts but has still to see the implications of these in terms of recognition and reward. It has also actively supported ILT membership.

9	TQEF funding provides a valuable means of motivating and rewarding innovation and lubricating change. It is recognised that there is intense competition for resources within the institution. Thus earmarked funds for L&T have been invaluable in progressing the L&T strategy.

10	The skills centre, partly sponsored by a regional company, has five staff. It organises a range of events and support including resources for students and one-to-one support. It also works closely with academic departments to progress skills and employability agendas.

11	The university sent a group of staff to the 2004 HE Academy Change Academy. They are enthusiastic champions and are working on a retention management information project for the institution.

12	The university uses a system of pro-deans L&T to connect faculties to institutional strategy and provide leadership within the faculties. Each pro-dean chairs the relevant faculty L&T committee. Beneath these is a network of school L&T committees. Each school has a director of L&T. There has been a strengthening of the faculty roles of pro-deans L&T (now part of the Faculty Executive).

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

13   The university is engaged with each strand of TQEF. It hosts two subject centres, has had a number of FDTL projects and several NTFS fellows. Now it will lead two CETLs and be involved in others. Through central support units and the pro-deans, efforts are made to capitalise upon the work of the subject centres hosted in the institution and the 'local' FDTL projects. There was a general feeling that more could probably be made of these resources, although transferability from discipline specific to generic is not always easy.

14   The same agents promote more general use of the work of subject centres and the output of FDTL projects, again with variable success, largely due to the inevitably localised and diverse nature of individual assessment of appropriateness and quality.

15   The NTFS fellows interviewed spoke very positively of the contribution of the award to the personal and career development. They also valued the fact that the university sought to make full use of their expertise. There appeared to be strong synergy between personal and institutional agendas and strategies.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

16   The evaluator employed by the institution believes that the TQEF initiative has had a very positive impact on staff and students. Evidence of the latter is displayed, for example, through the quality of student work or use of a virtual learning environment. In terms of staff it features in their project reports and via dissemination events. Some projects have attracted national attention. Similar evidence was gained through interviews during the visit. One project involved developed a year zero for potential social science students. The students spoke positively of the opportunity and the tutor support. The vast majority of the pilot cohort were mature students.

17   Projects support LTS aims but can be locally contextualised to harmonise with the culture of disciplines/schools. The development of projects was not always as planned but with sensitive support they progressed productively. There are encouraging levels of attendance at the annual L&T conference and numbers of applications for project funding.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

18   Provided valuable resources to progress the LTS. The various endeavours have borne/are bearing fruit both in terms of staff engagement and enhancement to the student learning experience. Indeed, generally the monies have aided the quality enhancement agenda and acted as an important support and counterpoint to QA endeavours. In addition, many project leaders are now sharing ideas and good practice within their own departments and faculties and across the university. The main opportunities to exchange information and ideas come through lunchtime seminars, L&T bulletin, and evaluation seminars (held once a year throughout the TQEF project).

19   Each strand has had an impact on the institution. The institutional strand has been the strongest and arguably FDTL has had more limited impact.

20   There is strong support for the continuation of earmarked institutional funding.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

21   *Encouragement and reward:* Rounds of project funding have been the most visible source. Teaching does feature in promotion and may feature more prominently in the future with the introduction of teaching only contracts.

22   The relevant central support units work with the pro-deans and the PVC L&T to promote *co-ordination and collaboration.* Careful attention is paid to structures to support those objectives.

23   Part of the supporting template for projects requires *dissemination of good practice.* That is also enabled via the L&T bulletin, the annual L&T conference, the work of the pro-deans, and the nesting system of L&T committees. The institution seeks regional, national, and international prominence and actively encourages staff to present and perform at these levels.

24   The projects are the main source of support for *research and innovation.* Central support is provided to assist projects.

25   The organisational structure is designed to aid *building capacity for change.* Sending a team to participate in the 2004 HE Academy Change Academy is powerful evidence both of a commitment to change and to supporting and developing potential institutional and faculty academic champions.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

26   Several projects have been designed to develop new routeways and curricula to support *widening participation.* The institution's Change Academy participants have elected to continue their institutional work on maintaining and improving retention rates providing management information directly tailored to meet the needs of academic staff and departments.

27   One of the core purposes of the skills centre is to develop the skills of students, thereby addressing *employability.*

28   Whilst it has an established record of success, the university has been adapting and developing its structures and processes to encourage and *disseminate good and innovative practice* in support of high quality L&T.

Conclusions

29   There is strong central commitment to high levels of performance and success in both research and teaching. Nonetheless, the extreme external pressures upon RAE performance means that there is a constant challenge to maintain a balance, to provide sufficient and appropriate reward and recognition and to avoid overloading busy staff. The levels of attendance at the annual L&T conference, the institution's success with other strands of TQEF and with the internal scheme of project all provide encouraging evidence that a workable balance is being achieved.

Case Study 13

The HEI

1   This is a pre-1992 university of medium size. During the 1990s its research profile was strengthened considerably, and continuation of this remains a key institutional priority. The decision making structure (which affects the implementation of TQEF) is highly devolved, with all resources allocated without any top slicing, and departments then being charged for services provided. This means that all central initiatives need to have the support of departments and faculties. Teaching quality is high (as measured by previous QAA scores) and retention is above benchmarks.

The Learning and Teaching Strategy

2   The devolved nature of the institution means that the LTS has been seen as an enabling document identifying generally accepted issues which need to be addressed rather than one which sets down clear central objectives with associated performance criteria. HEFCE strategy in requiring updated strategies is felt to have been generally helpful in emphasising the importance of a strategic approach. During the period of TQEF the university has developed a better understanding of the need to take a strategic approach to development, and is currently working on a new strategy which will strengthen the existing one.

3   In operation there are strong linkages between TQEF and the HEFCE Rewarding and Developing Staff, human resources and professional development initiatives, with elements of the LTS being funded by all these strands.   However, the different timescales associated with multiple programme funding has caused problems, and it is easier for the university to take an integrated approach where programme funding exists over a longer period (such as TQEF). Teaching enhancement work (including that funded from TQEF) is co-ordinated through a team that includes the PVC responsible for teaching, the director of professional development, and three faculty-associated deans responsible for teaching.

4   The bulk of TQEF funding has been spent in two ways although both focus on aspects of on-line learning and the development of C&IT. From 1999-2002 a distributed approach was

taken, with 12-15 staff from departments being seconded from teaching to develop skills in a range of on-line learning issues, and subsequently seeking to encourage adoption in their host departments (the university has its own virtual learning environment). This was only partially successful, and from 2002-2005 a more centralised approach has been taken with the appointment of on-line learning development officers in each faculty. These are co-ordinated by the central professional development unit, which has responsibility for all aspects of university professional development, quality and related areas.

5   The culture of the institution means that in practice outside the professional development unit, much of the impetus for enhancing teaching and student learning rests with enthusiastic individual members of staff. The need to perform well in the 2008 RAE currently represents a significant barrier to broader participation in enhancement activities. However, there are examples where very substantial progress has been made, and one academic area (with an excellent research rating) has become a leader in subject-based teaching enhancement (see below).

6   Overall, the HEI feels that the institutional strand funding of TQEF has been helpful in enabling its work on the development of C&IT to go ahead more quickly than might otherwise have been the case, and that both the earmarked nature of it and the need to produce strategies have been helping in the devolved context of the university.

Linkages With Other Aspects of TQEF

7   As noted in paragraph 5 in one academic subject there has been a very close linkage between FDTL projects, hosting a subject centre and a successful CETL bid. This came about (approximately 10 years ago) because of a specific subject-based initiative, and this work is now widely recognised within the discipline as being a main national focus for enhancement. The work is well embedded and sustainable, and is highly valued within the university. A prominent part has been played by the appropriate associate dean for teaching and latterly the director of professional development.

8   So far as other aspects of TQEF are concerned there has been much less linkage. There is no data on the extent of use of other subject centres by departments within the university, but anecdotally the pattern is thought to be patchy. The same applies to FDTL projects. There is no central mechanism by which the university seeks to bring together or disseminate the work of other parts of TQEF.

9   The university has not had any NTFS fellows, and has three main concerns about the nature of the individual strand of TQEF funding: the burden in making applications; a perception that awards are now being made not to excellent academics but to those with a particular interest in educational development type activities; and a view that it appears to be increasingly necessary for successful applicants to hold an institutional award before getting a national one. It is also critical of the feedback it has received on the applications that it has made, and contrasts the minimal information obtained with the much fuller feedback information provided by the research councils.

10   More generally there is criticism about the whole concept of transferability in many HEFCE initiatives in this area, most notably but not restricted to FDTL. Short-term project-based collaboration is often not felt to be effective, and the form and granularity of what is to be disseminated and transferred is often not considered. Much project management is perceived to be weak, and the work of the national co-ordination team was not considered to be very effective in supporting or enhancing weak projects. Conversely it served a helpful function in projects with sound management. There is evidence of considerable impact and adoption of some of the FDTL projects referred to in paragraph 7, but this involved considerable effort and linkages with professional networks.

Evidence of Institutional Impact

11   Specific data on the institutional impact of TQEF is generally weak, although at least two kinds are available: information on the increased usage of the virtual learning environment (although this comes about for a variety of reasons and causality with TQEF would be hard to determine); and some data is available on the external take-up of FDTL project outcomes. The achievement of a CETL is clearly based on previous work (both funded by TQEF and other sources) and could, therefore, be regarded as some measure of impact.

Summary of Overall Benefits of TQEF Funding

12   Overall, institutional funding has been helpful in taking forward development of the university's work on on-line learning more quickly than would otherwise have been the case. FDTL and subject centre funding have been particularly valuable in one large academic area. Otherwise the benefits of TQEF have been patchy.

13   The university generally supports earmarked funding for TQEF, but feels that if it was continued then clearer guidance about specifying success criteria and associated issues might be helpful.

14   There are concerns that some of the unresolved issues about transferability and project management concerning FDTL will also apply to CETLs where they may be much more significant because of the greater sums of money involved.

15   Although valuable, as a driver for change initially TQEF was relatively weak in comparison to QAA, and will remain so in the future in the face of the RAE, and the implications of variable student fees.

Progress Towards the Original 5 HEFCE Aims for TQEF

16   *Encouragement and reward:* The university has used TQEF and other HEFCE initiative funds to establish its own academic practice awards. It has also reviewed its promotion criteria and excellence in teaching now features more prominently than before in the criteria for promotion to senior lecturer. However, it has not changed the criteria for professorships in relation to teaching.

17   *Co-ordination and collaboration*: Internally co-ordination is strong at the level of the PVC, associate deans' teaching, and the professional development service. There are also strong external professional links to the subject area where a CETL has been awarded, indeed it is the view of the university that effective professional networking is crucial in ensuring effective dissemination and transferability.

      Elsewhere collaboration with other HEIs has been limited, and - in general - the university is critical of some HEFCE initiatives having unrealistic expectations about external collaboration partly because other initiatives (notably the RAE) set up fierce competitive pressures.

18   *Disseminating good practice:* In the key priority areas of developing C&IT this is done through co-ordination between the learning development staff now employed in faculties, elsewhere this is largely undertaken through the central professional development service.

19   *Research and innovation*: This is strong in the specific academic area which has had a long-term involvement in developing subject-based practice. The main area funded by TQEF does not concern research and innovation directly, except insofar as a university, wide use of C&IT for student learning is relatively new.

20   *Building capacity for change*: TQEF has been one of several factors which together are building capacity for change. However, progress on enhancement remains cautious, and the demands of the 2008 RAE are likely to be a disincentive to more rapid progress.

Impact of TQEF on Progress Towards Changed HEFCE Priorities

21   The revised priorities of HEFCE in 2002 had little influence on institutional policy or the learning and teaching strategy. *Widening participation and associated access issues* were dealt with in a separate widening participation strategy, and *employability* had always been an important part of university mission*. Retention* rates are above benchmark and TQEF did not seek to address issues in this area.

Conclusion

22   The university is an example of an HEI concentrating its institutional funding from TQEF in one main area, and having moved from an initial distributed approach to developing C&IT to one which now emphasises a more co-ordinated application mediated through the professional development service. It is also an example of enhancing learning and teaching in a very devolved environment, and where strong corporate leverage is not available to manage change.

Appendix C:
Interviews with Professional Bodies and Education Developers

On the following pages are summaries of 18 interviews with those professional bodies where a representative was willing and available for interview by telephone.

The main purpose of the interviews was to sample the views of national bodies having a professional subject or discipline focus on the activities, benefits and overall impact of the TQEF initiative.

Interviewees were asked if they were happy for their comments to be attributable and identified with the organisation, and with one exception (which is indicated) they were. The summaries, developed from contemporaneous notes, necessarily involve some degree of interpretation. Every effort has been made to keep them true to the original conversation.

Following the notes of the professional body interviews is a summary of interviews with a sample of 20 educational/academic developers.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **British Psychological Society (BPS)**

Interviewee: **Prof Richard Latto, Chair of Psychology Education Board**

1. Richard Latto (RL) is well aware of the subject centre (Psychology) and of the shift to the HE Academy.

2. Interaction between the Society and the SC is limited but useful – the director of the SC sits on the Psychology Education Board of the Society. There is a joint undergraduate essay prize, funded by BPS and administered by the SC.

3. RL is aware that the SC runs workshops and training. The BPS is not directly involved with these but acknowledges their value.

4. The SC is a useful source of information and ideas and helps to keep BPS' Education Board in touch with what is happening in HE that is relevant to Psychology education. This in turn helps to ensure that the BPS input to accreditation is well-informed. Both BPS and SC provide journals and there is some overlap here, but it is not a problem.

5. In RL's view, the creation of the SC delivers benefits to the profession of psychology in terms of information exchange and in the provision of workshops and training for lecturers.

6. He would welcome more sharing of good practice across departments, but recognises this is difficult and labour-intensive given the size of the discipline, possibly something for the SC to do together with the Association of Heads of Psychology Departments (there are 87 member departments in England alone).

7. RL is aware of the NTFS but there has been no involvement of the BPS in the scheme. There have been NTFS fellows in Psychology but the BPS has not given them any publicity, though RL responds positively to the idea.

8. Overall, RL takes the view that the quality of L&T in HE over the past five years has improved in terms of both quality assured processes and enhancements in teaching within some departments. On the other hand it has deteriorated steadily in terms of the contact hours and physical resources available.

9. RL attributes the improvements to the QAA and to TQEF funding, and the deterioration to the decline in the formula-driven unit of resource at the same time as numbers have increased rapidly (enrolment has doubled in the last eight years).

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE)**

Interviewee: **Lynn Beattie, Director of Education and Professional Development**

1. Lynn Beattie (LB) is aware of the subject centre (Built Environment) but not of its amalgamation into the HE Academy.

2. The SC keeps in touch and sends information, but CIBSE's role does not lead to any significant interaction with the SC.

3. LB believes the SC is beneficial in providing a network and resources to encourage cross-disciplinary teaching, which CIBSE is keen to encourage.

4. LB is not aware of the NTFS.

5. There is a small number of HEIs teaching in this field. As an accrediting body, CIBSE has visited all of these and sees increasing innovation in teaching and in a positive attitude to the students' learning experience.

6. This is attributed to increasing contact with industry for both lecturers and students, an approach which is actively encouraged by CIBSE.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CLIP)**

Interviewee: **Michael Martin, Adviser – Qualifications and Professional Development**

1. Michael Martin (MM) is aware of the HE Academy and of the subject centre network but has had no significant interaction with any single SC, and believes the same is true of CILIP.

2. MM took the opportunity provided by the HE Academy recently to respond to a consultation document. He has also sat in on a meeting concerning professional bodies and CPD, which provided an opportunity to make contributions and to hear others' ideas on the subject.

3. MM has heard of the NTFS but again there has been no interaction with it.

4. In MM's view the quality of L&T in HE is about the same as five years ago in his profession – this view is based on accreditation which is based on outcomes and coverage. The quality of the L&T process is regarded as the province of the QAA.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD)**

Interviewee: **Judy Whittaker, Director of Membership and Education**

1. Judy Whittaker (JW) is well aware of the subject centre (Business, Management and Accountancy – BEST). She has found it to be helpful and supportive.

2. CIPD is represented on the SC Board and has contributed to SC events.

3. In addition to the information network it offers, the SC is helpful in bringing together people from universities involved in different aspects of business, management and finance, to share and generalise good practice in L&T. This is of value to students and the continuing professional development of academic staff.

4. The CIPD has its own body of knowledge and therefore is not dependent on the SC. Nevertheless the provision of means of dissemination and networking – workshops, publications and web-sites – are important and JW would urge that they be properly resourced.

5. JW is aware of the NTFS but CIPD has no involvement with the scheme.

6. As to the general quality of L&T in HE in the last five years, JW has observed the value of research informing teaching in her domain and giving it greater depth, and of innovations and the use of new technology providing a wider and more flexible range of delivery of learning. However, the differential in salary levels between HEIs and the industries from which people are recruited to teach in her area means that recruitment of quality staff continues to be problematic.

7. JW believes the QAA process has had a big impact on quality, in particular the quality processes and benchmarks adopted and adapted from industry.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA)**

Interviewee: **Eileen Cummins, CPD Manager**

1. The CIPFA has its own qualification and courses are run within its own college, by open learning only.

2. Eileen Cummins is not aware of the subject centres or the NTFS and has no interaction with HEIs on L&T.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **College of Occupational Therapists**

Interviewee: **Anne Lawson-Porter, Group Head, Education**

1. Anne Lawson-Porter (AL-P) is well aware of the relevant subject centre - Health Sciences and Practices (KCL) - and was kept well informed of the move to the HE Academy.

2. AL-P receives information from the SC and disseminates it to occupational therapy programmes. AL-P regards the impact of this activity as important but unmeasured, as she gets no feedback from programmes on this dissemination.

3. AL-P values this as a way of raising awareness of trends in professional education, especially problem-based learning and inter-professional learning.

4. There are current issues around the availability of practice placements, progression following foundation degrees and reflective learning, where the SC helps to keep people abreast and disseminates information about best practice.

5. AL-P believes there have been benefits from TQEF for L&T in occupational therapy in areas of dissemination of good practice, sharing of ideas, and the development of collaborative approaches to L&T with other stakeholders in the process, especially the NHS.

6. AL-P would encourage the SC to generate even more information on innovative L&T approaches, and with widening participation in mind, to give attention to ensuring that a wider range of learning styles and student support are catered for.

7. The College sits outside the HEIs and can only influence, rather than prescribe, approaches to L&T.

8. AL-P is broadly aware of the NTFS from her earlier work at Salford University, and that it has developed to reward a wider range of people involved in L&T. There has been no direct link with or influence on her own field of occupational therapy.

9. AL-P was aware of the TQEF initiative and considers that in her subject L&T in HE is now better than five years ago – more innovative, student-centred, and the methods prepare students better for the changing world outside.

10. AL-P ascribes these changes to political drivers in both education and health service delivery, of which HEIs have had to take notice. The TQEF requirement for HEIs to have an explicit L&T strategy has brought L&T into focus and raised its internal status and career progression in relation to research.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Chartered Society of Physiotherapists**

Interviewee: **Jenny Carey, Education Officer**

1. Jenny Carey (JC) is well aware of the subject centre (Health Sciences and Practice) and regards the relationship as quite significant and helpful for the Society.

2. The Society has been developing an accreditation scheme with a view to affiliation of appropriate members to the HE Academy and the SC has been helpful with this. JC uses the SC site for reference materials and finds the newsletter useful. Staff get involved in the various study groups and this provides good networking opportunities.

3. The benefits so far have accrued mainly to the Society and its members.

4. JC was not aware of the NTFS.

5. In JC's view, L&T in the area of physiotherapy has changed and improved enormously in the past five years, in terms of improving the student experience and range of learning styles accommodated and increasingly significant work-based learning.

6. The main factors driving these changes are widening participation and meeting the needs of the NHS.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **The Engineering Council UK**

Interviewee: **Richard Shearman, Deputy Director**

1. Richard Sherman (RS) is very well aware of the subject centres, principally the engineering centre at Loughborough, through which he is kept in touch with the Materials centre in Liverpool and the Built Environment centre in Cardiff/Salford. He chairs the steering group of the Engineering SC.

2. RS describes interaction with SCs and especially the engineering SC as 'highly significant' for the Engineering Council. For example, the SC is running a workshop on the assessment of outcomes and output standards of degree courses to meet the Council's accreditation requirements. Council staff have had regular involvement through the SCs in studies of L&T and Engineering, teaching awards, judging student awards schemes, speaking at seminars and workshops.

3. The benefits to the Council are in being kept well-informed about Engineering in HE, and having a relationship which is invaluable when framing new standards for accreditation and professional registration.

4. RS believes that the SCs and their clients benefit in turn by being kept informed of the expectations of the engineering profession.

5. Widening participation now requires courses to deal with the learning needs of a much wider entry profile than the 'classical cohort' of the past.

6. Overall the subject centres have had a considerable impact as a two-way channel of communication between HE and the engineering profession and have facilitated wider contacts between them.

7. RS has no prescriptions for the future of the SCs – he looks for organic development based on the healthy relationships and processes already in place.

8. He is broadly aware of NTFS but not of any development relevant to Engineering.

9. Overall, RS believes there is now a more visible focus on L&T in HE than five years ago and this is helpful for the engineering profession as it has coincided with a change in the attitude of the professional bodies. They used to feel the need to place emphasis on L&T processes when accrediting courses; they are now shifting to output-based accreditation, a change informed by the increasing emphasis on L&T in HE, as a consequence of which they feel less inclined to prescribe processes rather than outcomes.

10. He ascribes the positive changes to both the TQEF institutional strand and to the subject centres, the latter providing a vital subject-based focus for dialogue between the engineering profession and HE.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **General Dental Council (GDC)**

Interviewee: **Alvan Seth-Smith, Director of Education**

1. Alvan Seth-Smith (AS-S) is aware of the subject centre (Medicine/Dentistry/Veterinary) but not of the move to the HE Academy. He receives its newsletter and there is occasional significant interaction between GDC and the SC, but not a great deal.

2. For example, two years ago, there was a meeting involving all the dental schools, to do with curriculum innovations, set up by the SC. GDC was working on their curriculum guidance documentation at the time, and this was a very useful session. The event was very well organised.

3. There are only 13 dental schools in the UK, and therefore the network is small and quite efficient and it is not always easy to identify specific interventions with the SC. AS-S finds the SC does provide an insight into trends in dental education and the opportunity to see a range and variety of approaches – for example the use of video.

4. Overall contact with the SC has been limited but positive. The GDC is a regulatory body and AS-S suggests there is an opportunity for the SC to provide more contact between administrative staff and the regulatory body.

5. He also feels that Medicine (human and veterinary) at present dominates the subject centre and that dental education has a specific and different set of learning requirements which might be better catered for if there was a dental-specific SC.

6. AS-S is aware of the NTFS and there have been two fellows in the last three years in the dental education field. This is very pleasing and has been publicised in the GDC magazine.

7. The NTFS awards have in his view offered benefits to dental courses and students who follow them by enabling innovative developments in dental education, in two areas: a) training dentists in teams with dental nurses and technicians, and b) exploring radical new curriculum design.

8. From its experience as a regulatory body of inspecting all 13 dental schools in the last 18 months, AS-S reflects the GDC view that overall quality of L&T is now strong, with a high commitment to L&T. He ascribes this to several universities placing strong emphasis on teaching and thus successfully resisting the pull towards research. He quotes in particular the changes in promotion criteria to embrace teaching more strongly, and says this is particularly noticeable in Dentistry and related subjects such as dental hygiene.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **General Social Care Council (GSCC)**

Interviewee: **Steve Trevillion, Head of Social Work Education**

1. Steve Trevillion (ST) is very familiar with the subject centre (Social Policy and Social Work – SWAP) and of the transfer to the HE Academy.

2. There is significant and increasing interaction between the GSCC (the regulatory body for the social care workforce) and SWAP which is described as very helpful.

3. Interactions include a key role by SWAP in producing a guide for disabled students, part funded and edited by the GSCC. SWAP has provided advice and support to the GSCC in an important transition in the appointment of external examiners for courses and programmes approved by the GSCC, and they have collaborated on issues relating to the student experience.

4. Benefits to the GSCC include being kept in touch with the agenda for quality in HE, a channel for dissemination of information via publications and the SWAP web-site, and the specific assistance with managing the external examiner transition. More generally, the SC has added value to the social work professional domain by providing welcome opportunities for networking

5. For the future, ST sees it as important to build on the collaboration already achieved between SWAP, the GSCC and the Joint University Council Social Work Education Committee.

6. ST is familiar with the NTFS but unaware of any interaction between the scheme and the GSCC.

7. The GSCC is aware of the problems facing HE in terms of the pressure on the unit of resource. Meanwhile, in terms of the overall quality of L&T in HE, the qualification structure is undergoing change - the GSCC is looking this summer to the first graduates from the new degree in Social Work, which provides three years of professional preparation as opposed to the two years of the Diploma in Social Work, and is optimistic that this will mark a significant step forward in preparedness for practice, the main criterion by which they measure quality.

8. Such changes in the social work field are driven principally by government debates and national policy.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Hotel & Catering International Management Association (HCIMA)**

Interviewee: **Kathryn Benzine, Director of Professional Development Services**

1. Kathryn Benzine (KB) is well aware of the subject centre (Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism) and of the amalgamation into the HE Academy.

2. KB regards the relationship with the SC as very significant for HCIMA. It centres on the exchange of information, which informs the work of HCIMA and supports its professional nature. She always goes to the SC conferences and they are valuable for making contacts. The SC's liaison officer is in regular touch, which she welcomes.

3. KB is very impressed by the quality of the information provided by the SC which enables her to make sure the hospitality industry is better informed about HE activity (given a climate in the industry where there is still some scepticism about what HE has to offer) and to share good practice in hospitality education and training.

4. The main beneficiaries are therefore the students and lecturers.

5. KB sees an opportunity for more mutual dissemination and publicity by the SC and HCIMA in the future. She would welcome an index of people who are authoritative in their fields of L&T within the hospitality industry domain.

6. KB is aware in general terms of the NTFS, but without any clear knowledge. She has now checked the web-site and sees that there are as yet no fellows in the hospitality discipline.

7. KB takes the view that L&T in the relevant subjects in HE has been subject to great change in the last three years (since she came to post). The industry is re-inventing itself. Greater cross-disciplinary working, broader boundaries and wider participation have set major challenges for course planners and teachers, and she believes the tutors have been very open to these changes, with the result that L&T is improving and developing strongly. The QAA is accepted as

the key assuror of quality in the processes of delivery while content and modes of assessment have been changing significantly.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Institute of Mathematics (IoM)**

Interviewee: **Nigel Steele, Honorary Secretary responsible for Education**

1. Nigel Steele (NS) is well aware of the subject centre (Mathematics, Statistics and Operational Research) and has had minor contact with the Engineering SC. He is aware of the shift to the HE Academy, and hopes that this will not in any way constrain the excellent work of the SC to date.

2. Contact between the Institute and the SC is significant and productive. At the organisational level IoM has a seat on the SC Advisory Board and it is IoM policy to have a representative of the SC on its HE Committee. The director of the SC is a member of the Council of the IoM.

3. Operationally, they collaborate on events – the IoM provides people for SC events and involves the SC in its own HE conference. They work closely to develop a common position in response to government consultation exercises affecting HE.

4. The close relationship ensures coherence in approaches to maths education, gives the SC access to IoM members, many of whom are industrially based, and provides the latter with a window on what is happening in HE, thereby raising the profile of maths education.

5. The consequent impact of the SC in enhancing the credibility of and attention paid to the teaching of Mathematics has been significant – particularly in overcoming the scepticism said to be felt by some mathematicians towards educationalists. This has been facilitated by the director of the SC being a distinguished applied mathematician in his own right. The SC's induction day for new maths lecturers has won particular praise from participants.

6. NS is overall very positive about the work of the SC and its organisational skills and hopes it will have a role in CPD for maths teachers when it is rolled out.

7. NS is aware of the NTFS, but not of any involvement of the Society with it. In his view the fellowships have benefited primarily the fellows' home universities.

8. As to the overall quality of maths teaching in HE, teaching is certainly being taken more seriously by the research-intensive universities as a consequence of the 'carrot and stick' represented by TQEF funding and the QAA, and there is a lot of good work now being done.

9. Nevertheless, he fears that this progress is being seriously undermined by the erosion of per capita funding and the consequent reduction in contact hours, especially at a time of widening participation with a higher proportion of students who are less able to learn and need more face-to-face tuition.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Institute of Physics (IoP)**

Interviewee: **Philip Diamond, Assistant Director, HE and Science**

1. Philip Diamond (PD) is well aware of the subject centre (Physical Sciences) and the migration to the HE Academy. There is active collaboration which he regards as significant.

2. PD is on the SC steering group and the director of the SC is on the IoP's HE group committee. They meet several times a year, hold joint meetings and sponsor meetings jointly. They collaborated on an outreach guide (together with the Royal Society for Chemistry) for the HE Physical Sciences community to guide academics on what they could do on visits to schools.

3. Since both they and the SC are active bodies with strong channels to the HE science community, the first benefit of being in close touch is ensuring they are not duplicating activity. The links with IoP also gave credibility to the SC from the start. The beneficiaries of their collaboration are primarily the academic community and secondarily the students.

4. PD believes the SC has raised the importance of teaching in the community and created an information flow to support this. For the future he believes it is important that the SC is able to work closely with the new CETL at the Open University.

5. PD is aware of the NTFS but has had no specific involvement, other than to disseminate the news of the awards, give publicity to the fellows and invite them to give talks at IoP. Having visited the NTFS web-site he is not much impressed by what he found there – missing profiles of the fellows, for example.

6. Without being able to cite specific evidence, PD feels that overall the quality of L&T in HE has got better in the last five years. He ascribes this primarily to the QAA process, while acknowledging that it promotes levelling up rather than innovation and enhancement.

7. In the area of Physics, the competitive drive for students has also obliged universities to seek recognition for good teaching. He regards the pedagogy of Physics as not highly developed, and takes the view that innovation awards of £5,000 to £10,000 are unlikely to motivate physicists to apply, given the economic structure of the discipline. (He contrasts this with Chemistry where awards of this size are, he believes, more likely to motivate bids.)

8. In physics the RAE is inevitably a major driver of behaviour and pulls back on any attempts to enhance the attention paid to teaching.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Not attributed**

Interviewee: **Not attributed**

1. The interviewee (an academic officer of a learned society) is aware of the relevant subject centre (Geography, Earth and Environmental Science, [GEES]) and of the amalgamation into the HE Academy. In addition to GEES, she is aware of the activities of at least five others (Biosciences; Languages & Area Studies; Economics; Sociology, Anthropology and Politics; Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism).

2. The Society has active interaction with GEES. On the one hand this interaction is described as marginal because the subject centre tries to do a lot of activities alone, but at the same time its subject advisers work more closely with the Society than they do with the subject centre staff.

3. Independently of the GEES subject centre, the Society maintains an external examiners database, undertook the QAA benchmarking and has a very active HE research group, the Health Economics Research Group (HERG). Many of the SC's activities are linked to HERG, but it is not central SC staff who are closely involved, but their subject advisers.

4. The concept of the GEES network was formed with the help of the Society and the interviewee was elected as secretary of the GEES steering group, with a member of a speciality group of the Society taking the Chair. The Society also helps the GEES centre in working up refereed papers for the Society's journal.

5. The interviewee believes that the GEES centre has raised awareness of L&T matters in the last five years, though perhaps less so in the Society's discipline than in some others because people in the discipline were well-known as 'advanced' on L&T before the foundation of GEES. This is said to be particularly true in the newer universities.

6. The interviewee suggests the SC needs to 'spread its wings more widely'. She contrasts this with the Society, which is very closely linked to its academic community and she e-mails heads of department and research groups at least twice a week.

7. She also feels that the SC should be more prepared to acknowledge professional bodies' expertise and undertake more joint activity where the professional body takes the lead. She suggests the professional body should be allowed to share with the SCs the process of disseminating information from CETLs.

8. The interviewee is aware of NTFS and there are close professional links with all three NTFS fellows in the discipline, who have each held sessions at the Society's annual conference. One NTFS fellow is a member of the Society's Council and a director of the GEES network. The benefit of the NTFS awards lies in increasing knowledge of a particular area by allowing the fellow to buy research time. The benefit accrues primarily to the fellow.

9. Overall, the quality of L&T in HE is considered to be better than five years ago, and this is ascribed to five factors, in her words:

   - the Teaching Quality Assessment, and then the QAA subject reviews – these have been the main factor
   - the impact of FDTL projects (which took time to come through)
   - subject benchmarks and the need for the community to address this, and to have ownership of the statement
   - subject benchmarks in turn leading on to PDPs, programmes etc and these have all enhanced the quality of student learning
   - to gain help before their QAA review, people have gone to the subject centre for assistance both virtually and by visiting. When a visit is free, people are more likely to use it.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA)**

Interviewee: **Chris Ellis, Head of Validation Services and Acting Director of Education**

1. Chris Ellis (CE) is well aware of the subject centre (Built Environment) though less sure about the amalgamation with the HE Academy.

2. There is extensive interaction and collaboration with the SC, which CE describes as providing excellent support, achieving credibility from the start because of the appointments made to run it, and responding sensitively to issues in architectural education. As examples he quotes active special interest groups established and funded by the SC, covering areas such as sustainability, health and safety in architecture, quality assurance and recruitment. RIBA is actively represented in such groups and assists with resources and dissemination.

3. The particular benefits provided by this SC derive from its perspective across related disciplines in the built environment. It has stimulated cross-disciplinary activity and links between architecture and other subjects relevant to the built environment and made available funding to support the special interest groups. The ultimate beneficiaries are the students themselves.

4. The emphasis on the Built Environment has provided less support for schools of architecture that are embedded within schools of art and design. CE suggests that the SC could usefully give more attention to them in the future.

5. CE is aware of the NTFS but neither he nor RIBA has had any direct contact with it or any fellows.

6. Overall, RIBA takes the view that L&T quality has improved somewhat in the past five years, but it is concerned that staff-student interaction is diminishing as staff-student ratios change (their statistics show a change in schools of architecture from 16:1 to 20:1 in the period 1999-2004). They fear this is having an impact on the overall quality of the student experience.

7. They see the new universities as under the greatest pressure on resources and therefore staff-student ratios. The RAE pressure is also perceived as a factor causing staff to give time to research rather than contact hours. TQEF institutional funds may have had less leverage in architectural education because of extensive use of practitioners as studio teachers (often on 0.4 or 0.5 FTE teaching contracts), who are less inclined to bid for innovation funds or awards.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)**

Interviewee: **Chris Barclay, Senior Education Officer**

1. Chris Barclay (CB) is well aware of the subject centre (Centre for Education in the Built Environment [CEBE]) and also of Accelerating Change in Built Environment Education (ACBEE), a programme jointly supported by CEBE and the engineering subject centre together with the Construction Industry Board, the Construction Industry Council and the industry itself.

2. Interaction is significant and includes receiving information from CEBE and attendance at CEBE events. Some key members of RICS are academics who have strong links with CEBE.

3. The principal benefits of CEBE have been the information it sends out, keeping RICS up to date with developments in HE, dissemination of new ways of teaching, and being a valuable influence in ensuring greater coherence of approach to the discipline across departments in universities across the country, to meet the needs of the profession.

4. CB is concerned that some new universities where RICS currently accredits courses are suggesting they will not submit to RAE in 2008, which would cause RICS to de-accredit their courses, accreditation being in part dependent on RAE assessment.

5. CB is well aware of the NTFS and that there have been awards to people in the surveying field. RICS has publicised this, but has no other interaction with fellows. CB considers the NTFS has helpfully raised the profile of L&T.

6. CB finds it difficult to take an overall view on the quality of L&T in HE because the goalposts have been moving. There has been major shift in the balance of surveying courses and qualifications from undergraduate to postgraduate, and RICS has been deliberately selective in its accreditation process and de-accredited courses which did not meet its requirements for RAE or Teaching Quality Assessment benchmarks – thus the standard has risen by exclusion of underperformance. Nevertheless, he is generally positive about the introduction of new approaches to teaching and the increased use of ICT in L&T, though there is constant pressure to pack more content into the curriculum in the same time.

7. He attributes these changes in L&T to the changed requirements of RICS itself, the Teaching Quality Assessment process, and the constantly growing scope of the profession, needing to take account of an increasing range of content, such as environmental factors and geo-data systems.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)**

Interviewee: **Libby Steel, Manager Professional Education and Development**

1. Libby Steel (LS) is very well aware of the subject centre (Physical Sciences) and of the move to the HE Academy. The RSC also works from time to time with the SCs in allied areas such as Bioscience, Maths and Engineering.

2. LS sits on the Advisory Board of the SC, and describes the relationship with the SC as very active and critically important, not least because the SC has taken over some of the work previously done by the RSC, in particular the running of L&T workshops for lecturers. They have jointly put out a guide on outreach science work in secondary schools (in collaboration with the Institute of Physics), and the RSC has hosted lecture series for the SC. LS refers to 'a huge amount' of collaboration and says they are in constant touch with each other.

3. The advent of the SC has enabled the Society to reach wider audiences, to share costs and has helped to raise the profile of L&T in Chemistry, to the benefit of staff and students.

4. The RSC had hoped for a dedicated Chemistry SC, rather than a joint SC with Physics and Astronomy. There are some disadvantages for Chemistry in the current arrangement, particularly at the biological end of the discipline, and in addressing the practical aspects of the learning experience, where significant differences from Physics mean that it would be advantageous to have a closer focus on the specific needs of Chemistry students. They hope this could be taken into account in future development of the SC network.

5. LS is well aware of the NTFS and the Society has entered or supported nominations in the past. RSC supports fellows and their work through publicity and promotion. LS believes the scheme has significantly raised the profile and recognition of teaching as a valid part of an academic's profile, to the benefit of the home department and the broader Chemistry community.

6. In LS's view, L&T in the majority of HEIs has improved in the last five years, especially in introducing a more applied dimension to the work, through problem-based learning and applied research. There remain some more traditional courses, and some such diversity of content and course is important.

7. However, there is a major problem with the closure of courses and whole departments as a result of funding pressures and consequent decisions by individual HEIs. This is threatening in particular the supply of BSc graduates needed as technicians by industry or to go into teaching.

8. LS ascribes the improvements in L&T in Chemistry primarily to the TQEF initiative and the increased attention paid to L&T as a consequence of its raised profile, resulting in more consideration being given to how people learn and to developing a variety of L&T techniques to suit their learning needs and styles.

Professional Body Interview

Body: **Royal Statistical Society (RSS)**

Interviewee: **Gerald Goodall, Director of Education and Professional Affairs**

1. Gerald Goodall (GG) is well aware of the subject centre (Mathematics, Statistics and Operational Research – at Birmingham and Nottingham Trent universities) and describes the interaction as very significant. They have close links. The director of the SC is a member of the professional

affairs committee of the RSS and is director of the Centre for Statistical Education, which is funded by RSS as well as the Office for National Statistics and Nottingham Trent University.

2. The RSS is a voluntary accrediting body and is informed via its links with the SC about what is happening in HE across related subjects. Without being in a position to offer specific evidence, GG believes that the SC enhances the quality of L&T and helps in making the subject area more vibrant and dynamic, thus benefiting students and attracting more applicants to study statistics at a time of national shortage.

3. GG takes the view, based on a review last autumn, that the SC is clearly doing a good job. There is a need to engage a greater number of the more traditional universities in developing the study of statistics and the SC is aware that it could have a role in this.

4. GG is aware of NTFS but has had no direct contact. Some statisticians have received awards, he believes and that is very pleasing in that it raises the profile of the subject.

5. In terms of overall L&T quality in HE, GG says that in his view quality has been maintained over the past five years, which he attributes to the enthusiasm of staff, encouraged by the subject centre to exchange ideas and innovate, and at the highest level by the NTFS awards.

Summary of Interviews of Educational/Academic Developers

1   A sample of 20 was approached. In the event one declined and two did not respond, so structured telephone interviews were held with 17 educational/academic developers, an 85 per cent response rate. Additionally, the postholder was typically seen in an institutional visit and a small number also featured in the series of stakeholder interviews.

Success of Institutional Strategic Approach

2   Overwhelmingly respondents believe that the approach of producing an institutional L&T strategy has worked. Each cited illustrative examples, normally contextualised in the history of their strategy and the culture/way of doing things in that institution. These factors meant, in effect, that institutions started with various infrastructures, procedures, arrangements and levels of activity and investment in the quality enhancement of L&T. Moreover whilst every institution has moved its chosen agenda forward positively, there were differences at the inter-institutional level in the rate and nature of change.

Improvement in Student Learning Experience

3   Generally respondents believed that it was difficult to be precise about the extent of improvement in the learning experience of students during the lifetime of TQEF. Everyone hoped that progress had been made and quoted illustrative examples to support this. The difficult issues surround causality and dimensions such as spread, level of impact and extent of embedding.

Level and Degree of Engagement with Institutional Strategy

4   The level and degree of engagement within institutions with the L&T strategy is affected by factors such as the longevity of an institutional strategic approach to L&T and the favoured means of progressing it. Many institutions have put in place a widespread network of champions – enthusiastic individuals who play a key role in shaping and progressing the institutional strategy at various levels within the HEI.

5   Almost invariably these individuals hold designated posts or an L&T award, which legitimises the role and lubricates the resource issue. There has been a marked trend both towards strengthening central, and often distributed, support and to ensuring greater connectivity across the institution in the pursuit of the key objectives of the L&T strategy. Many institutions have used other HEFCE earmarked funds, such as human resources and the professional standards monies, to further aspects of the work of the L&T strategy.

6   Some educational/academic developers believed that institutions should already have had certain support mechanisms such as an LTU unit/centre in place as a core activity, ie not funded from TQEF monies, and that all of the resource should have been applied more directly toward enhancement of the student learning experience. The relatively recent establishment of some centres/units means that they are probably at an earlier stage of development and impact than some of their longer established and successful counterparts. Whilst effectiveness in this context is not a simple correlate of time, it can be argued that developmental work, which by its nature tends to be a complex process of interaction and engagement, does require some time to blossom and mature.

Evaluation of Impact

7   Typically institutions evaluate specific initiatives and projects, monitor annually the achievement of action plans and targets, and undertake cyclical stocktaking and updating of the overall L&T strategy. Broad independent overarching evaluations are fairly uncommon, although there are examples of institutions allocating funds for this.

8   Universally, respondents strongly supported the continuation of earmarked funding for institutional L&T strategies. Most educational/academic developers believed that activities and structures were now quite well embedded. Although some posts might be lost if the dedicated funding ceased, the common reason for strongly urging the continuation of earmarked funding was a more fundamental concern: that otherwise support for quality enhancement would henceforth become part of the internal resourcing debate and discussions. Regardless of institutional type, respondents shared a common perception that QE of L&T could lose out in such deliberations, partly due to the weight of pressure upon institutional resources and partly due to the internal balance of political power. In many institutions deans are now powerful players in the budget-setting discussions.

The HEFCE Approach

9   There was universal support for the HEFCE approach for approving and monitoring institutional L&T strategies. Respondents welcomed the degree of trust implicit in the approach and the fact that it enabled and empowered institutional setting and ownership of priorities.

Views on Institutional Strand

10   Almost without exception respondents viewed the institutional strand as the most beneficial for their institution. Most believed that it had achieved a great deal and that it had developed and matured over time. It was generally perceived as enabling, legitimising, supporting, rewarding and recognising QE in L&T.

Views on Other strands of TQEF

11   Views on the other strands of TQEF ranged more widely. In part that was due to the philosophical inclination of some respondents who, for example, would like the NTFS to recognise teams rather than, or in addition to, individuals. In larger measure it reflected experience. Even institutions with a successful record in the NTFS scheme faced the problem of handling the disappointment of unsuccessful candidates. The problems were believed to be considerably greater in institutions which failed to get NTFS fellows and/or CETLs.

12   It is too early to reach any judgements about CETLs. Those with successful bids are energised and grappling with the opportunity. Others are more sceptical of potential value for money, overall impact and, indeed, guiding philosophy.

13   The respondents who had been actively engaged in an FDTL project tended to view that strand positively. Others were more cautious or critical. Generally many FDTL projects have presented educational/academic developers with testing challenges in terms of promoting dissemination and transferability. Whilst efforts have been made by HEFCE to raise the profile and importance of these matters, it would be fair to conclude that the overall perception is that many projects leave, at best, a modest legacy.

14   Respondents seek to foster and promote contact with subject centres, and that appears to be most successful when the centre has high credibility and the engagement is reasonably broadly based both numerically and academically. Common strategies for engagement with the HE Academy and SCs included involvement in the institutional L&T conference, usage of institutional champions and the direct involvement of new staff undertaking the PG Certificate, for example, by getting participants to use or review the resources of the relevant SC. Some respondents were personally involved in HE Academy or SC projects and activities.

15   Respondents hoped that the HE Academy would be a valuable resource for the sector and their HEI, although some expressed disquiet with the slowness of progress on professional standards and the level of engagement with individual practitioners and educational developers.

Reward and Recognition

16   Almost every institution has implemented ways of encouraging innovators, often via awards or fellowships, and showcasing and reporting their work. Some HEIs also promote or in other ways give personal financial reward. Again some institutions have introduced new promoted posts, such as pro deans or faculty-based principal lecturers, or have revised the roles of existing posts to embrace key L&T QE roles. Respondents indicated that academic staff thought that little change had occurred in the established structure of merit-based promotion, although excellence in T&L is now commonly recognised as a valid criterion.

Effect on Collaboration

17   Collaboration has improved by enhanced support mechanisms, the overall thrust of the L&T strategy, the terms of awards for innovation, and networks of institutional, faculty and school L&T committees.

Drivers for Change and Enhancement

18   Here institutional type, mission and history were the paramount factors. Whilst all of the responses could be subsumed under two macro headings (institutional reputation and purposes, and responses to key external pressures), the influences varied substantially in detail and nuance. Several responses made positive reference to the role of the QAA in shaping institutional actions and influencing practice.

19   Generally it was argued that institutions sought to establish their own priorities, aligned to their culture and identity, albeit within the parameters of a range of external influences, drivers and agendas, such as widening participation, student retention and progression, the RAE, and league tables. All of these items impinge upon institutions but with varying strength depending upon institutional performance and strategic orientation.

Staffing Factors

20   The universal replies were pressures on time and increases in the workloads of academic staff. So far as rewards and encouragement were concerned, prominent amongst these were recognition and support. References were also made to specific initiatives such as award schemes for innovators, encouragement to disseminate findings through conferences and publications and the perceived benefits, for participants and managers, of coherent developmental programmes such as the PG Certificates in Academic Practice or Learning and Teaching.

Appendix D:

Summary of Survey Responses From FDTL 3 and 4 Project Directors, and Directors of Relevant Subject Centres

Summary of Survey Responses From FDTL 3 and 4 Project Directors

Percentage of respondents: 35.3 per cent (24/68)

Links With The Relevant LTSN subject centre

1. How closely do the following statements fit what happened in your relationship with the relevant subject centre?

	Disagree strongly	Disagree	Agree	Agree strongly
The subject centre worked very closely with the project throughout	1	10	10	4
They helped me greatly in the early stages of designing the project (FDTL 4 only)	1	6	8	3
They have publicised the project on their web-site and Newsletters	1	1	8	14
They helped to disseminate it to all relevant departments	1	3	15	5
They have taken over the outputs of the project and they are being sustained by them	9	8	2	1

2. Please describe any ways in which the subject centre was particularly helpful to you and the project?	This question was answered in some depth by each institution, but basically the ways in which the subject centres were most helpful are:- - publicising and putting people in contact with those who had similar interests or who would benefit from the project - opportunities for presentations - disseminating information via newsletters - represented on steering committee; detailed advice on dissemination, e.g. organisation of meetings; provision of dissemination opportunities - holding FTDL 4 project staff meetings - initial risk analysis and project planning - face-to-face advice - useful dialogue and support prior to the bid being submitted.

3. If there were any problems in the relationship with the subject centre, please describe them, and the action that was taken. *(Please ring us at 01256 702826 if you would prefer to talk about this)*	The general opinion was there were no real problems or major issues. Negative points included:- • not enough notice was given of meetings, although this has now been communicated to the SC • the SC was not always able to deliver promises, mainly because of resource issues • there was a falling off of activity and support during years two and three. There was no communication due largely to staff changes in the SC. This situation was never resolved.

	Almost all	A lot	Some	None at all
4. Please indicate to what extent the take-up of outputs of your project in other HEIs is due to the help of the subject centre?	0	2	14	6

Relationships With The Institutional Strand

5. Please tell us about the impact of the project on relevant academic departments:

(a) How did academic departments get to know about your project?	The main methods listed are:- • material put out by the SC • articles written in L&T journals • specialist subject 'toolkits' and learning packs • presentation of papers at international conferences, seminars and workshops • web-sites, mailing lists, newsletters and magazines • internal publicity • steering groups • project team dissemination • formal launch of the project • project fliers.
(b) How would you describe the extent of embedding and use of the project by the relevant departments?	Positive feedback with comments such as: • excellent • enthusiastic • highly variable • over 70 per cent of relevant departments reported that their practice had changed significantly as a result of being involved in the project. However, a lot of the projects are not yet completed and therefore are still in the evaluating stages.
(c) If departments looked at your project and decided not to use its outputs, what were the	The main reasons given were: • NIHS or 'not invented here syndrome'

reasons?	- time pressures on lecturers - own in-house materials available - not interested in Learning and Teaching - lack of institutional back-up - resistance to change - no technical capacity - changes in the job/role of the individual who expressed an interest in the project - expense/effort in implementing computer-assisted assessment (CAA)
(d) Have any educational developers in institutions helped you to disseminate and embed the project? If your answer is yes, please give us an example	Around 70 per cent answered positively to this question and mentioned that they have had help in disseminating the results of their projects through educational developers.
(e) What evidence is there that teaching staff in *other disciplines than yours* have adopted (or adapted) outcomes from your project?	Some positive evidence:- - some institutions are being asked to give presentations - direct uptake of the project tools (formative assessment in science teaching, FAST) by other departments - enquiries from other departments - active involvement in dissemination workshops - enthusiastic feedback from users - A number of HEIs not involved with the project have taken out licences to use Recording Academic, Professional and Individual Development (RAPID) - ePortfolio system adapted for Dentistry in a national project involving undergraduates and vocational trainees - outcomes have been used by many other disciplines within the university, particularly in respect of one output, namely the student personal development planning tool. A negative comment was received in that the time limited funding of the project (three years) was the main inhibiting factor, and key staff moved onto other roles. Again, some institutions are awaiting evaluations.
(f) If your project relates to institutional L&T strategies (across the board), what success have you had in disseminating it at an institutional level?	Some of the successes in disseminating at an institutional level include:- - learning and teaching conference at which a presentation of the project results were made - presentation to the national conference of the Association of Civil Engineering Heads which was chaired by the university's deputy vice-chancellor - project team took a leading role within the faculty in helping to prepare the successful CETL bid for Employability and the Humanities - Objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) now being used in all three veterinary departments at the Royal Veterinary College - RAPID is specifically identified as an available tool in the university strategy statement for PDP and is likely to

	• receive central support
	• project team members have been invited on to committees
	• high success in influencing at levels of PVCs, deans, university L&T committees and academic development units
	• embedded into institutional human resources strategy.

Relationships With The Individual Strand

6. Have there been any significant interactions between your project and any of the National Teaching Fellows? If there have, please describe them briefly.	A poor response in that very few interactions have been made between the project and any National Teaching Fellows. However, several of the project directors are themselves National Teaching Fellows and are actively working closely with others in joint activities and publicising to other fellows.

General

7. From your perspective, do you think that the TQEF overall (see note at the start of this questionnaire) has been effective in enhancing learning and teaching? Please give brief reasons for your answer.	The response to this question was very positive - almost all felt that it had been instrumental in 'raising the profile of teaching and learning'. One negative note was that it has been a little hit and miss in that the three strands sometimes seem disparate – maybe more linkages between them could be engineered.

8. Please comment on the effectiveness of the support the project received (or receives) from the national co-ordination team/HE Academy senior advisers and other relevant sources.	Again the response to this question was mostly positive, with the main comments listed as:- • all the co-ordinators have been brilliant and very useful • excellent support throughout the main project • helpful specific advice and encouragement • excellent; fully supportive • useful advice received on structuring and progress of project • good – guidance • the contribution of the national co-ordination team was very effective and significant. On the negative side: • support has varied and we are on to our fourth co-ordinator. One co-ordinator tried to steer us in a direction we did not want to go. Our current relationship is satisfactory • the recent conference (February 2005) was helpful but was announced very late - makes the set-up look quite disorganised

	• we have treated the general lack of input from the national co-ordination team to our project as a vote of confidence – but it is not what we anticipated • we have not been visited by any of the co-ordination team since the very beginning of the project – to date we have not received any feedback on the annual reports that have been submitted – therefore I have to say that the support has been very poor

9. If your project was a generic one, to what extent was support provided (by national co-ordination team, the generic centre or others) to help your project to link to the other (institutional and individual) strands of the TQEF?	This question was not applicable to a lot of the project directors. The majority of the responses received mentioned that support from the generic centre, etc was in fact minimal. Responses included:- • the generic centre has been very useful and we will use it more when we enter the transferability phase • the project has strong generic elements. I feel more could have been done to foster linkage and interest groups in assessment. We have in effect created our own network • we had planned closer contact with the generic centre but reorganisation of the HE Academy put this on the back burner • minimal; we provided a case study for the generic centre following a very confusing pro forma with problems in support for that; this took significant effort at the time and became an unfortunate experience as the presumed publication did not materialise and we were informed that it had been put on the web-site – but have not been able to trace it. Exasperating • the project itself was not 'generic' though with the advent of the national initiative for PDP, RAPID had a more generic focus than was first anticipated. The project had some support from those at the generic centre involved in this initiative, though we tended to work more closely with the Centre for Recording Achievement. • subject specific collaborative project but with implications for generic issues – member of LTSN generic centre (now with the HE Academy) highly involved with the project advisory group. The national co-ordination team adviser provided referrals and contacts. On a more positive note: • in discussions with NCT members we were directed to other projects impinging on our area and provided with contact names of those who might help us and/or share in what we were doing.

10. Other. Please make any other comments that you wish on the effectiveness of the TQEF initiative	The comments of all the institutions that answered this question are captured here. **Positive Comments:**

| | 'Having received this funding has not only allowed me and my team to realise our project but has allowed us to meet and network with numerous people throughout the sector which has very much enriched us.'

'The TQEF initiative allowed projects on an astonishingly large range of topics and helped to foreground teaching to a degree which was very welcome.'

'I hope I am right in believing that we have been trusted to get on with trying to make a difference without too much focus on specific immediate outputs. In the long run this will have more impact than a more narrow focus.'

'A good idea that probably needed more resources to allow more individual support.'

'It is too early to measure the long-term impact of the project but it has given valuable time to bring together a number of professionals to look at inter-professional learning (IPL). It has also brought together five HEIs who would normally be in competition, to communicate and work together. This on its own must be a very positive outcome!'

'We applaud the principle behind the initiative for the raising standards and awareness of teaching and learning.
We also found the funding a major asset in being able to disseminate to the professional training community (no external help for this part).'

'The TQEF initiative has had a positive impact primarily by providing funding for L&T projects and initiatives it has raised the profile of teaching across the university. External funding is traditionally recognised as one of the indicators of successful activity in research and the availability of funding for L&T projects has gone someway towards giving a similar opportunity to academics who have been more teaching focused.'

'From our perspective, having a direct link to the Academy via a senior adviser has helped to embed educational development as a creditable activity (i.e. it enhances career development).'

'TQEF has been effective but I am not competent to comment on cost effectiveness. For project programmes such as FDTL it is important to support existing successful teams as well as bring in new talent.'

'The approach being discussed in this questionnaire is interesting as it has very recently influenced the approach to TQEF initiatives at Sheffield Hallam University. As the university is now (and previously has been) involved in a number of FDTL projects, has two teaching fellows and three CETLs, in addition to a range of |
|---|---|

TQEF funded learning and teaching initiatives, we have taken a new step in setting up a TQE Programme Management Board. This Board, chaired by the PVC for academic development, and including the head of our learning and teaching institute, has a remit to oversee and manage all the above initiatives primarily with a view to achieving a multiplier effect. We also foresee other benefits such as much higher levels of co-ordination, more effective dissemination (internal and external) and more effective overall management. This approach will also ensure fit with institutional strategies.'

'A highly valuable activity. It provides some counterweight to the all pervasive RAE in influencing activities of academic staff.'

'I believe it provided an excellent opportunity for very practical research to be conducted to produce outputs that were of immediate and effective value to institutions. The opportunity for collaboration with other institutions was also an excellent feature of TQEF.'

Negative Comments:

'In my view the methodological workshops run by the FDTL in the course of the programme, though well intentioned, were largely a waste of time and taxpayers' money. We were quite able to plan and run our project without them, and a few telephone calls could have dealt with the matters we needed help with.'

'There are insufficient opportunities to apply for continuation funding of successful projects.'

'We do have some deep concerns about the amounts of public money used to support developments whose impact remains unclear despite substantial interest and effort by individuals; the aims do not fit within the wider critical concerns eg there being no wider enhancing relationships with other HEIs or other external organisations. At times it has appeared to have a rather narrow and self-perpetuating interest in the way things were done.'

'However good a project and its outcomes, getting others (outside of the partner institutions) to embed will remain a key issue which necessitates large resources in terms of face-to-face meetings and funds to overcome existing institutional boundaries.'

Summary of Survey Responses: Subject Centre Directors or Managers

Percentage of respondents 66 per cent (8/12 relevant SCs)

Links With FDTL Project Directors

1. For each FDTL project in your subject area, please tick which box most accurately describes your centre's working relationship with the project director?

FDTL project name *(please list)*	Remote	Occasional contact	Regular work together	Very close working
The titles of these projects are detailed separately on each of the attached surveys. The majority of the responses show that each centre regularly works together with the project directors.	5	13	27	13

	Not at all	A little	Consider-ably	Extensively
2. In general, to what extent was your centre involved in the initial design and development of FDTL projects in your area? *(tick one box)*	*2*		4	1

3. Please describe how your centre has - in general - helped with the dissemination of FDTL project outcomes? What have been the main issues arising?	Below is a summary of ways in which each centre helped to disseminate FDTL project results • workshops, seminars and conferences • development meetings • dissemination via the web-site • newsletters and posters • facilitating network groups. The main issues arising were: • resources - who pays? • agreeing expectations • dissemination had started too late to elicit community interest and participation.
4. Overall, could the support your centre gave to FDTL projects have been improved? What would have been required for this to have taken place, and what barriers - if any - made this difficult?	On the whole it was felt that a good level of support was given in the form of regular communication and arrangement of meetings and also in one instance due to a successful bid for funding. Some of the main barriers included:

	• the limitation of staff time and resources • more effective support could have been given at the bidding stage if there had been a bit more time between stages 1 and 2 (and if this had not clashed with the CETL bidding period) • ensuring that projects understand the benefits they can get from working with/through the subject network can be a barrier with people who have not previously been very engaged with our work.

5. What is your view on the mandatory requirement for FDTL 4 and 5 projects to involve subject centres? Has it worked in the case of your centre?	All who answered this question were 100 per cent in agreement that it should be a mandatory requirement for FDTL 4 and 5 projects to involve SCs. The main reason being that it would be a considerable waste of resource not to include SCs, which have built expertise and networks of practitioners.

6. How would you assess the impact in your subject communities of the FDTL projects in terms of their enhancement of learning and teaching? If it was not as good as you would have hoped, what could have been done to improve things?	There was a fairly positive response to this question, with the majority feeling that their projects had been successful. (See detailed comments on individual questionnaires.)

Links With National Teaching Fellows

7 Please answer the following questions about the links between your centre and relevant National Teaching Fellows *(tick one box in each case)*	Not at all	A little	Consider-ably	Extensively
- Overall, the fellows in our subject area been actively involved in the work of our centre		2	2	1
- National Teaching Fellows are all celebrated on our web-site and in our newsletters	2	1	1	1
- We actively disseminate the work that they do		1	3	1
- The subject community is actively interested in the work of the fellows that we disseminate		3	1	1
- We actively build other projects on the work of the fellows for the benefit of our subject community	1	2	1	1

8. In what ways - if any - could the working relationship between the subject centre and relevant fellows be improved?	It was felt that the ways in which the relationship between the SC and relevant fellows could be improved were:- • it would be helpful if someone informed SCs of the subject backgrounds/specialisms of the winners at an early stage • more emphasis in the terms of the award on sharing and disseminating their work • A crucial word here is 'relevant'. I have found the publicity accorded to the fellows to be pitiful • greater interaction which required recognition of a need on both sides • more time to talk to each other • perhaps formalise links slightly more and improve dissemination of individual fellow's work to community.

9. In your view has the work of fellows in your area been of any benefit to the subject community outside their own institution? If not, why not?	Those to which this question applied agreed that the work of the fellows did benefit the subject community outside their own institution.

Links With The Institutional Strand And General

10. Overall, have educational developers in institutions been helpful in disseminating your work to their communities? If not, why not?	The general opinion is that the education developers (EDs) are not seen as particularly significant in disseminating any project information. Although the EDs have been helpful, it is felt that they will not necessarily take it upon themselves to disseminate the work of the subject centre without some impetus. A rather negative response – (see detailed comments on individual questionnaires).

11. From your perspective, do you think that the TQEF overall (see note at the start of this questionnaire) has been effective in enhancing learning and teaching? Please give brief reasons for your answer.	The response to this question is very positive, with comments such as:- • 'I think the TQEF has been effective in raising awareness of the importance of learning and teaching at various 'levels'.' • 'I think that the TQEF has been effective in enhancing learning and teaching, particularly through strand 2.' • 'Anything which allows time, resource and a

	focus on learning and teaching brings some benefit. Support to L&T enthusiasts encourages their learning and leads to enhancement.'
	• 'Its mere existence raises the profile of Learning and Teaching.'
	• 'Yes. TQEF has had direct impact on day-to-day teaching & learning activities in institutions.'
	• 'It has contributed. Bridgeheads have been established, some in rather unlikely places. A lot remains to be done.'
	• 'The networking alone has meant that many changes have taken place that would not otherwise have occurred, had people not got together.'
	• 'The institutional strand has probably been most effective in raising institutional attention to T&L.'

12. Other. Please make any other comments that you wish on the effectiveness of the TQEF initiatives as a whole.	The comments of each of the institutions that answered this question are captured here.
	'There are many positive things to say about the TQEF, but it would, I feel, be naïve to exaggerate its impact upon the goals and cultures of most universities. Nor will CETLs make much difference either, though, of course, they will help to create learning communities that are focused on the enhancement of teaching and learning. Please note I'm writing only as director of History in the subject centre for History, Classics and Archaeology. The views of Classics and Archaeology, not least with respect to their relationship with FDTL, may be quite different.'
	'I've tried to offer more general reflections in answers to earlier questions. I suppose that I would add that there is an ominous gap between the scale of the money associated with winning an NTFS award and the scale of the grants which we as an SC can award as development grants, for 'mini-projects', etc.'
	'Co-ordination sometimes seems less than systematic. On the whole, there is some really interesting work being done – need to ensure that, at the end of funding, outcomes are not lost so close links with the Academy's subject network need to be maintained/resourced.'

Appendix E: Comparative International Developments

1.1   At the request of HEFCE this paper summarises recent international developments to
       enhance teaching and learning that are relevant to the work of TQEF. It is based on a similar
       paper written by the Higher Education Consultancy Group for the Australian Department of
       Education Skills and Training (DEST) in 2003. It is not intended as a comprehensive and in-
       depth review, but rather provides an overview of a more limited range of developments.

1.2   Two main areas of activity are included: first, those major funds or schemes in other countries
       designed to stimulate innovation and the dissemination of good practice in teaching and
       learning in higher education (those most relevant to the TQEF are Australia, Sweden, the US,
       and Hong Kong); and second, the establishment of national centres to support learning and
       teaching. The analysis is mainly drawn from a literature search, web-based information, and -
       in the case of Australia - the personal experience and work of the author of this review.

2   The Unites States

2.1   The pattern of federal support for initiatives in learning and teaching in the US has stayed
       much the same in the last few years although the details of some specific funding activities
       have changed. In general, federal provision is characterised by funding from three strands:
       first, the FIPSE grants operated by the US Department of Education[3]; second, by voluntary
       members organisations that provide services - for example, the American Association of
       Higher Education (AAHE)[4] and EDUCAUSE[5]; and third, funding from charitable trusts of
       which the most active in higher education is the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of
       Teaching. In addition, there are multiple state initiatives that are beyond the scope of this
       paper.

2.2   The structure of higher education in the US means that there have been no national
       governmental attempts to create national centres such as TQEF or the HE Academy in the
       England.

FIPSE

2.3   As early as the 1970s the US Education Department was looking for ways to boost teaching
       and learning, and arising from the Newman Report of 1972, the Fund for the Improvement of
       Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) was set up in 1973 by the Department of Education with a
       mission to 'improve the quality and accessibility of post-secondary education'. Its main activity
       is the Comprehensive Program, an annual competition for grants to support 'innovative
       educational improvement projects that respond to problems of national significance' in higher
       education.

---

[3] See www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/fipse/index.html

[4] See www.aahperd.org/aahe/ However it is understood that the AAHE has very recently major financial and operational
problems and the future of the association is in doubt.

[5] See www.educause.edu

2.4   The guidelines for 2004 project proposals emphasise the importance of encouraging projects that support learning, and include in that definition faculty development and teaching.   The importance of innovation, collaborative proposals, and effective dissemination and evaluation in submissions is stressed. Funds may be granted for projects lasting up to three years, and between 50 and 55 grants were made in 2004. There is no maximum amount of funding that can be requested, although in 2003 the average was $448,000 for three years. Eligibility for FIPSE grants extends to a wide range of non-profit providers of educational services, including public and private universities, community organisations, trade and technical schools, state and local government agencies, and student groups.

2.5   An interesting aspect of FIPSE funding that matches developments in other countries is the increasing emphasis on 'active' dissemination. In 1998 a new competition was launched, entitled 'Disseminating Proven Reforms', arising from the recognition that 'even the most successful models of innovative programs need a receptive environment if they are to spread to other institutions'[6]. This scheme offers funding to directors of innovative post-secondary education programs which have already become fully embedded within the founding institution, to act as mentors to 'institutions committed to adapting their models'. Awards are made to the mentor institution which is then responsible for co-ordinating grant activity and distributing funds to its partners.

2.6   Two specific operational points concerning the Comprehensive Program are worth noting in relation to the Institute. First, as well as encouraging internal project evaluation, FIPSE has its own evaluation specialist who runs sessions for project directors at their annual meeting. Applicants for the dissemination programme grants are required to provide previous evaluation data that describes as precisely as possible how much the project has improved student learning and achievement. Second, sustainability and the continuation of projects after funding ceases is an important issue for FIPSE.

2.7   In addition, FIPSE runs several international programs which promote institutional co-operation, and student mobility: the USA-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program; the European Union Cooperation Program; and the North American Mobility Program.

Member Organisations

2.8   There are a large number of member organisations in higher education supported by institutional subscriptions which have grown up in the absence of federal systems for institutional co-ordination. So far as learning and teaching is concerned, the most relevant of these has been the American Association for Higher Education, although as noted in the footnote on the first page the future of the AAHE is now in doubt as it has run into operational and financial problems and this may mean that some of the activities noted below may either cease or be looking for a new host. Since 1990, the AAHE has run a teaching initiative program which has aimed to help institutions to 'establish a culture that values and pursues

---

[6] *Innovation and Impact, The Comprehensive Program, FIPSE, US Department of Education, at*
http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/fipse/index.html

effective teaching and learning'[7]. The actual activities undertaken have changed over time, and running the Campus Program of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning has been the main element of the AHHE teaching initiative (see below).

2.9   The AAHE teaching initiative was evaluated in 1997 and concluded that the scheme had been more successful in improving the level of teaching effectiveness than in fostering a culture of teaching and learning among faculty. This confirmed the need for such initiatives to address practice at a strategic level as well as in the classroom, and since that time the AAHE has run another important programme: its annual summer academy. This is a week long team-based and project-centred event which focuses on developing undergraduate change initiatives. Teams consider different components of change each day, and a range of workshop and mentoring activities take place. Other AAHE activities of relevance have included: running the AAHE WebCenter which is designed as a forum for sharing practice in innovation in learning and teaching; and holding other workshops and conferences.

2.10   Numerous other member organisations exist but are either more modest in scale or are not directly relevant to the Institute. These include the Professional and Organisational Development Network in Higher Education (POD)[8], and EDUCAUSE[9] which has an extensive list of institutional members (more than 1,900) and provides services to support the application of information technology to all aspects of higher education, including learning and teaching.

Charitable Trusts

2.11   By far the most important trust in this area is the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). This consists of three activities:

- The Campus Program (up to now run by AAHE) which is now in its fifth year and involves approximately 200 campuses which have made a commitment to support learning and teaching. For 2003 onwards the main thrust of this activity will be to support campus program clusters, a range of topic based special interest groups facilitated by experts in the areas concerned.

- The Carnegie Scholars Program, whose purpose is to create a community of scholars who will advance the profession of teaching and deepen student learning. The program is not an award for teaching excellence nor a teaching improvement activity, rather scholars are expected to disseminate examples of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Scholars are appointed for a one-year term and participate in two two-week residences in consecutive summers and spend shorter periods together during the academic year.

---

[7] See www.aahperd.org/aahe/

[8] See www.podnetwork.org

[9] See www.educause.edu

- The Scholarly and Professional Societies Program which works in two main ways: by fostering co-operation and networking opportunities between professional groups to support learning and teaching; and by running an invitational small grants scheme.

2.12   The other main trust that has been active in the past was the Pew Charitable Trusts[10] but its priorities now appear to be realigning to concentrate on early education. Since 1995, the trust had been supporting the annual Pew Leadership Award Program for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education, which sought to reward institutions that had 'broken out of the box of familiar structures and processes'.   However, this has now been discontinued. The principal remaining activity is reported to be funding some services provided by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education[11], and in particular a bi-annual report card scheme that provides public information on the effectiveness of universities in the US against a small number of criteria, one of which includes student learning.

3   Australia

3.1   Australian higher education has always been active in supporting enhancement activities in learning and teaching, and most universities have had teaching and learning support units (or equivalent) in place for many years. Indeed, Australian practice has long influenced UK activity.

3.2   The federal government has funded a number of activities to encourage the enhancement of teaching, of which two are particularly relevant to TQEF. Both have been managed within the Department of Education Skills and Training (DEST) under the auspices of the Australian University Teaching Committee (AUTC). First, the Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD) programme ran in the mid- to-late 1990s, funded a large number of small projects, and was similar in concept to the HEFCE FDTL programme. Indeed the evaluation of CUTSD (also carried out by the Higher Education Consultancy Group) found very similar issues arising to FDTL: particularly major issues concerning embedding, dissemination, and the need for enhanced central co-ordination.

3.3   One early feature of the CUTSD was the establishment of five national subject centres who were charged with encouraging dissemination of the outputs of the CUTSD programme. This initiative was taken several years before the LTSN was set up in England. However, the subject centres were generally not successfully and suffered from a number of operational problems including a specification for relying almost exclusively electronic dissemination, thus providing little opportunity for networking and information sharing between academics in the same disciplines.

3.4   More recently, and very mindful of the English approach to enhancement, the AUTC and DEST have decided to establish an equivalent to the HE Academy: the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching (see www.autc.gov.au). At A$22 million pa (approx £10 million sterling) funding is much more modest than in the UK, although the Australian higher

---

[10] See www.pewtrusts.com

[11] See www.highereducation.org

education system is, of course, much smaller.   The Institute faces very similar challenges to the HE Academy, and close collaboration is likely.

4   Sweden

4.1   Other than the UK, Sweden has been the most active European country in enhancing teaching through funding central initiatives, with a programme lasting for the whole of the past decade. Established in 1990, the Council for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education promoted efforts to develop the quality and renewal of teaching. Its name was changed in 1999 to the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education[12], and its mission now incorporates postgraduate education.

4.2   In fulfilling this role the Council undertakes the following main activities: supports pedagogical development at universities and colleges; distributes a grants programme for academics; initiates working groups for temporary support to particular areas of higher education; and disseminates information about research and the development of higher education. Previous activities have included disciplinary reviews of good practice in teaching; supporting a national centre for the development of case studies to be used in teaching; supporting the integration of environmental studies in higher education; supporting curriculum and pedagogic changes in engineering and natural science programmes to encourage more female students; supporting the use of IT in the training of academic staff; and financing a teacher exchange programme. The range of programmes is impressive and is set in the context of a high level of collaboration between universities and government, characteristic of Sweden's general approach to public sector management. Such a context is very different from the more market-orientated approach of the US and the more managed environment of the UK.

4.3   Of particular relevance to the Institute is the grants scheme for individual academics, which is competitive and designed to provide encouragement for staff to undertake innovations in teaching, and which has a strong element of student participation in projects. The grants scheme supports staff for between one and three years by paying for a proportion of their time to be spent on project work.

4.4   Summary evaluations of the work of the Council are now available in English[13], and suggest that the issues facing the grants programme are similar to those noted in the evaluation of FDTL, for example: encouraging applications from a wide range of staff; projects taking longer to complete than predicted; and the size of grants being perceived by some grant holders as too small for the work involved. In particular, whilst the Council undertakes a mid-term visit to all projects and has started to arrange half-day conferences on grant outcomes, dissemination and cross institutional adoption of outcomes remains relatively weak.

4.5   It is understood that neither Sweden - nor any other European country - has moved towards a national institute or academy model: in the case of Sweden almost certainly because it is not

---

[12] *See www.hgur.se/index_eng.htm*

[13] *See www.hgur.se/activities/index_english.htm*

perceived to be necessary due to the close collaboration between institutions and government in a small university system.

4.6   Elsewhere in Europe there is a growth of interest in learning and teaching, although practical measures to support innovation are only just starting. For example, Germany is currently reforming its higher education system to encourage greater competition, diversity, and international competitiveness. This is being done by deregulation and the creation of performance incentives. For five years from 2000 the federal government and the state länder have made available a total of DM120 million for a special funding programme to improve the quality of teaching[14].

5   Hong Kong

5.1   For some years the Universities Grants Commission (UGC) of Hong Kong has run a Teaching Development Grants programme. It was launched in 1994-05, and has been continued ever since. Originally described as a performance-based funding model by the UGC, it represented one stage of a three-step programme to assure both quality and value for money in higher education. The other two components were a research assessment exercise (also launched in 1994) and a Teaching and Learning Quality Process Review (TLQPR) which ran from September 1995 to April 1997[15]. The Teaching Development Grants scheme is now separate from the performance based funding model.

5.2   In total, HK$150 million was allotted to the Teaching Development Grant programme (up to 1998). In each of the first two years, HK$50 million was divided among the seven institutions based on student numbers in each: that is, funding was not granted on a competitive basis or to reward established excellence. Within defined limits, institutions could use the money as they chose, and projects could be of two-to-three years' duration, with an obligation to report annually to the UGC. Funds could be allocated for a wide variety of uses: purchase and development of special (not basic) equipment (including multimedia); projects to identify and help poor teaching performance; the training of postgraduates as teaching assistants; publication of 'uncommercial' teaching materials for small numbers of students; attendance at teaching development seminars; the support of experimental approaches to new teaching methods; and study groups for teachers. In the event, some institutions invested their funding in multimedia facilities or in setting up educational development units; others used the grant to boost internal teaching and learning projects. The project as a whole was overseen by a sub-group appointed by the UGC. In the second year, another HK$50 million was distributed to institutions on a pro rata basis.

5.3   After 1997-98 the UGC methodology has moved closer to that used by HEFCE in that grants were made on the basis of competitive bids from institutions, and collaborative projects were encouraged, with one university acting as a lead institution. Sample project titles included: www tools for instructors; the evaluation of the part-time student experience; the consortium

---

[14] *See www.bmbf.de/en/2513.html*

[15] *See www.ugc.edu.hk*

for the promotion of teaching skills and technology: and further action on teaching development.

5.4   However, an extension of the teaching development grants has been announced for the period 2005-08, and allocation of funding is now formulaic with HK$100 million being allocated over the period to eight HEIs. The formula involves an equal amount equivalent to 30 per cent of annual funding to go to all HEIs irrespective of size, and the balance to be distributed on the basis of student numbers.

Appendix G: Spreadsheet Summary of a Review of Learning and Teaching Strategies

Case study institutions	Am't 2005-6	L&T Strategy / Target Impact Areas 2005-6	Strategic Features: Subj-based approach?	Strategic Features: Synergy Inst/Subj/Indiv	Other features: Stud Learning Exp	Other features: Sustainability	Monitoring Statement: HEA's view of Progress and changes in L&T Strategy	Reporting Burden	--- 5 Aims of TQEF --- Enc & Reward	Coord & Collab	Dissem & Embed	Res & Innov	Capac for Change	Widening Participation
	Medium	T&L Enhancement Unit (£50k); PDP for students (35k); Teaching Development Fund (sabbaticals)	Themes for Teaching Dev't Fund identified by Departments	No evidence	e-PDP for students	? Teaching Dev't Fund (others OK)	2003-4 progress "satisfactory" "Met virtually all targets". Two new targets introduced in 2004-5 plan.	No evidence	Sabbaticals. Funding for ILT accreditiation in early years		T&L Enhancement Unit	Sabbaticals (Innovation is criterion)		Minor mention in L&T Strategy. No TQEF funding applied to this
	Large	Learning Dev't Unit projects to support flexible learning esp thru ICT (£193k); Dev't of e-PDP; iVLE;	No	No evidence	Use of ICT to support flexible learning, assessment etc; e-PDP; iVLE	Heavy investment in ICT has strong revenue expenditure implications	2003-4: Progress "good". Targets have varied somewhat, but are "in line with the original strategy", "not in terms of exact projects, but in terms of the ethos of a project" Progress good in most of the targets, but no cause for concern. 2004-5 targets fit broadly with 2002 strategy.	No evidence	Funding for ILT accreditation in early years		Evaluate and disseminate good practice from LDU projects		ICT developments	Important theme in L&T Strategy. TQEF funding not used
	Small	(L&T Fellows (£63k); L&T Innovation awards;	No	Inst-Indiv: L&T Fellows	Not directly addressed	Can awards and fellowships be sustained without TQEF funding?	2003-4 progress "satisfactory" Has "delivered well" against targets and made good progress. Some evidence of reviewing activities in 2004-5 plans and of embedding existing work.		Fellowships and awards			L&T Innovations awards		Brief mention of WP strategy in L&T Strategy - no TQEF funds used
	Medium	ICT to increase flexibility of Learning opps: VLE development (£50k); HE Academy; Enhance employability; Learning skills;	No	"Links with Subject centres and LTSN will be enhanced"	Increase flexibility of Lng Opps; create VLE across all schools; work on employability and Learning Skills	No major threats. £100k p.a. on L&T Development Initiatives is internally funded.	2003-4: progress "satisfactory". "Most" targets met. University suggesting remedies where needed. No major concerns. 2004-5 plans reflect 2002 strategy plus some additional targets.			Unifying existing VLEs		LTDI awards (internally funded)		L&T Strategy "is informed by" W/P Strategy.
	Medium	Teaching Fellowships (£40k); Research Fellow on R-led L&T (£35k); Review of Assessment (£20k); Learning Support for Students (£15k)	No	Inst-Indiv: Teaching Fellows	Learning support for students (1 PT post only)	Fellowships without TQEF funding	2003-4 progress "satisfactory" - met all broad targets with minor and reasonable shifts. 2004-5 plans build on and enhance success to date.		Teaching Fellowships		Fellowship project outputs available on intranet	Fellowships designed to support Innovation	Review of assessment	A feature of L&T strategy. Funds used to support E-Opps monitoring and awareness training on student diversity for staff 2002-5
	Large	Skills Centre: Student and Staff skills development (£171k); ICT/e-learning strategy & enhance VLE (£146k); Student Feedback project (£48k); Dissemination (£16k)	2 new Learning Technologists to work with course teams		High: Student skills development; e-learning and VLE; student feedback project	ICT investments are long term commitments	2003-4 progess "satisfactory". 2004-5 plans consistent with original strategy.			Unified VLE development			ICT Developments	Minor reference in L&T Strategy. No TQEF funds used.
	Medium	Targeted help for acad staff in developing materials and on-line resources (£148k); Computer assisted assessment and VLE development (£28k)	Yes - faculties and departments enabled to have own LTA strategies and are targetted for support	Yes Institutional-Subject, help for acad staff implemented through disciplines/subjects	PDP work in 2002-5. Planned shift now to more on-line learning, use of VLE, computer aided assessment	Strategy has evolved through departments as systems (e.g. VLE) and training have been established. Assumes continued funding for support staff posts	2003-4: Progress "satisfactory" - two targets updated for valid reasons. 2004-5 plans "Acceptable".				Support staff work directly with departments and academic staff		ICT Developments	WP acknowledged as important. Implemented through WP Strategy. No TQEF Funds used.
	Large	Learning and Teaching Unit (£267k); L&T Fellows (£65k)	Need for links between L&T Unit and faculty networks is acknowledged	Inst-Indiv: L&T Fellows	Not specifically addressed	L&T Unit depends on £260k p.a. of TQEF funding. (However University funding of overall L&T Strategy is £1.14m)	2003-4 "satisfactory" - progress against targets generally good and some exceeded. Some ICT implementation targets rolled forward. 2004-5 plans accepted without comment.		L&T Fellowships		Fellows to disseminate outcomes; "L&T in Action" publication		L&T Unit could be important change agent	WP acknowledged as context.
	Large	3 FT posts to support 10 L&T Enhancement Groups (wide range of topics), via staff dev't and dissemination of good practice (£183k); L&T Enhancement projects (£20k); e-Learning staff dev't (£20k)	No	No evidence	Many of L&T Enhancement Groups are student-centred e.g. Work-based Learning, Independent Learning; E-learning; Diverse student needs; PDP and transferable skills	Difficult to assess. Funding 2005-6 being used to make new L&T Coordinator and Administrator posts - is this sustainable?	2003-4 progress "good" - planned posts filled. University making national contributions via L&T workshops etc. 2004-5 plans accepted without comment.				A primary aim of L&T Enhancement Groups	Potential consequence of L&T enhancement Groups, but not specific aim	L&T Enhancement Groups could be major change agents	A specific aim is to develop pedagogy for diverse student needs - and some (c £10k) TQEF funding used for this aech year
	Medium	Staff Dev't: Disseminating good L&T practice through variety of activities (£63k); ICT: Embedding Learning Technologies (£62k); Quality enhancement at dept/ discipline level (£60k)	Quality enhancement strand only	No evidence	Undergrad Progress Files and Student Feedback system	Depends on continued central commitment to these initiatives	2003-4 progress "satisfactory" - HEI's report did not go into detail, reporting only against 3 strands, not all activities. However, no major concern noted by HEA. 2004-5 plans are again found coarse grained but acceptable.				Yes, via Dissemination strand	Not directly		Acknowledges WP briefly. No TQEF funds used.
	Small	Research project on student experience (£41k); L&T Research Fellowships (£11k); Support for career entry and progression (£10k); Developing students' independent study skills (10k)	No	Little	Major focus of research project, being main use of funds. Also help with study skills	Not possible to say at this stage, but it looks like effective leverage with small funds.	2003-4 progress "satisfactory", with "sufficient" progress, though original targets were insufficiently SMART. 2004-5 plans roll forward suitably from previous version.		Funding to support ILT membership. L&T Fellowships		Research into student experience is major theme	Potential, depending on output from research project	Addressing Diversity is a major theme, and use of TQEF funds has grown from part funding a support post to a key research project.
	Large	L&T Coordinators, located in schools: wide student centred agenda, e-learning, assessment and School-based Education Strategies (£177k); ICT: Improve e-access for students across 8 sites	Education strategies and L&T Coordination have been restructured to devolve responsibility to Schools	School Education Strategies are intended to be consistent/synergistic with institutional/corporate strategies	Important focus of L&T Coordinators' agenda	Structurally embedded. Coordinator posts dependent on TQEF funding?	2003-4 progress "Good" with any revisions justified by improved expected outcomes. 2004-5 plans accepted without further comment.				Strong function of L&T coordinators	Potentially a strong feature as L&T coordinators work within schools	Deliberate effort to integrate action on WP, Disability, Dyslexia, Race Relations with L&T Strategy. Implemented via faculties. No specified TQEF funding.
	Small	Staff development (various) (£17k); Research skills for UG and PG students (£7k)	Specialist institution.	Not explicit	Help with research skills	Not heavily dependent on TQEF funding.	2003-4 progress "good", in spite of distraction of planned merger with Laban. 2004-5 plans show similar activities with targets raised. Accepted.				Aims to embed new teaching methods		Refers to College's WP Strategy. No TQEF Funds used

	Medium	**L&T, Technology, and Student Support Coordinators in each school (£121k);** L&T Research: Cluster Leader on each campus and 10 projects (£35k); Innovation projects (£16k) and Embedding projects (£12k)	Potentially. Coordinators are school-based.		Not directly addressed	Coordinators in each school are dependent on TQEF funding	2003-4 progress "satisfactory". Reporting against funding is scant but adequate. Progress is "asserted rather than evidenced". 2004-5 plans show some minor variations in targets - ot yet signifianct, but will need watching to avoid "creep".			£2k on collaboration with FE City College	Main role of Coordinators	Some attention to Research into L&T	Subject to sustainability, coordinators are major agents for change	WP is "mainstream" to Univ's work. L&T Strategy focusses on guidance/support and retention. TQEF funding used for Student Support coordinators with these aims.
	Small	**Student ICT skills development (£15k);** L&T Impact evaluation (£14k); Teacher Fellows (£8k);	No	Teacher Fellows have explicit institution-wide role in evaluating /disseminating /embedding good practice	Students supported in developing baseline ICT skills	Strategy has evolved and focus has shifted from E-learning adviser to staff, to student ICT skills development. Largely sustainable	2003-4 progress "satisfactory" (no further comment). 2004-5 plans accepted without comment.		Teacher Fellows		Teacher Fellows		Impact evaluation identifies priorities for next phase of development	Refers to College's WP Strategy. No TQEF Funds used
Non-case study institutions (10):														
	£150k	**ICT: embedding MLE and support for staff and student use and in partner institutions (£90k);** PDP for students - extend to partner inst's (£33k); Enhanced Centre for L&T activity, inc awards for teaching excellence (28k).	No	No evidence	Yes - supporting student use of MLE and PDP, and extending to partner institutions i.e. HE in FE	Yes - 2005-6 plans clearly show embedding of work done in earlier years	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory". Any variations have been justified. 2004-5 targets do not map directly to original action plan, but still support strategic priorities of L&T Strategy.		Awards for Teaching Excellence	Collaboration with partner institutions in delivering benefits to students	Staff training to use the developing MLE; Learning and Teaching Centre			A specific aim of the University's L&T Strategy 2002-5 to be achieved through inclusive curricula and pedagogies, though TQEF funding not deployed directly on this.
	£155k	**E-learning - support for staff implementing schools' e-learning strategies £50k;** Various student-centred - career management skills for UGs/ employability workshops/ PDP on-line/ international students' needs/ L&T Disability workshops (£46k); Dissemination of projects from Curriculum Innovation Fund (£41k); Various staff development projects (£18k)	E-learning strategies implemented via schools	No evidence	Significant part of strategy - career-management skills, Employability Workshops; PDP on-line, Workshops to adapt L&T activities to addess Disability issues	Most strands of strategy seem to have taken root	2003-4 progress "good" - all targets met or exceeded. 2004-5 targets accepted as matching original action plan.				Key strand of 2005 6 plans	Curriculum Innovation Fund		Not specifically addressed, but needs of International Students and Disability issues in L&T are being tackled
	£11k	**Teaching Fellowships with ICT emphasis (£6k);** ICT - software evaluation (£3k); Staff development (£2k)	Specialist arts institution - software evalution is subject specific	No evidence		TQEF funding is marginal to sustainability of overall L&T strategy	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory" Most targets achieved at least in part. Acknowledged that some were ambitious or not well designed. 2004-5 targets accepted.		Teaching fellowships					A major strand (£7k) in 2002-3 action plans, but since then TQEF funding has been deployed elsewhere
	£183k	**Staff Dev't: Academic Staff Support Officer post (£60k);** ICT: VLE development for L&T and to support student PDPs (£45k); Development of Model PDP £35k); publication of TQI £20k); PV-C's fund for L&T (£20k)	No	No evidence	PDP development, e-portfolios, PV-Cs fund is targetted at innovations in student-centred approaches to L&T	Considerable element of salaries vulnerable if TQEF funding ceases (e.g. Acad Staff Support Officer post is extended specifically because funding was extended for 2005-6)	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory" though some slippage within overall "steady progress" 2004-5 targets accepted - consistent with plan and and picking up slippages.		Not directly		Implicit in work of Acad Support Offcier	PV-C's fund		A specific strand in L&T Strategy, but no TQEF funds allocated to this strand
	£179k	**ICT: VLE implementation: (£60k);** L&T Development Fund (£57k); WP initiatives (£21k); L&T Research (£15k); PDP development (13k); Other Staff Dev't (£13k)	No	No evidence	Development of VLE, PDPs, and WP initiatives	L&T Development Fund may be vulnerable - others seem more supported	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory" - some slippage but no cause for concern. 2003-4 targets accepted.		L&T Development Fund			L&T Development Fund		Not addressed in original L&T Strategy, but has become a significant part of plans by 2005-6
	£152k	**Student employability and placement (£119k);** Student Peer Mentoring system (£22k); Student support and guidance (£11k)	Schools-based Academic Skills Unit was the major thrust of the L&T Strategy 2002-5	No evidence	Secondary theme 2002-5 and the main theme in 2005-6 for using TQEF funds	Positive. The University seems to have achieved its first main target and is moving on	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory" with no further comment. 2004-5 targets accepted.		Not explicit		Key role of Academic Skills Unit		Acad Support Unit appears to have been a major agent for change	A major theme of the overall L&T Strategy, but not for use of TQEF funding
	£130k	**Employability activities (£37k);** ICT: e-learning pilot (£36k); Assessment project (£27k); Developing students' maths skills (£25k); Dissemination (£5k)	Assessment project is subject-based	No evidence	Employability, e-learning and maths projects	Promising - now building on earlier work. Cost effective L&T practices was an early focus of Strategy 2002-5	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory" - only a few targets not met. 2004-5 targets accepted.		Minor funding for ILT membership in first two years of strategy		Small specific project (£5k). E-learning pilot and Assessment project also aim at consistency across departments			Acknowledged in L&T Strategy, but TQEF funds not used for any specific projects. University's WP Strategy is implemented in parallel
	£163k	Teaching Forum; Employability activities; Continue develop Student PDPs; Accessible and Inclusive Curricula project; Evaluation of Strategy (elements not separately costed)	Fund for Faculty initiatives in 2002-5 (£45k p.a.)	Teaching Fellows scheme	A strong theme throughout	L&T strategy has become established over time and is now consolidating, evaluating and planning ahead	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory". Targets set were met or acted upon. 2004-5 targets accepted.		Teaching fellowship scheme in 2002-5 (10k p.a.)			Fund for Faculty Initiatives has been key feature	TQEF has supported corporate changes	Addressed in L&T Strategy, but TQEF funds not used for this.
	£284k	**ICT: VLEs and Wireless (£98k);** Student support and information (£62k); Employability and PDPs: (£40k); Staff Development (£38k); Distance Learning Project (£26k); Student Induction Programme (£20k)	No	No evidence	A strong theme throughout	Not possible to assess	2003-4 progress "Satisfactory" without further comment. 2004-5 targets accepted.	The 2002-3 Strategy was based on joint submission of documents from LGU and UNL during the merger. This rather obscures the evaluation of the way the Strategy has evolved. The current presentation is very terse so extended themes are difficult to detect. There is a strong focus on learner support and the use of ICT.						
	£180k	**Plagiarism detection (£55k);** Computer assisted Assessment (£50k); PDPs (£35k); U/grad Research Scholarships on curriculum development (£25k); On-line learning resources (£15k)	On line resource development is departmentally based	No evidence	Warwick Skills Certificate/Programme was the major theme 2002-4	TQEF has served to enhance established teaching quality mechanisms	2003-4 progress "good" - targets met or exceeded, with innovative work in use of blogs for PDP. 2004-5 targets "go far beyond what was agreed and what is needed"		Warwick Teaching certificate		Centre for Academic Practice	U/Graduate Scholarship scheme	Strong feature of the Univ.	L&T Strategy refers to Warwick's WP Strategy. TQEF funds not used in this area.

List of Abbreviations

AMS	annual monitoring statement
CETL	Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
CPD	continuing professional development
DVC	deputy vice-chancellor
FDTL	Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning
FE	further education
FTE	full-time equivalent
HE	higher education
HE Academy	Higher Education Academy
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEI	higher education institution
ILT	Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education
JISC	Joint Information Systems Committee
L&T	learning and teaching
LTC	learning and teaching co-ordinator
LTS	learning and teaching strategy
LTSN	Learning and Teaching Support Network
LTU	learning and teaching unit
NTFS	National Teaching Fellowship Scheme
PDP	personal development plan
PVC	pro vice-chancellor
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
QE	quality evaluation
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
SC	subject centre
TLTP	Teaching and Learning Technology Programme
TQEF	Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund
VC	vice-chancellor
VFM	value for money