

## **Annex G**

### **Review of performance indicators: response form**

Responses should be returned by **Friday 10 November 2006**, by e-mail to [j.akinbolu@hefce.ac.uk](mailto:j.akinbolu@hefce.ac.uk) or by post to:

Judy Akinbolu  
Analytical Services Group, HEFCE  
Northavon House  
Coldharbour Lane  
BRISTOL  
BS16 1QD

A summary of the replies will be published, along with recommendations to the PISG, by early 2007. Additionally, all responses may be disclosed on request, under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act.

Name:

Organisation:

Position:

The paragraph and annex references below refer to the consultation document, HEFCE 2006/34.

### Existing indicators (paragraphs 22-32 and Annex B)

1. Do you make use of any of the PIs?  
Yes/No

If so, how do you use them (tick all that apply):

<input type="checkbox"/>	to compare your institution with other institutions in your region
<input type="checkbox"/>	to compare your institution with other similar institutions
<input type="checkbox"/>	as part of your internal management processes
<input type="checkbox"/>	other (please specify)

### Widening participation indicators

2. For each of the widening participation indicators, we would like to know:
- how useful is it?
  - in what way do you use it, if at all?
  - would you like to see it retained as it is, or retained in an amended or extended form? If the latter, please describe the changes you would like, and why you would find them beneficial.

#### Percent from state schools

<input type="checkbox"/>	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Retain unchanged
<input type="checkbox"/>	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

#### Percent from low social class

<input type="checkbox"/>	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Retain unchanged
<input type="checkbox"/>	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Percent from low participation neighbourhoods

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Percent with no previous HE and from low participation neighbourhoods

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Percent that receive the Disabled Students' Allowance

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

**In what ways do you use the widening participation indicators?**

--

**Non-continuation indicators**

3. For each of the non-continuation indicators, we would like to know:
- how useful is it?
  - in what way do you use it, if at all?
  - would you like to see it retained as it is, or retained in an amended or extended form? If the latter, please describe the changes you would like, and why you would find them beneficial.

Percent not continuing in HE after first year of entry

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Percent returning to HE after a year out following their year of first entry

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Percent projected to obtain a degree, leave with no award

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Percent of modules passed

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

**In what ways do you use the non-continuation indicators?**

--

**Research indicators**

4. For each of the research indicators, we would like to know:

- how useful is it?
- in what way do you use it, if at all?
- would you like to see it retained as it is, or retained in an amended or extended form? If the latter, please describe the changes you would like, and why you would find them beneficial.

PhDs per academic staff costs

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Income from research grants and contracts per academic staff costs

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

PhDs per funding council funding for research

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

Income from research grants and contracts per funding council funding for research

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend

If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.

**In what ways do you use the research indicators?**

--

**Employment indicator**

5. For the employment indicator, we would like to know:

- how useful is it?
- in what way do you use it, if at all?
- would you like to see it retained as it is, or retained in an amended or extended form? If the latter, please describe the changes you would like, and why you would find them beneficial.

Percent in employment or studying six months after graduation

	Usefulness on a scale of 1 (very useful) to 5 (not at all useful)
	Retain unchanged
	Amend or extend
If amended or extended, please specify in what way, and why you think this would be beneficial.	

**In what ways do you use the employment indicator?**

--

**Additional comments on existing indicators**

--

**Proposed indicators (paragraphs 33-45 and Annex C)**

6. Do you think an indicator based on parental income would be useful?  
Yes/No

If so, what form should it take?

--

7. Do you think an indicator based on parental education would be useful?  
Yes/No

If so, what form should it take?

--

8. Do you think an indicator based on average school performance, as described in paragraph 40, would be useful?  
Yes/No

If so, what form should it take?

--

9. There are two suggested methods of defining a postcode-based indicator, summarised as the POLAR method and the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) method (see paragraphs 41-43). Which of these methods would you prefer (please tick one only)?

	POLAR
	IMD
	Both
	Neither

10. Do you think an indicator based on the job quality of a graduate six months after graduation would be useful?  
Yes/No

11. Do you have any suggestions for additional indicators? If so, please explain what you think would be useful, and why.

**Further comments on proposed indicators**



**Benchmarks (paragraphs 46-52 and Annex D)**

12. Do you find the benchmarks helpful to your understanding of the indicators?

	Very helpful
	Helpful
	Neither helpful nor unhelpful
	Unhelpful
	Very unhelpful

13. Bearing in mind the explanation in paragraph 46 and Annex D of how the benchmarks were developed, do you think they are providing the sort of information that was intended?

Yes/No

14. Do you think the factors currently included in calculating the benchmarks are the correct ones?

Yes/No

If not, what factors would you include or exclude to produce benchmarks? Please explain why.

--

15. On entry qualifications, are you content with the current groupings based on tariff scores for A-level and Scottish Higher qualifications, and qualification type for others?

Yes/No

If not, please tell us why not.

--

16. Do you think the more detailed data on entry qualifications could provide better groupings for benchmarking?

Yes/No

**Further comments on benchmarks**

--

### Transfer of PIs to HESA (paragraphs 53-54)

17. Has the transfer of production of the PIs from HEFCE to HESA altered your perception of the indicators?

Yes/No

If yes, in what way has your perception changed?

--

18. Has the transfer of production of the PIs from HEFCE to HESA affected your use of the indicators?

Yes/No

If yes, in what way has your use changed?

--

19. As well as the published indicators, extra information can be supplied to each institution about its own students. Do you make use of this extra information?

	Yes
	No
	Don't know about it

20. Is there any other information connected with the PIs that you think would be useful to you, or could the existing information supplied be made more useful?

--

### Additional comments

Please add any comments you wish to make on any issue not covered in the consultation document.

--