

LTC11D050

Title: Education and Student Academic Experience: Corporate Plan relationships and hierarchy
Author: Dr Garrick Fincham
Date: 24 January 2012
Circulation: Learning and Teaching Committee – 1 February 2012
Agenda: LTC11A003
Version: Draft v2
Status: Open

Issue

Relationship diagram to illustrate a potential target/monitoring/action scheme for the Education and Student Academic Experience for the Corporate Plan

Recommendation

Recipients are invited to consider the relationships displayed in light of the objectives of the Corporate Plan.

Resource Implications

None: The framework suggested is based upon existing work on reporting.

Risk Implications

Adoption of this framework will reduce the risk of *unforeseen* decline in league table positioning. It also builds upon efforts to provide early warning to the University of league table issues. In terms of the Corporate Plan it structures the various issues impacting upon the Education Agenda, and minimises the chance of key aspects of this landscape become 'lost' because of the high number of targets currently envisaged.

Equality and Diversity

Equality and Diversity is embedded in the monitoring/support of vulnerable groups. This aspect of the diagram aims to ensure that systematic information on how these groups perform to enable targeted support where appropriate.

Timing of decisions

To co-ordinate with the wider timeframe of the drafting of the Corporate Plan.

Further Information

G. Fincham (BIU/Planning)
Ext 3498
g.fincham@uea.ac.uk

Background

A request by senior management to review proposed Corporate Plan targets with a view to commenting upon whether or not they were susceptible to accurate monitoring and, where possible, to reduce them in number, resulted in the following two diagrams.

Discussion

Please see attached diagrams. The first suggests a structure that takes items under consideration as targets within the Education and Student Academic Experience section of the Corporate Plan and creates a division into four basic categories which, whilst in fact increasing the number of items under consideration, categorises them into actions, data items, real targets and outputs. This increase in items results from the fact that once viewed in this way, potential holes in target/monitoring, and the absence of other established data sources (e.g. Enquirer and Applicant Surveys or PTES), becomes apparent.

The proposal is that outputs and overarching targets (those functioning above the level of the Education strand in the plan) are clearly identified as being 'driven' by a lower level of items which lie at the appropriate level for target setting. These 'targets' though superficially appearing 'league table focused', in fact capture the key measurable metrics of the student experience.

Each target has multiple 'data items' feeding into it – those things that could be influenced to improve performance under that target. At the data item level, understanding is needed of the appropriate levels of performance in each item, but failure in one area can be counterbalanced by exceeding in another – balancing institutional progress towards the identified target as a whole. These data items are influenced by the actions/strategies picked out in red, and it is in the red boxes that we have tried to identify the levers that the university will/could establish within the Corporate Plan to drive performance.

It should be noted that the detailed structure beneath dropout, good honours and entry requirements is still under development and the current document merely sketches a very outline 'architecture'. It is also understood that some strategy areas, like 'Contact with Academics' or 'Academic Professional Development' have links to areas other than the Student Experience (for example, they might reasonably be expected to have an impact upon both dropout and good honours) but this was omitted for clarity, and the primary link (to the Student Experience) is thus the only one displayed.

The second diagram highlights links to the KIS (which are also noted on Diagram One). Six elements of the KIS as currently outlined feed from data collected under the proposed framework on the first diagram. The KIS should be considered as a 'blue box output', but as it draws from many parts of Diagram One it was not possible to directly represent this. The KIS also *feeds* the cycles outlined for monitoring because information gathered through KIS will influence future recruitment.

