**Review of HE student outcomes and destinations data**

**Working group meeting**

**11.00 – 15.00 Thursday 19 November 2015**

**etc.venues Liverpool Street, Bishopsgate Court, 4-12 Norton Folgate, London, E1 6DQ**

**Present:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Charlie Ball | Higher Education Careers Service Unit/Prospects |
| Jenny Bermingham | Higher Education Statistics Agency |
| Matthew Bollington | Department of Business, Innovation and Skills |
| Heather Burton | Queens University Belfast |
| Dan Cook | Higher Education Statistics Agency |
| Pip Day | Higher Education Statistics Agency |
| Hannah Falvey | Higher Education Funding Council for Wales |
| Rosa Fernandez | National Centre for Universities and Business |
| Rachel Hewitt | Higher Education Statistics Agency |
| David Hutton | British and Irish Modern Music Institute |
| Anita Jackson | University of Kent/Higher Education Strategic Planners Association |
| Nicola Kivlichan | Edinburgh Napier University |
| Michael MacNeill | Department for Employment and Learning (Northern Ireland) |
| Shaun Osborne | National College for Teaching and Learning |
| Richard Puttock | Higher Education Funding Council for England |
| Patrick Spicer | Health Education England |
| Chris Williams | Welsh Assembly Government |
| Kenny Wilson | Scottish Funding Council |
| Mike Wilson | Bangor University |
| Michael Wood | Higher Education Statistics Agency |
| Paul Youngson | University of Huddersfield |

**Apologies:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lindsey Johnson | Health Education England |
| Andrew Whitmore | University of Manchester/Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services |

## Action

1. **Welcome and introductions**

DC welcomed the group to the first meeting of the working group for the review of HE student outcomes and destinations data. All members of the group introduced themselves and their role within their organisation.

1. **Terms of reference (Paper 1)**

DC presented paper one and invited the group to comment. Members of the group accepted the terms of reference.

1. **Background information (Paper 2)**

DC presented paper two. Members of the group discussed the opportunities from the SBEE Act and also explored concerns about the basis upon which the data might be accessed, and the ways it might be used.

1. **Exploring the remit for the review (Papers 3 and 5)**

DC presented papers three and five as the remit document and the outcomes of the strategic group discussions. Members of the group were invited to discuss both papers on their tables. The outcomes of these discussions were reflected in the list below during a plenary discussion.

* Public gets information from league tables – need to consider how these data will be used
* Demand-led measures are as, if not more important than supply-led measures when considering what are ‘graduate jobs’
* SOC coding is just one way of determining the ‘graduateness’ of a job.
* Successful outcomes are important, not “graduate jobs”. Non-financial benefits need to be considered
* Colleges in Scotland don’t have comparable data (and FE in general needs to be included)
* Timescales are longer than 6 months for:
  + Relevance of degree
  + Trajectory
  + Careers and skills
  + Longitudinal
* Student voice must be heard through these data
* Contextual employment information
* Work and study - interrelations
* Subject – specific questions could be advantageous
* Link back to NSS – continuity and comparability
* Professional development/personal development
* Happiness/satisfaction
* Preparation for employment
* What was desirable outcome? HE all about employment prep?
* Pre-existing skills taken into consideration
* Discipline – skills – jobs - interrelation
* Employment relationship and needs
* What is a student? Mature, part time
* Motivation for study?
  + What do you/did you want to get out of HE?
  + Fit in with career plan?
* Survey at start of course to determine changes
  + Many HEPs do this already
  + Baseline – who is the person?
  + Motivation for taking the course (also the job, later on)
* Central collection – resourcing
  + HEP input – careers, alumni, student support – also pre-HE
  + Capacity, equity
  + Overseas graduates – gaps in the data
  + Danger of two-tier data

1. **Timescales and communications (Paper 4)**

DC presented paper four. Some members of the group raised concerns about the tight timescales not allowing enough time for thoughtful consideration of the issues by all interested parties. DC acknowledged that the timescales could be flexible if that was desirable given other parallel reviews elsewhere, but it was important to acknowledge that delaying the dates could have an impact on when changes can be implemented. It was also open at this stage what would be in the final business case, and what would be an implementation matter. It was agreed that the consultation questions would be informed by and tested on the Working Group.

1. **Developing the work plan**

Members of the group were invited to consider initial ideas for the consultation and to consider what information we need to know on student destinations and outcomes. The outcome of these discussions are as below.

Consultation

* Costing DLHE
  + Comparable, baseline data needed from initial requirements-gathering consultation
* Broad-based constituency – NCUB, league tables, FE
* Accrediting bodies – as they need current DLHE data
* Students
  + KIS review has done useful work in this area that can be scrutinised
  + Research students – RCUK requirements
  + Part time, PG, mature, protected characteristics – all to be considered in design
  + FE
* Impartiality of the collecting body

What do we need to know?

* Destinations – not just employment
* Do we need a survey?
* Data-linking delivers more than DLHE could
* Nothing in DLHE redundant – but sources could change
* Use of data
  + Student support
  + Business planning/ROI
* Quantitative and qualitative
* Success themes of students
* Pathways
* Proof of proposition – shows what paths are possible
* Parents need convincing – independent
* Portfolio careers
* Social return on investment
* Self-evaluation
* Demonstrate impact of HE
* Local and national
* Meeting expectations of students
* Use of public money
* Drive evidence-based careers advice/guidance
* Migration of skills
* Economic questions
* Policy – local/national
* Sector commitment to transparency
* Employment-based outcomes
* Other outcomes

1. **Papers to be published following the meeting**

Members will be asked to confirm *via* email.

1. **Date of next meeting**

The date of the next meeting was agreed as Tuesday 8 December. It was decided that a poll would be circulated to determine the best location from London, Birmingham and Manchester and that video-conferencing facilities would be looked into.

Post-meeting note - Birmingham was selected as the most popular location.