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1. **Attendance/Apologies**

DC welcomed members of the group to the third meeting of the working group, introduced new attendees and listed the apologies.

1. **Matters arising**

DC highlighted to the group that there are papers for most actions from the previous meeting. There were no matters arising.

1. **Consultation and timeline changes and work plan (Paper 1)**

DC raised with colleagues that paper 1 will require an update, and proposed that while we should still aim to get out a first consultation in March, that timescales should be pushed back, with the second consultation going out in late summer. This is largely due to the revised timescales for the Green Paper/TEF in England, and the less-clear responses to the SBEE Act in the other administrations of the UK.

**Action: DC to redraft paper 1 and circulate to the group**

RP highlighted the importance of considering the knock-on impacts of lengthening the consultation timescales to HE providers, and questioned when a decision about whether the 2016/17 DLHE collection should be cancelled would need to be made for if HE providers to handle resourcing implications. DC suggested that the group would have a better grasp of this after the results of the first consultation. It was decided to consult the strategic group on this matter.

**Action: RH to circulate redrafted paper 1 to the strategic group and ask for their feedback on making a decision on the 2016/17 DLHE collection.**

1. **BIS HMRC data linking feasibility study (Oral feedback – CI)**

DC referred the group to the HMRC data forms section of paper 9, which gives details of the information contained in a P14 and P45 form.

CI presented on the BIS HMRC data linking project, providing details of the data which is being linked, the timetable for the project and examples of this linked data in practice. As well as the P14 and P45 forms, CI highlighted that they are likely to obtain the data captured through other PAYE forms including P60 and P46 forms, as well as benefits data. CI stated that so far they have indications of strong match rates, and these will likely improve as the project goes on. CI also indicated that at the moment, P45 graduate employment data are available up to 6 months after the P45 is submitted and P14 earnings/tax data are available up to 12 months after the P14 is submitted . In future, it may be possible to obtain this data on a more timely basis, due to a new Real Time Information data collection system being brought in.

CI stated that BIS is constructing plans to release experimental publications of the data starting this year, to engage the sector and encourages feedback.

There was discussion of the role of devolved administrations and CI highlighted that discussions are being held between BIS and the devolved administrations as part of this project.

DC asked what contextual data about the employer is available, for example to determine employer size. CI responded that the analysis was at too early a stage to offer an answer about this, but that self-assessment data for tax-payers who are self-employed would be available. Employer names may also be possible to integrate into the data linkage.

CB asked how this data is linked and CI stated this is via forenames, surname, DOB, postcode, gender and National Insurance numbers. Discussion was held over ideal match rate for individuals in the HESA Student Record, and it was agreed that this would never be 100% due to groups such as international students who do not go on to work in the UK and that BIS’ current estimates suggest that this population could contribute 10-20% of the total HE population.

RP asked at which points job title or duties are made available to HMRC from employers in order to appear in the data. CI’s understanding is that this is declared on the P45 when taxpayers leave organisations, and so will probably mask job changes within the same organisation. Interrogation of the data will confirm whether this is the case. There was also discussion of the timescales for publication of this data after graduation point. CI highlighted that there is a considerable amount of development work before this data will be suitable for official publication. Publication of employment data is likely to be at least as timely as the 6 month DLHE publication but earnings data publications will probably be later

PY asked whether part time distinction will be available and CI confirmed it is not directly available in the data but there may be a way to derive this. CI also mentioned that earnings for those working below the tax threshold are more difficult to capture, although benefits data may be available for these and we should have information on their employment status.

**Action: RH to circulate CI’s slides to the group**

1. **Desired data arising from Action 2 (Paper 2)**

DC proposed that paper 2 was used as the framework for the remainder of the meeting, and the other papers would be referred back to where appropriate.

DC introduced paper 2 and explained the work undertaken by DC, TD, CB and Darren Watson from HEFCE to produce this paper. Each section was taken for discussion by the group.

* 1. **Demographic and contact info**

CB asked DC to expand on the upcoming EU legislation and the impact on opt outs and collecting data from third parties. DC stated that this was not yet clear as it is dependent of what type of research the DLHE survey is perceived as. DC stated that legal counsel needs to be sought on this, and that the group will be updated once this information is received.

The group agreed with the consultation proposal to maintain demographic and contact information and opt-out data.

**Action: HESA to obtain legal counsel on EU legislation regarding opt-outs and third party data in DLHE**

**Action: HESA to propose continued collection of this data in the consultation**

* 1. **Activity**

DC proposed that narrative responses were sought for this item in consultation.

RP highlighted the need to consider survey design and not make questions too long. CB also stated that caution was needed if this question was to be further broken down, to avoid ending with cohorts too small for onwards use.

AW questioned the requirement for the ‘Due to start a job in the next month’ option. It was agreed this should be considered alongside using routing to gain more information on unemployed graduates.

NK emphasised the role of most important employment option to keep the survey a manageable size.

The group discussed the potential change to the census date. DC and CB had considered paper on change in census date for this meeting but it was not possible in the timeframe. It was suggested that in the consultation respondents should record census date preferences, with proposed alternative dates. RP suggested highlighting that there are pros and cons for different approaches and asking how strongly would you support a survey at different dates.

The group suggested some potential options as maintaining 6 months, moving to 12 months or moving to 15-18 months.

It was agreed there needs to be some analysis alongside this to establish what response rate is required to use the data at course level. MB asked what evidence there is for response rates dropping if census data is extended. CB suggested alumni departments would be able to provide this and PY suggested LDLHE response rates as evidence. RP reminded the group that there will be contextual information from HMRC which will allow to measure against response bias.

**Action: DC and CB to prepare a paper on census date proposals, to circulate to the group and include in the consultation.**

**Action: HESA to propose continued collection of activity data in the consultation, with some additions.**

**Action: HESA staff to analyse required response rates for onward use of the data.**

* 1. **Job title, main thing done in job, and SOC code**

DC referred to Paper 3 for this item. The group supported the proposal to maintain these fields, and agreed that SOC still remains the best method of occupational coding.

**Action: HESA to propose continued collection of these data in the consultation**

**Action: HESA to investigate potential of self-SOC-coding methodology**

* 1. **Salary**

AJ highlighted some of the uses of salary data within an HE provider which would not be possible if HE providers cannot access the linked HMRC data on an individual student basis. It was agreed more information about the use of salary data should be sought in the consultation.

**Action: HESA to incorporate an item on HE provider use of salary data in the consultation**

DJ asked about international salary data and DC asked for feedback on the importance of capturing international salary data in comparison to the burden of collection. Members of the group agreed there was not a strong argument for the collection of this data, but that potential improved methods of collecting this data should be captured within the consultation. It was agreed that EU and international students should be considered separately.

**Action: HESA to include an item on salary data collection from EU/international students in the consultation.**

* 1. **Employment basis and hours**

The group supported the consultation proposal to maintain employment basis and remove questions on hours.

**Action: HESA to propose continued collection of employment basis and removal of questions on hours worked in consultation**

* 1. **Employer details**

The group supported the continued collection of these data and CB highlighted the importance of SIC when combined with SOC.

**Action: HESA to propose continued collection of employer details in consultation.**

* 1. **Location**

DC asked the group whether there was a demand for the collection of location of domicile post-graduation, e.g. to understand commuting patterns to employment location (or even social mobility). The HE provider representatives suggested that this was not likely to be of use to them, but other members of the group suggested there might be wider usage of this data. It was agreed this would be included within the consultation. It was also agreed that it was worth investigating with BIS whether this could be sourced through the linked data, as it is recorded on a P14 form ‘if known’.

**Action: HESA to include a question on the potential usage of graduate domicile within consultation**

**Action: CI to incorporate investigating level of unknowns of employee address from P14 form into data linking project**

* 1. **Relevance of qualifications**

It was agreed that this information should still be collected but it could use already existing question formats for asking these questions, which do not assume that a graduate can definitively know this information.

**Action: HESA to include an item on the relevance of qualifications with a potential alternative question format in the consultation**

* 1. **Skills**

RF presented paper 8 to the group. It was agreed this was an area which should be addressed in the consultation. DC asked the group how they believed this should be approached within the consultation. It was agreed that options for the questions should be published, such as the UKSES and FutureTrack skills questions. RP questioned whether assessing skills focuses on skill usage, skill possession or skill development. In discussion it was agreed that the consultation proposal should be on assessing skill development through analysis of HE outcomes data, while assessing skill usage through a survey.

**Action: RF and CB to draw up a paper for consultation on the potential questions assessing skills, using the FutureTrack and UKCES existing examples.**

**5.10** **Reasons for activity**

There was general support for moving towards a question on a Likert scale which asks whether the graduate is in the employment which they expected to/wanted to be. CB highlighted the importance of not assuming graduates have/should have a career plan.

**Action: HESA to include a proposal to change the reason for activity question in the consultation.**

**How a job opportunity was located**

The group agreed that this question is important for various reasons and more use should be made of this in measuring social capital and widening participation.

**Action: HESA to propose maintaining this question in the consultation**

**5.11. Placements**

It was identified that there are three strands to ‘placements’ - work based and work related learning, plus volunteering done at student union etc.

The proposal was made to collect fuller data on placements within the Student record by collecting location, duration and organisation for curriculum based placements. AJ highlighted concerns with the burden of collection of this data, as the data was not necessarily located in a structured format. It was agreed that non-curriculum placements would still be best collected through a survey.

**Action: HESA to expose debates on placements, including what constitutes a placement and the potential of collecting this data through the Student record, as an item on the consultation.**

**5.12. Employment in particular professions (including teachers and NHS employees)**

It was agreed that these discussions could be addressed outside the meeting with HEE and NCTL.

**Action: RH to arrange discussions with HEE and NCTL for specific consultation items**

**5.13 Further study, training and research**

DC proposed that these data could be accessed through data linking of Student record data. RP stated there was potential to expose this data back to HE providers following careful consideration of data protection issues.

There was some discussion about whether data should be captured on motivation to go into further study, training and research. NK suggested referring to already existing motivation questions in the PRES and PTES surveys.

**Action: DC to investigate data protection potential for sharing data on further study back to HE providers**

**Action: RH to review existing motivation questions in PRES/PTES to include in consultation**

**5.14 Overall HE experience**

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

**5.15 Graduate enterprise**

The group agreed that this should be addressed through an open question in the consultation.

**Action: HESA to include open questions on graduate enterprise in the consultation**

1. **Net promoter scale (Paper 6)**

DH and DO presented paper 6 and explained the use of NPS at BIMM. The potential for using this methodology in DLHE was briefly discussed and agreed it could be suitable as one of a range of potential metrical approaches to measuring outcomes.

**Action: HESA to include an item on the potential use of net promoter score in the consultation.**

1. **Paper on wellbeing (Paper 7)**

Time constraints prevented a full discussion of this paper, but DC proposed that this represented another possibility for an alternative metrical approach to measuring outcomes. Discussion would be handled on-line following the meeting.

1. **Literature review on skills, HE and employment (Paper 8)**

This paper was taken under Paper 2.

1. **Contesting Volatility (Paper 4)**

There was insufficient time to consider this paper at the meeting.

1. **Commissioned research (Paper 5)**

There was insufficient time to consider this paper at the meeting.

1. **HEA - use of the HEAR (Oral feedback – DC)**

There was insufficient time to discuss this item.

1. **Supplementary information supplied by members of the working group (Paper 9)**

This paper was referred to under Paper 2.

1. **International Student matters (Oral feedback – DC)**

This item had not been completed in time for the meeting.

1. **Finance paper (Paper 10)**

DC thanked members for the contributions made prior to the meeting, and proposed this paper becomes a part of the consultation.

1. **Governance of DLHE (Paper 11)**

This paper was not considered at the meeting due to insufficient time.

1. **Next steps**

DC proposed that, due to the shortness of time, any items which had not been covered in the meeting could be discussed online. DC would also summarise the proposed next steps to take in publishing the consultation.

**Action: DC to circulate a summary any items which had not been covered in the meeting and the proposed next steps to take in publishing the consultation.**

**Action: DC to draft first consultation, based on the discussions at this meeting, and circulate.**

1. **Date of next meeting**

It was proposed that the next round of work would be conducted electronically, and that dates for the next meeting would be canvassed in due course.

**Action points from the Minutes**

1. DC to redraft paper 1 and circulate to the group
2. RH to circulate redrafted paper 1 to the strategic group and ask for their feedback on making a decision on the 2016/17 DLHE collection.
3. RH to circulate CI’s slides to the group
4. HESA to obtain legal counsel on EU legislation regarding opt-outs and third party data in DLHE
5. HESA to propose continued collection of this data in the consultation
6. DC and CB to prepare a paper on census date proposals, to circulate to the group and include in the consultation.
7. HESA to propose continued collection of this data in the consultation, with some additions.
8. HESA staff to analyse required response rates for onward use of the data.
9. HESA to propose continued collection of these data in the consultation
10. HESA to investigate potential of self-SOC-coding methodology
11. HESA to incorporate an item on HE provider use of salary data in the consultation
12. HESA to propose continued collection of employment basis and removal of questions on hours worked in consultation
13. HESA to propose continued collection of employer details in consultation.
14. HESA to include a question on the potential usage of graduate domicile within consultation
15. CI to incorporate investigating level of unknowns of employee address from P14 form into data linking project
16. HESA to include an item on the relevance of qualifications with a potential alternative question format in the consultation
17. RF and CB to draw up a paper for consultation on the potential questions assessing skills, using the FutureTrack and UKCES existing examples.
18. HESA to include a proposal to change the reason for activity question in the consultation.
19. HESA to propose maintaining this question in the consultation
20. HESA to expose debates on placements, including what constitutes a placement and the potential of collecting this data through the Student record, as an item on the consultation.
21. RH to arrange discussions with HEE and NCTL for specific consultation items
22. DC to investigate data protection potential for sharing data on further study back to HE providers
23. RH to review existing motivation questions in PRES/PTES to include in consultation
24. HESA to include open questions on graduate enterprise in the consultation
25. HESA to include an item on the potential use of net promoter score in the consultation.
26. DC to circulate a summary any items which had not been covered in the meeting and the proposed next steps to take in publishing the consultation.
27. DC to draft first consultation, based on the discussions at this meeting, and circulate.