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What is TEF?

The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF):

• assesses the quality of teaching in higher education providers

• differentiates quality over and above the baseline set by quality assurance.

Ratings

The annual assessment process will rate HE providers as:

- TEF Gold
- TEF Silver
- TEF Bronze
Purpose of TEF

Better inform students’ choices about what and where to study

Recognise and reward excellent teaching and raise esteem for teaching

Drive up standards of teaching across the sector

Improve match of graduate skills with needs of employers and the economy.
# How is TEF being implemented?

## A phased approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment level</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider level 'meets expectations' awards</td>
<td>Provider level trial</td>
<td>Provider level + <strong>Subject level pilots</strong></td>
<td>Subject level + <strong>Postgraduate level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full inflationary uplift</td>
<td>Full inflationary uplift</td>
<td>Differentiated inflation uplift (provider level)</td>
<td>Differentiated inflation uplifts (provider level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>Further metrics development</td>
<td>On-going improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Continuous improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full inflationary uplift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Full inflationary uplift
- Differentiated inflation uplift (provider level)
- On-going improvements
How have we developed TEF?

Our approach

• Wide definition of ‘teaching excellence’
• Reflect diversity of the sector
• UK wide
• Balance of metrics and expert judgement
• Existing metrics as proxies

Principles

• Fair comparisons
• Avoid perverse incentives
• Minimise burden on providers
## TEF Year Two

### The Assessment Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of quality:</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Student Outcomes and Learning Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>Teaching quality criteria</td>
<td>Learning environment criteria</td>
<td>Student outcomes and learning gain criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td>Teaching, assessment and feedback (NSS results)</td>
<td>Academic support &amp; non-continuation (NSS results and HESA)</td>
<td>Employment / further study, including highly skilled (DLHE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metric splits**

**Outcome:**

- TEF rating & Statement of findings

**Evidence:**

- Metrics
- Submission

Provider submission (additional evidence)
TEF Year 2 Technical Consultation

Sector responses demonstrated **strong overall support** for the broad framework. Year Two incorporates some specific suggestions for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector feedback on...</th>
<th>How we responded...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>Introduced an appeals process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating descriptors</td>
<td>Renamed as Gold, Silver and Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment process</td>
<td>Clearer information on the assessment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment metrics</td>
<td>Included social disadvantage &amp; disability in benchmarking, and made employment definition consistent with UKPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive flags for high benchmarks</td>
<td>Removed the positive flag anomaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of additional evidence</td>
<td>Adjusted to better recognise a broader set of outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond Year Two

What’s next?

• Year Two ‘lessons learned’ exercise
• Further develop metrics package for Year Three
• Subject level pilots
• Taught postgraduate TEF design phase

Subject level pilots

• Design phase
  – Working collaboratively with the sector
  – Engaging with subject bodies, employers and students
• Pilots during TEF Year Three
The Teaching Excellence Framework: Year 2 implementation
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TEF Year Two: Timeline

Provider activity:
- Preview metrics
- Briefing events
- Submit application (window closes)
- Can start using TEF rating logo

Government activity:
- Publish Guidance
- Assessment
- Announce results
- Panel judgement
- Publish appeal results

Timeline:
- 2016: Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec
- 2017: Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul
TEF Year Two: who can participate?

Scope

- UK wide
- Undergraduate provision
- All modes of delivery
- UK and international students studying in the UK
- Franchised provision is assessed at the teaching provider

Eligibility

- Designation for student support
- Widening access and participation
- Quality requirement
- Suitable metrics: determines the type of award
Number of years

The number of suitable years determines the duration of the award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of suitable years:</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major teaching delivery mode:</td>
<td>full time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A metric is not reportable if:
  - X The provider returned no data in the relevant years (N/A)
  - X There are fewer than 10 students (N)
  - X The NSS or DLHE response rate was too low (R)
  - X There is insufficient data for benchmarking (Sup)
Quality Assessment and the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

Teaching Excellent Framework

Annual Provider Review
Higher Education Review (AP)
Quality Enhancement Framework
Quality Assessment Framework (Wales)
Components of an application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Data</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Data on the student profile</td>
<td>• Core metrics</td>
<td>• Additional context, explanation and/or evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data maps</td>
<td>• Split metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by HEFCE

Prepared by the provider
# TEF Year Two: The Assessment Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of quality:</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Student Outcomes and Learning Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>Teaching quality criteria</td>
<td>Learning environment criteria</td>
<td>Student outcomes and learning gain criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td>Teaching, assessment and feedback (NSS results)</td>
<td>Academic support &amp; non-continuation (NSS results and HESA)</td>
<td>Employment / further study, including highly skilled (DLHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric splits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Provider submission (additional evidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome:</td>
<td>TEF rating &amp; Statement of findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEF Year Two: assessment criteria

- Teaching Quality
- Learning Environment
- Student Outcomes and Learning Gain

- Student Engagement
- Resources
- Employment and Further Study

- Valuing Teaching
- Scholarship, Research and Professional Practice
- Employability and Transferrable Skills

- Rigour and Stretch
- Personalised Learning
- Positive Outcomes for All

- Feedback

Positive Outcomes for All Resources, Scholarship, Research and Professional Practice
Contextual data

Contextual data and maps will help the assessors understand the size, nature and context of the provider; but do not directly inform the ratings.

The workbook contains a breakdown of students by:

- Subject
- Level
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Sex
- Disability

Two maps indicate where students were prior to entry and after completion.
What are metrics?

Each metric comprises:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time headcount:</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teaching on my course</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and feedback</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-continuation</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment or further study</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly skilled employment or further study</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time headcount:</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teaching on my course</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and feedback</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-continuation</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment or further study</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly skilled employment or further study</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Split metrics**

Metrics are also ‘split’ by student characteristics, so the assessors can consider performance for students from different backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Level of study</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Welsh medium</th>
<th>Domicile</th>
<th>Splits different to core metric?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time headcount:</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teaching on my course</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-continuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment or further study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly skilled employment or further study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time headcount:</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teaching on my course</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-continuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment or further study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly skilled employment or further study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metrics – further information

• TEF Year Two additional guidance: www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/tef/
• A workbook has been released to each provider
• Metrics webinar: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v4BxQV2JPLk
• Technical documents: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/data/famd/latest/2014-15,overview/
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

Better inform students’ choices about what and where to study

Raise esteem for teaching

Recognise and reward excellent teaching

Better meet the needs of employers, business, industry and the professions
Additional evidence

The provider should put forward any additional evidence that best supports its case for excellence, within the following guidelines:

• Evidence should be relevant to the criteria
• Focus on excellence above the baseline
• Focus on current or recent activity and outcomes (in the last three years, unless addressing metrics from previous years); avoid future plans
• Focus on impact and effectiveness; avoid descriptions of strategy, policy or practice without evidence of their impact or effectiveness
• Evidence should relate to all provision that is in scope; avoid focusing on highly localised practice or out-of-scope provision
• Evidence can be quantitative and/or qualitative but should be factual and verifiable
Who will assess the applications?

• The TEF Panel will be responsible for deciding the outcomes:
  – Comprising academic, student, WP and employer expert members
• With advice and recommendations from a pool of assessors:
  – Comprising student and academic experts
• They were appointed from amongst 1,200+ candidates
• Details are available at [http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/tef/panel/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/tef/panel/)
• All applications will initially be assessed by at least:
  – One student and two academics
Assessment: Step 1a – Review of core metrics

- As a starting point in forming an initial hypothesis the assessors will look at core metrics flags in the majority mode of delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three or more positive flags and no negatives</th>
<th>The starting point is Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two or more negative flags (regardless of the number of positives)</td>
<td>The starting point is Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other combinations</td>
<td>The starting point is Silver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment: Step 1b – Review splits and other factors

- The assessors will then refine and arrive at an initial hypothesis by considering:
  - How the core metric flags are distributed across the three aspects of quality. Note that care will be taken not to overweight the NSS, which accounts for half of the metrics.
  - The split metrics, to see if performance varies for students with different backgrounds. No weight will be given to a split that has no flag.
  - The minority mode of delivery, in proportion to student numbers.
  - Other factors including z-scores, distances from the benchmarks, or gaps in the reportable metrics.

- This is non-formulaic and requires judgement

- The degree of confidence in which the initial hypothesis is held at this stage may vary depending on how clear-cut performance is against the metrics.
Assessment: Step 2 – Review the submission

**Step 2**
Provider submission

Assessors review:
- provider’s submission

Judgement:
- assessors test initial hypothesis

- The assessors will take full account of the provider submission and how far it:
  - Explains performance against metrics
  - Provides additional evidence against the criteria
- It will be more heavily relied on where, for example:
  - A provider has fewer than three years of metrics
  - There is an absence of flags due to small numbers
  - There are conflicting core and split metric flags
- In all but the most extreme cases review of the submission may lead to an adjustment of the initial hypothesis.
Assessment: Step 3 – Holistic judgement

The assessors will holistically consider the combination of evidence in the metrics and the submission, to confirm the rating corresponds with a best fit to the descriptor.

- If not, they should revisit the process.
- The application need not meet all the components of a descriptor; the judgement will be based on a ‘best fit’.
TEF Year Two: Final outcome

Rating

A brief statement on why the rating was awarded

Duration

Valid for up to three years (if provider continues to be eligible). If a provider has one or two years of suitable metrics, the award is valid for one or two years respectively

Communication

- Published on Unistats, UCAS and HEFCE websites
- Metrics and submissions will also be published
- Further details due in early 2017
Key Resources

• The TEF website: www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/tef/
  includes:
  – The TEF Year Two specification and guidance
  – Details of panel members and assessors
  – Providers’ nominated TEF contacts
  – Webinars
  – Links to technical documents

• The TEF extranet: tef.hefce.ac.uk/extranet includes:
  – Your metric workbook
How to find out more

Further information is available through TEF@hefce.ac.uk and at:

http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/tef/
Thank you for listening

c.millward@hefce.ac.uk