

Printable summary of your responses

Name : Seb Schmoller

Position : Chief Executive

Institution/organisation : Association for Learning Technology

Email : seb.schmoller@alt.ac.uk

Responding as : Academic association or learned society

Address : ALT, Gipsy Lane, Headington

Town : Oxford

County : Oxon

Postcode : OX3 0BP

Your responses

Generic questions

1a

Overall draft panel criteria and working methods

The generic and four main panel statements achieve an appropriate balance between consistency across the exercise and allowing for justifiable differences between the four main panels.

Agree

1b

Are there particular aspects of the criteria and working methods that should be more consistent across all the main panels? Are there differences between the disciplines that justify further differentiation between the main panel criteria? Where referring to particular main panels, please state which one(s).

While we think that a lot has been done to achieve the balance we still have some worries about two areas.

a) Cross referral between sub-panels.

Because of differences in criteria (for example the use of citation data) something cross referred may be judged by methodologies that were not what the submitter intended. An example might be a cross referral to Education (C25) from, say, Computer Science and Informatics (B11), or vice versa. We believe that the sub-panel receiving a cross-referral should apply the criteria of the sub-panel to which the research output had originally been submitted, rather than its own. We expand on this in 5b and 11b below.

b) Types of a output that are acceptable:

We note the wide divergence between, for example, the indicative lists outputs that are acceptable by Main Panel B and Main Panel C. Whilst some of the differences relate obviously to differences between the fields covered by the two panels, others do not. Why, for example, is there no equivalent to 2C paragraph 42 in 2B? Why does 2C use the term "paper-based" in

relation to outputs that may never have appeared in print. Why is no mention made in 2B of teaching, curriculum and assessment materials, or in 2C of standards documents? We believe that the clauses relating to lists of acceptable outputs should be reviewed across all four Main Panels and brought more closely into line with one another, making the necessary differences stand out rationally.

2a

Individual staff circumstances

The proposals for determining the number of outputs that may be reduced without penalty, for staff with a range of individual circumstances, are appropriate (Part 1, Tables 2 and 3).

Agree

2b

Please comment on these proposals. Respondents are also invited to comment specifically on:

- whether Tables 2 and 3 are set at appropriate levels
- the proposed options for taking account of pregnancy and maternity (Part 1, paragraph 62)
- whether a consistent approach across the exercise is appropriate, or whether there are any specific differences in the nature of research that justify differences in the approach between UOAs or main panels.

If commenting in respect of particular panels or disciplines, please state which.

While the proposals and tables are largely sound and sensible, we still have some worries about the proposed output tariffs for people who have taken maternity leave. The alternative approach, suggested in Part 1, paragraph 62, in which staff who had periods of maternity leave during the assessment period may reduce the number of outputs by one for each discrete period of maternity leave, without penalty in the assessment, seems clearer and more defensible. This does not stop further consideration for complex cases.

There seems to be little case for treating UOAs or main panels differently. Indeed if this were an area where there were divergence of approach, it would undermine the concept of greater uniformity and hence the overall validity of the exercise.

Main panel B criteria and working methods

B3a

Main panel criteria and working methods

The main panel statement achieves an appropriate balance between consistency and allowing for discipline-based differences between the sub-panels.

Disagree

B3b

Please comment on the balance between consistency and allowing for discipline-based differences between the sub-panels within this main panel. Please state the UOA(s) on which you are commenting.

This main panel seems to be the least consistent and the reasons are not fully explained. We give four examples:

Whilst the multi-author exception for Physics is understood the practice is not unique to Physics.

It is not clear why Mathematics should uniquely cross refer all pedagogy submissions to education (what are the characteristics of Mathematics that makes that necessary?). It is not clear why Google Scholar is not more widely used (one Sub-panel 11 only). This seems like a good thing to do, and not just in UOAs under Main Panel B. Similarly there is no obvious reason for the dichotomy over the 100 word descriptors which again seem like a good idea. It would be good if there were more consistency. See also below over cross referral.

B4a

Submissions and units of assessment (Section 1)

Do the UOA descriptor and boundary statements provide a clear and appropriate description of the disciplines covered by the UOAs? Please include any suggestions for refining the descriptors and state which UOA(s) you are commenting on.

Primarily UOA 11 Computer Science and Informatics.

Yes - clear.

B4b

Please comment on the main panel's criteria in relation to multiple submissions in its UOAs. Whilst we welcome the apparent encouragement of collaborative research- we are concerned that the requirement for institutions to have to produce a case for why they are submitting one paper for more than one person in the same UOA will mean that individual institutions will remain risk-averse and as a result very few cases will be submitted. It would be helpful if clear guidance on the grounds by which a case would be accepted could be issued.

B5a

Assessment criteria: outputs (Section 2)

Overall, the main panel criteria relating to outputs are clear and appropriate.

Neither agree or disagree

B5b

Please comment on the criteria in Section 2, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

There is a consistency problem with cross-referred papers, especially between main panels. For instance some will use citation data and others not. In the case of Pedagogic research, institutions have a choice between submitting in the subject UOA or to subpanel 25. In submitting to a given panel they are presumably choosing the assessment methods to be used. Will a panel looking at a cross referred paper use the inherited criteria or its own? (The different behaviour of subpanel 10 with respect to cross-referral to subpanel 25 is potentially inconsistent.)

Both approaches have dangers and it may be best if cross referral is kept to a minimum. It would be better to use the inherited criteria (to avoid the argument that had the institution known it would have submitted something else) but UOA25 may find this onerous and possibly difficult in view of the likely volume of referrals and of philosophical differences.

Accordingly we welcome strongly the decision summarised in Part 2B paragraph 23 that Main Panel B to have at least two sub-panel members or assessors who will have expertise in pedagogy. Such a development could be replicated in all main panels.

B6a

Assessment criteria: impact (Section 3)

Overall, the main panel's criteria relating to impact are appropriate and helpful to institutions in preparing submissions.

Agree

B6b

Please comment on the criteria in Section 3, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

There is likely to be problem of standardisation over impact which this and other panels will have to tackle. There will be an inevitable tendency for subpanels to norm reference and the Main Panel will have to have a very active role in achieving common standards, if indeed this is possible. The same problem exists even more strongly between Main Panels and some early attention to the relative overall impact of Panel and UOA areas is necessary in order to inform this process and avoid bringing the exercise into disrepute.

It would be absurd for the average impact per submitted FTE to be more or less the same in all UOAs but that might happen by default.

B7a

Assessment criteria: environment (Section 4)

Overall, the main panel criteria relating to environment are clear and appropriate.

Strongly Agree

B7b

Please comment on the criteria in Section 4, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

This seems clear.

B8a

Working methods (Section 5)

Overall, the working methods of the main panel and its sub-panels are clear and appropriate.

Agree

B8b

Please comment on the working methods, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

They seem well explained.

Main panel C criteria and working methods

C3a

Main panel criteria and working methods

The main panel statement achieves an appropriate balance between consistency and allowing for discipline-based differences between the sub-panels.

Strongly Agree

C3b

Please comment on the balance between consistency and allowing for discipline-based differences between the sub-panels within this main panel. Please state the UOA(s) on which you are commenting.

Seems to be very consistent with sensible deviations – e.g. the deviation in the timeframe for research leading to impact in UOA C16 Architecture, Built Environment and Planning

C4a

Submissions and units of assessment (Section 1)

Do the UOA descriptor and boundary statements provide a clear and appropriate description of the disciplines covered by the UOAs? Please include any suggestions for refining the descriptors and state which UOA(s) you are commenting on.

Yes

UOA25

ALT is pleased to see that the phrase "ICT" from the previous RAE 2008 description has been changed to "technology enhanced learning". (para 25 bullet 2). This reinforces the equal relationship between technology and learning and avoids using a deprecated and outdated term. We are also pleased to see from paragraph 41 bullet 4 that digital artefacts are within scope.

C4b

Please comment on the main panel's criteria in relation to multiple submissions in its UOAs. Whilst we welcome the apparent encouragement of collaborative research- we are concerned that the requirement for institutions to have to produce a case for why they are submitting one paper for more than one person in the same UOA will mean that individual institutions will remain risk-averse and as a result very few cases will be submitted. It would be helpful if clear guidance on the grounds by which a case would be accepted could be issued.

C5a

Assessment criteria: outputs (Section 2)

Overall, the main panel criteria relating to outputs are clear and appropriate.

Agree

C5b

Please comment on the criteria in Section 2, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

There is a consistency problem with cross-referred papers, especially between main panels. For instance some will use citation data and others not. In the case of Pedagogic research, institutions have a choice between submitting in the subject UOA or to subpanel 25. In submitting to a given panel they are presumably choosing the assessment methods to be used. Will a panel looking at a cross-referred paper use the inherited criteria or its own? Both have dangers and it may be best if cross-referral is kept to a minimum. It would be better to use the inherited criteria (to avoid the argument that had the institution known it would have submitted something else) but UOA25 may find this onerous and possibly difficult in view of the likely volume of referrals and of philosophical differences.

Accordingly we welcome strongly the decision summarised in Part 2B paragraph 23 that Main Panel B will have at least two sub-panel members or assessors who will have expertise in pedagogy. Such a development could be replicated in all main panels.

C6a

Assessment criteria: impact (Section 3)

Overall, the main panel's criteria relating to impact are appropriate and helpful to institutions in preparing submissions.

Neither agree or disagree

C6b

Please comment on the criteria in Section 3, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

There is likely to be problem of standardisation over impact which this and other panels will have to tackle. There will be an inevitable tendency for subpanels to norm reference and the Main Panel will have to have a very active role in achieving common standards, if indeed this is possible. The same problem exists even more strongly between Main Panels and some early attention to the relative overall impact of Panel and UOA areas is necessary in order to inform this process and avoid bringing the exercise into disrepute.

It would be absurd for the average impact per submitted FTE to be more or less the same in all subjects but that might happen by default.

C7a**Assessment criteria: environment (Section 4)**

Overall, the main panel criteria relating to environment are clear and appropriate.

Strongly Agree**C7b**

Please comment on the criteria in Section 4, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

This seems clear

C8a**Working methods (Section 5)**

Overall, the working methods of the main panel and its sub-panels are clear and appropriate.

Neither agree or disagree**C8b**

Please comment on the working methods, in particular on where further clarification is required or where refinements could be made.

The final paragraph (147) is not good as currently phrased. "each sub panel will examine all or virtually all of the outputs submitted in its UOA" gives the impression that some may not be examined at all. Given the rejection of any other data by the main panel, this cannot be right, even if that were the case in the last RAE, in some UOAs.

Presumably it means that all will be examined and that the vast majority will be carefully considered in full. This is not clear from the current phrasing and greater clarity is needed.

In any case it is best to avoid the word "virtually" as its current main meaning is presumably not that intended here.