Table 1: Forms of accountability reflected in sectoral evaluation of English Higher Education: drawing from Ranson’s typology, 2003: 463-464

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Forms of accountability**  | **NSS/TEF** | **REF** | **Commentary:** |
| *Professional forms of accountability* |
| Professional - based on professional judgement and using specialist knowledge as criterion | Low  | High  | REF: Academic Peer review of research papers forms the most significant proportion of the review. National Student Survey (NSS)/Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF): Evaluation is data-driven (student satisfaction data, employability data, and degree completion statistics).  |
| *Instrumental forms of accountability* |
| Consumer - market competition, consumer responsiveness, consumer choice | High | Medium  | REF: Stakeholder evaluation forms part of impact evaluation. Impact forms 20% component of overall rating and influences renumerative outcomes.NSS/TEF: based largely on student ratings and student outcomes (in employment and degree outcome/completion). |
| Contract - competitive tendering, service efficiency, technical efficiency | Low-Medium  | High  | REF: Ratings inform funding allocations in sectoral funding model.NSS/TEF: Proposed link between TEF ratings and ability to charge higher fees is delayed until 2020. |
| Performative - public inspection, product quality, national standards and targets) | Low-medium | Low-medium | REF: 6-yearly evaluations shaped by broad criteria of originality, rigour and significance as informed by review panels (peer review). TEF: 3-yearly evaluation cycle informed by annual student satisfaction and employability data. |
| Corporate - business plan, control infrastructure, profitability | High  | Medium  | REF: Evaluation based on discipline units of evaluation.NSS/TEF: Evaluation is more centralised and based on data collected at the organisational level.  |