

Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT)

Strategic Dialogue Cycle 2 Assessment of Performance

Background

The *National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030* recommended that a performance-based framework be put in place in higher education. The HEA has used this framework as the vehicle for conducting a process of strategic dialogue with individual institutions, leading to performance compacts with the HEA. These compacts set out institutional KPIs and associated targets, reflecting each institution's mission and contribution to overall national higher education objectives.

The first cycle of strategic dialogue concluded in 2014 with the agreement and publication of institutional compacts, together with a minute of each strategic dialogue meeting. The latter noted areas where progress was expected by the institution in the course of the period covered by the compact.

Performance-based funding was released to all institutions in 2014 on the basis of successful engagement by them with the process. In this the second cycle of strategic dialogue, the focus has shifted towards assessment of performance against agreed outcomes, using the approach set out in the Appendix

Assessment Process

The process of assessment was initiated with the return of a self-evaluation report by each institution. That assessment reviews performance against objectives and targets agreed for achievement by year end 2014 and set out in the performance compact. The assessment considered progress against own institutional objectives and as benchmarked against peer institutions. It was subject to review by members of the HEA Executive with input from external advisors - Mr. John Randall (former CEO UK Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency), Dr Andree Sursock (EUA) and Dr John Hegarty (former Provost of TCD).

A series of bilateral institutional meetings took place over the course of September and October. In advance of each meeting, each institution received a document entitled "Reflections on Performance". This set out feedback under each compact heading and formed the basis of the meeting agenda. A process auditor was present at all bilateral meetings.

Assessment Findings

In assessing performance, we have relied upon the self-evaluation report submitted by your institution, the "Reflections on Performance" document prepared by the HEA and the discussion at our recent strategic dialogue meeting, a minute of which has now been prepared. The aforementioned documentation is now attached.

The self-evaluation report, and subsequent discussion at the bilateral meeting, have demonstrated progress at year end 2014. The HEA welcomes the efforts by all partners working towards the delivery of TU4Dublin. The significant progress to date on common governance and

organisational structures is acknowledged. The significant effort attached to relocation to Grangegorm is also acknowledged.

In addition, DIT can point to efforts to benchmark the institution against comparators internationally. In some parts of the self-evaluation report, however, the self-reflection is lacking and further detail should be provided on internal analysis of performance and how the institution is learning and developing its capacity in this regard.

Some targets in respect of access, participation and lifelong learning have not been met, notably those relating to flexibility of accessing provision and part-time provision. While noting the justification for same in the self-evaluation report, and further comments at the meeting, DIT is advised to keep such targets under review given the central role of the institution in this area and in respect of the differentiated TU mission.

The delay in the implementation of the institution's research action plan has had significant implications in terms of the institution's failure to meet a number of interim targets in this area. DIT also discussed a number of additional environmental factors such as the adverse funding environment, a national decline in PhD numbers and the RGAM weighting attached to research in the IoT sector. In advance of the next cycle of this process, the institution must ensure that sufficient progress has been made in the delivery of this action plan and consider the need to revise targets if appropriate. As noted in the "Reflections" document, a range of measures have been put in place to address this point. DIT has also raised wider issues in relation to funding following the preliminary notification of the outcome of this round.

The institution is requested to reflect on the implementation of the International Strategy and associated metrics to measure its success and consider the need to revise targets if appropriate. As noted in the "Reflections" document, DIT has set out their commitment to address the internationalisation agenda, by reference to a range of measures.

This places DIT in category 2 in the Appendix. The institution is advised to address the above areas as a priority, reframing compact objectives as necessary, to ensure release of performance funding in future cycles.

Issues of general application

In addition to the institution specific issues identified above, the HEA identified the following issues of general application over the course of the bilateral meetings.

- The weakness of benchmarking at institutional, faculty or disciplinary level as a means of setting context for the statement of institutional ambition.
- Objectives should be reviewed to ensure that -
 - they are appropriately linked to overall institutional strategy,
 - they represent a performance stretch in ambition, and
 - they have an appropriate balance between process and outcome.
- There is a need to ensure that institutions are prioritising between the domains of the compact in the light of their institution's particular mission and strengths.

Institutions are required to have regard to these when reporting on 2015 performance in 2016 and in future compact preparation and reporting.

In addition, as discussed at the bilateral meetings, the HEA will further reflect on the future development of the strategic dialogue process. In particular, how the process can foster the setting of higher risk or stretch targets while accepting that not meeting such targets may not represent failure.

Next steps

In addition, all HEIs are invited to review the objectives set out in their compacts, in the light of experience of first year reporting. The review should consider whether:

- Any objective should be re-formulated to “stretch” the HEI more, so as to incentivise continuous improvement;
- Any objective related to the development of process should be redefined to place greater emphasis on the outcomes the process is intended to deliver;
- Any objective should be dropped, to enable resources to be better focussed on objectives which are more mission-oriented;
- Any objective should be modified to reflect significant changes in the environment in which the HEI operates.

Appendix: Progress Against Own Objectives

The performance funding consultation paper, circulated in Autumn 2014, set out three categories of performance. Drawing on this, and with further input from External Advisors recruited under cycle 2, performance is classified as follows:

- Category 1 comprises HEIs which, overall, have performed well against their objectives and have demonstrated excellence in some mission-critical domains.
- Category 2 comprises HEIs whose performance against their objectives is satisfactory overall, with some areas of strong performance. The institution's attention, however, is drawn to issue(s) that need to be addressed to ensure release of performance funding in future cycles.
- Category 3 comprises HEIs whose performance is inadequate to justify drawing down of conditional funding and who must submit a revised plan if they are to "win back" the withheld funding.