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SCOTTISH HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW - second consultation

We would like to contribute to the Review with observations and suggestions in the specific area of the way teaching funding is distributed.

Background
The Association was formed by the six Schools/Departments of Architecture in Scotland 20 years ago. A primary objective has been to foster collaboration between the Schools and improve the education provision. This has prompted a strategic view of the delivery of architectural education. Collaboration led, among others, to the establishment of common standards for the examination that governs entry into the profession of architecture for candidates taking it in Scotland. This was achieved 15 years ago and the United Kingdom has now followed suit in 2002. In the last RAE a number of the schools have been able to improve their results considerably.

The Association regularly looks at the standards of education provision to students in its care. Over recent years we have become concerned that schools have no longer been able to supplement students’ cost of educational materials and equipment and site and study visits related to their educational objectives. As students find these costs rising, schools have to be aware of the barrier this may create in future to the recruitment of students who are less able to raise the finance.

The increasing importance of computer equipment in the production of architecture and in teaching and learning has taken a much larger proportion of resources and forced schools to examine their ability to compete internationally. The quality of estates and equipment levels generally influences schools’ ability to market themselves to overseas students, of whom they have attracted a reasonable proportion. Future strength in this area is important in order to pursue ambitious plans for recruitment of overseas students. When making their case for funding schools find that their institutions limit this to the amount of the grant they receive from SHEFC, regardless of the strength of the individual case that is put forward.

Based on studies available to the Association, we became aware that more detailed information on the cost of providing architectural education was required.

When SHEFC announced their intention to restructure the funding subject groups our Association submitted information to the consultants - JM Consulting Ltd - who reported to SHEFC. The SHEFC consultation rejected the consultants’ proposals and called on organisations participating in further consultation to provide robust evidence. We accepted the challenge and conducted cost studies that are based on the subject
authority, the course delivery pedagogy, a notional cost model and a direct actual cost model. The notional cost model is a method for establishing costs that can be compared throughout subject areas. The actual cost model examines the extent to which the subject is delivered efficiently. When SHEFC drew up the reduced number of funding categories they placed architecture in a funding group, which allocates a price per student that does not meet the costs reflected in the cost studies we had submitted.

Current position
Since that decision was made by SHEFC we have sought to find out what cost comparisons had been made in preparation for its decision and were informed that no other subject area had provided similar evidence, hence the information we had provided had not been taken into account. We do not know what model SHEFC employed when the funding subject categories were reduced and therefore have not been able to avoid the impression that our subject funding requirements are disadvantaged by comparison to other subject areas. At this time SHEFC informs us that we can expect no further adjustment as the time for restructuring has passed.

Proposal for a review of the way teaching funding is distributed, undertaken independently of SHEFC
The Association of Scottish Schools of Architecture believes that SHEFC has not carried out its work adequately in developing a funding mechanism in close partnership with organisations that have made an earnest attempt to contribute relevant evidence. We therefore support the proposal by the Enterprise and Lifelong Learning Committee to review the way teaching funding is distributed, undertaken independently of SHEFC.

We contribute a copy of our submission and cost studies sent to SHEFC’s third consultation in March 2001, which should be examined by an independent review. We suggest the possibility that the methodology we have employed can serve to assist in finding comparable teaching costs by incorporating teaching pedagogy in the assessment of efficient delivery and establish a basis for equitable comparisons between all subject areas.
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Encl:

ASSA’s submission to the SHEFC Review of Teaching Funding – Third Stage Consultation, including cost models for the subject of architecture