

Research Direction Seminars
Abstracts
Friday 10 December: 12.00 – 13.15

A series of facilitated discussion seminars focusing on selected current research questions in research into higher education

RD1: Displacement in academia: making sense of not fitting

SRHE Network: Academic Practice

Convenors: Jason Davies (UCL), Roberto Di Napoli (Kingston), Ray Land (Durham) [tbc]
David Hay (KCL) [tbc]

It is a commonplace, even clichéd, claim that modern academic life is highly liquid, full of challenges (even chaos) and impacted by the articulation and practice of 'impact', while nonetheless seeking to retain its particular integrity. Common themes -- performance, imagination, creativity, and independent-learning -- span disciplines, which rally and respond in their distinctive ways; there is also substantial literature of what disciplines, interdisciplines and metadisciplines 'are' and how they mutate, as well as a recent tradition of reflecting on what it means to be (an) academic.

In short, there are many contours, objects, contours and signposts in this space. There are maps too: social science studies have made insightful in-roads into academic practice, as culture (e.g. Knorr Cetina) or as system (e.g. Latour). But map is not territory and planning the journey cannot capture what goes on for the traveller. What do they draw on to work with the maps, negotiate the objects and find their own response to the exhortations and necessity enshrined in the signposts?

The Academic Practice Research Directions Seminar seeks to cogently reflect and open debates on these experiences by building on brief evocative biographical exemplars to enquire into what frameworks and values academics and other HE professionals draw on to find coherence in, and seek integrity in adjusting to, challenges, changes and incommensurate demands. Which epistemic 'moves', strategies and tactics make professional displacement something that is tolerable, or an opportunity, a relief or a retreat (and a retreat to what exactly?)

The speakers will give biographical accounts as case studies, musing on questions like: how are we, as academic workers legitimised or delegitimised in our epistemological and ontological practices and journeys? How does the 'nomad academic' nonetheless find a meaningful voice and the confidence to offer authoritative and persuasive arguments at times of increasing forms of control on higher education life, in market and audit-led systems? The seminar will explore implications of these reflections for the future of the University project and the global higher education venture as a whole. We particularly welcome insights into these issues with colleagues from outside the EU.

The paper will end with two formulated questions as topics for discussion.

- Which expectations are being violated in current academic life?
- From which perspective is academic life nonetheless made meaningful?

Reference any key texts as appropriate (to encourage pre reading and facilitate participation)

- Cornford F. (1906) *Microcosmographica Academica*
- Rowland, S. (2002). 'Overcoming fragmentation in professional life: The challenge for academic development'. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(1), 52-64.
- Rowland, S. (2000). *The Enquiring University Teacher*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Rowland, S. (2006). *The Enquiring University: Compliance and contestation in higher education*. Open University Press.

- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner : How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Macfarlane, B. (2004). *Teaching with Integrity: The ethics of higher education practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Macfarlane, B., & Gurlay, L. (2009). 'The Reflection Game: Enacting the penitent self'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(4), 455-459.

RD2 Rethinking the 'non-traditional' student: considerations of construction, classification and identity

SRHE Network: Access and Widening Participation Network

Convenors: Professor Penny-Jane Burke, University of Roehampton
Professor Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University

The concept of the 'non-traditional' student has been part of the discourse of higher education since the movement from 'elite to 'mass' higher education in the late 21st century- in the UK, the USA and Australia in particular and, increasingly, elsewhere. Certain students are deemed to be 'non-traditional', in that they are different from other students by dint of their ethnicity, socio-economic class (SEC), family background, disability, residential location or age. Although there is no standard definition of 'non-traditional', these students are perhaps best known for what they are not - they are not young, male, White, middle-class, able-bodied or living away from home without family dependents. In the policy literature they have also, historically, been regarded as not having aspiration, not being prepared for higher education, not being able to 'stay the course' and not achieving as highly as their peers.

It is certainly true that there are some students who remain underrepresented in HE. In the UK this includes mature and part time learners, those from lower SEC groups, men, and students from specific ethnic minority groups (HEFCE, 2013) In the US , Hispanic and African-America men in particular have much lower participation rates in full-time four year degree programme than other ethnic groups or women (United States Census Bureau, 2011); whilst in Australia, students from low SECs and indigenous students remain much less likely than their wealthier non-indigenous peers to attain a place in higher education (Australian Government, 2013).

In some institutions, however, these 'non-traditional' students have always been the majority: for example ethnic minority students studying in historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) in the US, or part-time learners studying for a degree at the Open University in the UK. In addition, the continued transformation of distance, open, and technology based learning has meant that although campus-based part time learners have fallen adult distance learners are a growing population within higher education. In the US more than third of undergraduate students are over age 25, whilst older adults, including those working full time, alongside ethnic minority students are estimated to make up 85% of the growth in US higher education over the next century both online and on campus (Kamenetz, 2010).

These shifts and the continual reconfigurations of the higher education student population lead to important questions of:

- How and why are students constructed and classified as non/traditional and what do such constructions mean for students' sense of identity as well as for pedagogy and for institutional support?
- Are there new ways of conceptualising students which can and should circumvent such potentially crude polarisations, and how might we this shape new ways of thinking?

This seminar will, therefore, take the form of a reflective conversation exploring the different ways 'non-traditional' is conceptualised internationally, how this idea of the non-traditional has shifted and is continuing to shift (if at all), and how the shifts and changes are shaping policy and practice.

References

Australian Government (2013), The Demand Driven System: Undergraduate Applications and Offers, February 2013. Available at <http://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/undergraduateapplicationsoffers2013.pdf>

HEFCE (2013), Higher Education in England; impact of the 2012 reforms. HEFCE. Available at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/about/introduction/abouttheinengland/impactreport/2013.03.pdf>

Kamenetz, A. (2010). DIY U: Edupunks, edupreneurs, and the coming transformation of higher education. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green

United States Census Bureau (2011a) Educational attainment in the United States: 2011 – detailed tables. Available from: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2011/tables.html>

RD3 Critical perspectives on the digital and ‘the flipped classroom’

SRHE Network: Digital University

Convenors: Dr Lesley Gourlay & Dr Kelly Coate

The notion of ‘the flipped classroom’, although not new, has recently gained prominence in HE learning technologies circles. It is based on the notion that students will learn more effectively and will make better use of contact time if they are exposed to the ‘content’ of the curriculum via self-study in advance of class time, placing the emphasis on collaborative activities when in class.

This notion has been taken up enthusiastically in digital education recently (e.g. Baepler et al 2014) and interest has been growing in applying the concept to higher education (e.g. Chen et al 2014, Kim et al 2014). However, arguably it has tended to be discussed in relatively unexamined terms as an unproblematic ‘good’.

Now that it is a term starting to appear in Learning and Teaching Strategies in universities, it seems appropriate to question some of its basic assumptions. Is it, for instance, more suitable to certain subject areas than others, given that ‘flipping’ has arguably been the pedagogy employed in humanities classrooms for many years? If the dominant mode of content delivery in the flipped classroom is a video recorded lecture, is it simply shifting didactic modes of teaching online rather than fundamentally changing the ways we teach?

Facilitated by speakers from the Digital University strand at the conference, this seminar will provide an opportunity to apply critical perspectives to this concept. In particular we will encourage discussion on the following questions:

- What assumptions and ideologies underpin the notion of the ‘flipped classroom’ and do they stand up to critical scrutiny?
- How should HE researchers respond to this in a theorised and evidenced way in order to inform practice and research?

References

Baepler, P., Walker, J. and Driessen, M. 2014. It’s not about seat time: blending, flipping and efficiency in active learning classrooms. *Computers and Education* 78, 227-236.

Chen, Y., Wang, Y., Kinshuk and Chen, N. 2014. Is FLIP enough? Or should we use the FLIPPED model instead? *Computers and Education* 79, 16-27.

Kim, M., Kim, S., Khera, O. and Getman, J. 2014. The experience of three flipped classrooms in an urban university: an exploration of design principles. *Internet and Higher Education* 22,37-50.

RD4 Enterprise, Innovation, Research, and the Economy

SRHE Network: Employability, Enterprise and Work based Learning Network

Convenors: Professor Helen Higson
Dr Richard Blackwell

Contributor: Tobias Nolting, Baden-Wuerttemberg Cooperative State University
Mannheim, Germany

In the past 18 months the Network has focussed particularly on graduate skills and employability and the role of work experience and work-based learning. In the next period we propose to shift the spotlight to 'enterprise'. Of course in practice there is a strong relationship between the two domains, especially where the emphasis is on specifically 'student' enterprise. This was recently underlined by the UK's Quality Assurance Agency in their guidance on enterprise (2012), which advocated embedding of student enterprise into the curriculum. Defined in terms of the ability to develop creative ideas and apply them practically, including through self-employment, it defines a range of skills that overlaps with what elsewhere might be called 'employability skills' (e.g. problem solving, taking initiative, personal effectiveness). For some indeed, embedding student enterprise in this way forms a key part of employability strategy.

Another definition of enterprise focusses on employer engagement and the application of existing ideas and knowledge to promote growth and productivity gains in employment. In conventional thinking enterprise is distinguished from 'innovation,' which involves the generation and application of new ideas and creation of intellectual property. The latter is more closely aligned with research and research intensive activity. It has recently been argued by Mayhew and Keep amongst others that enterprise is more relevant to most of the economy and is affected by the effectiveness of graduate 'utilisation' and the scope for workplace, bottom-up, change. Schemes such as some graduate internships and graduate associates working on Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTP) could be seen as at least partial acknowledgement of this potential role. But with many graduates in non-graduate jobs, there may be scope for greater impact through job re-design and less hierarchical management that engage graduate workers locally. .

The focus of our discussion will therefore be:

- the nature and contribution of student enterprise, per se, and, second, its contribution to employability (and indeed other) strategies and practice.
- the extent to which graduates constitute a key input to the growth aspirations of organisations and local, regional and national agencies and how those inputs may be deployed to maximum mutual benefit.
- the role of graduates in science, innovation and enterprise policy

RD5: Policy, Research and the Persistence of Inequalities in the Academic Workforce

SRHE Network: Higher Education Policy

Convenor/Facilitator: Professor Carole Leathwood

Contributing speakers: Dr. Sarah Jane Aiston, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Dr. Pauline Reynolds, University of Redlands, USA
Emmanuel Mogaji, University of Bedfordshire, UK

In 1974, Adrienne Rich wrote:

The university is above all a hierarchy. At the top is a small cluster of highly paid and prestigious persons, chiefly men, whose careers entail the services of a very large base of ill-paid or unpaid persons, chiefly women: wives, research assistants, secretaries, teaching assistants, cleaning women, waitresses in the faculty club, lower-echelon administrators, and women students who are used in various ways to gratify the ego. (Rich 1980, p. 136)

Whilst Rich wrote this piece in 1974, I suspect that many will recognise not too dissimilar patterns in universities across the world today. Despite the considerable increase in participation of women students in many countries, this has not been matched by a similar increase in the proportion of women in more senior academic and leadership positions in universities (Leathwood and Read 2009, Morley 2013). The hierarchy Rich referred to also, of course, reflects other inequalities, with those from higher socio-economic and majority ethnic backgrounds also dominating the most prestigious positions, and those from lower socio-economic and minority ethnic groups far more likely to occupy posts lower down the hierarchy. So this seminar will be an opportunity to put inequalities in the higher education workforce on to the HE policy and research agendas. Questions for the discussion include:

- In what ways have higher education policy trends, developments and initiatives contributed to the persistence and/or the mitigation of inequalities in the HE workforce?
- What contributions has higher education research made to understanding the persistence of these inequalities?
- What additional research is needed?

The seminar will begin with short 5 minute contributions from each of the contributing speakers, followed by small group discussions and a final plenary session. The aim is to maximize debate and enable all participants to actively contribute to what promises to be an important and stimulating session. Delegates are encouraged to bring knowledge of research and experience from their own national/local contexts to contribute to the debate.

RD6 Doctoral Assessment: International, inter-institutional, inter-disciplinary and inter-genres comparability, equivalence and quality assurance

SRHE Network: Postgraduate Issues Network

Convenors: Professor Pam Denicolo, Dr Julie Reeves, Dr Martin Gough, Dr Richard Race

“The Dublin Descriptors are the cycle descriptors (or "level descriptors") presented in 2003 and adopted in 2005 as the Qualifications Framework of the European Higher Education Area. They offer generic statements of typical expectations of achievements and abilities associated with awards that represent the end of each of a (Bologna) cycle or level. “ Source: Bologna Working Group. (2005)

Since 2005 and the publication of the Dublin Descriptors of the third cycle of postgraduate education (the doctoral level), organisations and researchers across the world have explored the conundrum of examining what are essentially individual, unique research outputs, while simultaneously assuming commonality of standard.

The selected references below give an indication of the breadth of discussion, key issues and concerns arising globally. For instance, Morley, Leonard and David (2002) reviewed variation in the British viva while Tinkler and Jackson (2004) explored the examination process in the UK, producing a handbook for students, examiners and supervisors. In the southern hemisphere, the assessment processes used by experienced examiners in Australia were delineated by Mullins and Kiley in 2002 and Holbrook et al (2004) investigated examination reports. In 2008 Carter provided a discussion about the examination of the thesis in New Zealand and then Bourke and Holbrook (2013) continued to explore PhD and Masters assessment in Australia.

The US Council of Graduate Schools annually convenes a global summit on higher education. The 2010 Summit addressed specific types of quantitative and qualitative measurement designed to improve the quality and assess the outcomes of (post)-graduate education and research.

Recent publications include a review of the dynamic state of doctoral education world-wide (Nerad and Evans 2014) while an international conference run by UKCGE focussed on a range of developments in doctoral education and training including the assessment of professional doctorates (see the publication UKCGE 2014).

This Research Directions Seminar will provide an opportunity for participants to debate the implications from these international developments, focussing on two issues.

1. Is it possible to have global equivalence and comparability between doctorates from diverse backgrounds and sources (Slater, 2013; Stubb et al, 2014) whilst retaining their essential uniqueness?
2. How can examiners be prepared so that they can meet the quality assurance demands of global equivalence?

References

Bologna Working Group. (2005) *A Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area*. Bologna Working Group Report on Qualifications Frameworks (Copenhagen, Danish Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation). Includes Dublin Descriptors

Bourke, S & Holbrook, AP (2013) Examining PhD and Masters Theses, in *Assessment and evaluation in HE* vol 38 no 4 407-416

- Carter, S. (2008) Examining the Doctoral Thesis: A discussion, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, Vol.45, Issue 4, 365-374
- Holbrook, A. Bourke, S. Lovat, T, and Dally, K. (2004) Investigating PhD thesis examination reports, *International Journal of Educational Research* 41 (2) 98-120
- Morley, L. Leonard, D. and David, M. (2002) Variations in vivas: quality and equality in British PhD assessments, *Studies in Higher Education*, 27 (3) 263-273
- Mullins, G. and Kiley, M. (2002) 'It's a PhD, not a Nobel Prize': how experienced examiners assess research theses, *Studies in Higher Education*, 27 (4) 369-386
- Nerad, M. and Evans, B. (Eds.) (2014) *Globalisation and its impact on the quality of PhD education*, Rotterdam: Sense
- Slater, D.W. (2013) One university's approach to defining and supporting professional doctorates, *Studies in Higher Education*, 38, 8, 1175-1184.
- Stubb, J., Pyhalto, K., Lonka, K. (2014) Conceptions of research: the doctoral student experience in three domains, *Studies in Higher Education*, 39, 2, 251-264.
- Tinkler, P and Jackson, C. (2004) *The doctoral examination process*, Maidenhead: SRHE/Open University Press
- UKCGE (2014) International Conference on Developments in Doctoral Education and Training: conference proceedings, Litchfield: UKCGE
- US Council of Graduate Schools. (2010, September 13–15). *Principles and practices for assessing the quality of (post)graduate education and research training*. Presentation at the Strategic Leaders Global Summit, Brisbane, Australia.
www.cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Principles_and_Practices_Brisbane_2010.pdf (Retrieved 04 October 2014)

RD7 Increasing equity and better life chances? Perspectives on opening up higher education to under-served groups through vocational routes into and through higher education

SRHE Network: Post-Compulsory and Higher Education Network

Convenors: Professor Ann-Marie Bathmaker and Professor Yvonne Hillier

Invited contributors

Professor Jill Jameson, University of Greenwich, England UK

Hugh Joslin, University of Greenwich, England UK

Associate Professor Sylvie Lamoureux, University of Ottawa, Ontario Canada

Professor Ines Langemeyer, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

Dr Arti Saraswat, University of East London, England UK

Professor Sue Webb, Monash University, Melbourne Australia

Abstract

What work is diversification doing across different countries to enable the participation of under-served and disadvantaged students in HE provision?

HE across the globe involves increasingly diversified provision for an increasingly diverse student body. HE is no longer a pathway available only to students who have followed an academic route, and who continue on to a full-time academic-oriented undergraduate programme of study. Yet the latter remains the “gold standard” experience in numerous countries, even though an increasing number of students enter HE through vocational routes, and study vocationally-oriented forms of HE in a range of institutions, not just in universities. In this seminar we invite participants to discuss different practices and experiences of diversification across different countries.

What do recent and current developments and trends involve?

Do they focus on particular students – such as apprentices moving into HE, adult learners, indigenous populations, vocational students, learners from working-class backgrounds.

Are opportunities opening up or closing down?

What factors are shaping recent developments?

How should we understand different examples of diversification in relation to equity and better life chances?

References

Reference any key texts as appropriate (to encourage pre reading and facilitate participation)

Two questions for discussion

Are opportunities to study in higher education opening up or closing down for potential students from under-served and diverse backgrounds, particularly those with vocational qualifications?

How should we understand different examples of diversified provision in relation to equity and better life chances?

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Hugh Joslin is working on a series of projects that examine the progression of apprentices into Higher Education and the progression to higher education of FE students in England.
<http://www2.gre.ac.uk/about/faculty/eduhea/research/centres/cle/research/hiveped>

Professor Sylvie Lamoureux has a particular interest in access to and student experience of postsecondary education for Ontario's French language minority population. She will help to set the scene with an overview of current concerns regarding equity and disadvantaged groups in Canada, and Ontario in particular.
[Reference to publication/report to follow on 20.10.14](#)

Professor Ines Langemeyer conducts research in the field of inquiry-based and research-oriented teaching and learning in HE, lifelong learning and continuing education, particularly focusing on work-related and workplace learning. She will provide an overview of equity of opportunities for disadvantaged groups in Germany in relation to HE and professional education.
<http://lehr-lernforschung.org/>

Dr Arti Saraswat has recently completed a study on part-time college HE in England. Part-time HE is known to attract 'non-traditional' learners and College HE is distinctive in terms of its vocational and sub-degree provision. Arti will share some insights on the decline in participation in part time College HE in England.

Professor Sue Webb will identify current issues in Australia, drawing on her recently completed research on geography, place and participation in regional and rural Victoria and South Australia, which identifies the important role of VET routes to HE for low SES for those outside metropolitan centres, and research on the challenges for transitions from VET to HE associated with mismatches between TAFE/HE learning and assessment cultures.
Webb, S. (2014) Geographical dimensions of imagined futures: post school participation in education and work in peri-urban and regional Australia. <http://avetra.org.au/publications/conference-archives/conference-archives-2014>.
Webb, S. *Vocational Pathways to University* <http://sellen.org.au/resource-vault/>
Webb, S., Black, R., Morton, R., Plowright, S., and Roy, R. (2014 in press) *Geographical and place dimensions of post-school participation in education and work*, Adelaide, NCVET.

RD8 New universities? Reconstituting Higher Education as part of a Social Economy

SRHE Network: Southwest Higher Education Network

Convenor: Dr Lisa Lucas, University of Bristol

Presenter: Professor Rebecca Boden, Roehampton University

Globally, universities are becoming increasingly privatised, corporatised or marketised, often emulating aspects of the ownership, control, governance, organisational and financial forms of private and for-profit firms. The starting point of this research seminar will be to explore the extent to which these evolving university forms are neutral and benign, paying particular attention to the effects of such corporate forms in higher education on teaching and research. There are demonstrated effects on students' participation and their learning experience as programmes are commoditised, credentialised and monetised. In terms of research the drive for market alignment and the pursuit of income may be distorting the determination of what constitutes knowledge.

Building on this context, the main thrust of this seminar will be to identify and explore possible heterodox organisational forms that might be adopted by and adapted into higher education institutions from the social economy (Boden et al, 2012). Social economy organisations, such as co-operatives or labour benefit organisations such as the John Lewis Partnership, prioritise not profit or income, but a defined social purpose. As such, they are usually collectively owned or controlled, are intensively democratically governed, and tend to avoid managerialisation whilst effectively managing their finances to achieve their social purpose (Neary & Winn, 2012). Mondragon University in Spain offers an exemplar of a university run as a workers' co-operative. Heterodox university forms based on social economy models, such as co-operatives, may offer ways of re-embedding social equity in university education and facilitating knowledge production for collective good rather than private profit. This will be one of our topics of discussion.

Finally, this research seminar will seek to address how the routes to such heterodox universities forms might look - be that the reconstitution of existing institutions or the formation of new ones

Questions to Address:

1. In what ways do current corporatised forms of university ownership, control, governance, finance and organisation impact upon the capacity of HEIs to generate new knowledge and promote social justice in education?
2. What range of models exist, inside and outside the HE sector, that might be adopted and adapted for heterodox university forms?
3. What are the specific barriers to the transformation of universities to more heterodox forms?

References

Boden R, Ciancanelli, P and Wright S, (2012) The Trust universities: Governance for post-capitalist futures, *Journal of Co-operative Studies*, 45, 2: 16-24.

Neary, M. & Winn, J. (2012) Open education: common(s), commonism and the new common wealth, *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, 12, 4: 406-422

RD9 International topics in researching the quality of the student experience

SRHE Network: Student Experience Network

Convenors: Camille Kandiko Howson (presenting)
Matthew Cheeseman (in spiritu)

Contributors: Madeleine Kapinga Mutatayi, from Congo DRC, Kinshasa, Phd student at Department of Educational Sciences Center for Instructional Psychology and Technology at KU Leuven, Belgium

Dr Johanna Annala, Senior Lecturer, School of Education, University of Tampere, Finland

The Student Experience is growing in importance around the world (Barber 2013), whilst at the same time decreasing in common understanding, shared definitions and research coherence. This may be due to variety of foci of research into the student experience, including:

- Curricular (learning gains, assessments, breadth and depth) (Douglass et al 2012; Crosling et al 2008)
- Co-curricular (additional opportunities, such as community engagement, study abroad, and industry collaboration and employability) (Mourshed et al 2012)
- Extra-curricular (accommodation, lifestyle, sports, societies, politics) (Thomas 2012; UNITE 2014)

These levels are then further compounded by levels of analysis, including individual, group (such as minority groups and international students), institutional (on topics such as governance, engagement and satisfaction), and inter/national (such as access, progression, labour market and rankings).

Following the paradox of globalisation, and as countries around the world position higher education in society (such as dropping tuition fees in Germany and dramatically increasing them in the UK), what key issues about the student experience are of relevance across higher education research, beyond national politics and policies?

This seminar will present a brief summary of some current research in this area, along with a summary of events held through the Student Experience Network over the last year. Opportunities for collaboration and participation with the Network will be discussed, ideas for future events—particularly internationally, as well as exploring areas for research.

Two formulated questions as topics for discussion.

1. What research questions are not being asked about the student experience?
2. What research and evidence could promote productive, effective educational models of higher education?
3.
 - Barber, M., Donnelly, K., and Rizvi, S. (2013) *An Avalanche is coming: Higher Education and the Revolution Ahead*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research
 - Crosling, G., Thomas, L. and Heaney, M. (2008) *Improving Student Retention in Higher Education- The role of teaching and learning*, London: Routledge
 - Douglass, J. A., Thomson, G., & Zhao, C. M. (2012). The learning outcomes race: the value of self-reported gains in large research universities. *Higher Education*, 64(3), 317-335.
 - Staddon, E., & Standish, P. (2012). Improving the student experience. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 46(4), 631–648.
 - Mourshed, M., Farrell, D. And Barton, D. (2012) *Education to Employment: Designing a System that Works*, Washington, DC: McKinsey Center for Government
 - Thomas, L. (2012) *Building student engagement and belonging in Higher Education at a time of change: a summary of findings and recommendations from the What Works? Student Retention & Success programme*, London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation

- *UNITE (2014) Living and Learning in 2034- A higher education futures project, University Alliance and UNITE.*