

Name : A H Rankin

Institution/organisation : Committee of Heads of university Geoscience Departments (CHUGD)

Email : a.rankin@kingston.ac.uk

## Your responses

### 1a

Do you agree that HEFCE should support and protect its strategic priorities through the funding method?

Agree

### 1b

Comments?

-

### 2a

Do you agree with the concept of replacing premiums with targeted allocations that are outside the tolerance band and that address strategic priorities?

Don't know

### 2b

Comments?

-

### 3a

Do you agree that we should develop a consistent national framework for the collection of cost information in accordance with TRAC principles?

Agree

### 3b

Comments?

-

### 4a

Do you agree that we should not change subject weightings in the short term but should look to make more use of costs to inform them?

Agree

### 4b

Comments?

However, some of our members would like HEFCE to revisit this question in the medium term. Also strongly believe that the Geosciences falls within the "vulnerable" subject category and that HEFCE should consult with appropriate professional bodies on this: (See rationale below):

With reference to Section 65-67.

The Geosciences clearly falls within the category of "strategically-important but vulnerable" subjects in HEIs, judging from the steady decline in number of acceptances to courses (and closures) over the past 5 years.

Compared to physics and chemistry, which are often regarded as the epitome of the above category, the vulnerability of the geosciences has been much more acute this year as illustrated by UCAS data on acceptances to courses as of 19 Oct 2005. For Chemistry (F1) and Physics (F3) these are up by 12.5% and 10.3% respectively on last years acceptances, but for Geology (F6) they are down by 2.7% .

The strategic importance of the Geosciences is unquestionable in relation to the increasing needs of natural resource exploration, evaluation and development, waste disposal (including nuclear waste and CO2 sequestration), and our understanding of causes and effects of global warming and natural hazards.

HEFCE should therefore engage with the Geol Soc and the IMMM as well as the Royal Society of Chemistry

**5a**

Do you agree that we should continue to make an assumption about the income from fees in calculating our grants for teaching?

Don't know

**5b**

Comments?

-

**6a**

Do you agree that we should make a fee assumption for full-time undergraduates, in real terms, of £1,750 in 2007-08 and £2,000 in 2008-09?

Don't know

**6b**

Comments?

-

**7a**

Do you agree with our proposal to consider moving in the longer term towards funding on the basis of credit awarded?

Don't know

**7b**

Comments?

-

**8a**

Do you agree with our proposal to reflect the credit awarded to students who are reported as non-completions, for institutions that report module information in their individualised student data returns?

*Not Answered*

**8b**

Comments?

-

**9a**

Do you agree that we should move over time towards funding solely on the basis of HESA and ILR data collected at the end of the year, and cease to use HESES and HEIFES data for funding purposes?

Don't know

**9b**

Comments?

-

**10a**

Do you agree that we should look to provide extra funds to support those most at risk of not being able to afford part-time study?

*Not Answered*

**10b**

Comments?

-

**11a**

Do you agree that we should investigate the possibility of recognising the additional costs incurred by institutions that have a significantly greater proportion than others of students from under-represented groups?

Don't know

**11b**

Comments?

-

**12**

Do you have any further comments?

-