

January 2008/01

This document gives the outcomes of OFFA's annual monitoring of access agreements for 2006-07.

Access agreement monitoring

Outcomes for 2006-07

Alternative formats

This publication can be downloaded from the OFFA web-site (www.offa.org.uk) under 'Publications'. For readers without access to the internet, we can also supply it on 3.5" disk or in large print. Please call 0117 931 7171 for alternative format versions.

© OFFA 2008

The copyright for this publication is held by the Office for Fair Access (OFFA). The material may be copied or reproduced provided that the source is acknowledged and the material, wholly or in part, is not used for commercial gain. Use of the material for commercial gain requires the prior written permission of OFFA.



Foreword

In September 2006 we saw one of the most significant changes to the higher education (HE) landscape in many years - the introduction of variable tuition fees together with the creation of a generous support package on an unprecedented scale.

It will be the job of an independent commission in 2009 to assess the full impact of this new regime. In the meantime, we are able to report on how well institutions have lived up to the commitments in their access agreements in the first year.

I am delighted to say that many of the headline results are very encouraging. Institutions have spent more than a quarter of their increased fee income on access measures - almost £96 million on bursaries and around £20 million on additional outreach. An estimated 70,000 students from lower-income backgrounds have received bursaries and every student who has applied for a bursary through the correct channels has received one.

This is a superb effort and demonstrates the commitment by the sector to making sure that no student is deterred from HE on financial grounds.

But, as one might expect when implementing a financial support package on such a large scale, there have been some teething problems. In particular, research suggests that low awareness of bursaries and scholarships amongst some young people is still an issue. It was surprising to see a significant number of students fail to apply for bursaries, or consent to share their financial information with their institution, resulting in lower than expected bursary take-up. According to the latest data from the Student Loans Company (SLC), perhaps 12,000 students on full state support have failed to collect their bursaries. Many institutions have made strenuous efforts to increase take-up by improving their bursary awareness campaigns. Where we feel that institutions could have been more proactive, we have written to them asking them to take steps to remedy the situation.

Looking to the future, we must learn from our experiences to further improve and develop the operational mechanisms used to deliver financial packages. In particular, I expect to see continued efforts from institutions to reach and influence under-represented groups, so maximizing the number of eligible students that claim the financial support to which they are entitled. As we move into 2008, we will see new financial support schemes for 2008-09 entrants running alongside schemes for existing students, so the clarity, timeliness and accessibility of financial information will be more important than ever. OFFA will continue to work with institutions and other sector organisations to develop good practice so that access agreements support widening participation and fair access as effectively as possible.



But, all in all, this report shows that the sector has made a really good start and I am confident we can build on this in future years.



Sir Martin Harris
Director of OFFA

Access agreement monitoring outcomes for 2006-07

To	Heads of higher education institutions in England
Of interest to those responsible for	Implementation of access agreements, Widening Participation, Finance
Reference	2008/01
Publication date	January 2008
Enquiries to	Jean Arnold Operations and Research Manager jean.arnold@offa.org.uk 0117 931 7171

Executive summary

1. As a regulator, the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) has a responsibility to ensure that universities and colleges are meeting their commitments to individual students and are moving towards the milestones and legal obligations set out in their access agreements.
2. This report gives an overview of the progress made in the first year of operation under the new student finance arrangements. It is based on the response from institutions to our monitoring requirements - set out in the document 'Access agreement monitoring 2006-07' (OFFA 2007/01). Covering estimated and actual expenditure on financial support for lower income students, bursary take-up and additional outreach, it contains strong evidence that the higher education (HE) sector is meeting its obligations and that progress is being made to promote and safeguard fair access to HE for under-represented groups.

Background

3. The Office for Fair Access was established under the Higher Education Act 2004. Our role is to safeguard and promote fair access to higher education by regulating the charging of variable tuition fees through the approval and monitoring of access agreements.

4. An access agreement shows the fee limits an institution has established, its plans for bursaries and other financial support for lower income students and other under-represented groups, and, in some cases, additional outreach work. It also sets out the milestones and objectives the institution will use to monitor its progress in improving access.

5. When institutions draw up their access agreements, they are also asked to provide estimates of the additional fee income they expect to receive and their estimated expenditure on access measures.

Monitoring requirements

6. There is a legal requirement for institutions with an approved OFFA access agreement to inform us about the extent to which they have met their obligations, and to report on their progress against their objectives and milestones. Full details of our monitoring requirements can be found in the document 'Access agreement monitoring 2006-07' (OFFA 2007/01), which was published in March 2007.

7. Institutions were asked to provide a financial return on:

- additional fee income
- actual expenditure on financial support to lower income students and other under-represented groups, and any additional outreach activities covered in their access agreement.

8. Institutions were also asked to provide:

- an explanation where actual expenditure was more than 10 per cent below their original estimate
- a report on bursary take-up where there appeared to be a significant difference between the number of eligible students and the number of bursary awards paid

- a report on their progress against the objectives and milestones they have set themselves

9. The statistics outlined in this report relate to higher education institutions (HEIs) only. The numbers of students in further education colleges (FECs) and school centred initial teacher training providers (SCITTs) are often very small and relatively minor changes in student numbers can have a dramatic effect on the figures. For this reason we have included figures for FECs and SCITTs in the overall data but have not provided any detailed commentary.

Financial return

10. **Annex A** shows figures for actual and estimated income and expenditure on financial support for lower income students, and additional outreach. **The figures show that overall there is relatively little difference between the proportions of predicted and actual expenditure as a proportion of additional fee income.**

11. It was originally estimated that approximately £115 million would be spent on financial support, representing just over 25 per cent of additional fee income. The actual figure is almost £96 million which is just over 21 per cent.

12. It was originally estimated that £25 million would be spent on additional outreach, representing over 5 per cent of additional income. The actual figure is over £20 million which is just under 5 per cent.

13. Amongst individual institutions there is a wide range of differences in both predicted fee income, and also expenditure on financial support and/or outreach both above and below original forecasts.

Expenditure on financial support for lower income students

14. The graph at **Annex B** illustrates the actual expenditure on financial support as a proportion of predicted expenditure. In summary the figures for HEIs (excluding specialist or small¹ institutions) show that compared to original forecasts:

- 33 per cent (32 HEIs) spent 100 per cent or more than they predicted
- 8 per cent (8 HEIs) spent between 90 and 100 per cent of their predicted expenditure
- 58 per cent (56 HEIs) spent below 90 per cent of their predicted expenditure.

15. The predicted and actual proportions of additional fee income spent on financial support for lower income students are shown at **Annex C**. The amounts of expenditure are shown at **Annex D**.

16. The figures in Annexes C and D demonstrate that forecasting has been extremely difficult for institutions. The majority of bursary schemes were based on the household income thresholds for

eligibility for state support. At the time institutions were calculating their likely expenditure, these thresholds were increased by the Government, resulting in a lack of accurate data about the potential number of eligible students.

17. Forecasting has been particularly difficult for small specialist institutions where only slight variations in the number of eligible students have had a large impact on expenditure. (Of the ten institutions with the largest negative percentage variance, six are small or specialist institutions.)

18. We have always been clear that the expenditure levels set out in access agreements and the original financial returns were estimates based on assumptions of student profiles and that we would be flexible in our assessment of any differences between estimated and actual expenditure.

HEI reporting on expenditure on financial support

19. The main reason given by HEIs to account for the differences between estimated and actual expenditure, was an over estimation of the number of students who would be eligible for bursaries. With a lack of information on which to base estimates, many institutions sensibly forecast the maximum amount of expenditure for budgeting purposes so that all students entitled to receive a bursary would be able to do so.

20. Estimates also included an element of scholarship expenditure relating to lower income students. Because of the additional criteria attached to such awards it was difficult for institutions to accurately forecast how many of these discretionary awards might be taken up. For example some HEIs reported fewer students than anticipated meeting the academic standard required for a scholarship.

21. Many institutions also reported a larger number of deferred and transferring students than originally forecast, and in some cases higher than expected withdrawal rates resulting in fewer students being eligible for a bursary.

¹ Institutions with an additional fee income of under or around £1m

22. Another reason for the difference between estimated and actual expenditure is that some of the expenditure in the original financial returns was not 'countable' by OFFA. For example, some institutions offering bursaries to all students had included all expenditure in their original financial return, rather than just the expenditure relating to lower income students.

Our conclusions on financial support

23. Whilst expenditure on financial support has not been as high as estimated we are satisfied that institutions have met the commitments in their access agreements.

24. We acknowledge that a significant part of the 'shortfall' between original estimates and actual expenditure is a result of inaccurate forecasting of the numbers of eligible students.

25. In some cases there was underspend on scholarships. As these awards are entirely discretionary this is not an issue for OFFA.

26. We have provided institutions with an opportunity to revise financial estimates now that better data is available from the Student Loans Company (SLC) and we hope that in year two of the new arrangements we will see less difference between forecasts and actual expenditure.

27. However, there has also been an issue with bursary take-up which has contributed to a certain level of underspend. This is dealt with later in the report.

Expenditure on outreach

28. The predicted and actual amounts spent on outreach are shown at Annex E.

29. In summary the figures² for HEIs show that compared to original forecasts:

- 40 per cent (44 HEIs) spent 100 per cent or more than they predicted

- 17 per cent (19 HEIs) spent between 90 and 99 per cent of their predicted expenditure
- 34 per cent (38 HEIs) spent below 90 per cent of their predicted expenditure
- 8 per cent (8 HEIs) reported no expenditure.

HEI reporting on outreach

30. The majority of HEIs exceeded or broadly met their expenditure forecasts for outreach. Where expenditure was less than forecast several institutions reported having met planned levels of activities at a lower cost.

31. Other reasons given by HEIs to account for differences in outreach expenditure include:

- delays in recruiting additional staff with knock-on effects for additional activities and expenditure
- achieving planned levels of activity but being unable to disaggregate the level of expenditure that came from additional fee income
- reducing the level of expenditure to reflect a lower than expected income
- changes to other central sources of funding - for example, Lifelong Learning Networks - which meant that all, or an element of, expenditure from additional fee income was no longer necessary to meet planned activity
- including expenditure in their original financial returns that was not 'countable' by OFFA.

Our conclusions on expenditure on outreach

32. We have always been clear that institutions should be able to manage their outreach plans flexibly. We are satisfied that even where expenditure has been lower than predicted institutions have still met, or have made good progress towards, their outreach objectives.

² Percentages exclude HEIs that did not estimate additional expenditure on outreach

33. Where a shortfall in expenditure is due to delays in staffing or the start of activities, it is expected that expenditure will normally meet predicted levels in future years.

34. Where institutions were unable to disaggregate the level of outreach expenditure that came from additional fee income, we have written to them to ensure that for future monitoring they have an appropriate method for reporting and that they re-visit their outreach plans within access agreements, adjusting expenditure figures as appropriate.

Bursary take-up

35. Despite the efforts of institutions and others to ensure both the clarity and accessibility of financial support during the first year of implementation some students still failed to collect the institutional bursary to which they were entitled.

36. The majority (70 per cent) of HEIs use the Higher Education Bursary and Scholarship Scheme (HEBSS) run by the SLC to distribute their bursary and scholarship awards. Some eligible students, or their parents, did not tick the appropriate box on the SLC application form giving SLC permission to share information about their assessed household income with their university or college. As the majority of bursaries are means-tested, this information is critical if institutions are to distribute bursaries to all those entitled to receive them.

37. Initial data provided by the SLC for subscribers to the HEBSS service suggests that in 2006-07 as many as 12,000 students³ assessed by their Local Authority as eligible for a full Higher Education Maintenance Grant - and therefore eligible for a bursary - did not consent to share information.

38. The issue of bursary take-up is not limited to institutions subscribed to HEBSS. Non-HEBSS institutions also believe it is one of the reasons why their expenditure is lower than predicted. However they have no firm evidence for this belief as they were unable to accurately calculate the number of students eligible to receive a bursary.

39. There is also evidence from institutions that provided bursaries to all students without a means test that some students still failed to collect their entitlement. This suggests a continued lack of awareness of bursaries and/or unwillingness to apply for this additional support.

HEI reporting on take-up

40. The extent to which institutions have identified and proactively managed the take-up/consent to share issues has varied. Within access agreements all institutions set out their plans to publicise bursaries to prospective students. Once it was clear that there

was an issue with take-up, many institutions made significant efforts to build on their initial bursary marketing campaigns in order to raise student awareness. Additional measures included:

- multiple emails to students reminding them of the eligibility criteria for bursaries and consent to share issues
- poster campaigns run in conjunction with Students Unions
- letters to students' home addresses
- leaflets in pigeon holes
- pop-ups on the intranet
- reminders through course representatives.

41. Some institutions went further and were able to identify and target students who might be eligible for a bursary to remind them to consent to share. Strategies that appear to have been more successful than average include:

- contacting any students that did not appear on the HEBSS portal
- setting up help desks at registration to check the Local Authority notification and where this indicated receipt of a grant checking that the student had applied for a bursary/consented to share
- targeting students who appeared on the HEBSS portal whose parents had not consented to share information.

Our conclusions on bursary take-up

42. All institutions have met their commitments to individual students who have applied for a bursary and have provided their financial details through the appropriate channels.

43. The issue of bursary take-up and consent to share, and an apparent continued lack of awareness of bursary arrangements in some quarters, highlights the importance of clear

³ This figure relates to students entitled to the full Higher Education Maintenance Grant only. It does not include PGCE, ITT or Scottish students. It may also include students who have subsequently withdrawn. It should be treated as indicative only.

information about finance and raises the issue of how to ensure that as many students as possible access the financial support to which they are entitled.

44. HEIs will wish to ensure that greater efforts are made across the sector for 2007-08 and beyond. The first year of operation has been an exceptional one, but in future we will expect a tighter management of take-up and consent to share issues. We have written to institutions where there has been a significant difference between the estimated and actual expenditure and:

- efforts to raise student awareness appear to have been limited and/or
- bursary take-up/consent to share does not appear to have been actively managed or identified as an issue.

45. In these cases we expect institutions to consider making bursary payments available retrospectively to any student who can prove that they would have been eligible for a bursary in 2006-07 but who failed to apply/consent to share.

46. For institutions in the information-only⁴ service, or not in HEBSS, it is important that management systems allow institutions to monitor likely student take-up of bursaries. In future, we will ask for more evidence of how this has been managed.

47. We also expect all institutions to publicise bursary schemes and undertake awareness raising activity at enrolment and during the academic year as well as at application and pre-enrolment stage.

48. The SLC will be conducting telephone interviews with students who failed to consent to share to gain a better understanding of the issues. We will also develop good practice guidelines on take-up to assist institutions with their efforts.

⁴ The information only service provides institutions with the information on a student's assessed household income but the institution makes the bursary payment.

Milestones

49. Institutions set their own milestones and objectives to monitor their progress in improving access so the range of milestones and objectives is extremely varied. The majority (76 per cent) of HEIs are using the Higher Education Statistics Agency's published Performance Indicators (www.hesa.ac.uk) as part of their milestones. Some 24 per cent are using HESA data exclusively. A smaller number of institutions are relying on application data or the number of students entitled to a bursary.

50. Beyond this, milestones include a diverse range of objectives based on outreach activities or establishing new processes. For example, many institutions have set themselves objectives such as filling new finance or bursary officer posts, and timely publicity of bursary schemes.

HEI reporting on milestones

51. The HESA data relating to the impact of measures under the access agreements in year one (2006-07) will not be available until 2008. Institutions have therefore not reported on this aspect in their monitoring returns this year.

52. Institutions have reported good progress on achieving their outreach and process-based milestones. The majority say they have carried out planned activities, or that progress has been made. Where planned activities have not taken place this is largely due to delays in recruiting staff or because it was decided that other activities would be more appropriate.

54. Institutions will want to understand and closely monitor the impact of their bursary schemes and other access measures. Monitoring of access agreements is an annual process and we expect institutions to be able to provide a more detailed report on progress with milestones next year (2008).

Our conclusions on milestones

53. It was always likely that progress with milestones in the first year of operation - especially given the reliance on HESA data - would be difficult to report on. It is encouraging that following a dip in applications for 2006, the UCAS data shows there has been a significant increase in those seeking entry to HE in 2007. This includes a proportional increase in those applying from lower socio-economic groups.

Annex A

Additional fee income and expenditure on financial support for lower income students and additional outreach

Additional fee income

	Predicted £000	Actual £000
HEIs	454,819	448,449
FECs	11,522	6,469
SCITTs	1,466	1,351
Total	467,807	456,269

Expenditure on financial support for lower income students

	Predicted £000	Actual £000
HEIs	115,160	95,837
FECs	4,301	2,792
SCITTs	212	99
Total	119,673	98,728

Expenditure on financial support as a proportion of additional income

	Predicted %	Actual %
HEIs	25.32	21.37
Total (sector)	25.58	21.64

Expenditure on additional outreach

	Predicted £	Actual £
HEIs	25,093	20,674
FECs	722	518
SCITTs	149	93
Total	25,964	21,285

Expenditure on outreach as a proportion of additional income


	Predicted %	Actual %
HEIs	5.52	4.61
Total	5.55	4.67

Notes

1. Additional fee income is all fee income above the basic fee (£1,200 in 2006-07) for Home/European Union, full-time undergraduates
2. Fee income is based on actual additional fee income received by 30 June 2007 and estimated additional fee income to 31 July 2007
3. 'Lower income' is defined as any student with an assessed household income of up to £47,425. This is the Government threshold for state support plus £10,000
4. Expenditure is based on all actual expenditure to 30 June 2007 and estimated expenditure to 31 July 2007
5. The Student Loans Company provided data on all expenditure paid from the Higher Education Bursaries and Scholarships Scheme to lower income students to 31 July 2007
5. Figures exclude London Studio Centre who have not made a return yet
6. Figures exclude Heythrop College who entered from the private sector and as such had no additional fee income
7. Figures for FECs and SCITTs are a snapshot as at 7 January 2008 - not all data have been returned yet.

Annex B

Actual expenditure on financial support for lower income students as a proportion of predicted expenditure



Annex C

Proportion of additional fee income spent on financial support for lower income students

Institution	Predicted %	Actual %
Anglia Ruskin University	7.8	29.5
Aston University	20.3	19.9
University of Bath	20.8	20.1
Bath Spa University	14.7	28.1
University of Bedfordshire	38.0	40.0
University of Birmingham	22.5	18.9
Birmingham City University	10.8	13.4
Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies ¹	30.7	19.6
Bishop Grosseteste University College ²	38.9	33.1
University of Bolton ³	29.6	16.0
The Arts Institute at Bournemouth ⁴	20.0	15.5
Bournemouth University	27.1	27.5
University of Bradford ⁵	29.6	17.3
University of Brighton	20.8	21.8
University of Bristol	22.7	18.4
Brunel University	21.1	13.0
Buckinghamshire New University	38.3	35.5
University of Cambridge	26.5	19.4
Canterbury Christ Church University	29.2	19.5
University of Central Lancashire	69.4	40.8
Central School of Speech and Drama	20.0	4.5
University of Chester	20.0	25.3
University of Chichester	30.0	21.8
City University, London	16.9	19.1
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama ⁶	24.4	20.4
Courtauld Institute of Art	26.7	13.6

¹ Higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

² Actual expenditure higher than predicted, refer to annex D

³ Unused funds have been directed towards improving retention of 1st year undergraduate students by providing financial awards linked to uptake of personal tutoring

⁴ Amount of expenditure is within the 10 per cent reporting margin

⁵ The original estimate included expenditure used to support the Learner Development Unit which offers students targeted support to help them with their studies but is not countable as financial support by OFFA

⁶ Amount of expenditure is within the 10 per cent reporting margin

Institution	Predicted %	Actual %
Coventry University ⁷	38.5	28.4
University College for the Creative Arts	11.5	7.9
Cumbria Institute of the Arts	51.4	25.4
Dartington College of Arts	42.6	11.7
De Montfort University	21.5	14.8
University of Derby	27.8	24.7
University of Durham	21.8	27.1
University of East Anglia	12.6	13.1
University of East London	11.5	30.3
Edge Hill University	39.7	34.9
Institute of Education, University of London	9.0	12.1
University of Essex ⁸	20.8	9.3
University of Exeter	21.8	17.1
University College Falmouth	21.7	15.4
University of Gloucestershire ⁹	22.1	17.9
Goldsmiths College, University of London ¹⁰	29.0	21.8
University of Greenwich ¹¹	24.1	6.6
Guildhall School of Music and Drama ¹²	22.5	12.0
Harper Adams University College	15.9	20.6
University of Hertfordshire	39.4	37.6
University of Huddersfield ¹³	27.5	18.7
University of Hull	24.3	22.7
Imperial College London	29.3	31.1
Keele University	16.3	11.5
University of Kent ¹⁴	25.6	18.4
King's College London	24.2	21.1
Kingston University ¹⁵	21.6	15.1

⁷ £330,500 redirected into scholarships for direct entrants into years 2, 3 and 4. New scholarship introduced for 2007 and eligibility changed to increase take-up

⁸ EU students were included in original estimate when not eligible for bursaries. Re-directed £141,000 within the academic year to pilot a student employment scheme (this would not be countable under our outreach section but is a widening participation measure)

⁹ Original estimate included 7 per cent of potential spend that should not have been included

¹⁰ Actual expenditure higher than predicted, refer to annex D

¹¹ Charged a fee of £2,500 for all courses apart from Pharmacy; difference in expenditure relates to discretionary scholarship awards

¹² Higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

¹³ Actual expenditure higher than predicted, refer to annex D

¹⁴ Higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

¹⁵ Actual expenditure higher than predicted, refer to annex D

Institution	Predicted %	Actual %
Lancaster University	17.8	17.6
University of Leeds ¹⁶	23.1	15.8
Leeds Metropolitan University	0.0	1.3
Leeds College of Music	23.2	16.6
Leeds Trinity & All Saints ¹⁷	11.8	9.9
University of Leicester	16.9	19.8
University of Lincoln	14.7	39.3
University of Liverpool ¹⁸	30.0	26.8
Liverpool Hope University ¹⁹	34.4	22.9
Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts	10.4	7.7
Liverpool John Moores University	28.5	29.1
University of the Arts London ²⁰	11.8	9.9
London School of Economics and Political Science	25.5	26.1
London Metropolitan University	38.3	18.6
London South Bank University ²¹	20.0	14.8
Loughborough University	19.1	13.8
University of Manchester	25.5	29.0
Manchester Metropolitan University	29.7	17.9
Middlesex University	10.0	5.8
Newcastle University	20.5	15.9
Newman College of Higher Education	35.6	35.0
University of Northampton ²²	32.1	21.9
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	19.0	22.2
Norwich School of Art & Design	31.1	9.9
University of Nottingham ²³	30.7	22.9
Nottingham Trent University	27.9	20.8
The Open University	0.0	0.0

¹⁶ £600,000 re-profiled to other widening participation activities in future years. From 2008 the bursary scheme has been re-structured to be more generous with wider eligibility criteria

¹⁷ Charged a fee of £2,250; all awards are discretionary

¹⁸ Re-profiled £300,000 to other widening participation measures

¹⁹ Original estimate included expenditure for non-means tested bursaries not countable by OFFA

²⁰ Unspent bursary expenditure carried forward

²¹ Students allowed to access unclaimed bursaries after the end of the academic year

²² Original estimate included expenditure for non-means tested bursaries not countable by OFFA

²³ Original estimates included NHS funded students not covered by the Higher Education Act 2004. £250k has been re-directed to continuing bursaries and other widening participation measures

Institution	Predicted %	Actual %
School of Oriental and African Studies	17.7	11.1
University of Oxford ²⁴	40.4	35.2
Oxford Brookes University ²⁵	37.5	24.4
School of Pharmacy	20.6	14.6
University of Plymouth ²⁶	24.4	13.0
University College Plymouth St Mark & St John ²⁷	32.5	31.9
University of Portsmouth	21.3	15.2
Queen Mary, University of London	27.8	31.2
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication	20.7	7.5
Roehampton University	13.1	15.5
University of Reading	27.7	22.3
Rose Bruford College ²⁸	10.5	7.3
Royal Academy of Music ²⁹	39.3	33.7
Royal Agricultural College ³⁰	16.7	13.7
Royal College of Music ³¹	13.1	5.8
Royal Holloway, University of London	20.2	17.5
Royal Northern College of Music	20.0	14.6
Royal Veterinary College	27.7	26.1
St George's Hospital Medical School	11.5	19.4
St Martin's College	43.8	48.4
St Mary's College	38.1	19.6
University of Salford	13.8	11.8
University of Sheffield	14.5	14.9
Sheffield Hallam University	20.0	22.5
Southampton Solent University ³²	33.1	22.6
University of Southampton ³³	18.8	14.3

²⁴ Higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

²⁵ Higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

²⁶ £50,000 directed to hardship funds

²⁷ Charged a variable fee of up to £2,700

²⁸ Higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

²⁹ Within the 10 per cent reporting margin and higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

³⁰ Higher than estimated expenditure on outreach

³¹ Bursary scheme revised on a more generous basis for 2007 to take account of lower than anticipated take-up

³² Re-directed over £350,000 within the academic year to additional outreach

³³ Unallocated bursary funds re-directed to additional outreach activities in 2007-08. Bursary scheme eligibility also extended for 2007-08

Institution	Predicted %	Actual %
Staffordshire University	31.7	24.9
University of Sunderland	17.5	18.9
University of Surrey ³⁴	21.6	17.2
University of Sussex	15.7	19.6
Thames Valley University ³⁵	45.4	24.6
University of Teesside	31.0	38.3
Trinity Laban	16.7	7.2
University College London	26.7	38.5
University of Warwick ³⁶	33.7	16.6
University of the West of England, Bristol ³⁷	29.2	25.5
University of Westminster ³⁸	14.9	12.7
University of Winchester	25.3	24.2
University of Wolverhampton	42.2	16.3
University of Worcester ³⁹	24.4	15.2
Writtle College ⁴⁰	10.0	2.6
University of York	19.2	17.1
York St John University	28.1	30.3
Total	25.3	21.4

Note: figures relate to HEIs only

³⁴ 2006-07 bursaries will remain available retrospectively

³⁵ Charged a fee of £2,700

³⁶ Bursary scheme made more generous for 2007-08 and extended to continuing students

³⁷ Redirected over £420,000 within the academic year to additional outreach

³⁸ Actual expenditure higher than predicted, refer to annex D

³⁹ Original estimate included expenditure for non-means tested bursaries not countable by OFFA

⁴⁰ Charged a fee of £2,700

Annex D

Amount of additional fee income spent on financial support for lower income students

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
Anglia Ruskin University*	432	1,192
Aston University	572	571
University of Bath	842	731
Bath Spa University	388	855
University of Bedfordshire	940	1,359
University of Birmingham	1,796	1,416
Birmingham City University	580	645
Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies	660	242
Bishop Grosseteste University College	210	250
University of Bolton	640	326
The Arts Institute at Bournemouth	178	164
Bournemouth University	950	1,224
University of Bradford	857	537
University of Brighton	1,275	1,268
University of Bristol	1,362	935
Brunel University	1,042	633
Buckinghamshire New University*	1,035	731
University of Cambridge*	1,800	1,300
Canterbury Christ Church University	892	711
University of Central Lancashire*	4,709	3,119
Central School of Speech and Drama	88	17
University of Chester	810	915
University of Chichester	510	420
City University, London	387	446
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	158	148
Courtauld Institute of Art	16	12
Coventry University	2,770	1,250
University College for the Creative Arts	267	211
Cumbria Institute of the Arts	216	127
Dartington College of Arts	131	31
De Montfort University	1,400	1,143
University of Derby	1,288	931

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
University of Durham	1,130	1,448
University of East Anglia	580	1,216
University of East London	558	1,740
Edge Hill University	1,574	1,270
Institute of Education, University of London	144	257
University of Essex	754	330
University of Exeter	1,020	916
University College Falmouth	272	159
University of Gloucestershire*	846	554
Goldsmiths College, University of London	565	656
University of Greenwich*	596	185
Guildhall School of Music and Drama	49	25
Harper Adams University College	95	130
University of Hertfordshire	2,760	2,812
University of Huddersfield	1,100	1,122
University of Hull	1,095	1,129
Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine	744	840
Keele University	418	329
University of Kent ⁴¹	1,150	887
King's College London	1,200	897
Kingston University	1,052	1,179
Lancaster University	802	699
University of Leeds	2,400	1,500
Leeds Metropolitan University*	0	43
Leeds College of Music	80	42
Leeds Trinity & All Saints	115	84
University of Leicester	717	823
University of Lincoln	660	1,937
University of Liverpool	1,800	1,410
Liverpool Hope University	1,287	834
Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts*	35	25
Liverpool John Moores University	2,586	2,250

⁴¹ Internal budget was £945,000 based on improved forecasting

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
University of the Arts London	594	545
London School of Economics and Political Science	280	330
London Metropolitan University	3,160	1,353
London South Bank University	934	472
Loughborough University	933	704
University of Manchester	2,843	2,699
Manchester Metropolitan University	4,794	2,137
Middlesex University*	500	422
Newcastle University	1,576	1,036
Newman College of Higher Education	288	455
University of Northampton	750	435
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	1,370	1,444
Norwich School of Art & Design	72	58
University of Nottingham	2,484	1,786
Nottingham Trent University	2,472	1,644
The Open University*	0	0
School of Oriental and African Studies	193	111
University of Oxford	2,300	1,876
Oxford Brookes University	1,500	1,022
School of Pharmacy	52	35
University of Plymouth	1,123	628
University College Plymouth St Mark & St John	395	351
University of Portsmouth	1,245	983
Queen Mary, University of London	960	1,403
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication	130	40
Roehampton University	454	577
University of Reading	1,189	978
Rose Bruford College	35	29
Royal Academy of Music	27	35
Royal Agricultural College	45	35
Royal College of Music	15	7
Royal Holloway, University of London	491	401
Royal Northern College of Music	36	37

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
Royal Veterinary College	408	142
St George's Hospital Medical School	80	114
St Martin's College	929	1,100
St Mary's College	552	399
University of Salford	847	663
University of Sheffield	966	970
Sheffield Hallam University	1,500	1,958
Southampton Solent University	1,584	840
University of Southampton	1,036	848
Staffordshire University	1,475	1,223
University of Sunderland	756	752
University of Surrey	511	430
University of Sussex	570	644
Thames Valley University* ⁴²	1,330	662
University of Teesside	1,285	1,375
Trinity Laban	46	20
University College London	1,200	1,609
University of Warwick	1,419	784
University of the West of England, Bristol	2,673	1,974
University of Westminster	752	783
University of Winchester	511	481
University of Wolverhampton	2,288	956
University of Worcester*	608	351
Writtle College	63	9
University of York	696	655
York St John University	448	441
Total	115,160	95,837

Notes:

1. Figures relate to HEIs only
2. * denotes HEIs not subscribed to the HEBSS service
3. The sum of the individual amounts does not add up to the total shown due to rounding

⁴² Internal budget was £1,090,000 for support for lower income students

Annex E

Amount of additional fee income spent on outreach

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
Anglia Ruskin University	202	230
Aston University	0	0
University of Bath	130	128
Bath Spa University	30	57
University of Bedfordshire	0	250
University of Birmingham	150	131
Birmingham City University	56	56
Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies	110	256
Bishop Grosseteste University College	40	29
University of Bolton	22	28
The Arts Institute at Bournemouth	0	0
Bournemouth University	100	94
University of Bradford	0	0
University of Brighton	150	150
University of Bristol	400	250
Brunel University	400	170
Buckinghamshire New University	70	70
University of Cambridge	0	0
Canterbury Christ Church University	15	15
University of Central Lancashire	600	278
Central School of Speech and Drama	37	29
University of Chester	0	0
University of Chichester	55	52
City University, London	75	113
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	0	0
Courtauld Institute of Art	4	0
Coventry University	170	168
University College for the Creative Arts	200	190
Cumbria Institute of the Arts	50	48
Dartington College of Arts	0	0
De Montfort University	300	319
University of Derby	250	250

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
University of Durham	245	131
University of East Anglia	367	313
University of East London	80	76
Edge Hill University	750	646
Institute of Education, University of London	211	123
University of Essex	150	168
University of Exeter	30	30
University College Falmouth	9	9
University of Gloucestershire	191	143
Goldsmiths College, University of London	69	24
University of Greenwich	70	86
Guildhall School of Music and Drama	25	84
Harper Adams University College	0	0
University of Hertfordshire	100	43
University of Huddersfield	0	0
University of Hull	50	50
Imperial College London	70	67
Keele University	123	86
University of Kent	200	300
King's College London	50	0
Kingston University	100	100
Lancaster University	250	172
University of Leeds	100	100
Leeds Metropolitan University	300	300
Leeds College of Music	40	22
Leeds Trinity & All Saints	40	39
University of Leicester	180	120
University of Lincoln	190	630
University of Liverpool	225	282
Liverpool Hope University	100	100
Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts	41	34
Liverpool John Moores University	300	296
University of the Arts London	594	160

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
London School of Economics and Political Science	80	189
London Metropolitan University	2,770	69
London South Bank University	140	110
Loughborough University	244	208
University of Manchester	400	400
Manchester Metropolitan University	533	500
Middlesex University	350	360
Newcastle University	1,495	1,197
Newman College of Higher Education	50	42
University of Northampton	40	0
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	210	0
Norwich School of Art & Design	25	0
University of Nottingham	250	0
Nottingham Trent University	450	253
The Open University	7	0
School of Oriental and African Studies	50	27
University of Oxford	350	417
Oxford Brookes University	250	396
School of Pharmacy	0	0
University of Plymouth	290	272
University College Plymouth St Mark & St John	50	23
University of Portsmouth	840	413
Queen Mary, University of London	0	0
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication	80	78
Roehampton University	87	85
University of Reading	260	224
Rose Bruford College	30	66
Royal Academy of Music	0	12
Royal Agricultural College	20	49
Royal College of Music	8	8
Royal Holloway, University of London	193	146
Royal Northern College of Music	32	18
Royal Veterinary College	40	17

Institution	Predicted £000	Actual £000
St George's Hospital Medical School	24	0
St Martin's College	122	137
St Mary's College	60	69
University of Salford	200	200
University of Sheffield	943	558
Sheffield Hallam University	500	530
Southampton Solent University	150	512
University of Southampton	100	100
Staffordshire University	250	225
University of Sunderland	750	611
University of Surrey	100	100
University of Sussex	185	167
Thames Valley University	100	82
University of Teesside	480	584
Trinity Laban	46	46
University College London	300	333
University of Warwick	580	548
University of the West of England, Bristol	738	1,160
University of Westminster	321	719
University of Winchester	40	39
University of Wolverhampton	0	0
University of Worcester	306	101
Writtle College	85	47
University of York	121	110
York St John University	100	26
Total	£25,093	£20,674

Note:

1. Figures relate to HEIs only
2. The sum of the individual amounts does not add up to the total shown due to rounding

Office for Fair Access

Northavon House
Coldharbour Lane

BRISTOL

BS16 1QD

tel 0117 931 7171

fax 0117 931 7479

www.offa.org.uk