

b) Other milestones and targets

| Milestone / target type (from drop-down menu) | Description | Baseline data | Baseline year | Target | Target year | Progress to date | | | | | Performance summary (please select from drop-down menu) |
|--|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------|-------------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|
| | | | | | | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

2. HESA widening participation performance indicators to 2009-10 (from HESA table T1b)

| HESA PI category | Progress to date | | | | | | | Two-year change (2007-08 to 2009-10) | Five-year change (2004-05 to 2009-10) |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | | | |
| State School (%) | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Distance from benchmark</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| NS-SEC 4-7 [socio-economic class] (%) | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Distance from benchmark</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Low participation neighbourhoods (young) (%) | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Distance from benchmark</i> | | | | | | | | | |

3. Institution's commentary

For your statistical and other access agreement milestones (from Tables 9a and 9b), please provide a narrative (maximum 750 words) which:

- comments on the level of progress made against the targets
- sets the figures in some context, for example if there have been any external factors which may have influenced them
- provides explanations where you have not met targets or where progress has been less than anticipated.

Although there was a 4% drop in the percentage participation in 2010-11 compared with previous years, the proportion of higher education students from disadvantaged post codes remained very high at 79%. This is partly explained by a balancing out of the reliance on internal progression from level 3 (It was 38% in the baseline year but came down to 15% in 2010-11). The College regards this as positive because it improves and widens the learning experience for the students. The College expects internal progression to settle at around 20%