## Access agreement monitoring return academic year 2010-11: Milestones and targets Liverpool Community College

## Milestones and targets

This document reflects the institution's own analysis of its performance against the targets and milestones that it set itself in its access agreement for 2010-11. OFFA considered it as part of our holistic consideration of the institution's progress against its access agreement; we also took into account the other information provided in the monitoring return, the institution's general performance on widening participation, and our knowledge of its access agreement and previous monitoring rounds.

For further information about monitoring performance against milestones and targets, please see part four of the report, Access agreement and widening participation strategic assessment monitoring: Outcomes for 2010-11.

Table 1 contains a report from the institution on its progress against the milestones it set itself in its access agreement relating to 2010-11.

Table 1a): This shows statistical milestones/targets relating to the institution's applicants, entrants or student body – e.g. those based on HESA, Ucas or similar data that the institution uses to measure the outcomes of its widening participation work.

Table 1b): This shows other milestones and targets that the institution chose to include. These typically relate to outreach, lifelong learning, or institutional mission and targets.

**Table 2** sets out the HESA performance indicators for young entrants covering state school, social class (National Statistics Socio-economic Classification – NS-SEC) and low participation neighbourhoods (LPN). These are reproduced to provide a context for the institution's overall performance. Please note that 2010-11 performance indicators are now also available; however, these had not been published at the time institutions were submitting their monitoring returns and are not presented here. For more information on HESA performance indicators, see www.hesa.ac.uk/pi.

**Table 3** provides the institution's commentary on its progress. Specifically, we invited institutions to:

- comment on the level of progress made against their access agreement targets
- set the figures in some context, for example, if there were any external factors which may have influenced them
- provide explanations where they did not meet targets or where progress was less than anticipated.

## 1. Access agreement milestones and targets

a) Statistical milestones and targets relating to your applicants, entrants or student body (e.g. HESA, UCAS or internal targets)

						Progress to date					
Milestone / target type (from drop-down menu)		Baseline data (number or percentage)	Baseline year	Target (number or percentage)	Target year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Performance summary (from drop-down menu)
Other (please give details in comments box)	Maintain current levels of participation from under-represented groups	0.83	2008				0.83	0.83	0.83	0.79	Target met/exceeded

b) Other milestones and targets

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

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

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

## 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%