

June 2017/02

Outcomes

This document presents the outcomes from OFFA's monitoring of access agreements for 2015-16

Outcomes of access agreement monitoring for 2015-16

offa

office for fair access

Alternative formats

The publication can be downloaded from the OFFA website (www.offa.org.uk) under 'Publications'.

For readers without access to the internet, we can also supply it on CD or in large print. Please call 0117 931 7171 for alternative format versions.

Published by the Office for Fair Access.

© OFFA 2017

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



Fair access is a moral, social and economic imperative, and there is a long way still to go to achieve true equality of opportunity in higher education. But our monitoring of access agreements this year demonstrates that there is cause for optimism.

I have stepped up my expectations on universities and colleges in recent years, and they are rising to the challenge. I am pleased to report that progress has been made against over 80 per cent of the stretching new targets that institutions have set themselves. Meanwhile, their investment through access agreements in 2015-16 outstripped their predictions, and was better balanced across the whole student lifecycle – from preparing students for higher education to preparing them for life after graduation.

Nonetheless, our analysis reveals stark differences in outcomes against targets at different stages of that lifecycle. Progress is lagging on improving retention and attainment for disadvantaged students. And there is no sign of improvement in access for mature and part-time learners, which continues to be a grave concern.

A crisis in part-time numbers

While fair access for young people is a national success story, little or no progress has been made against a substantial proportion of targets for mature and part-time students. This is unacceptable. In response, my team at OFFA has been giving strong challenge to universities and colleges about this issue during negotiations over 2018-19 access agreements.

For many people from disadvantaged groups, a lack of flexible options can present an insurmountable barrier – particularly mature students, who often have to balance study with work and family commitments. Yet when mature students do get the right support to enter and complete their courses, they typically achieve good results and go on to good jobs. So it is a terrible waste of talent that people with such potential are dropping out of their courses at more than twice the rate of their younger counterparts.

Opportunities on the horizon

With less than a year until the new Office for Students launches, I look forward to the forthcoming appointment of the new Director for Fair Access and Participation. I believe the Office for Students has the potential to be a genuine vehicle for social mobility by continuing to champion the success that has been achieved, while challenging and supporting universities and colleges to make further, faster progress.

As this monitoring report shows, the remaining challenges for fair access are great. But it is our duty to tackle them head on. We cannot allow it to be the case that anyone with the talent to benefit from higher education is held back from getting in – and getting on – by their background. So I urge the new leadership of the Office for Students, the new Government, and the higher education sector as a whole to work together to ensure that fair access and widening participation permeate every aspect of the Office for Students. That will be key to supporting the further improvement that, as we see in this monitoring report, is still so very much needed.

Professor Les Ebdon CBE DL
Director of Fair Access to Higher Education



Contents

Foreword	3
Executive summary	5
Introduction	7
Overview of performance	9
Access	13
Student success	17
Progression to further study or employment	21
Our conclusions on institutions' progress against targets and next steps	23
Levels of investment	24
Annex	32

Executive summary

Introduction

1. This report sets out the outcomes of OFFA's monitoring of access agreements for the academic year 2015-16.

Key findings: overall performance

2. Although this year's data is not directly comparable with last year's (see paragraph 20), institutions have reported progress against the great majority of targets in their 2015-16 access agreement monitoring returns. Looking at the higher education sector as a whole, positive progress has been made on 82 per cent of the targets that higher education institutions (HEIs) and further education colleges (FECs) set themselves through their access agreements. This included positive progress towards:
 - 75 per cent of high-level outcomes targets
 - 92 per cent of activity-based targets
 - 90 per cent of collaborative activity targets where institutions worked with partners including other HEIs and FECs, third sector organisations, schools and colleges.

Performance against high-level outcome targets highlights the importance of a whole student lifecycle approach in widening participation

3. Performance against high-level outcome targets varied across the student lifecycle, with fewer targets met in student success (where targets address retention and attainment). Across the sector, institutions reported positive progress in:
 - 75 per cent of access targets (1,455 targets)
 - 73 per cent of student success targets (426 targets)
 - 85 per cent of progression to further study or employment targets (101 targets)
4. This report highlights that there were differences in performance against targets for specific disadvantaged and under-represented groups at different stages of the student lifecycle. Institutions reported most progress against targets relating to ethnicity. However, sector data reinforces the need for greater nuance to address challenges for certain Black and minority ethnic (BME) groups, notably with regards to non-continuation rates, attainment and progression to employment and further study.
5. The least progress was made against targets relating to part-time and mature students, where fewer targets were being met in both access and student success.
6. We have collated individual institutions' target tables, commentaries and Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) performance indicators into a user friendly tool which is available from our website:
www.offa.org/publications/monitoring



Levels of investment

Institutions invested more than predicted in widening participation through their access agreements

7. Overall, institutions invested a total of £725.2 million in widening participation through access agreements in 2015-16. This was slightly higher than the £718.8 million that institutions originally predicted.

Institutions continued to refocus their access agreement spend towards activity

8. Spend on activities to support access, student success and progression to further study and employment (as opposed to financial support) increased in 2015-16 to 38 per cent of total access agreement expenditure, up from 32 per cent in 2014-15. This is predicted to increase further to 51 per cent by 2020-21.

Substantial increase in widening participation activity

9. The total investment in widening participation activity across the sector by all institutions (with and without an access agreement) was £883.5 million. This is a substantial increase from the £842.1 million in 2014-15 and £802.6 million in 2013-14.



Introduction

Content of this report

10. This report sets out our analysis of institutions' performance and outcomes against the commitments in their 2015-16 access agreements.
11. The report gives details of:
 - performance: the higher education sector's progress in widening participation, including performance against the targets and milestones that institutions set in their access agreements
 - investment: institutions' investment in financial support and widening participation activity across the three stages of the student lifecycle (access, student success and progression to further study or employment), including the amount of additional investment made under access agreements.
12. The report is structured around the student lifecycle to give a detailed view of institutions' performance on access, student success and progression. Improved data collection has enabled us to focus on the outcomes of targets for different disadvantaged or under-represented groups across the lifecycle. We have set these within the context of wider sector activity and where appropriate compared groups of institutions, such as HEIs and FECs, and institutions with high, medium and low proportions of under-represented students.
13. This year, for the first time, we have published individual institutions' target tables, commentaries and HESA performance indicators in a user friendly tool, which can be downloaded from our website at www.offa.org.uk/publications/monitoring. We have also published details of institutions' investment summary data tables in the annex at the end of this report.
14. To minimise administrative burden on institutions, we monitored access agreements jointly alongside the Higher Education Funding Council for England's (HEFCE's) monitoring of expenditure under the student opportunity allocation. HEFCE will publish a separate report on the monitoring of the student opportunity allocation.

Context for this report

15. There have been significant and sustained improvements in fair access in the last decade. As a result, greater numbers of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds are in higher education than ever before. Institutions have demonstrated again, through these monitoring returns, that they have made significant gains and there is much to celebrate.
16. However, the challenges of widening participation for all groups remain. In their 2018-19 access agreements, submitted to us in April 2017, we asked institutions to focus on a number of priority areas including¹:
 - part-time student numbers, which have fallen for a seventh consecutive year
 - entry to higher tariff institutions, which has not progressed in line with our expectations; the most disadvantaged young people are still almost six times less likely to enter a higher tariff institution than young people from the most advantaged backgrounds
 - non-continuation rates for mature students, which are almost double those for young entrants
 - retention and attainment of students from certain BME backgrounds, which are significantly worse than for White students
 - professional employment rates, which are significantly lower for graduates from disadvantaged backgrounds.

¹ These findings are based on student record data published by HESA, applicant data published by UCAS and further analysis by HEFCE.



17. As well as placing a strong focus on outcomes, we continue to challenge and support institutions to enhance the evaluation of their practice. In their 2015-16 monitoring returns, we asked institutions to report on their evaluation of financial support, equality and diversity activities, and work to raise attainment in schools. These areas will be addressed in further qualitative data and analysis to be published later in summer 2017. Overall, our analysis provides examples of good practice and support the sector in identifying areas which require more attention.

OFFA's [Strategic Plan 2015-2020](#) sets out our aims to:

- increase the proportion of learners from under-represented and disadvantaged groups who enter, succeed in and are well prepared to progress from higher education
- make faster progress in improving access to the most selective higher education institutions by students from under-represented and disadvantaged groups.

18. We will be looking for institutions to build on the progress evidenced in this report to take a more strategic, whole student lifecycle and whole institution approach. This will help institutions to make further, faster progress towards their own targets, working in ways that are most effective for their particular circumstances while contributing to sector-wide improvements.



Overview of performance

OFFA's evolving expectations

19. The majority of targets that institutions reported on in their 2014-15 monitoring returns were first set in 2011-12 and have since reached the end of their five year lifespan. Those targets were set with a degree of caution about how the new fee arrangements might affect students. Since then, considerable progress against targets has been made across the sector, as evidenced in OFFA publication 2016/04, [Outcomes of access agreement monitoring for 2014-15](#).
20. In this year's monitoring of access agreements for 2015-16, we asked institutions to report on progress against the new and more stretching targets that they set in their 2016-17 access agreements. The sector responded positively to the challenge, allowing us to report on new targets for the first time this year. For this reason, direct comparisons with previous monitoring outcomes reports are not meaningful.

Types of target

21. In their access agreements, institutions were asked to set targets relating to access, student success and progression. We expected targets to be stretching and strategically focused.
 - All institutions set **high-level outcomes targets** which give a measurable indicator of how representative an institution's entrants, applicants or student body are, or how those students fare throughout their studies – using, for example, statistical data such as UCAS or HESA data to measure performance on access, success and progression.
 - The majority of institutions also set **activity targets** relating to activities and their impact on widening participation across the lifecycle. We expect high-level targets to reflect the desired outcomes of activities – for example, the impact of an outreach activity on attainment, or the impact of a pre-entry programme in preparing students for study.
22. Targets can be collaborative, for example through joined up outreach networks consisting of several institutions working together. These targets can have wider goals for the sector as well as specific goals for an individual institution. There is more detail on this later in the report.
23. We asked institutions to measure their performance against their targets and select one of five pre-set summaries of performance for each target. In this report, where we describe 'positive performance' we are referring to targets where institutions reported 'progress made', 'yearly milestone met' or 'overall target met'. Where we refer to 'no progress/negative performance' we are referring to targets where institutions reported 'no progress made against baseline data to date' or 'long-term performance shows negative performance'.




Overall findings

Progress against targets

24. In their 2015-16 monitoring returns, institutions reported positive performance in 75 per cent of high-level outcome targets (74 per cent for HEIs and 76 per cent for FECs – Figure 1). This was the first year of reporting for the majority of targets. Access agreement targets cover a five-year period and we expect to see a clearer trend in next year's report.

Figure 1 Institutions' assessments of their progress towards their high-level outcome targets as a percentage of total number of targets




Source: 2015-16 monitoring data collection

25. For activity targets, institutions reported positive performance in 92 per cent of targets (91 per cent for HEIs and 94 per cent for FECs – Figure 2). Activity targets are set with a strategic aim to widen participation to higher education. We acknowledge that some activities are more long-term in their approach, particularly in regards to raising attainment. However, if an institution is meeting its activity targets but underperforming on its outcomes targets, we expect that it will review this ahead of its next access agreement. In every instance, we expect institutions to have robust evaluation plans in place for their activities and will continue to support practitioners in this area.



Figure 2 Institutions' assessments of their progress towards their activity-based outcome targets as a percentage of total number of targets



Source: 2015-16 monitoring data collection

Collaborative targets

26. The Social Mobility Advisory Group's final report, [Working in partnership: enabling social mobility in higher education](#) (October 2016), highlighted the importance of improved collaboration across the education sector as a whole: between schools, colleges, student unions, the third sector and employers. The significant influence of prior attainment at school on higher education outcomes for young people reinforces the importance of strong links with schools and colleges, and many institutions reported on these in their monitoring return.
27. Our 2015-16 access agreement guidance asked that institutions include a greater focus on effective collaboration across the student lifecycle and set more collaborative targets. In the institutions' monitoring returns, 32 per cent of activity targets were described as collaborative and positive performance was reported against 90 per cent of these. Examples of collaboration included:
 - partnership work with local charities and authorities to support care leavers
 - institutions working together to deliver outreach programmes
 - working with students to deliver mental health awareness events.



Targets distributed across the lifecycle stages

28. Our guidance emphasises the importance of institutions working across the whole student lifecycle to support students from under-represented and disadvantaged groups throughout their studies and as they prepare for work or postgraduate study. This year, an improvement to our data collection methods has allowed us to report on the distribution of targets across the lifecycle: 71 per cent of targets were set in access, 28 per cent in success and 11 per cent in progression (Figure 3).

Figure 3 Distribution of targets across the student lifecycle stages



Source: 2015-16 monitoring data collection

Note - Percentages do not add to 100 because some targets referred to more than one lifecycle stage




Access

Progress made in three out of four access targets

29. In their monitoring returns for 2015-16, institutions reported progress in 75 per cent of high-level outcome targets set in the access stage of the lifecycle. There are some areas of notable progress. For example, UCAS data for the 2016 cycle shows that 18 year-olds from low participation neighbourhoods (POLAR3 quintile 1²) are entering higher education at a higher rate than ever before: 29 per cent higher than in 2012-13 (Figure 4) and with a quicker rate of progress than the 2015 cycle.
30. Despite the progress we have seen, the participation gaps in higher education remain large. Young people from disadvantaged backgrounds (POLAR3 quintile 1) are still nearly two and a half times less likely to enter higher education than their more advantaged peers (POLAR3 quintile 5), and nearly six times less likely to enter a higher tariff institution. Improving access to the most highly selective institutions is a strategic aim for OFFA, and there is still a need for further, faster progress at these institutions.

Figure 4 Trend in the 18 year-old entry rate for UK domiciled students in English institutions and those at higher tariff English institutions from the most disadvantaged areas (POLAR3 Q1)




Source: UCAS end of cycle report 2016

2 The participation of local areas (POLAR) classification groups areas across the UK based on the proportion of the young population that participates in higher education. For more information see www.hefce.ac.uk/analysis/yp/POLAR/



Figure 5 Progress against high-level outcome targets by target group: Access



Source: 2015-16 monitoring data collection

Note: 'Groups with very few or no targets' are defined as those with 20 or fewer targets set


Most progress reported in access targets relating to low income households, ethnicity and disability

31. Institutions reported the highest level of progress for targets focused on low income households (83 per cent). We are particularly pleased to see progress in this area in view of the significant impact of socio-economic factors on access to higher education. OFFA's [topic briefing on White British students from low socio-economic status groups](#) (April 2017), identifies socio-economic status measures (such as education, income and occupation) as the primary factor for the disadvantage faced by this group.
32. Institutions reported progress in 82 per cent of ethnicity access targets. This is encouraging and reflects the increase of first degree BME entrants by 63 per cent across the sector over the last 10 years as reported by HEFCE (www.hefce.ac.uk/analysis/HEinEngland/students, accessed April 2017). We commend work that has been done in this area and encourage institutions to think further and with more nuance when setting targets in this area.
33. OFFA is currently developing a research agenda around BME participation and success in higher education, due to be commissioned this year. The Success section of this report emphasises the need for work with under-represented ethnic groups to take a whole lifecycle approach to ensure these students are supported to complete their studies.



34. Institutions also reported positive performance against four out of five disability targets (80 per cent), reflecting the increase in students with a disclosed disability across the sector as reported by HEFCE (www.hefce.ac.uk/analysis/HEinEngland/students/disability, accessed April 2017). In their commentaries, institutions noted efforts made in the context of changes to Disabled Students' Allowances (DSAs) to ensure their students were making claims where they were entitled to additional support. Some institutions attributed progress in this area to specific awareness raising of the provision for students with disabilities, through pre-entry programmes, outreach events and collaboration with charities. We will report on institutions' evaluation of activities in this area in more depth in further qualitative data and analysis to be published later in summer 2017.

Figure 6 Number of UK domiciled mature and part-time entrants in English institutions



Source: HESA UK Performance indicators (Table 2a and 2b)

Much greater focus needed on part time-students

35. Targets which focused on mature entrants were the most frequently missed: no progress was reported against three out of 10 targets in this area. The steep decline in part-time numbers has had severely negative implications for mature numbers as 93 per cent of part-time learners are mature. The fall in part-time entrants for a seventh consecutive year has meant an overall decline of 58 per cent since 2010-11 (Figure 6). Immediate action is required in this area. The reductions in applicants to nursing, midwifery and allied health courses in 2017-18, which have traditionally attracted large numbers of mature and part-time students, may signal yet greater challenges ahead.



36. We welcome the Government's introduction of maintenance loans for part-time students from 2018-19 and we encourage institutions to continue to explore how they can provide additional support to this group.
37. Only 15 institutions set a target for part-time access in 2015-16. While subsequent access agreements have shown this number is rising, we encourage all institutions to continue to think about how they can attract and support part-time learners, for example through flexible study options that meet the needs of students from a range of backgrounds. For many students, particularly those balancing work and family commitments, part-time study is the only option. Part-time study has the potential to change lives and make a major contribution to the economy so it is critical that, as a sector, we work to reverse this decline. We understand that the reduction in part-time students will have affected some institutions more than others. However, given the particular equality and diversity implications, we believe all institutions have a responsibility to consider how they might work to support part-time and mature learners.
38. There is wide acknowledgement in institutions' commentaries that access for these groups is challenging. There is no simple cause, or simple solution. However, it is very encouraging to see that there are institutions who have succeeded in making progress within this area. Where this has been the case, the factors cited in institutions' commentaries include:
 - a strategic focus on providing alternative entry routes
 - extensive support throughout the pre-entry period
 - the addition of new courses
 - the use of technology to provide online learning platforms.
39. OFFA's [topic briefing on mature learners](#) (June 2015) gives further guidance in this area, and we will be publishing a further briefing on part-time students later this year.
40. OFFA has commissioned work led by the Open University to investigate [how universities and colleges evaluate their outreach schemes for adult learners with low or no prior qualifications](#). The findings of this project are due to be published later in summer 2017.




Student success

Non-continuation rates for the most disadvantaged young people have risen faster than for any other group

41. While more disadvantaged (POLAR3 quintile 1) young people are in higher education than ever before, the numbers of those students leaving before completing their studies has risen for the second year in a row. HESA performance indicators show that 8.8 per cent of disadvantaged (POLAR3 quintile 1) young, full-time, first degree entrants do not continue in higher education beyond their first year, an increase from 8.2 per cent the previous year and the highest level since 2009-10. The gap between the non-continuation rates of the most advantaged (POLAR3 quintile 5) and most disadvantaged (POLAR3 quintile 1) students has widened in the past year (Figure 7).
42. The significance of this for students is huge. Higher education can be a transformational experience that opens doors to rewarding careers and social mobility, but this is only the case if students achieve successful outcomes.
43. In their monitoring returns for 2015-16, institutions reported progress in 73 per cent of high-level targets in the student success lifecycle stage. We were pleased to see an increase in spend at this lifecycle stage, reflecting our access agreement guidance and a shift in focus across the lifecycle. However, institutions must ensure that this expenditure is focused where it will have the most impact in order to address the sector-wide trends in non-continuation.

Figure 7 Proportions of students no longer in higher education (non-continuation rate), by POLAR3 quintiles




Source: HEFCE analysis of HESA data



44. Institutions have reported on work in this area where progress was made in the commentaries of their monitoring returns. Pastoral services, student mentors, peer assisted study sessions and investing in study skills were all cited as factors for success in this lifecycle stage. Many institutions noted in their commentaries the importance of being able to identify students at risk of dropping out at an early stage, and tailoring effective interventions.

Figure 8 Progress against high-level outcome targets by target group: Student success



Source: 2015-16 monitoring data collection

Note: 'Groups with very few or no targets' are defined as those with 20 or fewer targets set


Institutions report progress for ethnicity targets, but more to be done to address non-continuation and gaps in attainment

45. When split by target groups, institutions reported the highest number of targets being met where ethnicity was the focus: progress was reported against 89 per cent of ethnicity targets. Targets set in this area may look at reducing the non-continuation rates of BME students or improving BME degree attainment.
46. A number of institutions have set targets to address the gap in attainment between students from BME backgrounds and White students. Where progress has been reported, institutions noted:
- sustained focus involving collaboration across all departments within the institution
 - building an inclusive curriculum
 - making BME attainment a strategic priority.



47. While we are pleased to see progress reported in this area, institutions must reflect on the fact that the non-continuation rate for Black students is almost 1.5 times higher than for White and Asian peers (Figure 9). For Black students who complete their degree, the level of attainment is also markedly different: while 76 per cent of White students graduated with a 'good degree' (First or 2:1), only 52 per cent of Black students did the same. In our guidance for institutions on developing their access agreements for 2018-19, we have stated our expectation that institutions should review their performance in this area and, where necessary, set (or revise) targets to ensure further and faster progress.

Figure 9 Proportion of students no longer in higher education (non-continuation), by Ethnicity



Source: HESA data provided by HEFCE

Institutions performing well in disability student success targets

48. Institutions reported positive performance against 87 per cent of student success targets for disabled students. According to HESA's student records, those with declared disabilities had lower non-continuation rates if they were in receipt of Disabled Students' Allowance. A number of institutions noted in their commentaries work they have done to ensure they are identifying students who need support and providing clear information about what they offer. The Disabled Student Sector Leadership Group report [Inclusive teaching and learning in higher education](#) (January 2017) on inclusive teaching and learning in higher education provides guidance to institutions on this area, in addition to OFFA's [topic briefing on disability](#) (July 2015).
49. Further information on institutions' evaluation of their activity to support disabled students will be detailed in further qualitative data and analysis to be published later in summer 2017.



No progress reported for two fifths of mature student success targets

50. As with access targets, institutions reported the least progress for student success targets focused on mature students. Positive performance was only reported for 59 per cent of targets in this area. Nearly all targets set in this area looked at non-continuation, a crucial area; HESA data shows that the risk of non-continuation beyond first year is almost twice as high for mature learners compared to young learners. However, when mature students do complete their studies, HEFCE research (HEFCE publication 2015/21, [Differences in degree outcomes: The effect of subject and student characteristics](#)) demonstrates they outperform younger students on a like for like basis and the proportion who enter professional employment is high.

A whole institution approach is needed


51. It is a terrible waste of talent and hard work if students, who have often already overcome huge obstacles to get into higher education, do not get to benefit from completing their studies. The implications and costs for students are vast and unacceptable.
52. There are a complex range of factors involved in the success of disadvantaged students. Some of these factors relate to the way institutions ensure they are welcoming to all students. This must be embedded at all levels of the institution, across all areas of its work and with a strong commitment from senior managers.
53. OFFA has commissioned Professor Liz Thomas of Liz Thomas Associates to carry out a project on [understanding a whole institution approach to widening participation](#) to support the sector in this area. We will publish a report later in 2017 outlining the key findings, with practical guidance to support institutions to develop, sustain and evidence effective approaches.



Progression to further study or employment

54. There was an increase in 2015-16 access agreements in the number of targets set by institutions that focus on students' progression. Access agreement investment in this area also rose significantly from £29.8 million (4 per cent of total spend) in 2014-15 to £41.1 million (6 per cent of total spend) in 2015-16. Though the number of targets set by institutions is relatively small, the impact of the work within this lifecycle stage was encouraging, with progress reported against 85 per cent of targets. This is an important element of fair access, as the full benefits of higher education are not realised simply by enrolling on a course, but also through the social mobility of increased employment prospects.
55. The majority of targets set in this area did not have a specified target group, and were classified by institutions as 'other' due to their targeting of the student population as a whole (Figure 10). HEFCE research (HEFCE publication 2016/18, [Differences in employment outcomes: Comparison of 2008-09 and 2010-11 first degree graduates](#)) shows that graduates from disadvantaged and under-represented groups have significant differences in employment outcomes and we therefore strongly encourage institutions to set specific targets to address these differences (Figure 11). We were pleased to have seen greater numbers of targets in this area in the latest round of approved access agreements (for 2017-18).

Figure 10 Progress against high-level outcome targets by target group: Progression to employment or further study




Source: 2015-16 monitoring data collection

Note: 'Groups with very few or no targets' are defined as those with 20 or fewer targets set



56. Where institutions made progress, key factors cited include:
- collaborative work with businesses and employers
 - providing opportunities for work experience, internships and placements
 - embedding activities into the curriculum to support the transition into work.
57. HESA data shows gaps between the destinations of White and BME graduates (for more details see HESA [Destinations of leavers by mode, activity, sex, age group, disability status and ethnicity 2014/15 \(Table 2\)](#), June 2016). In their 2015-16 monitoring returns, six institutions set a target in this area, with four reporting progress. We commend institutions for challenging themselves in this area, but it is not the role for a handful of institutions alone. We have asked all institutions to consider what more they can do to improve outcomes in this area.
58. HESA is currently in the process of designing a new Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education survey model which will allow institutions to undertake more bespoke enquiries into graduate outcomes. HESA describes that this model is effective because it has “the ability to collect more complete, accessible and reliable information on the outcomes and destinations of graduates from higher education in the UK, using a more efficient future-proof methodology” (for more details see www.hesa.ac.uk/innovation/newdlhe, accessed April 2017). With this new resource, we expect institutions to refine their future work in this area through greater focus on specific target groups in their targets.

Figure 11 Destination of leavers from higher education 6 months after graduation, by POLAR3 quintiles, 2014-15



Source: HESA Destination of leavers from higher education (DLHE) survey provided by HEFCE



Our conclusions on institutions' progress against targets and next steps

59. This was the first year of reporting for many targets, and we will be looking closely at how institutions progress in the next year of reporting. Overall, we are satisfied that institutions made reasonable progress against the 2015-16 yearly milestones they had set themselves.
60. Where institutions have identified that they are making insufficient progress in their monitoring return – for example, relating to progress against targets, or quality of evaluation activity – or against their HESA performance indicators, we will expect them to demonstrate in their 2018-19 access agreement that their planned activities and expenditure are focused effectively, and that they are taking the appropriate measures to address any issues.
61. The progress reported to us by institutions in their monitoring returns will also form an important part of our continuing year-round dialogue about performance and what works best to improve, access, student success and progression in the coming year.



Levels of investment

Investment in widening participation through access agreements

Key points and OFFA commentary

Fees and regulation

62. The 2015-16 academic year was the fourth year under the current system of fees and student support. It was also the fourth year in which both full-time and part-time fees were regulated, meaning that institutions needed an access agreement to charge above the basic fee caps for both modes of study. Figure 12 shows the fee caps and resulting maximum levels of higher fee income per student.

Figure 12 Fee caps and maximum higher fee income per student in 2015-16

	Basic fee cap (per year)	Maximum fee cap (per year)	Maximum higher fee income per student (per year)
Current system full-time	£6,000	£9,000	£3,000
Current system part-time	£4,500	£6,750	£2,250
Old system full-time	£1,380	£3,465	£2,085

63. In 2015-16, the higher fee income generated by higher education institutions reached £2.65 billion, an increase of £210 million from 2014-15 levels (Figure 13).

Figure 13 Higher fee income generated by higher education providers above the basic tuition fee

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Higher fee income (£bn)	1.89	2.03	2.22	2.44	2.65


64. In 2015-16, the total investment in widening participation through access agreements, including both activity and financial support, was £725.2 million (down from £725.4 million in 2014-15). This represents 27.4 per cent of institutions' higher fee income (down from 29.8 per cent in 2014-15).

65. Overall, institutions invested more in widening participation through their access agreements than they originally predicted, investing a total of £725.2 million in 2015-16 compared to the predicted investment of £718.8 million in their 2015-16 access agreements. The additional income demonstrated where institutions were rebalancing and increasing spend further on student success and progression activities.

66. Expenditure through access agreements is predicted to increase in future years; institutions forecast that they will spend £834.1 million in measures to support widening participation by 2020-21. This is shown in Figure 14.



Figure 14 Institutional access agreement expenditure (£m) from 2012-13 to 2020-21



Note: Figure is calculated from the most recent access agreement data so may not match previous predictions


The impact of evaluation

67. In our [Strategic Plan 2015-2020](#) we outline our long standing and ongoing expectation for institutions to take an increasingly evidence-led approach, in part by securing robust evidence of the impact of their work. To achieve this, institutions must harness academic, research and evaluation expertise in order to improve and strengthen performance across the whole student lifecycle.
68. In our [Strategic guidance for 2018-19 access agreements](#) we set out our expectation for institutions to review their evaluation plans alongside the development of access agreements in order to provide a strong rationale to inform activities and programmes to improve access, student success and progression. We expect to see evidence of reflective practice demonstrating how institutions are using the lessons from previous activities and programmes to improve future ones.
69. Following the spending review in June 2013, the Government announced that the National Scholarship Programme (NSP) would cease as an undergraduate programme from 2015-16 and instead funding would be repurposed to support postgraduate students. The 2015-16 academic year was the first where no Government funding for undergraduates was allocated through the NSP.
70. In 2015-16 institutions committed – on average – 62 per cent of their total access agreement spend to financial support, a reduction from 68 per cent in 2014-15 and 69 per cent in 2013-14. The drop in the balance of spend dedicated to financial support was due to the removal of the Government NSP, allowing institutions the flexibility to refocus spend previously dedicated to NSP towards infrastructure and activity to support access, student success or progression activities or programmes, where appropriate.



71. Institutions predict that they will continue to refocus spend towards access, student success and progression activity, as shown in the spend predictions up to and including 2020-21 (Figure 15). By 2020-21, financial support (including hardship funds) is forecast to account for 49 per cent of total access agreement spend, a reduction of 66 per cent from 2012-13 levels.

Figure 15 Distribution of access agreement expenditure from 2012-13 to 2020-21



Note: Figure is calculated from the most recent access agreement data so may not match previous predictions

72. OFFA commissioned the [development of a financial support evaluation toolkit](#) to support institutions in this area, the research for which was completed in December 2016. The project, led by Sheffield Hallam University, developed a statistical model to help institutions investigate whether bursaries and other forms of financial support are an effective tool to help students from disadvantaged backgrounds enter higher education, succeed in their studies, and be prepared for life after graduation.


73. The model allows institutions to track retention rates of bursary holders throughout their studies as well as their degree and employment outcomes. The tool can be used to help redesign or refocus financial support as and when necessary. Further detail on institutions' evaluation of financial support will feature in further qualitative data and analysis to be published later in summer 2017.

Institutions with low, medium and high proportions of under-represented and disadvantaged students are spending in line with our expectations

74. We are pleased that institutions with high proportions of students from under-represented and disadvantaged backgrounds are spending more than the average on student success and progression (26 and 10 per cent of access agreement expenditure compared to the sector average of 16 and 6 per cent respectively), in line with our [guidance to institutions](#).



Figure 16 Distribution of access agreement expenditure for HEIs in 2015-16 by proportions of students from disadvantaged backgrounds



75. Figure 16 demonstrates the notable differences in distribution of spend between institutions with high, medium and low proportions of students from disadvantaged and under-represented backgrounds. Institutions with high proportions committed 50 per cent of their total access agreement spend on access, student success, and progression activities and 50 per cent on financial support, while institutions with medium proportions committed 44 per cent dedicated to activities and 56 per cent towards financial support. The picture is significantly different for institutions with low proportions of disadvantaged students. On average, these institutions used only 28 per cent of their access agreement spend on activities and 72 per cent on financial support, 22 percentage points more than those institutions with high proportions of disadvantaged students. This gap has widened significantly from the equivalent 14 percentage point difference in 2014-15.
76. In our latest access agreement guidance for 2018-19, we challenged institutions to focus investment more strongly on activities that have the greatest impact, and to contribute to the sector's understanding of effective practice. We expect all institutions to ensure that they are evaluating their financial support and demonstrating that their balance of spend accurately reflects the areas in which most progress is needed and delivers this in the most effective way.



Total expenditure on financial support for students

Key findings

77. Overall, in 2015-16 the total investment in financial support for students from lower income backgrounds and other under-represented groups through access agreements was £447.5 million. This represents a decrease of £95.1 million compared to 2014-15.

Figure 17 Total expenditure on financial support for lower income students and other under-represented groups (including Government NSP, for 2014-15 and earlier) through access agreements

Financial support expenditure	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17 (predicted)	2017-18 (predicted)
Expenditure (£m)	532.7	542.6	447.5	431.5	411.7

Note: The Government's national scholarship programme (NSP) funding ceased in 2015-16 academic year

78. The £447.5 million total comprised:

- £357.2 million on bursaries, scholarships and in-kind support
- £71.6 million on fee waivers
- £18.7 million on hardship.

Putting these findings in context

79. There is an overall trend of decreasing financial support between 2013-14 and 2017-18, as shown in Figure 17. Overall, there was a decrease of £44.3 million dedicated to bursaries, a decrease of £54.3 million dedicated to fee waivers, and an increase of £3.5 million dedicated to hardship from the previous year. In part, this reflects the end of the Government's NSP scheme, as well as institutional refocus of spend towards access, student success and progression activity.

80. The total decrease in financial support spend (£95.1 million) is less than the £150 million of matched NSP funding which institutions committed to in 2014-15. We expect the deficit is where institutions may be continuing to support those students previously in receipt of the NSP funds through the duration of their courses.




Numbers of students receiving institutional financial support through access agreements

81. Around 296,000 students from lower income backgrounds and under-represented groups studying at HEIs and FECs with access agreements received a financial award in 2015-16, down from 328,000 in 2014-15 and 358,000 in 2013-14. This represents 31 per cent of the total 951,000 fee-regulated students reported by institutions in 2015-16, down from 35 per cent in 2014-15. This decrease is in line with our expectations, as institutions used the opportunity following the end of the NSP to redirect access agreement spend into evidence-based activities rather than financial support.
82. Of these 296,000 students:
- 240,000 (25 per cent of [fee-regulated students](#)) were from low income backgrounds (household residual income is £25,000 or less), i.e. those in receipt of full state support
 - 56,000 (6 per cent of fee-regulated students) were from other low income backgrounds (household residual income is between £25,001 and £42,620), i.e. those in receipt of partial state support, or from one of the other under-represented groups covered by our remit.
83. In 2015-16 there were fewer awards, which, on average, were of a lower value than in previous years. In 2015-16:
- students in receipt of full state support received financial support of £1,550 on average, compared to an average of £1,750 in 2014-15
 - those in receipt of partial state support and those from other under-represented groups received financial support of £1,007 on average, compared to an average of £1,001 in 2014-15.
84. In value terms, 87 per cent of the £447.5 million that institutions spent on financial support in access agreements was received by students from low income backgrounds (household residual income is £25,000 or less) up from 86 per cent in 2014-15.



Figure 18 Expenditure on widening participation activity by all institutions (with and without access agreements), 2012-13 to 2015-16



Note: Data correct for AA institutions and SOA only institution as of March 2017



Widening participation activity expenditure has increased substantially

85. Overall in 2015-16 the total investment in widening participation activity (for example, activities to improve access, student success and progression, as opposed to financial support) by all higher education providers (with and without an access agreement) was £883.5 million, up from £842.1 million in 2014-15 and £802.6 million in 2013-14.
86. This expenditure was funded by a number of sources, including HEFCE's student opportunity allocation (which supported around 39 per cent of the total sector investment in widening participation activity), access agreements (32 per cent of the total) and other sources such as charitable funds or funds from external organisations (29 per cent of the total).
87. Of the total investment in widening participation activity, the majority was focused on student success activities (62 per cent, £548.5 million), with much smaller proportions invested in access activities (26 per cent, £232.0 million) and progression activities (12 per cent, £102.9 million).
88. Funding committed to student success activity increased in 2015-16. Support for current students increased by £7.3 million, and support for disabled students rose by £3.6 million (6 per cent increase) from the previous year.
89. Investment in outreach work with disabled students remained relatively stable at £6.7 million (compared with £6.3 million in 2014-15), while outreach work with communities and adults was £34.3 million (compared with £35.5 million in 2014-15).

Hardship expenditure has increased in the past year

90. In 2015-16, we asked all higher education providers (both with and without an access agreement) to report on the hardship expenditure which they provided to students experiencing financial difficulties. The total investment in hardship was £39.0 million, up from £37.5 million in 2014-15. Investment in hardship across the sector consisted of £34.9 million towards support for students in financial hardship and £4.0 million towards widening participation staffing and administration for hardship. In 2015-16, a total of 39,463 students benefitted from hardship funds.



Annex

Data Tables

Table 1

Total sector widening participation activity for 2015 -16

Data is correct as of March 2017 as reported to OFFA

Table 1a) Access, student success and progression expenditure in 2015-16, by type of spend (£m)		HEIs (£m)	FECs (£m)	All institutions (£m)
Access	1. Outreach work with schools and/or young people	123.9	6.3	130.3
	2. Outreach work with communities/adults	30.3	3.9	34.2
	3. Outreach work with disabled students	5.8	0.8	6.7
	4. Strategic relationships with schools	12.1	1.0	13.0
	5. WP staffing and administration	44.3	3.5	47.7
	Total outreach expenditure	216.4	15.5	231.9
Student success	1. Support for current students (academic and pastoral)	430.2	23.7	454.0
	2. Support for disabled students	55.5	3.6	59.1
	3. WP staffing and administration	29.4	5.7	35.0
	Total student success expenditure	515.0	33.0	548.1
Progression	1. Support for progression from HE (into employment or postgraduate study)	76.6	3.2	79.7
	2. Support for progression of disabled students	6.3	0.7	7.0
	3. WP staffing and administration	14.7	1.4	16.1
	Total Progression expenditure	97.6	5.3	102.9
All activity spend	Total expenditure	829.0	53.9	882.9

Table 1b) Hardship expenditure in 2015-16, by type of spend (£m)		HEIs (£m)	FECs (£m)	All institutions (£m)
Hardship	1. Support for students in financial hardship	32.9	2.0	34.9
	2. WP staffing and administration	3.3	0.7	4.0
	Total hardship expenditure	36.3	2.7	39.0



Table 2

Fee income and expenditure through access agreements in 2015 -16

Data is correct as of March 2017 as reported to OFFA

Table 2 shows:

- the number of institutions with access agreements for 2015-16
- total fee income above the basic fee for all institutions with an access agreement in 2015-16
- access agreement expenditure (excluding Government NSP in 2012-13 to 2014-15), by type of spend, and by type of institution
- access agreement expenditure (excluding Government NSP in 2013-14 to 2014-15) for HEIs, by type of spend, and proportion of under-represented groups as a proportion of fee income above the basic fee (%)
- financial support (including Government NSP allocations in 2012-13 to 2014-15), by type of spend, institution type, amount (£), and student numbers

Please note that in Table 2:

- expenditure does not include initiatives that were in place before the introduction of variable fees in 2006-07
- figures only relate to income and expenditure under access agreements
- financial support expenditure includes expenditure dedicated to hardship
- student success and progression categories were combined in 2012-13

*We have split HEIs into three groups, by proportion of under-represented students they recruit. High access equates to a high proportion of students from under-represented groups, whereas low access equates to low proportions.

**Contains students on partial state support or where household income is unknown and institutions cannot make estimates

2a) Number of institutions with access agreements in 2015-16

Table 2a	Number of HEFCE-funded institutions with undergraduate provision	Number charging above the basic fee	% charging above the basic fee
Higher education institutions	123	122	99%
Further education colleges	211	46	22%
All institutions	334	168	50%

2b) Higher fee income (£m)

Table 2b	2012-13 £m	2013-14 £m	2014-15 £m	2015-16 £m
Higher education institutions	1,994.90	2,195.80	2,413.90	2,621.52
Further education colleges	31.6	21.6	21.50	30.54
All institutions	2,026.40	2,217.50	2,435.40	2,652.05

2c) Access agreement expenditure (excluding Government NSP allocation in 2012-13 and 2013-14), by type of spend, and institution type, as a cash amount (£m), and as a proportion of fee income above

Table 2c		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
		£m	%	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%
Financial support (including hardship funds)	Higher education institutions (HEIs)	406.9	20.3	429.8	19.6	484.4	20.1	438.6	17.4
	Further education colleges (FECs)	9.7	30.5	5.9	27.2	9.1	42.2	8.9	30.5
	All institutions	416.6	20.5	435.7	19.6	493.4	20.3	447.5	17.6
Access	Higher education institutions (HEIs)	73.5	3.7	91.2	4.2	103.7	4.3	117.3	4.5
	Further education colleges (FECs)	1.2	3.7	1.4	6.5	1.5	6.8	2.2	7.1
	All institutions	74.7	3.7	92.6	4.2	105.2	4.3	119.5	4.5
Student success (including progression in 2012-13)	Higher education institutions (HEIs)	70.7	3.5	75.5	3.4	95.2	3.9	114.3	4.4
	Further education colleges (FECs)	1.8	5.7	1.4	6.6	1.7	8.1	2.8	9.2
	All institutions	72.5	3.6	76.9	3.5	97.0	4.0	117.1	4.4
Progression	Higher education institutions (HEIs)			22.6	1.0	29.4	1.2	40.4	1.5
	Further education colleges (FECs)			0.6	2.8	0.4	2.0	0.7	2.4
	All institutions			23.2	1.0	29.8	1.2	41.1	1.6
All access agreement spend	Higher education institutions (HEIs)	551.1	27.5	619.0	28.2	712.7	29.5	710.6	27.1
	Further education colleges (FECs)	12.7	39.9	9.3	43.1	12.7	59.1	14.6	47.9
	All institutions	563.8	27.7	628.4	28.3	725.4	29.8	725.2	27.3

2d) Access agreement expenditure (excluding Government NSP allocation in 2012-13 and 2013-14) for HEIs, by type of spend, institution type,

Table 2d		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	
		%	%	%	%	
Higher education institutions	Financial support (ex. Gov NSP in 2012-13, 2013-14 & 2014-15)	high access*	18.5	16.1	16.2	11.3
		medium access	18.8	17.4	16.2	14.0
		low access	23.4	24.1	25.0	23.8
	Outreach	high access	2.7	3.3	3.4	3.2
		medium access	3.5	3.7	3.7	4.4
		low access	4.7	5.3	5.6	5.7
	Student success (includes progression in 2012-13)	high access	4.7	5.0	5.6	5.9
		medium access	3.9	4.0	4.6	5.1
		low access	2.1	1.6	2.1	2.4
	Progression	high access		1.7	1.8	2.2
		medium access		0.9	1.2	1.5
		low access		0.6	0.8	1.0
All access agreement spend	high access	25.9	26	27.0	22.6	
	medium access	26.2	26.1	25.6	25.0	
	low access	30.2	31.5	33.5	32.8	

2e) Financial support, by type of spend, institution type, amount (£m), and student numbers

Table 2e		2015-16					
		Students in receipt of full state support		Students from other under-represented groups**		All students	
		£m	students	£m	students	£m	students
Bursaries & scholarships	Higher education institutions (HEIs)	302.1		47.7		349.9	
	Further education colleges (FECs)	6.1		1.2		7.3	
	All institutions	308.2		48.9		357.2	
Fee waivers	Higher education institutions (HEIs)	63.0		7.4		70.4	
	Further education colleges (FECs)	1.1		0.1		1.2	
	All institutions	64.0		7.6		71.6	
Hardship	Higher education institutions (HEIs)					18.3	
	Further education colleges (FECs)					0.4	
	All institutions					18.7	
All financial support	Higher education institutions (HEIs)	365.1	232,176	55.2	54,329	420.3	286,505
	Further education colleges (FECs)	7.2	7,932	1.3	1,811	8.5	9,743
	All institutions	372.3	240,108	56.5	56,140	428.8	296,248



Table 3

Fee income and expenditure through access agreements in 2015 -16 by institution (HEIs only)

Data is correct as of March 2017 as reported to OFFA.

Institution	Region	Access Agreement expenditure (% higher fee income), by academic year				Higher fee income (£000)	Overall expenditure (£000)	Access (£000)	Student success (£000)	Progression (£000)	Total financial support (£000)	Hardship (£000)	Bursaries and scholarships (£000)	Fee waivers (£000)
		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16
Anglia Ruskin University	ES	41.7	39.3	42.7	30.1	24,354.2	7,340.6	969.1	1,323.6	140.3	4,907.5	100.9	1,915.1	2,891.6
Aston University	WM	24.5	28.4	30.5	28.6	20,202.8	5,784.3	407.7	562.9	633.2	4,180.5	16.6	3,057.2	1,106.7
Bath Spa University	SW	18.9	16.1	18.0	17.3	16,481.5	2,847.0	512.4	665.6	415.2	1,253.7	140.0	1,112.7	1.0
Birkbeck College	GL	74.5	49.5	43.4	31.2	12,533.3	3,913.3	314.6	696.3	165.4	2,737.0	132.0	2,335.2	269.8
Birmingham City University	WM	14.7	18.3	12.6	19.9	26,678.3	5,314.4	525.3	3,110.6	526.0	1,152.5	63.6	-	1,088.8
Bishop Grosseteste University	EM	15.1	14.2	16.3	12.9	4,884.7	628.2	48.2	-	-	579.9	122.3	457.7	-
Bournemouth University	SW	42.4	37.3	39.0	38.6	24,938.0	9,628.2	1,047.6	4,525.0	429.1	3,626.5	308.2	3,291.3	27.0
Brunel University London	GL	21.6	18.9	17.9	19.9	19,770.5	3,933.0	331.4	827.8	343.8	2,430.0	172.9	1,169.6	1,087.5
Buckinghamshire New University	SE	16.0	12.4	22.8	19.6	9,995.4	1,956.0	211.1	741.5	193.9	809.5	-	582.6	226.9
Canterbury Christ Church University	SE	25.0	24.1	24.1	24.1	20,771.6	5,006.8	727.7	579.5	299.8	3,399.7	163.2	3,170.2	66.3
City, University of London	GL	18.9	12.3	19.1	19.9	15,675.5	3,118.9	892.7	730.0	395.7	1,100.5	157.1	761.4	182.0
Courtauld Institute of Art	GL	45.1	50.4	53.4	51.6	500.3	258.2	113.2	10.0	10.0	125.0	-	33.0	92.0
Coventry University	WM	14.0	20.7	25.2	22.6	32,710.3	7,398.3	581.7	4,163.9	743.0	1,909.7	-	628.3	1,281.4
De Montfort University	EM	23.9	21.2	17.4	15.5	36,832.0	5,699.6	862.3	1,130.5	1,365.3	2,341.5	754.0	1,451.2	136.3
Edge Hill University	NW	21.6	19.2	23.5	19.9	26,511.6	5,268.8	1,529.2	1,371.0	489.9	1,878.7	-	1,878.7	-
Falmouth University	SW	17.1	19.5	19.8	22.6	11,958.0	2,702.0	725.8	159.1	153.7	1,663.3	-	1,663.3	-
Goldsmiths' College	GL	30.3	21.7	22.6	27.2	15,488.0	4,214.6	1,783.6	887.1	290.3	1,253.5	331.6	495.9	426.0
Guildhall School of Music & Drama	GL	29.8	28.7	31.8	29.5	1,554.7	459.1	370.4	45.4	-	43.3	-	-	43.3
Harper Adams University	WM	31.6	24.7	28.3	25.5	4,948.3	1,262.4	419.1	240.0	180.0	423.4	20.9	284.8	117.8
Imperial College London	GL	45.3	44.8	51.1	52.1	16,230.8	8,455.2	598.5	-	-	7,856.7	-	7,401.0	455.7
Keele University	WM	20.8	18.5	22.6	23.2	16,342.5	3,799.6	768.8	508.9	321.4	2,200.4	67.2	2,064.2	69.0
King's College London	GL	28.0	29.4	29.7	29.3	30,709.7	9,005.9	1,699.7	717.3	131.9	6,457.1	183.6	5,994.5	279.0
Kingston University	GL	22.5	20.7	24.1	22.3	30,163.4	6,732.8	908.0	2,161.2	516.7	3,147.0	668.0	2,458.4	20.5
Leeds Beckett University	YH	21.7	22.2	17.3	17.9	45,352.1	8,101.7	1,527.9	3,955.7	1,101.5	1,516.7	542.0	361.3	613.4
Leeds College of Art	YH	29.7	30.0	30.5	21.7	3,630.0	787.3	136.8	9.0	5.0	636.6	109.8	220.0	306.8
Leeds Trinity University	YH	29.4	29.7	34.4	19.0	6,897.1	1,313.2	400.0	550.0	150.0	213.2	-	164.0	49.2
Liverpool Hope University	NW	20.6	25.3	24.5	22.4	11,366.2	2,545.3	450.4	826.0	72.3	1,196.7	169.2	1,027.5	-
Liverpool John Moores University	NW	31.4	26.0	26.7	20.0	42,245.1	8,449.0	793.7	1,745.3	1,360.8	4,549.2	-	3,826.2	723.0
London Metropolitan University	GL	19.4	22.0	38.1	29.7	18,086.7	5,371.7	523.3	1,733.7	445.4	2,669.3	-	1,952.8	716.5
London South Bank University	GL	27.4	25.0	25.2	28.2	17,199.2	3,135.5	465.0	200.0	1,123.8	1,346.8	-	798.8	548.0
Loughborough University	EM	24.1	22.7	25.3	26.0	29,756.0	7,728.9	976.0	667.0	272.4	5,813.5	43.3	4,664.2	1,105.9
Manchester Metropolitan University	NW	36.8	37.9	31.8	19.5	58,484.9	11,406.7	879.8	1,757.3	234.5	8,535.1	56.0	8,463.1	16.0
Middlesex University	GL	18.1	16.6	26.0	20.7	30,454.3	6,310.9	548.0	3,818.1	381.3	1,563.5	414.6	704.1	444.8
Newcastle University	NE	25.9	29.6	32.9	33.4	40,152.6	13,413.4	3,322.2	991.9	642.0	8,457.3	130.1	7,404.5	922.7
Newman University	WM	17.2	14.0	12.1	13.3	5,723.7	759.0	50.0	371.0	30.0	308.0	70.0	181.0	57.0
Norwich University of the Arts	ES	27.2	27.4	28.2	26.8	5,293.0	1,418.8	275.0	230.0	76.0	837.8	13.8	824.0	-
Nottingham Trent University	EM	28.9	26.7	25.9	22.3	54,087.8	12,052.7	1,234.5	704.8	302.0	9,811.4	550.1	3,632.4	5,628.9
Oxford Brookes University	SE	29.9	27.0	31.3	25.8	25,188.0	6,503.3	570.3	301.0	230.2	5,401.7	604.9	3,400.1	1,396.8
Plymouth College of Art	SW	40.2	42.6	28.1	24.3	3,479.1	843.7	179.3	139.9	116.0	408.6	7.0	401.6	-
Queen Mary University of London	GL	26.3	28.5	29.4	28.9	30,152.2	8,700.6	383.0	570.7	257.0	7,489.9	244.0	7,245.9	-
Ravensbourne	GL	23.7	26.6	27.7	28.5	5,953.4	1,699.6	260.2	369.4	137.6	932.3	138.2	794.1	-
Roehampton University	GL	17.9	23.7	29.3	28.8	17,192.0	4,958.8	1,867.8	1,806.6	390.0	894.5	6.0	632.5	256.0
Rose Bruford College of Theatre and Performance	GL	19.5	23.9	22.8	18.7	2,193.0	410.1	128.8	104.7	60.2	116.5	-	82.5	34.0
Royal Holloway, University of London	SE	26.2	29.4	35.2	31.8	16,203.4	5,160.3	647.6	402.0	222.7	3,888.0	62.0	3,798.0	28.0
Royal Northern College of Music	NW	31.8	38.4	38.8	35.9	1,565.9	561.5	220.2	50.3	70.7	220.3	11.0	209.3	-
Sheffield Hallam University	YH	21.0	15.4	19.1	13.2	43,405.4	5,738.3	964.5	953.7	1,065.2	2,755.0	475.1	1,295.3	984.6
Southampton Solent University	SE	27.6	27.7	23.0	25.3	25,503.7	6,455.4	755.4	946.5	931.1	3,822.3	664.1	1,917.9	1,240.4
St Mary's University, Twickenham	GL	21.5	21.9	22.3	21.9	11,133.3	2,435.1	280.0	830.5	195.2	1,129.4	137.3	511.6	480.5
St. George's, University of London	GL	27.6	28.9	34.6	29.9	4,707.0	1,409.3	517.4	198.3	42.3	651.4	92.4	559.0	-
Staffordshire University	WM	26.9	21.7	17.3	20.4	17,388.4	3,539.4	920.0	400.0	200.0	2,019.4	113.0	1,183.1	723.3
Teesside University	NE	27.4	36.9	36.4	24.2	14,884.2	3,607.3	1,130.6	1,454.0	1,016.8	6.0	-	6.0	-
The Arts University Bournemouth	SW	16.3	14.7	19.3	18.5	7,806.7	1,444.6	575.0	280.0	85.0	504.6	9.8	388.2	106.7
The Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	GL	30.3	34.7	108.7	62.9	2,771.1	1,742.3	598.3	236.6	62.5	844.8	34.4	779.2	31.3
The Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts	NW	26.2	26.8	24.9	22.6	1,684.2	380.1	219.9	55.7	11.4	93.0	9.5	83.5	-
The London School of Economics and Political Science	GL	42.2	47.7	57.1	60.1	7,661.3	4,605.3	600.0	200.0	29.0	3,776.3	33.1	3,743.2	-
The Open University	OU	41.0	142.7	68.9	52.4	4,960.5	2,601.4	-	-	-	2,601.4	-	-	2,601.4
The Royal Academy of Music	GL	46.6	50.7	45.8	47.0	876.0	411.6	121.1	-	-	290.5	-	126.5	164.0
The Royal Agricultural University	SW	31.3	31.9	25.6	28.6	2,566.0	733.3	282.3	47.3	11.2	392.5	5.6	210.4	176.5
The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama	GL	26.2	28.3	28.1	26.7	1,793.1	479.3	226.7	180.0	30.0	42.6	3.9	38.8	-
The Royal College of Music	GL	50.7	65.0	63.0	50.0	997.4	498.3	326.9	133.3	38.0	-	-	-	-
The Royal Veterinary College	GL	29.4	28.1	30.4	27.9	4,257.0	1,185.9	346.4	162.4	10.4	666.7	-	666.7	-
The School of Oriental and African Studies	GL	25.1	23.0	22.9	24.1	6,577.5	1,583.9	347.6	190.1	-	1,046.2	32.7	871.6	142.0
The University of Bath	SW	23.7	25.5	27.5	25.1	25,573.3	6,430.1	1,615.7	884.3	351.7	3,578.5	165.0	2,930.5	483.0
The University of Birmingham	WM	35.6	32.4	33.2	29.1	49,909.4	14,525.1	1,792.7	2,217.7	537.3	9,977.4	-	8,550.4	1,427.0
The University of Bolton	NW	32.9	31.8	24.7	24.8	8,732.4	2,164.0	149.2	782.9	537.4	694.6	75.9	339.3	279.3
The University of Bradford	YH	27.0	23.5	22.1	20.4	16,815.6	3,436.8	446.5	500.3	333.0	2,157.0	-	2,151.6	5.4



Data is correct as of March 2017 as reported to OFFA.

Institution	Region	Access Agreement expenditure (% higher fee income), by academic year				Higher fee income (£000)	Overall expenditure (£000)	Access (£000)	Student success (£000)	Progression (£000)	Total financial support (£000)	Hardship (£000)	Bursaries and scholarships (£000)	Fee waivers (£000)
		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16									
		2015-16	2015-16	2015-16	2015-16									
Anglia Ruskin University	ES	41.7	39.3	42.7	30.1	24,354.2	7,340.6	969.1	1,323.6	140.3	4,907.5	100.9	1,915.1	2,891.6
Aston University	WM	24.5	28.4	30.5	28.6	20,202.8	5,784.3	407.7	562.9	633.2	4,180.5	16.6	3,057.2	1,106.7
Bath Spa University	SW	18.9	16.1	18.0	17.3	16,481.5	2,847.0	512.4	665.6	415.2	1,253.7	140.0	1,112.7	1.0
Birkbeck College	GL	74.5	49.5	43.4	31.2	12,533.3	3,913.3	314.6	696.3	165.4	2,737.0	132.0	2,335.2	269.8
Birmingham City University	WM	14.7	18.3	12.6	19.9	26,678.3	5,314.4	525.3	3,110.6	526.0	1,152.5	63.6	-	1,088.8
Bishop Grosseteste University	EM	15.1	14.2	16.3	12.9	4,884.7	628.2	48.2	-	-	579.9	122.3	457.7	-
Bournemouth University	SW	42.4	37.3	39.0	38.6	24,938.0	9,628.2	1,047.6	4,525.0	429.1	3,626.5	308.2	3,291.3	27.0
Brunel University London	GL	21.6	18.9	17.9	19.9	19,770.5	3,933.0	331.4	827.8	343.8	2,430.0	172.9	1,169.6	1,087.5
Buckinghamshire New University	SE	16.0	12.4	22.8	19.6	9,995.4	1,956.0	211.1	741.5	193.9	809.5	-	582.6	226.9
Canterbury Christ Church University	SE	25.0	24.1	24.1	24.1	20,771.6	5,006.8	727.7	579.5	299.8	3,399.7	163.2	3,170.2	66.3
City, University of London	GL	18.9	12.3	19.1	19.9	15,675.5	3,118.9	892.7	730.0	395.7	1,100.5	157.1	761.4	182.0
Courtauld Institute of Art	GL	45.1	50.4	53.4	51.6	500.3	258.2	113.2	10.0	10.0	125.0	-	33.0	92.0
Coventry University	WM	14.0	20.7	25.2	22.6	32,710.3	7,398.3	581.7	4,163.9	743.0	1,909.7	-	628.3	1,281.4
De Montfort University	EM	23.9	21.2	17.4	15.5	36,832.0	5,699.6	862.3	1,130.5	1,365.3	2,341.5	754.0	1,451.2	136.3
Edge Hill University	NW	21.6	19.2	23.5	19.9	26,511.6	5,268.8	1,529.2	1,371.0	489.9	1,878.7	-	1,878.7	-
Falmouth University	SW	17.1	19.5	19.8	22.6	11,958.0	2,702.0	725.8	159.1	153.7	1,663.3	-	1,663.3	-
Goldsmiths' College	GL	30.3	21.7	22.6	27.2	15,488.0	4,214.6	1,783.6	887.1	290.3	1,253.5	331.6	495.9	426.0
Guildhall School of Music & Drama	GL	29.8	28.7	31.8	29.5	1,554.7	459.1	370.4	45.4	-	43.3	-	-	43.3
Harper Adams University	WM	31.6	24.7	28.3	25.5	4,948.3	1,262.4	419.1	240.0	180.0	423.4	20.9	284.8	117.8
Imperial College London	GL	45.3	44.8	51.1	52.1	16,230.8	8,452.2	598.5	-	-	7,856.7	-	7,401.0	455.7
Keele University	WM	20.8	18.5	22.6	23.2	16,342.5	3,799.6	768.8	508.9	321.4	2,200.4	67.2	2,064.2	69.0
King's College London	GL	28.0	29.4	29.7	29.3	30,709.7	9,005.9	1,699.7	717.3	131.9	6,457.1	183.6	5,994.5	279.0
Kingston University	GL	22.5	20.7	24.1	22.3	30,163.4	6,732.8	908.0	2,161.2	516.7	3,147.0	668.0	2,458.4	20.5
Leeds Beckett University	YH	21.7	22.2	17.3	17.9	45,352.1	8,101.7	1,527.9	3,955.7	1,101.5	1,516.7	542.0	361.3	613.4
Leeds College of Art	YH	29.7	30.0	30.5	21.7	3,630.0	787.3	400.0	9.0	5.0	636.6	109.8	220.0	306.8
Leeds Trinity University	YH	29.4	29.7	34.4	19.0	6,897.1	1,313.2	400.0	550.0	150.0	213.2	-	164.0	49.2
Liverpool Hope University	NW	20.6	25.3	24.5	22.4	11,366.2	2,545.3	450.4	826.0	72.3	1,196.7	169.2	1,027.5	-
Liverpool John Moores University	NW	31.4	26.0	26.7	20.0	42,245.1	8,449.0	793.7	1,745.3	1,360.8	4,549.2	-	3,826.2	723.0
London Metropolitan University	GL	19.4	22.0	38.1	29.7	18,086.7	5,371.7	523.3	1,733.7	445.4	2,669.3	-	1,952.8	716.5
London South Bank University	GL	27.4	25.0	25.2	18.2	17,199.2	3,135.5	465.0	200.0	1,123.8	1,346.8	-	798.8	548.0
Loughborough University	EM	24.1	22.7	25.3	26.0	29,756.0	7,728.9	976.0	667.0	272.4	5,813.5	43.3	4,664.2	1,105.9
Manchester Metropolitan University	NW	36.8	37.9	31.8	19.5	58,484.9	11,406.7	879.8	1,757.3	234.5	8,535.1	56.0	8,463.1	16.0
Middlesex University	GL	18.1	16.6	26.0	20.7	30,454.3	6,310.9	548.0	3,818.1	381.3	1,563.5	414.6	704.1	444.8
Newcastle University	NE	25.9	29.6	32.9	33.4	40,152.6	13,413.4	3,322.2	991.9	642.0	8,457.3	130.1	7,404.5	922.7
Newman University	WM	17.2	14.0	12.1	13.3	5,723.7	759.0	50.0	371.0	30.0	308.0	70.0	181.0	57.0
Norwich University of the Arts	ES	27.2	27.4	28.2	26.8	5,293.0	1,418.8	275.0	230.0	76.0	837.8	13.8	824.0	-
Nottingham Trent University	EM	28.9	26.7	25.9	22.3	54,087.8	12,052.7	1,234.5	704.8	302.0	9,811.4	550.1	3,632.4	5,628.9
Oxford Brookes University	SE	29.9	27.0	31.3	25.8	25,188.0	6,503.3	570.3	380.0	230.2	5,401.7	604.9	3,400.1	1,396.8
Plymouth College of Art	SW	40.2	42.6	28.1	24.3	3,479.1	843.7	179.3	139.9	116.0	408.6	7.0	401.6	-
Queen Mary University of London	GL	26.3	28.5	29.4	28.9	30,152.2	8,700.6	383.0	570.7	257.0	7,489.9	244.0	7,245.9	-
Ravensbourne	GL	23.7	26.6	27.7	28.5	5,953.4	1,699.6	260.2	369.4	137.6	932.3	138.2	794.1	-
Roehampton University	GL	17.9	23.7	29.3	28.8	17,192.0	4,958.8	1,867.8	1,806.6	390.0	894.5	6.0	632.5	256.0
Rose Bruford College of Theatre and Performance	GL	19.5	23.9	22.8	18.7	2,193.0	410.1	128.8	104.7	60.2	116.5	-	82.5	34.0
Royal Holloway, University of London	SE	26.2	29.4	35.2	31.8	16,203.4	5,160.3	647.6	402.0	222.7	3,888.0	62.0	3,798.0	28.0
Royal Northern College of Music	NW	31.8	38.4	38.8	35.9	1,565.9	561.5	220.2	50.3	70.7	220.3	11.0	209.3	-
Sheffield Hallam University	YH	21.0	15.4	19.1	13.2	43,405.4	5,738.2	964.5	953.7	1,065.2	2,755.0	475.1	1,295.3	984.6
Southampton Solent University	SE	27.6	27.7	23.0	25.3	25,503.7	6,455.4	755.4	946.5	931.1	3,822.3	664.1	1,917.9	1,240.4
St Mary's University, Twickenham	GL	21.5	21.9	22.3	21.9	11,133.3	2,435.1	280.0	830.5	195.2	1,129.4	137.3	511.6	480.5
St. George's, University of London	WM	27.6	28.9	34.6	29.9	4,707.0	1,409.3	517.4	198.3	42.3	651.4	92.4	559.0	-
Staffordshire University	GL	26.9	21.7	17.3	20.4	17,388.4	3,539.4	920.0	400.0	200.0	2,019.4	113.0	1,183.1	723.3
Teeside University	NE	27.4	36.9	36.4	24.2	14,884.2	3,607.3	1,130.6	1,454.0	1,016.8	6.0	-	6.0	-
The Arts University Bournemouth	SW	16.3	14.7	19.3	18.5	7,806.7	1,444.6	575.0	280.0	85.0	504.6	9.8	388.2	106.7
The Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	GL	30.3	34.7	108.7	62.9	2,771.1	1,742.3	598.3	236.6	62.5	844.8	34.4	779.2	31.3
The Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts	NW	26.2	26.8	24.9	22.6	1,684.2	380.1	219.9	55.7	11.4	93.0	9.5	83.5	-
The London School of Economics and Political Science	GL	42.2	47.7	57.1	60.1	7,661.3	4,605.3	600.0	200.0	29.0	3,776.3	33.1	3,743.2	-
The Open University	OU	41.0	142.7	68.9	52.4	4,960.5	2,601.4	-	-	-	2,601.4	-	-	2,601.4
The Royal Academy of Music	GL	46.6	50.7	45.8	47.0	876.0	411.6	121.1	-	-	290.5	-	126.5	164.0
The Royal Agricultural University	SW	31.3	31.9	25.6	28.6	2,566.0	733.3	282.3	47.3	11.2	392.5	5.6	210.4	176.5
The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama	GL	26.2	28.3	28.1	26.7	1,793.1	479.3	226.7	180.0	30.0	42.6	3.9	38.8	-
The Royal College of Music	GL	50.7	65.0	63.0	50.0	997.4	498.3	326.9	133.3	38.0	-	-	-	-
The Royal Veterinary College	GL	29.4	28.1	30.4	27.9	4,257.0	1,185.9	346.4	162.4	10.4	666.7	-	666.7	-
The School of Oriental and African Studies	GL	25.1	23.0	22.9	24.1	6,577.5	1,583.9	347.6	190.1	-	1,046.2	32.7	871.6	142.0
The University of Bath	SW	23.7	25.5	25.1	25.1	25,573.3	6,430.1	1,615.7	884.3	351.7	3,578.5	165.0	2,930.5	483.0
The University of Birmingham	WM	35.6	32.4	33.2	29.1	49,909.4	14,525.1	1,792.7	2,217.7	537.3	9,977.4	-	8,550.4	1,427.0
The University of Bolton	NW	32.9	31.8	24.7	24.8	8,732.4	2,164.0	149.2	782.9	537.4	694.6	75.9	339.3	279.3
The University of Bradford	YH	27.0	23.5	22.1	20.4	16,815.6	3,436.8	446.5	500.3	333.0	2,157.0	-	2,151.6	5.4



Table 4

Number of students in receipt of financial support in 2015-16 through access agreements, by institution (HEIs only)

Data is correct as of March 2017 as reported to OFFA

***In receipt of partial state support or from one of the other under-represented groups covered by OFFA's remit

Institution	Region	Current system students in academic year 2015-16						Old system students in academic year 2015-16					
		In receipt of full state support		Other OFFA countable incomes/groups***		Total OFFA countable		In receipt of full state support		Other OFFA countable incomes/groups***		Total OFFA countable	
		Number	% of total current system students	Number	% of total current system students	Number	% of total current system students	Number	% of total old system students	Number	% of total old system students	Number	% of total old system students
Anglia Ruskin University	ES	2,789	26.3	846	8.0	3,635	34.2	-	-	2	12.5	2	12.5
Aston University	WM	3,756	47.2	984	12.4	4,740	59.5	82	41.0	5	2.5	87	43.5
Bath Spa University	SW	1,534	25.8	-	-	1,534	25.8	4	30.8	-	-	4	30.8
Birkbeck College	GL	2,354	34.7	237	3.5	2,591	38.2	13	86.7	-	-	13	86.7
Birmingham City University	WM	360	2.8	1	0.0	361	2.8	38	40.4	5	5.3	43	45.7
Bishop Grosseteste University	EM	975	44.8	-	-	975	44.8	8	88.9	-	-	8	88.9
Bournemouth University	SW	1,456	12.8	533	4.7	1,989	17.4	4	4.8	1	1.2	5	6.0
Brunel University London	GL	934	12.6	316	4.3	1,250	16.9	70	39.3	17	9.6	87	48.9
Buckinghamshire New University	SE	433	9.9	-	-	433	9.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Canterbury Christ Church University	SE	3,191	39.1	49	0.6	3,240	39.7	28	57.1	-	-	28	57.1
City, University of London	GL	649	12.2	-	-	649	12.2	5	5.5	-	-	5	5.5
Courtauld Institute of Art	GL	32	19.5	24	14.6	56	34.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Coventry University	WM	793	5.1	68	0.4	861	5.6	35	25.5	2	1.5	37	27.0
De Montfort University	EM	2,794	21.2	133	1.0	2,927	22.2	16	84.2	-	-	16	84.2
Edge Hill University	NW	1,471	15.0	34	0.3	1,505	15.3	6	50.0	1	8.3	7	58.3
Falmouth University	SW	1,442	36.1	464	11.6	1,906	47.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goldsmiths' College	GL	320	6.1	54	1.0	374	7.2	18	38.3	2	4.3	20	42.6
Guildhall School of Music & Drama	GL	44	8.5	-	-	44	8.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harper Adams University	WM	226	9.9	57	2.5	283	12.4	12	26.7	1	2.2	13	28.9
Imperial College London	GL	955	17.5	498	9.1	1,453	26.6	21	17.1	17	13.8	38	30.9
Keele University	WM	1,633	30.7	19	0.4	1,652	31.1	16	6.6	-	-	16	6.6
King's College London	GL	2,838	27.7	916	8.9	3,754	36.6	42	10.3	8	2.0	50	12.2
Kingston University	GL	2,001	17.0	-	-	2,001	17.0	231	56.3	27	6.6	258	62.9
Leeds Beckett University	YH	537	3.2	515	3.0	1,052	6.2	38	21.0	-	-	38	21.0
Leeds College of Art	YH	424	34.2	-	-	424	34.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Leeds Trinity University	YH	183	6.0	-	-	183	6.0	1	7.7	-	-	1	7.7
Liverpool Hope University	NW	545	14.2	154	4.0	699	18.2	7	41.2	1	5.9	8	47.1
Liverpool John Moores University	NW	6,704	42.5	591	3.8	7,295	46.3	87	69.6	22	17.6	109	87.2
London Metropolitan University	GL	2,004	23.4	294	3.4	2,298	26.9	14	5.3	3	1.1	17	6.4
London South Bank University	GL	1,043	14.8	-	-	1,043	14.8	45	90.0	-	-	45	90.0
Loughborough University	EM	2,202	19.3	219	1.9	2,421	21.2	90	22.8	36	9.1	126	31.9
Manchester Metropolitan University	NW	7,937	34.6	25	0.1	7,962	34.7	142	63.7	30	13.5	172	77.1
Middlesex University	GL	461	4.4	-	-	461	4.4	12	18.5	-	-	12	18.5
Newcastle University	NE	3,053	22.2	1,190	8.6	4,243	30.8	72	28.3	15	5.9	87	34.3
Newman University	WM	212	10.4	-	-	212	10.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norwich University of the Arts	ES	702	36.9	244	12.8	946	49.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nottingham Trent University	EM	6,825	32.4	435	2.1	7,260	34.5	74	42.8	12	6.9	86	49.7
Oxford Brookes University	SE	2,091	20.5	133	1.3	2,224	21.8	62	14.7	8	1.9	70	16.5
Plymouth College of Art	SW	588	49.0	181	15.1	769	64.1	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
Queen Mary University of London	GL	3,949	40.2	1,024	10.4	4,973	50.7	80	14.1	7	1.2	87	15.3
Ravensbourne	GL	785	38.8	8	0.4	793	39.2	1	6.3	-	-	1	6.3
Roehampton University	GL	196	2.8	-	-	196	2.8	1	4.2	-	-	1	4.2
Rose Bruford College of Theatre and Performance	GL	150	20.5	-	-	150	20.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Royal Holloway, University of London	SE	1,551	26.5	662	11.3	2,213	37.7	15	31.9	2	4.3	17	36.2
Royal Northern College of Music	NW	114	21.8	67	12.8	181	34.6	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0
Sheffield Hallam University	YH	2,576	15.2	1,421	8.4	3,997	23.7	73	48.3	30	19.9	103	68.2
Southampton Solent University	SE	3,666	34.3	-	-	3,666	34.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
St Mary's University, Twickenham	GL	316	7.3	355	8.2	671	15.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. George's, University of London	GL	418	29.8	116	8.3	534	38.0	3	1.2	1	0.4	4	1.7
Staffordshire University	WM	1,633	16.3	-	-	1,633	16.3	39	34.5	-	-	39	34.5
Teesside University	NE	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	15.2	1	1.5	11	16.7
The Arts University Bournemouth	SW	586	21.6	100	3.7	686	25.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	GL	295	32.0	173	18.7	468	50.7	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
The Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts	NW	167	29.8	-	-	167	29.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
The London School of Economics and Political Science	GL	651	24.2	270	10.0	921	34.2	7	46.7	-	-	7	46.7
The Open University	OU	2,079	3.6	-	-	2,079	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Royal Academy of Music	GL	62	21.2	-	-	62	21.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Royal Agricultural University	SW	143	16.5	12	1.4	155	17.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama	GL	5	0.8	3	0.5	8	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Royal College of Music	GL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Royal Veterinary College	GL	340	25.6	112	8.4	452	34.0	67	28.9	22	9.5	89	38.4
The School of Oriental and African Studies	GL	336	14.7	26	1.1	362	15.8	21	40.4	-	-	21	40.4
The University of Bath	SW	1,277	12.9	122	1.2	1,399	14.1	65	15.7	47	11.3	112	27.0
The University of Birmingham	WM	4,563	25.9	1,291	7.3	5,854	33.2	-	-	55	25.6	55	25.6
The University of Bolton	NW	621	14.1	96	2.2	717	16.3	17	29.3	1	1.7	18	31.0
The University of Bradford	YH	1,621	27.5	183	3.1	1,804	30.6	88	34.0	10	3.9	98	37.8
The University of Chichester	SE	1,457	32.8	656	14.8	2,113	47.5	-	-	-	-	-	-



The University of East Anglia	ES	1,759	21.8	-	-	1,759	21.8	54	20.8	-	-	54	20.8
The University of Essex	ES	2,051	25.8	1,054	13.2	3,105	39.0	24	27.6	8	9.2	32	36.8
The University of Huddersfield	YH	1,066	8.3	13	0.1	1,079	8.4	134	55.8	-	-	134	55.8
The University of Hull	YH	1,390	13.8	220	2.2	1,610	16.0	60	83.3	-	-	60	83.3
The University of Kent	SE	1,989	14.9	764	5.7	2,753	20.6	83	41.5	19	9.5	102	51.0
The University of Lancaster	NW	1,757	23.1	1,046	13.8	2,803	36.9	18	66.7	3	11.1	21	77.8
The University of Leeds	YH	4,480	24.4	2,110	11.5	6,590	35.9	117	37.4	21	6.7	138	44.1
The University of Leicester	EM	2,585	29.5	2,977	34.0	5,562	63.6	45	15.3	101	34.2	146	49.5
The University of Liverpool	NW	3,707	30.6	1,336	11.0	5,043	41.6	186	37.1	5	1.0	191	38.0
The University of Manchester	NW	5,405	28.6	1,930	10.2	7,335	38.8	117	30.9	3	0.8	120	31.7
The University of Northampton	EM	2,933	39.2	700	9.4	3,633	48.6	6	30.0	1	5.0	7	35.0
The University of Nottingham	EM	4,010	21.4	2,166	11.6	6,176	33.0	111	13.9	64	8.0	175	21.8
The University of Reading	SE	1,760	20.2	210	2.4	1,970	22.6	11	27.5	-	-	11	27.5
The University of Salford	NW	1,281	11.5	434	3.9	1,715	15.4	60	34.9	4	2.3	64	37.2
The University of Sheffield	YH	3,398	23.6	2,025	14.1	5,423	37.7	81	15.1	22	4.1	103	19.2
The University of Surrey	SE	2,006	28.5	157	2.2	2,163	30.7	51	30.5	13	7.8	64	38.3
The University of Warwick	WM	2,069	19.5	832	7.8	2,901	27.3	19	18.3	12	11.5	31	29.8
The University of West London	GL	3,519	60.7	508	8.8	4,027	69.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
The University of Westminster	GL	547	4.5	230	1.9	777	6.4	165	187.5	10	11.4	175	198.9
Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance	GL	149	22.4	9	1.4	158	23.8	3	30.0	-	-	3	30.0
University College Birmingham	WM	1,420	40.6	25	0.7	1,445	41.3	9	40.9	-	-	9	40.9
University College London	GL	2,927	23.7	1,072	8.7	3,999	32.3	51	14.2	24	6.7	75	20.9
University for the Creative Arts	SE	1,806	43.7	-	-	1,806	43.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Bedfordshire	ES	5,100	63.6	-	-	5,100	63.6	2	2.4	-	-	2	2.4
University of Brighton	SE	2,186	18.7	31	0.3	2,217	18.9	90	40.5	11	5.0	101	45.5
University of Bristol	SW	2,390	16.7	385	2.7	2,775	19.4	71	10.7	31	4.7	102	15.4
University of Cambridge	ES	1,327	13.4	781	7.9	2,108	21.2	101	22.2	44	9.7	145	31.9
University of Central Lancashire	NW	2,099	14.9	77	0.5	2,176	15.5	37	19.3	11	5.7	48	25.0
University of Chester	NW	2,371	29.7	324	4.1	2,695	33.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Cumbria	NW	1,631	36.0	-	-	1,631	36.0	3	60.0	-	-	3	60.0
University of Derby	EM	2,775	27.6	392	3.9	3,167	31.5	47	61.8	10	13.2	57	75.0
University of Durham	NE	2,080	18.3	437	3.8	2,517	22.2	30	47.6	-	-	30	47.6
University of East London	GL	5,132	61.9	2,001	24.1	7,133	86.1	114	57.6	42	21.2	156	78.8
University of Exeter	SW	3,052	20.9	1,099	7.5	4,151	28.4	17	38.6	1	2.3	18	40.9
University of Gloucestershire	SW	1,314	21.1	683	11.0	1,997	32.1	5	29.4	-	-	5	29.4
University of Greenwich	GL	2,395	21.0	288	2.5	2,683	23.5	9	3.4	3	1.1	12	4.5
University of Hertfordshire	ES	1,152	9.3	-	-	1,152	9.3	63	35.2	-	-	63	35.2
University of Lincoln	EM	3,018	35.6	1,442	17.0	4,460	52.6	24	75.0	7	21.9	31	96.9
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	NE	5,217	32.7	1,307	8.2	6,524	40.9	113	36.5	2	0.6	115	37.1
University of Oxford	SE	1,403	14.5	779	8.0	2,182	22.5	30	38.0	7	8.9	37	46.8
University of Plymouth	SW	1,232	8.5	42	0.3	1,274	8.8	114	28.4	8	2.0	122	30.4
University of Portsmouth	SE	5,150	35.2	1,627	11.1	6,777	46.3	141	45.9	17	5.5	158	51.5
University of Southampton	SE	3,249	25.4	778	6.1	4,027	31.5	85	18.8	26	5.7	111	24.5
University of St Mark & St John	SW	224	11.8	98	5.2	322	17.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Suffolk	ES	1,297	17.5	175	6.1	1,472	51.0	7	50.0	-	-	7	50.0
University of Sunderland	NE	4,122	52.7	1,442	18.4	5,564	71.2	45	47.4	11	11.6	56	58.9
University of Sussex	SE	2,378	27.4	1,100	12.7	3,478	40.1	40	36.0	3	2.7	43	38.7
University of the Arts, London	GL	3,133	31.6	156	1.6	3,289	33.2	7	100.0	-	-	7	100.0
University of the West of England, Bristol	SW	3,342	24.1	-	-	3,342	24.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Winchester	SE	1,701	30.5	524	9.4	2,225	39.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Wolverhampton	WM	589	5.6	131	1.2	720	6.8	78	69.0	6	5.3	84	74.3
University of Worcester	WM	598	7.9	288	3.8	886	11.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of York	YH	2,430	23.5	595	5.7	3,025	29.2	26	22.8	13	11.4	39	34.2
Writtle University College	ES	70	9.4	138	18.5	208	27.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
York St John University	YH	1,447	32.1	523	11.6	1,970	43.7	1	25.0	-	-	1	25.0



Office for Fair Access

Nicholson House

Lime Kiln Close

BRISTOL

BS34 8SR

tel 0117 931 7171

www.offa.org.uk