Appendix 4

Verification of HESES data

1.   The data submitted in HESES09 will be used to determine grant adjustments for 2009-10 and provisional grant allocations for 2010-11. As such it is important that the data submitted are accurate and suitable for this purpose.

2.   The HESES09 workbook contains a series of credibility checks and comparison tables incorporated to help institutions check data credibility prior to submission to HEFCE. Once the data have been submitted these checks and tables will be used by HEFCE staff to check the data are reasonable. Institutions will be asked to explain any apparent anomalies, or correct data, before verifying the data are correct. The HESES09 workbook also contains a series of validation checks which ensure that incorrect data are not submitted. The validation checks are described in Appendix 2.

Credibility checks

3.   A number of credibility checks are built into Tables 1a-5 of the Excel workbook. These checks are intended to warn institutions that they have entered data which may be (but are not necessarily) erroneous. Credibility cells above each column in each table in the workbook return **First stage credibility: OK** if the data have passed first stage credibility. If data in a table satisfy one or more of the conditions set out in the table in this appendix, then these cells return **First stage credibility: Warnings (see below table)** and a message describing the warning will be displayed below the table.

4.   Where first stage credibility warnings are shown, institutions should check that the data they have entered are correct and meet the guidance and definitions set out in the relevant section of the HESES09 publication. Completed workbooks that have first stage credibility warnings may be uploaded to our extranet; **however, institutions are asked to inform HEFCE of the reason(s) why the data are credible by e-mailing dataverification@hefce.ac.uk by 10 December 2009**. Such explanations will inform the subsequent data verification process.

Comparison tables

5.   The workbook also incorporates a series of comparison tables (within the COM1 and COM2 worksheets). These tables contain comparisons of the data submitted in HESES09 with data submitted in HESES08 and other sources. This information is provided to allow identification of any material changes in data which may indicate errors in the submission.

6.   The 'COM1' and 'COM2' worksheets contain 11 separate tables named A to K. Automatic check highlighting will highlight (in yellow) data which may be (but are not necessarily) anomalous or represent a significant year-on-year change. **Where data are highlighted institutions are asked to inform HEFCE of the reason(s) why the data are credible by e-mailing dataverification@hefce.ac.uk by 10 December 2009**. Such explanations will inform the subsequent data verification process.

7.   Not all tables contain automatic check highlighting. Tables that do contain automatic check highlighting say 'Automatic check highlighting is carried out in this table' underneath that table's title.

8.   The content of each comparison table, along with further information about the automatic check highlighting carried out in each table is described in the table below. This table also describes the further routine checks HEFCE carries out on the data using these tables. **Institutions are encouraged to review the comparison tables using this guidance and inform HEFCE of the reason(s) why the data are credible by e-mailing dataverification@hefce.ac.uk by 10 December 2009.**

The verification process

9.   When we receive the HESES09 returns, we will review the data and e-mailed explanations for outstanding credibility checks and automatic check highlighting. Where sufficient explanations have not already been provided we will ask you to explain the reasons for:
   a.   any outstanding credibility checks
   b.   significant differences between the data submitted and data from other sources, apparent from the comparison tables
   c.   apparent anomalies within the HESES09 data.

10.   The timescale for verifying HESES data is tight and we will ask for responses within five working days.

11.   You should use the credibility checks, comparison tables and the guidance in the table in this appendix to inform your own credibility checking of your data and should, where possible, provide explanations for any apparent data anomalies in the workbook you initially upload. This information will inform the checks carried out by HEFCE and will reduce the need for follow up questions.

Further information

12.   Any questions about your data prior to submission should be e-mailed to heses@hefce.ac.uk and questions about the estimated grant adjustments should be addressed to your HEFCE higher education policy adviser (HEPA) in the first instance (for contact details of your HEPA, see www.hefce.ac.uk under About us/Contact us).

13.   Verification checks will be carried out by a small team of data verification specialists at HEFCE. Any questions you have throughout the verification process should be e-mailed to dataverification@hefce.ac.uk. This e-mail box will be checked by the data verification team so e-mailing this address will ensure your query is dealt with as quickly as possible. If you wish to discuss the queries we raise, or your data, please ring the contact notified to you in the initial letter we will send detailing our queries.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
Non-completions		
Credibility checks relating to non-completions are included in Tables 1a, 2 and 3 as follows: • For Table 1a – for each level (excluding PGT and PGR) aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 100 and Column 3 $\div$ (Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ -0.014. • For Table 2 – for each level (excluding PGT) aggregated across all fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 200 and Column 3 $\div$ (Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ -0.005. • For Table 3 – for each level (excluding PGT and PGR) aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 100 and Column 3 $\div$ (Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ -0.02. • For Tables 1a, 2 and 3 – for each cell (excluding where level = PGT or PGR), Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 50 and Column 3 = 0.	Table A on sheet COM1 shows the calculation of non-completion rates after the 1 December census date for HESA 2007-08 and for HESES08 and HESES09. These are forecast non-completions (Column 3 on HESES Tables 1a and 3) as a percentage of total countable years (Columns 1 plus 2 on HESES Tables 1a and 3): HEFCE-funded students only, by mode and level. The HESA 2007-08 data are taken from the '2007-08 statistics derived from HESA data for the monitoring and allocation of funding', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 27 April 2009 or as subsequently revised. Generally we expect consistency between the three sets of data. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, there is a difference of at least 2 per cent between the HESA 2007-08 non-completion rate and the HESES09 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES09 is at least 20. • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, there is a difference of at least 2 per cent	Further guidance on non-completions and the completion of Column 3 can be found in paragraphs 28-51 of Annex E and paragraph 4 of Annex M respectively.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
	between the HESES08 non-completion rate and the HESES09 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES09 is at least 20. We will also compare the HESES09 non-completion rates with rates found through audit (where available) and may query any apparent discrepancy. We may also query where HESES09 rates vary substantially from sector norms or where there are unusual patterns of estimated non-completion rates across different modes and levels.	
Part-time FTE		
Credibility checks on Table 3 will highlight where • For each level (except 'UG (excl. FD)') aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 $\geq$ 50 and Column 4a $\div$ Column 4 $\geq$ 0.8. • For 'UG (excl. FD)' aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 $\geq$ 50 and Column 4a $\div$ Column 4 $\geq$ 0.67.	Table B on sheet COM1 compares the average FTE rates for part-time students in 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10. 'Maximum difference' shows the larger of the difference between the 2007-08 and 2009-10 data and the difference between the 2008-09 and 2009-10 data. The 2008-09 and 2009-10 data are the estimated FTE (Column 4a on Table 3) divided by estimated part-time countable years (Column 4 on Table 3): HEFCE-funded students only, by price group and level. The HESA 2007-08 data are taken from the '2007-08 statistics derived from HESA data for the monitoring and allocation of funding', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 27 April 2009 or as subsequently revised. Generally we expect consistency between the three sets of data.	Further guidance on FTE for part-time students and the completion of Column 4a can be found in Annex F and paragraph 6 of Annex M respectively.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
	Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: for each combination of price group and level of study, the value of 'Maximum difference' is at least 0.1 where the headcount in Column 4 of HESES09 is at least 50.	
	New entrants	
On Table 4 credibility checks will highlight where: • For sandwich year-out students, Column 3 > 0. • For students recorded as subject to 'Regulated £0' fees, Column 3 > 0. • For full-time postgraduate taught students recorded as subject to regulated full fees, Column 1 + Column 2 ≠ Column 3. On Table 5 credibility checks will highlight where • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'FD', 'Other UG degree' or 'PGR' and Column 1 ≥ 30 and Column 2 ÷ Column 1 ≥ 0.8. • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)', 'FD' or 'PGT' and Column 1 ≥ 50 and Column 2 ÷ Column 1 ≤ 0.33. • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students	Table C on sheet COM1 compares the number of fundable new entrants in 2008-09 and 2009-10 and shows the percentage change between the two. The data are from Column 2 of Table 5: HEFCE-fundable students (HEFCE-funded + independently funded), by mode and level. For comparison the percentage change in the total number of HEFCE-fundable students between 2008-09 and 2009-10 is shown. There is currently no automatic check highlighting in this table. We will query any large changes in new entrants (overall changes of more than 3%) unless we are aware of a reason for this change, for example the award of ASNs. We will also query any apparent discrepancy between the change in new entrants and the change in overall student numbers.	The definition of 'new entrant' can be found in paragraph 52 of Annex E

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses, Column 1 $\geq$ 30 and Column 2 ÷ Column 1 $\leq$ 0.2. • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)' and Column 1 $\geq$ 50 and Column 1 = Column 2. • For all part-time students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'FD', 'Other UG degree' or' PGR' and Column 1 $\geq$ 30 and Column 2 ÷ Column 1 $\geq$ 0.7. • For all part-time students aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses, Column 1 $\geq$ 30 and Column 2 ÷ Column 1 $\leq$ 0.1. • For all students aggregated across all modes, levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 2 = 0. • For all students aggregated across all modes, levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 = Total Column 2.		

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
	FTEs by price group	
Not applicable	Table D on sheet COM1 compares the FTEs from HESES09 against our expectation. The '2009-10 Assumed' data are the HESES08 FTEs plus the various adjustments to FTEs (for additional student numbers and other miscellaneous transfers and adjustments) included in the latest 2009-10 grant Table D. The '2009-10 Actual' data are the FTEs taken from Column 4 of Table 1a (for full-time), Column 4 of Table 2 weighted at 0.5 FTE (for sandwich year-out) and Column 4a of Table 3 (for part-time). In both cases the data are for HEFCE-funded FTE students only by price group, mode and level. There is no automatic highlighting in this table. We may query any apparent shifts across price groups or any large differences between assumed and actual FTE.	Further information on the assignment of activity to price groups can be found in Annex H.
	Fundability status	
Not applicable	Table E on sheet COM1 compares how students have been attributed between the four categories of fundability status (HEFCE-funded, independently funded, non-fundable, and Island and overseas) in 2008-09 and 2009-10. The data are the headcount numbers and percentage	The definition of each category of fundability status can be found in Annex G.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
	change for estimated countable years (Column 4 of Tables 1a, 2, 3 of HESES08 and HESES09) in each fundability category: by mode (full-time and sandwich year-out, or part-time) and level. There is currently no automatic check highlighting in this table. We may query: • significant shifts in the fundability status of students, particularly where independently funded students are concerned. • where significant number of independently funded students (more than 50 on Tables 1a, 2 and 3 combined) have been returned. We may ask for the details of the funding arrangements of independently funded students. • where independently funded students have been returned and the institution has a positive percentage difference. It is not usually in the interest of institutions to return students as independently funded in these circumstances.	
	Long years of instance	
Credibility checks in Tables 1a and 3 will highlight where Length = Long and Level = FD and Column 1 + Column 2 >	Table F on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of students recorded as being on long courses in 2008-09 and 2009-10. The data are the proportion of total	The definition of a long year of study can be found in Annex K. Further

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
0.	estimated countable years (Column 4 of Tables 1a and 3 of HESES08 and HESES09) recorded as being long: HEFCE-funded students only, by mode (full-time or part-time) and level. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study and level of study there is a difference of at least 5 per cent between the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long in HESES08, and the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long in HESES09 where the headcount in Column 4 of HESES09 is at least 50. • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long has either changed from zero in HESES08, or has changed to zero in HESES09 (where the change in proportion is at least 10 per cent). We may also ask institutions for evidence that courses returned as long meet the criteria.	guidance on long years of instance and foundation degrees can be found in paragraphs 3-4 of Annex K.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
Fee status		

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
Credibility checks on non-regulated fees • For full-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 30 and ('Non-regulated' Column 1 + Column 2) $\div$ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ 0.1. • For full-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 5 and Total Column 1 + Column 2 < 30 and ('Non-regulated' Column 1 + Column 2) $\div$ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ 0.25. • Where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Non-regulated' total > 0. • Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Non-regulated' category can be found in paragraph 11 of Annex M. Credibility checks on Regulated £0 fees • For HEFCE-fundable students aggregated across all modes and columns, (difference between HESES08 'Regulated £0' total and HESES09 'Regulated £0' total > 100) or (HESES08 'Regulated £0' total = 0 and HESES09 'Regulated £0' total ≠ 0) or (HESES08 'Regulated £0' total ≠ 0 and	Table G on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of students who are subject to regulated fees in 2008-09 and 2009-10. The data are the total number of students recorded as being subject to regulated fees as a proportion of the total student numbers on Table 4 (Columns 1 and 2): All home and EC students, by fee level, mode and level. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: for each combination of mode of study, level of study and fee level, the difference in the proportion of students on designated courses subject to regulated fees between HESES08 and HESES09 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount in HESES09 is at least 50.	Further information on recording fee levels in Table 4 can be found in paragraphs 9-14 of Annex M.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
HESES09 'Regulated £0' total = 0). • Where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Regulated £0' total > 0. • Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated £0' category can be found in paragraph 10c of Annex M. <u>Credibility checks on regulated half fees</u> • For full-time students aggregated across all price groups (excluding ITT(QTS)), levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 30 and ('Regulated half fee' Column 1 + Column 2) $\div$ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ 0.05. • For full-time students aggregated across all price groups (excluding ITT(QTS)), levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 5 and Total Column 1 + Column 2 < 30 and ('Regulated half fee' Column 1 + Column 2) $\div$ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ 0.25. • For part-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, 'Regulated half fee' total > 0. • For part-time postgraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses 'Regulated half fee' total > 0.		

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
• Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated half fee' category can be found in paragraph 10b of Annex M. Credibility checks on regulated full fees • For part-time students aggregated across all price groups, levels and fundability statuses, 'Regulated full fee' total > 0. • Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated full fee' category can be found in paragraph 10a of Annex M, and further guidance on which part-time students can be recorded as being subject to regulated fees can be found in paragraphs 12-13 of Annex M.		
Proportion of undergraduates on sub-degree courses		
Not applicable	Table H on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of undergraduate students who are recorded as being on below degree-level courses in 2008-09 and 2009-10. The data are from Table 5 and are calculated as ['HND' + 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)'] as a proportion of ['HND' + 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)' + 'FD' + 'Other UG'] All home and EC students, by mode. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as	Further guidance on the breakdown of level of study in Table 5 can be found in paragraph 11 of Annex L.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
	follows: for each mode of study, the difference in the proportion of undergraduate students on sub-degree level courses between HESES08 and HESES09 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount of undergraduates in HESES09 is at least 50.	
	Students franchised-out	
Not applicable	Table I on sheet COM2 compares the students recorded as wholly franchised-out in HESES09 with an expected figure for 2009-10. • The '2009-10 Assumed' is the sum of those students recorded as wholly franchised-out in Column 3 of Table 5 of HESES08; plus any students transferred to the institution for 2009-10 as a result of a further education college electing to be indirectly funded. • The '2009-10 Actual' is taken from Column 3 of Table 5 of HESES09. In both cases, all students are headcounts and are disaggregated by type of institution to which they are franchised, mode and level. The transfers from further education colleges that have been added in to the '2009-10 Assumed' figures were originally calculated as FTEs. For the purposes of converting them to headcounts, we have assumed that each part-time student counts as	Further guidance on which activity should be counted as franchised-out can be found in paragraphs 7-13 of Annex C.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
	0.5 FTE. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study, level of study and type of institution franchised to, the difference between the assumed 2009-10 franchised-out numbers and the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HESES09 is at least 20 per cent, where the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HESES09 are at least 100. • For each combination of mode of study, level of study and institution franchised to, the franchised-out numbers have either changed from zero in the 2009-10 assumed numbers, or have changed to zero in HESES09.	
Split between 'home' and 'other' students	
Not applicable	Table J on COM2 compares the split of numbers between 'Home' and 'Other' for home and EC students in Table 5 of HESES09 with HESES08.The data are for all home and EC students, by mode and level of study. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as	Guidance on the disaggregation between 'Home' and 'Other' can be found in paragraph 10 of Annex L.

Credibility checks	Comparison table	Further information
	follows: for each combination of mode of study and level of study, the difference between the proportion of home and EC students recorded as home in HESES08 and HESES09 is at least 5 per cent, where the total home and EC students recorded on Table 5 of HESES09 is at least 50.	
	Clinical Students (FT UG)	
Not applicable	Table K on sheet COM2 compares the numbers of full-time undergraduate clinical students on Tables 1a and 1b. The data are the estimated countable years for full-time undergraduates in price group A (Column 4 of Table 1a), compared to the estimated countable years for full-time undergraduates in clinical medicine and dentistry (Column 4, rows 2 and 4, of Table 1b): HEFCE-funded. In general, any differences between these two figures should be due to veterinary science students only. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: where the differences between the data in Table 1a and Table 1b in HESES09 cannot be attributed to veterinary science.	Guidance on the completion of Table 1b can be found in paragraphs 2-8 of Annex L.