

Higher Education in Further Education: Students Survey 2011-12 (HEFCE 2011/26)

Appendix 4

Verification checks on HEIFES11 data

1. The data submitted in HEIFES11 will be used to determine grant adjustments for 2011-12 and initial grant allocations for 2012-13. As such it is important that the data submitted are accurate and suitable for this purpose.
2. The HEIFES11 workbook contains a series of credibility checks in the form of first stage credibility warnings on Tables 1 to 7 and automatic check highlighting on the comparison tables to help colleges check data credibility prior to submission to HEFCE. Where credibility checks are present in the submitted workbook (either in the form of first stage credibility warnings on Tables 1 to 7 or automatic check highlighting on the comparison tables) colleges must inform us of the reason(s) why the data are credible. An e-mail detailing why the data are credible should be sent to dataverification@hefce.ac.uk by 16 November 2011. Such explanations will inform the subsequent data verification process.
3. Once the data have been submitted these checks and comparison tables will be used by HEFCE staff to check the data are reasonable. Colleges will be asked to explain any apparent anomalies, or correct data, before verifying the data are correct. Annex E paragraphs 18 to 20 of the HEIFES11 publication (HEFCE 2011/26) contain more information on this data verification process.
4. This appendix describes in detail the credibility checks that are carried out within the HEIFES11 workbook, and describes the content of each comparison table in the COM1, COM2 and COM3 worksheets. For information on how credibility checks are displayed in the workbook and what colleges should do if first stage credibility warnings or automatic check highlighting are shown, see paragraphs 4 to 10 of Annex E of the HEIFES11 publication (HEFCE 2011/26).
5. The HEIFES11 workbook also contains a series of validation checks which ensure that incorrect data are not submitted. The validation checks are described in Appendix 2.

Further information

6. If the source of a first stage credibility warning in Tables 1-7 or automatic check highlighting in the comparison tables cannot be identified, colleges should e-mail us for advice at heifes@hefce.ac.uk.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Non-completions		
<p>Credibility checks relating to non-completions are included in Tables 1, 2 and 3 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Table 1 – for each level aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 ≥ 50 and Column 3 \div (Column 1 + Column 2) ≥ -0.03. • For Table 3 – for each level aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 ≥ 50 and Column 3 \div (Column 1 + Column 2) ≥ -0.03. • For Tables 1, 2 and 3 – for each cell, Column 1 + Column 2 ≥ 50 and Column 3 = 0. 	<p>Table A on sheet COM1 shows the calculation of non-completion rates after the 1 November census date for ILR 2009-10 and for HEIFES10 and HEIFES11. These are forecast non-completions (Column 3 on HEIFES Tables 1 and 3) as a percentage of total countable years (Columns 1 plus 2 on HEIFES Tables 1 and 3): HEFCE-fundable students only, by mode and level. The ILR 2009-10 data are taken from the ‘2009-10 statistics derived from ILR data for the monitoring and allocation of funding in FECs’, originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska’s letter to heads of institutions on 8 April 2011 or as subsequently revised.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each combination of mode of study and level of study (except PG), there is a difference of at least 5 percentage points between the ILR 2009-10 non-completion rate and the HEIFES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HEIFES11 is at least 20. • For each combination of mode of study and level of study (except PG), there is a difference of at least 5 	<p>Further guidance on non-completions and the completion of Column 3 can be found in Annex I and paragraph 7 of Annex D respectively.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>percentage points between the HEIFES10 non-completion rate and the HEIFES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HEIFES11 is at least 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each combination of mode of study and where level is PG, there is an increase of 5 percentage points or less or any decrease, between the ILR 2009-10 non-completion rate and the HEIFES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HEIFES11 is at least 20 • For each combination of mode of study and where level is PG, there is an increase of 5 percentage points or less or any decrease, between the HEIFES10 non-completion rate and the HEIFES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HEIFES11 is at least 20 <p>We may also query unusual differences between the estimated non-completion rates across different modes and levels.</p> <p>Where non-completion rates vary from historical rates and/or those determined during audit colleges will need to ensure that there is robust evidence to support the changed rates. We will ask colleges to provide details of how they have arrived at their estimated rates.</p>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Part-time FTE		
<p>On Table 3 credibility checks will highlight where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each level (except 'UG (excl. FD)') aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 ≥ 10 and Column 4a \div Column 4 ≥ 0.8. • For 'UG (excl. FD)' aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 ≥ 10 and Column 4a \div Column 4 ≥ 0.67. 	<p>Table B on sheet COM1 compares the average FTE rates for part-time students in 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12. 'Maximum difference' shows the larger of the difference between the 2009-10 and 2011-12 data and the difference between the 2010-11 and 2011-12 data. The 2010-11 and 2011-12 data are the estimated FTE (Column 4a on Table 3) divided by estimated part-time countable years (Column 4 on Table 3): HEFCE-fundable students only, by price group and level. The ILR 2009-10 data are taken from the '2009-10 statistics derived from ILR data for the monitoring and allocation of funding in FECs', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 8 April 2011 or as subsequently revised. Generally we expect consistency between the three sets of data.</p> <p>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 HEIFES11 is at least 50. This does not include data where ILR 2009-10 is zero but there are non-zero values for both HEIFES10 and HEIFES11.</p>	<p>Further guidance on FTE for part-time students and the completion of Column 4a can be found in Annex J and paragraph 9 of Annex D respectively.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
New entrants		
<p>On Table 5 credibility checks will highlight where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'FD', 'Other UG degree' or 'PG' and Column 1 ≥ 30 and Column 2 \div 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 'PG' and Column 1 ≥ 50 and Column 2 \div Column 1 ≤ 0.33. • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses, Column 1 ≥ 30 and Column 2 \div Column 1 ≤ 0.2. • For all part-time students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'FD', 'Other UG degree' or 'PG' and Column 1 ≥ 30 and Column 2 \div Column 1 ≥ 0.7. • For all part-time students aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses, Column 1 ≥ 30 and Column 2 \div Column 1 ≤ 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 	<p>Table C on sheet COM1 compares the number of fundable new entrants in 2010-11 and 2011-12 and shows the percentage change between the two. The data are from Column 2 of Table 5: HEFCE-fundable students, by mode and level. For comparison the percentage change in the total number of HEFCE-fundable students between 2010-11 and 2011-12 is shown.</p> <p>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 per cent) unless we are aware of a reason for this change, for example the award of additional student numbers. We will also query any apparent discrepancy between the change in new entrants and the change in overall student numbers.</p>	<p>The definition of 'new entrant' can be found in paragraph 30 of Annex D.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 = Total Column 2.		
FTEs by price group		
Not applicable	<p>Table D on sheet COM1 compares the FTEs from HEIFES11 against our expectation.</p> <p>The '2011-12 Assumed' data are the HEIFES10 FTEs (including independently funded students) plus the various adjustments to FTEs (for additional student numbers and other miscellaneous transfers and adjustments) included in the latest 2011-12 grant Table D. The '2011-12 Actual' data are the FTEs taken from Column 4 of Table 1 (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-fundable FTE students only by price group, mode and level.</p> <p>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.</p>	Further information on the assignment of activity to price groups can be found in Annex L.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Fundability status		
Not applicable	<p>Table E on sheet COM1 compares how students have been attributed between the three categories of fundability status (HEFCE-fundable, non-fundable, and Island and overseas) in 2010-11 and 2011-12. The data are the headcount numbers and percentage change for estimated countable years (Column 4 of Tables 1, 2, 3 of HEIFES10 and HEIFES11) in each fundability category: by mode (full-time and sandwich year-out, or part-time) and level. The 2010-11 data for HEFCE-fundable includes students returned as HEFCE-funded and independently funded in HEIFES10.</p> <p>There is currently no automatic check highlighting in this table. We may query:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant shifts in the fundability status of students. • Where few or no non-fundable students are returned. We would expect that most colleges will have some ELQ students. 	The definition of each category of fundability status can be found in Annex K.
Long years of programme of study		
Credibility checks in Tables 1 and 3 will highlight where students are recorded as being on long foundation degree courses (Length = Long and Level = FD and Column 1 + Column 2 > 0).	Table F on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of students recorded as being on long courses in 2010-11 and 2011-12. The data are the proportion of total estimated countable years (Column 4 of Tables 1 and 3	The definition of a long year of study can be found in Annex O. Further guidance on long years of

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>of HEIFES10 and HEIFES11) recorded as being long: HEFCE-fundable students only, by price group, mode (full-time or part-time) and level.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each combination of price group, 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 HEIFES10, and the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long in HEIFES11 where the headcount in Column 4 of HEIFES11 is at least 20. • 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 HEIFES10, or has changed to zero in HEIFES11 (where the change in proportion is at least 10 per cent). <p>We may also ask colleges for evidence that courses returned as long meet the criteria.</p>	<p>programme of study and foundation degrees can be found in paragraphs 4-5 of Annex O.</p>
Fee status		
<p><u>Credibility checks on non-regulated fees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For full-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, Total Column 	<p>Table G on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of students who are subject to regulated fees in 2010-11 and 2011-12. The data are the total number of students</p>	<p>Further information on recording fee levels in Table 4 can be found in</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>1 + Column 2 \geq 30 and ('Non-regulated' Column 1 + Column 2) \div (Total Column 1 + Column 2) \geq 0.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. For full-time students where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Non-regulated' total > 0. <p>Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Non-regulated' category can be found in paragraph 4 of Annex P.</p> <p><u>Credibility checks on Regulated £0 fees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Regulated £0' total > 0. <p>Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated £0' category can be found in paragraph 3c of Annex P.</p> <p><u>Credibility checks on regulated half fees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>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 EU students, by fee level, mode and level.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 HEIFES10 and HEIFES11 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount in HEIFES11 is at least 50. For each combination of mode of study, level of study and fee level, the proportion of students on designated courses subject to regulated fees has either changed from zero in HEIFES10, or has changed to zero in HEIFES11. <p>We may also query where the proportion of students on designated courses subject to regulated fees varies by price group</p> <p>Table P on sheet COM3 compares the numbers of HEFCE fundable, undergraduate (including foundation degrees) students on designated courses subject to Regulated £0 fees, by mode, between 2009-10 ILR or</p>	<p>Annex P.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>Column 1 + Column 2) \geq 0.05.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 full-time postgraduate students aggregated across all fundability statuses and price groups B, D and media studies, 'Regulated half fee' total $>$ 0 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. <p>Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated half fee' category can be found in paragraph 3b of Annex P.</p> <p><u>Credibility checks on regulated full fees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For part-time students aggregated across all price groups, levels and fundability statuses, 'Regulated full fee' total $>$ 0. For full-time postgraduate students aggregated 	<p>HEIFES 2010-11, and HEIFES 2011-12 data.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table where for each mode, the difference between 2009-10 ILR or HEIFES 2010-11, and HEIFES 2011-12 data is at least 10 per cent.</p>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>across all fundability statuses and price groups B, D and media studies, 'Regulated full fee' total > 0.</p> <p>Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated full fee' category can be found in paragraph 3a of Annex P, and further guidance on which part-time students can be recorded as being subject to regulated fees can be found in paragraphs 5-6 of Annex P.</p>		
<p>Proportion of undergraduates on sub-degree courses</p>		
<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Table H on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of undergraduate students who are recorded as being on below degree-level courses in 2010-11 and 2011-12. 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'] for all Home and EU students, by mode.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: for each mode of study, the difference in the proportion of undergraduate students on sub-degree level courses between HEIFES10 and HEIFES11 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount of undergraduates in HEIFES11 is at least 50.</p>	<p>Further guidance on the breakdown of level of study in Table 5 can be found in paragraph 23 of Annex D.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Students franchised-out		
Not applicable	<p>Table I on sheet COM2 compares the students recorded as wholly franchised-out in HEIFES11 with an expected figure for 2011-12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The '2011-12 Assumed' is the sum of those students recorded as wholly franchised-out in Column 3 of Table 5 of HEIFES10; plus any students transferred to the college for 2011-12 as a result of a further education college electing to be indirectly funded. • The '2011-12 Actual' is taken from Column 3 of Table 5 of HEIFES11. <p>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 '2011-12 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 0.5 FTE.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each combination of mode of study, level of study and type of institution franchised to, the difference between the assumed 2011-12 	Further guidance on which activity should be counted as franchised-out can be found in paragraphs 5-12 of Annex F.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>franchised-out numbers and the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HEIFES11 is at least 10 per cent, where the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HEIFES11 are at least 100.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2011-12 assumed numbers, or have changed to zero in HEIFES11. 	
Split between 'Home' and 'other' students		
Not applicable	<p>Table J on COM2 compares the split of numbers between 'Home' and 'Other' for Home and EU students in Table 5 of HEIFES11 with HEIFES10. The data are for all Home and EU students, by mode and level of study.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each combination of mode of study and level of study, the difference between the proportion of Home and EU students recorded as Home in HEIFES10 and HEIFES11 is at least 5 per cent, where the total Home and EU students recorded on Table 5 of HEIFES11 is at least 50. For each combination of mode of study and level 	Guidance on the disaggregation between 'Home' and 'Other' can be found in paragraph 22 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	of study, the proportion of 'other' students has either changed from zero in HEIFES10, or has changed to zero in HEIFES11.	
Media studies price group		
For Tables 1 and 3, aggregated across all modes, lengths, levels and fundability statuses, for colleges who submitted to the HEFCE review of media studies in 2004-05, Total of Column 1 + Total of Column 2 = 0 where price group = Media studies.	Not applicable	Guidance on the media studies price group can be found in paragraphs 5 and 12 of Annex L.
Co-funded employer engagement students		
Where a college has co-funded employer engagement FTEs for 2011-12 (as shown in the latest 2011-12 grant Table B), credibility checks in Tables 1-3 will highlight where Total Column 5 = 0.	<p>Table K on sheet COM3 compares the co-funded employer engagement FTEs recorded in Column 5 of Tables 1 and 2 and Column 5a of Table 3 in HEIFES11 with an expected figure for 2011-12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The '2011-12 Assumed FTEs' are the sum of '2011-12 core FTEs', '2010-11 FTE shortfall against 2010-11 core' and 'ASNs awarded for 2011', all included in the latest 2011-12 grant Table H as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The '2011-12 core FTEs' are the sum of the '2010-11 Recruited FTEs' and 'Adjustment to 2010-11 FTEs' from Columns F and G of grant Table H. 	Guidance on the completion of Columns 5 and 5a can be found in paragraphs 10-11 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>ii. The '2010-11 FTE shortfall against 2010-11 core' are 'FTEs awarded up to 2010-11' minus '2010-11 Recruited FTEs' from Columns E and F of grant Table H.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'ASNs awarded for 2011' are the '2011-12 ASN FTEs' from Column H of grant Table H • The '2011-12 Actual FTEs' are taken from Column 5 of Tables 1 and 2 (weighted at 0.5 FTE for sandwich year-out) and Column 5a of Table 3 of HEIFES11. <p>All figures are FTEs rather than headcounts and are disaggregated by mode and level.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, the difference between the 2011-12 assumed FTEs and the 2011-12 actual FTEs is at least 20 per cent, where the 2011-12 actual FTEs are at least 50. 	
2011-12 student number control		
On Table 6 credibility checks will highlight where:	Table L in COM3 compares full-time years of programme of study counted toward the student number control in	Guidance on the completion of Table 6 can

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For undergraduates for each fundability status, Column 3 of Table 6 > 0 and the comparable total on Table 1 = 0 (for HEFCE-fundable this is Column 1 + Column 2, for employer co-funded this is Column 5) • For undergraduates for each fundability status, Column 3 of Table 6 = 0 and the comparable total on Table 1 > 0 (for HEFCE-fundable this is Column 1 + Column 2, for employer co-funded this is Column 5) • For HEFCE-fundable PGCEs, Column 3 = 0 and HEFCE-fundable PGCE students are included in 2009-10 ILR student data. The ILR 2009-10 data are taken from the '2009-10 statistics derived from ILR data for the monitoring and allocation of funding', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 8 April 11 or as subsequently revised. • For HEFCE-fundable, full-time and sandwich year-out undergraduates, Column 1b plus Column 2 of Table 6 differs by more than 5 per cent from the relevant sum of new entrants in Column 2 of Table 5 (full-time and sandwich year out HND plus Sub-degree (excl. HND) plus FD plus Other UG degree) • For HEFCE-fundable full-time and sandwich year- 	<p>2010-11 and 2011-12 and an equivalent population derived from 2009-10 ILR data. 'Maximum percentage change' shows the larger of the percentage change from 2009-10 to 2011-12 and the percentage change from 2010-11 to 2011-12.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each row the 'Maximum difference' is at least 10 per cent and where the difference between HEIFES11 and ILR09 or HEIFES10 is at least 5 FTE. <p>We may query any apparent shifts in the split of years of instance between Columns 1a, 1b and 2.</p> <p>We may also query where the proportion of UG students estimated to be in the AAB+ equivalent population differs substantially from the proportion of UG students known to be in this population.</p>	<p>be found in paragraphs 31-36 of Annex D and paragraphs 29-45 of Annex H.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>out undergraduates where, Column 1b + Column 2 of Table 6 = Total Column 2 of Table 5 and Column 1b + Column 2 of Table 6 \geq 500</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Total Column 3 \geq 50 and Total Column 1 = 0 • For each fundability status (HEFCE fundable or employer co-funded) the total number of students in Column 3, reported as being in the AAB+ equivalent population is greater than 10 per cent of the Total (that is, those who are in and those who are not in the AAB+ equivalent population) • For each fundability status (HEFCE fundable or employer co-funded) the total number of students in Column 3, reported as either in or not in the AAB+ equivalent population > 200 and no students are recorded in the AAB+ equivalent population • For each fundability status there is a difference of 10 percentage points between the proportion of students recorded as actually in the AAB+ equivalent population and the proportion of students recorded as estimated in the AAB+ equivalent population 		

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
2012-13 forecast of countable years and FTE		
<p>On Table 7 credibility checks will highlight where old-regime students are recorded, but there are no new-regime students recorded, and vice-versa:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each combination of price group, level of study and mode of study, except sandwich year-out, Total old-regime counts of years of programme of study =0 and new-regime counts of years of programme of study >0. For each combination of price group, level of study and mode of study, except sandwich year-out, Total old-regime counts of years of programme of study >0 and new-regime counts of years of programme of study = 0. <p>A credibility check will highlight where new-regime sandwich year-out years of programme of study are returned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where Total Column 2(iii) > 0. <p>Credibility checks will highlight where the numbers of old-regime students recorded in Table 7 exceed numbers recorded in Tables 1 and 3 and where part-time FTEs recorded in Table 7 exceed FTEs recorded in Table 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each combination of price group, level of study 	<p>Table M in COM3 compares new-regime HEFCE-fundable and employer co-funded students recorded in Table 7 to Tables 1-3 split by price group, mode of study and level of study. It does this in two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compares the number of students recorded in Table 1-3 against Table 7 and Compares the proportion of students in each combination of price group, mode of study and level of study in Tables 1-3 to the equivalent proportion in Table 7. <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each combination of price group, mode of study, and level of study, there is a difference of 5 per cent between the numbers of HEFCE fundable students recorded in Column 4 of Tables 1-3 to that in Table 7. The proportion of students in Column 4, Tables 1-3, for each combination of price group, mode of study and level of study has a difference of at least 5 percentage points to the equivalent proportion of old-regime students in Table 7, for each combination of price group, mode of study and 	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>and mode of study, old-regime HEFCE-fundable counts of years of programme of study returned on Table 7 > counts of years of programme of study returned in Column 4 on Tables 1 or 3 across all lengths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each combination of price group, level of study and mode of study, old-regime employer co-funded counts of years of programme of study returned on Table 7 > counts of years of programme of study returned in Column 5 on Tables 1 or 3 across all lengths. • For part-time FTEs, for each combination of price group and level of study old-regime, HEFCE fundable FTEs returned in Table 7 > HEFCE fundable FTEs in Column 4a(a) of Table 3, across all lengths. • For part-time FTEs, for each combination of price group and level of study, employer co-funded FTEs returned in Table 7 > employer co-funded FTEs in Column 5a of Table 3, across all lengths • Where a college has co-funded employer engagement FTE targets for 2011-12 (as shown in the latest 2011-12 grant Table B), credibility checks in Table 7 will highlight where Total in Column 1(ii), Column 2(ii), Column 3(ii), and Column 3a(ii) = 0 	<p>level of study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proportion of students recorded as old-regime students in Table 7, for each combination of price group, mode of study and level of study has a difference of at least 5 percentage points to the proportion of new-regime students recorded in Table 7 for each combination of price group, mode of study and level of study. <p>Table N compares the proportion of HEFCE fundable students returned in Table 5 that are recorded as new entrants with the proportion of students returned in Table 7 that are recorded as new-regime by mode and level of study. The proportion in Table 5, for each mode and level of study, is Column 2 / Column 1. The proportion in Table 7, for each level of study and for the following modes of study, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-time and sandwich year-out: $(\text{Column 1(iii)} + \text{Column 2(iii)}) / (\text{Column 1} + \text{Column 2})$ • Part-time: $\text{Column 3(iii)} / \text{Column 3}$ <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: for each combination of mode and level of study, there is a difference is 5 percentage points or more where the number of new-regime students is 5 or more.</p>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>Table O on sheet COM3 compares the part-time FTE recorded in Table 7 to the equivalent part-time FTE recorded in Table 3, split by price group and level of study. The FTE load in Table 3 is compared to the FTE load recorded in Table 7, split by old-regime, new-regime and the Total (new- and old-regime).</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: for each combination of price group and level, the difference in FTE load in Table 3 to Table 7 (for each regime type) is at least 10 per cent.</p>	