

# Higher Education Students Early Statistics Survey 2011-12 (HEFCE 2011/27)

## Appendix 4

### Verification checks on HESES11 data

1. The data submitted in HESES11 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 HESES11 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 institutions 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 1a to 7 or automatic check highlighting on the comparison tables) institutions 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](mailto:dataverification@hefce.ac.uk) by 9 December 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. Institutions 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 HESES11 publication (HEFCE 2011/27) contain more information on this data verification process.
4. This appendix describes in detail the credibility checks that are carried out within the HESES11 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 institutions should do if first stage credibility warnings or automatic check highlighting are shown, see paragraphs 4 to 10 of Annex E of the HESES11 publication (HEFCE 2011/27).
5. The HESES11 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, institutions should e-mail us for advice at [heses@hefce.ac.uk](mailto:heses@hefce.ac.uk).

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Non-completions		
<p>Credibility checks relating to non-completions are included in Tables 1a, 2 and 3 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Table 1a – for each level (excluding PGR) aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 <math>\geq 100</math> and Column 3 <math>\div</math> (Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\geq -0.014</math>.</li> <li>• For Table 2 – for each level aggregated across all fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 <math>\geq 200</math> and Column 3 <math>\div</math> (Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\geq -0.005</math>.</li> <li>• For Table 3 – for each level (excluding PGR) aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 <math>\geq 100</math> and Column 3 <math>\div</math> (Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\geq -0.02</math>.</li> <li>• For Tables 1a, 2 and 3 – for each cell (excluding where level = PGR), Column 1 + Column 2 <math>\geq 50</math> and Column 3 = 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Table A on sheet COM1 shows the calculation of non-completion rates after the 1 December census date for HESA 2009-10 and for HESES10 and HESES11. 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-fundable students only, by mode and level. The HESA 2009-10 data are taken from the ‘2009-10 statistics derived from HESA data for the monitoring and allocation of funding’, originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska’s letter to heads of institutions on 6 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"> <li>• For each combination of mode of study and level of study (except PGT), there is a difference of at least 5 percentage points between the HESA 2009-10 non-completion rate and the HESES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES11 is at least 20.</li> <li>• For each combination of mode of study and level of study (except PGT), there is a difference of at least 5</li> </ul>	<p>Further guidance on non-completions and the completion of Column 3 can be found in Annex I and paragraph 14 of Annex D respectively.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>percentage points between the HESES10 non-completion rate and the HESES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES11 is at least 20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each combination of mode of study and where level is PGT, there is an increase of 5 percentage points or less or any decrease, between the HESA 2009-10 non-completion rate and the HESES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES11 is at least 20</li> <li>• For each combination of mode of study and where level is PGT, there is an increase of 5 percentage points or less or any decrease, between the HESES10 non-completion rate and the HESES11 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES11 is at least 20</li> </ul> <p>We will also compare the HESES11 non-completion rates with rates found through audit (where available) and may query any large discrepancy. We may also query where HESES11 rates vary substantially from sector norms or where there are unusual patterns of 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 institutions will need to ensure that there is robust evidence to support</p>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	the changed rates. We will ask institutions to provide details of how they have arrived at their estimated rates.	
Part-time FTE		
<p>On Table 3 credibility checks will highlight where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each level (except 'UG (excl. FD)') aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 <math>\geq 50</math> and Column 4a <math>\div</math> Column 4 <math>\geq 0.8</math>.</li> <li>For 'UG (excl. FD)' aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 <math>\geq 50</math> and Column 4a <math>\div</math> Column 4 <math>\geq 0.67</math>.</li> </ul>	<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 HESA 2009-10 data are taken from the '2009-10 statistics derived from HESA data for the monitoring and allocation of funding', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 6 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 HESES11 is at least 50. This does not include data where HESA 2009-10 is zero but there are non-zero values for both HESES10 and HESES11.</p>	<p>Further guidance on FTE for part-time students and the completion of Column 4a can be found in Annex J and paragraph 16 of Annex D respectively.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-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"> <li>• 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 <math>\geq 30</math> and Column 2 <math>\div</math> Column 1 <math>\geq 0.8</math>.</li> <li>• 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 <math>\geq 50</math> and Column 2 <math>\div</math> Column 1 <math>\leq 0.33</math>.</li> <li>• For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses, Column 1 <math>\geq 30</math> and Column 2 <math>\div</math> Column 1 <math>\leq 0.2</math>.</li> <li>• For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)' and Column 1 <math>\geq 50</math> and Column 1 = Column 2.</li> <li>• For all part-time students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'FD', 'Other UG degree' or 'PGR' and Column 1 <math>\geq 30</math> and Column 2 <math>\div</math> Column 1 <math>\geq 0.7</math>.</li> <li>• For all part-time students aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses, Column 1 <math>\geq 30</math> and Column 2 <math>\div</math></li> </ul>	<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 34 of Annex D.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>Column 1 <math>\leq</math> 0.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For all students aggregated across all modes, levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 2 = 0.</li> <li>For all students aggregated across all modes, levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 = Total Column 2.</li> </ul>		
FTEs by price group		
Not applicable	<p>Table D on sheet COM1 compares the FTEs from HESES11 against our expectation.</p> <p>The '2011-12 Assumed' data are the HESES10 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 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-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 1a-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 1a, 2, 3 of HESES10 and HESES11) 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 HESES10.</p> <p>There is currently no automatic check highlighting in this table. We may query:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant shifts in the fundability status of students.</li> <li>• Where few or no non-fundable students are returned. We would expect that most institutions will have some ELQ students.</li> </ul>	The definition of each category of fundability status can be found in Annex K.
Long years of instance		
Credibility checks in Tables 1a 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 1a 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 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>of HESES10 and HESES11) 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"> <li>• 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 HESES10, and the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long in HESES11, where the headcount in Column 4 of HESES11 is at least 20.</li> <li>• 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 HESES10, or has changed to zero in HESES11 (where the change in proportion is at least 10 per cent).</li> </ul> <p>We may also ask institutions for evidence that courses returned as long meet the criteria.</p>	<p>instance 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"> <li>• For full-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, Total Column</li> </ul>	<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 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>1 + Column 2 <math>\geq</math> 30 and ('Non-regulated' Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\div</math> (Total Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\geq</math> 0.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For full-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 <math>\geq</math> 5 and Total Column 1 + Column 2 &lt; 30 and ('Non-regulated' Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\div</math> (Total Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\geq</math> 0.25.</li> <li>For full-time students where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Non-regulated' total &gt; 0.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>For HEFCE-fundable students aggregated across all modes and columns, (difference between HESES10 'Regulated £0' total and HESES11 'Regulated £0' total &gt; 35).</li> <li>Where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Regulated £0' total &gt; 0.</li> </ul> <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>	<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"> <li>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 HESES10 and HESES11 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount in HESES11 is at least 50.</li> <li>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 HESES10, or has changed to zero in HESES11.</li> </ul> <p>We may also query where the proportion of students on designated courses subject to regulated fees varies by price group.</p> <p>Table Q 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 HESA 2009-10 or</p>	<p>Annex P.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For full-time students aggregated across all price groups (excluding ITT(QTS)), levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 <math>\geq 30</math> and ('Regulated half fee' Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\div</math> (Total Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\geq 0.05</math>.</li> <li>• For full-time students aggregated across all price groups (excluding ITT(QTS)), levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 <math>\geq 5</math> and Total Column 1 + Column 2 <math>&lt; 30</math> and ('Regulated half fee' Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\div</math> (Total Column 1 + Column 2) <math>\geq 0.25</math>.</li> <li>• For full-time postgraduate taught students aggregated across all fundability statuses and price groups B, D and media studies, 'Regulated half fee' total <math>&gt; 0</math>.</li> <li>• For part-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, 'Regulated half fee' total <math>&gt; 0</math>.</li> <li>• For part-time postgraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses 'Regulated half fee' total <math>&gt; 0</math>.</li> </ul> <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>HESES 2010-11, and HESES 2011-12 data.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table where for each mode, the difference between HESA 2009-10 or HESES 2010-11, and HESES 2011-12 data is at least 10 per cent.</p>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p><u>Credibility checks on regulated full fees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For part-time students aggregated across all price groups, levels and fundability statuses, 'Regulated full fee' total &gt; 0.</li> <li>For full-time postgraduate taught students aggregated across all fundability statuses and price groups B, D and media studies, 'Regulated full fee' total &gt; 0.</li> </ul> <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</p>	<p>Further guidance on the breakdown of level of study in Table 5 can be found in paragraph 27 of Annex D.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	courses between HESES10 and HESES11 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount of undergraduates in HESES11 is at least 50.	
Students franchised-out		
Not applicable	<p>Table I on sheet COM2 compares the students recorded as wholly franchised-out in HESES11 with an expected figure for 2011-12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The '2011-12 Assumed' is the sum of those students recorded as wholly franchised-out in Column 3 of Table 5 of HESES10; plus any students transferred to the institution for 2011-12 as a result of a further education college electing to be indirectly funded.</li> <li>• The '2011-12 Actual' is taken from Column 3 of Table 5 of HESES11.</li> </ul> <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</p>	Further guidance on which activity should be counted as franchised-out can be found in paragraphs 6-13 of Annex F.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each combination of mode of study, level of study and type of institution franchised to, the difference between the assumed 2011-12 franchised-out numbers and the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HESES11 is at least 10 per cent, where the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HESES11 are at least 100.</li> <li>• 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 HESES11.</li> </ul>	
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 HESES11 with HESES10. 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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	Guidance on the disaggregation between 'Home' and 'Other' can be found in paragraph 26 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<p>HESES10 and HESES11 is at least 5 per cent, where the total Home and EU students recorded on Table 5 of HESES11 is at least 50.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each combination of mode of study and level of study, the proportion of 'other' students has either changed from zero in HESES10, or has changed to zero in HESES11.</li> </ul>	
Clinical Students (FT UG)		
Not applicable	<p>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-fundable. In general, any differences between these two figures should be due to veterinary science students only.</p> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: where there is a difference between the data in Table 1a and Table 1b in HESES11 and the institution is not on our list of veterinary science providers.</p>	<p>Guidance on the completion of Table 1b can be found in paragraphs 5-11 of Annex D.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Co-funded employer engagement students		
<p>Where an institution has co-funded employer engagement FTE targets 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>	<p>Table L on sheet COM3 compares the co-funded employer engagement FTEs recorded in Column 5 of Tables 1a and 2 and Column 5a of Table 3 in HESES11 with an expected figure for 2011-12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>iii. The 'ASNs awarded for 2011' are the '2011-12 ASN FTEs' from Column H of grant Table H.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The '2011-12 Actual FTEs' are taken from Column 5 of Tables 1a and 2 (weighted at 0.5 FTE for sandwich year-out) and Column 5a of Table 3 of HESES11.</li> </ul>	<p>Guidance on the completion of Columns 5 and 5a can be found in paragraphs 17-18 of Annex D.</p>

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	<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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	
2011-12 student number control		
<p>On Table 6 credibility checks will highlight where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For undergraduates for each fundability status, Column 3 of Table 6 &gt; 0 and the comparable total on Table 1a = 0 (for HEFCE-fundable this is Column 1 + Column 2, for employer co-funded this is Column 5)</li> <li>For undergraduates for each fundability status, Column 3 of Table 6 = 0 and the comparable total on Table 1a &gt; 0 (for HEFCE-fundable this is Column 1 + Column 2, for employer co-funded this is Column 5)</li> <li>For HEFCE-fundable PGCEs, Column 3 = 0 and HEFCE-fundable PGCE students are included in</li> </ul>	<p>Table M in COM3 compares full-time years of instance counted toward the student number control in 2010-11 and 2011-12 and an equivalent population derived from 2009-10 HESA 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"> <li>for each row the 'Maximum difference' is at least 10 per cent where the difference between HESES11 and, HESA09 or HESES10 is at least 5 FTE.</li> </ul> <p>We may query any apparent shifts in the split of years of</p>	<p>Guidance on the completion of Table 6 can be found in paragraphs 35-38 of Annex D and paragraphs 20-31 of Annex H.</p>



First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>2009-10 HESA student data. The HESA 2009-10 data are taken from the '2009-10 statistics derived from HESA data for the monitoring and allocation of funding', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 6 April 2011 or as subsequently revised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• For HEFCE-fundable full-time and sandwich year-out undergraduates where, Column 1b + Column 2 of Table 6 = Total Column 2 of Table 5 and Column 1b + Column 2 of Table 6 <math>\geq</math> 500</li> <li>• If Total Column 3 <math>\geq</math> 50 and Total Column 1a = 0.</li> </ul>	<p>instance between Columns 1a, 1b and 2.</p>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-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"> <li>For each combination of price group, level of study and mode of study, except sandwich year-out, Total old-regime counts of years of instance = 0 and new-regime counts of years of instance &gt; 0.</li> <li>For each combination of price group, level of study and mode of study, except sandwich year-out, Total old-regime counts of years of instance &gt; 0 and new-regime counts of years of instance = 0.</li> </ul> <p>A credibility check will highlight where new-regime sandwich year-out years of instance are returned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where Total Column 2(iii) &gt; 0.</li> </ul> <p>Credibility checks will highlight where the numbers of old-regime students recorded in Table 7 exceed numbers recorded in Tables 1a and 3 and where part-time FTEs recorded in Table 7 exceed FTEs recorded in Table 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each combination of price group (except price group A), level of study and mode of study, old-regime HEFCE-fundable counts of years of instance returned on Table 7 &gt; counts of years of instance</li> </ul>	<p>Table N 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"> <li>Compares the number of students recorded in Table 1-3 against Table 7 and</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
<p>returned in Column 4 on Tables 1a or 3 across all lengths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each combination of price group, level of study and mode of study, old-regime employer co-funded counts of years of instance returned on Table 7 &gt; counts of years of instance returned in Column 5 on Tables 1a or 3 across all lengths.</li> <li>For part-time FTEs, for each combination of price group (except price group A) and level of study old-regime, HEFCE fundable FTEs returned in Table 7 &gt; HEFCE fundable FTEs in Column 4a(a) of Table 3, across all lengths.</li> <li>For part-time FTEs, for each combination of price group and level of study, employer co-funded FTEs returned in Table 7 &gt; employer co-funded FTEs in Column 5a of Table 3, across all lengths.</li> <li>Where an institution 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.</li> <li>For undergraduate, price group A in each combination of mode of study, new-regime HEFCE-fundable counts of years of instance returned on</li> </ul>	<p>level of study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>Table O 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"> <li>Full-time and sandwich year-out: <math>(\text{Column 1(iii)} + \text{Column 2(iii)}) / (\text{Column 1} + \text{Column 2})</math></li> <li>Part-time: <math>\text{Column 3(iii)} / \text{Column 3}</math></li> </ul> <p>Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: for each combination of mode and level of study, there is a difference of 5 percentage points or more where the number of new-regime students is 5 or more.</p>	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-7	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Table 7 ≥ 200.	<p>Table P on sheet COM3 compares the average FTE rates for part-time students recorded in Table 7 to the equivalent average FTE rates for part-time students recorded in Table 3, split by price group and level of study. The average FTE rates for part-time students in Table 3 is compared to the average FTE rates for part-time students 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 average FTE rates in Table 3 compared to Table 7 (for each regime type) is at least 10 percentage points.</p>	