

THE RELATIVE COSTS OF QUALIFICATION PROGRAMMES AND “OTHER PROVISION”

PREFACE

This relatively small piece of research was undertaken in November and December 2002 to assist and inform discussions at the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) about the future funding of qualifications within the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and “other provision” programmes.

It is informed by earlier research for the LSC on Other Provision, completed in September 2002, which aimed to clarify and interpret what Colleges understand and categorise as “other provision”.

This report summarises the process and the findings of the research and draws conclusions, which will illuminate the debate about how best to fund provision to respond to the wide variety of learning needs which the sector is required to meet.

The Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) wishes to acknowledge the help given by college Principals and their Staff in providing information and advice to enable this report to be completed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This research sought to identify the relative costs of NQF courses and 'other provision' and assess whether they influenced provider behaviour

2. We found

- That many college staff were unclear about whether programmes were in the NQF or not
- That college staff consistently stated that they did not consider the NQF when deciding whether to offer a programme
- That colleges did not systematically collect or use data about the costs of courses in their planning
- That colleges, when questioned, frequently asserted that 'other provision' was more expensive than NQF courses but their responses often suggested misunderstandings about costing
- That colleges frequently described 'other provision' as essential to aspects of their curriculum offer
- That the costs of examinations administration represent at most a few pounds per examination entry
- That the cost of external accreditation, for programmes within and outside the NQF is between 2% and 5% of the total cost of a programme and around half of this sum would fall to be paid from public funds

3. We concluded

- That college decisions to offer 'other provision' are unlikely to be based on any systematic assessment of relative costs
- Despite college assertions it is unlikely that 'other provision' is more expensive than NQF programmes when offered in similar circumstances
- That the costs associated with external assessment and accreditation of programmes inside and outside the NQF form a relatively small part of total costs
- The reasons why colleges offer 'other provision' require further detailed examination, distinguishing non accredited from internally and externally accredited courses.¹
- That the information about which courses are in the NQF is too uncertain and too fluid to form a sound basis for funding policy at the present time.

4. We recommend

- That LSC does not, at the present time, seek to reflect in national rates the relative costs of NQF programmes and 'other provision'
- That the LSC does not, at the present time, seek to introduce any incentive payment for NQF programmes
- That the LSC should investigate as a matter of priority college assertions that the NQF is inappropriate for the needs of several important categories of client.

¹ Research is currently being carried out by LSDA for LSC on Externally accredited courses outside of the NQF

5. INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this paper is to report on the findings of a project designed to identify whether there are systematic differences in the relative costs of qualification programmes and “other provision” and whether this influences provider behaviour. The ultimate aim is to inform the process of setting rates for LSC provision.

THE PROJECT

2. This project was commissioned by the LSC in the autumn of 2002. It was a short study of the costs of delivering qualification programmes compared with those categorised as “other provision”.
3. It is informed by an earlier study for the LSC in the summer of 2002 *“Other Provision: definition, categorisation and funding”*² which had two main aims: to determine what colleges were providing under the “other provision” category and to develop and refine the categorisation if possible.
4. The research project was focussed around two linked questions:
 - **Do providers in general incur additional costs when offering programmes that lead to qualifications approved within the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) compared with all other programmes i.e. not in the NQF - “other provision”?**
 - **Does such a cost differential, or if it is the case, the absence of a cost differential, discourage providers from developing and delivering qualification programmes?**
5. These questions were examined in face to face interviews with college staff who were questioned on:
 - Why do colleges provide Other Provision courses?
 - What is the college view of the NQF?
 - What are the comparative the costs of running qualification courses and other provision?

Earlier research by LSDA³ has shown that ‘Other Provision’ is not a homogenous group of courses. At least three types can be identified and it seems probable that there will be differences in unit costs between them. They are

- Programmes that lead to externally awarded qualifications outside the NQF
- Programmes that lead to internally awarded qualifications
- Programmes that do not lead to qualifications

In order to understand more fully the nature of ‘other provision’ and its associated costs, the interviewers sought to distinguish the following reasons for offering programmes outside the NQF.

² *Other Provision: definition, categorisation and funding* Burch E. 2002 LSDA website

³ Op.cit

Scenario 1

In cases where a reasonably comparable qualification is available “other provision” might be offered because:

- Learners are not interested in assessment
- Employers are not interested in assessment
- The learner only wishes to access initially a very small “chunk” of learning
- The provider judges that the approved qualification is unsuitable
- Qualifications within the framework cost more to deliver other things being equal

Scenario 2

In cases where there is no other comparable qualification “other provision” might be offered because:

- A relevant qualification is under development but has not yet been approved
- There is a problem with the NQF which makes it impossible to develop a programme that meets the needs of some learners
- There is a no good reason why the NQF cannot be used but providers and other stake holders have lacked any incentive to change
- There seem to be unrecoverable costs associated with such developments

6. Colleges were also asked to compare the costs of delivering comparable courses in a single subject area using specific examples e.g. a course in the NQF and an “other provision” course.

DEFINITIONS

7. The two main definitions used in this research were those used for the earlier “other provision” project as follows:

Qualifications

- These are learning aims which lead to qualifications approved by the Secretary of State under Sections 96 and 97 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000

Other Provision

- Those learning aims which do not lead to qualifications as defined above.

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

8. The methodology prescribed for this research and analysis was based on the following principles:
 - That the research should involve a sample of colleges in face to face interviews with researchers
 - That the interviews would be based on the questions outlined in paragraph 5 and the comparisons in paragraph 6 of this report

- That the colleges selected would be, in the main, from those who participated in the previous “other provision” project
- That the selection of colleges would provide a geographical spread and an urban/rural dimension to responses.

9. The project had three phases:

Preparatory	November 2002 including planning and preparation meetings at LSDA Discussions between LSC and LSDA managers
Research	November/December 2002 Two research consultants visited a total of 11 colleges for face-to-face meetings with appropriate staff
Collation and Review of Research Findings	December/January. Production of interim reports by two research consultants for consideration at a meeting with Research Managers at LSDA.

KEY FINDINGS.

WHY DO COLLEGES PROVIDE “OTHER PROVISION” COURSES?

10. Colleges gave a number of plausible reasons for delivering “other provision” identifying the issues set out below. It was not possible in the time available for the project to obtain independent verification of these assertions, nor to quantify the significance of each reason in terms of total learner recruitment.

Attracting Non Traditional Learners and Returners

11. Colleges interviewed said that they used “other provision” as a way of attracting non-traditional learners and people who were returning to more formal learning after a number of years. While we see no reason to doubt the fact that ‘other provision’ is used in this way it is equally true that it is unlikely to be the case that all learners on programmes outside the NQF are ‘non-traditional’. Colleges did not supply an analysis of enrolments in support of their assertions and we are unable to judge the proportion of learners involved.

12. Colleges stated that these students may have been motivated to join for a whole range of reasons; to acquire life skills or work skills, as a re-entry into learning, as a first stepping-stone, as confidence building, to achieve progression or for social reasons. They felt that the courses need to match these aspirations and demonstrate links between learning and a whole range of outcomes; economic development, social cohesion, self-development, health, fitness or citizenship without over pressurising new learners. While this is likely to be true it is not clear from our research why NQF programmes are judged to be deficient in this respect.

Learners and Assessment/Qualification

13. The majority of colleges reported that many learners who do not have the goal of a university place as a target, want to learn in small, bite sized portions of learning without a qualification or assessment. We were not able to collect evidence on the number of learners for whom ‘bite sized’ learning opportunities were crucial, nor on the numbers who might be dissuaded from participation by assessment. There were some variable views concerning assessment. Some respondents for example, noted that students were not necessarily unhappy with assessment but did not wish to take a formal examination. Others felt that any form of assessment could frighten off new learners. The LSRC has commissioned research looking into the impact of summative assessment on learner motivation to identify whether this is in fact so. Colleges reported that learners, in some cases, will not necessarily take an examination to achieve a qualification even if one is offered; and if a qualification course is the only one offered then retention and achievement may be poor among students who do not want the qualification.

Employers, Employment and Assessment

14. Colleges reported that employers seem to be ambivalent about assessment and qualifications in courses for their employees. Some colleges note that employers are only interested in assessment/qualification if it is relevant and applicable for their employees. They stated that larger companies are more likely to look for a qualification; SMEs and MEs are less likely to require a qualification but will need to be assured that courses are “tailor made and job specific” and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of their workforce. Employers therefore often require competence, not necessarily qualifications from courses. We were not able to identify the extent to which ‘other provision’ offered by the colleges we visited had been introduced to meet specific concerns by employers about the nature of NQF provision, nor the aspects of the NQF which led to such

provision being seen as less desirable. It is unlikely that colleges in fact referred to NQF in their dealings with employers.

15. Some colleges stated that employers are attracted to “other provision” because it is short, sharp curriculum/skill specific and cost effective. The employers can also claim ownership and control of “other provision” training often because they require “just in time” training. Further work is needed to understand better the nature and prevalence of these issues.

“Other Provision” and Starting Your Own Business

16. Several colleges cited “other provision” as helping and motivating people, leading to them running their own businesses and contributing to the economic development of a locality. Examples of courses cited which colleges said had no appropriate specialist comparable NQF qualification included; bee keeping, tree surgery, ceramics, stained glass, toy making, hand painting, Indian head massage, botanical illustration and bridal make-up.

Bite Sized Courses

17. Colleges stated that in order to meet the widening participation and inclusiveness agendas, they use “other provision” to offer bite sized opportunities to satisfy those students who wish to step onto the first rung of the learning ladder and gain the confidence to climb higher, possibly to an NQF course. Examples quoted were life drawing, aromatherapy, sugar craft, basic IT., basic skills, photography and floral decoration. While it seems probable that some learners are attracted by ‘bite sized’ opportunities we were offered no analysis of recruitment to support the assertion that these programmes are particularly effective in reaching vulnerable learners, nor any evidence that learners would not attend longer programmes. Our analysis of data on 3 and 6 glh courses for FEFC casts some doubt on the links between short courses and widening participation.

Judgements that Approved Qualifications in the NQF are Unsuitable so “Other Provision” is provided

18. Colleges reported that “other provision” may ultimately lead either to students joining an NQF course or to a college providing a course as a follow-up to a successful “other provision” starter. An example quoted was Archaeology for Fun leading to GCSE then AS/A Level Archaeology and onto University. Others included DIY courses leading to Brickwork or Carpentry/Joinery qualifications. While examples of such progression undoubtedly exist it is not clear why it is not possible using the NQF.

19. NQF courses are by definition national qualifications. Colleges state that they therefore preclude development of specialist local courses for specific employers. While it is not clear why, in specific cases, local employers do not want what is available on the NQF, nor how prevalent this situation is, the issue is serious and worthy of further investigation.

WHAT IS THE COLLEGE VIEW OF THE NQF?

20. Colleges state that they recognise the importance of having a “national” qualification framework and what it offers as a framework and a concept. The framework’s most important asset is that it is “national”. In that sense it is unequivocal. It has no more or less purchase wherever it is referred to or used throughout England.

21. Secondly colleges also felt that the NQF provides a curriculum map across which individuals, parents and providers can plot routes to progression based on attainment of nationally recognised qualifications.

22. Notwithstanding recent problems of grading of A Levels, they felt that the NQF has a credibility for having within it the courses that open doors to progression and, in particular, to higher education and training and university in particular.

23. In contrast to these obvious strengths the colleges interviewed also had some significant misgivings/issues about the courses within the NQF for new learners or returners. Issues cited included:

- The NQF is too rigid and inflexible to respond quickly to employers and new learning trends
- It takes too long to approve new courses into the NQF
- One qualification being replaced by another requires time for syllabus, schemes of work, lesson planning, assessment and evaluation to be re-shaped
- NQF qualifications are too rigid, too formally assessed to accommodate adult returners to learning
- The bureaucracy of the NQF is a barrier to flexible, bite sized, outreach, entry start-up, confidence building courses becoming part of it
- Providers are exhausted with change and new initiatives including any changes to programmes in order for them to be eligible for NQF – both new courses entering and those being removed from the NQF.
- NQF will have to espouse a whole new range of qualifications and do so much more flexibly and quickly (fast track) if it is to meet public/business/provider/stakeholder needs and become sufficiently attractive
- Since Schedule 2 and Non-Schedule 2 disappeared as categories, the NQF has not been widely publicised as a framework, a concept or as having a QA role
- NQF is currently not a “brand”. It is bureaucratic.

WHAT ARE THE COLLEGES' VIEWS OF THE NQF AND "OTHER PROVISION" AS PLANNING TOOLS?

24. Most colleges interviewed do not base their programme offers on whether courses are within the NQF or "other provision". They state that they view their key responsibility as responding to the learning needs of communities, businesses and individuals.

25. They also state that they see NQF provision and "other provision" jointly as broad, rich inseparable sectors of a map of curriculum opportunities.

- NQF qualifications provide a bedrock of interrelated accredited courses recognised nationally as the gateway to higher education or to employment **a pre-determined, structured offer to the students.**
- "Other Provision" is seen as **a flexible response to business, community and individual need.**

26. Colleges spoke of the importance of both modes of delivery and the need to provide both formats in an integrated programme if targets, for example, for achievement, widening participation, basic skills, new learners, are to be met.

27. Colleges provided no reliable evidence on which we could base an independent assessment of the extent to which other provision is necessary to meet any or all of the needs claimed for it for any significant group of learners. What is undoubtedly true however is that college planning is at least indifferent to the issue of whether a programme is within the NQF and at most actively hostile to the view that the NQF should influence their offer. Managers often had to be reminded what was in the framework and what was not; and their responses suggested that they often had a partial view of what counted as 'other provision'. Their comments most frequently focussed on non-accredited work to the exclusion of the other two categories.

28. The disinclination of colleges to consider whether a course is within or outside the framework when deciding what to offer is reinforced by the difficulty of determining which programmes are within the NQF. This is illustrated by the difficulties experienced by the research team when attempting to derive from ISR analysis a picture of the extent and nature of 'other provision' offered. The ISR database shows that a number of programmes which should be categorised as in the NQF are in fact appearing as Other Provision. This is due to the complexity of coding, changes in the number of programmes in the NQF and changes in codes. It is therefore difficult for colleges to distinguish what constitutes accredited OP and what is in the NQF.

COMPARISON OF THE COSTS OF RUNNING QUALIFICATION COURSES AND OTHER PROVISION

29. As indicated above there is little evidence that colleges consider whether a programme is within or outside the NQF when deciding what to offer, and considerable evidence that they do not. Similarly there is very little evidence that their offer is affected by the relative costs of other provision and NQF programmes, and good reasons for thinking that it is not. The principal reason for thinking that it is not is the lack of any evidence on the collection or use of costing data by colleges for any purpose which has been identified not only in this brief study but other recent pieces of research.

30. The research sought to make a comparison of the costs of running qualification courses with “other provision” based on pairing courses at a similar level in the same subject area e.g. comparing:

<u>NQF</u>		<u>OTHER PROVISION</u>
French A Level	with	French College Stage 4
ECDL	with	Computers for the Terrified
Diploma in Holistic Massage (Level 3)	with	Introduction to Basic Massage.

31. For the purpose of the research costs were divided into:

<u>DIRECT COSTS</u>	<u>INDIRECT COSTS</u>
Teachers Numbers	Management
Teachers Salaries	Marketing
Teachers Travel	Student Support
Technicians	Quality Assurance
Consumables	
Exam Costs	
Premises	

32. There was no set or common pattern of costing across the colleges interviewed. Funding of qualification courses and for “other provision” does not appear to be normally compared and contrasted. Colleges interviewed stated that they did not collect data in a form that can easily distinguish between the specific costs of NQF courses and Other Provision, and other studies of costing suggest that this is true. Responses to questions were generally based on a perception of costs although some colleges could identify costs of, for example, tutors’ salaries and then indicate a percentage on- cost for a particular category, such as off-site premises and management

33. In the large majority of colleges “other provision” was claimed to be more expensive to run, mainly, it was said through its attracting additional indirect costs. Analysis of responses suggests that this view is often based on a misunderstanding. ‘Other provision’ is frequently associated with disadvantaged learners. Disadvantaged learners are felt to require additional resources. Hence ‘other provision’ is held to be more expensive.

34. Direct costs were generally felt to be comparable between the two modes with two exceptions. Many colleges believed that “other provision” outreach work was more expensive because often additional premises had to be rented and funding for equipment and resources to be transported to courses had to be made available. Equally courses that incurred examination costs were more expensive, regardless of whether they are in the NQF or externally accredited Other Provision.

The additional costs arising from the hire of premises for outreach work seems to be a further misunderstanding by colleges. Although many 'other provision' programmes are delivered through outreach many, probably a majority, are not. It is not a necessary feature of 'other provision' that it is delivered in this way and not accurate therefore to ascribe any extra costs to it.

It is in any event debateable whether outreach premises cost more than main college premises.. The implicit calculations made by college managers seem to add the marginal cost of hiring external premises on top of an overhead charge that covers the premises cost of the main site. It is unlikely that the average cost of hiring a community building is greater than the average cost of using college buildings, which is the comparison that ought to be made.

35. Colleges quoted a number of other reasons for increased costs in "other provision"

Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-More time taken in developing OCN work-Top slice for managing growing outreach provision-Management role in producing and implementing personal Records of Achievement and Learning Outcomes-50% more management costs for short course development.
Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-The need for continuous year round marketing in the media-Enhanced marketing to attract 'reluctant' students-Promoting "other provision" requires localised, specific marketing and publicity-Major marketing initiatives often required front-loaded costs-Flexible marketing for an instant response.
Student Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Additional staff development for part-time staff to work with students with learning challenges and difficulties e.g. new returners to learning-Need to take AIG support out to students off the college campus-Greater personal support likely with "other provision" students
Quality Assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Colleges have had to develop their own new framework in "other provision" courses-Now "other provision" is being more systematically quality reviewed more staff input and management is required-QA at arms length in outreach locations is more expensive to provide-Increased quality assurance and assessment in "other provision".

These assertions were not backed up by reliable *quantifiable* evidence and in any event most appear to be concerned with factors that happen to be associated with certain types of other provision rather than having a necessary association.

The same would be true of any offsite provision or new curriculum development, regardless of whether the programme is or is not in the NQF.

36. Some colleges however thought that qualifications cost more to provide because:

- Examination costs were more expensive
- Expectations of learners can demand more support in NQF courses
- Quality assurance has more frameworks to cover in NQF courses offered.

Once again there was little evidence that enabled these assertions to be checked.

37. One area where there might be expected to be some clear evidence of a difference in cost between certain forms of 'other provision' and NQF programmes concerns the costs associated with external and internal assessment. The study has enabled some light to be shed on this area.

Most colleges contain an examinations office with one or more staff largely devoted to the administration associated with examinations and assessments. The costs of this operation should logically be an overhead charge on those programmes which involve assessment (including some sorts of 'other provision') but not on non-accredited work. One college supplied an analysis of the costs and work of its exams office. It has three full time staff with an estimated annual wage cost of around £50,000. It processes between 30,000 and 50,000 exam entries per year. Even allowing for overheads the cost per entry of the exams office is in the region of £1 to £2 per entry; hardly a significant figure.

The direct costs of examinations and assessment amount to a larger figure, though it needs to be remembered that in many cases this is borne by the learner, and is not therefore a cost to the provider. An analysis of some typical course and examination costs suggests that the level of exam fees is normally no more than 5% of the funding available for a qualification aim. If it is assumed that the comparable cost for a non-accredited programme is nil (and colleges in our sample argued that non-accredited work increasingly involves quality assurance costs) the relative weightings of accredited and non-accredited provision ought to vary by no more than 0.05. If only half the extra cost falls on the public purse the difference in weights ought to be 0.025.

	3 A levels 2 years	BTEC Diploma Bus Studies	Access Programme 450 glh pa	GCSE evening class	2 yr PT plumbing 250 glh pa	
Total LSC Funding	£4530	£6123	£4560	£373	£2838	
Accreditation Costs	£180	£124	£77	£18	£107	
Accreditation percentage	4.0%	2.0%	1.7%	4.8%	3.8%	

CONCLUSIONS

38. The relative costs of 'other provision' and NQF programmes:

- This study suggests that colleges do not collect cost data in a form that can distinguish the relative costs of programmes in the NQF and OP. This is consistent with other studies of college costs
- The costs of provision do not appear to be a disincentive to offering NQF courses. Colleges lack systematic evidence on which such judgements could be made and state that the costs of courses at the time of recruitment are less important than whether a course meets the needs of the students.

Most colleges surveyed believe that it costs more to provide "other provision" courses than "off the shelf" NQF courses. However, given that costs are not attributed to the different programmes it is not possible to verify this. Some of the reasons given for believing that 'other provision' costs more may be based on simple misunderstandings.

- The costs of running an examination office appear to be relatively slight when averaged over all the examination entries in a college and not sufficient to register in cost weights.
- The direct costs of examination entry and related fees amount to around 5% of the total programme funding in most cases. If half of this cost falls on the public purse an increased weighting of 0.025 might be justified for all externally accredited programmes, regardless of whether they are in the NQF or not.

39. Rationale for delivering Other Provision:

- Colleges state that they do not develop programmes based on whether a course is or is not within the NQF or "other provision". They state that the needs of individuals, or the communities and businesses they serve are of paramount importance and are the basis on which they plan. The lack of clarity among senior managers about what constitutes 'other provision' or the NQF strongly suggests that this is true
- N.B. The ISR categorisation of 'other provision' does not make it easy for colleges to identify 'other provision' because of the regular updates to the NQF and changing codes.

Colleges reported that they saw the NQF fulfilling an important nationwide function as a means of organising, recognising and relating qualifications to one another in a format that can be helpful to colleges, students, staff, parents and employers. We conclude that Courses within the NQF in a college programme can be usefully viewed as "A predetermined offer" while "other provision" courses in the same programme are "a flexible response to business, community and individual needs"

- Colleges stated that "Other provision" courses offer a way of learning which can be assessed without formal examinations leading to a qualification. However, they may often provide a route into qualification courses and to self employment
- Many of the views about the NQF expressed to the researchers suggested that colleges saw the framework as currently not fully meeting key aspects of its own aims. They argue:

'The NQF course offer is not currently flexible enough to respond to the need for short, bite sized, tailor made/customised courses so important to colleges in responding to the widening

participation/inclusiveness agendas. It takes too long for a new course to be accredited and become part of the NQF'

RECOMMENDATIONS

40. This report is the result of a small-scale, short research project. Its findings should be read in conjunction with the report on "Other Provision"⁴ and both used to inform any current or future evaluation of the impact of the NQF.

41. This report and that for the "Other Provision" project⁵ should inform the long-term vision for future planning and funding of provision and help

"Secure the availability of a coherent, accessible, high quality range of opportunities for study which does not lead to qualifications but which promotes the wider purposes of lifelong learning, including return to learning, community development, languages and personal interest programmes".⁶

42. This piece of research has revealed the difficulty of attempting to compare detailed costs of providing courses within the NQF and "other provision". Colleges interviewed do not collect data in a form that can easily distinguish between the relative costs of the two categories of courses. LSC do not provide data in a form that is easy for colleges to use to identify what is or is not in the NQF. Consideration should therefore be given to how a system and appropriate software, if required, could be put in place to provide the necessary data.

43. The data available suggests that the costs associated with external assessment might amount to around 5% of total funding and around half of this might fall on the public purse. A case might be made therefore *all things being equal* for funding programmes that lead to external qualifications at a rate of around 2.5% more than that for comparable non accredited programmes.

Further research is required however to establish the actual costs to FE colleges of providing non-accredited other provision and to test some of their reasons for believing that it costs more than qualification programmes.

44. Overall we do not believe that the LSC should introduce a funding differential based on the relative costs of NQF programmes and 'other provision' for the following reasons

- The differences in costs that we have been able to estimate are slight, and not of the same order of magnitude as the differences between current programme weights
- There is a serious lack of cost data available from colleges that could inform any better estimates within a realistic timescale
- There is confusion in colleges about which courses are and are not within the NQF that reflects a rapidly changing context.

⁴ Op.cit Note 1

⁵ Op.cit Note 1

⁶ LSC Strategic Plan

45. We do not believe that at the current time the LSC should introduce a funding differential reflecting a policy priority for NQF courses for the following reasons.

- There is not a clear picture of which programmes are within the NQF and which are not, and the position is very fluid
- There would be widespread resistance in institutions to an incentive that they consider inappropriate; the LSC needs to promote the reasons for the NQF more clearly as a first step.

COLLEGES VISITED

EASTON COLLEGE

FILTON COLLEGE

HAMMERSMITH COLLEGE

NORWICH CITY COLLEGE

YEOVIL COLLEGE

NEW COLLEGE, DURHAM

SOLIHULL COLLEGE

ENFIELD COLLEGE

CANTERBURY COLLEGE

CITY LITERARY INSTITUTE

PETER SYMONDS COLLEGE