Higher Education Students Early Statistics Survey 2010-11 (HEFCE 2010/26)

Appendix 4

Verification checks on HESES10 data

1.   The data submitted in HESES10 will be used to determine grant adjustments for 2010-11 and provisional grant allocations for 2011-12. As such it is important that the data submitted are accurate and suitable for this purpose.

2.   The HESES10 workbook contains a series of credibility checks in the form of first stage credibility warnings on Tables 1a-6 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 6 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 by 9 December 2010. 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 17-19 of the HESES10 publication (HEFCE 2010/26) contain more information on this data verification process.

4.   This appendix describes in detail the credibility checks that are carried out within the HESES10 workbook, and describes the content of each comparison table in the COM1 and COM2 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 4-10 of Annex E of the HESES10 publication (HEFCE 2010/26).

5.   The HESES10 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 1a-6 or automatic check highlighting in the comparison tables cannot be identified, institutions should e-mail us for advice at heses@hefce.ac.uk.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Non-completions		
Credibility checks relating to non-completions are included in Tables 1a, 2 and 3 as follows: • For Table 1a – for each level (excluding PGT and PGR) aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 100 and Column 3 $\div$ (Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ -0.014. • For Table 2 – for each level (excluding PGT) aggregated across all fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 200 and Column 3 $\div$ (Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ -0.005. • For Table 3 – for each level (excluding PGT and PGR) aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 100 and Column 3 $\div$ (Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ -0.02. • For Tables 1a, 2 and 3 – for each cell (excluding where level = PGT or PGR), Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 50 and Column 3 = 0.	Table A on sheet COM1 shows the calculation of non-completion rates after the 1 December census date for HESA 2008-09 and for HESES09 and HESES10. These are forecast non-completions (Column 3 on HESES Tables 1a and 3) as a percentage of total countable years (Columns 1 plus 2 on HESES Tables 1a and 3): HEFCE-funded students only, by mode and level. The HESA 2008-09 data are taken from the '2008-09 statistics derived from HESA data for the monitoring and allocation of funding', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 25 June 2010 or as subsequently revised. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, there is a difference of at least 5 per cent between the HESA 2008-09 non-completion rate and the HESES10 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES10 is at least 20. • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, there is a difference of at least 5 per cent between the HESES09 non-completion rate and the	Further guidance on non-completions and the completion of Column 3 can be found in Annex I and paragraph 14 of Annex D respectively.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	HESES10 non-completion rate, where Column 1 + Column 2 in HESES10 is at least 20. We will also compare the HESES10 non-completion rates with rates found through audit (where available) and may query any large discrepancy. We may also query where HESES10 rates vary substantially from sector norms or where there are unusual patterns of estimated non-completion rates across different modes and levels. Where non-completion rates vary from historical rates and/or those determined during audit due to the change in definition institutions will need to ensure that there is robust evidence to support the changed rates. We will ask institutions to provide details of how they have arrived at their estimated rates.	
Part-time FTE		
On Table 3 credibility checks will highlight where • For each level (except 'UG (excl. FD)') aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 $\geq$ 50 and Column 4a $\div$ Column 4 $\geq$ 0.8. • For 'UG (excl. FD)' aggregated across all price groups, lengths and fundability statuses, Column 4 $\geq$ 50 and Column 4a $\div$ Column 4 $\geq$ 0.67.	Table B on sheet COM1 compares the average FTE rates for part-time students in 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11. 'Maximum difference' shows the larger of the difference between the 2008-09 and 2010-11 data and the difference between the 2009-10 and 2010-11 data. The 2009-10 and 2010-11 data are the estimated FTE (Column 4a on Table 3) divided by estimated part-time countable years (Column 4 on Table 3): HEFCE-funded students only, by price group and level. The HESA 2008-09 data are taken from the '2008-09 statistics derived	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.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	from HESA data for the monitoring and allocation of funding', originally sent with Ewa Wawrzynska's letter to heads of institutions on 25 June 2010 or as subsequently revised. Generally we expect consistency between the three sets of data.	
	Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: for each combination of price group and level of study, the value of 'Maximum difference' is at least 0.1 where the headcount in Column 4 of HESES10 is at least 50. This does not include data where HESA 2008-09 is zero but there are non-zero values for both HESES09 and HESES10.	
New entrants		
On Table 5 credibility checks will highlight where • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'FD', 'Other UG degree' or 'PGR' and Column $1 \geq 30$ and Column $2 \div$ Column $1 \geq 0.8$. • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)', 'FD' or 'PGT' and Column $1 \geq 50$ and Column $2 \div$ Column $1 \leq 0.33$. • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses,	Table C on sheet COM1 compares the number of fundable new entrants in 2009-10 and 2010-11 and shows the percentage change between the two. The data are from Column 2 of Table 5: HEFCE-fundable students (HEFCE-funded + independently funded), by mode and level. For comparison the percentage change in the total number of HEFCE-fundable students between 2009-10 and 2010-11 is shown. There is currently no automatic check highlighting in this table. We will query any large changes in new entrants (overall changes of more than 3 per cent) unless we are aware of a reason for this change, for example the award	The definition of 'new entrant' can be found in paragraph 33 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Column 1 $\geq$ 30 and Column 2 $\div$ Column 1 $\leq$ 0.2. • For all full-time and sandwich year-out students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)' and Column 1 $\geq$ 50 and Column 1 = Column 2. • For all part-time students aggregated across all fundability statuses where Level = 'HND', 'FD', 'Other UG degree' or' PGR' and Column 1 $\geq$ 30 and Column 2 $\div$ Column 1 $\geq$ 0.7. • For all part-time students aggregated across all levels and fundability statuses, Column 1 $\geq$ 30 and Column 2 $\div$ Column 1 $\leq$ 0.1. • For all students aggregated across all modes, levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 2 = 0. • For all students aggregated across all modes, levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 = Total Column 2.	of additional student numbers. We will also query any apparent discrepancy between the change in new entrants and the change in overall student numbers.	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
FTEs by price group		
Not applicable	Table D on sheet COM1 compares the FTEs from HESES10 against our expectation. The '2010-11 Assumed' data are the HESES09 FTEs plus the various adjustments to FTEs (for additional student numbers and other miscellaneous transfers and adjustments) included in the latest 2010-11 grant Table D. The '2010-11 Actual' data are the FTEs taken from Column 4 of Table 1a (for full-time), Column 4 of Table 2 weighted at 0.5 FTE (for sandwich year-out) and Column 4a of Table 3 (for part-time). In both cases the data are for HEFCE-funded FTE students only by price group, mode and level. There is no automatic highlighting in this table. We may query any apparent shifts across price groups or any large differences between assumed and actual FTE.	Further information on the assignment of activity to price groups can be found in Annex L.
Fundability status		
Not applicable	Table E on sheet COM1 compares how students have been attributed between the four categories of fundability status (HEFCE-funded, independently funded, non-fundable, and Island and overseas) in 2009-10 and 2010-11. The data are the headcount numbers and percentage change for estimated countable years (Column 4 of	The definition of each category of fundability status can be found in Annex K.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	Tables 1a, 2, 3 of HESES09 and HESES10) in each fundability category: by mode (full-time and sandwich year-out, or part-time) and level.	
	There is currently no automatic check highlighting in this table. We may query:	
	• Significant shifts in the fundability status of students, particularly where independently funded students are concerned.	
	• Where significant number of independently funded students (more than 50 on Tables 1a, 2 and 3 combined) have been returned. We may ask for the details of the funding arrangements of independently funded students.	
	• Where independently funded students have been returned and the institution has a positive percentage difference. It is not usually in the interest of institutions to return students as independently funded in these circumstances.	
	• Where few or no non-fundable students are returned. We would expect that most institutions will have some ELQ students.	

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	Long years of instance	
Credibility checks in Tables 1a and 3 will highlight where 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 2009-10 and 2010-11. The data are the proportion of total estimated countable years (Column 4 of Tables 1a and 3 of HESES09 and HESES10) recorded as being long: HEFCE-funded students only, by mode (full-time or part-time) and level. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study and level of study there is a difference of at least 5 per cent between the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long in HESES09, and the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long in HESES10 where the headcount in Column 4 of HESES10 is at least 50. • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, the proportion of Column 4 students recorded as long has either changed from zero in HESES09, or has changed to zero in HESES10 (where the change in proportion is at least 10 per cent). We may also ask institutions for evidence that courses	The definition of a long year of study can be found in Annex O. Further guidance on long years of instance and foundation degrees can be found in paragraphs 4-5 of Annex O.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	returned as long meet the criteria.	
Fee status		
Credibility checks on non-regulated fees • For full-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 30 and ('Non-regulated' Column 1 + Column 2) $\div$ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ 0.1. • For full-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 $\geq$ 5 and Total Column 1 + Column 2 < 30 and ('Non-regulated' Column 1 + Column 2) $\div$ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) $\geq$ 0.25. • For full-time students where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Non-regulated' total > 0. • Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Non-regulated' category can be found in paragraph 4 of Annex P. Credibility checks on Regulated £0 fees • For HEFCE-fundable students aggregated across all modes and columns, (difference between HESES09 'Regulated £0' total and HESES10 'Regulated £0' total > 35) or (HESES09 'Regulated	Table G on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of students who are subject to regulated fees in 2009-10 and 2010-11. The data are the total number of students recorded as being subject to regulated fees as a proportion of the total student numbers on Table 4 (Columns 1 and 2): All home and EU students, by fee level, mode and level. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study, level of study and fee level, the difference in the proportion of students on designated courses subject to regulated fees between HESES09 and HESES10 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount in HESES10 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 HESES09, or has changed to zero in HESES10.	Further information on recording fee levels in Table 4 can be found in Annex P.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
£0' total = 0 and HESES10 'Regulated £0' total ≠ 0) or (HESES09 'Regulated £0' total ≠ 0 and HESES10 'Regulated £0' total = 0). • Where price group = ITT(QTS), 'Regulated £0' total > 0. • Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated £0' category can be found in paragraph 3c of Annex P. Credibility checks on regulated half fees • For full-time students aggregated across all price groups (excluding ITT(QTS)), levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 ≥ 30 and ('Regulated half fee' Column 1 + Column 2) ÷ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) ≥ 0.05. • For full-time students aggregated across all price groups (excluding ITT(QTS)), levels and fundability statuses, Total Column 1 + Column 2 ≥ 5 and Total Column 1 + Column 2 < 30 and ('Regulated half fee' Column 1 + Column 2) ÷ (Total Column 1 + Column 2) ≥ 0.25. • For part-time undergraduates aggregated across all price groups and fundability statuses, 'Regulated half fee' total > 0. • For part-time postgraduates aggregated across all		

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
price groups and fundability statuses 'Regulated half fee' total > 0. • Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated half fee' category can be found in paragraph 3b of Annex P. <u>Credibility checks on regulated full fees</u> • For part-time students aggregated across all price groups, levels and fundability statuses, 'Regulated full fee' total > 0. • Further guidance on what can be returned under the 'Regulated full fee' category can be found in paragraph 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.		
	Proportion of undergraduates on sub-degree courses	
Not applicable	Table H on sheet COM2 compares the proportions of undergraduate students who are recorded as being on below degree-level courses in 2009-10 and 2010-11. The data are from Table 5 and are calculated as ['HND' + 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)'] as a proportion of ['HND' + 'Sub-degree (excl. HND)' + 'FD' + 'Other UG'] All home	Further guidance on the breakdown of level of study in Table 5 can be found in paragraph 26 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	and EU students, by mode. 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 HESES09 and HESES10 is at least 5 per cent, where the headcount of undergraduates in HESES10 is at least 50.	
	Students franchised-out	
Not applicable	Table I on sheet COM2 compares the students recorded as wholly franchised-out in HESES10 with an expected figure for 2010-11. • The '2010-11 Assumed' is the sum of those students recorded as wholly franchised-out in Column 3 of Table 5 of HESES09; plus any students transferred to the institution for 2010-11 as a result of a further education college electing to be indirectly funded. • The '2010-11 Actual' is taken from Column 3 of Table 5 of HESES10. 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 '2010-11 Assumed' figures were originally calculated as FTEs. For the purposes of converting them to	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-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	headcounts, we have assumed that each part-time student counts as 0.5 FTE. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study, level of study and type of institution franchised to, the difference between the assumed 2010-11 franchised-out numbers and the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HESES10 is at least 10 per cent, where the franchised-out numbers entered in Table 5 of HESES10 are at least 100. • For each combination of mode of study, level of study and institution franchised to, the franchised-out numbers have either changed from zero in the 2010-11 assumed numbers, or have changed to zero in HESES10.	
Split between 'home' and 'other' students		
Not applicable	Table J on COM2 compares the split of numbers between 'Home' and 'Other' for home and EU students in Table 5 of HESES10 with HESES09. The data are for all home and EU students, by mode and level of study. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as	Guidance on the disaggregation between 'Home' and 'Other' can be found in paragraph 25 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	follows: • 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 HESES09 and HESES10 is at least 5 per cent, where the total home and EU students recorded on Table 5 of HESES10 is at least 50. • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, the proportion of 'other' students has either changed from zero in HESES09, or has changed to zero in HESES10.	
Clinical Students (FT UG)		
Not applicable	Table K on sheet COM2 compares the numbers of full-time undergraduate clinical students on Tables 1a and 1b. The data are the estimated countable years for full-time undergraduates in price group A (Column 4 of Table 1a), compared to the estimated countable years for full-time undergraduates in clinical medicine and dentistry (Column 4, rows 2 and 4, of Table 1b): HEFCE-funded. In general, any differences between these two figures should be due to veterinary science students only. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: where the differences between the data in Table 1a and Table 1b in HESES10 cannot be attributed to	Guidance on the completion of Table 1b can be found in paragraphs 5-11 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
	veterinary science.	
Co-funded employer engagement students		
Where an institution has co-funded employer engagement FTEs for 2010-11 (as shown in the latest 2010-11 grant Table B), credibility checks in Tables 1a-3 will highlight where Total Column 5 = 0.	Table L on sheet COM2 compares the co-funded employer engagement FTEs recorded in Column 5 of Tables 1a and 2 and Column 5a of Table 3 in HESES10 with an expected figure for 2010-11. • The '2010-11 Assumed FTEs' are the sum of co-funded FTEs awarded up to 2009-10 and 2010-11 ASN FTEs • The '2010-11 Actual FTEs' are taken from Column 5 of Tables 1a and 2 of Column 5a of Table 3 of HESES10. All figures are FTEs rather than headcounts and are disaggregated by mode and level. Automatic check highlighting is included in this table as follows: • For each combination of mode of study and level of study, the difference between the 2010-11 assumed FTEs and the 2010-11 actual FTEs is at least 20 per cent, where the 2010-11 actual FTEs are at least 50.	Guidance on the completion of Columns 5 and 5a can be found in paragraphs 17-18 of Annex D.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
2010-11 student number control		
On Table 6 credibility checks will highlight where: • For HEFCE-fundable undergraduates, Column 3 of Table 6 > 0 and Total Column 1 + Column 2 of Table 1a = 0 • For HEFCE-fundable undergraduates, Column 3 of Table 6 = 0 and Total Column 1 + Column 2 of Table 1a > 0 • For employer co-funded undergraduates, Column 3 of Table 6 > 0 and Total Column 5 of Table 1a = 0 • For employer co-funded undergraduates, Column 3 of Table 6 = 0 and Total Column 5 of Table 1a > 0 • For HEFCE-fundable PGCEs, Column 3 = 0 and HEFCE-fundable PGCE students are included in the HESES08 re-creation using 2008-09 HESA student data • For HEFCE-fundable full-time and sandwich year-out undergraduates, ((Column 1b of Table 6 + Column 2 of Table 6) - Total Column 2 of Table 5) ÷ Total Column 2 of Table 5 ≥ 0.05 or ((Column 1b of Table 6 + Column 2 of Table 6) - Total Column 2 of	Not applicable	Guidance on the completion of Table 6 can be found in paragraphs 34-37 of Annex D and paragraphs 29-45 of Annex H.

First stage credibility warnings in Tables 1a-6	Checks using the comparison tables	Further information
Table 5) ÷ Total Column 2 of Table 5 ≤ -0.05		