

Recipients of this document

All HEFCE-funded higher education institutions in England
All LSC-funded further education colleges in England
Association of Careers Guidance Advisory Services (ACGAS)
Association of Colleges
Association of Graduate Recruiters (AGR)
Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)
Association of University Teachers (AUT)
Award Scheme Development and Accreditation Network (ASDAN)
Chief education officers of all local education authorities in England
City and Guilds
Community Service Volunteers (CSV)
Connexions
Confederation of British Industry (CBI)
Council for Industry and Higher Education (CIHE)
Education Action Zone Co-ordinators
Excellence Challenge partnerships
Forum for the Advancement of Continuing Education (FACE)
Girls' Schools Association (GSA)
Regional Government Offices
Headmasters and Headmistresses Conference (HMC)
HEFCE and LSC funded widening participation projects
Higher Education Liaison Officers Association (HELOA)
Higher Education Regional Associations
Institute of Directors (IOD)
Learning and Skills Development Agency
Local Government Association
Local Learning Partnerships
National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT)
National Association of Schoolmasters and Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT)
National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE)
National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE)
National Open College Network (NOCN)
National Union of Students (NUS)
National Union of Teachers (NUT)
NHS Workforce Development Confederations
Partnerships for Progression Business Planning Leads (as listed in Annex C, Table 3)
Professional Association of Teachers (PAT)
Regional Development Agencies
Regional Assemblies
Secondary Heads Association (SHA)
Sector Skills Councils
Skill: National Bureau for Students with Disabilities
Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL)
Society of Education Officers (SEO)

Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE)
Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP)
Trades Union Congress (TUC)
Universities Association for Continuing Education (UACE)
Ufi Ltd
Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS)
Universities UK
UNISON

HEFCE regional consultants and LSC lead executive directors

Region	Contact
South-West	<p>David Noyce Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7349 e-mail d.noyce@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Trish Taylor Executive director Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole LSC tel 0120 265 2642 e-mail trish.taylor@lsc.gov.uk</p>
South-East	<p>David Noyce Acting regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7349 e-mail d.noyce@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Hilary Chadwick Executive director Hampshire and the Isle of Wight LSC tel 01329 228588 e-mail hilary.chadwick@lsc.gov.uk</p>
London	<p>Robin Jackson Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7021 e-mail r.jackson@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Vic Seddon Executive director London South LSC tel 020 8929 4744 e-mail vic.seddon@lsc.gov.uk</p>

West Midlands	<p>John Selby Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7343 e-mail j.selby@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Adele Bebb Executive director Staffordshire LSC tel 01782 463102 e-mail Adele.bebb@lsc.gov.uk</p>
East Midlands	<p>Tansi Harper Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7313 e-mail t.harper@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Rob Wye Executive director Northamptonshire LSC tel 01604 533 058 e-mail rob.wye@lsc.gov.uk</p>
East of England	<p>Derek Hicks Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7460 e-mail d.hicks@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Nick Foster Executive director Suffolk LSC tel 01473 883068. e-mail nick.foster@lsc.gov.uk</p>
North-West	<p>Kate Murray Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7022 e-mail k.murray@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Steve Palmer Executive director Lancashire LSC tel 01772 790612 e-mail steve.palmer@lsc.gov.uk</p>

<p>Yorkshire and the Humber</p>	<p>Roger Lewis Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7027 e-mail r.lewis@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Margaret Coleman Executive director West Yorkshire LSC tel 01274 751379 e-mail margaret.coleman@lsc.gov.uk</p>
<p>North-East</p>	<p>Derek Hicks Regional consultant HEFCE tel 0117 931 7460 e-mail d.hicks@hefce.ac.uk</p> <p>Austin McNamara Executive director County Durham LSC tel 01325 372308 e-mail austin.mcnamara@lsc.gov.uk</p>

P4P: Guidance notes for strategic plans**Summary**

1. There will be a single joint HEFCE/LSC fund for Partnerships for Progression. These notes:
 - set out the timetable for implementation of the partnerships strand and the targets and funds to be allocated to regions
 - provide guidance to regional partnerships on submitting their 2003-06 strategic plans for funds
 - explain the process that will be used by the two Councils to approve plans and release funds.
2. P4P business planning leads are invited to submit 10 copies of strategic plans in hard copy, in the form described in these notes, by **noon on 31 January 2003** to:

Clare Streatfield
 HEFCE
 Northavon House
 Coldharbour Lane
 BRISTOL BS16 1QD.

Please also e-mail one electronic copy (in a compatible Microsoft Office format) to:
 c.streatfield@hefce.ac.uk

Timetable

3. The timetable for implementing the partnerships strand of the initiative is as follows.

31 January 2003	Deadline for partnerships to submit strategic plans
Mid February 2003	Advice provided to HEFCE/LSC by regional monitoring groups (RMGs) Initial feedback will be given to P4P business planning leads at this point
20 March 2003	Plans approved by the national steering group
From 1 April 2003	Funds available for activity to start

4. The Councils hope that the national steering group will be able to give broad approval to plans on 20 March 2003, so that partnerships can set up activities to use funds effectively from April 2003. Minor amendments to finalise plans or to meet any conditions attached to the initial approval would be agreed in discussion with HEFCE regional consultants and LSC lead executive directors, over the period March to May 2003. Regional consultants and lead executive directors will be happy to discuss draft plans before formal submission.

Setting regional targets and allocating funds

Targets

5. Attached at Annex E is a detailed note on the method we have adopted for calculating the targets and funding for regions under this initiative. Targets have been set in terms of the HE participation rates of young people (that is, those aged 18-19) from each region to be achieved by 2010-11. Targets do not relate to the HE destinations of these young people, which may well be outside the region. Applying the formula leads to the following targets for individual regions, set out in Table 1.

Table 1 Current and target rates of HE participation for young people, by region		
Region	Current participation rate of young people (%)	Target participation rate of young people (%)
North-East	24	34
North-West	28	38
Yorkshire and the Humber	25	35
East Midlands	28	38
West Midlands	28	38
East of England	29	39
London	35	45
South-East	33	43
South-West	29	39

6. The strategic plan should set out how each partnership intends to progress, during the initial three-year funding period, towards achieving this target for its region by 2010-11. The current intention is that the P4P initiative will be funded through to 2010, to support coherent planning for stable, long-term activity.

7. Both Councils consider it important to set and monitor targets for the P4P initiative. Targets are a means of expressing a common understanding among all partners, in quantified form, of the objectives to be achieved. They are also a way to assess whether the intended progress is being made towards achieving these objectives. However, we recognise that many factors may affect achievement of the 50 per cent participation objective, some of which are outside the capacity of HEIs and FECs to influence. With so many different players and activities, it will never be feasible to identify the contribution of any one player or any one activity towards meeting the target.

8. As a result, the targets we are setting for P4P are indicative. Failure to meet them will not result in sanctions. However, we will review progress towards the targets, in collaboration with the partnerships, and we may revise the targets, and/or the funding associated with them, in the light of experience.

9. We expect that partnerships will set their own detailed targets, including targets for the end of this funding period (March 2006), and sub-regional targets where appropriate. Plans should be clear on how such targets relate to activities to be pursued, and hence link to funding. We will review delivery against targets on an annual basis, as well as progress towards the regional participation targets set out above.

Funding

10. We have applied a formula, explained in Annex E, to the total funds provided for the initiative by the HEFCE and the LSC (£60 million between April 2003 and March 2006). This gives the following minimum allocations to individual regions, shown in Table 2.

Region	Percentage of funds	P4P funding April 2003 to March 2006 (£)
North-East	6.2%	3,721,916
North-West	15.4%	9,251,514
Yorkshire and the Humber	11.8%	7,074,394
East Midlands	9.1%	5,452,070
West Midlands	11.8%	7,050,138
East of England	11.2%	6,731,782
London	10.5%	6,317,950
South-East	14.1%	8,485,612
South-West	9.9%	5,914,621
Total	100%	£60,000,000

11. The strategic plan should set out proposals for the use of funds for 2003-06, against the background of a clear strategic framework, with targets and activities extending through to 2010. Funds will be available from 1 April 2003. We expect though that the plan will show expenditure and activities for each academic year (1 August to 31 July). The plan should start with a 'long' year, that is 1 April 2003 to 31 July 2004; and will end with a 'short' year, that is August 2005 to March 2006.

12. The Councils' intention is that the initiative should continue as a long-term and sustained stream of funding. However, we can only confirm funds until the end of March 2006. The plan should indicate how activities would be sustained after the end of the funding period, subject to further funds being made available at the same level as in 2005-06.

13. We will track annually whether or not the intended activities have been undertaken. We recognise that the pattern of activities may well need to evolve in the light of experience. We will be happy to discuss proposals for change, with a view to securing a more effective pattern of activity than originally proposed. However the two Councils may decide to withdraw funds if planned activities are not undertaken and there is no agreed redeployment into more effective activities. We may also cease to provide further funding if the evaluation of activities by their intended recipients and beneficiaries indicates that they are not having a significant and relevant impact.

14. Once plans are approved, the two Councils will set up a formal agreement with each partnership that confirms the targets, activities and expenditure plans accepted by the HEFCE and the LSC, assigns responsibilities and sets out reporting arrangements. The HEFCE will be responsible for the agreement and will manage the funding on behalf of the two funding councils.

15. We will give partnerships the maximum opportunity to use funds flexibly and collaboratively, consistent with proper and secure accountability. As part of this agreement the Councils will need to confirm the HEIs and/or FECs that will receive funds, but there will be a single monitoring and accounting

process by the HEFCE. This is discussed further in paragraph 50. The Councils may also audit expenditure.

16. The first full monitoring return should be returned on 1 August 2004. This should show that partnerships are undertaking the activity which they had planned, that this is of high quality, and that its impact on the target groups has been reviewed. We will require an interim return in August 2003, which will report on activity carried out since April 2003.

Who should create and submit strategic plans?

17. We are already providing £100,000 (£200,000 in London) to HE/FE partnerships in each region to support the business planning capacity needed to respond to this call for strategic plans. The Councils expect the contacts identified through the business planning exercise to initiate the process of drawing together the strategic plan, and to submit it on behalf of the partnerships. These regional 'business planning leads' are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 P4P business planning leads for each region	
South-West	Rob Cuthbert Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic Development University of West of England Coldharbour Lane Frenchay BRISTOL BS16 1QY e-mail rob.cuthbert@uwe.ac.uk tel 0117 344 2240
South-East	Lawrie Taylor Higher Education for the South East (HESE) SEEDA Headquarters Cross Lanes GUILDFORD Surrey GU1 1YA e-mail Taylorlawrie@aol.com admin@hese.ac.uk tel 0118 942 1273
London	John Hall LHEC (in partnership with Geoff Melling at AOC London Region) London First 1 Hobhouse Court Suffolk Street LONDON SW1Y 4HH e-mail jhall@London-First.co.uk tel 020 7665 1510

West Midlands	<p>Dr Vivien Wylie Pro Vice-Chancellor University of Wolverhampton Wulfruna Street WOLVERHAMPTON WV1 1SB e-mail v.wylie@wlv.ac.uk tel 01902 322585</p>
East Midlands	<p>Professor Beverly Sand University of Derby Kedleston Road DERBY DE22 1GB e-mail B.Sand@derby.ac.uk tel 01332 591300</p>
Eastern	<p>Chris Green Anglia Polytechnic University Bishop Hall Lane CHELMSFORD Essex CM1 1SQ e-mail c.green@apu.ac.uk tel 01245 493131 ext 4925</p>
North-West	<p>Rhiannon Evans Director for Students/External Relations Edge Hill College of Higher Education St Helens Road ORMSKIRK Lancashire L39 4QP e-mail Evansr@edgehill.ac.uk tel 01695 584 268</p>
Yorkshire and the Humber	<p>Michael Noble Chief Executive Officer Yorkshire Universities University of Leeds University House Cromer Terrace LEEDS LS2 9JT e-mail m.j.noble@yhua.ac.uk tel 0113 233 1582</p>

North-East	Shona Paul Widening Participation Regional Project Manager Unis4NE Knowledge House 1 Hylton Park Wessington Way SUNDERLAND SR5 3HD e-mail s.paul@unis4ne.ac.uk tel 0191 516 4405
------------	---

18. We have indicated (HEFCE 01/73) that we expect all HEIs and FECs to contribute in some way to partnerships and to be involved in the development of strategic plans. HEIs and FECs (and indeed other prospective partners, such as schools, employers and regional bodies) should make contact with the relevant lead person in their region if they have not already been contacted.

Coverage of strategic plans

19. The consultation has stressed the importance of sub-regional and even local approaches to activity, rather than assuming that all activities must be undertaken across the whole region. The Councils do not require any specific regional approach to conducting the activity supported under this initiative. However, we will expect that:

- a. A comprehensive plan will be prepared in each region, which covers all areas as appropriate (that is, according to identified priorities) and does not duplicate activity or leave part of the region uncovered. This may take the form of a set of co-ordinated sub-regional plans, but these should include some regional overview to describe how the sub-regional partnerships were drawn. We do not expect there to be competition between plans in any region.
- b. The approach to activity (including targets and funds allocated to sub-regions) will reflect the educational, social, economic and geographical make-up of the region, identifying and addressing priorities.
- c. The approach to planning and activity will be cost-effective (that is, maximising opportunities to share and replicate best practice and to achieve economies of scale), and to maximise choice for young people. In particular, we will expect summer schools for year 11 students to be administered regionally, to provide the range of HE choices that will best meet the needs and aspirations of young people. This is discussed further in paragraphs 45-48.

20. We recognise that there are important social and economic links across regional boundaries. We are happy to support partnerships in responding more effectively to the needs of local communities by taking activity beyond regional boundaries. Partnerships should inform their HEFCE regional consultant and/or lead LSC executive director about their intentions at an early stage, and we will agree a sensible arrangement across regions.

Content of strategic plans

Partners

21. The strategic plan should set out the approach taken to planning, activity and programme management in the region. In particular, it should describe the partners to the plan, their different roles and relationships, and how they will come together to conduct and monitor the activity and progress towards targets set out in the plan. Both Councils expect the partnership to be based upon or developed from existing partnerships and relationships where these are already working successfully.

22. We expect partners to the plan to be drawn from two groups:

- HEIs and FECs funded by the HEFCE and the LSC
- a wide range of other contributors (see below).

23. We do not expect that every HEI and FEC will play the same role or have the same level of engagement in the activity described in the plan. However, we do expect all HEIs and FECs to contribute to the partnership, and to agree between themselves what their respective contributions should be to secure the most effective pattern of complementary activities for the region. FECs may play a role in the initiative to encourage more young people to progress into HE, but may also be providers of HE themselves. Therefore there must be solid evidence of partnership in the development and delivery of plans, and evidence that both HEIs and FECs play important roles. The initiative is funded jointly by the HEFCE and the LSC and we expect plans to reflect the full contributions that can be made by both the HE and the FE sectors to achieve the target.

24. This initiative also depends on the active participation and enthusiasm of a range of other partners, including young people, their parents and carers, schools and sixth-form colleges and teachers, employers and the range of local and regional partnerships and bodies that bring these and others together. It is for each partnership to decide the range of contributors with whom they wish to work. These may differ for different types of activity. For example, local education authorities, local LSCs, schools, teachers and parents will be important partners in activities to strengthen links between schools, FE and HE; while LSCs, Regional Development Agencies, Sector Skills Councils and employers are important partners for supporting vocational and workplace learning routes into HE. We expect the plan to describe the key partnerships and links that will be made. In particular we expect to see evidence that partnerships are developing new and appropriate pathways, patterns of curricula, and modes of delivery to meet the needs of learners and the labour market.

25. In its Race Equality Scheme, drawn up under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, the HEFCE has committed itself to linking race equality to its wider strategic aims and objectives. The LSC has produced its National Equality and Diversity Widening Participation Strategy 2001-04, which sets out its approach to this issue. As part of our monitoring of the initiative, the two Councils will review whether partnerships represent the interests of black and ethnic minority groups, and address issues of race equality in their activities. We would also expect activities to take into account the needs of other under-represented groups, including making reasonable adjustments to support disabled students.

26. This initiative builds upon the Government's Excellence Challenge programme, which aims to increase the number of people from poorer backgrounds who apply for and enter higher education. Therefore, partnerships should consider in particular how they can work with Excellence Challenge

partnerships. Contact details for the co-ordinators for each partnership can be found on the Excellence Challenge web-site at www.excellencechallenge/eccoord/

27. Results of consultation have indicated the importance of close working between regional partnerships and the Connexions service when providing advice and guidance to young people. The Connexions service will be aware of where there are disadvantaged young people who may be targeted under this initiative, and will also have close contacts with schools. Regional partnerships may be able to complement and support the work of Connexions by providing information specifically on the opportunities for HE entry and the career paths that may follow from there. As an example, partnerships could work with Connexions to assist in informing young people's Individual Learning Plans, as proposed in the Government's Green Paper on extending opportunities for 14-19 year-olds. Contact details for Connexions partnerships in each region can be found on the Connexions web-site at www.connexions.gov.uk

28. The LSC is working with Ufl Learndirect on the provision of information, advice and guidance for adult learners and those in work. Regional partnerships may wish to keep in touch with any proposals that may emerge. Ufl Learndirect may be an important partner in its own right, both for its materials and because of its helpline and network of learning centres.

29. Local LSCs will be able to contribute planning information to support sub-regional activities. We expect all plans to have been discussed with and endorsed by the relevant local LSCs before submission.

30. We expect the final plan to have the endorsement of all key partners, including the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs).

Vision and strategy

31. Plans should present the overall vision and strategy of the partnership to address the initiative. This should include a picture of the local community and the priorities (specific geographical areas or schools with low participation rates, or types of disadvantage, including disability) and, in particular, progression routes that are proposed as the focus of the plan. Plans should show how the vision links to other strategies in the region, such as the RDA Regional Economic and Skills Strategies, LSC plans, including Area Reviews, Neighbourhood Renewal programmes and Frameworks for Regional Employment and Skills Action (FRESAs).

Aims and objectives

32. The strategic plan should address the aims and objectives set out in HEFCE 01/73:

- a. To support the achievement of 50 per cent participation in HE by:
 - i. Raising aspirations and motivation to enter HE among school and FE students from age 13, and particularly those from lower socio-economic groups.
 - ii. Raising the achievements of students from age 13, through actions which complement the school reforms already in hand, so that they gain the academic or vocational qualifications and learning skills that will enable them to enter HE.
 - iii. Strengthening progression routes via NVQ level 3 from schools and FE providers into HE.

33. The plan should address only the partnerships strand of the P4P initiative which is the subject of joint HEFCE/LSC funding. The quality standards and workplace learning strands will be the subject of separate implementation proposals. However, activity in the plan may complement work that may be supported through the other strands. (As an example, a plan might propose a comprehensive service of information and guidance on HE entry that might be offered across vocational and work-based learning routes as well as in schools.)

34. In HEFCE 01/73 we proposed that the initiative should focus on young people from age 13. Responses to the consultation have stressed that work with younger age groups may be necessary and effective to raise aspirations to enter HE. In all cases, plans should set out a comprehensive programme of support activities focused on the needs of those aged 13 plus. Beyond that, we leave it up to partnerships to determine whether it is effective and affordable to work with younger children.

35. Respondents also stressed the general importance of lifelong learning, providing social and economic benefits to the individual and society. They therefore argued that no upper age limit should be set for those who might benefit from this initiative. However, these funds have been provided to meet the Government's HE target, which is explicitly focused on those aged 18-30. So, while additional activity focused on the over 30s would be welcome, the primary target remains the participation of 18-30 year-olds in HE. It may well be that work in communities and in family learning will have a positive impact on participation rates of older learners, and we would welcome this, but it is not the primary focus of this initiative.

36. Both Councils have stressed that P4P activity will complement that undertaken by schools and colleges to raise standards, which itself may have a significant impact on achievement of the HE participation target. We expect plans to demonstrate how the activities proposed would add value, appropriately to the region, to the wider agenda to raise standards in schools and colleges. Plans should focus on areas that may need greater effort and an HE/FE contribution, that is:

- a. Increasing HE participation among the most disadvantaged groups in society.
- b. Working, in partnership with schools and colleges, with younger children to raise their aspirations and achievements so as to increase the proportion of 16 year-olds staying on in full-time education and training, who might then seek HE entry.
- c. Improving attainment and progression in vocational routes leading to HE entry.

Evidence

37. Plans should be evidence-based, covering:

- a. Evidence that the plan addresses the needs, wishes and views of local communities on the activities that might successfully increase participation in HE among the local population. The plan should refer to demand studies, consultations, or results of evaluation. It should have the endorsement of appropriate partners that speak from an informed view of local demand. Children and young people in the region should be consulted on the content of the plan at an appropriate point.

b. Mapping of existing activity, including the HEFCE widening participation special projects, HE in FE projects funded by the HEFCE and the LSC, and Excellence Challenge Strand 2. We expect plans to build upon existing activity that has been shown to be effective and to link with institutional strategies where appropriate. The plan should provide evidence of awareness of activities by other partners, and demonstrate how the planned activity complements these. It should demonstrate that gaps in activity (for example, geographical or sectoral) have been identified, and that the work planned will address those gaps. It should explain how any duplication is being eliminated and cost-effectiveness promoted by identifying and addressing overlaps.

c. Evaluation of approaches, partnerships and activities that have been tried. The plan should demonstrate how the activities proposed build upon effective exemplars and best practice.

d. We would expect partnerships to consult with widening participation project workers in reviewing how well existing activities have worked.

38. The HEFCE is supporting planning through the POLAR (participation of local areas) project. This provides a web interface to a series of maps, cartograms and data sets showing the young population and participation for regions, LSC areas, local education authorities and wards. These data provide an accurate and consistent base for planning covering England and Wales. For further information, see www.hefce.ac.uk/polar

Activities

39. Work should take place in all regions in all the priority areas identified in Table 4 below, between now and 2010. However, we accept that the business plan to March 2006 may only focus on a sub-set of the priorities, or may address them differently in different years. We leave it to partnerships to determine the nature and mix of activities and projects they wish to undertake in each area, in the light of the needs of local communities and of the range of activities already in place. The examples of activities and projects provided is not prescriptive or restrictive.

Table 4 Priority areas for P4P activities and examples of projects		
<i>Priority areas</i>	<i>Rationale/Comments</i>	<i>Examples of activities and projects</i>
a. Raising awareness of higher education	Disadvantaged young people, particularly those without previous HE experience among their family or peers, may not be aware of HE or may not consider it a realistic option for them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Marketing’ campaigns • HE staff ‘ambassador’ programmes, visiting schools and colleges • Visits by HE staff and HE students to schools and colleges • Visits by young people to HEIs and FECs • Inviting parents/carers or community groups to summer schools or open days
b. Provision of information, advice and guidance to young people, parents/carers and teachers about the benefits of, and opportunities for, HE entry	This is necessary to counter some of the perceived barriers to HE entry. Raising awareness of the possible progression routes through vocational and workplace learning into HE will be important. The activity might be best conducted in partnership with Connexions and the Careers Service. Employers will play an important part in demonstrating the value they attach to HE experience and qualifications. HE Careers Services may play a role in identifying opportunities flowing from graduation. This type of activity might be delivered effectively through a regional information service.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information services and materials provided by HEIs/FECs to schools, colleges and workplaces about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – entry requirements and progression routes into HE – costs of HE and the types of support (financial and non-financial) available – career and employment opportunities following on from HE – the variety of potential HE experiences, including types of institution, subjects and modes of study. • Engagement by HE Careers Services in presenting opportunities beyond HE • Saturday schools • Tailored information sessions as part of summer schools • Joint FE/HE ACE (Aiming for College Education) days
c. Preparation for HE study	This should provide young people with a realistic appreciation of the challenges and rewards of HE study so that they can make sensible choices about their preferred HE experience and be successful once they get there. It may include raising awareness of, and starting development of, the requisite skills for successful HE study and career development after graduation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE/FE staff and students providing mentoring and other pre-entry guidance • Visits and talks by HE/FE staff and students to schools • Saturday or short summer schools with young people, and perhaps parents, visiting HEIs or FECs with HE provision • Tailored sessions in summer schools to demonstrate HE approaches to learning

Table 4 Priority areas for P4P activities and examples of projects		
<i>Priority areas</i>	<i>Rationale/Comments</i>	<i>Examples of activities and projects</i>
d. Raising aspirations and motivation so that young people feel confident to go on to seek HE entry	Increasing motivation to study and achieve success at higher qualification levels needs to start early, particularly for disadvantaged young people who otherwise would not reach level 3 and/or stay on at 16. Connexions and Excellence Challenge Co-ordinators will be important partners in such activity. HE/FE will also need to work with the broader range of partners focused on progression through levels 2 and 3 (eg Lifelong Learning Partnerships): the local LSC will provide an overview of such activity. HE/FE undergraduate and postgraduate students have been found to be effective in working with young people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing information and guidance for young people in preparing Individual Learning Plans (14-19 Green Paper) • Summer schools, including provision for younger children • Mentoring by HE/FE staff and students • Young people shadowing HE/FE students
e. Raising attainment and enriching, accelerating and extending the school and college curriculum	HE/FE staff and students can assist teachers in the classroom, particularly in specialist or shortage areas. This may include preparing young people for HE entry in subjects not usually taught in school. It will be important that such activity is developed and delivered in close conjunction with teachers and schools. HE Education Departments may play valuable roles in 'bridging' between HE/FE and schools sectors, including providing research and consultancy. Excellence Challenge Co-ordinators may also play an important role here. RDAs, Sector Skills Councils and employers are important partners for vocational routes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended summer schools in both HE and FE, particularly for younger children, to increase achievement • HE/FE staff and undergraduate and postgraduate students assisting teachers in the classroom • HEIs/FECs providing tasters in specialist subjects in schools or workplaces • HE/FE undergraduate and postgraduate students acting as Teacher Associates in specialist or shortage subject areas • Joint appointments or secondments of HE/FE staff to offer specialist teaching outside the standard school curriculum • HE centres in FECs providing a greater range of facilities and HE type experience

Table 4 Priority areas for P4P activities and examples of projects		
<i>Priority areas</i>	<i>Rationale/Comments</i>	<i>Examples of activities and projects</i>
f. Facilitating progression routes and curriculum developments and pathways	<p>Attention needs to be given to opening up progression routes through vocational and workplace learning. Local LSCs, RDAs and Sector Skills Councils will be important partners to work with on vocational and workplace pathways. It will be important to involve HE/FE admission staff so that they are aware of the variety of progression routes into HE and can respond to these. Working with schools, colleges and employers may encourage HEIs/FECs to tailor and develop their own curricula to facilitate progression. This may assist HE/FE to identify new programmes and methods of delivery, including new Foundation Degree courses and routes through Modern Apprenticeships, Advanced Modern Apprenticeships and Foundation Degrees. FE Centres of Vocational Excellence (COVE) and New Technology Institutes (NTIs) may have roles to play.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEIs/FECs providing foundation/access programmes or summer schools to assist progression into HE • HEIs and FECs providing tailored admissions advice (including accreditation of prior and experiential learning), particularly for vocational and workplace routes • Ensuring HE admissions procedures give full recognition to new qualifications of equivalent value to traditional qualifications • HE admissions staff being trained in, and applying, best practice in admissions procedures • Admissions compacts to raise awareness of alternative routes for HE entry • HE engagement with Modern and Advanced Modern Apprenticeship frameworks • Progression agreements, eg school and FE students guaranteed entry on certain conditions • Local consortia for awarding academic credits • Development of student progress files and records of achievement • New HE/FE course designs to open up new or enhanced progression pathways
g. Sharing or providing access to HE facilities	<p>Experience of the facilities that can be offered in HE may assist young people in perceiving the attractions of HE study. Sharing facilities across HE and FE (and even employers) may be both cost-effective and valuable in facilitating progression. HE and FE institutions can encourage widening participation and embed themselves further in the life of their communities by opening up facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing facilities across HEIs and FECs to widen the range of resources available to FE students • HE/FE centres as foci for staff development in widening participation • Young people from schools, colleges and workplaces visiting facilities in HEIs/FECs to experience use of specialised equipment • Use of HE/FE facilities for community or schools events • Young people having regular access to HE facilities such as learning resource centres

Table 4 Priority areas for P4P activities and examples of projects		
<i>Priority areas</i>	<i>Rationale/Comments</i>	<i>Examples of activities and projects</i>
h. Developing partnerships, research and development, and disseminating good practice	Many bodies in a region need to be brought together to achieve widening participation, and thereby contribute to social inclusion. These broader links in turn will enhance the P4P partnerships activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of a single contact point in each HEI/FEC for each school/college/workplace • Designated contact points for Excellence Challenge Co-ordinators or Connexions services • Research and development • Dissemination of good practice

40. We expect all plans to include the following elements to some extent:
- a. Activities that engage HE and FE academic and other staff, particularly those involved with admissions, and in working with schools, colleges and workplaces.
 - b. Summer schools. This should include maintaining the current year 11 provision (see paragraphs 45 to 48).
 - c. Activities that engage undergraduate and postgraduate students in HEIs and FECs in working with schools, colleges and workplaces.
 - d. The sharing of HE facilities for the benefit of schools, colleges and workplaces. We do not expect to fund capital items under this initiative, but the additional costs incurred in sharing or opening up facilities may be included.
 - e. Staff support, training and development, particularly for staff in HEIs and FECs but this may also involve school and college staff.
41. Plans should be clear on the activities that will be funded in different years of the initiative (April 2003 to July 2003; August 2003 to July 2004; August 2004 to July 2005; August 2005 to March 2006). They should also set out milestones that illustrate across time how significant blocks of activity (such as the summer school scheme) and targets will be achieved.
42. The Councils are not able to fund activity through this initiative that could be funded through the mainstream teaching and learning allocations from the HEFCE and the LSC. We expect though that P4P partnerships funding may provide the capacity-building and development that will lead to new provision, which can then be funded through the main allocations.

Transitional funding for HEFCE/LSC widening participation special projects

43. We previously agreed to provide transitional funding for January to March 2003 for existing widening participation special projects:
- a. To extend these so that they may form the basis of P4P activities.
 - b. And/or to evaluate, embed and disseminate good practice that may inform P4P or other widening participation activity (including that focused on retention).
44. Both Councils have written to individual project managers informing them of the funds available in the region for transitional funding and the allocation process. We have asked that in submitting their plans for the use of transitional funding they consult with the P4P business planning leads in their region, and that the business planning leads take account of the proposals in preparing their plans. We will notify project managers of the outcome of their bids by the end of November 2002.

Summer schools

45. The HEFCE currently administers a national HE summer schools scheme, and intends to roll this into P4P from 2004 onwards. It has not been possible to include the set up of 2003 summer schools in

P4P because of timing difficulties. The HEFCE has written to HEIs presently in the scheme informing them of funding for 2003 summer schools.

46. The HEFCE has provided funding for regional co-ordinators to assist in the development of the summer schools and to put in place administrative systems. We will involve regional co-ordinators in the matching process for 2003 summer schools, and we will then expect them to take over running the scheme fully for 2004 onwards. The lead contacts for summer schools in each region are given in Table 5 below.

Table 5 Summer schools regional contacts	
South-West	Nick Wright Education Liaison Office University of Exeter Northcote House The Queen's Drive EXETER EX4 4QJ e-mail nicholas.c.wright@ex.ac.uk tel 01392 263034
South-East	Lynn Champion Higher Education for the South-East SEEDA Headquarters Cross Lanes GUILDFORD GU1 1YA e-mail Lynnchampion@hese.ac.uk tel 01483 470118
London	Gary Davis London P4P Team 33 St James's Square LONDON SW1Y 4JS e-mail Gary@londonp4p.ac.uk tel 020 7661 9996
West Midlands	Sarah Hough Outreach Office Aston University Aston Triangle BIRMINGHAM B4 7ET e-mail s.e.hough@aston.ac.uk tel 0121 359 3611 ext 5370

East Midlands	<p>Dr Neil Raven EMUA External Relations Loughborough University LOUGHBOROUGH LE11 3TU</p> <p>e-mail n.d.raven@lboro.ac.uk tel 01509 228498</p>
Eastern	<p>Dr John Nicholson Manager Science Starter & Widening Participation Programme University of East Anglia The Registry, University Plain NORWICH NR4 7TJ e-mail j.nicholson@uea.ac.uk tel 01603 593691</p>
North-West	<p>Professor Keith Percy Department of Continuing Education Lancaster University University House Bailrigg LANCASTER LA1 4YW e-mail k.percy@lancaster.ac.uk tel 01524 592620</p>
Yorkshire and the Humber	<p>Adriane Marriott-Mills Yorkshire Universities University of Leeds University House Cromer Terrace LEEDS LS2 9JT e-mail yhuamm@yhua.ac.uk tel 0113 233 1582</p>
North-East	<p>Claire Smiles-Harrison Summer School Liaison Officer Unis4NE Knowledge House 1 Hylton Park Wessington Way Sunderland SR5 3HD e-mail s.paul@unis4ne.ac.uk tel: 0191 516 4405</p>

47. Strategic plans should present the summer schools activity proposed. We expect that this will at least maintain in 2004 the current level of activity. The existing scheme is focused on giving older children (year 11s) an opportunity to find an HE experience suited to their needs and aspirations, and to receive a taster of HE learning methods. It has been limited to HEIs. But we also hope to see the summer school element extended in plans where appropriate – with provision for younger students, in FECs with HE provision, and longer experiences aimed at raising achievement as well as aspirations.

48. The year 11 provision being rolled into P4P will be administered regionally from 2004 so that young people have a range of HE providers to choose from. Following consultation, the HEFCE will also administer a small national scheme to enable young people to apply for specialist summer schools provision, for example in music or art and design, that is only available outside their region. The HEFCE will work with the regional co-ordinators on this national scheme. Further details will be provided in due course.

Overall P4P targets, indicators, monitoring and evaluation

49. Each plan will need to provide:

a. Commentary on the partnership's ability to attain the participation target we have set for the region, and the key factors that will influence success. The Councils also expect plans to set out the partnership's own target for HE participation to be reached by the end of the funding period (March 2006), and other targets as thought appropriate to guide activity accurately and focus on priorities. These might include, for example:

- targets for participation by certain types of disadvantaged or socio-demographic groups
- targets for sub-regions or other significant blocks of activity
- targets for stages towards HE entry (such as progression to levels 2 and 3).

Plans should give timetables for delivery of targets over the period of the initiative, and show who is responsible for them. Targets should relate to activities and funds (for example, if sub-regional partnerships are responsible for significant blocks of funding or activities then these should also be assigned appropriate targets). Targets should be stated in terms of proposed outcomes, not in terms of outputs or processes.

b. The activity indicators that the partnership proposes to use. Activity indicators are standardised ways of reporting activities so that we can judge the scale of the activity and the value for money. These might include, for example, summer school place days, mentoring contact hours, or numbers of full-time equivalent staff on P4P activity in classrooms.

c. The quality monitoring regime that will be applied, and how the partnership will gain both qualitative and quantitative feedback. Regular and systematic feedback on the perceived quality and success of activities from the demand side – young people, parents/carers, schools and local education authorities – will be as important in monitoring progress as quantitative indicators.

50. As we set out in paragraphs 13-16, we will conduct annual monitoring, focusing on progress towards the regional target we have set, as well as progress on the targets and milestones adopted by the partnerships in their plans. We will want to present a national view of progress of the initiative to Government, to make the case for further investment, and so we will need to aggregate some information from regions. The Councils will therefore require some standard reporting of activity

indicators, as well as standardised reporting on results of quality monitoring. However, we recognise that monitoring systems are most effective if they are shaped by those close to the activity, particularly by working with other regional partners to achieve cost-effective data capture and presentation of indicators. We will discuss with partnerships, individually and collectively, the form of reporting, based on the proposals in their plans and the monitoring cycle, during the period of finalising plans. Council staff will convene a forum of the P4P business planning leads, listed in Table 3 above, to discuss consistent national approaches that can fit with regional systems. This will require a consistent methodology within regions.

51. As part of evaluation activity, we would encourage partnerships to consider longitudinal studies of the impacts of activities on individual young people to judge outcomes. This might include, for example, tracking young people from age 13 to determine not only whether they go on to HE, and which interventions had most impact, but also whether they succeed there. The DfES will be piloting in 2003 a longitudinal study to track a sample of young people from 13 through to age 24-25. If a full study is funded this will provide a rich source of information to assess the separate and combined effects of different learning experiences on attainment and participation.

Funding

52. The strategic plan should contain a funding plan, using the funding template provided at Annex F. This should set out how the partnership intends to use funds to pursue the priority areas set out at Table 4. Funds should be assigned to those who will be responsible for delivering them (for example, broken down by sub-regional partnerships if that is appropriate). The budget should be presented on the following basis: April 2003 to July 2003; August 2003 to July 2004; August 2004 to July 2005; August 2005 to March 2006. We would expect the information in the funding plan to fit the information provided in the rest of the strategic plan.

53. The money will be a single joint fund, distributed by the HEFCE on behalf of both Councils. However, we will need to know the likely split of the funds for each region between HEFCE-funded and LSC-funded providers, so that we can make sure that both HEIs and FECs are actively involved in the activities and that there is a genuine partnership. Both Councils need to account nationally while seeing the rough balance in the use of funds in each region, so that we can review the national picture. Partnerships will have flexibility in the use of funds and will be able to adjust the distribution as needs change, so long as the principle of joint working is maintained.

54. The funding plan should list all the HEIs and FECs that may be recipients of funds under this initiative. We do not, however, require a detailed breakdown of funds and activities per institution.

55. The strategic plan should propose how accountability for funds will be assured. A single institution could take on responsibility for accountability and for co-ordinating reports of progress for the region, or several institutions could each take sub-regional responsibilities. Accountable institutions may be HEIs or FECs. This will enable partnerships to use funds flexibly across providers to make the most effective use of them. Both Councils recognise that there are significant burdens involved, and we would expect such responsible institutions to charge reasonable handling costs to the initiative. These costs should be open and transparent to the other institutions in the partnership, and we will scrutinise them in approving plans. As set out in paragraph 14, the HEFCE will make a formal agreement with each accountable institution, on behalf of the partnership, once the Councils have approved plans. The aim is to make sure that the responsibilities of the partners, and particularly the accountable institutions, are clear and understood by all.

Programme management arrangements

56. Active programme management will be important for the P4P initiative, which needs to deliver a complex target, requiring changes in social attitudes, over a long timescale. Plans should set out the programme management arrangements, including how the programme will be brought together at the regional level to ensure a comprehensive approach. As part of this, the plan will need to cover:

- a. Governance of the partnership, including how decisions are taken, who employs project staff, and the committee structures for involving all partners. This should state how the partnership will identify and monitor the contribution expected of each member.
- b. Co-ordination. We have emphasised that a critical part of P4P is joining up activities so that the young person experiences a co-ordinated set of activities encouraging them to enter HE. We therefore expect to see co-ordination, which responds to the young person's needs, featuring strongly in the programme management arrangements.
- c. Promotions, marketing and communications. Raising awareness of HE and its benefits – among young people, parents/carers, schools and colleges, and employers – will be very important. Each plan should set out the partnership's proposals for regional and local activity. Partnerships should liaise with Excellence Challenge co-ordinators to co-ordinate with any promotions and activities in their region under the Aimhigher brand. The Aimhigher web-site can be found at www.dfes.gov.uk/aimhigher/
- d. Dissemination of good practice and success stories, indicating how the partnership will seek to identify what is working and why, and disseminate the lessons throughout the partnership and nationally.

57. The HEFCE presently funds the Action on Access national co-ordination team to support widening participation special projects. The team will be able to assist partnerships in developing their plans. The HEFCE and the LSC have recently re-appointed Action on Access for a further three years; the team will be enlarged, reflecting the need for increased support both to institutions and to P4P projects. We will inform partnerships of contact details for their regions when regional advisers are in place. Further information on the work of Action on Access is available on its web-site, www.actiononaccess.org

Other details

58. Plans should also:

- a. Include a short executive summary: maximum one A4 page.
- b. Provide details for a contact person as the first port of call for queries on the plan.
- c. Be signed by a person with authority for the partnership.

59. We leave it to partnerships to decide the length of strategic plan they wish to submit, but we believe that 12 pages of A4 (not including the funding plan, an executive summary and any annexes) should provide the level of detail we require.

Assessing plans

Role of regional monitoring groups and the national steering group

60. The HEFCE and the LSC have appointed a national steering group (NSG), and a regional monitoring group (RMG) in each region, to advise us on the processes of approving and monitoring plans. Membership of the groups is given in Annexes G and H. The RMGs bring together major partners in the region who can advise on the likely effectiveness of the plan to meet the needs of local people and achieve the required increase in participation. The NSG will validate the reviews conducted by the RMGs to ensure consistency in the application of criteria, and to advise us on the overall effectiveness of the plans to meet the national target.

61. RMGs and the NSG will assess plans against the following criteria:
- a. The plan presents a programme of activity that is coherent and effective, in that it:
 - i. Addresses the aims and objectives of the initiative.
 - ii. Considers all the priorities identified in the light of analysis of local demand.
 - iii. Is likely to add value to the contributions being made by schools and colleges to address the HE target, focusing on widening participation, younger children and vocational and work-based routes.
 - iv. Addresses the main priority areas and elements identified in this document.
 - v. Is likely to meet the HE participation goal set for the region.
 - vi. Involves, and has been endorsed by, the HEIs and FECs in the region and other key partners.
 - vii. Represents value for money.
 - viii. In general is a robust basis for funding, with clear outcome targets and milestones.
 - b. There are no gaps or overlaps in the totality of plans in the region.

P4P: aims and objectives, priorities and principles (as originally stated in HEFCE 01/73)

1. The Government has set a target that 50 per cent of 18-30 year-olds should have the opportunity to benefit from higher education by 2010. We expect that the current extensive programme of reform in school standards, and the LSC's action to raise attainment among pupils aged 16 plus, should make a substantial contribution towards achieving this target. However, we believe that the HE and FE sectors can also play an important part in adding value to the work of schools and colleges, and engaging with employers.
2. In the light of this, the HEFCE and the LSC proposed the Partnerships for Progression initiative, with the following aims and objectives:
 - a. To support the achievement of 50 per cent participation in HE by:
 - i. Raising aspirations and motivation to enter HE among school and FE students from age 13, and particularly those from lower socio-economic groups.
 - ii. Raising the achievements of students from age 13, through actions which complement the school reforms already in hand, so that they gain the academic or vocational qualifications and learning skills that will enable them to enter HE.
 - iii. Strengthening progression routes via NVQ level 3 from schools and FE providers into HE.
 - iv. Raising achievement and strengthening progression routes into HE through workplace learning.
3. The two Councils proposed a substantial investment to meet these aims and objectives that would be focused on these priorities:
 - a. Partnerships strand: the extension of HE/FE regional partnerships and their widening participation activities, which would be supported by both the HEFCE and the LSC.
 - b. Quality standards strand: support by the LSC for improvement in quality standards in further education and training providers working with disadvantaged students, as a means of securing an increase in the number of students achieving the qualifications needed to benefit from HE.
 - c. Workplace learning strand: incentives by the LSC for workplace learning to provide progression to HE entry.
 - d. Research and evaluation strand: a national programme of research and evaluation to assess what interventions have most effect, supported by both the HEFCE and the LSC.
4. We also proposed that the initiative should be characterised by the following principles:
 - a. Working in comprehensive partnerships, recognising the many players that need to work together to achieve the target.
 - b. Achieving coherence in activity across successive age groups and across different progression routes to achieve a 'supply chain' effect into HE.
 - c. Building on existing partnerships, systems and activities that have been shown to work and being flexible to respond to regional, sub-regional or local circumstances.
 - d. Providing stable funding and activity over the longer term.

Calculation of the targets and funding for regions

Targets for regions

1. The targets are based on regional participation rates for young entrants, with each region expected to increase its participation by the same percentage points. The reasons for this approach are set out below.

Participation rates of regions

2. The P4P activity is intended to stimulate demand for higher education overall, not for entry to specific institutions. Successful activity will not necessarily lead to applications to the institutions which carried out the activity, and the construction of the target must take this into account. Therefore the target is based on the numbers of entrants from regions, without concern for which particular institutions they attend.

Measures based on participation rates of young entrants

3. The targets should align as closely as possible to the overall government target to achieve a 50 per cent participation rate by the end of the decade, as measured by the Initial Entry Rate (IER). The 2000-01 rate is between 41 and 42 per cent.

4. The IER to higher education is the sum of the participation rates of cohorts for each age from 17 up to 30. Participation is defined as starting an undergraduate course of a year or more, without having previously started a higher education course. The rate is based on the whole population for each age.

5. An obvious approach would be to set IERs as targets for specific areas. It would be possible to produce values of the IER, at least for large areas, but they would not be meaningful.

6. All participation rates involve some variant of the formula: participation = (number of students) / (number in population). Standard resident populations (such as National Statistics mid-year estimates) would include students, so that regions with a high inflow of students would appear to have lower participation rates than was really the case. Also, for the populations aged 21 and over, the proportions that have already participated will be significant; and, given the mobility of young graduates, this would further complicate target setting. These difficulties do not arise for participation rates for young entrants.

Regions as the geographical unit

7. The P4P funding is provided at a regional level and therefore, for accountability purposes, it is appropriate that targets are set at this level. The HEFCE has also provided a wealth of information on participation by much smaller geographical units, which should help partnerships plan their work and produce their own more specific and detailed targets (see Annex C paragraph 38 for more information).

Ensuring the regional targets are consistent with the overall 50 per cent target

8. It is essential that the individual regional targets are consistent with the overall 50 per cent target. In other words, if each of the regional targets were met, we must be confident that the overall 50 per cent target would also be met.

9. The first step is to estimate by how much the overall young participation rate should increase from the current value of 29 per cent, if the IER is to increase from 41-42 per cent to 50 per cent or more. In doing this we have taken into account government projections which are based on an expectation that the growth in participation by young entrants will be greater than for mature entrants. The implication of this is that the young participation rate should increase by about 10 per cent to 39 per cent.

Allowing for current differences in regional participation rates

10. Regional young participation rates vary: young people in London are around 50 per cent more likely to enter HE than their peers in the North-East. A target which implies that these regional differences will disappear over the next decade seems unrealistic. Indeed historic evidence suggests that growth may be easier to achieve in regions that have high participation. Nevertheless, given the imperative to widen participation as well as increase it, it was thought that the targets should not assume a further widening of differences in the regional participation rates.

11. Deciding where the balance should lie between accepting the realities of regional differences and overcoming them, is a difficult question of judgement. We decided to set the targets with the same increase in percentage points from current participation levels. This corresponds to an assumption that the absolute differences in regional participation rates will remain the same, though the relative rates, as a proportion, will narrow.

12. We believe that achieving these targets will be more difficult for the regions with lower participation and, in recognition of this, the per capita funding for those regions will be higher.

Table 6 Regional participation targets

Region	Young participation rates			Indicative equivalent IER rates	
	Current %	Target %	Target % /current %	Current %	Target %
North-East	24.2	34.2	141	34	45
North-West	27.8	37.8	136	39	50
Yorkshire and the Humber	25.3	35.3	139	35	47
East Midlands	27.7	37.7	136	39	50
West Midlands	27.9	37.9	136	39	50
East of England	28.7	38.7	135	40	51
London	35.3	45.3	128	49	60
South-East	32.9	42.9	130	46	57
South-West	29.2	39.2	134	41	52

13. The indicative IER rates were simply calculated by assuming that the young participation figures represent the same proportion of total IER participation in each region. The overall increase is 52 per cent, which includes a 2 per cent safety margin taken from government projections. To aid understanding

of the funding algorithm, the participation rates shown in this table are given to three significant figures. Since it is not possible to measure regional participation to that precision, the targets themselves are set with two significant figures at Annex C.

Data sources and definitions for calculating young participation rates

14. The young participation rates quoted are from our ongoing work on measuring participation that will be fully described in a future report. Briefly, they are the proportion of the cohort of English domiciled children who were 15 on 31 August 1996 that went on to enter a full-time first degree, HND or HNC course at a UK HEI or FEC in the academic years 1999-2000 or 2000-01. The counts of entrants are derived from linked HESA, ISR and FES student records. The population counts are from a method developed by the HEFCE using 1991 census data and recent child benefit records.

Funding

15. The starting point will be to take account of the different size of the regions, so that, in the first instance, the funding should be proportional to the population of the relevant age groups in each region. We have taken the number of children in schools in each region in January 2002 who were aged between 11 and 15 on 31 August 2001, as an indicator of the share that each region has of the likely core P4P activity populations over the funding period. These figures are from supplementary local education authority (LEA) tables for 'Statistics of education: schools in England' (DfES 2002, LEA tables at www.dfes.gov.uk/statistics). We are, in effect, assuming that the target population for mature entrants will be proportional to these populations. There is no easy way of making a more accurate estimate of these mature entrant populations.

16. In addition to the regional size, in order to estimate the relative costs of P4P activity we need to consider:

- a. The relative difficulty (and therefore cost) in achieving each additional participant through P4P activity.
- b. The expected increase in participation which would have occurred without the P4P project.

17. In this model we took the costs of achieving each additional participant to be the same for each region. We also assumed that the growth in regional participation that would occur without P4P would be proportional to the current participation. This is how participation has increased historically. Finally we assumed that half of the increase in participation required to meet the overall target would be due to P4P activities. Table 7 below shows how these assumptions lead to the funding allocations.

Table 7 Allocation of funds between regions

	Assumed increase not due to P4P (% points)	Increase in young participation due to P4P (% points)	Relative funding per 2002 11-15 school population	Share of 2002 11-15 school population	Share of funds	Total funding 2003-06 (£)
North-East	4.1	5.9	1.18	5.3%	6.2%	3,721,916
North-West	4.7	5.3	1.05	14.6%	15.4%	9,251,514
Yorkshire and the Humber	4.3	5.7	1.14	10.4%	11.8%	7,074,394
East Midlands	4.7	5.3	1.06	8.6%	9.1%	5,452,070
West Midlands	4.8	5.2	1.05	11.2%	11.8%	7,050,138
East of England	4.9	5.1	1.02	11.0%	11.2%	6,731,782
London	6.0	4.0	0.80	13.2%	10.5%	6,317,950
South-East	5.6	4.4	0.88	16.0%	14.1%	8,485,612
South-West	5.0	5.0	1.01	9.8%	9.9%	5,914,621

18. As is customary in funding allocations, the shares shown here are calculated from the full precision of the underlying data sets.

P4P National Steering Group: membership

HEFCE

Professor Peter Scott (Chair), Vice-Chancellor, Kingston University – and HEFCE Board member
John Rushforth, Director (Widening Participation)
John Selby, HEFCE Regional Consultant, West Midlands
Sheila Watt, HEFCE Head of Widening Participation Policy
HEFCE board member (tbc)

Learning and Skills Council

Hilary Chadwick, LSC Local Executive Director, Hampshire LSC
Geoff Daniels, LSC Assistant Director of Funding, Policy and Development
Professor Bob Fryer, Chief Executive, NHSu – and LSC National Council member
Martin Lamb, LSC Assistant Director, Young People's Programmes
Caroline Neville, LSC National Director, Policy and Development
Ken Pascoe, LSC National Operations Director
Vic Seddon, LSC Local Executive Director, London South LSC
Vincent Watt, RDA Skills Chair, East of England Development Agency - and LSC National Council member
Avril Willis, LSC National Quality and Standards Director

Other participants

Rose Collinson, Assistant Director for Lifelong Learning at Medway Council
Anne Weinstock, Chief Executive, Connexions

Observers

Leigh Hackel (or Helen Brooks), Department for Education and Skills
John Storan, Action on Access

P4P regional monitoring groups: membership

1. The regional monitoring groups (RMGs) are composed of key players from agencies in each region. The groups will advise the national steering group and, through it, the HEFCE and the LSC on plans within the region, providing detailed oversight of the regional strategy.
2. Each RMG will have a common core membership consisting of:
 - the HEFCE regional consultant
 - the LSC executive director from the region who leads on higher education
 - a representative from the Regional Government Office
 - a representative from the Regional Development Agency.
3. The secretariat for each group will be:
 - a higher education adviser from the HEFCE regional team
 - an officer from a local LSC within the region.
4. In addition to this core membership, the RMG may, at its discretion, co-opt up to four additional members drawn from other organisations in the region with an interest in widening participation. The co-opted members shall include a person with knowledge and expertise of the schools sector. None of the co-opted individuals shall be involved in the direct management or delivery of P4P in the region. The co-options shall be subject to approval by the NSG.
5. The regional Action on Access representative will act as an observer and adviser to the group as appropriate, and the RMG may invite a representative of the regional partnership to join the group as an observer. Their role will be to assist it in its discussions and to facilitate good communication between the group and those delivering P4P in the region, but not to participate in decision making.

List of abbreviations

ACE	Aiming for College Education
ESF	European Social Fund
FE	Further education
FEC	Further education college
FRESA	Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action
FES	Further Education Statistics
HE	Higher education
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEI	Higher education institution
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency
ISR	Individual Student Record
LSC	Learning and Skills Council
NSG	National steering group (for P4P)
NTI	New Technology Institute
P4P	Partnerships for Progression
RDA	Regional Development Agency
RMG	Regional monitoring group (for P4P)