

# Annex A

## Data sources and definitions

### Students

1. Four main sources of student data were used:
  - the Higher Education Students Early Statistics survey 2002-03 (HESES02), collected in December 2002
  - the Higher Education in Further Education Students Survey 2002-03 (HEIFES02), collected in November 2002
  - the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) 2001-02 student record, as at 31 July 2002
  - the Learning and Skills Council's Individualised Student Record (LSC's ISR) 2001-02, as at 31 July 2002.

### HESES and HEIFES

2. All students returnable to HESES or HEIFES are included, regardless of funding status or nationality. Students who are at further education colleges (FECs) that receive funding directly from HEFCE are included in the HEIFES return. Students registered at an FEC but funded through a HEFCE recognised funding consortium are included in the early statistics return of the lead institution. We have deducted them from the lead institution and added them to the FEC numbers.
3. Students who are registered at a higher education institution (HEI) but taught through a collaborative agreement at another institution are recorded in their registering institution's early statistics return. We have included them with their registering institution rather than their teaching institution.
4. Information on the numbers of consortium or collaboratively taught students returned are recorded for home and EC fundable students only; we made no adjustment for this when reallocating consortia numbers. We have used the number of years of programme of study countable between 1 August 2002 and 31 July 2003, and have not deducted the number of years of programme of study which students fail to complete.
5. Where possible we have presented the student data in terms of both headcounts and full-time equivalent (FTE) numbers. The FTE is a better measure of the amount of activity than a headcount, and is the basis of HEFCE funding. In HESES, full-time students have an FTE of 1, sandwich students on their industrial placement have an FTE of 0.5, and the FTE of part-time students will depend on the student load as recorded by the institution in column 4a of the HESES and HEIFES tables.

### HESA student data

6. The HESA student record was filtered to match the HESES return. Students who would not be counted in HESES were excluded. This excludes a number of students who are included in published figures from HESA, such as students who are writing up their theses. Full details of the HESES derivation from the HESA record are given in HEFCE 2003/04, 'HESA 2001-02 derived statistics for funding allocations and monitoring'.
7. On HESA data students are recorded by their registering institution.

## **Higher education students registered at regional institutions**

### **Student numbers**

8. Student numbers were derived from HESES and HEIFES 2001 and 2002. The numbers are summed over all funding categories, and are based on column 1 plus column 2 of the HESES and HEIFES tables.
9. The headcounts of students registered at HEIs are taken from HESES 2001 and 2002, and the headcounts of students registered at FECs are from HEIFES 2001 and 2002. Students who are part of a funding consortium and registered at an FEC are excluded from the HEI total and included in the FEC total.
10. The overall proportion of FTE to headcount for each institution was calculated using the ratio of column 4a (student load) to column 4 of the HESES and HEIFES tables. This proportion was then applied to the headcount total to give an estimate of total FTEs for each institution. The FTEs were estimated in the same way for students who are part of a consortium using the proportions from the lead institutions. Although data on student load are collected for part-time students only, column 4a is filled in for full-time and sandwich students as described in paragraph 5.

### **HE student headcounts by type of institution: pie chart**

11. HESES02 and HEIFES02 were the source for this chart. Numbers of collaboratively taught students were taken from column 6 of the HESES and HEIFES tables. Consortia funded students were included with the institution at which they are registered rather than the lead institution that reports them to HESES or HEIFES. No attempt was made to adjust for the fact that these numbers are reported for home and EC fundable students only.

### **Higher education student numbers at institutions**

12. These are a breakdown by institution of 'student numbers'. Headcounts were used, as these involve less estimation. Students who are part of a funding consortium and registered at an FEC are excluded from the lead institution and included in the FEC total; such numbers are estimates because they are only reported for home and EC fundable students.

## **Learning in the region**

13. All the data on this page, except the total figures for FECs in the first section, are drawn from the 2001-02 HESA student record.
14. This page has been included to illustrate the extent to which the provision of higher education is not necessarily located in the region where the student is registered.
15. The first section gives the numbers of students both registered and learning in the region. The majority of students are in this category for all regions.

### **Registered and learning in the region**

16. HEI numbers do not include collaboratively taught students, which are in a separate category. Distance learners are only included in the HEI total if they are both registered at an institution in the region and domiciled in the region. The domicile is the student's home address when they first applied for the course. It is assumed to be where the distance learning takes place.

17. FEC numbers were derived from the ISR 2001-02. No account was taken of franchising from an FEC to another FEC because such franchising is recorded differently to the collaborative teaching agreements which exist between HEIs and FECs. Similarly we did not look at campuses of FECs or at their distance learners. We therefore assume that a student registering at an FEC learns at the FEC's administrative centre.

### **Open University students domiciled in the region**

18. These were derived from HESA 2001-02. The Open University has a widely dispersed support system spread throughout the UK, so although the administrative address of the Open University is in Milton Keynes it is not a campus university in the same sense as others. For this reason data from the Open University are not included in the South-East region. All Open University students were treated in this manner, whether they were recorded as distance learners or not.

### **Registered in the region but learning outside the region**

19. In all other data pages of the region these students are included in statistics of the given region.

20. Three methods of learning that lead to students being registered and learning in different regions are considered:

- campuses
- collaboratively taught students
- distance learners.

21. The postcodes of the teaching institutions and campuses were used to allocate students to the region in which learning takes place. Similarly the region of domicile of distance learners is assumed to be the region in which learning takes place.

22. Details of non-regional campuses are given in the first table in this section.

23. Numbers of collaboratively taught students for each registering and teaching institution combination are not provided as these are published as a separate document on the web: 'Franchised students 2000-01: Students registered at one institution and taught at another' (HEFCE 2002/51).

24. The second table details the numbers of distance learners registered at an HEI in the region but domiciled outside the region. We assume that distance learners learn at home. To keep the lists to a reasonable size, only institutions with 10 or more FTEs for distance learners were included.

### **Registered outside the region but learning in the region**

25. None of these students are included in any other data page of the given region.

26. This section has a similar layout to the previous one. The total headcounts for the three methods of learning are shown in the bar chart, and the institutional details of the campus and distance learners are given in the tables.

## HE students registered at HEIs: characteristics

### Students by mode

27. These were derived from HESES02. The regional comparison chart and the pie chart show the split in headcounts. The percentage of part-timers, in terms of FTEs, is given below the pie chart. Those students registered at FECs in consortia led by an HEI were excluded.

### Students by level

28. Most of these data were derived from HESES02. However, in order to subtract those students who were part of an HEI-led consortium we used data supplied by the lead institutions in a separate survey carried out in February 2003, together with a further breakdown of level from the LSC's ISR 2001-02.

### Undergraduates by age on entry

29. These charts were derived from the HESA 2001-02 student record. The age on entry was derived from the commencement date and the date of birth. 'Young' students are those aged 20 or under on entry to higher education. 'Mature' students are those aged 25 and over on entry. Undergraduate students only were used, to avoid distorting the comparison through regional differences in the proportion of postgraduate students.

### Graphs showing movements and home region of young full-time undergraduate students

30. Several charts, in the background section and the chapters on each region, draw on an analysis of the home region of young full-time undergraduates. For young students, the 'home' region is their home on application to higher education – normally their parents' or guardians' home. The HESA 2001-02 record was used to assign all such students to their home region, as described above for Open University students. This was done for all institutions in the UK, so that movements of students to and from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland could be traced, as well as movements within England. The majority of older students study close to home, so we restricted this analysis to young full-time undergraduates. This is the most mobile group of students, and the group for whom we have the best data on domicile. Students whose home region was unknown were excluded; these were approximately 1 per cent of the total.

- a. **Percentage of young full-time undergraduate students studying at HEIs in their home region.** The number of young students studying in their home region was expressed as a percentage of the total number of young students from that region.
- b. **Flow of young full-time undergraduate students at HEIs into and out of regions: percentage of total students from region.** For each region, the difference between the number of young students entering the region to study from elsewhere in the UK, and those leaving the region to study elsewhere in the UK, was expressed as a percentage of the total number of young students from that region. In the plot, a positive value indicates that the region takes in more young students than it exports. England as a whole is a net exporter of young students to the rest of the UK.
- c. **Where do young students in Region X come from?** The home region data are used as above, but taking into account overseas students as well as UK students. 'Island' means the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands.

d. **Where do young students from Region X study?** This gives the breakdown by region of institution for young students whose home is in the given region.

### **Students at HEIs: subjects**

31. These are derived from the HESA 2001-02 record, using HESA standard subject groupings. The classification is by subject of qualification aim – it is not a breakdown in terms of the teaching load on different departments. It should be noted that institutions differ in the extent to which programmes are classified as ‘Combined’. Therefore, if a region appears to have a low proportion of students in a given subject, this may be a reflection of the way courses are organised (for example in a modular programme), rather than presenting the actual extent of provision in the region.

### **HE students registered at FE colleges**

32. The students included in this section are those that are registered with FECs. Students at FECs directly funded by HEFCE and students funded through a consortium are included, while students registered at an HEI and taught by an FEC (collaboratively taught students) are excluded.

### **HE student headcounts in FECs by mode**

33. These figures are derived mainly from HEIFES02, but data on students at FECs in consortia led by an HEI have been included here.

### **HE student headcounts in FECs – qualification aim**

34. These are derived mainly from HEIFES02. However, in order to add those students who were part of an HEI-led consortium we used data supplied by the lead institutions in a separate survey carried out in February 2003, together with a further breakdown of level from the LSC’s ISR 2001-02.

### **HE students at FECs: subjects**

35. These are derived from the LSC’s ISR 2001-02, and its qualifications database, using a mapping of the former Further Education Funding Council subjects (sub-programmes) to HESA’s standard subject groupings. Students were defined as HE if they fitted the criteria laid down by HEIFES02. For a detailed description see ‘ISR 2001-02 derived statistics for funding allocations and monitoring in FECs’ (HEFCE 2003/21).

### **Major FE providers of HE**

36. To give as full a picture as possible we have included collaboratively taught students from the 2001-02 HESA record where known, and where they make up a significant proportion of the college’s provision. For reasons given in paragraph 37 there may be other colleges with large numbers of collaboratively taught HE students for whom we have no data.

37. The directly funded and consortium numbers are derived from HEIFES02 and HESES02 respectively.

### **Collaboratively taught students**

38. This information is derived from HESA data for 2001-02. Institutions were asked to confirm whether the details of their collaboratively taught students were correct. The FTE measure for collaborative teaching takes account of the proportion of the students' time at the teaching college.

39. Most, but not all, collaborative arrangements are with FECs. For some institutions, it was not apparent from the data where the students were taught, in which case we have not attempted to estimate the numbers taught through a collaborative arrangement by FECs. For this reason the numbers given as collaboratively taught by FECs are likely to be under-reported. More detailed tables of the previous year's franchised (collaboratively taught) students are provided on our web-site in 'Franchised students 2000-01: Students registered at one institution and taught at another (November) (*Web only*)' (HEFCE 2002/51).

### **Income to HE institutions 2001-02**

40. All data on HEI income and expenditure were extracted from the HESA 2001-02 finance record.

- a. **Total income to HEIs: by region.** This was derived from Table 1 of the HESA finance record. The 'Other' category includes 'Endowment and investment income'.
- b. **Research grants and contracts: by region of institution and source.** This was derived from Table 6 of HESA 2001-02 finance record and relates to the chart in the introduction
- c. **Income to individual HEIs by source, and pie-charts of income to HEIs by source.** These were also produced from Table 1 of the HESA 2001-02 finance record. 'Funding bodies grant' includes grant from the Teacher Training Agency as well as HEFCE. 'Tuition fees' includes academic support grants. 'Other' includes endowment income. This relates to the pie and bar charts in the regional sections.

### **HEFCE funding by region (2003-04) and by institution**

41. The source for funding from HEFCE to higher education institutions was taken from HEFCE's 2003-04 grant tables, as published in HEFCE 2003/10 'Recurrent grants for 2003-04'; subsequent grant adjustments made up to June 2003 are included. The data are taken from Table 1. Other grants are made up of 'Moderation of teaching and research' and 'Rewarding and developing staff 2003-04'. No special funding has been included as only a small proportion of it is allocated by March when the recurrent grants circular is published.

### **Research Assessment Exercise performance**

42. For details of these data see '2001 Research Assessment Exercise: The Outcome' published in December 2001 (RAE 4/01). The graphs show the number of research-active staff employed by institutions in the region, grouped into the RAE grade that their department received.

### **Participation in HE**

43. These data are taken from 'Performance indicators in higher education in the UK' (HEFCE 2002/52). Institution names used in that publication have been kept. Data are shown for young full-time first-degree entrants only.

- a. **Students from low participation neighbourhoods.** This is taken from Table T1a of HEFCE 2002/52. Low participation neighbourhoods are defined as those where the rate of participation in higher education for young people (under 21) has been less than two-thirds the national average. About one-third of young people live in such areas.
- b. **Non-continuation rates following year of entry.** This is taken from Table T3a and is the percentage of young full-time first degree students entering an institution in 1999-2000 who could not be traced anywhere within the HE sector in 2000-01.

## **First destinations of graduates**

44. These data were derived from the HESA First Destinations Survey. This relates to full-time students who completed their course in 2001. The First Destinations Survey is a questionnaire-based survey of the activity of former students six months after completing their course. The response rate for home-domiciled first degree students is over 80 per cent. All data in this publication are for first-degree graduates only, to prevent comparisons between regions being distorted by regional differences in proportions of postgraduate students.

### **Full-time first degree students graduating from HEIs in 2001**

45. Graduates recorded as 'Employed' and 'Further study' are those whose main activity was recorded as such. Graduates described as 'Unemployed' are those whose main activity was recorded as 'Seeking employment or training', and who did not have a different secondary activity recorded. Graduates who were unavailable for work – or who were seeking work as the main activity but were also carrying out further study, work or professional preparation as a secondary activity – were not included. The percentages do not therefore sum to 100 per cent.

### **Where do graduates from Region X's HEIs find employment?**

46. This was derived using the location of the main activity of all full-time first degree students who were employed, including self-employed, for each HEI. This was then grouped by region of institutions.

### **Employed graduates of region X's HEIs: first destinations by type of industry**

47. Home-domiciled full-time first degree graduates who were in employment (including self-employment) in the UK were grouped according to the main activity of their employer, using the Standard Industrial Classification. The region in which they are employed is also shown.

## **Population and economics**

48. The sources for all data were the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). Sources used in the regional chapters are given below.

## **Population**

49. Population statistics are 2001 estimates, taken from Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 14.1 of the ONS publication 'Regional Trends 37' published by The Stationery Office in 2002. All these tables are based on the 2001 census and take account of births, deaths and net migration between census day and mid-year.

## **Economic indicators**

50. Figures on gross domestic product (GDP) per head, are 1999 estimates from Table 12.1 of 'Regional Trends 37'. The calculations are made at basic prices (which includes taxes, less subsidies, on production). Regional statistics are compiled on a residence basis: income from commuters is included in the region where they live, rather than where they work. This will have a significant effect on the estimates of GDP for London, the South-East and the Eastern region, but not elsewhere.

51. The percentage and the £ per head calculations are made less 'extra-regio', where extra-regio describes that part of UK economic activity that cannot be allocated to a specific region. Further details on the calculation of regional GDP are given in 'Regional Trends 37'.

52. Population estimates used in table 12.1 of 'Regional Trends 37' are based on the 1991 census and are not consistent with the population estimates above.

## **Unemployment and qualification level**

53. The unemployment rates quoted are for summer 2002 taken from Table 7 of the 'Regional competitiveness indicators' document, which can be found on the DTI web-site ([www.dti.gov.uk/sd/rci](http://www.dti.gov.uk/sd/rci)). The International Labour Organisation (ILO) definition of unemployment is used. The ILO unemployment rate is calculated as the number of unemployed (as defined by the ILO) as a proportion of the resident economically active population of the area concerned.

54. Table 9(c) of the DTI regional competitiveness indicators was used to find the percentage of economically active adults qualified to at least NVQ level 4.

55. Population estimates used in both Table 7 and 9(c) of the DTI regional competitiveness indicators are based on the 1991 census and are not consistent with the population estimates above.