



# **Access Agreement**

## **2018/19**

**Submitted April 2017**

City, University of London

Access Agreement 2018/19

## Contents

<b>Section 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Section 2: Tuition Fee Charges from September 2018.....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1: Background .....	1
2.2: Tuition fee levels for new entrants in 2018/19 .....	1
2.3: Real terms inflationary increases from 2018/19 .....	2
<b>Section 3: Commitments and Expenditure on Access, Student Success and Progression.....</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1: Assessment of City’s access, student success and progression record .....	2
3.2: Access Agreement funding levels .....	3
3.3: An evidence-based approach to access.....	3
3.4: An evidence-based approach to success .....	4
3.5: Institutional commitments to access, success and progression .....	5
<b>Section 4: Programme of Access Measures .....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1: Access measures: taking a strategy-led approach.....	6
4.2: School sponsorship .....	6
4.3: Co-sponsor partnership activities – attainment raising .....	7
4.4: Other work to raise attainment.....	8
4.5: Work with specific student groups .....	10
4.6: Improve provision around flexible study.....	10
4.7: Collaborative working across the sector .....	10
4.8: Investment in access and alignment with Student Opportunity Allocation.....	11
<b>Section 5: Student Success and Progression Measures .....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1: Enhanced student success and progression work.....	11
5.2: Development of new work to improve student success .....	11
5.3: Progression – positive outcomes in employability and further study.....	12
5.4: Taking an evidence-based approach to strategic planning .....	12
5.5: Supporting students: Who Cares at City? Project .....	13
<b>Section 6: Financial Support from 2018/19.....</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1: Evaluating current provision.....	14
6.2: Implementation of OFFA’s framework and statistical model.....	14
6.3: <i>Closing the Gap</i> : Response and initial findings at City.....	14
6.4: Better financial support .....	16

<b>Section 7: Learning Success and Student Counselling and Mental Health Services.....</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1: Services and provision for disability and dyslexia support.....	17
7.2: Data collection and analysis.....	17
7.3: Students with Specific Learning Difficulties and targeted academic learning support.....	18
7.4: Student Counselling and Mental Health Service .....	18
<b>Section 8: Clear Information and Communication with Students .....</b>	<b>19</b>
8.1: Methods of communication with prospective and current students .....	19
<b>Section 9: Strategic Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.....</b>	<b>20</b>
9.1: Monitoring and oversight .....	20
9.2: Embedding access, student success and progression across the institution .....	20
9.3: Developing an evaluation strategy .....	21
<b>Section 10: Student Consultation and Work with the Students' Union.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Section 11: Equality and Diversity .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	
Five Year Analysis: HESA Performance Indicators	
<b>Appendix B</b>	
Targets and Milestones: 2017/18-2021/22	

## **CITY, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON ACCESS AGREEMENT 2018/19**

### **Section 1: Introduction**

- 1.1 This is City, University of London's Access Agreement for 2018/19. It details our commitment to fair access and support for students. City is looking to the future as a member of the University of London and implementing our ten-year *Vision & Strategy* taking us to 2026. The commitment that was part of our founding mission remains a fundamental purpose. We seek to transform the lives of our students and contribute to global social good.
- 1.2 This Access Agreement sets the tuition fee for new entrants from September 2018. It outlines our direction for access, student success and progression. It addresses how we will promote access to and through Higher Education and the benefits this brings.
- 1.3 Our Access Agreement identifies achievements to build on and areas to improve. We remain committed to widening participation and will develop our work with purpose and clarity. Across City we have committed to the success and progression of our students once they join us. A new framework, including ways to evaluate and demonstrate impact of work, will guide us. Our Access Agreement commitments enable us to achieve what we need to, to ensure our support is effective.
- 1.4 Changes are happening in the sector. This includes the ongoing Higher Education and Research Bill, development of the Teaching Excellence Framework and transition to the Office for Students. All may have bearing on this plan. This Access Agreement builds in an element of flexibility as we adapt to coming changes. Changes to NHS-related courses and the Student Opportunity allocation will come into effect before the period covered by this Access Agreement. We will protect work to support students' successful progression to, through and beyond their studies at City.

### **Section 2: Tuition Fee Charges from September 2018**

#### **2.1 Background**

- 2.1.1 When setting fees City remains committed to maintaining our diverse student body as a source of strength. According to 2015/16 HESA data, 53% of City's students are from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups. Five per cent declared themselves disabled. 64% of our undergraduate students meet one or more common widening participation indicators. In this section we outline our tuition fee levels for 2018/19, before addressing what we will do to meet the needs of our students.

#### **2.2 Tuition fee levels for new entrants in 2018/19**

- 2.2.1 City will charge £9,250 for all full-time courses for 2018/19 entrants. This is for full-time students only as City does not offer fee-regulated part-time undergraduate

courses. City will apply an inflationary uplift as permitted by Government in subsequent years and will make this clear to students from the outset. Currently this uplift is based on the link to meeting the required level in Teaching Excellence Framework Year Two.

2.2.2 Students on sandwich/placement years will be charged up to a maximum 20% of the full fee (£1,850) for this year for all courses.

2.2.3 Students on Year/Study Abroad and Erasmus schemes will be charged up to a maximum 15% of the full fee (£1,385) for the year that they study abroad.

2.2.4 New students on City's franchised provision with City and Islington College will be charged £9,250 in 2018/19.

### **2.3 Real terms inflationary increases from 2018/19**

2.3.1 Students will be informed prior to registration that the fee levels for new entrants in 2018/19 will apply for the duration of their programme and will be subject to the annual increases permitted in accordance with Government regulations.

## **Section 3: Commitments and Expenditure on Access, Student Success and Progression**

### **3.1 Assessment of City's access, student success and progression record**

3.1.1 We will focus on student success while maintaining our programme of outreach activities. We assess ourselves as having a medium-to-high proportion of students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Appendix A provides analysis of City's performance over five years.

3.1.2 Across the sector in the UK, for students entering in 2014/15 non-continuation has increased from 6.0 per cent to 6.2 per cent.<sup>1</sup> This in turn is up from 5.7 per cent for 2013/14 entrants. For students from postcodes with the lowest participation rates non-continuation has increased from 8.2 to 8.8 per cent. While the non-continuation rate of students from low participation neighbourhoods has increased at City, due to the low headcount there is a high level of volatility in the percentage. Although lower than last year, we remain higher than the previous five years in the continuation of our students in this category and are in line with our benchmark. This is also reflected in the split according to POLAR data in our TEF metrics. It is consistent with our analysis of student progression.

3.1.3 City continues to contribute to increased access by students from disadvantaged backgrounds. To supplement Appendix A, we have analysed our population

---

<sup>1</sup> HESA UK Performance Indicators 2015/16: Non-continuation rates, release date 9 March 2017.

according to common WP criteria.<sup>2</sup> In 2016/17, 64% of City’s population met one or more criteria. When we remove low income, the most frequent indicator is NS-SEC 4-7, followed by no family history of HE. 39% of our undergraduate students are the first in their family to go to university. 20% of students have no family history of HE and are from the lowest socio-economic backgrounds.

3.1.4 Further detail on City’s performance and priorities in student success and progression are provided in Section 3.4 below.

### 3.2 Access Agreement funding levels

**Table 1: Summary of Access Agreement allocated expenditure (% higher fee income)**

Areas of investment	AY 2017/18	AY 2018/19	AY 2019/20	AY 2020/21	AY 2021/22
Financial support	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Access	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8
Student success	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Progression	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
<b>Total spend</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>

3.2.1 We have allocated Access Agreement resource across the student lifecycle. This is in line with OFFA’s steer. We have changed expenditure to reflect priorities, reducing the proportion on financial support. In 2016/17 we re-directed this towards access to maintain and enhance our widening participation provision. We allocated a higher amount to student success as a key priority. City commits to improving our performance in student success and progression, which will be priority for the next five years. As we move through 2017/18 we will continue to check the impact of our financial support. We provide conclusions from initial analysis and changes made as a result in Section 6. In future we may direct resource from financial support into student success activity. We will continue to enhance our evaluation to ensure that we spend the increased allocation on what works. This is addressed in the respective sections relating to each area below, and the overarching approach in Section 9.

### 3.3 An evidence-based approach to access

3.3.1 City has a high proportion of BME students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The Government has identified white men from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds as less likely to progress to HE. The Department for Education and OFFA have asked us to improve the access, success and progression of these students. We have identified that this group is a small proportion of our undergraduate population. We outline initial measures to address this in Section 4.6.

<sup>2</sup> The criteria include: low income, first in family to progress to Higher Education, National Statistics Socio-economic Classification 4-7, POLAR3 Low Participation Neighbourhood Quintile 1, identification as disabled, care leaver and/or mature student.

3.3.2 We provided details on how we will target students for access work in previous Access Agreements. We are looking at the targeting and evidence base we use in developing our access work as part of our Widening Participation Review (Section 4.1). We will make sure this is current, relevant and in line with our priorities.

3.3.3. Progression Improvement work (Section 5.1) will focus on addressing challenges students face in progressing once they are with us. These may be students facing individual challenges or groups under-represented at City. Section 7 outlines support for students with specific learning difficulties and mental health needs.

### **3.4 An evidence-based approach to success**

3.4.1 Through internal analysis we have established that students from the lowest HE participation quintiles do not have an appreciably different retention rate than those from areas of high participation. On the whole, students with widening participation attributes are not more likely to withdraw than the institutional average. The challenge at City is to improve retention for all, with work to help all, disaggregated by students from widening participation backgrounds or targeted for students based on specific needs at School or programme level.

3.4.2 We know that from 2012/13-2013/14 BME students' progression from Year 1 to Year 2 was not statistically different to the overall undergraduate population. This remained the case in 2014/15. At a more granular level, students from some BME backgrounds have lower retention rates than the average. Further, there is variance across programmes. The Progression Improvement Programme detailed in Sections 5.1 and 9.1 will address this type of variation.

3.4.3 To support the development of our new *Vision & Strategy 2026* and this Access Agreement we have done a comprehensive analysis of progression data across all undergraduate programmes. We seek to better understand the challenges in order to take actions to improve. The data is for academic year 2014/15 but was supplemented by analysis of the 2012/13 and 2013/14 academic years. An initial review of 2016/17 data indicates trends have continued and findings remain current. The key points we identified from the analysis were:

- i. There is no correlation between higher rates of withdrawal for students and lower tariff on entry.
- ii. Over half of the students who withdrew or left with a lower award than intended did so within their first year.
- iii. Home students were more likely to withdraw or leave with a lower award than EU or overseas students.

- iv. There was no appreciable difference in the progression rates of our students meeting Widening Participation criteria compared to the overall undergraduate population (using the commonly identified indicators for the sector).
- 3.4.4 Our approach to improving student progression is therefore directed at our overall undergraduate student cohort, with a focus on the first year of study. The analysis also highlighted subject-level issues that need more targeted interventions. For example, certain programmes have particularly low retention rates and large cohorts. Half of the HEFCE Young High Risk students who do not progress are in one School. Equally, although we will focus on the first year, we will not look at this in isolation. We will address reasons for withdrawal throughout the student lifecycle. Where there are challenges faced by specific student groups or individual students in certain programmes, we will consider this in the design of institutional activity. Where appropriate we will develop discrete, bespoke activity to help these students.
- 3.4.5 In this way, the Access Agreement closely aligns with our *Vision & Strategy 2026*. It will enable the successful delivery of our institutional objectives.

### **3.5 Institutional commitments to access, success and progression**

- 3.5.1 We will maintain our focus on access as part of our core Widening Participation mission. At the same time we will seek to make significant improvement on students successfully progressing through and beyond their studies. We will retain the targets and commitments set out in our previous Access Agreement. This is to allow these to be bed in so that we can establish how we are performing and what we need to change. We may seek to supplement these in future years with additional commitments and in response to changes in the sector.
- 3.5.2 We will work to develop a new target in relation to Widening Participation. At present, we use the reporting outlined in Section 3.2 to provide extra insight to complement HESA data. However, we are looking at whether we can apply HEFCE's attainment gap analysis data internally.<sup>3</sup> This means we will be using externally validated data which will also align with the National Collaborative Outreach Project objectives and methodology. Work on testing this data will begin in autumn 2017.
- 3.5.3 As detailed above, we seek to significantly improve student success. This challenges us to live up to the values we aspire to. Our Widening Participation mission takes as a starting point the belief that every student with the ability to do so should consider progression to university as an attainable option regardless of background. In the same way, for every student joining us the starting point is that they should progress through to graduation unless there are exceptional circumstances. To achieve our commitments we must provide our students with the support they need to succeed.

---

<sup>3</sup> HEFCE: *Gaps in young participation in higher education* - <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/analysis/yp/gaps/>

Detail of this is provided in Sections 5 and 7. In delivering our *Vision & Strategy 2026*, we reach the five-year staging point in 2021. At the same time we will be able to review the delivery of our Access Agreement commitments to ensure that our plan is still fit for purpose and meeting OFFA's expectations of us.

## **Section 4: Programme of Access Measures**

### **4.1 Access measures: taking a strategy-led approach**

4.1.1 We will maintain our access work as outlined in previous Access Agreements. We are conducting a Widening Participation Review throughout the rest of 2016/17. This applies the Periodic Review practice typically used in an academic setting to our access provision. This engages academics from across City in considering the outreach programme, reviewing and making recommendations. It is a new way for the Widening Participation Outreach team to assess and evaluate their activities. The Dean of The City Law School chairs the panel, with each member of the WPO team responsible for a different area.

4.1.2 The Review will look at what we do, why, how, the targeting we use and evaluation in place. It will consider how our access work aligns with our mission and sector priorities, what we want to achieve and how we will know if we are being successful. The panel will have external membership, and will lead to a reflective review and action plan. We will put in place recommendations throughout 2017/18 in the lead-in to 2018/19. Conclusions will inform our access programme and our next Access Agreement. We will share our findings with OFFA and other HEIs as appropriate.

### **4.2 School sponsorship**

4.2.1 City is a co-sponsor of the City of London Academy, Islington (COLAI) with the City of London. The Academy is an 11-19 school. There are 120 students in each year group in Years 7-11 and 106 students in the sixth form. Over half of the students are boys and 70% are "Ever 6". This indicates that they are receiving Free School Meals or have done in the last six years. This is over twice the national average of 29%. 69% of students are ethnic minority students. Over 50% speak English as an additional language. The level of deprivation experienced by students at the Academy is 0.54, approximately 2.5 times the average national deprivation index (0.21). Typically students have prior attainment levels significantly below the national average.

4.2.2 COLAI's vision is to be outstanding, with a commitment to improving the lives of the young people of Islington. In 2016 COLAI achieved its best results at GCSE. 68% of students achieved 5 A\*-C passes including English and Mathematics. 93% of Academy students achieved GCSE A\*-C in English. The Academy registered an outstanding score of 0.81 in the Progress 8 measure. Progress 8 is a new measure for the progress of pupils across a selected set of eight GCSE-level subjects. It aims to

encourage schools to teach a broad curriculum and reward schools that teach all pupils well. COLAI's score places it as one of the top performing Schools in the country in terms of the value added to students' progress from Year 7 to Year 11.

*City, University of London input into Academy governance*

- 4.2.3 City has four places on the governing body and members make a strong contribution to the governance of the Academy. City Governors are valued for their input and commitment across the range of governance duties. City Governors' roles have included Chair of the Governing Body, Chair of the Finance, Personnel and Premises Committee and serving on the Curriculum and Community Committee. All take link Governor roles, overseeing and engaging with important themes or areas.

**4.3 Co-sponsor partnership activities – attainment raising**

- 4.3.1 City offers a range of partnership activities with COLAI through a dedicated post in the Widening Participation team. Central to this is the tutoring project to raise attainment. City students work with pupils to support learning and the development of skills and confidence in Maths and English. The focus has been, and will continue to be, developing and expanding the existing programme.

Maths Tutoring Programme

- 4.3.2 At Key Stage 3, core Maths tutoring takes place with Years 7 and 8 once per week. Tutoring moved to focus on this younger age group after initially focusing on Year 11. This was to provide longer term support for students and greater impact.
- 4.3.3 At Key Stage 4, tutors support both higher and foundation level revision for GCSEs in weekly tutoring sessions. A revision weekend will take place this summer, which will integrate tutoring and revision with aspiration raising activities and workshops.

Literacy Tutoring Programme

- 4.3.4 Sessions run throughout the week in one-to-one or small group settings for both Key Stage 3 and 4. Focus is on reading and writing comprehension. Tutors are present in COLAI four-to-five days per week, in comparison to once per week last academic year. There is a flexible approach, with a mixture of in-class support and dedicated tutoring sessions. We take this approach to cater for the differing needs of the cohort and to maximise the impact student tutors can have.
- 4.3.5 This work has helped to raise the profile of City within the Academy. Discussions on the direction of work have focused on enhancing existing provision and offering more attainment raising initiatives. We will measure and evaluate the impact of the changes to the tutoring programme in 2016/17 before future plans are confirmed.

#### **4.4 Other work to raise attainment**

4.4.1 Our current work in raising attainment is focused on tutoring in schools and colleges. In addition to the dedicated work with COLAI above, we run a general Tutoring Scheme open to all target schools.

4.4.2 We work within target schools with young people identified by the schools as:

- Borderline C/D students
- Those performing below expectations
- High performing SEN students doing their GCSEs

4.4.3 The aim of tutoring is to raise attainment in Maths and literacy through one-to-one or small group tutoring. Our tutoring programme is tailored to the needs of each school to complement and enhance existing provision.

*How this work has grown, and is planned to grow, over time*

4.4.4 There is great demand for tutoring in primary schools. We have therefore increased the number of contact hours year-on-year. With secondary and post-16 tutoring, rather than increasing hours we have focussed on greater tailoring of programmes to support specific cohorts within schools. In 2016/17 we trained tutors to support the numeracy and literacy skills BTEC Health students need to successfully pass Nursing admissions tests. We have expanded to work with high achieving SEN students in a local Academy and have developed literacy support for students with dyslexia at COLAI. This will continue to be the direction of travel.

#### **4.5 Evaluation of attainment raising work**

4.5.1 Impact of both COLAI tutoring and the general tutoring programme is measured by looking at the grade boundary progression students have made in both Maths and English. English tutoring started later in the year for 2016/17 so there may be less impact on progression between grade boundaries. We will arrange a focus group for tutees to gain feedback on what having a tutor means to them, with the intention of starting tutoring earlier in 2017/18.

4.5.2 We have previously completed initial evaluation of our general tutoring programme. There is an indication of positive impact on the attainment of students. Teachers provide attainment data prior to the first tutoring session including start level and target level for each tutee. Additional attainment data is returned from schools at the end of the academic year. Each school uses a separate system for recording and reporting attainment and we are led by individual schools on this.

4.5.3 We are able to produce two markers of impact: whether the outcome has been met or exceeded and whether the students' achievement has improved. Teachers

provided attainment data prior to the first tutoring session. Start level and target level are usually, but not universally, different, with target level typically being higher than start level. Additional attainment data was returned from schools at the end of the academic year.

- 4.5.4 In previous years we have established that the majority of pupils moved up at least one sub-level over the months the Tutoring Programme took place, with most pupils achieving the targets established by teachers. A number of the schools' rankings within the borough improved. One primary school went from the bottom to upper-middle. Another was top in the borough. Although anecdotal at this stage, teachers at these schools attributed this rise in places directly to having a critical mass of tutors working with the same pupils intensively over a long period of time.
- 4.5.6 In 2015/16 17 schools took part in tutoring: 13 primary schools, three secondary and one sixth form. 77 City students were trained and tutored 261 tutees in local schools. Tutoring started in the second half of the autumn term and ran throughout the year, with tutors spending between 1-3 hours with their tutees.
- 4.5.7 Due to external reasons, data returned from schools varied, and in some cases limited. However, six schools accounting for 80 tutees returned information on start and end attainment levels. 85% of tutees improved their grades whilst 62% met or exceeded outcome targets. The gap between outcome and improvement levels indicates a group who improved their attainment without meeting outcome target, representing an increase of at least one grade level. The majority of tutees both improved and met outcome targets. We are aware that there are counterfactuals here and will do further work to develop our evaluation in order to demonstrate impact and establish the extent to which this intervention relates directly to the outcomes. While there is some correlation, in terms of a suitable comparator group we would seek to compare this performance to students' overall class and performance of classes in similar schools. We will seek to establish whether it is feasible to make such comparisons and, beyond this, develop a meaningful control group of those who were eligible but didn't participate. There may be an element of self-selection or in-built success as a result of students being put forward by teachers. However, we will establish more clearly why teachers put forward specific students. For example, some teachers select students who may have been identified as at risk of failing to make progress or achieve as expected. In which case, when considering the outcomes above, meeting a predicted level would be a critical success for this student.
- 4.5.8 We will seek to build on previous evaluation. We will establish in a more rigorous way any correlation or causation between involvement in tutoring and positive outcomes.

## **4.6 Work with specific student groups**

4.6.1 The Widening Participation Review (Section 4.1) will include consideration of City's recruitment of mature students. This is an area we have committed to developing further in previous Access Agreements. We will consider how Marketing and Communications and Widening Participation Outreach can work together in this area. City has links with Further Education Colleges that we may develop activity with. This will be particularly important for the School of Health Sciences, which has the highest mature student population studying Nursing and Midwifery.<sup>4</sup>

4.6.2 As noted in Section 3.3, due to our success in widening access for students from BME backgrounds, white men from disadvantaged backgrounds make up a small proportion of our population.<sup>5</sup> Increasing progression to HE for these students will require careful, dedicated work. It will need to be beyond our historic geographic focus. We are in contact with a coastal HEI with a higher local population of targeted students to look at developing collaborative work on this. This is in the early stages.

## **4.7 Improve provision around flexible study**

4.7.1 We agree that offering alternative forms of study, and flexible study modes, may help to support different groups of learners to access our courses. The City Law School is developing a degree apprenticeship as an alternative model for HE study. Details of this were provided in our previous Access Agreement.<sup>6</sup>

## **4.8 Collaborative working across the sector**

4.8.1 We support the annual HELOA event for children in care, care leavers and carers. This is a collaborative project between London HEIs that recently won an award for collaboration at the 2017 national HELOA conference.

4.8.2 City will continue its membership of AccessHE and NEON. We have been involved with AccessHE's work as part of the National Network for Collaborative Outreach.

4.8.3 AccessHE is one of the three London networks coordinating the National Collaborative Outreach Project (alongside Linking London and Aimhigher London South). City is not a member of the NCOP consortium work but will continue to be an active member of AccessHE. We are in touch with AccessHE about the development of the NCOP activity. The project will focus on schools in Havering and Barking & Dagenham. City also delivers access activity in these boroughs. As such, we will work closely with AccessHE and the NCOP to ensure that there is no overlap. Where there is complementarity we will work together as appropriate.

---

<sup>4</sup> City University London, Access Agreement 2017/18, Section 3.5.

<sup>5</sup> City University London, Access Agreement 2017/18, Section 3.3.

<sup>6</sup> City University London, Access Agreement 2017/18, Section 4.5.

4.8.4 City is a member of the Higher Education Access Tracker (HEAT) service which helps HEIs target, monitor and evaluate outreach activity. By subscribing to HEAT we can take an evidence-based approach to planning activity so that we can continue to invest in work that maximises progression for disadvantaged cohorts.

#### **4.9 Investment in access and alignment with Student Opportunity Allocation**

4.9.1 City's investment in access is commensurate with our population of students from disadvantaged backgrounds or from groups under-represented in HE. This is forecast to increase over the five years of this Access Agreement. We will focus on long-term impact of activity.

4.9.2 In terms of protecting activity funded via Student Opportunity, at present this is directed to Schools in line with HEFCE's formula allocation. Access Agreement resource will be used to support activity as and when any changes come into effect. This may require the group overseeing the Access Agreement and financial planning (Section 9.1) to make decisions based on evidence of impact of current activity.

### **Section 5: Student Success and Progression Measures**

#### **5.1 Enhanced student success and progression work**

5.1.1 As outlined in Section 3, and expanded in Section 5.2 below, improving student success is the key priority at City for the next five years. This aligns City's Access Agreement with our institutional *Vision & Strategy* and the focus of our TEF submission to deliver the best possible teaching and education for our students.

5.1.2 As such, we will focus investment derived from our Access Agreement to making substantial progress on student success. Over time we will consider directing additional resource towards this through redistribution of funds previously allocated to financial support. We will take this decision once our evidence base on the impact of this provision is fully developed, as outlined in Section 6.

5.1.3 We will retain the commitments made in our previous Access Agreement on student success and progression. However, we will review these over the next year to ensure they align with our institutional Key Performance Indicators. Delivery of our Access Agreement commitment on non-continuation, and the TEF metric, will contribute to successfully achieving our institutional KPI.

#### **5.2 Development of new work to improve student success**

5.2.1 We will continue the Student Development work outlined in previous Access Agreements. We have established a Progression Improvement Working Group to oversee further work in the area of student success. The group will coordinate City-wide projects. This will chiefly be improving our Personal Tutorial system and

developing our approach to attendance monitoring and student engagement. This is to ensure that our students receive the best quality academic experience. We want to better support our staff in helping students in the educational setting. It will improve our ability to identify students facing challenges. We will be able to help students at risk earlier, before problems become overwhelming. We do this to make sure that our students are getting the most from their studies and that we are delivering courses that are meaningful, in ways that are most effective.

5.2.2 Through 2017/18 and 2018/19 we will develop a series of projects to improve student success. These will include:

- i. Pre-induction sessions across City's Schools and programmes to improve access, transition and ongoing success.
- ii. CityBuddies: expanding the scheme to be offered to every first year student.
- iii. Peer Assisted Study Support scheme, initially across key programmes.
- iv. Targeted study support sessions, particularly in programmes with modules a high number of students struggle with.
- v. Development of a toolkit for staff and students to provide tailored support throughout the student lifecycle.

5.2.3 Where interventions are delivering our Access Agreement commitments, they will be overseen by the Access Agreement planning group (Section 9.1). Elements of the work will be supported by the Progression Improvement Programme team, working with colleagues across Schools and Services. We will direct Access Agreement resource to developing these projects. Ultimate accountability will be with the Progression Improvement Working Group.

### **5.3 Progression – positive outcomes in employability and further study**

5.3.1 City is proud of enhancing students' employment outcomes. This makes a positive contribution to the social mobility of our students and we perform well in this area. That being said, this continues to be something we want to strengthen and develop. In our previous Access Agreement we set out some key initiatives and provided a commitment in this area for the first time led by the Careers Service. We will proceed in line with this published plan and will review once work has begun.

### **5.4 Taking an evidence-based approach to strategic planning**

5.4.1 The Data and Policy Analyst is leading our work on evaluation. We are developing an overarching framework to guide our work in access, success and progression. At the same time, a series of initial analyses has been completed to establish impact of current activity. We are identifying what gaps in data and process need to be filled so that we can demonstrate outcomes better. We will include detail of this in our 2016/17 report to OFFA.

5.4.2 Where work is delivering Access Agreement commitments a proportion of overall costs must be set aside for evaluation. Evaluation should begin before the work itself starts. The governing principles and process of this will be finalised by January 2018. At that point we would share this with OFFA and other colleagues in the sector.

## **5.5 Supporting students: Who Cares at City? Project**

5.5.1 City is committed to improving our provision, anticipating and responding to change in the sector. It is becoming increasingly understood that there is no typical student experience of Higher Education. Our students come from a range of backgrounds and deal with a range of challenges.

5.5.2 In line with previous commitments to OFFA, we have begun to extend our support and provision for care leavers to other young vulnerable groups who may need help. This includes financial and accommodation support, priority access for services, and a Designated Member of Staff to advocate on students' behalf. We are now supporting students who are estranged from their families or those with caring responsibilities themselves. Work may also include supporting Asylum Seekers, children of Asylum Seekers, unaccompanied minors or those with limited leave to remain. We recognise that these students often face similar challenges to those of care leavers or would benefit from dedicated support. So they will be prioritised for the same or similar support that care leavers receive. This will require mindful, cohesive work. As part of this we will make the Stand Alone Pledge, which guides activity and provides a framework for students estranged from their families in the same way that the Buttle UK Quality Mark for care leavers did for students from care backgrounds. The practices put in place as part of our Buttle UK delivery will continue, and will inform our commitment to Stand Alone and to our students.

5.5.3 We will do this through a branded scheme which aims to increase engagement with the range of support offered. By having a greater visibility across City, and in clear communications with potential applicants, we will be able to better identify vulnerable students in order to better help.

5.5.4 The project will be developed over 2017/18. We will create a working group involving staff from across City to do this. The group will collaborate across Schools and Professional Services to create a sustainable, long-term support plan for vulnerable students. They will act as champions of the scheme in their School or Service and will be essential in forming a system of support for vulnerable students, liaising with the central Designated Member of Staff to ensure consistency and clarity. We will encourage positive and proactive involvement through the programme, rather than singling out students for meeting a particular status.

## **Section 6: Financial Support from 2018/19**

### **6.1 Evaluating current provision**

- 6.1.1 In 2015/16, in response to OFFA's guidance, City commissioned external researchers to review our financial support. This included bursaries allocated as part of our Access Agreement. We wanted to know whether our Access Agreement financial support provision was effective in increasing recruitment and retention of students from targeted widening participation backgrounds.
- 6.1.2 The research looked at the impact, perception and management of City's scholarship packages. We wanted to know how the scope, shape and nature of the financial support could be revised to make it more effective and so that we would be able to better evaluate it in the future. Key findings included identifying any issues arising such as data quality or gaps, what limited our ability to draw conclusions and why.
- 6.1.3 Consultants conducted interviews with a range of staff and reviewed data on student progression and completion. This included a limited analysis of impact on students. As primary research, online surveys were conducted to understand the impact of bursaries on decision-making and the student experience of recipients. Research also covered other models of financial support in the sector to consider alternative offers to students and management approaches. A number of issues were highlighted, with conclusions provided to OFFA in our report on 2015/16. We are now in a position to make effective changes.

### **6.2 Implementation of OFFA's framework and statistical model**

- 6.2.1 City notes that OFFA has recently published a framework and toolkit to enable HEIs to do evaluation similar to our commissioned research, but more robustly and on an ongoing basis. It is our intention to change our financial support, including simplifying provision, re-balancing the number of awards and value on offer. As noted in Section 5.1, through 2017/18 we may consider redirecting some financial support allocation to other means of supporting student success and progression given the limited evidence of impact of current provision.
- 6.2.2 As committed to in previous Access Agreements, City has appointed a Data and Policy Analyst to lead on this work. Key to making changes to our bursary provision will be to ensure it is possible to demonstrate impact and develop financial support that meets the needs of students off the back of research and OFFA's 'Closing the Gap' report (December 2016). We will do this.

### **6.3 *Closing the Gap*: Response and initial findings at City**

- 6.3.1 To further enable decision-making based on evidence, City has used OFFA's statistical tool to model the impact of our financial support in previous years. We

analysed the impact of bursaries awarded to 2009 and 2012 first-year cohorts (2009: Maintenance Grant, 2012: National Scholarship Scheme). The main findings have informed the decisions below.

- 6.3.2 The rationale for changes to our financial support comes from analysing the differential outcomes of two year groups, in line with OFFA's toolkit. For each year analysed, financial support yields some positive results for recipient groups. We therefore consider it appropriate to continue providing financial support at the current level while we conduct further analysis across subsequent years.
- 6.3.3 For the 2009 cohort, students who were prioritised as grant recipients (care leavers) were more likely to continue in their studies. In statistical terms, holding all other variables constant in the model, the estimated odds of completing a degree for priority-bursary holders (care leavers) were more than 11 times the odds of the comparator group (students from similar financial backgrounds but without the support of a financial bursary).
- 6.3.4 Receipt of the highest value award in 2012 correlated with a higher probability of success for students from low-income backgrounds (supported by anecdotal data from bursary recipients). Holding all other variables constant in the model, the odds of completing the first year were 161% higher for low-income students in receipt of a bursary than the odds of completion for the comparator group of low-income students without a bursary. We can therefore infer that there is a statistically significant association between being a low-income bursary holder and increased odds of completing the first year of studies in comparison to the comparator group.
- 6.3.5 From this we might infer that bursaries are more effective in overcoming disadvantage if they are of higher value, while retaining an element of prioritisation. As there is an early indication of a positive impact, we consider it premature to reduce the amount directed to financial support at this time. We will therefore restructure our financial support, combining the means-tested aspect, priority criteria and higher-value. We will guarantee awards based on more specific criteria.
- 6.3.6 We will monitor and evaluate our new scheme to check whether our changes have led to the assumed outcomes. We will combine the statistical model with an online survey of recipients. We will do more granular analysis, looking at the interaction of variables to establish where bursaries are having the most effect on priority groups. As the analysis accumulates we will respond to the evidence we establish. This would include potentially reducing the resource directed to financial support should our findings justify such a decision.

## 6.4 Better financial support

6.4.1 The changes below are based on the research already done, OFFA’s steer in this area and initial findings of our use of OFFA’s toolkit.

6.4.2 City has had multiple bursaries for different student groups. We have found that ‘bursary’ itself is not widely understood as a term. There is no compelling evidence that the different bursaries currently in place, for different groups with different purposes, had the desired impact or achieved those purposes. We will therefore merge various bursaries into a single City Education Grant for new entrants in 2018/19. Students who received support though the previous bursary programmes will continue to receive their instalments.

6.4.3 We will amend the eligibility criteria so that the grant is awarded to students with the greatest need and those students who are under-represented at City for whom we seek to increase access. See Table 2 for details of the eligibility criteria

6.4.4 Using these criteria, we will reduce the overall number of awards but increase their value to those with the greatest need. It will allow us to guarantee an award for every student who is eligible.

**Table 2: Summary of Access Agreement financial support provision**

Type	Amount	Eligible Students
City, University of London Education Grant	£3,000 per year	All students who meet eligibility criteria will receive grant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ordinarily resident in England</li> <li>- New full-time entrants to Higher Education</li> <li>- Household income of zero; OR</li> <li>- *From a Low Participation Neighbourhood POLAR3 Quintile 1; OR</li> <li>- *White men from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds; OR</li> <li>- Attending City’s partner Academy</li> </ul>
The City Cares Award	£3,500 per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New full-time entrants to Higher Education</li> <li>- Aged 25 years old or younger on 1<sup>st</sup> Sept. at commencement of study</li> <li>- Can demonstrate that they are a care leaver per the DfE definition; OR</li> <li>- Can demonstrate that they are irrevocably estranged from their family; OR</li> <li>- Can demonstrate that they have unpaid caring responsibilities</li> </ul>
Article 26 Scholarship	Full fee waiver Maintenance grant to value of £12,102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Be an asylum seeker or the partner/dependent of an asylum seeker; OR</li> <li>- An asylum seeker/partner/dependent who has been granted Limited or Discretionary Leave to Remain or other form of temporary status; AND</li> <li>- Have a conditional or unconditional offer of undergraduate study from City, University of London, having applied through UCAS; AND</li> <li>- Be currently attending a school, college, community or voluntary group which can provide a reference in support of application; AND</li> <li>- Be unable to access mainstream funding, e.g. Student Finance or Local Authority grant.</li> </ul>

\*Note: These criteria have been retained as they are priority areas for City to respond to national priorities, in line with OFFA’s strategic guidance.

- 6.4.5 We will retain two awards that have distinct brands. These awards provide support linked to specific student needs and strategic goals.
- 6.4.6 As part of the Who Cares at City? Project (Section 5.5), we will retain a designated grant for students from care backgrounds. However, as indicated in previous Access Agreements, we will expand this to help estranged students and young carers. This is a distinct award that has become embedded in our practice.
- 6.4.7 In 2017 we have implemented an Article 26 Scholarship. This is for students who are Asylum Seekers, refugees or who have limited leave to remain or another temporary status. The award consists of a fee waiver and a grant to the value of the full maintenance provided by Student Finance England. We are proud to offer this support and will retain it as a prominent award that serves a specific purpose.
- 6.4.8 These changes will mean we are able to communicate with students who receive awards in a more timely way. As all eligible students will receive an award, this will allow targeted communication. Students may make a choice to go to a university based on factors other than receipt of financial support. However, these changes will mean the awards can at least potentially be a factor. We will evaluate the new provision to that effect.

## **Section 7: Learning Success and Student Counselling and Mental Health Services**

### **7.1 Services and provision for disability and dyslexia support**

- 7.1.1 City remains committed to the ethos that social barriers disable people, not their impairments. City has a multidisciplinary team of specialist staff including counsellors, mental health and disability experts and qualified teachers. Colleagues within Learning Success offer support to students with specific learning difficulties and physical disabilities. They support the general student population who require academic learning support. Colleagues within the Student Counselling & Mental Health Service offer specialist psychological support to all students and mentoring and adjustments for students with diagnosed mental health difficulties. Our support for students in advance of applying to and enrolling at City will continue in line with previous Access Agreements.

### **7.2 Data collection and analysis**

- 7.2.1 At the end of 2016/17 statistical reports will be produced showing which students have accessed support and for what reason. This will enable identification of academic areas where students are not accessing support services and allow for effective targeting and improved communication. We will review information in relation to certain groups, for example students with Autistic Spectrum Disorders, in order to identify potential enhancements. This may include raising awareness among

staff or formation of peer support groups. We are improving City's capacity for reporting in order to evaluate the impact of our provision. By the end of 2017/18 it will be possible to assess the effectiveness of support offered to and impact on progression of targeted groups.

### **7.3 Students with Specific Learning Difficulties and targeted academic learning support**

7.3.1 Our work in this area continues in line with our previous Access Agreement. As noted above, we are developing means of evaluating this provision, particularly the impact on the student experience and progression.

### **7.4 Student Counselling and Mental Health Service**

7.4.1 In 2018/19 the Student Counselling and Mental Health Service will continue to provide a range of interventions focusing on student need, considering barriers to accessing psychological services for hard to reach students. These services include on-the-day consultation, individual counselling and Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, workshops, embedded sessions and e-consultation. The Service takes a flexible approach to what is provided based on student demand and reviews provision on a termly basis, which influences yearly allocation of resources.

7.4.2 In 2016/17 the Service continues to provide a range of targeted projects. These included reflective practice groups run in collaboration with the Speech and Language Therapy Department for third year students who had been identified as a year group at risk of withdrawing. The sessions are tailored to the needs of the department and facilitated by two counsellors. In 2017/18 and 2018/19, the Service will further develop activity based on students' academic context. For example, early interventions for healthcare students can positively influence their progression.

7.4.3 A group has been set up in 2016/17 to meet the needs of mature students who may be less able to access counselling provision due to caring responsibilities. The group is designed to fit around students' additional demands so they can fully engage with their course whilst accessing peer and counselling support. An Art Therapy group has been established to provide an alternative to traditional talking therapies for students who may find it harder to engage in these approaches. This will be further developed in 2017/18 as initial findings suggest that students from BME backgrounds and LGBT+ students are more likely to put themselves forward to attend this type of group.

7.4.4 The specialist mentor role has been developed to ensure provision for care leavers and students with complex mental health needs is consistent and long-term. This has meant that more students with care experience, severe and enduring mental illness and complex diagnoses have a named person to contact throughout their course. This has reduced crisis incidents and enables proactive support when a student is at

risk of not progressing or completing their course. This post has enabled City to manage the effects of changes to DSAs as one-to-one support for these students is not reliant on DSAs funding.

- 7.4.5 Analysis of data for 2013/14-2015/16 demonstrates year-on-year increase in demand for the Mental Health Service with increase in students presenting with generalised anxiety disorder, depression and risky behaviours. In order to maintain the quality and flexibility of support, an increase in staffing for the Mental Health team will be put in place for 2018/19 to ensure students receive the help they need.
- 7.4.6 Specialist advice and practice is available at an institutional level to help in the development of appropriate policies and procedures. This will ensure that, for example, the delivery of the curriculum meets the needs of all students. In 2018/19, SCMHS will continue to run a Personal Tutor development program with Learning Success and the Academic Practice team. This will support tutors to identify students at risk of academic failure and enable early interventions. It will increase tutors' understanding of students who may be more likely to disengage based on their backgrounds or circumstances and how they may best be able to help them.
- 7.4.7 The Service recognises that students with no family history of HE involvement or from lower socio-economic backgrounds, BME groups or LGBT+ may be less likely to access psychological support even though this may help their progression. In 2016/17, SCMHS established a service level agreement with the Retention and Success team to provide consultation to designated staff supporting care leavers. This enables non-specialist staff to guide and advise students, enabling proactive support and reducing crisis incidents. In the lead in 2018/19 the SCMHS will develop their consultancy service with other non-specialist staff who advise and support targeted groups. This will be crucial to the delivery of the Who Cares at City? Programme outlined in Section 5.4.

## **Section 8: Clear Information and Communication with Students**

### **8.1 Methods of communication with prospective and current students**

- 8.1.1 City, University of London is committed to providing information to students in the most accessible way possible. It is essential that prospective students are well-informed in order to make decisions from a clear perspective.
- 8.1.2 City will provide a range of information in formats accessible to all. We will retain the approach outlined in previous Access Agreements.<sup>7</sup> Clear communication includes providing up-to-date information to UCAS and the Student Loans Company.

---

<sup>7</sup> City University London, Access Agreement 2016/17, Section 9.1.

- 8.1.3 As part of our Modernising Administration for Students work we will develop better means of communicating with potential and current students. This is referred to in previous Access Agreements.<sup>8</sup> We will ensure that the changes to our financial support package (Section 6) are communicated effectively.
- 8.1.4 We remain committed to fulfilling our responsibilities to the Competition and Markets Authority. We will ensure that applicants, and then students, are fully informed about every material aspect of their course.

## **Section 9: Strategic Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation**

### **9.1 Monitoring and oversight**

- 9.1.1 City, University of London monitors performance against the commitments made in Access Agreements through reporting to the Access and Success sub-committee. In 2017/18 this will be transferred to the Access Agreement planning group. Activity to improve student success will be overseen by the senior Progression Improvement Working Group. Access Agreement performance is ultimately reported to and signed off by the Executive Committee.
- 9.1.2 City uses HESA data to identify specific progress towards meeting milestones and benchmarks. Performance against these benchmarks informs widening participation objectives and aligns with KPIs in our *Vision & Strategy 2026*. In this way the Access Agreement is an essential element of the institution's broader vision.

### **9.2 Embedding access, student success and progression across the institution**

- 9.2.1 As noted in Section 5.1, we are conducting a Widening Participation Review. At the same time, student success and progression have been identified as crucial academic KPIs. Access, success and progression will therefore be a focus for the institution for the next ten years.
- 9.2.2 The Access Agreement commitments to the student lifecycle are embedded in the Education and Student Strategy. As part of the Annual Programme Evaluation process, Programme Directors receive key statistical information on student success, progression and employability. Programme Directors provide a summary of how each programme contributes to these areas. We are therefore embedding awareness and commitment to these areas through the education setting. This now also features in Schools and Professional Services annual planning. In future, this will be included in Programme Approval and Periodic Review. This combines with the Student Opportunity allocation to each School to embed the principles of access, success and progression across City.

---

<sup>8</sup> City University London, Access Agreement 2017/18, Sections 5.5 and 8.1.

### **9.3 Developing an evaluation strategy**

- 9.3.1 As noted in Sections 4-6, implementing a consistent, coherent and effective approach to evaluation is a priority. As captured in our successive monitoring returns to OFFA, this is something that City has made progress with over recent years. We are clear in stating that our work in this area was, at best, in keeping with the sector as a whole. The Retention and Success Manager who coordinates the Access Agreement has a remit to proactively develop this. Any new projects or interventions allocated within City's Access Agreement must have an evaluation plan to demonstrate impact agreed at the outset (Section 5.3). A short, clear framework is being developed to guide all of our work.

### **Section 10: Student consultation and Work with the Students' Union**

- 10.1 City, University of London is committed to student involvement across its breadth of activities. The Students' Union President, Vice-President (Education), Vice-President (Activities) and Chief Executive have been involved in discussions to formulate this Access Agreement.
- 10.2 Input from our students is a considerable positive driver in this work. The Students' Union President sits on ExCo. The Vice-President (Education) sits on the Progression Improvement Working Group noted in Section 9.1. The Vice-President (Activities) was consulted and is personally committed to the expansion of work for vulnerable students (Section 5.5), the development of our Article 26 Scholarships and the work to ensure that our financial support is as effective as possible.
- 10.3 The Students' Union plays a key role in the student lifecycle and supporting students through all aspects of the student journey. We are committed to working with the SU to ensure that students have a vital role in delivery of our Access Agreement. The SU has also stated that they are committed to working with the institution in supporting its widening participation, student success and progression initiatives.
- 10.4 City agrees with its SU that engagement in activities is more likely to enhance a student's experience of university, helps to build community and provides opportunities to volunteer, develop new skills and become more employable. All of this supports successful progression. Whilst the SU is working to make its activities accessible to all, some students can face additional barriers to participation. Students with additional time commitments due to caring responsibilities, paid work and long commutes may struggle to find time and funds to participate in some activities. We will work with the SU to look at the engagement between students and their Union and identify and remove barriers to participation amongst students from disadvantaged backgrounds and groups under-represented in HE.

- 10.5 The SU has done research on the preferences and points of engagement of particular groups and how likely students are to participate in SU activities. We will use our Access Agreement to support the SU to develop projects that will further engage students from widening participation backgrounds. These projects focus on the transition into Higher Education and on supporting students who commute to university. Both have the aim of developing and enhancing communities at City.

## **Section 11: Equality and Diversity**

- 11.1 When creating this Access Agreement City, University of London ensured that it was compliant with the Equality and Diversity Act 2010. The access, student success and progression support outlined here covers students from different backgrounds and groups under-represented in Higher Education.
- 11.2 Access Agreement commitments and activity are included in the City's Public Sector Equality Duty statement. The Access Agreement also features in City's Public Benefit Statement published as part of our annual accounting to HEFCE.
- 11.3 City has one of the most diverse student bodies in the country. We are proud of this and we are committed to retaining this aspect of our identity. This forms a crucial part of making City a world-leading institution. The measures set out in this Access Agreement and in the HESA PI summary (Appendix A) reiterate our formal commitment to students from an array of diverse backgrounds and contexts. This includes commitments to disabled students, those entering university from care backgrounds and mature learners. As we develop new policies and provision we will look at how our Access Agreement can be used to support work across the student lifecycle, including in investment in new activity where appropriate. For example, we are in the process of finalising a policy commitment to the inclusion of Transgender, Intersex and Gender Non-Conforming staff and students. Staff supporting delivery of our Access Agreements have contributed to the development of this policy and will be involved in its delivery. We do this to create a culture in which equality of opportunity for staff and students is actively promoted.
- 11.4 Initiatives and measures described in this Access Agreement and the ethos that underpins outreach and student success activity are fundamentally concerned with fairness and equality of access to Higher Education, business and the professions. We remain committed to doing all we can to increase and enhance students' progression to, through and beyond university. We will continue to work proactively to promote this work in keeping with the principles of equity of provision and the role of the university in society. We will evaluate all projects and monitor their effects on applications and admissions to that end.

**Five Year Analysis**

**Appendix A**

**HESA Widening Participation Performance Indicators – City, University of London**

The tables referred to are published by HESA as part of the PI statistics

Key: NS = Not Significant

NS-SEC = National Statistics Socio-economic Classification

Identification of Low Participation Neighbourhoods: POLAR3 (POLAR2 in brackets for 2011/12)

Indicator	Headcount known data 2015/6	City 2015/6	City 2014/5	City 2013/4	City 2012/3	City 2011/2
<b>Table T1a Participation: young full-time first degree entrants</b>						
% from state schools or colleges	1680	92.4	90.5	92.3	90.8	89.3
Benchmark %		91.3	91.2	91.1	90.4	88.6
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		89.5	88.8	89.0	87.9	86.2
Location-adjusted significance		+	+	+	+	+
% from NS-SEC classes 4,5,6,7	NA	NA	46.0	46.2	41.0	40.3
Benchmark %		NA	34.9	34.5	33.6	30.6
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		NA	37.9	37.7	35.9	32.9
Location-adjusted significance		NA	+	+	+	+
% from Low Participation Neighbourhoods	1705	3.8	3.4	3.2	3.0	2.9 (5.2)
Benchmark %		11.2	11.3	11.0	10.7	9.6 (10.2)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		4.2	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.0 (5.5)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
<b>Table T1b Participation: young full-time UG entrants</b>						
% from state schools or colleges	1715	92.6	90.6	92.4	90.8	89.8
Benchmark %		91.5	91.4	91.3	90.7	89.2
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		89.7	89.0	89.3	88.2	87.0
Location-adjusted significance		NS	+	+	+	+
% from NS-SEC classes 4,5,6,7	NA	NA	46.2	46.6	41.1	41.6
Benchmark %		NA	35.2	34.7	33.9	31.4
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		NA	38.2	37.8	36.1	33.6
Location-adjusted significance		NA	+	+	+	+
% from Low Participation Neighbourhoods	1745	3.7	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.1 (5.1)
Benchmark %		11.3	11.5	11.1	10.9	10.1 (10.6)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		4.2	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.2 (5.8)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
<b>Table T1c Participation: young FT other UG entrants</b>						
% from state schools or colleges	35	100.0	91.7	97.1	91.7	95.6
Benchmark %		97.8	97.0	97.7	96.2	96.4
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		97.5	93.8	99.5	94.3	95.0
Location-adjusted significance		+	NS	NS	NS	NS
% from NS-SEC classes 4,5,6,7	NA	NA	53.3	65.4	45.2	53.8
Benchmark %		NA	40.8	46.4	44.2	39.1
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		NA	45.7	52.8	42.0	43.0
Location-adjusted significance		NA	NS	NS	NS	NS

Indicator	Headcount known data 2015/6	City 2014/5	City 2014/5	City 2013/4	City 2012/3	City 2011/2
<b>Table T1c Participation: young FT other undergraduate entrants</b>						
% from Low Participation Neighbourhoods	40	0.0	0.0	7.9	0.0	4.3 (3.6)
Benchmark %		13.1	13.9	15.0	14.1	14.2 (15.4)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		2.4	2.1	8.0	4.3	6.2 (6.9)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
<b>Table 2a Participation: mature FT undergraduate entrants</b>						
First degree entrants: % no previous HE & LPN	410	3.9	3.1	2.6	1.8	3.5 (4.0)
Benchmark %		8.2	10.8	10.0	9.6	10.2 (10.9)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		3.1	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.9 (5.4)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
All undergraduate entrants: % no previous HE & from LPN	555	2.9	2.3	2.0	1.4	2.7 (3.7)
Benchmark %		6.2	8.4	7.7	7.6	8.7 (9.3)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		2.4	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.1 (4.6)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
<b>Table 2b Participation: PT undergraduate entrants</b>						
Young entrants: % no previous HE & from low part neighb'd	0	..	..	..	..	..
Benchmark %						
Location-adjusted Benchmark %						
Location-adjusted significance						
Mature entrants: % no previous HE & from Low Participation Neighbourhood	690	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.3	0.0 (0.4)
Benchmark %		3.1	2.0	1.3	0.5	1.0 (1.0)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		0.8	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.1 (0.3)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
All entrants: % no previous HE & from Low Participation Neighbourhood	690	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.4	0.4 (0.0)
Benchmark %		3.1	2.0	1.3	0.6	1.0 (1.0)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		0.8	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.3 (0.1)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
<b>Table 2c Participation: Mature FT other UG entrants</b>						
Other undergrad entrants: % no previous HE & from Low Participation Neighbourhood	145	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5 (3.1)
Benchmark %		0.4	0.8	0.9	1.0	5.8 (6.6)
Location-adjusted Benchmark %		0.3	0.1	0.4	0.2	1.8 (3.3)
Location-adjusted significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
<b>Table T7 Participation: Disabled Students' Allowance</b>						
FT first degree: % in receipt DSA	5510	3.8	4.0	3.2	3.4	3.1
Benchmark %		6.1	6.2	6.2	5.8	5.3
FT all undergrad: % in receipt DSA	5735	3.8	3.9	3.3	3.6	3.4
Benchmark %		6.0	6.1	6.1	5.8	5.4
PT all undergrad: % in receipt DSA	125	5.5	1.5	1.8	2.2	1.3
Benchmark %		6.0	5.7	5.1	3.4	3.0

## Five Year Analysis

### HESA Non-continuation Performance Indicators – City, University of London

#### Identification of Low Participation Neighbourhoods: POLAR3 (POLAR2 in brackets for 2011/12)

Indicator	Total entrants City 2014/5	City 2014/5	City 2013/4	City 2012/3	City 2011/2	City 2010/1
<b>Table T3a Non continuation following year of entry: FT first degree entrants</b>						
Young entrants: % no longer in HE	1660	10.2	9.0	10.3	9.3	11.5
Benchmark %		6.4	6.1	6.0	5.5	5.9
Significance		-	-	-	-	-
Mature entrants:% no longer in HE	450	15.6	19.1	18.3	22.1	15.5
Benchmark %		10.1	11.1	11.3	10.8	10.9
Significance		-	-	-	-	NS
All entrants: % no longer in HE	2105	11.3	11.2	12.3	12.5	12.5
Benchmark %		7.2	7.2	7.4	6.8	7.2
Significance		-	-	-	-	-
<b>Table T3b Non continuation following year of entry: young FT first degree entrants</b>						
Young entrants from Low Participation Neighbourhood: % no longer in HE	55	8.9	2.0	14.7	7.7	7.9 (12.5)
Benchmark %		8.9	6.8	7.1	6.5	5.8 (6.5)
Significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS (NS)
Young entrants from other neighb'd: % no longer in HE	1590	10.3	9.3	10.1	9.4	11.6 (11.5)
Benchmark %		6.0	5.7	5.6	5.1	5.6 (5.5)
Significance		-	-	-	-	- (-)
<b>Table T3c Non continuation following year of entry: mature FT first degree entrants</b>						
With previous HE qualification: % no longer in HE	180	17.1	19.8	13.7	18.0	13.4
Benchmark %		8.7	10.0	10.5	9.4	9.3
Significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
With no previous HE qualification: % no longer in HE	265	14.6	18.5	22.3	23.8	17.6
Benchmark %		11.1	12.0	12.0	11.7	12.6
Significance		NS	NS	-	-	NS
<b>Table T3d Non continuation following year of entry: FT other undergrad entrants</b>						
Young entrants: % no longer in HE	35	35.1	31.6	26.5	13.7	17.1
Benchmark %		14.4	10.8	10.0	10.1	11.7
Significance		-	-	-	NS	NS
Mature entrants: % no longer in HE	150	17.9	20.7	12.6	12.5	11.1
Benchmark %		15.3	17.7	15.1	14.5	9.7
Significance		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
All entrants: % no longer in HE	190	21.3	23.0	16.3	12.9	12.8
Benchmark %		15.1	16.3	13.7	13.0	10.2
Significance		-	-	NS	NS	NS

<b>Table 7a</b> - Statistical targets and milestones relating to applicants, entrants or student body											
Reference number	Stage of lifecycle and target type	Description	Is this a collaborative target?	Baseline year	Baseline data	Yearly milestones					Commentary on milestones/targets or textual description where numerical description is not appropriate
						2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	
T16a_01	Access - Ethnicity	Maintain level of recruitment of students from BME backgrounds	No	2012-13	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%		
T16a_02	Access - State School (HESA T1a Young, full-time, first degree entrants)	Maintain participation rate above location-adjusted benchmark	No	Other (see commentary)	90.8%	90.8%	90.8%	90.8%	90.8%		Baseline data based on period covering 2011/12-2013/14 (benchmark 87.7%)
T16a_03	Access - Socio-economic (HESA T1a Young, full-time, first degree entrants)	Maintain participation rate above location-adjusted benchmark	No	Other (see commentary)	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%		Baseline data based on period covering 2011/12-2013/14 (benchmark 35.5%)
T16a_04	Access - Low participation neighbourhoods	Increase participation of students from LPN Quintiles 1+2	No	Other (see commentary)	10.5%	12.5%	13.5%	14.5%	15.5%		Baseline data based on period covering 2010/11-2012/13
T16a_05	Student Success - No longer in HE after 1 year (HESA T3a Young, full-time, first degree entrants)	Improve retention rate to in line with or better than location-adjusted benchmark	No	Other (see commentary)	9.5%	9.0%	8.0%	7.0%	5.5%		Baseline data based on avg performance from 2011/12-13/14. Five-year target based on avg benchmark (5.9%).
T16a_06	Student Success – Care leavers	Reduce gap in retention between care leavers and institutional average	No	Other (see commentary)	24.6%	17.6%	13.6%	10.1%	7.1%		Baseline data based on long-term analysis of period covering 2008/09-2011/12
T16a_07	Progression	Reduce WP student outcomes gap (six months after leaving)	No	2013-14	11.5%	9.5%	5.5%	1.5%	0.0%		Yearly milestone relates to year's cohort (students enrol in 2016/17 will have outcomes gap improved following graduation in 2019)

<b>Table 7b – Other milestones and targets</b>											
Reference number	Stage of lifecycle and target type	Description	Is this a collaborative target?	Baseline year	Baseline data	Yearly milestones					Commentary on milestones/targets or textual description where numerical description is not appropriate
						2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	
T16b_01	Access - Operational targets	Tracking participation % of students to have full data on HEAT	Yes	2015-16	0.0%	60%	70%	80%	80%		
T16b_02	Access - Outreach / WP activity	Spotlight: measuring participants' increased understanding of HE	No	2013-14	78%	82%	84%	86%	88%		Participants responding that the activity has increased their understanding of HE
T16b_03	Access - Attainment raising	Secondary school partnership: % achieve three key measures developed with schools	Yes	2016-17	0.0%	60%	70%	75%	80%		
T16b_04	Access - Attainment raising	Tutoring - % of pupils who reach academic progression target set by school	Yes	2014-15	70%	70%	70%	80%	80%		Target relates to proportion of tutee cohort meeting or exceeding target grade. The total population each year will be approx. 280 students from primary school to BTEC.
T16b_05	Student Success - Operational targets	Transition: Pre-induction	Yes	2015-16	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%		% of WP participants progressing from Year 1 to Year 2 to be no lower than programme average
T16b_06	Student Success - Operational targets	Transition: Pre-induction	Yes	2015-16	70%	72%	74%	76%	80%		% WP participants reporting that participating helped them feel more prepared and equipped for HE study
T16b_07	Student Success - Operational targets	Transition: CityBuddies	No	2015-16	85%	87%	88%	89%	90%		% WP participants reporting that participating helped them feel more prepared and equipped for HE study
T16b_08	Student Success - Operational targets	Transition: CityBuddies	No	2015-16	87%	87%	88%	89%	90%		% of WP participants progressing from Year 1 to Year 2 to be no lower than programme average
T16b_09	Student Success - Operational targets	Transition: CityBuddies	No	2014-15	754	1100	1200	1300	1300		Number of mentoring pairs supported through the scheme
T16b_10	Progression - Operational targets	Professional Mentoring	Yes	2012-13	78%	84%	85%	86%	87%		% of WP students reporting personal/professional development
T16b_11	Progression - Operational targets	Professional Mentoring	Yes	2012-13	86	160	175	190	190		Number of mentoring pairs supporting students with WP characteristics