

Appendix 1

Nine areas in which HEIs and FECs should be responding positively

Nine inter-linked areas, topics or domains, in each of which HEIs and FECs should be responding positively to needs and expectations for disabled students. These nine domains capture what have been key ongoing points for action in recent years.

In summary, the areas are:

- *1. Physical access needs of disabled students and potential students.* This is a matter on which we might today expect a degree of awareness across HEI managements of 'base-level' requirements (even if much remains to be done), and where ongoing physical infrastructure improvements need to be kept under regular review.
- *2. Equipment and space needs of disabled students.* This may involve assessment prior to arrival at university, as well as provision for students both within learning processes and in relation to university-run accommodation.
- *3. Communications needs of disabled students and potential students.* This can be important across the full range of the learning and social experience of being in HE, relating to general information needs, institutional responsiveness to specific impairment issues, teaching and assessment practices, and so forth. Good communications are also important for potential entrants considering university, and in terms of advice services when reaching the end of a degree programme.
- *4. Financial provision and needs for disabled students.* This will include resource allocation, use of any externally provided funds that have been targeted for meeting costs incurred in recruiting and supporting disabled students, access to funds, take-up of allowances, and methods of assessment, any barriers or problems (such as delays), variations across institutional populations according to impairments, etc. We are aware that there can also be issues around self-identification and hidden needs (and the extent of institutional awareness), although achieving 'good practice' here might inevitably be difficult.
- *5. Dedicated resources, and their scale, scope, and targeting.* This concerns ensuring not only that financial resources serve effective purposes (linked with the issues under the previous bullet point), but also covers matters such as the establishment of facilities and services directly responding to specific impairment needs, and the locating of 'equality champions' in positions where they can impact directly upon organisational change.
- *6. Adoption and implementation of appropriate formal practices and procedures.* This would concern both the '*mainstreaming*' of disability issues by any necessary

adjustments to prior arrangements or mechanisms, as well as any specific new practices of record-keeping, audit or testing. We would consider use of monitoring, reporting, and impact assessment by institutions. The focus could be at several levels, from central administration down to departmental levels.

- *7. Consultation and participation.* Working towards inclusion requires involvement of disabled students in regular discussion and consultation. This can be issue-based (access, equipment availability, accommodation, etc.), but also more 'generic' or proactive. For example, some disabled students might wish to be involved in outreach work with potential applicants for student places.
- *8. Communications and interactions with external organisations and environments.* This reflects the desirability of HE institutions adequately representing the interests of disabled students alongside other students in consultations and negotiations with external bodies (such as the Research Councils).
- *9. Relationships with other dimensions of 'difference' amongst students,* including issues around ethnicity, gender, being a mature student, etc., at the same time as being a disabled person.

The nine concerns outlined above will be salient for disabled students in varying combinations and at particular times.

Appendix 2

Levels of support available for individual students via DSA at the time of this study

Maximums for full-time and part-time higher education students: 2008/2009

Type of allowance	Full-time students	Part-time students
Specialist equipment	£5,030 for entire course	£5,030 for entire course
Non-medical helper	£20,000 a year	£15,000 a year (depends on intensity of course)
General Disabled Students' Allowances	£1,680 a year	£1,260 a year (depends on intensity of course)

Maximums for full-time and part-time higher education students: 2007/2008

Type of allowance	Full-time students	Part-time students
Specialist equipment	£4,905 for entire course	£4,905 for entire course
Non-medical helper	£12,420 a year	£9,315 a year (depends on intensity of course)
General Disabled Students' Allowances	£1,640 a year	£1,230 a year (depends on intensity of course)

Appendix 3

National Surveys: main cover letters sent via email

Dear

The e-mail below and the two accompanying attachments have been sent to the Vice Chancellor or Principal of your institution. We are also sending these documents to you, in hopes that this will help your institution in developing its response.

We are carrying out a study on behalf of HEFCE (and HEFCW) related to disabled students, and understand that HEFCE has already been in touch with your institution about this. We are now sending you the questionnaire and a letter from HEFCE (see attached) that form the basis of the national survey to which HEFCE has already referred.

We very much hope that all institutions will respond positively to this enquiry, which includes an opportunity to identify particular exemplars of good practice. The survey is expected to help inform future policy.

The beginning of the questionnaire includes full contact details for our team and guidance notes. If you would prefer a printed version of the attached documents, please let us know. The research will also involve a set of case studies, and we will be contacting selected institutions about this at a later date.

Many thanks for your help.

Yours Sincerely
Laura Hemingway

Dear Vice Chancellor or Principal

We are carrying out a study on behalf of HEFCW (and HEFCE) related to disabled students, and understand that HEFCW has already been in touch with your institution about this. We are now sending you the questionnaire (in both Welsh and English) and the letter from HEFCW (see attached) that form the basis of the national survey to which HEFCW has already referred.

We very much hope that all institutions will respond positively to this enquiry, which includes an opportunity to identify particular exemplars of good practice. The survey is expected to help inform future policy. We are suggesting a return date of 30th May, in hopes that this would be feasible for institutions. We appreciate that this is a rather tight timetable, so please do not hesitate to get in touch if you have any difficulties with this. The most important result is that we receive a completed form as early as you can manage.

The beginning of the questionnaire includes full contact details for our team and guidance notes. If you would prefer a printed version of the attached documents, please let us know. The research will also involve a set of case studies, and we will be contacting selected institutions about this at a later date.

Many thanks for your help.

Yours Sincerely
Laura Hemingway

Please note: We are also copying the attachments to disability services officers in HEIs and FECs to help facilitate any responses.

Appendix 4

Supplementary data from the national surveys

England

Table A1 Top three funding priorities (Question 17)

Category listed in the top three	Number of institutions
Improving campus accessibility	13
Improving accessibility of residential accommodation	5
Providing technical assistance and equipment	19
Providing accessible information services	4
Providing individual support services	6
Providing general dedicated disability services	26
Improving admission and outreach services for student recruitment	2
Improving careers services for disabled students	1
Providing staff training	4
Supplementing DSA for individual students	7
Other	3
Could not clarify/unanswered	21

Some of the comments added by respondents referred to budgeting issues:

“Our allocation (£43,551 in 2008/09) is a small part of our total grant. It is spread rather thinly over the items indicated in Question 16.”

“The mainstream funding added to the budgets allocated to each department for them to apply as required. Area above indicates primary use, though funds allocated are significantly less than costs.”

“This funding contributes to the salary costs for the specialist posts, there is nothing left over! In fact the School supplements that funding by providing the remainder of the funding for the specialist posts. Where individual cases need additional funding we make a special request and the Finance Department will try to find the resources.”

Table A2 Separate monitoring to record spending of mainstream disability funding allocation (Question 19)

Monitoring of funding	Number of institutions
Yes, our institution has separate monitoring in place	17
No, our institution does not have separate monitoring in place	29
Don't know	11
Unanswered	7

“Separate budget accounts for disability and annual reviews of support delivered.”

“The allocation is managed within the overall budget of Student Support and Guidance. Decisions on expenditure are made by the Manager of Student Support Services, who receives the monthly management accounts report.”

“Head of Disability, Dyslexia and Access Centre, and Associate Director of Student Experience are responsible for monitoring expenditure of funding. DRC budgets [are] part of budget forecasting and monitoring for Academic Services.”

“Disability co-ordinator compiles annual report.”

Table A3 Allocation of own resources by type of institution (Question 25)

Institution classification	Allocation of own resources for disabled students' needs			Total
	Yes	No	No answer	
New large urban	8	3	1	12
New small scale	6	3	0	9
Old large civics	9	1	1	11
Old small town	1	0	1	2
Specialised	7	2	3	12
High status + research	1	2	1	4
FEC	9	2	2	13
Special category	1	0	0	1
Total	42	13	9	64

Table A4 'Emergency' or temporary financial assistance (Question 34)

Emergency/temporary funds	Number of institutions
Yes	53
No	7
Don't know	2
Unanswered	2

Table A5 The availability of funding to supplement DSA funds (Question 35)

Funds to supplement DSA	Number of institutions
Yes	52
No	8
Don't know	3
Unanswered	1

Table A6 Funding offered in place of DSA funds when unavailable (Question 36)

Funds in place of DSA	Number of institutions
Yes	53
No	7
Don't know	3
Unanswered	1

Table A7 Other types of funding available for disabled students (Question 37)

Types of funding	Number of institutions
Access to Learning Funds (ALF)	58
Snowdon Scheme	22
Funding for international disabled students	22
Other	21
Don't know	4
Unanswered	1

Table A8 Steps taken to uncover undeclared impairments (Question 38)

Uncovering undeclared impairments	Number of institutions
Yes	54
No	6
Don't know	4
Unanswered	0

Table A9 Number of different kinds of support offered by type of institution (Question 32)

Institution classification	Number of different kinds of support offered							Total
	none	1	2	3	4	5	No answer	
New large urban	0	0	0	3	4	5	0	12
New small scale	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	9
Old large civics	0	0	0	3	7	1	0	11
Old small town	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Specialised	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	12
High status + research	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4
FECs	1	1	2	3	4	1	1	13
Special category	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total	1	1	2	18	31	10	1	64

Wales

Table A10 Top three funding priorities (Question 17)

Category listed in the top three	Number of institutions
Improving campus accessibility	4
Improving accessibility of residential accommodation	0
Providing technical assistance and equipment (e.g. computers)	3
Providing accessible information services (e.g. transcription)	0
Providing individual support services (e.g. Personal Assistants)	0
Providing general dedicated disability services (e.g. disability staff)	4
Improving admission and outreach services for student recruitment	0
Improving careers services for disabled students	0
Providing staff training	1
Supplementing DSA for individual students (e.g. hardship funds)	1
Other/comment	0
Could not clarify/unanswered	3

Table A11 Separate monitoring to record spending of disability premium funding (Question 19)

Monitoring of funding	Number of institutions
Yes, our institution has separate monitoring in place	4
No, our institution does not have separate monitoring in place	2
Don't know	1
Unanswered	1

Appendix 5

Follow-up enquiry on disclosure and take-up of support

Dear

Some time ago we contacted you with a questionnaire about disabled people's experiences of higher education. You very kindly took part in the research, and yours was one of the responses that offered some very useful insights (or provided useful examples) for us. We are now getting in touch again with several institutions, in order to seek expert views on a particular issue that is of interest to HEFCE and the research team.

We do hope you will be able to help us again, and that this will not require more than a few minutes of your time.

One issue that has been highlighted during the research concerns the take-up of DSA by disabled students, and the impact that arrangements to facilitate disclosure can have. We would welcome any observations you might be able to let us have on the three key questions below.

- 1) How important are sensitive (and non-intrusive) practices when institutions are trying to facilitate disclosure amongst disabled students?
- 2) Do sensitive practices on disclosure lead to better levels of DSA take-up and wider access to support?
- 3) In your institution's experience, have better levels of take-up been achieved by improving the way disclosure is handled?

Please comment further if there is anything that you feel would be useful for us.