

Cylchlythyr | Circular

Fee Plans 2015/16 – Consultation on detailed proposals for change

Date: 17 January 2014
Reference: W14/02HE
To: Heads of higher education institutions in Wales
Principals of directly-funded further education institutions in Wales
Response by: 28 February 2014
Contact: Name: Leanne Holborn
Telephone: 029 2068 2259
Email: leanne.holborn@hefcw.ac.uk

This circular is a consultation on detailed proposals for changes to the fee planning process from 2015/16 and provides an outline framework to indicate the proposed structure of the fee plan.

If you require this document in an alternative accessible format, please telephone us on (029) 2068 2225 or email info@hefcw.ac.uk.



Noddir gan
Lywodraeth Cymru
Sponsored by
Welsh Government

Introduction

1. This circular is a consultation on detailed proposals for changes to the fee planning process from 2015/16 and provides an outline framework to indicate the proposed structure of the fee plan. The circular invites views from higher education institutions and directly-funded further education institutions. There are a series of questions throughout this circular to structure the response process. For ease of reference the questions are re-produced at Annex A.
2. This consultation builds on a previous consultation on fee plan proposals and relates to a statutory process. HEFCW officers have in parallel been developing proposals relating to strategic planning. That is a separate process and will be subject to consultation later this month.

Background

3. Since 2007/08 institutions in Wales have been allowed to charge variable fees capped at a level per student in the region of £3,000 per annum. This level matched that charged in both England and Northern Ireland. In Wales, only institutions which submitted an acceptable five year fee plan to HEFCW were permitted to charge this higher fee level.
4. The Browne Review of Higher Education, published in October 2010, advocated an end to capping of fees at this level in England. Subsequently in December 2010 the decision was taken in England to allow institutions to raise fees to a maximum of £9,000 per annum subject to approval of a satisfactory access agreement by OFFA.
5. In November 2010 the then Minister for Children, Education and Lifelong Learning in Wales, in responding to the Browne Review of Higher Education in England, announced that from 2012/13 Welsh institutions would be allowed to charge fees up to a maximum of £9,000 for full time undergraduate or PGCE courses. In February 2011 the Minister confirmed that the basic rate of fees that could be charged in Wales would be £4,000. Any institution wishing to charge above this basic rate would be required to submit an acceptable Fee Plan to HEFCW.
6. As a result fee legislation was put in place and HEFCW issued "Fee Plan Guidance" circulars in 2011 ([W11/14HE](#)) and in 2012 ([W12/15HE](#)), which provided guidance to Welsh institutions who wished to charge above the basic fee rate of £4,000 in 2012/13 and 2013/14 respectively, for UK and EU full time undergraduate courses and those postgraduate courses, such as PGCEs, that were subject to regulated undergraduate fees. Those institutions were required to submit a one year fee plan detailing the additional investment they would make in support of equality of opportunity and the promotion of higher education, and the objectives they would set to secure those outcomes. Fee plan monitoring would take place retrospectively.

The current fee plan process

7. Reflecting on the fee plan process for 2012/13 and 2013/14, we became aware of some issues that needed to be addressed, and improvements to be made, moving forward into the 14/15 fee plans. Although the list was not exhaustive, we identified these as –
 - The need for better alignment of the fee planning process with the new HEFCW Corporate Strategy to 2016;
 - Given the decreasing HEFCW funding available to support Welsh Government policy, the need to maximise the use of the fee plan as a lever for the delivery of policy;
 - The need to address the time gap between agreement of the plan and the assessment of its effectiveness, in order to improve its role as a lever for delivery;
 - The need to align the fee plan with the institutional strategies (and associated targets) covering the fee plan areas;
 - Given the reduction in funding available for those strategies, a requirement for a more direct link to the fee plan, providing a lever for policy and to help to give the fee plan a strategic context;
 - The need to build in the work HEFCW officers do in assessing institutional forecasts against corporate strategy targets, and monitoring performance (which feeds in to the fee planning process).
8. As a result of the identification of these issues, we compiled a set of proposals for fee planning from 2014/15 and published a consultation circular, taking account of additional discussion with Welsh Government officials and NUS Wales.
9. As part of those discussions both the WG and NUS endorsed our direction of travel and the WG suggested that we seek legal advice on the precise nature of the corporate strategy targets that could be included in the fee plan process. We also met informally with nominated institutional planning representatives to test our proposals.

Initial Consultation outcomes

10. In April 2013 circular W13/10HE –*Fee Plan Proposals – Consultation Outcomes* was published which summarised the responses to our consultation on proposals for new fee plan arrangements, and concluded that we would move to using the relevant corporate strategy targets in the fee plans from 2015/16.

11. As a result of a number of the responses asking that we delay the implementation of the new arrangements until 2015/16, and the need for additional time to obtain the necessary legal advice, Council decided that the new fee plan process, based on the corporate strategy targets as a framework, would be introduced 2015/16. The outcomes circular also set out a number of principles for the new fee plan process when it does come into operation in 2015/16. These are listed below-

- A new fee plan process will be in place from 15/16, using HEFCW corporate strategy targets as a framework to secure national outcomes and to ensure consistency, but also recognising the diversity and uniqueness of individual institutions.
- Targets would be set in conjunction with individual institutions, recognising their diverse missions and their different contributions to the overall sector outcomes.
- Negotiation would take place with individual institutions should the targets proposed be perceived as unambitious, and a rationale provided should HEFCW feel individual targets could be adjusted.
- Fee plans may also include other institutional performance measures as the institutions wish. These measures will be used to provide context in the plans and will be included in the feedback but their success will not contribute to the overall assessment of the plan achievement.
- Higher Education Students Early Statistics (HESES) would be used to provide early indicators of success where appropriate, robust and reliable, but would not be redesigned in order to fit the fee plan process more fully.
- HEFCW would conduct early and on-going dialogue with institutions as appropriate, during the duration of the plan.
- Assessment of a plan would be based on a number of criteria that would be published in the fee plan guidance, prior to fee plan submission.
- These criteria would need to be developed but may involve –
 - Setting a level of achievement in the full range of targets included (e.g. 80%) above which an institution would be deemed to have succeeded in its plan;
 - Recognising that where a sector target is met, individual institutions' contribution to that target would not be part of the assessment;

- Identifying those targets which are noted as more challenging for a particular institution and weighting its performance to take account of this;
- Taking account of areas where targets are exceeded and allowing that to inform the assessment of individual institutions' overall performance;
- Allowing a tolerance level for each institution's performance against each target;
- Where a target is not met, taking account of the direction of the trajectory of performance.

Post-publication developments

12. The legal advice has now been received regarding our ability to set down corporate strategy targets as the assessment vehicle for fee plans. It has confirmed that we can include all the targets with the exception of those related to ITT, research council income, reconfiguration and collaboration and governance. The rationale for taking forward these proposals, set out in our high level consultation and reiterated in para 4.2 above, remains largely appropriate with some small adjustments.
13. Although there was a proposal to move the fee plan to a two year period, it is proposed that, given that our current Corporate Strategy ends in 2015/16, the first year of this process, we retain the one year plan, with an option to extend to two years, if appropriate, nearer the time.
14. In addition, the principles and criteria have been revisited and, in the main, we have assessed that these are still current and appropriate. However, there would appear to be little value in applying a pre-determined "tolerance level" against each performance as experience (e.g. maximum fee grant exercise) has proved that this tolerance level just then becomes the accepted threshold.
15. Likewise further discussion has refined the criteria surrounding individual targets where the overall sector target is met. Should this be the case each target will be checked to ensure that the individual institutional targets are still sufficiently ambitious. If so, the individual target will be deemed satisfactorily achieved without further scrutiny.
16. Fee plans may include other institutional performance measures as institutions wish. These measures will be used to provide context in the plans and will be included in the feedback. Their success may also contribute to the overall assessment of the plan achievement and a consultation question is now provided on that point.

17. Given the reduction in funding available for institutional strategies, a separate process of development of strategic planning has been taken forward in parallel, which will be the subject of separate consultation.

Questions

- a) *We intend to include all those corporate strategy targets that we are legally entitled to. Do you have any comments on the rationale we have given for this? (please also see paragraph 7).*
- b) *Do you agree that, given that HEFCW's Corporate Strategy ends in 2015/16, the 2015/16 plan should be a one year plan, with an option to extend to two years if appropriate? How might this be achieved to ensure ease of operation?*
- c) *Do you have any comments on our intention not to operate a pre-determined "tolerance level" against each target?*
- d) *Do you have any comments on the inclusion of institutional performance measures and any advantages or disadvantages of their inclusion in the plans and in the assessment process?*

Development of the criteria

18. We have now developed the criteria into a transparent process for assessing the plans and the targets contained with each one. During this process officers were keen to keep at the forefront the commitment made to take account of institutional diversity and the fact that some targets would be more challenging for particular institutions. A more "scientific" approach is intended to assess targets, to ease the assessment process and to ensure transparency and consistency.
19. However, this "scientific" approach will be the first step in the assessment of the ambition of the targets and will be used to inform detailed and extensive dialogue with individual institutions regarding their target ambition.

Targets to be included

20. Taking into account the legal advice obtained, the following targets are proposed to form the basis of the fee plan targets from 2015/16 onwards – (the explanation against each one is based on the legal advice obtained and its justification of the target inclusion)

Promotion of Equal Opportunities

- Target 1 Widening Access – sits within the requirement in regulation 4 (A) of the approved plans regulations requiring measures to attract members of under-represented groups.
- Target 2 Participation- sits within the requirement in regulation 4 (A) of the approved plans regulations requiring measures to attract members of under-represented groups.
- Target 3 Retention – this falls within the Ministers’ guidance, namely “activities aimed at supporting and increasing student retention, particularly from low participation neighbourhoods.”
- Target 4 Part-time - this falls within regulation 3 of the approved plans regulations, and in the Ministers’ guidance which enjoins institutions to consider part time students within their overall approach to access, with HEFCW taking this into account in the fee plans.
- Target 6 Welsh Medium – this under representation of particular groups is not confined to economic or social conditions and this target addresses the under representation of those wishing to pursue courses through the medium of Welsh.

Promotion of Higher Education

- Target 5 NSS – this target falls within regulation 4 of the approved plans regulations and is evidence by which to assess fee plan objectives in meeting the Ministers’ guidance regarding “activities which aim to support students’ experience of HE.”
- Target 7 Overseas students – this has been included noting the Ministers’ guidance reference to “actions which promote Welsh HE more effectively internationally.”
- Target 8 Quality – this derives from the Ministers’ guidance which includes within the promotion of higher education ‘investments in improving the quality of learning and teaching, with reference to the quality of the student experience’, noting that this target is concerned with the meeting of UK thresholds for quality and standards.
- Target 10 Employment – falls within promotion of HE and the Ministers’ guidance as being “activities which strengthen the employability of Welsh graduates.”
- Target 11 Employability – falls within promotion of HE and the Ministers’ guidance as being “activities which strengthen the employability of Welsh graduates.”
- Target 12 Continuing professional development – targets relating to the matters of engagement with professions, business and the community relate to the “promotion of HE” and the Ministers’ guidance as being evidence of “more effective engagement with private public or voluntary bodies and communities in Wales.”

Target 13 Collaborative Research Income - targets relating to the matters of engagement with professions, business and the community relate to the “promotion of HE” and the Ministers’ guidance as being evidence of “more effective engagement with private public or voluntary bodies and communities in Wales.”

Assessment of ambition of targets

21. It is proposed that the assessment of the ambition of the targets included in the fee plans would be different depending on how they have been devised and worded. The Corporate Strategy Targets are a combination of target outcomes for the HE sector in Wales, and targets tracking the performance of the HE sector against UK performance. For those numeric and percentage targets which anticipate an individual performance against a sector total, we propose a process of assessment as detailed below. For those tracking against UK performance we would have an expectation that these are reiterated in each individual plan, with a commitment to at least maintain the current position and any growth at least at the same rate as the UK.
22. For the transparent assessment of the appropriateness of the target ambition as a contribution to the sector whole, officers propose to look at a range of data, both forecasting and historical. To reiterate, we expect this approach to the initial assessment of the ambition of the targets to be a pre-cursor to dialogue and negotiation with individual institutions, the detail of which may include discussion on diversity of mission, different fee levels and the varying contributions to each target by each institution.
23. The first thing to be considered would be to see if the sector forecasts combined take us to our 2015/16 corporate strategy target. If so, each individual institution’s target would be scrutinised, to make sure their expectation is not to tread water. If they are all increasing appropriately, the individual target would be deemed acceptable.
24. Secondly, if the combined forecasts do not meet our target, officers would then look individually at each HEI and compare their forecast against what might be expected if we were assuming an equal share (pro rata) for each HEI to gain overall achievement.
25. For numeric targets, the percentage change (on the current position) required for the sector to reach the target is applied (evenly across the forecast period) to each institution’s current position, so that each institution changes at the same rate as that expected for the sector.
26. For percentage targets, the percentage change (on the current percentage position) required for the sector to reach the target is applied (evenly across the forecast period) to the numerator of each institution’s

current percentage position, so that each institution's numerator changes at the same rate as that expected for the sector.

27. Thirdly, officers would consider the targets proposed against each institution's trajectory of progress over the last three years. This is each institution's average percentage change based on the most recent three years' data applied to their current position and subsequently to each year of the forecast period.
28. Essentially this is a two measure approach looking at where an institution would be if everyone grew at the same rate across the sector and then looking at where an institution would be if it continued to grow at the same rate as it had over the last 3 years.

The examples set out below illustrate how this data might be used by officers to assess the forecasts –

Target based on percentages

Institution A	Forecast	22.7%	This forecast exceeds what we might expect as an equal share and exceeds recent performance. Therefore we would be likely to accept this forecast as the target.
	Equal share	22.6%	
	Average annual change %	20.2%	

Institution B	Forecast	29.0%	This forecast is below what we might expect as an equal share and recent performance. Therefore we would challenge this forecast and enter into a dialogue with the institution in order to encourage revision upwards.
	Equal share	31.0%	
	Average annual change %	30.5%	

Institution C	Forecast	9.0%	This forecast is what we might expect as an equal share but is below recent performance. Therefore we would seek further dialogue, but are likely to accept on the basis that in some instances there is less scope for a continuous growth trajectory (those that have performed exceptionally well in the past and have less distance to travel).
	Equal share	9.0%	
	Average annual change %	9.7%	

Institution D	Forecast	46.0%	This forecast is below what we might expect as an equal share but is above recent performance. Therefore we would seek further dialogue on the basis that those with a weaker starting point will have further to travel.
	Equal share	47.8%	
	Average annual change %	45.8%	

Target based on numbers

Institution E	Forecast	2080	This forecast is well below what we might expect as an equal share and below recent performance. Therefore we would challenge this forecast and enter into a dialogue with the institution in order to encourage revision upwards.
	Equal share	2299	
	Average annual change	2098	

29. These data provide a transparent framework for the assessment of target ambition. Following further scrutiny of the overall position by officers, recommendations would be put to Council for approval of the fee plans.
30. Should a plan not be approved on the basis of the targets included, there is a formal process, conducted by the WG, which provides for an appeal. Non-approval of a plan would result in the institution not being able to charge the higher rate of fees for FTUG and PGCE students in 2015/16.

Questions

- e) For those tracking against UK performance we would have an expectation that these are reiterated in each individual plan, with a commitment to at least maintain the current position and any growth at least at the same rate as the UK. Do you have any comments on this proposal or alternative suggestions for assessing the ambition of this type of target?***
- f) Do you have any comments on the proposed methodology to be used as an initial scrutiny of target ambition, prior to dialogue with individual institutions?***
- g) Do you have any additional, or alternative, suggestions about the data sources that we might use in the initial ambition assessment?***
- h) Recognising that institutions will have already submitted their 2015/16 forecasts prior to fee plan submission, would it be useful for those forecasts to be reiterated back to institutions as part of this process (perhaps in the pro-forma), for them to accept, or adjust, and submit as the targets in the plan?***

Rest of Plan

31. Part of the outcome of the consultation was the agreement that institutions, should they wish, may include other targets and information contextually as part of the plan. This is valuable to give officers a holistic view of activity and may provide intelligence as to the setting of a certain level of achievement of a target.

32. However, it may be that this information should also contribute to the assessment of the plan.
33. In addition to this the Welsh Government may have specific requirements for inclusion in plans, or may require us to collect and report on detail of activities that can only be accessed through the detail in the Plan. This could include context and textual detail but also detailed expenditure information.

Questions

- i) How might we retain the flexibility to enable adequate information to be contained within the plan, for the institution, HEFCW and WG, while retaining the ease of reading and conciseness for every audience?***
- j) How might we expect additional institutional targets and milestones to be presented within the plan (e.g. as a separate annex)?***
- k) Do you have any comments on what information should contribute to the assessment of plan performance. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the inclusion and assessment of different types of institutional, expenditure and target information.***
- l) What level of expenditure breakdown would you consider appropriate and adequate (see also annex B)?***

Plan Framework

34. Annex B provides a basic possible framework on which to record a fee plan for 2015/16. It is made up of a numbers of headings against which we would expect some prose about the activities being undertaken, a skeletal spreadsheet which would be used to record your corporate strategy targets for assessment, and the suggestion of an additional annex which might be used for institutions to record the individual additional targets that they wish to include in the plan.
35. For ease of reference the headings have been reiterated below –

Contextual information

- Introduction
- Executive summary
- Fee Limits and Income above £4,000
- The Student Voice (including measures for communication of fee levels and the processes by which you have engaged with your student body)
- Equality of Opportunity – activities supported through the tuition fee income (including sub headings as appropriate with detail such as the financial and bursary support for students etc.),

- Promotion of HE - activities supported through the tuition fee income (including sub headings appropriate outlining detail such as marketing activity and promotion etc.)
- Additional specific information (e.g. the WG requirement to include mention of the Mental Health Strategy - this would be specified by HEFCW with the guidance)
- Expenditure information – including tables detailing new tuition fee income, and outlining expenditure under Equality of Opportunity and Promotion of HE (including sub-heading as appropriate to individual institutions)

Authorisation and sign off section

Annex A – Corporate Strategy Targets template

Annex B – Additional institutional targets and milestones.

Questions

- m) Do you think the headings are appropriate and adequate to cover the detail required in a fee plan?***
- n) Do you have any suggestions to make the fee plan more “student friendly” recognising the diverse audience of the plan?***
- o) With reference to your response to question (h), would it be useful for institutions’ previously submitted forecasts to be reiterated back to institutions in the initial proforma, for them to accept, or adjust, and submit as the targets in the plan?***

Assessment of Achievement of Plan

36. In order to assess the achievement of the plans on completion, we will require institutions to submit a monitoring report detailing the activities that have been undertaken, the outcome of the targets, a critique of the success or otherwise of those targets, and how that has contributed to the overall success of the plan. This report will be scrutinised by officers who may require additional information to be submitted for further clarity. We are aware of the need to be realistic in the current uncertain and volatile environment in which HE is operating and the rationales for achievement or otherwise will be looked at very carefully in that context.
37. Following this process we propose convening an independent panel of no more than 6 members, including an independent chair and representation from NUS Wales.
38. Following analysis of the outcomes of the plan, officers will make recommendations to this independent panel as to whether they consider the achievement adequate. The panel may wish to accept that

recommendation or request further information from officers or the institutions themselves in order to inform their recommendation.

39. The panel would be in place to consider the outcomes of the plans and officers' assessments and make recommendations to Council for approval. Ultimately, if a plan is assessed to not be achieved satisfactorily, Council is refusing sanction for the institution to charge the higher rate of fees in the following year(s).

Questions

- p) Do you have any suggestions for the membership and composition of the independent panel which will consider officers' recommendations?***
- q) In the event that the Panel sought further information from institutions, how should that information be provided (e.g. personal representation, correspondence etc.)?***

Proposed Timetable

40. Timeline for Fee Plan Process 2015/16

Activity	Due Date
Publication of fee plan guidance	April 2014
Return date for first submission	May 2014
Initial responses to HEIs	June 2014
Resubmission and dialogue	June 2014 – July 2014
HEIs informed of final decision	Mid - July 2014
Initial referral to appeal	Late - August 2014
Publication of Fee Plan online	Within one week following acceptance of Fee Plan by HEFCW
Fee Plan report submitted	January 2017
Consideration of fee plan reports and recommendations to panel	March 2017
Panel decisions to institutions	April 2017
Appeal process if required	May 2017 onwards

Questions

- r) Do you have any comments on the proposed timetable?**
- s) Do you have any further comments about the proposals?**

Questions

- a) *We intend to include all those corporate strategy targets that we are legally entitled to. Do you have any comments on this? (please also see paragraph 7).*
- b) *Do you agree that given that HEFCW's Corporate Strategy ends in 2015/16, the 2015/16 plan should be a one year plan, with an option to extend to two years if appropriate? How might this be achieved to ensure ease of operation?*
- c) *Do you have any comments on our intention not to operate a "tolerance level" against each target?*
- d) *Do you have any comments on the inclusion of institutional performance measures and any advantages or disadvantages of their inclusion in the plans and in the assessment process.*
- e) *For those tracking against UK performance we would have an expectation that these are reiterated in each individual plan, with a commitment to at least maintain the current position and any growth at least at the same rate as the UK. Do you have any comments on this proposal or alternative suggestion for assessing the ambition of this type of target?*
- f) *Do you have any comments on the proposed methodology to be used as an initial scrutiny of target ambition, priori to dialogue with individual institutions?*
- g) *Do you have any additional, or alternative, suggestions about the data sources that we might use in the initial ambition assessment?*
- h) *Recognising that institutions will have already submitted their 2015/16 forecasts prior to fee plan submission, would it be useful for those forecasts to be reiterated back to institutions as part of this process (perhaps in the pro-forma), for them to accept, or adjust, and submit as the targets in the plan?*
- i) *How might we retain the flexibility to enable adequate information to be contained within the plan, for the institution, HEFCW and WG, while retaining the ease of reading and conciseness for every audience?*
- j) *How might we expect additional institutional targets and milestones to be presented within the plan (e.g. as a separate annex)?*
- k) *Do you have any comments on what information should contribute to the assessment of plan performance. What are the advantages*

and disadvantages of the inclusion and assessment of different types of institutional, expenditure and target information.

- l) What level of expenditure breakdown would you consider appropriate and adequate?***
- m) Do you think the headings are appropriate and adequate to cover the detail required in a fee plan?***
- n) Do you have any suggestions to make the fee plan more “student friendly” recognising the diverse audience of the plan?***
- o) With reference to your response to question (h), would it be useful for institutions’ previously submitted forecasts to be reiterated back to institutions in the initial proforma, for them to accept, or adjust, and submit as the targets in the plan?***
- p) Do you have any suggestions for the make-up of the independent panel who will consider officers recommendations?***
- q) In the event that the Panel sought further information from institutions, how should that information be provided (e.g. personal representation, correspondence etc.)?***
- r) Do you have any comments of the proposed timetable?***
- s) Do you have any further comments about the proposals?***

Institution Name & Contact Details

Contextual information (possible headings)

1 Introduction

2 Executive summary

3 Fee Limits and Income above £4,000

What level of fees do you propose to charge from 2015/16?	
a) Does your institution propose to charge full time undergraduate fees above the basic rate?	Y/N
b) What is your highest proposed fee rate (up to a £9K maximum) for: i) Full time undergraduate ii) PGCE (where applicable)	£ £
c) Will level i) (above) be charged for all undergraduate higher education provision at your institution?	Y/N
d) If no, what is your average (mean) fee per full time undergraduate student likely to be? Note: in calculating this, you should include fees up to and including the basic fee of £4,000 as well as fees above this basic level.	£

Where you propose to charge different fees for different courses please provide details below. You should categorise your fee charges by a) qualification aim (HND / degree / FD etc) b) subject and/or c) cohort, as appropriate.

For each category included please provide details of your assumed numbers, and whether (for HEIs only) numbers represent franchised out provision.

Students covered by the new fee regime for all years of study should be included here. The fees and student numbers returned should result in the average fee returned in 1d and be consistent with the expected income.

Qualification Aim	Subject with JACS Code	Cohort	Franchised out provision? Y/N	Assumed student numbers used in calculation of average

- 4 The Student Voice** (including measures for communication of fee levels and the processes by which you have engaged with your student body)

- 5 Equality of Opportunity** – activities supported through the tuition fee income (including sub heading as appropriate with detail such as the financial support for students etc.),

- 6 Promotion of HE** – activities supported through the tuition fee income (including sub headings appropriate outlining detail such as marketing activity and promotion etc.)

- 7 Additional specific information** (e.g. the WG requirement to include mention of the Mental Health Strategy - this would be specified by HEFCW with the guidance)

8 Expenditure information – including tables detailing new tuition fee income, and outlining expenditure under Equality of Opportunity and Promotion of HE (including sub-heading, breaking down the two main headings, where appropriate to individual institutions)

Institutions are required to invest at least 30% of fee income above the basic level in relation to a) equality of opportunity and b) promotion of higher education.

Please provide details of your financial commitments to both investment areas. Institutions with further to travel to ensure further equality of access should invest more heavily in those activities.

	2015/16 £k	
	Total Fee Income Investment 2015/16 (in the region of 30% of fee income above the basic level)	
a) Total amount to be invested in equality of opportunity	£	
b) Total amount to be invested in promotion of higher education	£	
Total	£	

Authorisation and sign off section

Date approved by Governing Body:	
Signed Vice Chancellor/Principal:	
Date:	

Institution Name –
<p>This table has been prepopulated with information that you have provided to us in the forecasting exercise undertaken in July 2013.</p> <p>You will need to consider whether you wish to adjust those forecasts. Those adjustments should be made and on confirmation, the detail in this spreadsheet will change from being regarded as forecast to target information.</p> <p>NB. The targets which have been highlighted are those that are comparing to the UK position, and for that reason, no forecast has been included. In those instances we would expect the commentary column to contain a commitment from institutions that they will endeavour to at least maintain their performance comparatively to the UK position.</p>

Corporate Strategy Information

Target	Target Description and Sector Aspiration	2015/16 Forecast (this will be changed to target following confirmation from institution)	Commentary on establishment and aspiration of target.
Widening Access	A rise in the proportion of all Welsh domiciled students studying higher education courses at higher education institutions and further education institutions in Wales who are domiciled in the bottom quintile of Lower Super Output Areas in the		

	Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation or in Communities First cluster areas, from 20.1% in 2011/12 to 22.4% in 2015/16 (a rise of 11.6%)		
Participation	An increase in the proportion of all UK domiciled students studying higher education courses at higher education institutions and further education institutions in Wales who are from UK low participation areas from 33.2% in 2011/12 to 35.3% in 2015/16 (a rise of 6.3%)		
Retention	<p>a) A decrease in the percentage of full-time undergraduate students no longer in higher education following year of entry from 9.2% in 2011/12 to 8.2% in 2015/16 (a drop of 10.7%)</p> <p>(b) a decrease in the percentage of part-time first degree students no longer in higher education two years following year of entry from 33.7% in 2011/12 to 30.1% in 2015/16 (a drop of 10.7%)</p>		
Part-time	The percentage change in the number of part-time students attending higher education courses in Welsh higher education institutions and further education institutions to be equal to, or greater than, the comparable figure for the UK.		
Welsh Medium	a) a) The number of students studying higher education courses at higher education institutions and further education institutions in Wales undertaking at least 5 credits of their course through the medium of Welsh, per annum, will rise from 4,335 in 2011/12		

	<p>to 5,600 in 2015/16</p> <p>b) The number of students studying higher education courses at higher education institutions and further education institutions in Wales undertaking their course through the medium of Welsh, per annum, will rise from 2,269 to 3,030 for those studying at least 40 credits per annum</p>		
NSS	The three year rolling average score for Wales in the National Student Survey 'overall satisfaction' question will be equal to, or greater than, the comparative score for the UK		
Overseas students	The percentage change year on year in the number of overseas students attending higher education courses in Welsh higher education institutions will be equal to, or greater than, the comparable figure for UK higher education institutions (excluding London and the South East)		
Quality	All institutions being reviewed in the Corporate Strategy period to receive QAA Institutional Review outcomes of 'commended' or 'Meets UK expectations' for all judgements'.		
Employment	The proportion of leavers from Welsh higher education institutions obtaining undergraduate qualifications through full-time or part-time study who were employed, studying or both six months after leaving will be equal to, or greater than, the UK proportion		

Employability	The proportion of leavers who were working or working and studying who were working in a managerial/professional job six months after leaving to rise from 67.5% in 2010/11 to 72.7% in 2015/16 (a rise of 7.7%)		
Continuing Professional Development	The total number of learner days delivered by Welsh higher education institutions for continuing professional development will rise from 202,498 in 2011/12 to 226,000 in 2015/16 (a rise of 11.6%)		
Collaborative Research Income	The total amount of income from collaborative research involving both public funding and funding from business will rise from £65,294k in 2011/12 to £72,000k in 2015/16 (a rise of 10.3%)		

HEFCW Fee Plan 2015/16 – Additional Institutional Targets

Annex B

Institution Name –

This table has been left blank to allow institutions to submit their own additional targets and milestones.

Target/Milestone	Target Description	2015/16 Target/Milestone	Commentary on establishment and aspiration of target.