

Access and Participation Plan

2020-21 to 2024-25

Index

1.	<u>Assessment of performance</u>	2
1.1	Higher education participation, household income, or socioeconomic status	3
1.2	Black, Asian and minority ethnic students	7
1.3	Mature students	13
1.4	Students with a disability	16
1.5	Care leavers	20
1.6	Intersections of disadvantage	20
1.7	Other groups who experience barriers in higher education	20
2.	<u>Strategic aims and objectives</u>	21
2.1	Target groups	22
2.2	Aims and objectives	22
3.	<u>Strategic measures</u>	25
3.1	Whole provider strategic approach	25
3.2	Student consultation	36
3.3	Evaluation strategy	37
3.4	Monitoring progress against delivery of the Plan	45
4.	<u>Provision of information to students</u>	46
	<u>Appendix</u>	46

1. Assessment of performance

At Bloomsbury Institute we pride ourselves on providing disadvantaged and underrepresented students with access to a transformative higher education experience. We recruit students that have the potential, attitude and aspiration to succeed. This is key to us fulfilling our broader vision of offering students from all backgrounds the opportunity to define and pursue success through education.

We currently deliver full-time undergraduate degrees in accounting, business and law that are awarded by the University of Northampton. We do not currently deliver part-time degrees, although full-time students may switch to part-time study in their final year if they have had to extend their studies to retake some modules in order to complete the degree.

We offer 4-year degrees with an integrated foundation year that are critical to our widening participation agenda.

Our student numbers on the 4-year degrees have grown since they were first launched in January 2016, initially under a franchised arrangement and then, in 2016-17, under a validation arrangement. In 2017-18 and 2018-19, 4-year degree students accounted for over 50% of our student body or 73% and 87% of new students, in each respective year.

Table 1: Percentage of students enrolled on a four-year degree with integrated Foundation Year [HESA]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Total Students	1,344	1,282	1,617	2,089
FY Students [studying at Level 0]	231	505	828	1,219
% of FY Students [studying at Level 0]	17%	39%	51%	58%

Table 2: Percentage of new students that enrol on a four-year degree with an integrated Foundation Year [HESA]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Total New Students	888	808	1,033	1,290
New FY Students	194	462	752	1,128
% of New FY Students	22%	57%	73%	87%

From 2020-21, we will only recruit students onto our 4-year degrees, and we will stop recruiting to our 3-year, 2-year accelerated and 1-year top-up degrees.

The rationale for this is to enable us, as a relatively small provider, to focus exclusively on the unique challenges faced by students on our 4-year degrees, and to ensure they are supported effectively from initial enquiry through to graduation to achieve positive success and progression outcomes.

We have based our assessment of performance below on the OfS Access and Participation Dataset supplied to us by the OfS in 2020 [OfS A&PP Data] supplementing this, where necessary, with data from other sources (e.g. the Student Loans Company and HESA), and our own internal data. Consideration has also been given to the OfS National Key Performance Measures (KPMs).

Given our future focus on the 4-year degrees, where possible we have disaggregated the data within the OfS A&PP Data to look at how the performance of our full-time undergraduate students compares to our full-time 4-year degree students.

Note: The data for full-time undergraduate students includes those taking a first degree, including a first degree with an integrated foundation year, and other undergraduate courses such as Higher Nationals and foundation degrees.

1.1 Higher education participation, household income, or socioeconomic status

1.1.1 Access

Access: Full-time undergraduate

We have a low proportion of new students from POLAR4 Quintiles 1 and 2, and we are significantly below the sector level. Throughout the period 2014-15 to 2018-19, the gap has ranged between -85% and -70%.

However, POLAR4 only applies to students who are 18 or 19 years of age when they start higher education. The vast majority of our students are over the age of 21 when they start (between 80% to 91% are mature; see **Section 1.3.1** below).

Table 3: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students by POLAR4 quintiles [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
POLAR4 Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	10	8	7	15	7
POLAR4 Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	90	92	92	85	93
Bloomsbury Institute POLAR4 Difference	-80.0	-83.0	-85.0	-70.0	-85.0
POLAR 4 Q1 and 2: Sector	27.2	27.4	27.5	27.7	27.8
POLAR4 Q3, 4 and 5: Sector	72.8	72.6	72.5	72.3	72.2
Sector POLAR4 Difference	-45.6	-45.2	-45.0	-44.6	-44.4

We have consistently attracted more new students from the most deprived areas (IMD Quintiles 1 and 2) than the least deprived areas (IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5). In 2014-15, new students coming from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 accounted for 76% of our new student intake, representing a gap of +52%. Whilst that gap reduced in subsequent years, there was a positive and substantial differential throughout; in the last year (2018-19) the gap was +27%; the sector gap was -16.7%.

Table 4: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students by IMD quintiles [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	76	67	71	66	63.5
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	24	33	29	34	36.5
Bloomsbury Institute IMD Difference	52	34	42	32	27
IMD Q1 and 2: Sector	39.5	40.1	40.6	41.1	41.6
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Sector	60.5	59.9	59.4	58.9	58.4
Sector IMD Difference	-21.0	-19.8	-18.8	-17.8	-16.7

Given the low number of 18 and 19-year old students that we recruit, it is appropriate to measure the socioeconomic disadvantage of our students based on: (i) IMD measures that apply to all students, irrespective of their age; and (ii) the actual household incomes as verified by the Student Loans Company (SLC):

Table 5: Percentage of students with a household income of £25,000 or below [SLC Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Students with a household income of £25,000 or below excluding those who did not submit means testing information and whose household income would therefore have been unknown.	96%	96%	94.5%	94.3%
Students who did not submit means testing information and therefore their household income was unknown.	9.0%	11.7%	12.5%	13.3%
Students with a household income of £25,000 or below including those who did not submit means testing information and whose household income would therefore have been unknown.	87.7%	84.7%	82.8%	81.8%

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Enrolled students (HESA Data)	1,344	1,282	1,617	2,089
	UK 1,308	UK 1,228	UK 1,562	UK 2,039
	EU 10	EU 38	EU 39	EU 34
	Non-EU 26	Non-EU 16	Non-EU 16	Non-EU 16
Enrolled students funded through SLC	96%	80%	90%	93%

Our contribution at an institution level to narrowing the gap between the most and least represented groups is not accurately reflected when using POLAR4 measures (OfS National KPM 1 is not applicable as we are not a high-tariff provider). The IMD indices and SLC data serve to underline the strength of our success in this area.

Access: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

The IMD data is broadly similar to that for undergraduate students. We have consistently recruited more new students to the 4-year degrees from the most deprived areas (IMD Quintiles 1 and 2) than the least deprived areas (IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5). There has been a positive differential throughout, and in the last year (2018-19) the gap was +26.4%.

With regards to entry qualifications, the majority of new students have entered the 4-year degrees without a Level 3 qualification. In 2017-18, 61.2% of our new students entered the 4-year degrees without a Level 3 qualification, compared to the sector where only 18% entered without a Level 3 qualification [Source: OfS report published in May 2019 (updated in July 2020): *Preparing for degree study – Analysis of access to Higher Education Diplomas and integrated foundation year courses*]. In 2018-19, 79.5% of our new students entered without a Level 3 qualification.

Looking at the split within IMD Quintiles 1 and 2, the vast majority enter without a Level 3 qualification. Although a majority of students coming from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5 also enter without a Level 3 qualification, the differential is not as great.

Table 6: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students by IMD quintiles, and entry qualifications [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	66.3	71.2	65.7	63.2
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	33.7	28.8	34.3	36.8
Bloomsbury Institute IMD Difference	32.7	42.4	31.4	26.4
IMD Q1 and 2: Sector			30.0	
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Sector			70.0	
Sector IMD Difference			-40.0	
Entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	69.3	50.8	61.2	79.5
Entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	30.7	49.2	38.8	20.5
Bloomsbury Institute entry qualifications difference	38.6	1.6	22.5	59.1
Entry without Level 3: Sector			18.0	
Entry with Level 3: Sector			82.0	
Sector entry qualifications difference			-64.0	
IMD Q1 and Q2, and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	49.0	35.4	40.8	49.3
IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	17.3	35.8	24.9	13.9
Bloomsbury Institute entry qualifications difference for IMD Q1 and 2	31.7	-0.4	15.9	35.5
IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	20.3	15.4	20.5	30.2
IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	13.4	13.4	13.9	6.6
Bloomsbury Institute entry qualifications difference for IMD Q3, 4 and 5	6.9	2.0	6.6	23.6

We intend to continue to recruit a majority of our new students from lower income households/IMD Quintiles 1 and 2, with or without Level 3 qualifications.

Access: Monitoring

We have consistently recruited a low proportion of new students from POLAR4 Quintiles 1 and 2, and we are significantly below the sector level. We will monitor this going forward, as follows:

- Each year, as soon as access data becomes available, this will be considered by our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) that will provide a written report to our Senior Management and Leadership Team (SMLT) to include the proportion of new students from POLAR4 Quintiles 1 and 2, as compared to previous years.
- We will continue to strengthen our partnerships with Leyton Sixth Form College and Christ the King College, and we will consider introducing an additional scholarship scheme for 18-year-old and 19-year-old students from POLAR4 Quintiles 1 and 2.

1.1.2 Success

Continuation: Full-time undergraduate

We have no reportable continuation data for students from POLAR4.

The IMD data shows a mixed picture. Whereas the sector continuation rate for students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 is consistently lower than that for Quintiles 3, 4 and 5, our gap has ranged from +4% to -6%. An explanation for this, as discussed in **Section 1.1.1** above, is that although some of our students come from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5, the vast majority of our students have an actual household income of £25,000 or lower which indicates actual deprivation.

Table 7: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (including students who transfer to another institution) by IMD quintiles [OfS A&PP Data]

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	69	68	67	64
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	68	74	63	67
Bloomsbury Institute IMD difference	N/A	1.0	-6.0	4.0	-3.0
IMD Q1 and 2: Sector	88.6	87.4	87.1	87	86.7
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Sector	92.8	92.4	92.3	92.3	92
Sector IMD difference	-4.2	-5.0	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3

Continuation: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

Note: Our continuation rate data in Table 8 excludes students who transferred to another provider at the end of Year 1. Our actual continuation rates will therefore be higher.

We changed from franchised to validated 4-year degrees in 2016-17. Since we moved to validated provision, the continuation rate for students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 is broadly similar to that for students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5.

It is only when entry qualifications are considered that a differential arises, but the differential relates exclusively to whether a student enters with or without a Level 3 qualification, rather than the IMD.

In 2017-18, our internal continuation rate for students who come from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2, and who enter with a Level 3 qualification, is 62.7% compared to 49.2% for students who enter without a Level 3 qualification (a gap of -13.5%).

In 2017-18, our internal continuation rate for students who come from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5, and who enter with a Level 3 qualification, is 62.1% compared to 50.7% for students who enter without a Level 3 qualification (a gap of -11.5%).

The reverse is true for students who started in 2016-17. However, in 2016-17 we had a particular issue with a group of mature students who entered with Ofqual-regulated Level 3 qualifications. These students did not have the knowledge or skills that would have been expected from someone in receipt of such qualifications. This impacted upon the continuation rate and resulted in a change to our admissions policy in terms of the Level 3 qualifications that would be accepted for direct admission onto a 4-year degree (otherwise the applicant would have to go through our admissions assessments and one-to-one interview).

Our own internal data from our HESA returns for 2018-19 and 2019-20, shows an internal continuation rate of 62.0% for students who started a 4-year degree in 2018-19. This internal continuation rate has been calculated by considering the number of students who have continued with us 1 year and 14 days after their start date. This represents a significant improvement and the impact is likely to be due to changes we had made to, *inter alia*, the curriculum and assessment, interventions for at risk students, and enhanced support services. It should also be noted that in this particular year, a larger percentage of students entered without Level 3 qualifications.

Table 8: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (excluding students who transfer to another institution) by IMD quintiles, and entry qualifications [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
IMD Q1 and 2	47.8	53.2	54.3
IMD Q3, 4 and 5	61.8	52.8	55.3
Bloomsbury Institute IMD difference	-14.0	0.4	-1.0
Entry without Level 3	47.1	62.5	49.7
Entry with Level 3	64.5	43.3	62.5
Bloomsbury Institute entry qualifications difference	-17.4	19.2	-12.8
IMD Q1 and 2, and entry without Level 3	44.4	66.7	49.2
IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3	57.1	39.9	62.7
Bloomsbury Institute entry qualifications difference for IMD Q1 and 2	-12.7	26.8	-13.5
IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3	53.7	52.9	50.7
IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3	74.1	52.5	62.1
Bloomsbury Institute entry qualifications difference for IMD Q3, 4 and 5	-20.4	0.4	-11.5

Continuation: Target

Although the 4-year degree data for our validated provision that started in 2016-17 indicates a small continuation rate gap for students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 compared to those from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5, this data excludes students who transferred to another provider at the end of Year 1.

In contrast, the continuation rate gap for full-time undergraduate students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 compared to those from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5 is significant. We will seek to reduce this gap year-on-year and subsequently eliminate it [Target PTS_1].

Implementation of this target will contribute to the OfS National KPM 2.

Attainment: Full-time undergraduate

Over the last two years we have seen a recent decline in the percentage of students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 who achieve a good degree compared to students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5. Having previously had a positive gap in 2014-15 through to 2016-17, the negative gap in 2017-18 (-17%) and 2018-19 (-14%) is above the sector average.

Table 9: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who achieve a good degree (1st Class or Upper 2nd Class) by IMD quintiles [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	80	53	45	53	36

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	70	38	40	70	50
Bloomsbury Institute IMD difference	10.0	15.0	5.0	-17.0	-14.0
IMD Q1 and 2: Sector	66.4	67.5	69.2	70.5	70.5
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Sector	79.1	80	81.4	82.3	82.4
Sector IMD difference	-12.7	-12.5	-12.2	-11.8	-11.9

Attainment: Target

The attainment gap for students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 compared to those from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5 is significant. We will seek to reduce this gap year-on-year and subsequently eliminate it [Target PTS_5].

1.1.3 Progression to employment or further study

We only have data for students who graduated in 2015-16 and 2016-17. The percentage of students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 who progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study is higher than that of students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5, having a positive gap in both 2015-16 (+4.0%) and 2016-17 (+14%).

Table 10: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study by IMD quintiles [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17
IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	49	54
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	45	40
Bloomsbury Institute IMD difference	4.0	14.0
IMD Q1 and Q2: Sector	66.6	69.9
IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Sector	72.4	74.7
Sector IMD difference	-5.8	-4.8

1.2 Black, Asian and minority ethnic students

1.2.1 Access

Access: Full-time undergraduate

But for the last 2 years, we have attracted an ethnically diverse student body with a large number of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students. In 2017-18, however, this was reversed when the majority of our new students were White (a gap of -14%) and this trend continued in 2018-19 (with a gap of -52.2%), which was significantly higher than the sector (-37.4%).

The majority of our BAME new starters have been Black students. In 2014-15, 64% of our new starters were Black students, decreasing to 12.6% in 2018-19. Even though we have had a consistent decline in the number of new Black students year-on-year, we remain ahead of the sector. We have seen a decline in other ethnicities, but it is clearly the significant decline in our recruitment of Black students that has had the primary impact.

There is a negative gap between the percentage of new Asian students compared to new Black students. However, the gap has decreased year-on-year, from -53% in 2014-16, to -19% in 2015-16, -16% in 2016-17, -15% in 2017-18 and -6.2% in 2018-19. This is partially explained by the fact that the percentage of new Asian students increased for three years until 2017-18 (before starting to decrease), whilst that of new Black students decreased year-on-year.

We have a smaller percentage of new students with mixed or other ethnicities.

Table 11: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students by ethnicity [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	82	64	73	43	23.9
White: Bloomsbury Institute	18	36	27	57	76.1
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity difference	64	28	46	-14	-52.2
BAME: Sector	28.4	29.4	30.4	31	31.3
White: Sector	71.6	70.6	69.6	69	68.7
Sector ethnicity difference	-43.2	-41.2	-39.2	-38	-37.4

Table 12: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students by specific ethnicities [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
White: Bloomsbury Institute	18	36	27	57	76.1
White: Sector	71.6	70.6	69.6	69	68.7
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	-53.6	-34.6	-42.6	-12	7.4
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	82	64	73	43	23.9
BAME: Sector	28.4	29.4	30.4	31	31.3
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	53.6	34.6	42.6	12	-7.4
Black: Bloomsbury Institute	64	38	40	26	12.6
Black: Sector	9.8	10.1	10.4	10.5	10.3
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	54.2	27.9	29.6	15.5	2.3
Asian: Bloomsbury Institute	11	19	24	11	6.4
Asian: Sector	12.5	12.9	13.3	13.7	13.9
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	-1.5	6.1	10.7	-2.7	-7.5
Mixed: Bloomsbury Institute	5	4	5	3	2.9
Mixed: Sector	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.9
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-1.8	-2
Other: Bloomsbury Institute	2	3	4	3	2.1
Other: Sector	1.8	1.8	2	2.1	2.2
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	0.2	1.2	2	0.9	-0.1

Access: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

BAME new entrants to our 4-year degrees with an integrated foundation year represented 66.7% of our student body in 2015-16, but this has steadily declined such that only 19.9% were recruited in 2018-19. In 2017-18, the sector recruited 49% BAME students.

We have included in Table 13 below some intersectional data, combining ethnicity with age, and separately with IMD quintiles.

Table 13: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students by ethnicity, and age and IMD quintiles [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	66.7	74.1	32.6	19.9
White: Bloomsbury Institute	33.3	25.9	67.4	80.1
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity difference	33.3	48.3	-34.8	-60.2
BAME: Sector			49.0	
White: Sector			51.0	
Sector ethnicity difference			-2.0	
BAME and Mature: Bloomsbury Institute	55.2	59.7	22.8	14.1
White and Mature: Bloomsbury Institute	28.4	21.7	56.6	69.5
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and age (mature) difference	26.9	38.0	-33.8	-55.5

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
BAME and Young: Bloomsbury Institute	11.4	14.4	9.8	5.8
White and Young: Bloomsbury Institute	5.0	4.1	10.8	10.5
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and age (young) difference	6.5	10.3	-1.0	-4.7
BAME and IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	44.8	57.2	25.1	14.3
White and IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	21.4	14.0	39.8	48.7
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and IMD Q1 and 2 difference	23.4	43.2	-14.7	-34.4
BAME, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	21.9	16.9	7.5	5.6
White, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	11.9	11.9	27.6	31.4
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and IMD Q3 4 and 5 difference	10.0	5.0	-20.1	-25.8

Access: Monitoring

The proportion of new BAME students has been declining year-on-year. We will monitor this going forward, as follows:

- Each year, as soon as access data becomes available, this will be considered by our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) that will provide a written report to our Senior Management and Leadership Team (SMLT) to include the proportion of new BAME students as compared to previous years, and to include disaggregated ethnicities.

1.2.2 Success

Continuation: Full-time undergraduate

The continuation rate for White students has been consistently above that for BAME students, and generally above the sector differential. The gap has varied between -12% and -3%.

We have undertaken an analysis for specific ethnicities compared to the sector, and it is apparent from this that all ethnicities (other than Asian students in 2017-18) have a negative gap compared to White students.

The continuation rate for Black students decreased from 69% in 2015-16 to 62% in 2017-18. Against all other ethnicities, the continuation rate for Black students was consistently higher than that for all other BAME students, except for 2017-18 when there was a -2% gap. The continuation rate for Asian students has been consistently lower than that for Black students, except for 2017-18 when it was higher (a gap of +8%), and as stated above it was also higher than that for White students (a gap of +1%).

The continuation rate for students with mixed or other ethnicities was higher than that for both Black students and Asian students in 2015-16 (a gap of +1% and +11% respectively with regards to Black students, and a gap of +7% and +17% respectively with regards to Asian students) and 2016-17 (a gap of +8% and +13% respectively with regards to Black students, and a gap of +17% and +22% respectively with regards to Asian students), before decreasing in 2017-18 to be lower (a gap of -2% for both with regards to Black students, and a gap of -10% for both with regards to Asian students).

Table 14: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (including students who transfer to another institution) by ethnicity [OfS A&PP Data]

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	66	68	66	64
White: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	78	75	69	69
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity difference	N/A	-12.0	-7.0	-3.0	-5.0
BAME: Sector	90.1	88.7	88.5	88.2	87.7
White: Sector	91.8	91.4	91.3	91.3	91.1
Sector ethnicity difference	-1.7	-2.7	-2.8	-3.1	-3.4

Table 15: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (including students who transfer to another institution) by specific ethnicities [OfS A&PP Data]

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
White: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	78	75	69	69
White: Sector	91.8	91.4	91.3	91.3	91.1
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	-13.4	-16.3	-22.3	-22.1
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	66	68	66	64
BAME: Sector	90.1	88.7	88.5	88.2	87.7
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	-22.7	-20.5	-22.2	-23.7
Black: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	69	69	67	62
Black: Sector	87.7	86	85.2	85.1	84.5
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	-17.0	-16.2	-18.1	-22.5
Asian: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	55	63	58	70
Asian: Sector	92	90.7	90.8	90.3	89.8
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	-35.7	-27.8	-32.3	-19.8
Mixed: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	55	70	75	60
Mixed: Sector	89.9	89.2	89.1	88.9	89
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	-34.2	-19.1	-13.9	-29.0
Other: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	DP	80	80	60
Other: Sector	90.2	88.8	88.2	88.4	87.6
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	N/A	-8.2	-8.4	-27.6

Continuation: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

The gap in continuation rates between BAME and White students is even greater than that for undergraduate students.

We have included in Table 16 below some intersectional data, combining ethnicity with age, and separately with IMD quintiles.

Table 16: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (excluding students who transfer to another institution) by ethnicity, and age and IMD quintiles [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
BAME	91.4	49.3	50.3	44.7
White	100.0	59.7	61.9	61.5
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity difference	-8.6	-10.4	-11.6	-16.8
BAME and Mature	90.3	54.1	47.1	46.2
White and Mature	100.0	63.2	64.2	63.5
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and age (mature) difference	-9.7	-9.1	-17.1	-17.3
BAME and Young	100.0	26.1	63.5	41.2
White and Young	0.0	40.0	50.0	50.7
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and age (young) difference	N/A	-13.9	13.5	-9.5
BAME and IMD Q1 and 2	96.6	46.7	50.4	44.8
White and IMD Q1 and 2	100.0	51.2	65.6	62.3
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and IMD Q1 and 2 difference	-3.4	-4.5	-15.2	-17.5
BAME, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5	66.7	54.5	50.0	44.2
White, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5	100.0	75.0	57.7	60.2
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity and IMD Q3, 4 and 5 difference	-33.3	-20.5	-7.7	-16.0

Continuation: Target

Although the proportion of BAME new students and Black new students has decreased, there is a significant negative continuation rate gap for BAME students as a collective, and for Black students separately that we will seek to reduce year-on-year and subsequently eliminate [Targets PTS_2 and PTS_3].

Implementation of these targets will contribute to the OfS National KPM 2.

Attainment: Full-time undergraduate

In 2014-15 attainment rates for BAME students stood at 65% (similar to the sector level, but representing a -20% gap between our White and BAME students). Following a significant drop in 2015-16 to 47% (although there was a positive gap of + 3 compared to White students), we saw a gradual upward trend in the subsequent two years, reaching 55% in 2017-18 (although there was a -15% gap compared to White students) before dropping again to 35% in 2018-19 (with a negative gap of -15% compared to White students).

The BAME student population was made up exclusively of Black students, in all but one year, 2016-17. This is because there is no data for other ethnicities. In this one year for which data is available (2016-17), the attainment of Asian students was lower than that of Black students, with a gap of -30%. However, in that particular year, the attainment of White students was similarly lower than that of Black students, the attainment gap also being -30%.

Table 17: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who achieve a good degree (1st Class or Upper 2nd Class) by ethnicity [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	65	47	51	55	35
White: Bloomsbury Institute	85	44	30	70	50
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity difference	-20.0	3.0	21.0	-15.0	-15.0
BAME: Sector	64.3	64.9	67.2	68.8	68.9
White: Sector	78.9	79.9	81.1	82	82.2
Sector ethnicity difference	-14.6	-15.0	-13.9	-13.2	-13.3

Table 18: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who achieve a good degree (1st Class or Upper 2nd Class) by specific ethnicities [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
White: Bloomsbury Institute	85	44	30	70	50
White: Sector	78.9	79.9	81.1	82	82.2
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	6.1	-35.9	-51.1	-12.0	-32.2
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	65	47	51	55	35
BAME: Sector	64.3	64.9	67.2	68.8	68.9
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	0.7	-17.9	-16.2	-13.8	-33.9
Black: Bloomsbury Institute	65	45	60	52	35
Black: Sector	54.3	55.2	57.3	58.9	60.1
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	10.7	-10.2	2.7	-6.9	-25.1
Asian: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	N	30	N	N
Asian: Sector	67.3	67.9	70.6	71.8	71.4
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	N/A	-40.6	N/A	N/A
Mixed: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP	N	DP	DP
Mixed: Sector	73.5	73.4	75.3	78	77.4
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP	N	DP	DP
Other: Sector	65.4	66.4	68.1	68.8	67.9

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Attainment: Target

Although the proportion of BAME new students and Black new students has decreased, it is clear that targets must be set to ensure the attainment gaps are reduced for BAME students as a collective, and for Black students separately. We will seek to reduce the attainment gaps year-on-year and subsequently eliminate them [Targets PTS_6 and PTS_7].

Implementation of target PTS_6 will contribute to the OfS National KPM 3.

1.2.3 Progression to employment or further study

We only have data for students who graduated in 2015-16 and 2016-17. The gap between our BAME students and White students is positive (+17% and +1% respectively).

In both years, Black students have had a higher progression rate than White students (a gap of +21% and +6% respectively).

We only have disaggregated ethnicity data for 2016-17, and only for Black students and Asian students. This data indicates that Asian students had a lower progression rate than Black students, a gap of -16%.

Table 19: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study by ethnicity [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	54	51
White: Bloomsbury Institute	37	50
Bloomsbury Institute ethnicity difference	17.0	1.0
BAME: Sector	67.1	70.1
White: Sector	71.6	74
Sector ethnicity difference	-4.5	-3.9

Table 20: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study by specific ethnicities [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17
White: Bloomsbury Institute	37	50
White: Sector	71.6	74
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	-34.6	-24.0
BAME: Bloomsbury Institute	54	51
BAME: Sector	67.1	70.1
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	-13.1	-19.1
Black: Bloomsbury Institute	58	56
Black: Sector	65.9	69.3
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	-7.9	-13.3
Asian: Bloomsbury Institute	N	40
Asian: Sector	67.2	70.2
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	-30.2
Mixed: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	N
Mixed: Sector	68.9	71.1
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	N/A
Other: Bloomsbury Institute	R	N

	2015-16	2016-17
Other: Sector	67.5	70.1
Difference between Bloomsbury Institute and the Sector	N/A	N/A

Progression: Monitoring

Based on the one year of available data for Asian students, we have a low proportion of such students that progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study. We will monitor this going forward, as follows:

- Each year, as soon as progression data becomes available through the new Graduate Outcomes survey, this will be considered by our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) that will provide a written report to our Senior Management and Leadership Team (SMLT) to include the proportion of Asian students that progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study as compared to previous years, and also to include disaggregated ethnicities.

1.3 Mature students

1.3.1 Access

Access: Full-time undergraduate

The data shows that we have consistently attracted more mature students than young students, the gap being between +60% and +82%.

Table 21: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students by age [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Mature: Bloomsbury Institute	91	88	82	80	82
Young: Bloomsbury Institute	9	12	18	20	18
Bloomsbury Institute age difference	82	76	64	60	64
Mature: Sector	26.4	27.1	27.6	27.9	29.4
Young: Sector	73.6	72.9	72.4	72.1	70.6
Sector age difference	-47.2	-45.8	-44.8	-44.2	-41.2

Access: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

It is a similar story for the 4-year degrees, with the gap between mature and young being between +58.8% and +66.8%. This compares with the sector that had a negative gap of -22% [Source: OfS report published in May 2019 (updated in July 2020): *Preparing for degree study – Analysis of access to Higher Education Diplomas and integrated foundation year courses*].

We have included in Table 22 below some intersectional data, combining age with IMD quintiles, separately with entry qualifications, and also with IMD quintiles and entry qualifications combined.

Table 22: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students by age, and IMD quintiles and entry qualifications [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Mature: Bloomsbury Institute	83.2	81.4	79.4	83.4
Young: Bloomsbury Institute	16.8	18.6	20.6	16.6
Bloomsbury Institute age difference	66.3	62.8	58.8	66.8
Mature: Sector			39.0	
Young: Sector			61.0	
Sector age difference			-22.0	
Mature, and IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	54.5	58.5	51.8	52.5

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Young, and IMD Q1 and 2: Bloomsbury Institute	11.9	12.7	13.9	10.6
Bloomsbury Institute age, and IMD Q1 and 2 difference	42.6	45.8	38.0	41.9
Mature, and IMD Q1 and 2: Sector			70.0	
Young, and IMD Q1 and 2: Sector			30.0	
Sector age, and IMD Q1 and 2 difference			40.0	
Mature, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	28.7	22.9	27.6	30.8
Young, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5: Bloomsbury Institute	5.0	5.9	6.7	6.0
Bloomsbury Institute age, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5 difference	23.8	17.0	20.9	24.8
Mature and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	56.4	37.9	47.8	66.2
Young and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	12.9	12.9	13.5	13.3
Bloomsbury Institute age, and entry without Level 3 difference	43.6	24.9	34.3	52.9
Mature and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	26.7	43.5	31.6	17.2
Young and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	4.0	5.7	7.1	3.3
Bloomsbury Institute age, and entry with Level 3 difference	22.8	37.9	24.5	13.9
Mature, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	38.6	26.1	31.8	41.2
Young, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	10.4	9.3	9.0	8.1
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q1 and 2, and entry without Level 3 difference	28.2	16.8	22.7	33.1
Mature, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	17.8	11.8	16.0	25.0
Young, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	2.5	3.6	4.4	5.2
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3 difference	15.3	8.2	11.6	19.8
Mature, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	15.8	32.4	20.1	11.3
Young, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	1.5	3.4	4.8	2.5
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3 difference	14.4	29.0	15.2	8.8
Mature, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	10.9	11.1	11.6	5.8
Young, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3: Bloomsbury Institute	2.5	2.3	2.3	0.8
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3 difference	8.4	8.8	9.3	5.0

1.3.2 Success

Continuation: Full-time undergraduate

In all years except 2017-18 (where there was a -1% gap), the continuation rate for mature students has been equal to or higher than that for young students.

Table 23: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (including students who transfer to another institution) by age [OfS A&PP Data]

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Mature: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	71	70	66	65
Young: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	51	66	66	66

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Bloomsbury Institute age difference	N/A	20	4	0	-1
Mature: Sector	85.9	85.3	85.1	85	84
Young: Sector	92.7	92.3	92.1	92.2	92.1
Sector age difference	-6.8	-7	-7	-7.2	-8.1

Continuation: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

It is a similar story for the 4-year degrees, with the exception of 2016-17 when there was a gap of -8.2%. However, as previously explained at **Section 1.1.2** above, in 2016-17 we had a particular issue with a group of mature students who entered with Ofqual-regulated Level 3 qualifications. These students did not have the knowledge or skills that would have been expected from someone in receipt of such qualifications. This impacted upon the continuation rates of our mature students and resulted in a change to our admissions policy in terms of the Level 3 qualifications that would be accepted for direct admission onto a 4-year degree (otherwise the applicant would have to go through our admissions assessments and one-to-one interview).

We have included in Table 24 below some intersectional data, combining age with IMD quintiles, separately with entry qualifications, and also with IMD quintiles and entry qualifications combined.

Table 24: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (excluding students who transfer to another institution) by age, and IMD quintiles and entry qualifications [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Mature	57.1	51.5	57.1
Young	29.4	59.8	45.1
Bloomsbury Institute age difference	27.7	-8.2	12.0
Mature, and IMD Q1 and 2	51.8	50.8	56.9
Young, and IMD Q1 and 2	29.2	64.3	44.7
Bloomsbury Institute age, and IMD Q1 and 2 difference	22.7	-13.5	12.2
Mature, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5	67.2	53.5	57.6
Young, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5	30.0	50.0	46.0
Bloomsbury Institute age, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5 difference	37.2	3.5	11.6
Mature and entry without Level 3	50.9	62.9	51.8
Young and entry without Level 3	30.8	61.4	42.0
Bloomsbury Institute age, and entry without Level 3 difference	20.1	1.5	9.8
Mature and entry with Level 3	70.4	41.7	65.1
Young and entry with Level 3	25.0	56.0	50.9
Bloomsbury Institute age, and entry with Level 3 difference	45.4	-14.3	14.2
Mature, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry without Level 3	47.4	66.1	51.3
Young, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry without Level 3	33.3	68.3	41.8
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q1 and 2, and entry without Level 3 difference	14.1	-2.2	9.5
Mature, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3	58.3	55.8	52.9
Young, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3	20.0	43.8	42.4
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry without Level 3 difference	38.3	12.0	10.5
Mature, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3	62.5	38.5	65.8
Young, and IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3	0.0	53.3	50.0
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q1 and 2, and entry with Level 3 difference	62.5	-14.9	15.8
Mature, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3	81.8	51.0	64.0
Young, and IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3	40.0	60.0	52.9
Bloomsbury Institute age, IMD Q3, 4 and 5, and entry with Level 3 difference	41.8	-9.0	11.0

Continuation: Monitoring

The continuation rate for mature students has been declining year-on-year. We will monitor this going forward, as follows:

- Each year, as soon as continuation rate data becomes available, this will be considered by our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) that will provide a written report to our Senior Management and Leadership Team (SMLT) to include the continuation rate for mature students as compared to previous years.

Attainment: Full-time undergraduate

We have no publishable attainment data for young students in order to make a comparison.

The proportion of our mature students achieving a good degree has varied between 42% to 75%. They have performed less well than the sector in all years except 2014-15. There was a sharp drop in 2015-16 to 46%, and a further decrease in 2016-17 to 42% whilst rates at a sector level moved gradually in the opposite direction. We saw a more marked increase in attainment rates in 2017-18, before a decrease in 2018-19.

Table 25: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who achieve a good degree (1st Class or Upper 2nd Class) by age [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Mature: Bloomsbury Institute	75	46	42	55	42
Young: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP	N	N	N
Bloomsbury Institute age difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mature: Sector	66.6	67.6	68.6	70	70.3
Young: Sector	76.9	77.8	79.4	80.2	80.2
Sector age difference	-10.3	-10.2	-10.8	-10.2	-9.9

1.3.3 Progression to employment or further study

We have no publishable data for young students, and we only have publishable data for 2015-16 and 2016-17 for mature students. However, the latter shows that progression rates for our mature students are significantly lower than sector rates: 48% and 50% respectively, compared with 73.1% and 75.7% respectively.

Table 26: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students who progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study by age [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17
Mature: Bloomsbury Institute	48	50
Young: Bloomsbury Institute	R	N
Bloomsbury Institute age difference	N/A	N/A
Mature: Sector	73.1	75.7
Young: Sector	69.7	72.3
Sector age difference	3.4	3.4

1.4 Students with a disability

1.4.1 Access

Access: Full-time undergraduate degree

The proportion of our new entrants with a disability has broadly mirrored the picture seen at a sector level, except in 2018-19 when our proportion of new students with a disability dropped significantly to 5.8%.

The disaggregated data shows that a higher proportion of our students with a disability declare multiple impairments. The decline in 2018-19 of the total proportion of students with a disability is most significant for those with multiple impairments (a 3.8% decrease compared to 2017-18), whereas for those with a mental health there was a slight increase of 0.3% compared to 2017-18. Students with a mental health condition has remained relatively constant at between 1 and 2%, whereas at a sector level there has been a year-on-year increase, with 5.7% declaring a mental health condition in 2018-19 (compared to 1.3% of our students). Obviously, those with multiple impairments could also have a mental health condition.

Table 27: Percentage of full-time first degree students with a disability [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Disabled: Bloomsbury Institute	12	11	13	11	5.8
No Known Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	88	89	87	89	94.2
Bloomsbury Institute disability difference	-76	-78	-74	-78	-88.4
Disabled: Sector	12.3	12.9	13.7	14.6	15.8
No Known Disability: Sector	87.7	87.1	86.3	85.4	84.2
Sector disability difference	-75.4	-74.2	-72.6	-70.8	-68.4

Cognitive and Learning: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	1	1	1	0.5
Mental Health: Bloomsbury Institute	1	1	2	1	1.3
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Bloomsbury Institute	3	4	3	3	1.8
Multiple Impairments: Bloomsbury Institute	8	4	7	6	2.2

Cognitive and Learning: Sector	6.2	6	5.8	5.6	5.7
Mental Health: Sector	1.9	2.5	3.1	3.8	4.6
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Sector	1.9	2	2.1	2.2	2.2
Multiple Impairments: Sector	1.9	2	2.2	2.4	2.6

Access: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

It is a similar story for the 4-year degrees for new entrants with a disability. The sector has a higher proportion of students with a disability [Source: OfS report published in May 2019 (updated in July 2020): *Preparing for degree study – Analysis of access to Higher Education Diplomas and integrated foundation year courses*].

Table 28: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students with a disability [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	8.4	8.8	8.2	4.3
No Known Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	91.6	91.2	91.8	95.7
Bloomsbury Institute disability difference	-83.2	-82.3	-83.6	-91.4
Disability: Sector			14.0	
No Known Disability: Sector			86.0	
Sector disability difference			-72.0	

Cognitive and Learning: Bloomsbury Institute	1.0	0.2	0.7	0.2
Mental Health: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	2.5	1.2	0.9
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Bloomsbury Institute	2	2	2.4	1.7
Multiple Impairments: Bloomsbury Institute	5.4	4.1	3.9	1.5

Access: Monitoring

The proportion of new students with a disability fell significantly in 2018-19. We will monitor this going forward, as follows:

- Each year, as soon as access data becomes available, this will be considered by our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) that will provide a written report to our Senior Management and Leadership Team (SMLT) to include the proportion of new students with a disability as compared to previous years, and to include disaggregated disabilities.

1.4.2 Success

Continuation: Full-time undergraduate

Our continuation rate for students with a disability, compared to students with no known disability, has been variable, the gap being positive in 2016-17 (+11%) and then negative in 2018-19 (-14%).

We have limited disaggregated data. This shows that the continuation rate for students with multiple impairments was higher compared to students with no known disability in 2014-15 and 2016-17 (the gap being +19% and +20% respectively), whereas it was lower in 2015-16 and 2017-18 (the gap being -5% and -7% respectively). The only other data we have is for students who declare a sensory, medical or physical condition for whom the continuation rate in 2015-16 was equal to that for students with no known disability, but was significantly lower in 2017-18 (the gap being -17%).

Table 29: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students with a disability who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (including students who transfer to another institution) [OfS A&PP Data]

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	86	69	76	53
No Known Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	66	70	65	67
Bloomsbury Institute disability difference	N/A	20	-1	11	-14
Disability: Sector	89.9	89.7	89.4	89.4	89.4
No Known Disability: Sector	91.2	90.6	90.4	90.4	90
Sector disability difference	-1.3	-0.9	-1	-1	-0.6

Cognitive and Learning: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	DP	DP	DP	N
Mental Health: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	DP	N	N	N
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	N	70	N	50
Multiple Impairments: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	85	65	85	60

Cognitive and Learning: Sector	92.3	92.2	92	92.4	92.4
Mental Health: Sector	86.6	87.1	87.3	87.7	87.9
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Sector	90.4	90.7	90	90	89.8
Multiple Impairments: Sector	90.2	89.8	88.7	89.4	89.6

Continuation: Full-time 4-year degree with integrated foundation year

It is a similar story for the 4-year degrees, with the continuation rate for students with a disability, compared to students with no known disability, having a positive gap in 2016-17 (3.7%) and then negative in 2017-18 (-22%).

Table 30: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students with a disability who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (excluding students who transfer to another institution) [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Disability	47.1	56.4	34.4
No Known Disability	53.0	52.7	56.5
Bloomsbury Institute disability difference	-5.9	3.7	-22.0
Cognitive and Learning: Bloomsbury Institute	0	100	0
Mental Health: Bloomsbury Institute	N/A	27.3	22.2

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Bloomsbury Institute	50	88.9	50
Multiple Impairments: Bloomsbury Institute	54.5	55.6	34.5

Continuation: Target

We have a significant negative continuation rate gap for students with a disability. We will seek to reduce the gap year-on-year and subsequently eliminate it [Target PTS_4].

Implementation of this target will contribute to the OfS National KPM 2.

Attainment: Full-time undergraduate

We only have publishable attainment data on students with a disability for 2016-17 and 2017-18. It is interesting to note that in 2016-17, the proportion of our students achieving a good degree was higher for students with a disability than for those without a disability (a gap of 19%), thus contributing significantly towards OfS National KPM 4. There was, however, a reversal in outcomes in 2017-18 with a higher proportion of our students without a disability obtaining a good degree than those with a disability (a gap of -4%).

We have no disaggregated data.

Table 31: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students with a disability who achieve a good degree (1st Class or Upper 2nd Class) [OfS A&PP Data]

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	N	N	60	55	N
No Known Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	75	46	41	59	41
Bloomsbury Institute disability difference	N/A	N/A	19	-4	N/A
Disability: Sector	72.3	73.4	74.7	75.9	76.2
No Known Disability: Sector	75.4	76.2	77.7	78.7	78.7
Sector disability difference	-3.1	-2.8	-3	-2.8	-2.5

Cognitive and Learning: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP	DP	DP	DP
Mental Health: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP	DP	DP	DP
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	N	N	DP	N
Multiple Impairments: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP	N	N	N

Cognitive and Learning: Sector	70.5	71.7	73	74.7	74.6
Mental Health: Sector	74.2	76.2	77	76.8	77.2
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Sector	71.4	74.2	74.1	76.3	74.8
Multiple Impairments: Sector	73.8	72.8	74.5	74.6	77.2

Attainment: Target

It is clear that a target must be set to ensure the attainment gap is reduced for students with a disability. We will seek to reduce the attainment gap year-on-year and subsequently eliminate it [Target PTS_8].

Implementation of this target will contribute to the OfS National KPM 4.

1.4.3 Progression to employment or further study

We only have data for students who graduated in 2015-16 and 2016-17. At a sector level, progression outcomes for students with a disability are only marginally lower than those students with no known disability. However, the publishable data we have (albeit from only the last two years) shows that a larger proportion of our students with a disability have progressed than those students with no known disability.

We only have disaggregated data for one year (2015-16) and only for students with multiple impairments. Such students out-performed students with no known disability, the gap being +32%.

Table 32: Percentage of full-time undergraduate students with a disability who progress to highly skilled employment or postgraduate study [OfS A&PP Data]

	2015-16	2016-17
Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	65	60
No Known Disability: Bloomsbury Institute	43	48
Bloomsbury Institute disability difference	22	12
Disability: Sector	68.9	71.5
No Known Disability: Sector	70.7	73.3
Sector disability difference	-1.8	-1.8

Cognitive and Learning: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP
Mental Health: Bloomsbury Institute	DP	DP
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Bloomsbury Institute	N	R
Multiple Impairments: Bloomsbury Institute	75	N

Cognitive and Learning: Sector	69.2	72.4
Mental Health: Sector	64	68.9
Sensory, Medical and Physical: Sector	68	70.1
Multiple Impairments: Sector	69	71.1

1.5 Care leavers

There is no data available for care leavers, and we have not captured internal data for care leavers.

We have now made this a reportable field at the point of application, and therefore once we resume recruitment of new students, we will be able to use our own internal data.

We are aware that care leavers are an OfS priority area for access to higher education. 40% of care leavers aged 19-21 are unemployed, and only 7% enter higher education¹.

Once we resume recruitment, we will monitor the number of care leavers to ascertain whether we should introduce a strategic measure to increase access.

We will also monitor the success and progression outcomes of any care leavers who we recruit to ascertain whether we need to introduce any strategic measures related to access.

1.6 Intersections of disadvantage

We have included intersections of disadvantage within **Sections 1.1 to 1.4** above.

1.7 Other groups who experience barriers in higher education

1.7.1 Ex-offenders

We are already ahead of the sector with regards to the admission of students with criminal convictions. We believe strongly in the right of people from all backgrounds (regardless of any 'bad cards life may have dealt them' hitherto) to access higher education. In the interest of social justice and equity and in order not to deter an applicant with a criminal conviction from making an application, from 2018-19 entry onwards we removed the requirement for applicants to disclose previous criminal convictions. This decision, that was made by our Academic Committee (whose membership includes student representatives), was supported by international research.

¹ Care Leaver Covenant (2016), Department for Education. Available at: <https://mycovenant.org.uk/>

1.7.2 Other groups

We have not included within this Plan other marginalised groups such as people estranged from their families, and children from military families as we do not currently capture information on them. However, going forward we will be introducing changes to our systems to enable us to record and track their progress. As regards children from military families, we have signed up to the Armed Services Covenant. Whilst we do currently capture data on people from Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, numbers are such that they fall below publishable thresholds.

2. Strategic aims and objectives

From 2020-21, we will only recruit students onto our validated 4-year degrees with an integrated foundation year, and we will stop recruiting to our 3-year, 2-year accelerated and 1-year top-up degrees.

The rationale for offering 4-year degrees varies from provider to provider. For some, the rationale is to provide a pathway for young students who did not obtain the requisite UCAS tariff points to enrol on their preferred course. Our rationale is to provide an opportunity for students who may struggle to enter higher education.

As set out in **Section 1** above, our students are typically mature and without traditional qualifications, who are from low-income households and who may have other underrepresented and disadvantaged characteristics. In 2018-19, 87% of our new students enrolled on a 4-year degree (the remaining 13% enrolled on a 2-year or 3-year degree) [Source: HESA]. In 2018-19, the vast majority of our new 4-year degree students were from a low-income household [Source: SLC], 83.4% were mature and 79.5% were admitted without a Level 3 qualification [Source OfS A&PP Data]. This compares to the sector where 39% were mature and 18% were admitted without a Level 3 qualification [Source: OfS report published in May 2019 (updated in July 2020): *Preparing for degree study – Analysis of access to Higher Education Diplomas and integrated foundation year courses*].

We achieved this at the same time as we expanded the number of new students on our 4-year degrees, from 462 full-time students in 2016-17 to 1,128 in 2018-19, representing a 144% increase [Source: HESA]. This clearly demonstrates that our 4-year degree provision promotes equality of opportunity for underrepresented students, including those without a Level 3 qualification.

The foundation year, although part of a 4-year degree, is classified as Level 0. Our foundation year comprises four 30-credit modules. Three of the modules are designed to equip students with the academic and soft skills needed to succeed in higher education. The fourth module is discipline specific (Introduction to Business, Law or Accounting). Students exit our foundation year at Level 3, so they are ready to progress to the Level 4 modules, Level 4 being the first stage of a traditional undergraduate degree.

By only recruiting students onto our 4-year degrees, as a relatively small provider we will be able to focus exclusively on the unique challenges faced by our students, and to ensure they are supported effectively from initial enquiry through to graduation to achieve positive success and progression outcomes.

This is something that we strategically plan for, implement, monitor and evaluate as part of our overall commitment to social mobility, student wellbeing and success. Driving this widening participation agenda is our Strategic Framework 2019-22 which seeks to embrace students with potential, enhance the student experience, and improve student outcomes.

The diverse nature of our academic community is valued as an important asset to the educational experience we provide. The insights and learning of our graduates, educated in the midst of this diversity, is, we recognise, one of the important contributions we can make to society. It is through our students therefore that we aspire to break down barriers to social mobility and, thereby, enrich the society in which we live.

While we recognise the deficit model, we do not subscribe to it². Our ambition is to raise and help realise the ambitions of our students by deconstructing the limited aspirations many have and encouraging them to see beyond the injustices that have restricted their lives and ambitions. We see the raising of aspirations and the empowerment of students to build rewarding careers as a central component of the education and experience we offer. Supporting students on their academic journey and in their personal development is key to the above ambitions.

In **Section 2.1** below we specify the groups that we will target to reduce and/or eliminate the gaps in performance identified in **Section 1** above. We set out our aims and objectives, to reduce and/or eliminate these gaps, in **Section 2.2** below. The main strategic measures (and the associated programmes) that we will implement in order to achieve our aims and objectives are set out in **Section 3.1.2** below.

2.1 Target groups

We will seek to improve the continuation rate for all students through developments to our curriculum, assessment, interventions strategy and support services (see **Section 3.1.2 Continuation and attainment** below). We will also seek to improve the progression rate for all students through the implementation of our new Let's Grow programme (see **Section 3.1.2 Progression** below).

Our specific target groups are as follows:

Target No	Target Group	Student Lifecycle	Rationale	OfS National KPM
PTS_1 PTS_5	Students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2	Success (Continuation rates and attainment)	Continuation rate gap between students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2, and students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5 is -3% (2017-18). Attainment gap between students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2, and students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5 is -14% (2018-19).	KPM2 N/A
PTS_2 PTS_6	BAME students	Success (Continuation rates and attainment)	Continuation rate gap between White and BAME students is -5% (2017-18). Attainment gap between White and BAME students is -15% (2018-19).	KPM2 N/A
PTS_3 PTS_7	Black students	Success (Continuation rates and attainment)	Continuation rate gap between White and Black students is -7% (2017-18). Attainment gap between White and BAME students is -15% (2018-19).	KPM2 KPM3
PTS_4 PTS_8	Disabled students	Success (Continuation rates and attainment)	Continuation rate gap between students with a disability and students without a disability is -14% (2017-18). Attainment gap between students with a disability and students without a disability is -4% (2017-18).	KPM2 KPM4

2.2 Aims and objectives

We set out our aims and objectives below. Set out in **Section 3.1.2** below are the main strategic measures (and the associated programmes) we will implement in order to achieve the aims and objectives.

² See, for example, Reynolds, C. (2019) 'A brief reflection on the implication of 'deficit model' considerations within foundation year provision', *Journal of the Foundation Year Network*, Volume 2, 53-58.

					Milestones				
Target No	Aim	Objective	Target group	Baseline	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
PTS_1	Eliminate continuation rate gap for students from <u>IMD Quintiles 1 and 2</u> [OfS KPM 2]	Progressively reduce continuation rate gap year-on-year No continuation rate gap for students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 (compared to students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5) who start in 2024-25	Socio-economic	3% [OfS A&PP: 2017-18]	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%
PTS_2	Eliminate continuation rate gap for <u>BAME</u> students [OfS KPM 2]	Progressively reduce continuation rate gap year-on-year No continuation rate gap for BAME students (compared to White students) who start in 2024-25	Ethnicity	5% [OfS A&PP: 2017-18]	4%	3%	2%	1%	0%
PTS_3	Eliminate continuation rate gap for <u>Black</u> students [OfS KPM 2]	Progressively reduce continuation rate gap year-on-year No continuation rate gap for Black students (compared to White students) who start in 2024-25	Ethnicity	7% [OfS A&PP: 2017-18]	6%	4%	2%	1%	0%
PTS_4	Eliminate continuation rate gap for <u>students with a disability</u> [OfS KPM 2]	Progressively reduce continuation rate gap year-on-year No continuation rate gap for students with a disability (compared to students without	Disability	14% [OfS A&PP: 2017-18]	11%	8%	5%	2%	0%

Target No	Aim	Objective	Target group	Baseline	Milestones				
					Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
		a disability) who start in 2024-25							
PTS_5	Eliminate attainment gap for students from <u>IMD Quintiles 1 and 2</u>	Progressively reduce attainment gap year-on-year No attainment gap for students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 (compared to students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5) who graduate in 2024-25	Socio-economic	14% [OfS A&PP: 2018-19]	12%	10%	8%	3%	0%
PTS_6	Eliminate attainment gap for <u>BAME</u> students	Progressively reduce attainment gap year-on-year No attainment gap for BAME students (compared to White students) who graduate in 2024-25	Ethnicity	15% [OfS A&PP: 2018-19]	12%	10%	8%	3%	0%
PTS_7	Eliminate attainment gap for <u>Black</u> students [OfS KPM 3]	Progressively reduce attainment gap year-on-year No attainment gap for Black students (compared to White students) who graduate in 2024-25	Ethnicity	15% [OfS A&PP: 2018-19]]	12%	10%	8%	3%	0%
PTS_8	Eliminate attainment gap for <u>students with a disability</u> [OfS KPM 4]	Progressively reduce attainment gap year-on-year No attainment gap for students with a disability (compared to students without a disability) who	Disability	4% [OfS A&PP: 2017-18]	3%	2%	1%	0%	0%

Target No	Aim	Objective	Target group	Baseline	Milestones				
					Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
		graduate in 2024-25							

3. Strategic measures

3.1 Whole provider strategic approach

3.1.1 Overview and alignment with other strategies

Our Strategic Framework 2019-22 sets out seven Goals. Some of these seven goals relate to Access (Goal 1), Success (Goals 2 and 3) and Progression (Goal 4). The Success and Progression Goals are as follows:

- Goal 2: To bring academic potential to life: We invest in each student to identify and maximise their academic potential. We nurture students to be confident and independent learners and we are committed to giving them every opportunity to ensure they can engage, progress and graduate.
- Goal 3: To deliver high-quality education: We offer courses in accounting, business and law that have PSRB recognition. Our experienced lecturers deliver challenging and engaging modules that are highly relevant to the new graduate working environment.
- Goal 4: To create opportunities: We create opportunities for students to build their networks and engage with inspiring thinkers, innovative leaders and sector specific experts. Our academic and enhancement activities lead to personal growth, individual success and community impact.

The Goals are sub-divided into Sub-goals. The Sub-goals are further sub-divided into Divisional/Departmental Actions that will be implemented, cross-institutionally, during the subsequent 12-month period.

For example, Goal 3, Sub-goal 3.4 provides that ‘Our course design, content and delivery will reflect sector trends, and disciplinary innovation’. This Sub-goal includes 5 actions, the first (A3.4-1) provides that ‘We will continue to review our curriculum from an inclusivity perspective’, the action lead being the Academic Division.

Our Strategic Framework aligns closely with our Access and Participation Plan, drawing on the assessment of performance in **Section 1** of this Plan, with both working to deliver change based on an understanding of our student body – not as a collective, but as individuals - and our ambitions for each of them.

Complementing the employability-related actions set out within the Strategic Framework, we have developed a new Let’s Grow programme, that brings together current and new employability-related initiatives, that we will roll out from September 2020 (see **Section 3.1.2** below).

Closely aligned to our Access and Participation Plan is our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy the implementation of which is driven through our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC). The EDIC’s membership includes the President of our Student Guild and provision for up to 6 additional student representatives, one of whom is currently Lead for our Student Guild’s Equality Society.

It is the EDIC which is responsible for developing and recommending approval to our SMLT (that in turn recommends approval to our Board of Directors) of this and all subsequent Access and Participation Plans. The EDIC also plays a role in monitoring the implementation of the strategic measures.

Contributing to the work of the EDIC and informing our strategic approach to equality is our newly formed Widening Participation Forum. This Forum is designed to act as a catalyst for research on widening participation topics, evidence the impact of widening participation focused initiatives and prompt evidence-based need for new initiatives.

3.1.2 Strategic measures

Set out below are the main strategic measures (and associated programmes) we will implement in order to achieve the aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above, while at the same time improving continuation rates and progression outcomes for all students.

Financial support

Our students typically live within London travel zones 3-6. We are located in travel zone 1.

Given this fact, our students are classified as 'commuter students'. Research suggests that not only does the commuter student have a different university experience to a student living on campus, but they may also be disadvantaged because they do not have access to the same academic and social opportunities as campus-based students (Thomas and Jones, 2017³; Thomas 2019⁴). These students are likely to have life demands such as paid employment or caring or parenting responsibilities which compete with their studies and engagement in extra-curricular activities. As a result, commuter students may struggle to integrate into university social support systems and to develop a sense of belonging with their institution (Morgan, 2012⁵; Thomas, 2012⁶; 2017). This can impact on student persistence and degree attainment as well as their overall higher education experience satisfaction. A major study in the UK looking at all early leavers from 108 English universities found that 48% of early leavers were commuter students (Stephens, 2012⁷).

Thomas and Jones found that students who chose to stay at home to reduce costs and debt (commuter students) experienced a range of issues which impacted on student outcomes (Thomas and Jones, 2017). These included:

- Travel being tiring, expensive and stressful.
- Lack of acknowledgement of the challenges in being a commuter student (e.g. making trips to campus viable due to cost, time taken for travel).
- Impact on attendance (e.g. delayed or cancelled public transport).

The cost for a monthly tube and bus Travelcard (taking into account the student discount) is between £113.70 (zones 1-3) and £177.10 (zones 1-6). Over an 8-month academic year, total travel costs are between £909.60 and £1,416.80. Transport for London has stated that these costs will increase significantly, as it seeks to raise additional revenue to cover the 90% loss of income it has incurred during the Covid-19 pandemic lockdown.

³ Thomas, L. and Jones, R. (2017) *Student engagement in the context of commuter students*, London: The Student Engagement Partnership.

⁴ Thomas, L. (2019) *Commuter students in London: Pilot project Qualitative perceptions of students about commuting and studying in London*, London: London Higher.

⁵ Morgan, M. (2012). *Supporting student diversity in higher education*, Abingdon: Routledge.

⁶ Thomas, L. (2012) *Building student engagement and belonging in Higher Education at a time of change: final report from the What Works? Student Retention & Success programme*, London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation.

⁷ Stephens, B. (2012) *Annual Research Report Presentation of Findings from the First and Second Years of the Back on Course Project December 2011*, London: Open University.

Although many of our students come to us with combined intersecting ‘underrepresentation and disadvantaged’ challenges (in terms of ethnicity, disability, age, educational attainment) the one factor that affects the vast majority of our students is low household income, and the inevitable lack of financial support upon which they can draw. We want to reduce financial barriers to attendance and success for people from low household income backgrounds, and reward engagement.

Our internal data shows a clear correlation between engagement (measured in terms of physical attendance) and achievement at a modular and course level.

When we consulted with students on initiatives for this Plan, the majority were in favour of bursaries.

We have identified the high costs of travel as a barrier to engagement, and ultimate success

The obvious consequence of not having funds to cover travel costs is that student attendance is impacted. As stated above, our internal data shows a clear correlation between attendance and achievement at a modular and course level. In addition, an ability to attend beyond timetabled sessions helps to develop a sense of belonging which has also been proven to contribute to more positive student success and progression outcomes. In 2020-21 we will introduce a travel bursary scheme. The scheme will be available to all new full-time students who have a household income of £25,000 or less. The bursary scheme will be administered through the Student Loans Company (SLC) for students who are provided with funding through the SLC, and through ourselves for students who are privately funded. Eligible students will be entitled to the cost of a monthly Travelcard from month 2 to month 8 (i.e. 7 payments) of each academic year (i.e. in each year of the student’s course). To remain eligible, students must be engaging in their studies (measured through average monthly attendance of at least 75% and submission of assessments) and provide proof of purchase of each monthly Travelcard (after receipt of the bursary to cover month 2). We expect that not only will this impact positively on engagement levels and, by extension, student success outcomes, but more students will engage with the full range of extra-curricular activities that are designed to enhance student progression outcomes.

This scheme, although open to all new students with a household income of £25,000 or less, will contribute to the achievement of all 8 aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above [targets PTS_1 to PTS_8] and to the OfS National KPMs 2, 3 and 4.

We currently have a hardship fund to reduce success barriers for students who suffer financially in any way. However, the fund is relatively small, and there is a very strict and rigorous application process.

In 2020-21 and beyond, we will increase the Hardship Fund for new students and make it easier to access it. It will be open to any new student with a household income of £25,000 or less who has had an unexpected change in their financial circumstances; there are no other eligibility criteria. The maximum payment per student will be £1,600 per academic year.

This scheme, although open to all new students with a household income of £25,000 or less, will contribute to the achievement of all 8 aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above [targets PTS_1 to PTS_8] and to the OfS National KPMs 2, 3 and 4.

In 2020-21 and beyond, there will be a separate ring-fenced Disability Hardship Fund that can only be accessed by new students with a declared disability. This fund can be used to pay for disability assessments, materials and additional support. Level of household income will not form part of the eligibility criteria. The maximum payment per student will be £1,000 per academic year.

This scheme will contribute to the achievement of targets PTS_4 and PTS_8 (see **Section 2.2** above) and to the OfS National KPMs 2 and 4.

Access

Given our success in recruiting underrepresented students, and given that from 2020-21 we will only recruit students onto our 4-year degrees with an integrated foundation year, we have no specific access-related targets. However, we remain committed to consolidating and expanding our access-related activities, to ‘make a difference’:

Ex-offenders

We already reach out to this marginalised group through links to ex-offender organisations such as Unlock and Prisoners Abroad, whose ethos and values resonate strongly with ours.

We have developed a personal development programme focused on prisoners who are nearing the end of their sentences and will start to deliver the programme from September 2022. We will repeat delivery each year thereafter.

The programme is underpinned by the personality and performance assessment tool we use for our Leadership, Employability and Awareness Development (LEAD) programme (LEAD is now incorporated into our Let's Grow programme, see **Section 3.1.2 Progression** below). The programme is also strongly focused on the Content Language and Integrated Learning (CLIL) framework whereby the participants will receive key academic skills development (note-taking; academic language; academic writing skills). There will be no formal assessment, but participants will be required to complete a piece of academic writing and make a presentation; formative oral and written feedback will be provided.

Change Grow Live (CGL)

We are currently exploring a strategic partnership with CGL. CGL has grown from a small volunteer-led Sussex-based organisation, to a nationwide charity that helps tens of thousands of people each day. CGL's health and wellbeing services support people who face a range of difficulties including mental and emotional health needs, homelessness, criminal activity, addiction, domestic abuse and deprivation. CGL offers free, confidential treatment and support to adults, children and young people, families and friends, offenders and the wider community. CGL's mission is to help people change the direction of their lives, grow as individuals, and live life to its full potential. This strategic partnership will provide us with reach-out opportunities, that could also lead to student recruitment opportunities.

Continuation and attainment

As discussed above, from 2020-21 we will only recruit students onto our 4-year degrees with an integrated foundation year, and therefore closing the continuation and attainment gaps will be solely applicable to 4-year degree students. While we need to close the gaps, we also acknowledge the need to improve continuation rates for all students.

Our continuation rates for our validated 4-year degrees (that we developed and designed), that include students who transferred to another provider at the end of Year 1, are as follows:

Table 33: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (including students who transfer to another institution) [OfS Data]

2016-17	2017-18
63.4	62.6

In line with OfS expectations, having completed the foundation year, we have supported students to transfer to some of London's top universities, including LSE, SOAS and Birkbeck.

We have disaggregated the 4-year degree data from the OfS A&PP Data, to ascertain the percentage of students who transferred to another provider at the end of Year 1:

Table 34: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students who transferred to another provider at the end of Year 1 [OfS A&PP Data]

	2016-17	2017-18
Percentage of students who continue with Bloomsbury	53.5	54.7
Percentage of students who transfer to another provider	9.9	7.9

Total percentage of students who continue	63.4	62.6
---	------	------

Using data from our HESA submissions, we have calculated our internal continuation rate for 4-year degree students who started in 2018-19 (the third year of delivery of our validated 4-year degrees).

Table 35: Percentage of full-time 4-year degree with integrated Foundation Year students who continue from Year 1 to Year 2 (excluding students who transfer to another institution) [HESA Data, 2018-19 and 2019-20]

	2018-19
Percentage of students who continue with Bloomsbury	62.0

Since we started to deliver our validated 4-year degrees in 2016-17, changes we have made over the subsequent two years have led to this positive impact on student continuation rates. The development of these changes has been informed by the sharing of good practice and research⁸, including through our membership of the Foundation Year Network⁹, and our membership of Advance HE¹⁰. We invest in the development of all our staff and have supported academic staff to achieve HEA Fellowships, have started to deliver our own Advance HE-accredited Fellowship programme 'In Bloom', and hold monthly Teaching and Learning Forums culminating in our Annual Teaching and Learning Conference, both of which include presentations by internal and external speakers.

Formal development of the changes, and their subsequent implementation, have been made through the application of our Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures (that includes substantial student input); see **Section 3.3.5** below. Changes have been made to, for example, the curriculum and assessment, use of online classroom response systems (e.g. Mentimeter, Kahoot), introduction of a Reading Group, enhancing learning enhancement (academic skills) support, and introduction of predictive data analytics software to better inform our intervention policy that we apply to 'at risk' students.

We will continue to make changes to the 4-year degrees to improve all student outcomes year-on-year.

However, at the same time, we will ensure that we reduce and eventually eliminate the gaps identified in **Section 1** above by achieving the aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above.

The primary aim of the six strategic measures (and associated programmes) set out below is to achieve these aims and objectives, and to reduce and eventually eliminate the gaps. However, they are also intended to lead to a general increase in continuation rates.

In developing these strategic measures (and associated programmes), we have been guided by our own internal evidence as well as external evidence where available.¹¹ We have also been guided by our participation in external projects, including: the HEA's "London Retention Project" (2017) that

⁸ For example, for the second year of delivery (2017-18) we redesigned one of the two Semester 1 modules to provide more effective "scaffolding" of learning and assessment. We included a low-stake task in Week 3, followed by progressively longer and more difficult tasks. This was then rolled out across other modules in 2018-19. Chapman has stated that "[a]n early low-stakes assessment can be used to enhance confidence and self-efficacy" [Chapman, A. (2017) 'Using the assessment process to overcome Imposter Syndrome in mature students', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 41:2, 112-119, at page 113].

⁹ The Foundation Year Network publishes its own Journal of the Foundation Year Network (available at: <https://jfyn.co.uk/index.php/ukfyn>). Our approach to foundation year learning and assessment aligns with Hale, S. (2018) 'Surveying the foundations: The purposes of assessment at Foundation Level and how best to achieve them', *Journal of the Foundation Year Network*, Volume 1, 63-69.

¹⁰ For example, low stake assessments were considered in: Advance HE (2019) 'High Impact Pedagogical Practices in Business Schools Report 1/2: Operational Considerations'.

¹¹ Some examples are: Jones, J. (2019) *Getting a better understanding of our BAME students: We can get them in, but how do we encourage them to stay, progress and attain?*, Advance HE (available at: www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub); Coughlan, T. and Lister, K. (2018), *Transforming Student Journeys*, The Open University; Berry, J. and Loke, G. (2011) *Improving the degree attainment gap of Black and minority ethnic students*, Equality Challenge Unit and the Higher Education Academy.

brought our staff and students into contact with other professionals working in the areas of retention and success; and Advance HE's "Closing Degree-awarding Attainment Gaps" project (2018-19), a year-long collaborative project involving 12 other English-based universities and colleges.

Each of the programmes associated with the strategic measures will be subject to evaluation to assess their effectiveness and impact (see **Section 3.3** below). We will use the findings of the evaluation for each programme to:

- Build on strengths and eliminate weaknesses [if the evaluation concludes that the programme is contributing to achievement of the aims and objectives].
- Take remedial action that could include the discontinuance of the programme and the introduction of one or more new strategic measures (and associated programmes) [if the evaluation concludes that the programme is not contributing to achievement of the aims and objectives].

Strategic measure 1: Pre-entry course

The vast majority of our students are admitted to our 4-year degrees with an integrated foundation year without a Level 3 qualification.

Our assessment of performance in **Section 1** above indicates that such students have lower continuation rates than those who are admitted with a Level 3 qualification. This includes students within our target groups. For example, students from IMD Quintiles 1 and 2 have a continuation rate broadly similar to that for students from IMD Quintiles 3, 4 and 5. However, students from Quintiles 1 and 2 who enter a 4-year degree without a Level 3 qualification have a continuation rate over 10% lower than those who enter with a Level 3 qualification. Similarly, students from Quintiles 3, 4 and 5 who enter a 4-year degree without a Level 3 qualification have a continuation rate over 10% lower than those who enter with a Level 3 qualification. Nearly three times as many BAME students enrol on our 4-year degrees from Quintiles 1 and 2, compared to Quintiles 3, 4 and 5, whereas for White students the differential is just over half as many.

It is our intention to continue to fulfil our commitment to widening participation and social mobility, without creating any barriers for underrepresented and disadvantaged students to enter higher education.

However, given the lower continuation rates for those without a Level 3 qualification, we will pilot a short pre-entry course (a "taster") that will be offered to all 4-year degree applicants without a Level 3 qualification. The evaluation we undertook for the pre-entry course related to our past experience in delivering a free-of-charge pre-English course to applicants who had marginally failed our English Language assessment; all the applicants who completed/passed the course and enrolled on the 4-year degree successfully continued to Year 2. The pre-entry course also enables participants to begin the process of transition to higher education at an earlier stage.¹²

The pre-entry course will provide applicants with an exact replication of the first 4 weeks of study, that will include 12 hours of contact hours, out-of-class preparation for seminars and workshops, in-class and out-of-class formative assessments, and one summative assessment that will be marked and feedback provided. The purpose is to enable applicants to make a fully informed decision about whether they can cope with the academic and time demands of the full-time course.

In 2021-22 we will pilot a 4-week pre-entry course that will be offered, free-of-charge, to all 4-year degree applicants who do not have a Level 3 qualification. We will seek to ensure that the participants include applicants from within each of our four target groups.

At the end of the 2021-22 academic year, we will undertake an evaluation (see **Section 3.3.2** below) that will include a consideration of the levels of engagement and continuation for those who undertake the pre-entry course compared to those who do not, to include a consideration of any trends for our target groups, to inform whether the pre-entry course should be incorporated as a compulsory

¹² See, Chivers, E (2019) 'The trials and tribulations of transition into foundation year study', *Journal of the Foundation Year Network*, Volume 2, 69-78.

component within our admissions process for all applicants without a Level 3 qualification from 2023-24.

If the pre-entry course is incorporated as a compulsory requirement, we will reimburse the travel costs incurred to attend the pre-entry course for any applicant with (i) a household income of £25,000 or less; or (ii) who is in receipt of specified state benefits (e.g. Universal Credit).

If the evaluation supports the pre-entry course becoming compulsory, it follows that this will contribute to achieving targets PTS_1 to PTS_4 (see **Section 2.2** above) and to the OfS National KPM 2.

Strategic measure 2: Peer Mentoring Schemes

We have a fundamental belief in the power of students to sustain and indeed transform each other's lives through peer-based activities and projects.

Our internal evaluations show that Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) enhances the student experience both academically and socially, providing a valuable opportunity for peer interaction and fostering a greater sense of community and belonging. In addition, participation in the global PAL community has led to strong collegial bonds with universities around the world and our students have opportunities each year to attend conferences and training events in the UK and further afield.

Our PAL project was launched in 2015 to provide mentoring support for students at Level 4; higher level students are trained as a PAL Leader to mentor Level 4 students.

During the recent Covid-19 pandemic, when the last 3 weeks of the 2019-20 academic year moved to online delivery, we provided Virtual PAL sessions. The number of students participating in these Virtual PAL sessions increased significantly.

During 2018-19, we developed our peer-based projects further by piloting a Foundation Year Peer Mentoring Scheme which enabled former foundation year students, who had progressed to Levels 4 and 5, to use their experience and knowledge to support foundation year students. We trained 7 students, who had previously completed the foundation year successfully, as Peer Mentors to provide mentoring support to a group of foundation year students. The 7 mentors were matched with 13 mentees who had attended 2 or more peer support group sessions to ensure mentee engagement with the mentoring process. The Peer Mentors were then introduced into the process in Week 6, where they worked together with their new mentees on a reflection exercise. The mentoring groups continued to meet on a weekly/bi-weekly basis for the rest of the academic year. Our Centre for Student Engagement, Wellbeing and Success (SEWS) produced a Peer Mentoring Scheme Handbook which provides important information on how the scheme works and guidance on mentoring best practice.

By September 2021 we will:

- (i) Ensure all peer mentoring schemes are provided face-to-face and online.
- (ii) Expand the PALs project to provide Level 5 students with mentoring support.
- (iii) Expand the Foundation Year Peer Mentoring Scheme to provide all new foundation year students with mentoring support, in addition to those students who are restarting the foundation year.
- (iv) Appoint a new full-time member of staff to SEWS to co-ordinate and train students to work on the peer mentoring schemes.

The PAL scheme will be separately promoted to students within the target groups. We will undertake an evaluation of the PAL scheme as set out in **Section 3.3.2** below, and subject to the findings of the evaluation, in subsequent years we will further develop the PAL scheme to ensure students from within the target groups act as Mentors.

Our peer mentoring schemes will contribute to the achievement of all 6 aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above [targets PTS_1 to PTS_6] and to the OfS National KPMs 2, 3 and 4.

Strategic measure 3: Using predictive data analytics to inform interventions

We have been using data analytics since September 2018 to provide combined reports on attendance and VLE engagement. Our Centre for Student Engagement, Wellbeing and Success (SEWS) has used this data to prompt interventions for students that are identified to be at risk of attrition, and to offer support as required.

Our approach to the use of data analytics and interventions has been informed by work undertaken by JISC.

In September 2019 we introduced a data analytics dashboard through which all data (attendance, VLE engagement, assessment submission and assessment results) is pulled together and used for predictive analysis. This is now enabling SEWS to make better informed interventions: (i) from the outset, because we attach a risk rating to each student, and a higher risk rating can be attached to students from within one of our 4 target groups which can be increased further if a student has entered without a Level 3 qualification; and (ii) as a student progresses through the course, when the inputs are used to make an assessment of the student's actual risk. This will lead to more positive student success outcomes¹³.

SEWS provides students with pastoral support. Currently, when interventions are made, SEWS can also sign-post students to other internal support, including our peer mentoring schemes.

In 2020-21, we will allocate a higher initial risk rating to any student from within our target groups (and also attach a higher risk rating for any student who enters without a Level 3 qualification), to enable us to use the predictive data analytics to make better informed interventions for students from our target groups.

When we make interventions, we will continue to offer support as required.

We will undertake an evaluation of our use of predictive data analytics to inform interventions as set out in **Section 3.3.2** below.

From 2021-22, and in all subsequent years, we will invest further in developing and delivering a range of activities that are targeted at 'at risk' students, the aim of such activities being to increase engagement and achievement

Using our predictive data analytics to inform interventions for students from our target groups will contribute to the achievement of all 6 aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above [targets PTS_1 to PTS_6] and to the OfS National KPMs 2, 3 and 4.

Strategic measure 4: Disability and wellbeing

Our students with a disability, specific learning difficulty, long-term medical illness, and/or mental health condition are currently supported by a full-time Disability and Wellbeing Advisor in our Centre for SEWS.

Since 2018-19 we have provided students with regular wellbeing activities, such as mindfulness workshops.

Our Disability Annual Report 2019-20 sets out the full range of services provided and the demand on such services. For example, reasonable adjustments have been made for 54% of students with a disability, and these are recorded in a Student Learning Support Agreement (SLSA).

In September 2021 we will appoint a full-time specialist to work alongside our current Disability and Wellbeing Advisor.

We will undertake an evaluation of our disability and wellbeing services as set out in **Section 3.3.2** below.

¹³ Richards, P [2017]. *How universities can use learning analytics to boost fair access and retention*. Jisc [online]. Available at: <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/blog/how-universities-can-use-learning-analytics-to-boost-fair-access-and-retention-11-apr-2017>

We will act on the evaluation findings and make further enhancements to our disability and wellbeing services as required.

This will contribute to the achievement of targets PTS_3 and PTS_6 (see **Section 2.2** above) and to the OfS National KPMs 2 and 4.

Strategic measure 5: Flexible timetables

We currently only offer full-time face-to-face study with classes scheduled Monday to Friday 09.00 to 17.00, with classes scheduled over 3 days per week. Given the vast majority of students on our 4-year degrees are 'commuter students', and they are mature with work and family commitments, providing more flexible timetables could have a positive impact on continuation rates and attainment¹⁴.

From September 2021 we will offer more flexible timetables to enable students to select their preference for the 3 days they attend classes.

We will undertake an evaluation of our flexible timetables policy as set out in **Section 3.3.2** below, and act on the evaluation findings.

From September 2023 we intend to implement a timetable self-selection system (that is possible through our current software) to enable students to build their own timetables.

Subject to the evaluation findings, we will also look at introducing more flexible forms of delivery, to include part-time delivery (that could also be delivered in the evenings and at weekends), because currently a full-time student who finds the time commitment too great, cannot move to part-time study.

This will contribute to the achievement of all 6 aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above [targets PTS_1 to PTS_6] and to the OfS National KPMs 2, 3 and 4.

Strategic measure 6: Virtual classroom

During 2018-19, through our VLE, we delivered additional Virtual Classes for the FY in the final week of semester 1. We also delivered additional Virtual Classroom resubmission workshops during a period when students are under increased time pressure.

We have full access to software that enables us to deliver and record Virtual Classroom sessions. In terms of functionality, it provides lecturers with tools to share audio, slides and documents, chat, video, and share their desktop. Lecturers can work on a live whiteboard for annotations which are automatically displayed to students in real-time. Recorded sessions can be uploaded onto our VLE for students to use to reinforce learning, check their note-taking and use it for revision for formative and summative assessments.

From 2021-22, we will embed regular Virtual Classroom lessons within the foundation year (Level 0) curriculum as an additional teaching activity. This will take place once a week and will focus on a weekly diagnostic review of what has been covered that week.

We will undertake an evaluation of our virtual classrooms as set out in **Section 3.3.2** below, and act on the evaluation findings.

If the findings are positive, in 2021-22 and in subsequent years, we will roll this out across all modules.

This will contribute to the achievement of all 6 aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** above [targets PTS_1 to PTS_6] and to the OfS National KPMs 2, 3 and 4.

¹⁴ See Footnotes 2-6 above.

Other strategic measures that may have a marginal impact on closing the gaps

Inclusive Practices

Our focus on inclusive practices is embedded in our mission, and in our curriculum design and teaching and learning practice. This focus extends to the life cycle of our students and is articulated within our Inclusive Learning Environment (ILE). Within our Strategic Framework 2019-22, we have identified a number of areas where we aim to enhance and expand our inclusive practices.

In 2019 we created a Widening Participation Forum separate from our existing Research Forum to act as a catalyst for research on widening participation topics. Both Academic and Professional Services staff can join this Forum. We will transfer any evidence-based findings of the Forum into the classroom to further promote inclusive practices.

In 2021-22 we will create a research grant for staff engaging with our Widening Participation Forum to explore the impact of students' external commitments (e.g. family responsibilities, working hours) on their engagement and academic success, with a specific focus on students within our target groups.

Learning Design

The importance of learning design came to the forefront during the recent Covid-19 pandemic when the last 3 weeks of teaching of the 2019-20 academic year moved fully online. Although our online course content is comprehensive, and through our Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) we are able to deliver live recordable teaching activities, our online course content can be enhanced.

In 2020-21 we will review and further develop our online course content to make it more accessible and engaging. We will participate in a Learning Design Bootcamp that involves learning technologists and academics working together to develop an existing 30-credit module according to a learning design framework. The design team will be supported by experienced mentors and coaches during the process. The experience and skills that are gained can be shared across the Institute, and the developed module can be used as an exemplar for a roll out across all our modules from 2021-22. Spending more time on supporting staff to create more engaging interactive content will result in more innovative online teaching methods and support self-study both on and off campus.

Learning enhancement (academic skills) support

We currently provide students with a comprehensive range of learning enhancement (academic skills) support, delivered one-to-one and in small group sessions, through our Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

The Learning Enhancement (and Employability) Annual Report 2019-22 shows that learning enhancement (academic skills) sessions were also delivered to all students within module workshops. For example, in week 5, all BA (Hons) Business Management students were provided with a session on assessment and Turnitin similarity checks. This approach ensures that all students are made aware of this additional support.

During 2020-21 and subsequent years, we will further develop our range of academic skills support sessions, to ensure such sessions are available both face-to-face and online.

Laptop loan service

Some of our students do not have laptops or computer access at home, and many do not have funds available to purchase one. Students can make use of our computer facilities, but to do this on days they do not have classes, they have to travel into central London. For 2019-20 we purchased 40 laptops for students to borrow on either a short or long-term basis [this proved to have been a wise investment during the recent Covid-19 pandemic]. Of these 40 laptops, 10 are reserved specifically for students with a disability, long-term health condition or specific learning difficulty. Currently, 3.3% of our student body is taking advantage of the scheme.

As demand rises, we will increase the number of laptops that are available for students to borrow.

Bloomsbury Radio

Recognising some of the barriers which prevent students from participating, we will use our newly launched radio station, Bloomsbury Radio, to broadcast material. The radio station allows students to tune-in either live or through our catch-up service:

www.bil.ac.uk/bloomsburyradio/

During the recent Covid-19 pandemic we provided a weekly live programme (also available through our catch-up service), that not only looked at aspects of coping during the lockdown (including mental health awareness and wellbeing), but also included specialised sessions on, for example, entrepreneurship and employability.

From 2020-21, the Commissioning Editor will train students to enable them to be involved in the production and delivery of programmes through Bloomsbury Radio.

Student Guild and Peer Advisors

Our independent Student Guild was established in September 2016. We provide an annual grant to the Guild.

The Guild is supported by a team of trained Peer Advisors who are employed (and paid) by the Guild to provide support to the Advisors' fellow students, dealing with student queries and directing students to where appropriate help is available. The Peer Advisors play an important role in cultivating a sense of belonging to the Institute amongst the student body by encouraging them to join student societies and attend the many events which both the Student Guild and ourselves run during the year.

During 2020-21 we will review the operation of the Peer Advisor project to discern how their work can be expanded into other areas of student support from September 2021 and in subsequent years.

Progression

Let's Grow

Whilst recognising the role played by poverty, lack of social capital and social injustice in relation to our students and graduates finding appropriate work and postgraduate study opportunities, we also want to address the limited aspirations of some students, caused, no doubt, by the challenges they have faced.

Our new Let's Grow programme, to be introduced in September 2020, will create a clear approach to personal and professional development that results in the best possible preparation for students and graduates to achieve their aspirations. It aligns with the Goals and Sub-goals as set out in our Strategic Framework 2019-22. This ensures students and graduates are "work-ready" in the context of graduate employment, self-employment and new venture creation, or "study-ready" in the context of postgraduate study. We will ensure that students and graduates are "life-ready", capable of understanding themselves and others and appreciative of the values which underpin living life well.

We will achieve this by:

- Developing a clear understanding for each student and graduate of how their personal constitution feeds into how they think, behave and perform.
- Using this insight to map clear pathways linked to personal and professional goals.
- Building up self-belief and wellbeing through positive affirmations of individual worth through individual and group support.
- Empowering our students and graduates to achieve their potential and make valuable contributions to all the communities to which they belong through the development of skills and attitudes which underpin success.

Let's Grow recognises the diverse academic community that is Bloomsbury Institute. Reflecting our vision, mission and values, Let's Grow aims to provide the best possible support, opportunities and learning for all students and graduates in order that they reach their full potential.

Let's Grow comprises the following six strategic measures:

- Let's Grow embodies a person-centred approach to personal and professional development. All students and graduates will be well-prepared to take on the challenges of postgraduate study, employment, self-employment or entrepreneurship, and lead lives that are rewarding and constructive. Furthermore, students will be able to communicate their skills and experiences effectively to a range of audiences from employers to investors.
- Although embedded within our curriculum, Let's Grow is a distinct and notable feature of our provision whereby students are provided with and actively encouraged to take on opportunities to develop and apply a wide range of employability skills.
- Our work is informed by global and sectoral trends. Our work in the area of employability and graduate outcomes draws upon national and international research.
- Work-related learning will be promoted, encouraged and rewarded.
- Let's Grow works cross-divisionally to build key strategic partnerships involving employers, professional bodies and postgraduate study providers and contributes to building an alliance of employers who are keen to offer placements to our students and employment to our graduates.
- Students will be rewarded at appropriate times for taking ownership of their career development and student-centred interventions.

3.2 Student consultation

Students formally engage, and are consulted on, through their membership of key committees. The Student President and one other student representative attend meetings of the Board of Directors. Elected student representatives are full members of our Academic Committee, Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC), Course Committees, and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC). All elected student representatives are members of our Student Staff Consultative Forum (SSCF), where Institute-wide and management initiatives are discussed.

In developing this Plan, student representatives were consulted within the EDIC (where the Plan was formally developed), the SSCF, and the Board of Directors (where the Plan was formally approved).

During its developmental stage, we canvassed our students' opinions on what they would like to see us investing in. We held focus groups and sent all students a questionnaire covering the same areas that were discussed in the focus groups. Two separate focus groups were held: one for students with a disability, specific learning difficulty, and/or long-term medical illness, and another for all students. Our Disability and Wellbeing Advisor and then Deputy Director of our Centre for Student Engagement, Wellbeing and Success (SEWS) led the first group and the Deputy Academic Principal and Deputy Director of SEWS led the second. The results of these focus groups and questionnaires were considered by EDIC as it further developed the Plan.

At the developmental stage of the Plan, we had no firm proposals about the provision of bursaries, but the majority of students (as evidenced through the focus groups and the questionnaires) were in favour of bursaries. This developed into the travel bursary scheme, that was finalised in consultation with the students (see **Section 3.1.2** above).

Students will be involved in the implementation of the Plan through the evaluation activities set out in **Section 3.3** below and the monitoring activities set out in **Section 3.4** below.

3.3 Evaluation strategy

3.3.1 Strategic approach to evaluation

The OECD defines evaluability as:

The extent to which an activity or project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion.¹⁵

Our strategic approach to evaluation ensures that, at the design stage, an evaluability assessment is undertaken for each of the programmes associated with each of the strategic measures. This assessment is designed to ensure that each programme can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion.

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to determine whether a programme is contributing, or has contributed, to the achievement of the applicable aims and objectives that relate to reducing and subsequently eliminating the continuation rate and attainment gaps for 4 target groups of students. If it is/has, the evaluation will also identify any strengths that can be built upon, and any weaknesses that need to be rectified, in order to enhance each programme. If it is/has not, then remedial action will be taken, and this may include changes to the commitments set out within this Plan (something we are committed to do). These changes could include the discontinuance of one or more strategic measures (and associated programmes) and the introduction of one or more new strategic measures (and associated programmes).

For each new intake of students per academic year, an interim and final evaluation will be undertaken for each programme, the timing of which is linked to the aims and objectives of each programme, and when relevant data becomes available (although the evaluation methods associated with each programme is not restricted to data analysis; see **Section 3.3.2** below). Dates for interim and final evaluations for student intakes in Years 1 and 2 are as follows:

	Student Intake [Academic Year]	
	Year 1 2020-21	Year 2 2021-22
Interim Evaluation: Continuation Rate Gap	<u>Data Source: Internal attendance and engagement</u> 1 March 2021 1 May 2021 1 July 2021 <u>Data Source: Internal continuation rates [excludes students who transfer to another provider]</u> 1 November 2021	<u>Data Source: Internal attendance and engagement</u> 1 November 2021 1 January 2022 1 March 2022 1 May 2022 1 July 2022 <u>Data Source: Internal continuation rates [excludes students who transfer to another provider]</u> 1 November 2022
Final Evaluation: Continuation Rate Gap	<u>Data Source: OfS/HESA [includes students who transfer to another provider]</u> 1 May 2022	<u>Data Source: OfS/HESA [includes students who transfer to another provider]</u> 1 May 2023
Interim Evaluation: Attainment Gap	<u>Data Source: Internal performance in summative assessments</u> 1 March 2021	<u>Data Source: Internal performance in summative assessments</u> 1 January 2022

¹⁵ OECD-DAC (2010), *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management*, at page 21.

Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf>

Student Intake [Academic Year]		
	Year 1 2020-21	Year 2 2021-22
	1 July 2021	1 March 2022
	1 Sep 2021	1 July 2022
	1 July 2022	1 Sep 2022
	1 Sep 2022	1 July 2023
	1 July 2023	1 Sep 2023
	1 Sep 2023	1 July 2024
	1 July 2024	1 Sep 2024
	<u>Data Source: Internal degree classification</u>	1 July 2025
	1 Sep 2024	<u>Data Source: Internal degree classification</u>
		1 Sep 2025
Final Evaluation: Attainment Gap	<u>Data Source: OfS/HESA attainment</u>	<u>Data Source: OfS/HESA attainment</u>
	1 Mar 2025	1 Mar 2026

Note: The above evaluation dates do not apply to the Financial Support programmes. These programmes will be evaluated separately using the Office for Students' Financial Support Evaluation Toolkit.

Interim evaluation

Our aims and objectives seek to reduce and subsequently eliminate: (i) the continuation rate gap for the 4 target groups of students; and (ii) the attainment gap for the 4 target groups of students.

A programme that is linked to the continuation rate gap will start to be evaluated soon after it is being implemented, once we have internal attendance and engagement data for students within each target group (and the comparator). One that is linked to the attainment gap will start to be evaluated once we have internal summative assessment performance data for students within each target group (and the comparator). In the latter case, for example, if the assessment performance of students within each target group is lower than that for White students, the evaluation may identify weaknesses that need to be rectified, or that remedial action needs to be taken that could include the discontinuance of the programme and the introduction of one or more new strategic measures (and associated programmes).

The interim evaluation methods for each programme are set out below.

Final evaluation

A final evaluation will be undertaken once the relevant data is available.

In the case of continuation rate gaps, although we will have our own internal data, we do not track students who transfer to another provider at the end of Year 1. We would use our own internal data as part of the interim evaluation. The final evaluation can only be undertaken once OfS/HESA data is provided.

In the case of attainment gaps, the impact of the strategic measures will be measured for new students who start in 2020-21 and beyond. Given that new students will be enrolling on a 4-year degree, it will be Year 4 before the full impact can be measured. For that reason, the milestones for Years 1 to 3 are less 'ambitious' than for Years 4 and 5.

The final evaluation methods for each programme are set out below.

3.3.2 Evaluation methods

Our evaluation methods are designed to: (i) determine whether a programme is contributing, or has contributed, to the achievement of the applicable aims and objectives that relate to reducing and subsequently eliminating the continuation rate and attainment gaps for the 4 target groups of students; (ii) identify any strengths that can be built upon, and any weaknesses that need to be rectified, in order to enhance each programme, and/or to identify any remedial action that needs to be taken that may include the discontinuance of one or more strategic measures (and associated programmes) and the introduction of one or more new strategic measures (and associated programmes).

The evaluation methods we will use for each programme are as follows:

Stage	Measure	Evaluation methods
Success	Financial support	<p>We will use the Office for Students' Financial Support Evaluation Toolkit.</p> <p>Given the number of students that will be in receipt of financial support, we will use all three tools: Statistical Tool, Survey Tool, and Interview Tool.</p> <p>There will be a specific and separate analysis for students within our target groups.</p> <p>The aim of the evaluation is to test whether the travel bursaries assist/encourage students to: (i) attend a minimum of 75% classes; (ii) submit all assessments; (iii) attend extra-curricular activities on non-teaching days; (iv) continue into Year 2; and (v) subsequently complete the course and attain a good degree.</p> <p>There will be additional questions relating to the Hardship Fund and the Disability Hardship Fund for any students that accessed this additional financial support.</p>
Success	Pre-entry course	<p>At the end of the first delivery of the pre-entry course we will undertake a separate evaluation of the course [based on a 'condensed' application of our Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures (see below)], to include student questionnaires and a focus group. The aim of this evaluation is to identify any strengths that can be built upon, and any weaknesses that need to be rectified, before the subsequent delivery of the course. This evaluation will be repeated at the end of each subsequent delivery of the course.</p> <p>We will undertake an interim evaluation of the course at each of the dates set out above (see <i>Strategic approach to evaluation</i>). This interim evaluation will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ascertain the levels of attendance and engagement [and internal continuation rate] for those who undertake the pre-entry course compared to those who do not - Consider any trends for our target groups [to ascertain if it has a positive impact on reducing the gaps] - Survey students who undertook the course through a questionnaire of all students and interviews with some students <p>The interim evaluation of 1 November 2023, that includes internal continuation rates, will inform whether the pre-entry course should be incorporated as a compulsory component within our admissions process for all applicants without a Level 3 qualification from 2023-24.</p> <p>The interim evaluation will be updated into a final evaluation report once OfS/HESA continuation rate data (that includes students who transfer to another provider at the end of Year 1) is made available.</p>
Success	Use of predictive data analytics	<p>The Centre for Student Engagement, Wellbeing and Success will undertake an interim evaluation of the use of predictive data analytics at each of the dates set out above (see <i>Strategic approach to evaluation</i>). This interim evaluation will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For our target groups, include the number and type of interventions made per student, and its impact (i.e. did the student continue to engage /

Stage	Measure	Evaluation methods
		<p>submit assessments / pass assessments (and level of performance) / continue to Year 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compare this with students outside of the target groups. - Consider any trends for our target groups [to ascertain if it has a positive impact on reducing the gaps] - Survey students within the target groups, for whom interventions were made, through a questionnaire of all students and interviews with some students <p>This interim evaluation will inform whether any changes need to be made to our interventions policy, and whether bespoke “support measures” should be introduced for students within a specific target group. It will also inform whether the initial “red” risk rating for students with the target groups is appropriate.</p> <p>The interim evaluation will be updated into a final evaluation report once OfS/HESA continuation rate data (that includes students who transfer to another provider at the end of Year 1) is made available.</p>
Success	Peer mentoring schemes	<p>The Centre for Student Engagement, Wellbeing and Success will undertake an interim evaluation of the peer mentoring schemes at each of the dates set out above (see <i>Strategic approach to evaluation</i>). This interim evaluation will build upon the current Annual Report that is submitted to our Senior Management and Leadership Team, Academic Committee and Board of Directors. This interim evaluation will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For our target groups, include the number of attendances made per student, and its impact (i.e. did the student continue to engage / submit assessments / pass assessments (and level of performance) / continue to Year 2) - Compare this with students outside of the target groups. - Consider any trends for our target groups [to ascertain if it has a positive impact on reducing the gaps] - Survey students within the target groups, who attended one or more mentoring sessions, through a questionnaire of all students and interviews with some students - Interview students from within the target groups who act as Mentors, to ascertain how this has impacted upon their educational experience <p>This interim evaluation will inform whether any changes need to be made to our peer mentoring schemes, and whether there are sufficient students from within each target group undertaking the role of Mentor. It will also inform whether the initial “red” risk rating for students with the target groups is appropriate.</p> <p>The interim evaluation will be updated into a final evaluation report once OfS/HESA continuation rate data (that includes students who transfer to another provider at the end of Year 1) is made available.</p>
Success	Flexible timetables and Virtual classroom	<p>The Academic Division will undertake an interim evaluation of flexible timetables and virtual classroom activities at each of the dates set out above (see <i>Strategic approach to evaluation</i>). This interim evaluation will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For our target groups, include the number of “virtual classroom” attendances made per student, and its impact (i.e. did the student continue to engage / submit assessments / pass assessments (and level of performance) / continue to Year 2) - Compare this with students outside of the target groups. - Consider any trends for our target groups [to ascertain if it has a positive impact on reducing the gaps] - Survey students within the target groups, who attended one or more of the virtual classroom activities, through a questionnaire of all students and interviews with some students - Survey students within the target groups about the flexible timetables, through a questionnaire of all students and interviews with some students – the questionnaire will also include questions related to more flexible forms of delivery (e.g. evening/weekend, part-time and blended learning); we will also specifically target students who have low levels of attendance

Stage	Measure	Evaluation methods
		<p>and engagement (and also students who withdraw) to ascertain whether this is/was connected to the method of delivery.</p> <p>This interim evaluation will inform whether any changes need to be made to the flexible timetables policy and the virtual classroom activities.</p> <p>The interim evaluation will be updated into a final evaluation report once OfS/HESA continuation rate data (that includes students who transfer to another provider at the end of Year 1) is made available.</p>
Success	Disability and wellbeing	<p>The Centre for Student Engagement, Wellbeing and Success will undertake an interim evaluation of our disability and wellbeing services at each of the dates set out above (see <i>Strategic approach to evaluation</i>). This interim evaluation will build upon the current Annual Report that is submitted to our Senior Management and Leadership Team, Academic Committee and Board of Directors. This interim evaluation will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For students with a disability, include a breakdown of the support being provided per student, and its impact (i.e. did the student continue to engage / submit assessments / pass assessments (and level of performance) / continue to Year 2) - Compare this with students without a disability. - Consider any trends for students with a disability [to ascertain if it has a positive impact on reducing the gaps] - Survey students with a disability through a questionnaire of all students and interviews with some students <p>This interim evaluation will inform whether any changes need to be made to our disability and wellbeing services, and whether there are sufficient resources.</p> <p>The interim evaluation will be updated into a final evaluation report once OfS/HESA continuation rate data (that includes students who transfer to another provider at the end of Year 1) is made available..</p>

3.3.3 Strategic approach to programme design

In developing the strategic measures (and the associated programmes) set out in **Section 3.1.2** above, we drew on our own internal expertise as well as external resources and research (including through our memberships of the Foundation Year Network and Advance HE)¹⁶. This included an evaluation of whether or not the strategic measures (and the associated programmes) could be effective to achieve the aims and objectives for our target groups set out in **Section 2.2** above.

The only strategic measures (and associated programmes) we have not had “direct experience of” ourselves are the travel bursaries (financial support), and the pre-entry course. For the travel bursaries, we considered evidence related to commuter students as well as feedback from our own students, when determining that this measure could have a positive impact on achievement of the aims and objectives. The evaluation we undertook for the pre-entry course related to our past experience in delivering a free-of-charge pre-English course to applicants who had marginally failed our English Language assessment; all the applicants who completed/passed the course and enrolled on the 4-year degree successfully continued to Year 2.

We have direct experience of all the other measures, such that we identified how we could adjust or enhance them to have the desired impact.

3.3.4 Evaluation findings

As stated above, we will use the findings of the evaluation for each programme to:

¹⁶ See Footnotes 2-13 above.

- Build on strengths and eliminate weaknesses [if the evaluation concludes that the programme is contributing to achievement of the aims and objectives].
- Take remedial action that could include the discontinuance of the programme and the introduction of one or more new strategic measures (and associated programmes) [if the evaluation concludes that the programme is not contributing to achievement of the aims and objectives].

The evaluation outcomes will be incorporated into an *Annual Access and Participation Plan Impact Report*, prepared by the Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. The Impact Report is submitted to the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) for recommended approval to our SMLT, that in turn recommends approval to our Board of Directors. Once approved, the Impact Report is submitted to our Academic Committee for consideration and action, and to our Student Staff Consultative Forum for information. It is also submitted to the Office for Students.

We will share our evaluation findings internally within our Teaching and Learning Form and Widening Participation Forum. We will also share within our Annual Teaching and Learning Conference, attendance being open to outside guests.

We will engage with external stakeholders to share our findings primarily through our memberships of the Foundation Year Network and Advance HE. We would also respond positively to any invitations to contribute to conferences and workshops organised by other interested bodies, including the Office for Students.

3.3.5 Annual monitoring and evaluation of the 4-year degrees

We regularly monitor and evaluate our performance, and this includes performance in relation to student outcomes. During each academic year, our Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures comprise the following elements (each occurring in the order stated):

- Initial Course Evaluation (ICE)
- Student Module Evaluation Questionnaire (SMEQ)
- Module Monitoring Report (MMR)
- End-of-year Course Evaluation (ECE)
- External Examiner Report (EER) and External Examiner Response Form (EERF)
- Internal and External Intelligence Report (IEIR)
- Annual Course Evaluation Reports (ACERs)
- Overview ACER
- Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports (AMERs)
- Overview AMER

A summary of each of the above elements follows:

The **Initial Course Evaluation (ICE)** is completed by new students. It is conducted at course level and considered within the relevant Course Committee. It is received by the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) and the Senior Academic Leadership Team (SALT) for information. The ICE is also formally considered within the ACER.

The **Student Module Evaluation Questionnaire (SMEQ)** is completed by students. It is conducted at module level and considered within the relevant Course Committee. It is received by the QAEC and the SALT for information. The SMEQ is also formally considered within the MMR and AMER.

The **Module Monitoring Report (MMR)** is completed by the Module Leader after the end of each semester and the results are collated and formally considered within the AMER.

The **End-of-year Course Evaluation (ECE)** is completed by students. It is conducted at course level and considered within the relevant Course Committee. It is received by the QAEC and the SALT for information. The ECE is also formally considered within the AMER.

External Examiner Reports (EERs) are received by the relevant Course Leader (through the Head of Quality) who completes an **External Examiner Response Form (EERF)**. The QAEC approves the EERF prior to its submission to the University of Northampton. The relevant Course Committee monitors the completion of any actions set out within the EERF. The QAEC has institutional oversight of the completion of any actions and monitors any responses from the Course Committees. The Academic Committee receives all EERs and EERFs for information. EERs are formally considered within the AMER.

The **Internal and External Intelligence Report (IEIR)** is approved by the Senior Management and Leadership Team (SMLT), (following a recommendation for approval by the QAEC). The IEIR brings together all relevant internal and external intelligence which may have an impact on our future direction. The IEIR informs the development of the ACERs and the Overview ACER. The IEIR is received by the Academic Committee and Board of Directors for information.

[Note: The IEIR feeds into our Annual Planning Cycle by informing the development and implementation of the Strategic Framework and the Annual Divisional/Departmental Actions.]

The **Annual Course Evaluation Report (ACER)** is approved by the QAEC, following a recommendation for approval by the relevant Course Committee, and received by the Academic Committee for information.

The ACER is completed at the mid-year stage of delivery of a course.

The ACER is informed by, *inter alia*, the IEIR and the ICE.

The ACER includes a holistic reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the course. The purpose of the ACER is not just to identify weaknesses; strengths and good practices are also identified so that they can be disseminated internally and externally. Actions relate to how weaknesses will be rectified and how strengths and good practices will be built upon.

Within the ACER, the Action Plan from the previous year is reviewed. The Action Plan from the current AMER is also reviewed, this being its mid-year point.

The ACER incorporates a new Action Plan. Implementation of the new Action Plan is monitored within the relevant Course Committee. The Course Committee minutes are received by the QAEC for consideration and action.

New actions can be added to the Action Plan from recent Course Committee meetings or other relevant meetings.

The **Overview ACER** is approved by the QAEC. It is received by the SMLT, Academic Committee and the Board of Directors for information.

Once all the ACERs have been finalised and approved, the Overview ACER is compiled. The Overview ACER is informed by the IEIR and summarises the salient points and Action Plans from each ACER.

Within the Overview ACER, the Action Plan from the previous year is reviewed. The Action Plan from the current Overview AMER is also reviewed, this being its mid-year point.

The Overview ACER incorporates a new Action Plan. Implementation of the new Action Plan is monitored within the QAEC. The QAEC minutes are received by the Academic Committee and SMLT for consideration and action.

New actions can be added to the Action Plan from recent Course Committee meetings or other relevant meetings.

[Note: The Overview ACER is at the heart of the Annual Planning Cycle. In accordance with our Annual Planning Cycle, the Overview ACER informs the development of: the three-year Strategic Framework and the Annual Divisional/Departmental Actions.]

The **Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (AMER)** is approved by the QAEC, following a recommendation for approval by the relevant Course Committee, and received by the Academic Committee for information.

The AMER is completed at the end of each academic year.

It is the principal instrument for the routine monitoring of our activities. The AMER provides comprehensive and reliable evidence on the quality and standards of our academic provision, and on factors that impact upon that provision. It provides intelligence on current and possible future developments within a Course Team's academic or professional community and across the institution.

The AMER procedure is a crucial component of the deliberative aspect of the quality system – a system that is dependent on the mutual accountability of, and open exchanges between, managers, students and staff. A useful or conclusive AMER is comprehensive, forward-looking, action-focused, strategic and evaluative. The AMER provides an 'early warning' of issues and factors that may affect – either positively or negatively – the standards and quality of our provision.

The AMER identifies areas of good practice which are worthy of dissemination throughout the institution. This dissemination will take place through the Teaching and Learning Forum (which is convened by the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL)).

Within the AMER, the Action Plan from the previous year is reviewed. The Action Plan from the current ACER is also reviewed, this being its mid-year point.

The AMER incorporates a new Action Plan. The Action Plan is an integral part of the AMER and it distinguishes between the actions required from the Course Team itself, and those required from other parts of the institution. Action points are identified within the sections of the AMER, and cross referenced to the Action Plan.

Implementation of the new Action Plan is monitored within the relevant Course Committee. The Course Committee minutes are received by the QAEC for consideration and action.

New actions can be added to the Action Plan from recent Course Committee meetings or other relevant meetings.

The **Overview AMER** is approved by the QAEC. It is received by the SMLT, Academic Committee and the Board of Directors for information.

Once all the AMERs have been finalised and approved, the Overview AMER is compiled. The Overview AMER summarises the salient points and Action Plans from each AMER.

Within the Overview AMER, the Action Plan from the previous year is reviewed. The Action Plan from the current Overview ACER is also reviewed, this being its mid-year point.

The Overview AMER incorporates a new Action Plan. Implementation of the new Action Plan is monitored within the QAEC. The QAEC minutes are received by the Academic Committee and SMLT for consideration and action.

New actions can be added to the Action Plan from recent Course Committee meetings or other relevant meetings.

[Note: In accordance with our Annual Planning Cycle, the Overview AMER informs a mid-year review of the Strategic Framework and the Annual Divisional/Departmental Actions].

These procedures have been applied each year to the 4-year degrees since we started delivery. We have set out above how the actions implemented in 2017-18 and 2018-19 have had a major and positive impact on continuation rates for students who started in 2018-19.

Through this evaluation process, for the second year of delivery (2017-18) we redesigned one of the two Semester 1 modules to provide more effective “scaffolding” of learning and assessment. We included a low-stake task in Week 3, followed by progressively longer and more difficult tasks. This was successful and it was then rolled out across other modules in 2018-19.

It is through the continued implementation of these procedures, that will also draw on the evaluations of the programmes (and the associated strategic measures) set out within this Plan, that we will continue to enhance the 4-year degrees in order to improve student outcomes.

3.4 Monitoring progress against delivery of the Plan

Our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC), which includes student representation, is responsible for developing the Access and Participation Plan and recommending approval to our Senior Management and Leadership Team (SMLT), that in turn recommends approval to our Board of Directors (which includes student representation).

The Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for ensuring the strategic measures (and associated programmes) set out in this Plan are implemented and for ensuring the aims and objectives are achieved; i.e. that the identified gaps set out in **Section 2.2** above are reduced year-on-year and eventually eliminated.

The latter will be included in our Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Our KPIs are used as an indicator as to whether a risk may materialise or has materialised, to enable appropriate actions to be taken. The KPIs are considered at each meeting of the Board, together with any interim and final evaluation reports (see **Section 3.3.2** above). The Board will therefore be able to make a fully informed decision about whether the aims and objectives set out in **Section 2.2** are on track or not. If not, the Board would look at taking corrective action, and this would be informed by the interim and final evaluations that are undertaken for each of the strategic measures (and associated programmes); see **Section 3.3.2** above.

At an operational level, our Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, working with the EDIC, is responsible for monitoring the year-on-year reduction of the identified gaps, leading to their eventual elimination.

The interim and final evaluation reports are submitted to the EDIC every two months, together with the relevant KPIs. The evaluation reports and the KPIs, together with any observations of the EDIC, are submitted to the SMLT, Academic Committee and Board of Directors for consideration and action.

Ongoing monitoring by students is achieved through their membership of the EDIC and their presence on our Academic Committee and Board of Directors as well as through receipt of the evaluation reports and the relevant KPIs at the Student Staff Consultative Forum – an opportunity for all student representatives to come together with relevant key staff and the Student Guild Manager. This Forum can make written representations to, for example, the EDIC, SMLT, Academic Committee and/or Board of Directors.

The frequency of reporting by the Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and EDIC provides an early opportunity for all key stakeholders including the SMLT, Academic Committee and Board of Directors to identify either any problems with implementation of the strategic measures (and associated programmes) or concerns that the strategic measures may be proving ineffectual.

If the Board of Directors has any concerns with regards to implementation of the strategic measures (and associated programmes), it can refer the matter to the Audit Committee, a committee of the Board of Directors which reports directly to the Board. The Audit Committee, that comprises non-executive

directors (i.e. executive directors are not allowed to attend), is empowered to require any member of staff to attend its meetings. It can also meet with any member of staff outside of the formal Committee.

4. Provision of information to students

Our Terms and Conditions provide that the tuition fee that is payable in the first year will not increase in subsequent years provided the student completes within 12 months of the expected completion date for the course (otherwise the tuition fee may increase by the RPI or CPI whichever is the higher).

We provide the following information to prospective students:

- Tuition Fee, broken down into annual fee and the total fee for the course.
- Financial support available i.e. travel bursaries, and hardship fund (that includes a ring-fenced disability fund).
- Financial support available through other sources: e.g. Student Loans Company, charities.

We provide this information through the following mediums:

- Website.
- Prospectus.
- Open days and offer holder days.

This Plan will be published on our website, and there will be a link to the Plan on all course pages. Prospective students will be signposted to the Plan within the prospectus and at our open days and offer holder days.

Appendix

The OfS will append the following items from the fees and targets and investment documents when the Access and Participation Plan is published:

- *Targets (tables 2a, 2b and 2c in the targets and investment plan)*
- *Investment summary (tables 4a and 4b in the targets and investment plan)*
- *Fee summary (table 4a and 4b in the fee information document)*

Summary of 2020-21 entrant course fees

*course type not listed

Inflationary statement:

We do not intend to raise fees annually

Table 4a - Full-time course fee levels for 2020-21 entrants

Full-time course type:	Additional information:	Course fee:
First degree	This applies to students who started a first degree before 2020-21.	£6,000
Foundation degree	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0	This applies to students who start a 4-year degree that incorporates a Foundation Year on or after 2020-21.	£9,000
Foundation year/Year 0	This applies to students who started a 4-year degree that incorporates a Foundation Year before 2020-21.	£6,000
HNC/HND	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	*
Sandwich year	*	*
Erasmus and overseas study years	*	*
Other	*	*

Table 4b - Sub-contractual full-time course fee levels for 2020-21 entrants

Sub-contractual full-time course type:	Additional information:	Course fee:
First degree	*	*
Foundation degree	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0	*	*
HNC/HND	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	*
Sandwich year	*	*
Erasmus and overseas study years	*	*
Other	*	*

Table 4c - Part-time course fee levels for 2020-21 entrants

Part-time course type:	Additional information:	Course fee:
First degree	*	*
Foundation degree	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0	*	*
HNC/HND	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	*
Sandwich year	*	*
Erasmus and overseas study years	*	*
Other	*	*

Table 4d - Sub-contractual part-time course fee levels for 2020-21 entrants

Sub-contractual part-time course type:	Additional information:	Course fee:
First degree	*	*
Foundation degree	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0	*	*
HNC/HND	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	*
Sandwich year	*	*
Erasmus and overseas study years	*	*
Other	*	*

Targets and investment plan

2020-21 to 2024-25

Provider name: Bloomsbury Institute Limited

Provider UKPRN: 10004061

Investment summary

The OfS requires providers to report on their planned investment in access, financial support and research and evaluation in their access and participation plan. The OfS does not require providers to report on investment in student success and progression in the access and participation plans and therefore investment in these areas is not recorded here.

Note about the data:

The investment forecasts below in access, financial support and research and evaluation does not represent not the total amount spent by providers in these areas. It is the additional amount that providers have committed following the introduction of variable fees in 2006-07. The OfS does not require providers to report on investment in success and progression and therefore investment in these areas is not represented.

The figures below are not comparable to previous access and participation plans or access agreements as data published in previous years does not reflect latest provider projections on student numbers.

Table 4a - Investment summary (£)

Access and participation plan investment summary (£)	Academic year				
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Total access activity investment (£)	£9,000.00	£18,000.00	£33,000.00	£45,000.00	£60,000.00
Access (pre-16)	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Access (post-16)	£9,000.00	£18,000.00	£24,000.00	£30,000.00	£39,000.00
Access (adults and the community)	£0.00	£0.00	£9,000.00	£15,000.00	£21,000.00
Access (other)	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Financial support (£)	£202,512.00	£925,640.00	£1,447,386.00	£1,793,054.00	£2,029,464.00
Research and evaluation (£)	£15,000.00	£20,000.00	£25,000.00	£30,000.00	£30,000.00

Table 4b - Investment summary (HFI%)

Access and participation plan investment summary (%HFI)	Academic year				
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Higher fee income (£HFI)	£600,000.00	£2,220,000.00	£3,354,000.00	£4,149,000.00	£4,704,000.00
Access investment	1.5%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	1.3%
Financial support	33.8%	41.7%	43.2%	43.2%	43.1%
Research and evaluation	2.5%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%
Total investment (as %HFI)	37.8%	43.4%	44.9%	45.0%	45.1%

