

## Annex B

### Data extraction methods used for Annex A

#### Tables A1 to A4: students registered in HEIs

1. Those students in the HESA 1998-99 July return who had a location of study (LOCSDY) of 2 or 3 were taken as franchised students. Only those student who satisfied the Higher Education Students Early Statistics (HESES98) survey's criteria were included (HESEXCL=0 and HESCOL4='1').
2. There were problems with institutions where the HESA return was modular and the same module taught at different teaching institutions were not distinguished. We resolved this in the following ways:
  - a. The institution supplied data that could be used to amend the HESA record. In some cases this could not be done for all students.
  - b. The institution supplied aggregate data that could not be used to amend the HESA record but that we could incorporate into our tables. These are labelled as 'data supplied by the registering institution', and details of the changes are given in the tables.
  - c. The institution gave details of how to distinguish the teaching institution of given modules. We used these in the extraction of data for all the tables in this document but we could not amend the HESA record.
3. The level and mode and FTEs used were those derived in the HESA/HESES comparison (HEFCE 00/06).
4. Numbers of students are given as headcounts in Tables A1 and A3, and as FTEs in Tables A2 and A4.
5. Tables A1 and A2 are arranged by the registering institution and Tables A3 and A4 by the teaching institution.

#### Tables A5 and A6: students registered at FECs

6. Students were included if they were in the Further Education Funding Council's (FEFC) Individualised Student Return (ISR) and satisfied the Higher Education in Further Education: Students (HEIFES98) survey's criteria for HE students.
7. The level and mode derived in the ISR/HEIFES comparison (HEFCE 00/10) were used.
8. The names of teaching institutions were supplied by the FEFC. Many of the teaching institutions were not publicly funded colleges, but where possible we have presented the information.
9. The definition of franchised students is not the same in the ISR as in the HESA return. In the ISR, students are recorded as franchised out only if more than 50 per cent of their guided learning hours take place at another institution.
10. Tables of the FTEs of students franchised-out from FECs are not included as the ISR is based on guided learning hours. Table A5 is arranged by registering institution and Table A6 by teaching institution.

## **Comparison populations**

### Students registered in HEIs and taught in FECs

11. This is the same population used in Table A1 except that only those students who are taught at FECs are included.

12. HESA subjects and level categories were used. The entry qualifications categories were calculated by the method used in the performance indicators (HEFCE 00/18 page 17). Year of programme of study and mode were calculated according to the HESSES98 definitions. The extent of franchising was taken as 'fully' if the proportion taught at another institution (PCOLAB) was 100 per cent, and otherwise treated as 'partly'. The age groups were the age on entry, calculated from birth date (BIRTHDTE) and start date (COMDATE).

### FEC higher education students

13. These were all students on the IRS who met the criteria for HE students defined in HEIFES98. All FECs were used, not just those who franchise in students from HEIs. An attempt was made to match the HESA subject and level categories. The mode and year of programme of study derived in the ISR/HEIFES comparison were used. Data on the highest qualification on entry and A-level points was extracted (ST\_QUAL, ST\_A\_LEV). Age groups were calculated as above.

### HEI directly funded students

14. The source, the variables considered and the definition of students used were the same as for the 'students registered in HEIs and taught in FECs' group. The only difference was that franchised out students were excluded.