Annex A

First Destination Return

Previous arrangements

1. The First Destination Return is a survey carried out by institutions among their own graduates to obtain information about what new graduates are doing. The questions asked have been agreed with HESA, and each institution submits data in an agreed format to HESA for collation and analysis. This dataset forms the First Destination Supplement (FDS) to the individualised student record held by HESA.

2. Until this year, institutions started collecting information about graduate destinations almost as soon as the student graduated. Questionnaires were distributed to graduates, either in person or by post, and these were followed up by telephone contact if no response was received. The survey asked for details of main activity, using a question of the form 'Please tick one of the following boxes which best describes the MAIN activity you are currently undertaking, or which you will definitely begin before 31 March'. The options provided were:

- in employment (paid or unpaid)
- self-employed
- undertaking further study, training or research
- not available for (or not seeking) employment, study or training
- unemployed and seeking employment, further study or training.

3. The survey also asked if the graduate had any other, secondary, activity. The options given for the secondary activity were:

- full-time employment (paid or unpaid)
- part-time employment (paid or unpaid)
- self-employment
- full-time further study or training
- part-time further study or training
- professional preparation time, e.g. portfolio preparation
- looking for a job or course
- no secondary activity.

4. Depending on the response, there were further questions to determine the nature of the work or study, and other related details.

5. In practice, graduates who said they were seeking employment at any stage of the data collection process were followed up to see if they had subsequently obtained work, but graduates who said they were employed or studying were not followed up to see if they had changed status. Although there was a nominal reference date of 31 December as the date to which replies should refer, the long data capture period prior to this date and the flexibility allowed in its interpretation led to inconsistencies between institutions.

Changes to FDS for 1999-2000 graduates

6. When it was suggested that the information from the survey should be used to produce a performance indicator, it was decided to hold an audit of a sample of institutions to see how robust the data would be. The audit concluded that the survey was satisfactory for its original purpose, but did not provide data that were sufficiently robust for production of a PI. However, the auditors said that if a few changes could be made to the survey, the data quality could be substantially improved.

7. There were two main changes suggested by the auditors. The first was to use a fixed reference date for the survey, so that all institutions would be asking for their graduates' status at the same time. The second change was to restrict the data collection period. Both of these were put in place for the survey of 1999-2000 graduates.

8. The questions asked in 1999-2000 were similar to those used in previous years, with the same categories provided for main and secondary activities. However, respondents were asked what their main and secondary activities would be on 3 January 2001. In addition, institutions were asked to restrict their data gathering period to between the end of September 2000 and the end of January 2001, with telephone follow-up only taking place in December and January. It was felt that these changes would provide data that would be more comparable across institutions, and so more robust for producing the PI.

Central data collection

9. During discussions regarding the performance indicator, it was suggested that collecting the data from this survey centrally, rather than each institution making its own arrangements, might provide more robust information. As part of a feasibility study into the issue, it was agreed to carry out a pilot survey this year, and a small sample of graduates from each institution was selected for this purpose. It was decided to omit these graduates from the population used for the employment indicators, as the different methods of collection might affect the outcomes.

Review of First Destination Return

10. Prior to the work on an indicator of employment, the FDS was being reviewed by HESA, in consultation with HEIs and other interested bodies, as part of its general review process. The review group considered what form the survey should take in future, bearing in mind the data needs of the various stakeholders. It was at this stage that the suggestion for a pilot study into central data collection procedures was put forward. It was agreed that the review should not be implemented until the pilot was complete, so it was deferred for a year. Once implemented, it is expected that this review will improve data availability, and will eventually allow an extended set of indicators to be produced.

Annex B

Benchmarks for employment indicator

1. The benchmarks for the performance indicators of access to HE and retention rates, which have already been produced (see HEFCE publication 00/40), are sector averages that allow for the effects of age, subject of study and entry qualifications. So, for example, an institution with a large medical school would be expected to have a higher retention rate than a similar institution with no medical school, because medical students have a low leaving rate compared with students of other subjects.

2. A similar principle has been used in defining benchmarks for the employment indicators. Each benchmark is the value that would be expected by looking at all students across the sector who are similar to those at the institution. We have again taken into account age, subject of study and entry qualifications (education students, for example, are more likely to be employed six months after graduation than students of philosophy) but in addition we have taken other factors into account. The table below shows what factors have been used.

3. In addition to factors specific to the student, we have looked at factors that refer to each institution, and their locality. Three institutional factors have been included in the benchmarks, also shown in the following table.

Table B1: Factors used in the benchmark

Student factors	**No. of categories**	**Comment**
Subject of study	19	
Entry qualifications	11	
Age on entry	4	
Gender	2	
Ethnic group	10	
Whether or not on sandwich course	2	
Social Class	3	Includes a category for unknown
From low participation neighbourhood or not	3	Includes a category for unknown
Degree classification	5	Only included in indicator which excludes those going on to further study
Institutional factors		
Average A-level/Highers score		Based on entrants in 1999-2000 with A-levels or Scottish Highers
Unemployment among 20-29 year olds		Figures based on the ILO definition, for the institution's locality
Percentage of jobs classified as graduate jobs		For the institution's locality, with definition based on IER work

Student factors

4. The subject, entry qualifications, and age groups used are all slightly different from those used in constructing the benchmarks for other indicators. The information for all of the factors, both at a student and at an institution level, comes from the HESA individualised student record, UCAS supplementary files, the First Destination Supplement, and the 1999 Annual Labour Force Survey. Full definitions, based on the HESA fields, are given in Annex C.

5. Tables B2-B6 show the unemployment rates for each group within some of the student factors.

Institutional factors

6. The average A-level/Scottish Highers score, for those entrants to the institution who have such qualifications, is a proxy for the overall selectivity of the institution. It adds significantly to the model, and has been introduced partly to make allowances for those situations where individual student entry qualifications are missing. It will also compensate for the fact that we have only a simplified summary of entry qualifications available.

7. The other two institutional factors used are related to employment prospects in the neighbourhood of the institution. The institution's neighbourhood has been defined by reference to where its graduates get jobs, as the set of local authority areas closest to the institution in which at least half of the institution's graduates have found jobs on graduation. This information comes from the FDS, and depends on the postcode of where the graduate works being supplied. For some institutions there is not sufficient postcode information available, and in such cases the national rates have been used. These institutions have been noted in the table.

8. The unemployment rate in the neighbourhood among all 20-29 year olds has been taken from the Labour Force Survey for 1999. The percentage of all jobs in the neighbourhood which can be classified as graduate jobs also comes from that survey, and is based on the classification through Standard Occupational Classification as developed at the Institute of Economic Research (IER) at Warwick University for the report 'Moving On'. Details are given in Annex C.

Model used to produce benchmark

9. The benchmarks produced for the performance indicators of access and retention were based on a simple arithmetic model. As there are more factors to take into account in the benchmarks for the employment indicator, it has not proved possible to use this simple method of construction. Instead, it was decided to use a statistical model. A number of models were investigated, and a random-effects multi-level model was chosen to construct the benchmarks.

10. Multi-level models are used when the outcomes for individuals may be affected by both individual characteristics and characteristics of groups to which the individuals belong. In this case, whether a graduate is employed or not will depend on individual characteristics of the graduate, but possibly also on characteristics of the institution or its location. The form of model used is:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k x_{ijk} + \sum_{l=1}^{n} \gamma_l x_{jl} + u_j + e_{ij}$$

where y_{ij} is an indicator of employment for student i at institution j (that is, y_{ij} is 1 if the student is employed, and is 0 otherwise), and there are m student-level factors x_{ijk}, and n institution-level factors x_{jl}.

11. The terms u_j and e_{ij} represent the random factors at institutional and individual levels respectively. Both terms are assumed to be normally distributed with a mean of zero. The software package used, MLwiN, not only provides estimates of the coefficients β and γ but also estimates these random terms and their associated standard deviations. The institution term, u_j, provides an estimate of the difference between an institution's benchmark and its indicator, allowing the benchmark and the standard deviation of the difference to be obtained. The estimates of the coefficients are shown in Table B11.

12. Institutions where the value of u_j is large compared with the standard deviation – say, three times the standard deviation in absolute value – are those where the indicator and the benchmark are significantly different. For such institutions the factors used have not completely accounted for the differences from the sector, and it may be that the performance of the

institution has been particularly good or particularly poor.

13. Alternatives to the linear form of the model used here include random-effects logistic regression models. In some contexts such models have advantages over linear formulations with dichotomous outcomes, but the logistic approach runs into difficulties when the available predictor variables identify subsets of individuals with 0 per cent or 100 per cent success rates. This occurs here as some of the smaller specialist institutions have employment rates close to 100 per cent. Professor David Draper of the University of California, Santa Cruz, and Mark Gittoes of the University of Bath have shown through simulation experiments that random-effects linear modelling provides a reliable basis for identifying unusual universities in this situation.[1]

Interactions between factors

14. It was originally intended to use two models, one for males and one for females, to allow for the interactions between gender and the other variables. However, it was found that, although these interactions exist, using a single model with gender as one of the factors did not significantly change the benchmarks produced.

15. The possibility of including a limited number of interaction terms was also looked at, but again these did not change the benchmarks significantly. In particular, the interaction between gender and ethnic group, which appears relatively large, did not make a significant change to the model.

Employment rates

16. The following tables show the number of graduates who are employed, in further study, or unemployed in each category of each factor, and the percentage who are in employment or further study, or in employment. These figures are not adjusted for other factors.

17. In each table, the numbers employed or in further study or unemployed are shown as 'Base pop 1', with the numbers employed or unemployed shown as 'Base pop 2'. 'Indicator 1' is the percentage of Base pop 1 who are employed or studying; while 'Indicator 2' is the percentage of Base pop 2 who are employed.

[1] A technical report is available from the authors, and will also be made available on the PI web-site.

Table B2: **Employment by subject of study**

Subject	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
Medicine, dentistry, veterinary science	4,804	99.5	4,400	99.5
Pharmacy, Ophthalmics, Nursing, Medical Technology	3,539	99.0	3,473	98.9
Other subjects allied to medicine	5,917	96.2	4,742	95.3
Biological sciences	12,232	94.0	8,472	91.3
Agriculture	1,411	92.9	1,203	91.7
Physical sciences	9,082	93.3	6,103	90.0
Mathematical sciences	3,002	94.2	2,176	92.0
Computer science	6,555	91.8	6,145	91.1
Engineering & technology	9,741	92.8	8,316	91.5
Architecture, building & planning	3,327	96.0	2,798	95.2
Economics, Social work, Geography	5,222	94.8	4,302	93.6
Other social & political studies, and Law	15,010	94.2	9,537	90.9
Business & administrative studies	17,399	94.1	15,836	93.5
Librarianship & information science	2,966	91.5	2,694	90.6
Languages and Humanities	18,274	93.9	12,787	91.3
Music and Drama	3,673	94.3	2,667	92.1
Other creative arts	9,054	89.3	7,818	87.6
Education	8,674	98.1	8,229	98.0
Combined studies	17,045	93.7	12,993	91.7
All subjects	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B3: **Employment by entry qualification**

Entry qualifications	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
A-levels*, points unknown	3,748	93.8	3,018	92.2
A-levels*, up to 8 points	12,351	93.1	10,183	91.6
A-levels*, 9 to 12 points	14,084	94.2	11,682	93.0
A-levels*, 13 to 18 points	28,123	94.7	22,489	93.3
A-levels*, 19 to 24 points	30,867	95.2	23,747	93.8
A-levels*, 25 to 30 points	29,711	96.3	21,466	94.9
Access course	8,528	89.9	6,811	87.3
BTEC or equivalent	5,733	91.2	5,073	90.0
GNVQ level 3+	4,105	91.5	3,663	90.5
Higher education	12,707	92.4	10,924	91.1
Other / not known	6,970	91.9	5,535	89.8
All qualifications	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

* or Scottish Highers

Table B4: **Employment by age on entry to higher education**

Age on entry	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
Under 21	124,690	94.7	98,633	93.3
21 to 24	15,962	92.1	13,473	90.7
25 or over	16,241	91.3	12,454	88.7
Unknown	34	85.3	31	83.9
All ages	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B5: **Employment by gender**

Gender	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
Female	87,218	95.3	68,755	94.1
Male	69,709	92.6	55,836	90.8
All	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B6: **Employment by whether or not on sandwich course**

	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
On sandwich course	16,386	95.1	14,591	94.5
Not on sandwich course	140,541	94.0	110,000	92.3
All	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B7: **Employment by ethnic group**

Ethnic group	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
White	132,542	94.6	105,942	93.2
Black Caribbean	1,097	90.7	908	88.8
Black African	1,415	87.0	1,032	82.2
Black other	531	92.7	425	90.8
Indian	5,259	91.7	3,979	89.1
Pakistani	2,240	89.0	1,599	84.6
Bangladeshi	655	88.4	488	84.4
Chinese	1,339	90.3	940	86.2
Asian other	1,480	92.7	1,104	90.2
Other / not known	10,369	93.0	8,174	91.2
All	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B8: **Employment by Social Class**

Social Class	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
Social Class I, II, IIIn	82,980	95.1	65,050	93.8
Social Class IIIm, IV, V	25,178	94.2	20,007	92.7
Unknown Social Class	48,769	92.3	39,534	90.6
All ages	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B9: **Employment by neighbourhood type**

Neighbourhood type	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
Low participation	19,254	93.2	15,322	91.5
Other known type	136,303	94.2	108,237	92.8
Unknown	1,370	92.9	1,032	90.6
All ages	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B10: **Employment by degree class**

Degree class	Base pop 1	Indicator 1	Base pop 2	Indicator 2
First class honours	13,520	96.9	8,855	95.2
Upper second class honours	75,511	95.1	55,562	93.6
Lower second class, or undivided second class honours	52,525	92.6	44,116	91.2
Third class honours	6,636	88.9	5,833	87.4
Other classification	11,735	94.6	10,225	93.8
All ages	156,927	94.1	124,591	92.6

Table B11: **Coefficients in model excluding further study**

(See tables in Annex C for codes used)

Variable	Coefficient	Variable	Coefficient	Variable	Coefficient
Constant	1.022	Entry qual 2	-0.008	Male	-0.030
		Entry qual 3	-0.002		
Subject A	0.016	Entry qual 4	-0.002	Ethnic group 2	-0.027
Subject C	-0.048	Entry qual 5	-0.001	Ethnic group 3	-0.083
Subject D	-0.090	Entry qual 6	0.001	Ethnic group 4	-0.007
Subject E	-0.075	Entry qual 7	-0.026	Ethnic group 5	-0.050
Subject F	-0.099	Entry qual 8	-0.012	Ethnic group 6	-0.085
Subject G	-0.085	Entry qual 9	-0.019	Ethnic group 7	-0.079
Subject H	-0.070	Entry qual 10	-0.005	Ethnic group 8	-0.074
Subject I	-0.076	Entry qual 11	-0.009	Ethnic group 9	-0.035
Subject J	-0.037			Ethnic group 10	-0.017
Subject K	-0.061	Degree 2	-0.018		
Subject L	-0.089	Degree 3	-0.036	Neigh'hood 2	0.001
Subject M	-0.061	Degree 4	-0.061	Neigh'hood 3	-0.012
Subject N	-0.091	Degree 5	-0.046	Social Class 1	0.003
Subject O	-0.099			Social Class 3	-0.002
Subject P	-0.089	Age 2	-0.010		
Subject Q	-0.112	Age 3	-0.041	**Institutional factors**	
Subject R	-0.019	Age 4	-0.084	Average A-level	0.001
Subject S	-0.082			Unemp. rate	-0.178
				% grad. jobs	0.097
Sandwich	0.019				

Annex C

Definitions

Definitions of factors

1. In defining the groupings of each factor that have been used in constructing the benchmarks, we have taken into account the employment rates at different levels of the factor. We have tried to balance the need for a reasonably small number of groups against the requirement for homogeneity. In most cases we have had to include an 'unknown' category.

2. Tables C1 to C8 have been included at the end of this annex.

Subject of study

3. Table C1 shows the subject groupings used. It also provides the HESA codes used.

4. Institutions return information to HESA about each student's subjects of study, using up to three fields (subject of qualification aim). We have defined broad subject groups, based on this information, and allocated each student to one of the groups. A student whose subjects cover different groups will be included in the 'Combined studies' group.

5. The groups were chosen to be as homogeneous as possible as regards employment rates, but bearing in mind that there should not be too many groups, nor groups containing small numbers. For example, it was found that among subjects allied to medicine there were two distinct sub-groups. Graduates from Pharmacy, Ophthalmics, Nursing and Medical technology showed much higher employment rates than graduates from the other subjects in this group, so were treated separately. Conversely, as graduates from Languages and Humanities showed similar employment rates, these two subject areas were combined.

Entry qualifications

6. Institutions return data to HESA about the entry qualifications of their students, by providing a code to denote the type of qualification (QUALENT2), and by providing the points score for those entering with A-levels or Scottish Highers. In cases where the institution has not provided this information, it has been taken from UCAS. For the benchmarks for the access and retention indicators, the point scores were grouped in pairs, but it was found that fewer groups could be used in this exercise. The groups are shown in Table C2.

Age group

7. The age on entry to HE of a student is classified in a variety of ways. Those under 21 years of age at entry are young students, those aged 25 or over are generally classed as mature, while those between 21 and 25 are sometimes treated as young, sometimes as mature. In this case, we have treated all three groups separately. The groups used are in Table C3.

8. We have defined age on entry as the age at 30 September of the year of entry to the institution, as defined by their date of commencement of studies.

9. Unknown age includes those whose birth date has been excluded, and those whose year of birth has been wrongly recorded to give an age at entry of under 10 years.

Ethnicity

10. The HESA record contains details of each student's ethnic origin, based on information provided by the student to the institution. The groups used are those from the 1991 Census, shown in Table C4.

11. Over 80 per cent of graduates class themselves as 'white', and we considered combining some of the other groups, as they contained relatively small numbers. As the employment rates varied considerably between these groups, it was decided to retain each one separately.

Social Class/low participation neighbourhoods

12. Here, we used same the breakdown as was used for the access indicators. In both cases this meant taking two defined groups, plus a third group for unknowns. More detailed splits were investigated, but found not to be helpful enough to warrant the extra variables required.

13. All graduates who were over 21 years of age on entry to higher education were allocated to unknown Social Class. Information from UCAS was used to provide Social Class for graduates who were under 21 on entry. The groups are shown in Table C5.

14. The full definition of low participation neighbourhoods is given in Annex A2 of HEFCE 00/40. The groups are shown in Table C6.

Degree classification

15. For the indicator excluding those going on to further study, it was agreed that degree classification should be included as a factor in the benchmark. The groups are given in Table C7.

Sandwich course

16. This variable was a marker to show whether or not the graduate had been on a sandwich course. It took the value 1 for those from a sandwich course, 0 otherwise.

Institutional factors

Definition of location

17. One question the FDS asks is the location and postcode of the employment obtained. Using a postcode to Local Authority District (LAD) or Unitary Authority (UA) look-up we can obtain details of the LADs/UAs to which graduates from each institution go for employment. The location of each institution is known, and so for each institution we can list all LADs/UAs in order of their distance from it. The set of areas closest to the institution which contain at least 50 per cent of all the graduates with known job location is then used to define the institution's neighbourhood.

18. We have obtained estimates of the unemployment rates in each LAD/UA using the 1999 annual Labour Force Survey (LFS). The percentage of jobs in each LAD/UA which are at graduate level (see below) have been obtained from the same source. Together with the number of jobs in each area, these allow the unemployment rates and percentages of graduate jobs in each institution's neighbourhood to be calculated.

Graduate jobs

19. In the study by the Institute for Employment Research, 'Moving on', jobs were classified on the basis of their Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) as graduate jobs, graduate track jobs, and non-graduate jobs. We have used this breakdown to obtain information about the types of job available in an institution's neighbourhood.

20. The factor used in the model is the percentage of jobs in the neighbourhood which are graduate jobs. This gave better discrimination between institutions for the model used than the combined percentage of jobs which were either graduate or graduate track.

21. Table C8 lists the SOC codes that are used to define the three job types.

Unemployment rate

22. Because the majority of graduates are in their twenties, it was decided to use the unemployment rates among 20-29 year olds in each neighbourhood.

Average entry scores

23. This variable is calculated for home-domiciled entrants to full-time first degree courses in 1999-2000. It was decided to use the most recent entry data available, rather than take an average over the leaving cohort, who would have entered at different times and possibly with differing entry requirements.

24. The average was taken for all such students who entered with A-levels or Scottish Highers, and for whom number of points was recorded. The following tables show the grade to points conversions used.

A-levels

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Points	10	8	6	4	2

AS-levels

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Points	5	4	3	2	1

Scottish Highers

Grade	A	B	C
Points	6	4	2

25. The maximum number of points recorded is 30, equivalent to three grade As at A-level, or five grade As at Scottish Highers. The average entry qualification for

an institution is therefore an underestimate, in general. For institutions with few point scores recorded, the average score across the sector has been used.

Table C1: Subject groups

	Subject	HESA codes
A	Medicine, dentistry, veterinary science	A1-A4, D1
B	Pharmacy, Ophthalmics, Nursing, Medical technology	B3, B5, B7, B8
C	Other subjects allied to medicine	B1, B2, B4, B6, B9
D	Biological sciences	C1-C9
E	Agriculture	D2-D4, D8, D9
F	Physical sciences	F1-F9
G	Mathematical sciences	G1-G4, G9
H	Computer science	G5
I	Engineering and technology	H1-H9, J1-J9
J	Architecture, building and planning	K1-K9
K	Economics, Social work, Geography	L1, L5, L8
L	Other Social and Political studies, Law	L3, L4, L6, L7, M1, M3, M9
M	Business and administrative studies	N1-N9
N	Librarianship & information science	P1-P6
O	Languages, Humanities	Q1-Q9, R1-R8, T1-T9, V1-V9
P	Music, Drama	W3, W4
Q	Other Creative arts	W1, W2, W5-W9
R	Education	X1-X9
S	Combined studies	Y1-Y6

Table C2: **Entry qualifications**

Code	Entry qualifications	HESA codes
1	A-levels or Highers, points unknown	QUALENT2=39, 40
2	A-levels or Highers, up to 8 points, or Baccalaureate	QUALENT2=39, 40, 47
3	A-levels or Highers, 9 to 12 points	QUALENT2=39, 40
4	A-levels or Highers, 13 to 18 points	QUALENT2=39, 40
5	A-levels or Highers, 19 to 24 points	QUALENT2=39, 40
6	A-levels or Highers, 25 points or over	QUALENT2=39, 40
7	Access qualification	QUALENT2=29, 43, 48
8	BTEC or equivalent	QUALENT2=41
9	GNVQ level 3 or above	QUALENT2=40
10	Higher education	QUALENT2=01 to 16, 21 to 30
11	Other, or not known	QUALENT2=55, 56, 92, 93, 97, 98, 99

Table C3: **Age group**

Code	Age group
1	Under 21 at entry
2	Age 21 to 24 at entry
3	Age 25 or over at entry
4	Unknown age

Table C4: **Ethnicity**

Code	Ethnic group	HESA codes
1	White	ETHNIC=10
2	Black Caribbean	ETHNIC=21
3	Black African	ETHNIC=22
4	Black other	ETHNIC=29
5	Indian	ETHNIC=31
6	Pakistani	ETHNIC=32
7	Bangladeshi	ETHNIC=33
8	Chinese	ETHNIC=34
9	Asian other	ETHNIC=39
10	Other, or unknown	ETHNIC=80, 90, 98, 99

Table C5: **Social Class**

Code	Group
1	Social Classes I, II and IIIn
2	Social Classes IIIm, IV and V
3	Unknown Social Class

Table C6: Neighbourhood type

Code	Group
1	Low participation neighbourhood
2	Neighbourhood that is not low participation
3	Neighbourhood of unknown type

Table C7: **Degree classification**

Code	Degree class
1	First class honours
2	Upper second class honours
3	Lower second class honours, or undivided second class honours
4	Third class honours
5	Other classification

Table C8: **Definition of graduate and graduate track jobs**

Job type	SOC codes used
Graduate	100 101 102 103 110 111 113 120 123 124 125 126 131 150 151 152 153 154 155 170 176 190 191 200 201 202 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 230 231 232 233 234 235 239 240 241 242 250 251 252 253 260 261 262 270 271 290 291 292 293 3003301 302 303 304 310 311 312 313 320 331 340 341 342 343 344 347 348 350 360 361 362 363 364 480 381 382 383 384 390 392 394 395 396 399
Graduate track	112 121 122 127 130 132 139 140 141 142 160 169 171 172 173 174 175 177 178 179 199 309 330 332 345 346 349 370 371 385 386 387 391 393 400 401 410 420 421 450 463 491 511 512 513 515 516 517 518 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 529 532 534 540 541 543 556 560 561 570 571 573 592 593 598 610 611 612 613 642 643 650 660 661 700 701 702 703 710 719 790 791 864 893 904
Non-graduate	411 412 430 440 441 451 452 459 460 461 462 490 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 509 510 514 519 530 531 533 535 536 537 542 544 550 551 552 553 554 555 557 559 562 563 569 573 579 580 581 582 590 591 594 595 596 597 599 614 615 619 620 621 622 630 631 640 641 644 651 652 659 670 671 672 673 690 691 699 720 721 722 730 731 732 733 792 800 801 802 809 810 811 812 813 814 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 829 830 831 832 833 834 839 840 841 842 843 844 850 851 859 860 861 862 863 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 889 890 891 892 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 910 911 912 913 919 920 921 922 923 924 929 930 931 932 933 934 940 941 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 990 999

Annex D

Membership of Performance Indicators Steering Group

1. The Performance Indicators Steering Group (PISG) was set up in March 1998, with members representing the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), HM Treasury, HESA, the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (now Universities UK), the Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP), the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW). The Scottish Higher Education Funding Council (SHEFC) originally sent an observer, but subsequently became a full member of the group. The Higher Education Management Statistics group (HEMS) send an observer. Papers are sent to both the Welsh Office and the Department of Higher and Further Education, Training and Employment (DHFETE) in Northern Ireland.

2. A number of other bodies were later invited to join the group. The steering group now also includes members from the National Union of Students (NUS), Committee of Scottish Higher Education Principals (now Universities Scotland), Universities and Colleges Admissions Services (UCAS), Office of Science and Technology (OST) and the Department of Health (DH). In addition, the sub-group formed to consider employment indicators includes representatives from the Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (AGCAS) and the Careers Service Unit (CSU).

3. The following are the current members representing these bodies on the steering group and on the sub-group.

Membership of PISG

Bahram Bekhradnia (Chairman)	HEFCE
Patricia Ambrose	SCOP
Carole Barrington	HESA
Linda Bradley	DHFETE
Tony Bruce	Universities UK
Michael Davidson	DfEE
Reg DeMellow	SHEFC
Frances Good	HEFCW
Jeremy Taylor	HM Treasury
Sofija Opacic	NUS
Tony Higgins	UCAS
Michael Hipkins	DfEE
Ben Newbound	OST
Jane Wild	HESA
Professor Joan Stringer	Universities Scotland
Marian Taylor	DH
John Thompson	HEFCE
David Young	Universities UK
David Wann	SHEFC
Professor Robin Sibson	HEMS
Judy Akinbolu (Secretary)	HEFCE

Membership of employment sub-group

Bahram Bekhradnia (Chairman)	HEFCE
Carole Barrington	HESA
Mary McAleese	DfEE
Michael Davidson	DfEE
Frances Good	HEFCW
Jeremy Taylor	HM Treasury
Mike Hill	CSU
Michael Hipkins	DfEE
Anne-Marie Martin	AGCAS
Graeme Rosenberg	HEFCE
Professor Robin Sibson	HEMS
John Thompson	HEFCE
Judy Akinbolu (Secretary)	HEFCE