

## REFERENCE NOTES FOR PRACTITIONERS

### Technical detail and explanations

These reference notes are provided as an aide to practitioners responsible for the technical design of the costing model (described in the Annex) that calculates the total costs of partnership activity in an HEI or FEC. It includes a glossary that will be of use to readers of the main report.

Pages 1 to 9 are reference notes giving technical detail and explanations. Key words and phrases are listed on the left in alphabetical order.

Pages 10 to 18 contain a list of activities that are relevant to partnership provision, along with notes on how the relevant costs of each activity can be established in both an HEI and a college, using the methods described in the Annex.

Academic departments	<p>Departments can be defined differently by individual institutions, e.g. as a school or faculty, curriculum area or campus.</p> <p>It is assumed that academic and lecturing staff are managed within academic departments; non-teaching departments are called central service departments.</p> <p>Academic staff include academic/lecturing staff, visiting lecturers, administrators, managers, heads of department, etc. They may be called teaching staff in colleges.</p> <p>Non-staff or non-pay costs will cover salary costs and departmental costs (office costs, equipment, travel, fieldwork, etc).</p>
Accreditation	<p>Process by which an awarding body delegates authority to an organisation for a wide range of quality assurance functions while remaining ultimately responsible for quality and academic standards.</p> <p>(Extract from <i>Policy, practice and prospects</i>, p52)<sup>1</sup></p>
Activities	<p>A list of each activity relevant to partnerships is given on pages 10 to 18, together with notes describing how the relevant costs of each can be established in both an HEI and a college.</p>
Activity-based costing	<p>Activity-based costing techniques ensure that all costs are attributed to all activities (e.g. teaching, research and, within teaching, the costs of collaborative provision separately from all other provision). All costs are attributed – those in academic departments and those in central service departments.</p> <p>Two techniques are used (see separate entries below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct attribution (through either direct identification or direct allocation);</li> <li>• apportionment.</li> </ul>
Actual costs	<p>Using actual costs helps to ensure objectivity, and examining actual spend can help to understand why the costs are at the level they are. An alternative – ‘should-be’ costs – often leads to lack of agreement and confusion.</p> <p>Therefore, the Annex assumes that actual costs are used, except in the</p>

<sup>1</sup> *Supporting higher education in further education colleges: Policy, practice and prospects*, HEFCE, March 2009/05

	<p>following respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the TRAC cost adjustments are included (in both the HEI and – using a proxy – in the FEC);</li> <li>• any abnormal patterns of spend are smoothed out;</li> <li>• standard costs (e.g. pay-bands) and assumptions (e.g. when calculating a cost per hour) are used where helpful.</li> </ul>
Actual hours	See productive hours.
Apportionment	When costs are apportioned, costs sharing similar characteristics are grouped into 'cost pools'. These are then attributed to activities (different activities within teaching, research and knowledge transfer activities) using cost drivers (such as staff time or student numbers).
Central service departments	<p>All departments in an institution that are not academic or teaching departments. This includes libraries, Information Technology, registry, finance, marketing, human resources, quality assurance, student support, principal/vice-chancellor's office and estates.</p> <p>Costs in these departments include both salary and non-pay costs (audit, insurance, advertising, estates depreciation and maintenance, etc).</p>
Collaborative arrangements	<p>Provision leading to an award by an awarding HEI which is delivered and/or supported through an arrangement with a partner organisation (this is the QAA definition).</p> <p>(Based on <i>Policy, practice and prospects</i>, p176)</p>
Colleges	Further education colleges.
Contact hours	<p>Face-to-face timetabled contact with students. For the tutor, this includes class contact hours, but also includes placement supervision, project supervision, etc.</p> <p>It is not the same as guided learning hours (LSC) or study time for the students, which will include contact time, tutoring, work-based learning hours, mentoring, online learning and independent study.</p> <p>Contact hours are different from contractual or scheduled hours (see separate entry).</p> <p>Also see uplift.</p>
Contractual hours	<p>Hours that are scheduled in workload planning models in colleges. These include contact hours, but generally also include remissions and non-contact activity (module leadership, scholarly activity, etc).</p> <p>They are sometimes called scheduled hours.</p> <p>Contractual hours could be identified through workload planning models. These are often used for costing in colleges, as all contact hours are recorded in such models, and they cover a significant part of lecturers' time (recording about half – around 830 – of their available hours). They of course include standards (in FECs, one hour contractual time often equals about two hours of actual effort, assuming a total available time of around 1650 hours per annum).</p> <p>Institution-wide workload planning models are far less common in HEIs than they are in colleges. However, even in FECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitions of scheduled hours differ among institutions (time on scholarly activity for staff involved in HE, quality assurance or research may or may not be accounted for within the scheduled hour allocations and remissions from this).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time spent in developing programmes, or in partnership management and quality assurance activities, could not be established from workload planning models that do not specifically recognise these types of activity.</li> <li>• There is a wide variation of scheduled and contractual hours in the college sector: 830 hours are used by some colleges for staff delivering HE provision; contractual hours for HE staff in some colleges are 550 (reflecting HEI contracts); staff in other colleges are scheduled to work 1000 hours (with no remissions – i.e. everything is planned and scheduled); programme managers may be on a reduced contractual hour total of say 414, or alternatively may be on something nearer 850 from which hours are remitted in recognition of their additional responsibilities.</li> <li>• Contractual hours can differ from scheduled hours. Even if the contract states 830 hours, the hours actually timetabled or scheduled for an individual may only total 750 or 800.</li> </ul> <p>These variations lead to a lack of consistency and comparability (and robustness) when costing. It can be more helpful to use a tighter definition of contact hours instead of contractual hours, and non-contact activities can then be accounted for in a different way. This is the approach taken in the Annex.</p>
<p>Contribution costing</p>	<p>An alternative approach to activity-based costing is to establish only the costs that are incurred on this provision by the academic departments, and then calculate a contribution (towards the central support costs). This approach is commonly used by colleges.</p> <p>The contribution can be expressed in terms of a required contribution (e.g. “a surplus equivalent to 100% of academic department costs needs to be generated if central support costs are to be covered”). This assumes that total costs are therefore 200% of department costs. This is a more simplistic way of arriving at a total cost than that used by an activity-based costing model.</p> <p>Simple activity-based costing techniques can be easily introduced instead of the contribution approach. HEIs are very familiar with these techniques – they benefit from fairly sophisticated models in TRAC. But simple activity-based costing techniques can be used in FECs, and these are assumed in the Annex. Those relevant for each activity are described at the end of these reference notes.</p>
<p>Cost adjustments</p>	<p>See full economic cost, or fEC.</p>
<p>Course</p>	<p>Programme or module: HNC, foundation degree, undergraduate or postgraduate taught degree.</p>
<p>Direct attribution</p>	<p>Costs should be directly attributed to collaborative provision where possible, rather than relying on a more indirect apportionment using proxies (such as student numbers, or staff numbers).</p> <p>Two techniques are used to directly attribute costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct identification (directly incurred costs); or</li> <li>• direct allocation.</li> </ul> <p>Direct identification is more precise. It is generally done by identifying the activity for which that cost was incurred when it was spent (e.g. the cost of staff travel supporting students on one partnership could be allocated to that partnership and those students on the expenses claim). These costs are termed ‘directly incurred’ in TRAC.</p>

	<p>However, in practice, these 'directly incurred' costs are few, and direct allocation is used instead. A range of measurements (e.g. academic staff time, or estimates) are used to allocate a range of costs such as academic salaries, administrative and technical staff, and non-staff costs in academic departments.</p>
Direct funding	<p>Direct funding is where the college has a direct contract with HEFCE, which the college manages itself. It can set its own fees but, except where a college has been granted powers to award foundation degrees, needs to have the curriculum validated by an awarding body, usually an HEI. The college has responsibility for the student numbers, the quality of the provision, and the student experience, but the standards of the award are the responsibility of the awarding body. HEFCE is empowered to fund only certain types of full HE qualifications in directly funded colleges.</p> <p>(Extract from <i>Supporting higher education in further education colleges: Policy, practice and prospects</i>, HEFCE March 2009/05, p36)</p>
FEC	Further education college.
Franchising	<p>In relation to funding, this describes almost all collaborative funding arrangements – where a student is registered at one institution but taught at another.</p> <p>In terms of collaboration over curriculum development and delivery, a college is franchised to deliver a programme owned by the HEI, under agreed terms and within the HEI's quality assurance regime.</p> <p>(Based on <i>Policy, practice and prospects</i>, p176)</p>
FTEs	Full-time equivalent staff or students. Sometimes the term WTE (whole-time equivalent) is used instead.
Full economic cost (fEC)	<p>'Full costs' means not marginal. An appropriate portion of all costs is attributed to the partnership activities – both academic department and central department costs. While there has been a tendency in HE to cost activities at a marginal level (ignoring the infrastructure costs that 'would have been incurred anyway'), it is very dangerous to do this unless it is very clear what activities are (and will continue to be) really so small as to demand an insignificant (marginal) use of an institution's resources, and it is clear how the full costs of the infrastructure required for these marginal activities are being funded through 'full cost plus' recovery on other activities.</p> <p>The word 'economic' is used in TRAC as two cost adjustments are included – to incorporate a return for financing and investment (this used to be called a cost of capital employed) and to ensure that the replacement costs of estates are used in the depreciation calculations. This gives a full economic cost that can be directly compared with HEFCE funding (and, in research, determines Research Councils' funding).</p> <p>TRAC(T) in HEIs calculates the cost per student to inform HEFCE's funding model; these reported costs include the two cost adjustments.</p> <p>The TRAC cost adjustments are described in Annex 15 of the TRAC guidance (<a href="http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/revisions/annex15.doc">http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/revisions/annex15.doc</a>).</p> <p>In 2006/07 these two adjustments added 7.8% to HEIs' costs (see <a href="http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/circlets/2008/cl14_08/">http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/circlets/2008/cl14_08/</a>); 8% is suggested in the Annex, for both HEIs and FECs.</p>
HEIs	Higher education institutions. Sometimes referred to in colleges as universities.

<p>HE provision</p>	<p>All higher education provision delivered under the partnership arrangement. In an FEC this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HEFCE-fundable – both directly funded and indirectly funded;</li> <li>• full fee-paying;</li> <li>• Department of Health-fundable provision;</li> <li>• non-prescribed HE (LSC-fundable);</li> <li>• co-funded (by employers);</li> <li>• whether Edexcel or HEI validated;</li> <li>• or under QAA or Ofsted quality assurance regimes.</li> </ul> <p>Partners would need to agree whether all or only some of this provision is to be included in the costing exercise.</p>
<p>Indirect cost rates</p>	<p>Indirect costs (or support costs) as defined under TRAC include all activities that are not specific to a particular course (e.g. quality assurance, pastoral support, teaching committees, interviewing prospective students). They also include scholarship; administrative support; faculty/school management; central service departments such as finance and registry; and estates. Most of these costs are apportioned to teaching, rather than directly identified or directly allocated.</p> <p>In TRAC, these costs form part of the indirect cost rates. In HEIs, TRAC produces robust indirect and estates cost rates for research. Indirect cost rates for teaching could be calculated using the total indirect costs that have been identified through TRAC, but they are not formally used or reported under TRAC. Expressed as a £ per staff FTE, or £ per student, they could be added to the direct costs of delivery (directly incurred, or directly allocated) to arrive at a total cost.</p> <p>However, TRAC indirect cost rates for teaching are arguably too blunt a tool to use in the type of costing exercise described in the Annex, as some of the indirect costs of teaching, such as quality assurance or partnership management, can be identified and analysed more specifically. That is one of the benefits of doing the exercise.</p> <p>Therefore, most HEIs will find it more useful to look at their total TRAC indirect/estates costs for teaching before they are converted to an indirect cost rate for teaching, and specifically consider the best way to attribute those costs to this type of provision. This will look at each type of cost (without any aggregation into cost pools) and attribute them to collaborative provision either directly or through apportionment.</p> <p>Exactly the same techniques can be applied in colleges. It need not be burdensome.</p> <p>The techniques which are most appropriate for each activity are described at the back of these reference notes.</p> <p>The Annex assumes that this technique is used – i.e. each type of indirect cost is examined and attributed using a specific technique; a general indirect cost rate for teaching is therefore not applied.</p>
<p>Indirect funding</p>	<p>Indirect funding is where the student numbers belong to another lead institution, normally an HEI, and are sub-contracted to the college. The HEI retains responsibility for student numbers, the curriculum, the quality of the provision and the student experience.</p> <p>(Source – as for ‘direct funding’, above)</p>
<p>Institution</p>	<p>Further education college (FEC) or higher education institution (HEI).</p>

Normal levels of activity	<p>Reflecting normal levels of activity and cost in the costing model removes the impact of, for example, any unusually high vacancies, or the impact of joiners and leavers, and would spread out unusual peaks or troughs in expenditure (e.g. on equipment, or in course development).</p> <p>However, actual student numbers would generally be included, irrespective of recruitment patterns.</p>
Partnership	<p>A partnership or collaborative arrangement (see separate entry) between one HEI and one FEC. This could cover directly funded students and/or indirectly funded students, and could take place in a formal or informally constituted consortium or federation.</p> <p>One typography described different partnerships in this way:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Validation (HEI validates a course developed and delivered by an FEC, where the students are directly funded).</li> <li>B. Validation/registration (HEI validates a course developed and delivered by an FEC, where the students are indirectly funded).</li> <li>C. Franchise (HEI designs and develops a course which is all or mainly delivered by an FEC) – see separate entry.</li> <li>D. Tutor supported (HEI designs a course and provides some learning materials, assignments, etc).</li> <li>E. Joint development and delivery (both partners design a course, and jointly deliver it).</li> </ol> <p>There are other classifications (e.g. provided by the Council of Validating Universities) that could be used instead of or alongside the above. For example, for each of A to E above, it can be helpful to consider the extent to which accreditation accompanies validation (see separate entries). These will determine the services provided by the HEI, and the level and type of quality assurance activities that each institution will carry out.</p> <p>In general, it is assumed in this report that universities and colleges both have multiple partners and more than one partnership agreement with each partner (although in practice this will not always be the case).</p>
Productive hours	<p>The actual hours available for work in a year.</p> <p>It includes time on all activities – teaching, research, other activities and support. Teaching includes any activity linked to a teaching course (from recruitment, development, delivery, assessment).</p> <p>It is used to divide into salaries to obtain a cost per hour. This cost per hour is then applied to the estimates of hours, or contact hours recorded, on relevant activities.</p> <p>In HEIs the standard assumption in TRAC is 1650 productive hours a year. This reflects the hours available to work, after ‘normal’ levels of holiday and sickness.</p> <p>(TRAC guidance: Part V, Section C, paragraphs 11-17, see <a href="http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/part5_c0C.htm">http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance/part5_c0C.htm</a>)</p>
Reasonableness tests	<p>Once the costs of partnership have been obtained in the HEI and FECs, these should be critically revised through tests for reasonableness, including comparing and understanding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cost per hour;</li> <li>• staff hours per student FTE;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cost of each activity;</li> <li>• resources used on each activity (numbers of meetings, visits etc, time, type of staff/unit, non-pay costs);</li> <li>• cost per student, compared with HEFCE's standard unit of resource, and with the HEI's TRAC(T) cost per student figures;</li> <li>• proportion of input made by each partner in a partnership.</li> </ul>
Scheduled hours	See contractual hours.
Should-be costs	See actual costs.
Standard costs	<p>Standard costs and assumptions can be used instead of trying to identify actual costs in very variable or controversial areas. These might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the number of staff required to support a course in a year, or the hours required to deliver a course in a year;</li> <li>• the uplift from contact hours to actual 'real' hours worked;</li> <li>• an average cost per student for library and estates;</li> <li>• the average number of days per manager required in support of one meeting;</li> <li>• pay-bands for staff.</li> </ul> <p>These could be informed by average actual numbers or costs (e.g. average of the experience of all partners).</p> <p>Standards help to reduce the amount of (arguably unnecessary and unhelpful) detail and therefore the work involved in costing. The standard-setting process helps to acknowledge the flexibility in how services are performed, while it also has the benefit of not stifling innovation by insisting that every variation is identified.</p> <p>Standards can help to reduce unhelpful fluctuations in the data caused, for example, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one validation visit being missed in the year being studied (the standard assumption on visits/time would include this visit);</li> <li>• different hours worked in a year (see productive hours);</li> <li>• different workload planning models (i.e. how scholarly activity, HE provision and quality assurance activities are accounted for in different departments or institutions) – see contact hours, and uplift;</li> <li>• different points on salary spines for each lecturer or academic.</li> </ul>
Statistical returns – prepared for	
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency (e.g. the individualised student record)
HESES/HEIFES	Higher Education Students Early Statistics Survey Higher Education in Further Education: Students Survey
LSC (ILR)	Individualised Learner Record collected by the FE data service on behalf of the Learning and Skills Council and other stakeholders.

Support time	<p>Support time is a TRAC term that describes academic activity that is often not quantified in workload allocation models and generally cannot be linked directly to a course or student. The main examples of this are scholarly activity (staff development, research), management, and administration and work required to support all provision in the department.</p> <p>Academic staff in HEIs carry out a range of administrative and managerial work and scholarly activity. This will not be included in their estimates of time spent on a particular activity (such as validation, or supporting partnership provision). Yet this is important activity which is necessary to support partnership provision.</p> <p>TRAC shows that support activity accounts for a significant part of academic activity – on average, nearly 33% of the time of academics (source: 2007/08 annual TRAC results, unpublished). However, when costing collaborative arrangements, some of this TRAC support time would be included in the specific estimates for this provision (such as quality assurance, interviewing students, etc). Therefore (say) one-third of the support time might need to be added to the time and costs estimated for specific partnership activities – i.e. 10% (based broadly on <math>10/(100-20)</math>).</p> <p>There are two alternative ways of adding support time:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) by reducing the 1650 productive hours by 10%, i.e. to around 1500 hours; or</li> <li>b) by adding 10% onto the estimates for specific activities.</li> </ol> <p>The first method (a) is used in the Annex.</p> <p>In FECs, where contact hours are used in the Annex to estimate time, the simplest approach to deriving a cost/hour would be to assume the same productive hours as in an HEI – i.e. 1650. There would be no need for an abatement of hours (to 1500) as it could be assumed that all of the support activities are built into the uplift of contact time to actual hours (i.e. the 2.5 actual hours for each one hour of contact time).</p> <p>In both HEIs and FECs, other support time is provided by academic managers and staff in central service departments. This is included in the apportionment of their total time, which is done separately from the academic or lecturing staff.</p>
Uplift on contact hours	<p>Where contact hours are used to record lecturers' time on teaching, these can provide a proxy for 'actual' productive hours. To do this, they need to be uplifted.</p> <p>A comparative study of leadership, governance and management (LGM) issues of three HE/FE partnerships suggested a formula of 1.3 or 1.5 for each hour of teaching at HE level for time to undertake scholarly activity (in addition to normal preparation), as well as time for meetings and undertaking the QA procedures. The study was led by the University of Huddersfield, and was funded by HEFCE under the LGM initiative (final report, June 2006, see <a href="http://lgm.hud.ac.uk">http://lgm.hud.ac.uk</a>).</p> <p>Applying this formula would mean that every hour of contact time was uplifted to become 2.5 actual hours.</p> <p>Using this approach, it would be important to agree precisely which types of activities were included in the contact time, which were in the uplift, and which would be estimated in addition to these. The following approach may be helpful:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development, preparation, assessment, administration, recruitment, programme leadership, etc are not in the contact time. However, these are included in the contact hour uplift (no additional estimates of time are then required from lecturers).</li> <li>• Similarly, the time that <b>lecturers</b> spend in the development of programmes, or in partnership management and (most) quality assurance activities, is in the contact hour uplift.</li> <li>• But the time that <b>managers</b> spend on the management of the partnership, and quality assurance, is not part of their contact time uplift (so additional estimates of time just for those areas would be required from managers with those responsibilities).</li> <li>• And lecturers' time on one-off exceptional responsibilities (such as supporting IQER or other periodic external quality assurance) might also be separately estimated (i.e. not included in the uplift).</li> </ul>
<p>Validation</p>	<p>Process by which the curriculum of an organisation is judged by the awarding body to be of an appropriate quality and standards to lead to its awards.</p> <p>(Based on <i>Policy, practice and prospects</i>, p52)</p>

Activities – and how their costs can be established

<p><b>A. Validation</b></p> <p>These are fixed costs – broadly irrespective of the size of course – and incurred irrespective of whether the course recruits or not.</p> <p>These costs could be estimated for one course by the <b>HEI</b>. This would provide useful information for pricing validation services. It would involve estimates from academic staff, institutional managers and the quality assurance unit.</p> <p>The costs could then be divided by (say) five years, and extrapolated for the number of courses validated in a year to provide the annualised cost of validation. This would form part of the total annual costs of supporting partnership provision in the HEI.</p> <p>The <b>college</b> costs of validation might not be identified separately. They would then form part of a broader estimate of total costs.</p>	<p><b>Validation</b></p> <p>This covers the initial course validation. It would cover one HE course delivered in partnership, either indirectly or directly validated.</p> <p>Initial discussions, advice, site visit, documentation for programme committee</p> <p>Programme committee</p> <p>Operational meetings – draft operations manual</p> <p>Team meetings</p> <p>Preparation of programme documents for academic committee</p> <p>Academic committee</p> <p>Preparation for HEI approval</p> <p>Validation event</p> <p>Finalise report, amend to reflect panel recommendations</p> <p>Finalise financial arrangements, memorandum of agreement</p> <p>Sign off by QA board</p> <p><b>Periodic (five-yearly) programme review</b></p> <p>External examiners selected and trained</p> <p>Advice and support by QA unit</p> <p>Site visit</p> <p>Academic programme committee</p> <p>Prepare and present documentation to academic board</p> <p>Follow-up</p> <p>Preparation for school validation event</p> <p>Validation</p> <p>Prepare and finalise responses and report</p> <p>School or HEI QA board</p>
--	--

<p><b>B. Quality assurance of the partnership</b></p> <p>These are fixed costs, broadly irrespective of size of the partnership provision. Some are incurred annually, most are incurred every five or so years.</p> <p>These costs could be estimated for one partnership arrangement by the <b>HEI</b>. This would provide useful information for pricing validation services.</p> <p>These costs would be divided by five (as appropriate) when calculating the average annual cost of supporting a partnership, a partner or a student.</p> <p>The <b>college</b> costs associated with setting up, reviewing and the quality assurance of their partnership are unlikely to be identified separately. They would then form part of a broader estimate of total costs.</p>	<p><b>Setting up a partnership</b>  <b>Periodic review of partnership strategy and operations</b>  <b>IQER</b>                  Developmental engagement/s                  Summative reviews                  (a detailed list of activities is available in the IQER handbook available on the QAA website)  <b>Collaborative audit</b>  <b>Internal quality improvement review</b>  <b>National Student Survey (NSS)</b>  <b>Teaching Quality Information (TQI)</b></p>
<p><b>C. Course design and development</b></p> <p>These are fixed costs, broadly irrespective of the size of course, or whether it recruits or not.</p> <p>The work required for one course compared to another would vary significantly (depending on the subject area, level, staff member, etc). It may involve a significant input from a range of partners (HEI, colleges, employers). This area is better dealt with through course costing models (estimating the costs of a new course), rather than a 'total partnership' costing model that is described here.</p> <p>Therefore, rather than identifying a range of costs for developing a course, a simpler approach could be adopted. The costs incurred in the year by the <b>HEI</b> for course design and development could be built into the total annual costs of partnership. <b>Colleges</b> would include this time in their contact hours (and uplift) assumption.</p>	<p><b>Initial curriculum design and development</b>  <b>Annual maintenance</b>                  Updating materials, incorporating pedagogical developments, etc                  (<b>Validation</b> is covered under A above)</p>

<p><b>D. Management and delivery of programmes</b></p> <p>Estimates of time and direct costs associated with these activities would be made by <b>HEI</b> managers. This could record the time and cost for each partnership separately.</p> <p>In the <b>colleges</b>, contact hours could be used to provide information. Where the contact hours definition excludes any of the activities listed right, an estimate of time would be made in addition to contact hours.</p>	<p><b>Delivery</b>                  Academics or lecturers delivering courses                  Link/liaison tutors                  Course leader                  Programme leader                  Curriculum manager/team leader</p> <p><b>Internal programme review:</b>  <b>Annual monitoring</b>                  Assessment boards, study boards                  Student representation and feedback                  Preparing/advice on the annual monitoring report                  Scrutiny of it and the external examiners' reports                  School or HEI QA board</p> <p><b>Assessment of students</b>                  Setting and marking of assessments                  Internal moderation of assessment                  HEI moderation of assessment                  External examining                  Academic offences panels                  Administration and management of assessment marks                  Preparation for exam boards                  Board (and sub-board) of examiners: members                  Board (and sub-board) of examiners: administration                  Independent members of boards                  Preparation and distribution of results</p> <p><b>Leadership and management</b>                  Programme team meetings                  Management liaison meetings                  Involving: academic staff management posts (e.g. programme leader, curriculum manager/team leader)                  HE co-ordinator/s                  Heads of department</p> <p><b>Administrators</b></p>
---	--

<p><b>E. Student support</b></p> <p>Estimates could be provided by academic managers and the head of each unit in both the <b>college</b> and <b>HEI</b>. The level and type of services each provides would be explored during this. Standards (e.g. average levels of support to a group of students for remedial teaching or additional learning needs (ALN)) might be applied instead of actual support for a particular cohort or year.</p> <p>In <b>colleges</b>, some of the support described here is provided by academic staff – e.g. tutorial support, ALN or remedial teaching, etc. That support is unlikely to be estimated separately, but would be included in the contact hour assumption.</p>	<p><b>Academic tutorial support</b>  <b>Pastoral tutorial support</b>  <b>Additional learning needs</b>  <b>Remedial teaching</b>  <b>Mentorship/peer-assisted learning</b>  <b>Work-based learning/placement organisation</b>  <b>Industrial advisory meetings</b>  <b>Counselling</b>  <b>Careers advice and guidance</b>  <b>Employability</b>  <b>Introduction to progression opportunities</b>  <b>International student support</b>  <b>Disability office</b></p>
<p>College students may be members of the HEI's students' union. They may not be geographically close to use it. A cost per student could be calculated, and a simple weighting applied to reflect lower use by off-campus students.</p>	<p><b>Students' Union</b></p>
<p>This cost could be excluded, assuming it is funded outside of any partnership arrangement.</p>	<p><b>Students accommodation (if applicable)</b></p>

<p><b>F. Marketing, admission, registration</b></p> <p>Academic department staff time would be provided through estimates in <b>HEIs</b>, or through the contact hour assumption in <b>colleges</b>.</p> <p>The support provided by central units would need to be estimated by the managers in charge of those units. In both <b>HEI</b> and <b>colleges</b>, an average level of service could be assumed (not linking service levels to particular students or partnership). One way of arriving at this is to remove an amount for any services not used by partnership students, divide the remaining costs of each unit by total students in the institution, and then apply this cost per student to the partnership student numbers.</p>	<p><b>Marketing and promotion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prospectus</li> <li>Advertising and publicity</li> <li>Open days</li> <li>Website</li> <li>Outreach, including school visit</li> <li>Publicity materials, events and advertising:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>course-specific</li> <li>department</li> <li>institution</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Recruitment of students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Admission decision-making for standard applicants</li> <li>Decision-making for non-standard applicants</li> <li>Clearing</li> </ul> <p><b>Admission and induction of students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre-entry information welcome pack</li> <li>Admissions – making offers, conducting interviews</li> <li>Enrolment</li> <li>Induction</li> </ul> <p><b>Registry services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Registration at the HEI</li> <li>Fee assessment and administration</li> <li>Administration of student loans and grants</li> <li>Administration of access funds and hardship loans</li> <li>Conferment and certification</li> <li>Awards ceremony</li> <li>Student appeals and complaints</li> <li>Network access</li> </ul> <p><b>Management information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statistical returns, including for HEFCE, HESA, HESES/HEIFES, LSC (ILR) – see reference notes for definitions</li> </ul>
--	--

<p><b>G. Learning resources</b></p> <p>Estimates could be made by appropriate heads of unit in both the <b>college</b> and <b>HEI</b>.</p> <p>These areas are commonly costed on the basis of eligibility for use, not actual use. If the students are located at a distance they may not physically enter the HEI's library, but there may be additional licensing and online resource costs incurred by the HEI instead.</p> <p>Estimates could be made in detail (e.g. books, licences, use by staff and students), or at a broader level (total costs divided by number of eligible students). In HEIs, the costs already attributed to teaching in TRAC would be used as the basis.</p>	<p><b>Libraries</b></p> <p>Books and journals at location of study                  Online resources at location of study                  Access to HEI library provision for students                  Access to HEI library provision for staff                  Library training (tutorials, workshop)</p> <p><b>IT resources</b></p> <p>Computers for student use, including internet access                  Use of VLE/Blackboard/intranet                  User support</p>
<p><b>H. Scholarly activity</b></p> <p>This is part of the costs of staff in both HEIs and colleges. There are sometimes issues about the availability of lecturers' time in colleges to do this.</p> <p>For staff benefiting from the activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>HEIs</b>, this time would not be recorded separately, but would be included in the productive hour uplift.</li> <li>• In <b>colleges</b>, the simplest approach would build an assumption for this time into the contact time uplift.</li> </ul> <p>However, the time of staff delivering the staff development activities could be specifically estimated as part of the costing exercise.</p>	<p>This includes continuing professional development (CPD) and research, including: own study, attendance at specific conferences run by the HEI or college, access to workshops and conferences run by the HEI and college on pedagogy, HEFCE/HESA policies and requirements etc, research (funded through internal sources or not), attendance on HEI higher degree programmes, attainment and maintenance of Institute for Learning (IfL) registration and qualifications.</p>

<p><b>I. General administration and management in academic departments</b></p> <p>Time on administration and management in academic departments that is specifically related to partnership provision would be obtained through estimates made by <b>HEI</b> staff.</p> <p>Time on administration and management that cannot be specifically related to partnership provision would be taken into account through the reduction in the productive hour assumption (in <b>HEIs</b>).</p> <p>In <b>FECs</b>, all time on administration and management – whether specifically related to partnership provision or not – would be taken into account in the contact hour assumption and its uplift.</p> <p>Non-pay costs that are specifically related to partnership provision would be obtained through estimates made by <b>HEIs</b> and <b>FECs</b>.</p> <p>In <b>HEIs</b>, other non-pay costs would mainly relate to other provision and could be ignored. In <b>FECs</b>, the balance of costs could be allocated to partnership provision on the basis of student numbers.</p>	<p>Staff and managers in academic departments spend time on administrative and management duties that are not associated with a specific course or student. These include planning and management duties carried out by the head of department or school, head of faculty and senior curriculum manager/programme area manager, and include work in resource management, planning, personnel management, attendance on departmental or institutional committees, etc. These are a necessary part of supporting all activities, including partnership provision.</p>
<p><b>J. Partnership management</b></p> <p>Time and costs would be specifically identified.</p> <p>Standards could be used to estimate the average time that a member of each committee spends on partnership provision (e.g. two days per meeting, to allow for preparation, attendance, follow-up).</p>	<p>Head of collaborative partnerships or equivalent post in both HEI and colleges (and any staff they have supporting them).</p> <p>Dedicated HE committees or sub-groups.</p>

<p><b>K. Finance</b></p> <p>Under TRAC, the costs of the finance department in <b>HEIs</b> are already allocated between teaching, research and other activities. The costs allocated to teaching could then be allocated on the basis of student numbers. In <b>FECs</b>, all costs could be allocated on the basis of student numbers.</p> <p>Uncollected fees are a cost. They might be borne by either an <b>FEC</b> or <b>HEI</b>.</p> <p><b>HEI-</b> or <b>college-</b>wide bursaries could be included at an average cost (for all students). Programme-specific bursaries could be included at actual levels paid.</p>	<p><b>Payments to partner institutions</b>  <b>Financial monitoring</b>  <b>Collection of fees</b>  <b>Financial returns to HEFCE and HESA</b></p> <p><b>Bad debts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>part-time fees</b></li> <li>• <b>full-time fees</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Bursaries/scholarships:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HEI- or college-wide</b></li> <li>• <b>programme-specific</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>L. Estates</b></p> <p>A simple approach (used in TRAC) would not attempt to cost each building used to teach the students, nor to identify who funded that building.</p> <p>Unless the <b>HEI</b> delivers teaching, it would be simplest to ignore space costs incurred on the HEI campus.</p> <p>In the <b>college</b>, a simple method of allocating space (using student numbers) could be used.</p>	<p><b>Lecture rooms, laboratories, studios, etc used by students</b>  <b>Offices used by staff</b>  <b>Circulation space used by staff and students</b>  <b>Space used by central service departments</b></p>
<p>The annual expenditure on equipment could be established in the college or HEI unit teaching the students, normalised to reflect expenditure in an 'average year', and allocated across the student populations using student numbers.</p>	<p><b>Equipment</b></p>

<p><b>M. Other central service departments</b></p> <p>Central service departments are important to partnership provision. Some of the time of the managers in these units may already have been identified elsewhere. The costs of any staff or managers whose time has already been taken into account (e.g. in quality assurance, or on committees) would not be included.</p> <p>In <b>HEIs</b>, the remaining costs in departments attributed to teaching in TRAC could be attributed to partnership provision using the established TRAC and TRAC(T) cost drivers.</p> <p>In <b>colleges</b>, the remaining costs of these departments could be divided by student FTEs, and then attributed to partnership provision on the basis of the FTE students in the partnership.</p>	<p>e.g.</p> <p><b>Vice-chancellor/principal’s office</b>  <b>Offices for the pro vice-chancellors (PVCs)/deputy principals/campus heads</b>  <b>Planning</b>  <b>Human resources</b></p>
<p><b>N. Cost adjustments</b></p> <p>These are part of the full economic costs under TRAC, and form part of the costs that are fundable under the HEFCE grant plus fees.</p> <p>A simple percentage (e.g. 8%) could be added to all other costs, in both <b>HEI</b> and <b>FECs</b>, to include these.</p>	<p><b>Infrastructure adjustment</b>  <b>Return for financing and investment</b></p>