

Funding for equivalent or lower qualifications (ELQs)

Submission to Innovation, Universities and Skills Select Committee

Introduction

The University and College Union (UCU) represents more than 120,000 academics, lecturers, trainers, instructors, researchers, managers, administrators, computer staff, librarians and postgraduates in universities, colleges, prisons, adult education and training organizations across the UK. We have consulted with UCU members, practitioners and vice-chancellors on the ELQ funding withdrawal and the following response draws upon the views of this diverse constituency.

Executive summary

1. The UCU is strongly opposed to the withdrawal of ELQ funding.
2. The policy will undermine, rather than bolster, the Leitch agenda and government objectives to raise higher level skills and widen participation.
3. Abolishing public support for a huge swathe of ELQ places will lead to large and differential increases in the tuition fees paid by UK/EU students.
4. There is little evidence to suggest that employers will be willing to plug the funding gaps, both in terms of supporting students and co-funded HE programmes.
5. The consequences of the ELQ withdrawal will be reduced participation in HE, particularly from part-time students.
6. The withdrawal of funding will disproportionately disadvantage women returners and older learners.
7. While the Open University and Birkbeck College are hardest hit, the cuts in funding affect a wide variety of universities and departments – often those which have done most to widen participation.
8. Specialist expertise and infrastructure in adult, part-time HE may be permanently damaged as a result of the ELQ policy, hitting both first time and second time HE students.
9. UCU calls on the Government to withdraw the policy and defer the issue of ELQ funding to the 2009 Fees Commission.

Section 1: The arguments for and against the Government's decision to phase out support to institutions for students studying ELQs

10. The Government has stated that the reason for withdrawing £100 million of funding to English institutions for students studying ELQs is one of 'fairness'. According to the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS) the teaching of ELQ students 'is not...usually as high a priority for public funding as support for students who are either entering higher education for the first time, or progressing to higher qualifications'.¹ The Department has also claimed that the changes 'should make a difference to the importance institutions attach to raising skills and to widening participation'.² For the following reasons, we believe that these assumptions are highly questionable.

- It is wrong to claim that the ELQ policy will only affect 'Second Degree Students'. In fact, the decision affects a very wide range of students and universities in England, including many involved in short or part-time vocational, employer-focused and professional education and training courses.
- ELQ learners are not 'middle class freeloaders' who are looking to be perpetual students at the taxpayers' expense. The majority of them are studying part-time whilst juggling work and family commitments.
- The ELQ proposals are based on a simplistic notion of skill acquisition. Modern labour markets require re-skilling, as well as up-skilling, and ELQ students are often the very ones acquiring new vocational and professional skills and qualifications along the lines advocated by the Prime Minister and Lord Leitch.
- To assume that first-time learners are somehow in competition for funds and places with ELQ students ignores the role played by ELQ students in ensuring the viability and availability of courses for first-time applicants. Widening participation work in a continuing education setting is particularly dependent, both financially and in terms of the quality of the student experience, on the involvement of ELQ students.

11. Another reason put forward by the Government for withdrawing public funding for ELQ students is that their employer will be able 'to pay at least a proportion of the costs of such re-training'.³ Unfortunately, UK employers do not have a good track record of investing in training and education and we are extremely sceptical about their willingness to subsidise employees' participation in higher education

12. The DIUS has said that the £100 million will be reallocated to the new priority area, namely, co-funded places with employers. However, HEFCE has pointed out that the co-funding strategy still requires major development work. In the meantime, the Government's high risk strategy is likely to damage existing part-time, adult higher

¹Letter from John Denham, Secretary of State for Innovation, Universities and Skills, dated 7 September 2007.

²DIUS, Advance Notice on Higher Education Funding Changes for England – Second Degree Students, <http://www.dius.gov.uk/publications/hefunding.html>

³Letter from John Denham, dated 7 September 2007.

education and seriously jeopardise the prospects of many individuals who aspire to improve their life chances

13. We are dismayed by the ultra-utilitarian approach adopted by the Government on ELQ funding, including the choice of exemptions proposed by HEFCE (see section 3). The value of lifelong learning cannot be reduced to an employer-led, skills agenda but is important in promoting an intellectually healthy and culturally rich society. There is also government-funded research highlighting the wider benefits of learning, such as in relation to health and wellbeing, community safety, civic engagement and social cohesion, and economic regeneration.⁴

Section 2: The timing of the decision and of the implementation of the change

14. This massive change in Government policy was announced in September 2007 without any prior consultation or parliamentary debate. Instead, the HEFCE is consulting only over how the ELQ decision is to be implemented. We ask why there was no consultation on alternatives to this approach.

15. The September announcement was not simply an operational one but an historic shift in the principle of higher education funding. Beginning in 2008, a number of UK/EU students will be no longer fundable for an HE course and as a result they are likely to be treated in the same way as international students. When public funding is scrapped for ELQ students, universities will have no option but to charge similar tuition fees to those charged to overseas students (i.e. where full-time fees start at £7000 per year).

16. The new policy will mean different fee levels for UK residents studying on the same course and further divergence across the nations of the UK. Similarly, British residents with an overseas qualification awarded years ago but who have not previously accessed UK higher education will also be charged the same fees as international students. The ELQ funding withdrawal represents a significant de-regulation of the English tuition fee regime in advance of the 2009 Commission on fees.

17. We are also concerned about the short-time frame for phasing out ELQ funding and particularly the impact on staff. Although the HEFCE consultation period has only just finished, the Government is insisting on withdrawing ELQ funding from the 2008-9 academic year. Unfortunately, the results are entirely predictable:

⁴The Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning (WBL)
<http://www.learningbenefits.net/Index.htm>

*'The implementation timescales do not give sufficient time to scope the issues before having to make decisions on matters such as next year's advertised programme, our prospectus and the required staffing for next year.'*⁵

Section 3: The exemptions from the withdrawal of funding proposed by the Higher Education Funding Council for England

18. The UCU has a principled objection to 'cherry picking' various subjects, courses and employer-led programmes for continued public support, whilst encouraging a full-fee regime for ELQ students on non-HEFCE funded courses. Even in terms of the Government's vocational mindset, however, it is difficult to see the logic behind some of the HEFCE exemptions. For example, why are students involved in land management and courses related to EU accession countries publicly supported while ELQ students on vocational courses related to management, psychology and computing receive no public funding for their studies? We would like to know what HEFCE's rationale is for excluding core vocational subjects such as these.

19. We are mindful of the practical consequences of a policy based on subject and programme exemptions. For example, it is likely to result in widespread institutional 'games playing' such as repackaging existing undergraduate provision as foundation degrees and re-branding subject areas to fit in with current HEFCE exemptions.

20. Crucially, the new policy fails to recognize the 'shelf life' of qualifications and the rapid changes in skills that are required in a knowledge economy. ELQ students are often engaged in re-training and career development activities a number of years after they completed their first degree. In the absence of the DIUS withdrawing the current policy we advocate exempting all students who return to study five years after their first degree. We believe that a five year time limit would go some way towards mitigating the detrimental impact on different groups, particularly women returners and older learners (see section 4).

Section 4: The impact upon students, including whether the change will affect some groups of students more than others

21. Modelling by HEFCE and institutions shows that part-time students are much more likely to be affected by the ELQ changes than full-time students. Part-time students are also particularly 'price sensitive' in relation to course fees.⁶ The introduction of full market fees for ELQ students is likely to depress part-time participation in higher education, particularly as part-timers already have less access to student support packages than their full-time equivalents.

⁵Response from the head of a pre-1992 continuing education/lifelong learning centre.

⁶Universities UK, *Part-time students and part-time study in higher education in the UK: a survey of students' attitudes and experiences of part-time study and its costs 2005-6*, November 2006.

22. A major unintended consequence is that widening participation students will also lose local opportunities to participate in HE. Many part-time, professional development and continuing education courses in higher education will become non-viable without ELQ students.

23. As part of our consultation for this inquiry we have become aware of the negative effects on future WP programmes. For example, the head of a pre-1992 lifelong learning centre reports that the ELQ changes are *'likely to hit at least one of our new frameworks designed especially to encourage WP of local adults from under-represented and disadvantaged groups.'* In another case, the ELQ proposals have forced Bristol University to drop its popular Art History outreach course and abandon plans to appoint a lifelong learning coordinator.⁷

24. Women are over-represented in the part-time student population and also in the disciplines that are threatened with the funding withdrawal, principally, in the arts, humanities and the social sciences. We are concerned that the ELQ funding changes have the potential to impact disproportionately on women returning to work.

25. There will be a detrimental impact on older learners who will have obtained their first degree many years ago. Older workers are also much less likely to get employer support for education and training and in many instances employers may prefer simply to replace them.

26. The disproportionate impact on London institutions has implications for students from black and minority ethnic (BME) backgrounds. In particular, some of the hardest hit HE institutions, such as London Metropolitan and the University of East London, are very successful in recruiting BME students.

27. Initial feedback from UCU members suggests that the ELQ policy will have a detrimental impact on different groups of staff. It is likely that the majority of job cuts resulting from the funding reallocations will be amongst fixed-term and hourly-paid teaching staff traditionally employed on part-time and short-term courses. Our research has shown that women in particular are disproportionately employed on fixed-term and hourly-paid posts.⁸ In terms of the ELQ policy we have been informed by a head of department that the *'key impact will be on fixed term part-time tutors, especially women and minority ethnic groups who are trying to get onto the teaching ladder or who juggle several posts at different institutions.'*

28. For these reasons, we strongly urge the HEFCE to undertake and publish a proper equality impact assessment before the ELQ policy is introduced.

⁷<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/arthistory/lifelong>

⁸Association of University Teachers, *The Unequal Academy: UK academic staff 1995-96 to 2002-03*, October 2004.

Section 5: The impact of the change upon institutions, with particular reference to the long-term implications for specialized institutions such as the Open University and Birkbeck College London.

29. The two specialist part-time higher education institutions - the Open University and Birkbeck College - are clearly the main victims of the ELQ proposal. UCU analysis has shown that the Open University is set to lose over £31.6 million in teaching funding by 2014-15 (a 22.7% cut), affecting nearly a quarter of all its HEFCE-funded students. Birkbeck will suffer a 38% cut in its teaching grant over the same period (£7.87 million), affecting more than a third of all its HEFCE-funded students (see tables 1, 2 & 3 in the appendix).

30. Local UCU branches are very concerned about the impact on jobs, particularly the large numbers of hourly paid lecturers teaching on adult courses. Our members also see the proposals as a fundamental attack on the liberal ethos of these unique institutions.

31. This is not just an issue affecting these two institutions. Our analysis of the HEFCE data shows that a wide variety of institutions will experience significant reductions in public funding (see tables 1 & 2 in the appendix). Universities such as London Metropolitan, Westminster and Sunderland – who do wonderful work to support widening participation and employer engagement – are amongst some of the worst affected.

32. It is difficult to reconcile the ELQ funding withdrawal with Lord Leitch's call '*to increase the higher education sector's focus on workforce development*' and to encourage HEIs '*to collaborate with employers in delivering training that meet employers' needs*'. This is because many of the threatened ELQ programmes focus on national and regional priorities for retraining and up-skilling adults. Coventry University, for example, is very concerned about the '*negative impact on courses in management*' especially as '*improved management competence*' is the '*top priority for the Regional Skills Partnership under the RDA*'. Similarly, cultural regeneration has been vital to the revival of the North East economy and yet the ELQ cuts threaten Sunderland University's lifelong learning programmes with more than 40 cultural partners.

33. Nor is the problem confined to post-92 institutions. Both King's College and City University, for example, are significantly affected by the cuts in ELQ funding for professional and vocational courses in pharmacy, clinical psychology, enterprise and small business management, specialist law and computer programming or design.

34. At the micro-level, specialist continuing education/lifelong learning centres, often located in universities like Oxford that are criticised for not doing enough to widen access, are most affected by the ELQ funding withdrawal. In research-led universities it is increasingly difficult to persuade local managements, preoccupied with the RAE and research grants, that lifelong learning activities and community engagement are core

academic activities. The loss of ELQ funding will make the job of local lifelong learning specialists much harder.

35. Above all, we are concerned that the ELQ funding changes will result in a permanent loss of staff expertise in working with adults and part-time students at the HE level. The threat of ELQ funding cuts is already having an impact on continuing education provision. At Hull the new policy poses *'a threat to the sustainability of some areas of provision especially around liberal adult education and work related learning in SMEs, the public sector and the voluntary and community sector.'* Oxford University is *'very concerned about the effect the reduction in funding may have on the employment of staff, particularly in the Department of Continuing Education, where lecturers tend to work on a part-time basis.'* Another head of a lifelong learning centre has warned that:

'At best it appears that 50% of the programme would go; at worst 75% (depending on what is meant by 'equivalent' qualifications - another little problem that hasn't been thought about). In turn this would mean that each year between 400 and 600 students without experience of higher education would be denied that opportunity and between 25 and 45 tutors (who are part time sessional staff) would no longer be employed.'

36. Unless there are major changes to the Government's approach, specialist departments, centres and networks may simply disappear or be profoundly damaged. *'There simply won't be the infrastructure and expertise to offer this expanded provision for adults,'* warns Professor Leni Oglesby from the Universities Association for Lifelong Learning (UALL). *'The university centres for lifelong learning will have disappeared, and with them that enormous pool of expertise, experience and commitment which has done so much for so many adults for so long.'*

37. HEFCE safety net procedures will provide some assistance to institutions that are badly affected by the ELQ proposal. However, the safety net will only be in place for three years and because there will be no inflationary increases it will still result in a major loss of income for part-time oriented universities. Safety nets will not crack the destabilization of institutions and departments and simply calling on institutions to adapt their business plans is unacceptable when the cofunding mechanisms for doing so are inadequate.

38. The £20 million additional 'uplift' funding to support part-time provision, while welcome, is inadequate to mitigate the effect of this policy across all institutions. It was also announced prior to the ELQ funding policy and will only start from 2009-10.

39. The UCU has concerns about the viability, and indeed administrative costs, of monitoring and recording prior qualifications. Universities will continue to rely on students accurately reporting their previous qualifications and given the financial implications, students will have few incentives to disclose prior qualifications. The complex additional bureaucracy needed to police the new system flies in the face of the government's own ambition to reduce the burden of regulation in higher education. We

would like to know whether the DIUS has conducted a regulatory impact assessment of the ELQ policy.

40. Although the £100 million funding withdrawal represents only 0.2% of the overall HE budget, it will have a disproportionate, long-term and damaging impact on part-time institutions and students.

Conclusion

41. The UCU is strongly opposed to the Government's decision to withdraw £100 million of funding to institutions for students studying ELQs. In short, we commend the analysis developed by the head of the CBI:

'The Government is now setting out on a drive to develop co-funding with what seems like a very limited base of evidence on which to build its arguments...Its decision to finance this programme in part by shifting funding away from ELQs looks like a crude measure, which has not been properly discussed with the sector and which will probably have unintended consequences'.⁹

42. In addition, given falls of 17,500 full-time first year enrolments of UK-domiciled students in England in 2006-7 compared with 2005-6, England can ill afford to cut 52,000 FTE ELQ students.

43. We call on the Government to defer the implementation of the ELQ policy and to refer it to the 2009 Fees Commission for proper consideration and consultation.

⁹Richard Lambert, Universities UK Inaugural Annual Lecture, 11 December 2007.

Appendix: Funding for equivalent or lower qualifications

Table 1: Institutions losing at least £2m of relevant teaching funding by 2014-15 (2007-8 levels)

	£
Open University	31,628,519
Birkbeck College	7,866,367
London Metropolitan University	6,191,987
University of Oxford	4,151,668
University of East London	3,774,215
Thames Valley University	3,630,467
London South Bank University	3,476,541
City University, London	3,191,136
University of the Arts London	3,122,340
University of Westminster	2,966,099
University of Wolverhampton	2,888,322
King's College London	2,719,681
University of Bedfordshire	2,677,349
University of Sunderland	2,642,639
Anglia Ruskin University	2,623,211
University of Brighton	2,576,959
Leeds Metropolitan University	2,466,895
University of Central England in Birmingham	2,352,250
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	2,299,911
Coventry University	2,277,465
University of Teesside	2,140,443
Middlesex University	2,040,832
University of Nottingham	2,018,560
Manchester Metropolitan University	2,004,391

Table 2: Institutions with >10% cuts to relevant teaching funding by 2014-15 (2007-8 levels)

	%
City of Westminster College	40.8%
Birkbeck College	38.3%
South Thames College	28.0%
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	26.0%
London Business School	24.9%
Open University	22.7%
Barking College	21.6%
Institute of Cancer Research	19.5%
Manchester College of Arts and Technology	17.8%
School of Pharmacy	15.3%
Southampton City College	13.9%
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	13.7%
Bradford College	13.6%
City University, London	13.3%
Thames Valley University	12.5%
Craven College	11.6%
Lewisham College	10.8%
University of Bedfordshire	10.7%
University of East London	10.6%
London Metropolitan University	10.3%
North East Surrey College of Technology	10.2%

Table 3: Full-time equivalent (FTE) HEFCE-funded students affected by withdrawal of funding for non-exempted ELQ students

2005-06 Student FTE derived from 2005-06 HESA/ILR data

Calculations by UCU, using data at

http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2007/07_27/

Institution	Total ELQ not exempted FTE	Total ELQ not exempted FTE as % total HEFCE-funded FTE
Open University	8,381	23.0%
Birkbeck College	2,191	37.3%
London Metropolitan University	2,026	12.2%
University of East London	1,214	12.4%
London South Bank University	1,046	12.7%
Nottingham Trent University	1,026	5.9%
City University, London	992	14.8%
University of Oxford	974	7.8%
Thames Valley University	969	12.9%
Anglia Ruskin University	958	7.9%
University of the West of England, Bristol	936	5.7%
University of Westminster	849	6.1%
Leeds Metropolitan University	842	5.4%
University of Wolverhampton	802	6.6%
University of Central England in Birmingham	766	7.7%
University of Warwick	721	6.5%
University of the Arts London	710	7.3%
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	706	5.0%
Sheffield Hallam University	687	4.3%
Manchester Metropolitan University	666	3.1%
University of Sunderland	662	8.0%
University of Brighton	637	6.3%
Middlesex University	625	5.6%
University of Nottingham	617	4.0%
University of Bedfordshire	615	10.0%
University of Teesside	614	6.1%
Coventry University	609	6.3%

Institution	Total ELQ not exempted FTE	Total ELQ not exempted FTE as % total HEFCE-funded FTE
University of Kent	606	5.7%
University of Leicester	562	6.3%
University of Central Lancashire	556	3.7%
De Montfort University	548	3.9%
University of Salford	480	4.4%
Kingston University	465	3.4%
Liverpool John Moores University	458	3.3%
University of Greenwich	453	3.9%
King's College London	453	4.3%
University of Birmingham	452	2.7%
University of Bristol	429	3.5%
University of Sussex	427	5.7%
University of Lincoln	422	4.8%
Oxford Brookes University	422	4.7%
University of Manchester	420	2.0%
University of Derby	406	4.6%
University of Exeter	378	4.2%
University of Huddersfield	374	3.4%
Lancaster University	367	4.3%
Staffordshire University	355	4.1%
University of Southampton	332	3.0%
University of Sheffield	330	2.2%
Keele University	324	5.8%
University of Hull	323	3.7%
University of Portsmouth	323	2.5%
University of East Anglia	321	4.3%
Brunel University	318	3.8%
University of Reading	314	3.9%
Canterbury Christ Church University	304	5.2%
University of Plymouth	303	1.9%
Goldsmiths College, University of London	294	6.7%
University of Cambridge	292	2.6%
University of Bolton	276	5.9%
University of Cumbria	272	8.3%
Roehampton University	271	5.2%
Bradford College	256	13.3%

Institution	Total ELQ not exempted FTE	Total ELQ not exempted FTE as % total HEFCE-funded FTE
University of Bradford	252	4.5%
University of Northampton	243	4.1%
University of Gloucestershire	239	4.3%
University of Hertfordshire	238	1.9%
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College	237	4.8%
University of Durham	210	1.8%
University of Chester	205	3.8%
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	202	26.2%
York St John University	188	6.0%
London Business School	179	24.9%
University of Liverpool	178	1.4%
University of Newcastle upon Tyne	158	1.2%
Bournemouth University	156	1.7%
University of Surrey	144	2.7%
Southampton Solent University	143	1.7%
Edge Hill University	142	3.4%
University of Worcester	137	4.3%
Liverpool Hope University	132	3.3%
University of Bath	123	1.7%
University College London	118	1.0%
School of Oriental and African Studies	114	5.4%
University of Leeds	111	0.6%
School of Pharmacy	108	15.8%
Institute of Education	99	9.0%
University of York	95	1.4%
Queen Mary, University of London	94	1.2%
University of Winchester	94	3.4%
Universities of East Anglia and Essex; Joint Provision at University Campus Suffolk	87	6.1%
Aston University	83	1.6%
Royal Holloway, University of London	71	1.5%
Imperial College London	70	1.0%
University of Essex	67	1.2%
University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone, Rochester	65	1.5%
Doncaster College	64	8.0%
Blackburn College	62	4.6%

Institution	Total ELQ not exempted FTE	Total ELQ not exempted FTE as % total HEFCE-funded FTE
Bishop Burton College	58	9.1%
University of Chichester	57	1.9%
London School of Economics and Political Science	55	1.5%
Manchester College of Arts and Technology	52	18.7%
Bath Spa University	50	1.2%
Central School of Speech and Drama	50	7.4%
Rose Bruford College	48	8.4%
University College Falmouth	47	2.5%
City of Westminster College	46	38.5%
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	45	13.7%
Cranfield University	44	4.5%
Barking College	43	21.4%
Royal Academy of Music	43	10.1%
Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance	42	6.0%
North East Surrey College of Technology	40	9.3%
St Mary's University College	40	1.8%
Royal College of Art	37	5.8%
Blackpool and The Fylde College	34	3.1%
Loughborough University	34	0.4%
Havering College of Further and Higher Education	33	4.4%
Royal College of Music	32	7.3%
Liverpool Community College	31	8.2%
The Grimsby Institute of Further and Higher Education	31	3.6%
Northbrook College, Sussex	30	3.7%
Wirral Metropolitan College	30	9.6%
College of St Mark & St John	30	2.6%
Leeds College of Art and Design	30	3.9%
Newman College of Higher Education	26	2.6%
Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies	25	1.1%
The Solihull College	25	8.0%
South Thames College	24	28.9%
Arts Institute at Bournemouth	23	1.5%
Trinity & All Saints	23	1.5%
Croydon College	22	3.0%
Courtauld Institute of Art	21	9.7%
Loughborough College	19	4.0%

Institution	Total ELQ not exempted FTE	Total ELQ not exempted FTE as % total HEFCE-funded FTE
Farnborough College of Technology	18	2.5%
Norwich School of Art & Design	17	1.8%
New College, Nottingham	17	3.9%
Royal Northern College of Music	17	3.1%
Swindon College	14	4.5%
Exeter College	14	9.0%
City of Sunderland College	14	6.9%
City College, Manchester	13	3.9%
The College of North West London	13	9.4%
St Helens College	13	2.1%
University of London	13	6.5%
Westminster Kingsway College	13	6.8%
St George's Hospital Medical School	11	0.8%
Hull College	11	2.0%
Newcastle College	11	0.6%
Chesterfield College	11	5.6%
Wiltshire College	10	7.5%
Northumberland College	10	8.0%
York College	10	4.7%
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication	9	0.9%
Worcester College of Technology	9	2.0%
Warwickshire College, Royal Leamington Spa, Rugby & Moreton Morrell	8	1.4%
Dudley College of Technology	8	3.1%
Accrington and Rossendale College	8	3.6%
New College, Durham	8	0.8%
Stephenson College	8	5.5%
The Sheffield College	8	1.8%
Dartington College of Arts	7	1.4%
Lakes College - West Cumbria	7	5.3%
Wigan and Leigh College	7	1.6%
Herefordshire College of Art and Design	7	3.2%
North Lindsey College	7	2.2%
Gateshead College	7	3.2%
Leicester College	6	3.3%
Leeds College of Music	6	1.0%

Institution	Total ELQ not exempted FTE	Total ELQ not exempted FTE as % total HEFCE-funded FTE
Royal Veterinary College	6	0.5%
Brooklands College	5	3.7%
Dewsbury College	5	3.0%
South Tyneside College	5	1.2%
Southampton City College	5	12.5%
Filton College	5	2.3%
Wakefield College	5	2.5%
New College Stamford	5	5.5%
Calderdale College	5	2.6%
Bromley College of Further and Higher Education	5	8.6%
Herefordshire College of Technology	5	5.5%
Writtle College	4	0.5%
North Trafford College of Further Education	4	3.5%
Bedford College	4	3.0%
Institute of Cancer Research	4	19.5%
Sandwell College	4	8.4%
Oxford and Cherwell Valley College	4	3.5%
South Leicestershire College	4	9.0%
Ealing, Hammersmith and West London College	4	3.8%
West Thames College	4	2.3%
Craven College	4	12.1%
West Nottinghamshire College	4	1.3%
Dearne Valley College	3	3.1%
North West Kent College of Technology	3	1.8%
City of Bath College	3	3.7%
Bishop Grosseteste University College, Lincoln	3	0.5%
Hopwood Hall College	3	2.0%
Henley College Coventry	3	2.4%
North Nottinghamshire College	3	7.5%
Stockport College	3	0.4%
Bridgwater College	3	1.6%
Matthew Boulton College of Further and Higher Education	3	2.4%
Tyne Metropolitan College	3	1.4%
City College Plymouth	3	4.5%
South Nottingham College	3	2.6%
Lewisham College	3	10.8%

Institution	Total ELQ not exempted FTE	Total ELQ not exempted FTE as % total HEFCE-funded FTE
Kingston College	3	3.0%
Chichester College	3	2.0%
Tameside College	3	2.3%
RCN Institute	2	1.3%
North East Worcestershire College	2	0.8%
Leeds College of Technology	2	5.1%
Askham Bryan College	2	1.2%
Macclesfield College	2	1.6%
City College, Coventry	2	1.7%
Kensington and Chelsea College	2	4.9%
Castle College Nottingham	2	0.8%
Barnfield College	2	2.9%
Carlisle College	2	1.6%
Walsall College	1	0.8%
Harper Adams University College	1	0.1%
Royal Agricultural College	1	0.2%
Central Sussex College	1	0.7%
Stroud College in Gloucestershire	1	6.0%
North Warwickshire and Hinckley College	1	1.6%
South Downs College	1	1.4%
Sparsholt College, Hampshire	1	0.3%
Newham College of Further Education	1	2.7%
Stourbridge College	1	3.6%
City College, Birmingham	1	1.6%
Salford College	1	2.2%
West Kent College	1	3.0%
Total	52,504	5.3%