

ASU LONDON

ACCESS AND PARTICIPATION PLAN: 2022/23-2025/26

INTRODUCTION

We are ASU London a new small specialist provider which offers innovative degrees in engineering to a diverse range of students, starting from 2021/22. A key aim for us is to increase the diversity of engineers in the UK. This Access and Participation Plan (APP) articulates our commitment to improving equality of opportunity for underrepresented groups to access, succeed in and progress from higher education.

By committing to undertaking the actions outlined within this Access and Participation Plan, we hope to avoid – from the start of our programmes – having the types of attainment and continuation gaps that are currently being experienced across the sector. We initially have small cohorts which enable us to work closely with each student based on their individual needs.

As we are a new provider, we have scant APP data to draw upon currently. We have a robust plan to collect and analyse access and participation data and are committed to ensuring that the trends are drawn from this data will be used to make any necessary interventions to meet our APP targets. Our aims currently relate to access to higher education, but we will set aims regarding success in 2022/23 and will set aims and report on progression in 2024.

As part of the preparation of this APP, we have made use of the OfS dataset, UCAS end of cycle report, and engineering-specific information. We will continue to refer to these data whilst we embark on our research, analysis, and evaluation over the coming years. Our plan adheres to the guidance provided by the OfS, including individual advice from OfS APP officers. We have paid due regard to equality and diversity in designing our plan, as is our responsibility under the Equality Act 2010. Our plan has been approved by our Board of Trustee Directors, and we have ensured alignment with our institutional Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Policy.

Our plan incorporates contributions from colleagues across ASU London, and from specialist consultants. This has included review and feedback from our Board and engagement with our summer school students and our first cohort of degree students. The structure of our plan, adhering to the OfS template, is as follows:

1. Assessment of performance – drawing on OfS, UCAS and Engineering Council data on student access, success, and progression for target student groups, and identifying trends and key issues we aim to address.
2. Strategic aims and objectives – our aims, objectives and targets relating to student access and participation, including key areas for focus based on our assessment of performance.
3. Strategic measures – our intended strategy and key interventions for achieving our stated aims and objectives, including our approach to student consultation and engagement, and our approach to evaluation.
4. Provision of information to students - the ways in which we will ensure that applicants and students have the right information, advice, and guidance to inform their decision making.

1. ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE

As a new higher education provider, we do not yet have a set of data on which to assess our current performance. The analysis below therefore represents a summary of the most recently available national data and the trends over time, contextualised as much as possible for a new, small, specialist engineering provider looking to predominantly recruit students from our local area of London and the south east of England.

1.1 HIGHER EDUCATION PARTICIPATION, HOUSEHOLD INCOME, OR SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

1.1.1 Access

It is widely recognised that there is a sector-wide challenge in meeting the OfS's ambition that future generations should have equal opportunities to access and succeed in higher education (HE), and to achieve successful and rewarding careers.

POLAR4 data is an important proxy for measuring students with potential disadvantage, but the value of using POLAR4 as a measure does not work well as a single metric of disadvantage in London institutions. Examination of the POLAR4 and Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) data maps for the London area reveal very different pictures – with areas of relatively high participation also having high levels of deprivation. We will therefore use the IMD and Free School Meals (FSM), a means-tested benefit that can also serve as an indicator of those from low income families, as measures in addition to POLAR4.

The UCAS End of Cycle report 2019¹ shows record entry rates for POLAR4 areas. The entry rate gap (defined as the ratio of the Q5 entry rate to the Q1 entry rate) narrowed to a record low in 2019, with students in Q5 areas 2.26 times more likely to enter university than those in Q1. This is consistent with the trend across the period, which has seen the gap narrow every year since 2006. IMD data show that 20.8% of students entering HE in 2018/19 were from Q5, compared to 21.0% from Q1. The numbers have changed from 22.0% for Q5 and 19.4% for Q1 in 2014/15.

The entry rate gap narrowed across higher, medium, and lower tariff providers in 2019 but at higher tariff providers, the gap remains large, with pupils in POLAR 4 Q5 areas 5.27 times more likely to access higher education than those in Q1. IMD data showed a gap of 0.2pp between entrants from Q5 and Q1 in 2018/19, this has narrowed from 2.5pp in 2014/15.

Since 2006, those who received Free School Meals (FSM) have consistently had lower entry rates to HE than those who did not receive FSM. In 2019, only 26.3% of pupils receiving FSM at age 15 entered HE by 19, compared with 44.9% of those who did not receive FSM. The FSM equality gap is most pronounced at higher tariff providers, where those in receipt of FSM are 3.36 times less likely to enter HE than those not in receipt of FSM.

Focussing specifically on Engineering provision, the number of applications for Engineering subjects (Group H) has fluctuated between 105,000 and 171,000 since 2007. In that period the proportion of applications from POLAR4 Q1 areas has risen slightly with those from Q5 areas dropping slightly.

These could be attributed in part to the findings of the Aspires 2 Project that found that working-class, lower-attaining and students who are unsure of their aspirations or who plan to leave education post-16 are all significantly less likely to report receiving careers education that might inform them about the options of HE.

¹ [UCAS 2019 End of Cycle Report](#)

1.1.2 Success - Non-continuation

OfS data indicate a statistically significant 5% gap in continuation rates between students from POLAR4 Q1 areas and Q5 areas, with the former continuing at a rate of 89.2% and the latter at 94.2%.

Similarly, consideration of Deprivation Quintiles (DQ) shows a 7.9% gap in continuation between students from Q1 areas and Q5 areas. In both cases there is an almost linear relationship between quintile and continuation rate.

When considering students who were eligible, or not, for free school meals at Key Stage 4, the continuation rate for those students who were eligible is significantly lower (5.8%) than those who were not.

1.1.3 Success – Attainment

OfS data indicate a 9.6% gap in attainment between students from POLAR4 Q1 areas and Q5 areas, with the former attaining good honours degrees at a rate of 74.5% and the latter at 84.1%.

Similarly, consideration of DQ shows an 18% difference in attainment between students from Q1 areas and Q5 areas. As with non-continuation rates there is an almost linear relationship between quintile and attainment rate.

1.1.4 Progression to employment or further study

OfS data indicate a 6% gap in progression between students from POLAR4 Q1 areas and Q5 areas, with the former progressing to employment or further study at a rate of 68.8% and the latter at 74.8%. This size of this gap has fluctuated over time but there is a general trend of the gap reducing.

Similarly, consideration of DQ shows a 7.1% difference in progression between students from POLAR4 Q1 areas and Q5 areas, although this gap has decreased steadily since 2012- 13.

1.2 ETHNIC MINORITY STUDENTS

1.2.1 Access

The UCAS End of Cycle report² highlights the differences that exist in the likelihood of entering HE for students in different ethnic groups. Since 2007, former state school pupils recorded as being in the Chinese ethnic group have consistently had the highest entry rate to higher education, with 68.0% of from this group progressing to HE, while those from the White ethnic group have had the lowest, at 30.3%. The entry rate gap between the

Chinese ethnic group and all other ethnic groups remained stable in 2019, with this ethnicity 2.24 times more likely to enter HE than the White ethnic group.

For black students, the entry rate to HE has continued to grow. 12,350 Black students started university in 2019, this represents an 8.2% increase on 2018, which means that the entry rate is now only lower than the rate for students in the Chinese or Asian ethnic groups.

² [UCAS 2019 End of Cycle Report](#)

However, within Engineering subjects (Group H), applications are dominated by the White ethnic group, although the proportion of these has steadily dropped since 2007. Applications from the Black, Asian, Mixed and Other groups all increased over the same period with the biggest increase seen for Asian applicants. This pattern is reflected in the number of acceptances with the biggest increase seen for Asian applicants.

The Aspires 2 Project found that minority ethnic students are significantly less likely to report receiving careers education that might inform them about the options of HE.

1.2.2 Success - Non-continuation

OfS data indicates that there are statistically significant differences in continuation between students from White, Asian, Black, Mixed, and other backgrounds. Continuation rates range from 91% for White students to 85% for Black students.

1.2.3 Success – Attainment

OfS data indicates that there are statistically significant differences in attainment rates between students from white, Asian, Black, Mixed, and other backgrounds.

The Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Student Attainment at UK Universities: #Closingthegap report³ identified a 13% attainment gap between BAME students and their white counterparts. The size of this gap fluctuated from 14.8% in 2013-14 to 13.2% in 2017-18 with no sustained progress over this time frame.

The size of the attainment gap varies significantly between different ethnic backgrounds, with the largest gap in 2017-18 between White and Black students of 23.1%. This has only reduced slightly (from 24.6% in 2013-14).

The report recognised that BAME students have faced systematic discrimination from all parts of society.

1.2.4 Progression to employment or further study

OfS data indicates that progression rates range from 69.3% for black students to 74.0% for white students. These rates have been increasing for students in all categories since 2012-13, and the progression gaps between White and Ethnic Minority students have been falling.

Engineering UK's 2018 State of Engineering report⁴ identified marked differences in destinations between white and ethnic minority leavers. Data from 2015-16 showed a much larger proportion of white engineering graduates entering full time employment (65.6%) within six months of graduating than those of ethnic minority backgrounds (48.6%). This trend is reflective of that observed across all discipline areas, but these differences were more pronounced among engineering and technology graduates.

The Engineering UK 2018 report also highlights that while ethnic minority groups comprised 12.2% of the overall UK workforce in 2016, they only made up 8.1% of those working in engineering sector.

³ [Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Student Attainment at UK Universities #closingthegap, 2019](#)

⁴ [Engineering UK 2018 The State of Engineering](#)

1.3 MATURE STUDENTS

1.3.1 Access

According to the UCAS End of Cycle report 2019⁵, the number of applicants aged 30-34 increased by 8.7% and those aged 35 and over by a record 15%. Mature students have distinct characteristics, typically presenting with different qualifications and applying to and accepting places at providers closer to home. They also tend to apply later in the cycle, to a smaller range of courses, as reported in the 'Admissions patterns for mature applicants' report⁶.

Mature students are less likely to make the full set of five choices, compared to 18- and 19-year olds, reducing their chances of receiving offers and being accepted to a provider.

The courses that mature applicants tend to apply to include subjects allied to medicine, business and administration studies, and education – all subject groups which had an increase in acceptance rates in 2019.

In Engineering subjects (Group H), the number of applications from mature "aged 21 and over" students increased between 2007 and 2011 has declined since 2015. The proportion of mature applications has fluctuated between 15.8% and 20.4% but in 2018 was only 16.0% of the total. The number of acceptances for mature "aged 21 and over" students has fluctuated between 2007 and 2018 and in 2019 declined slightly.

1.3.2 Success - Non-continuation

OfS data shows that there is a significant difference in the continuation rates between mature students (21+ years) and young students (<21 years), with the former continuing at a rate of 84.8% compared to the latter at 92.2%. Reasons behind this are complex and frequently specific to the individual including family commitments or changes in family circumstances.

1.3.3 Success – Attainment

Similarly, OfS data indicates an attainment gap of 10% between mature students and young students with the former having an attainment rate of 70.3% compared to the latter at 80.2% students. This gap widens with age when analysed at a more granular level and has increased slightly since 2013-14.

1.3.4 Progression to employment or further study

Despite mature students being less likely to continue with their studies, or attain a good degree, when compared with young students they are more likely to progress into employment or further study. In 2016-17 the progression rate for mature students was 75.7% compared to 72.3% for young students, according to OfS data.

1.4 DISABLED STUDENTS

1.4.1 Access

According to UCAS, the proportion of applicants declaring a disability has grown steadily since 2010. In 2019 they accounted for 12.6% of all applicants, growing from 6.6% in 2010.

⁵ [UCAS 2019 End of Cycle Report](#)

⁶ [Admissions Patterns for Mature Applicants](#)

Similarly, the proportion of applicants to Engineering subjects (Group H) declaring a disability has grown steadily since 2010, now representing 11.58% of the applications and 11.54% of the acceptances.

1.4.2 Success - Non-continuation

Analysis of OfS data reveals a small gap in the continuation rate between students who have a disability and those with no known disability (90.8% versus 90.3%). The size of the continuation gap varies depending on the disability type, with the difference greatest for those with a mental health condition; 8.8% of these students continued with their studies.

Since 2013-14 continuation rates for students with cognitive learning difficulties have been higher than those with no known disability (91.5% versus 90.0%), perhaps reflecting higher levels of 1:1, academic and pastoral support that these learners can, and do, access.

1.4.3 Success – Attainment

Similarly, analysis of OfS data reveals a statistically significant difference of 2.8% in attainment rate between students who have a disability and those with no known disability. This gap has reduced slightly since 2012-13 when it was 3.4%.

Again, the size of the attainment gap varies depending on the disability type, with the difference greatest for those with a social or communication disability (69.4% compared to 78.7% for those with no known disability).

The smallest attainment gap is found between students with a mental health condition and those with no known disability (77.7% versus 78.7%), perhaps indicating that students with mental health conditions who continue with their studies are more likely to attain good degrees.

1.4.4 Progression to employment or further study

Again, data shows a statistically significant difference in progression rate between students who have a disability and those with no known disability. This gap has increased from 1.1% in 2012-13 to 1.8% in 2016-17.

The progression gap varies widely depending on the disability type, with the greatest difference between those with a social or communication disability and those with no known disability. This gap, having increased to 15% in 2013-14 has been slowly reducing to 11.5% in 2016-17.

In 2016-17 there was no progression gap between students with cognitive learning difficulties and those with no known disability, which has reduced steadily since 2012-13 from a position where those with cognitive learning difficulties progressed at a higher rate than those with no known disability.

1.5 CARE LEAVERS

1.5.1 Access

Access to HE is much lower for care leavers than for other students. The DfE report⁷ that only 12% of care leavers entered HE in 2017-18 compared to 42% of other pupils.

1.5.2 Success - Non-continuation

The continuation rate in 2017-18 for care experienced students was 5.6% lower than the continuation rates for non-care students. Care leavers are 38% more likely not to continue their course.

1.5.3 Success – Attainment

OfS data⁸ show a 12.1% gap between the attainment rates for care experienced students and other students in 2018-19.

1.5.4 Progression to employment or further study

Progression rates for non-care students are slightly higher (0.4%) than care experienced students.⁹

1.6 INTERSECTIONS OF DISADVANTAGE: HIGHER EDUCATION PARTICIPATION, HOUSEHOLD INCOME, OR SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND ETHNICITY

The UCAS End of Cycle report 2019 also uses the Multiple Equality Measure (MEM) to produce an evidence-based measure of equality.

Analysis using this method showed modest increases in entry rates of all groups in 2019. The entry rate of students in MEM group one (the most disadvantaged group) increased by 6.9 per cent proportionally, to a value of 13.1%, nearly three times the increase seen

in the entry rate of students from MEM group five (the most advantaged group), which rose by 2.5% to 57.7%.

The entry rate gap between group five and one narrowed in 2019, with pupils in group five 4.40 times more likely to enter HE than those in group one, compared to 4.58 in 2018. The equality gap is substantial but is the lowest on record, and the largest proportional decrease since 2014. The most advantaged students were 13.64 times more likely to enter HE than the most disadvantaged, compared to 15.0 in 2018 meaning that the gap is narrowing.

1.6.1 Success - Non-continuation

When considering the intersection of deprivation quintile (DQ) or POLAR4 quintile (P4Q) and ethnicity, data from 2017/18 shows statistically significant differences in continuation rates when comparing Q1+2, Q3-5, white and BAME students: Q1+2 white students had a continuation rate of 87.5% compared to Q1+2 BAME students with 85.9%. For Q3-5, this was 92.5% for white students and 90.9% for BAME.

⁷ [Widening participation in higher education: 2019](#)

⁸ [OfS Differences in Student Outcomes: Further Characteristics, 2020](#)

⁹ [OfS Differences in Student Outcomes: Further Characteristics, 2020](#)

Whilst the continuation rates have largely been declining since 2012-13, the biggest gap when considering deprivation quintiles is between white students in DQ3-5 and BAME students in DQ1+2 (6.4%).

1.6.2 Success – Attainment

Analysis of the intersection of deprivation quintile (DQ) or POLAR4 quintile (P4Q) and ethnicity also highlights statistically significant gap of 19.4pp when comparing Q1+2, Q3- 5, white and BAME students.

Whilst attainment rates for all categories have been increasing steadily since 2013-14, the biggest gap when considering deprivation quintiles is between white students in DQ3-5 and BAME students in DQ1+2 (19.3%). In DQ1+2 and DQ3-5 white students perform better than their BAME counterparts. This trend is mirrored when considering POLAR4 quintiles, which also shows a more than 12% gap between BAME and White students in P4Q3-5.

Consideration of the gaps between the groups shows no sustained progress in reducing the gaps between 2013-14 and 2017-18.

1.6.3 Progression

Analysis of the intersection of deprivation quintile (DQ) or POLAR4 quintile (P4Q) and ethnicity shows a similar pattern in progression rates to those of continuation and attainment rates.

The gaps between groups of students are reducing over time, particularly the gap between white and BAME students in Q3-5, where the gap was 1.5pp in 2016/17.

1.7 OTHER GROUPS WHO EXPERIENCE BARRIERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

As a new, specialist provider, we currently do not have our own data, and national data for the following groups is not available:

- Carers
- People estranged from their families
- People from Gypsy, Roma, and Traveller communities
- Refugees
- Children of military families
- Marriage and Civil Partnership
- Pregnancy and Maternity

As we move to recruit students and embed our data management systems, we will ensure that our systems and staff capture the required information for reporting, monitoring, and evaluation purposes.

2. STRATEGIC AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Internationally, there is a shortage of socially aware engineers with industry skills to enable governments, organisations, and businesses to address global issues such as clean energy and sustainable food and water supplies. Innovative and sustainable solutions to ensure development and progression in sectors like this are essential for the future of humankind.

In the UK, Engineering UK's 2020 report¹⁰ acknowledges that developing the engineering graduate pipeline to address the skills needs of the engineering sector remains a key challenge.

To address this shortage of engineering talent with a social focus, a fundamental part of the ASU London strategy is to attract students from a range of disciplines and backgrounds to engineering as a career option. Key to this is inspiring and building aspiration in young people to see engineering as a potential career and providing an accessible, supportive, and responsive environment to allow them to reach their full potential.

Undoubtedly, engineering needs more people from diverse backgrounds to break new frontiers and to help solve the challenges of the future. Research shows that the highest performing teams are from mixed backgrounds¹¹. Their diversity of perspectives transforms team performance and ability to effectively innovate and deliver new solutions to existing business and social challenges.

Research indicates that emphasising the opportunities for engineers to use higher order social ("soft") skills, not traditionally associated with this career, can attract potential students who might not otherwise have thought of engineering as a career for them¹². This coupled with admissions criteria extending beyond the traditional requirement for maths and physics sets our offer apart. These are fundamental to our access and participation ethos.

2.1 TARGET GROUPS

In setting our targets, our emphasis at this point in our development is on access, as we believe this is an area where we can make a substantial difference in diversifying the student population within ASU London and the engineering sector.

We are developing a robust student records system for collecting and monitoring information about the characteristics of our cohorts. We collect information using our student portal at the admissions and enrolment stages and we update this as part of the annual re-enrolment process to ensure that the data remains accurate.

We have selected our target groups based on the nationally identified underrepresented groups, considered in the context of our role as a small London-based specialist engineering provider with a mission to attract and empower individuals and partners from a range of backgrounds and perspectives to help address the national and global engineering skills gap. Our target groups are students from low HE participation areas, mature students, and ethnic minority students.

¹⁰ [Engineering UK 2020](#)

¹¹ [McKinsey 2015](#)

¹² [International Journal of STEM Education 2019](#)

We are including ethnic minority as a target despite there being a relatively high level of participation from ethnic minority students across higher education generally, as described in 1.2.1, as the proportion of ethnic minority students in engineering remains low, with 27% of UK domiciled graduates coming from ethnic minority backgrounds in 2018¹³.

We will not set targets for access of disabled students or for care leavers at this time. During 2022/23 we will review our access performance in relation to these groups, and where appropriate will set targets.

2.2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

2.2.1 Strategic aim

Our mission as an organisation is to transform engineering education and transform lives by empowering students from diverse backgrounds to become independent, curious learners with a global, future-focused outlook.

Our strategic aim is to broaden the scope of people attracted to engineering and to recruit capable students from non-traditional backgrounds, including mature students and people from a variety of socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds.

2.2.2 Objectives

Our aims for the first five years of operation are to increase participation in engineering HE for identified groups by aiming for:

- 35% of our cohort to be made up of students from low HE participation areas
- 50% of our students to be from BAME backgrounds
- 20% of our cohort to be mature students

Within ten years, we want to sustain, and where possible exceed, our goals in the above areas and for our student body to be moving closer to reflecting society in terms of socio-economic status and ethnicity. Specifically, to have a student body that:

- Has 40% of students from POLAR4 Q1 and 2, in line with the OfS KPM to eliminate the gap in participation between the most and least represented groups.
- Is made up of over 50% BAME students.
- Has more than 20% mature students.

2.2.3 Targets and interventions

The grid below outlines our theory of change, including our longer term aims, 5-year objectives, key interventions, and desired outcomes for each of the target groups noted above. For each area, there is an associated target, with intermediate goals in our supporting Targets and Investment Plan. There is further information on planned interventions in section 3.1.2 below.

¹³ [Celebrating leading minority ethnic engineers - Royal Academy of Engineering \(raeng.org.uk\)](https://www.raeng.org.uk)

Target group	10-year aim	5-year aim	Key interventions	Outcomes
Students from low HE participation areas (POLAR4 Q1 and Q2)	For 40% of our cohort to be from POLAR4 Q1 and Q2 areas.	For 35% of our cohort to be from POLAR4 Q1 and Q2 areas.	Target schools in POLAR4 Q1+2 areas in London for outreach activities to raise awareness of engineering.	Increased applications from POLAR4 Q1+2 areas.
			Inclusive admissions policy that includes an expanded range of entry requirements while ensuring all entrants have a chance to succeed via our bespoke assessment centre.	Increased number of applicants offered places with non-standard entry requirements.
			Publish our Student Fees Policy which makes a commitment that there will be no additional costs associated with the programmes.	Students can be confident that there are no hidden charges that they will be required to meet.
			Automatic bursaries for students from households with an annual income of less than £35,000, given on a sliding scale from £500 to £2,000 annually, in line with their household income.	Helping with students' living costs. Reducing the need for them to seek paid employment.
			Engagement with University Technical Colleges and Institutes of Technology.	Improved relationships with key influencers.
BAME students	50% or more of our cohort to be from ethnic minority backgrounds.	For 50% of our cohort to be from ethnic minority backgrounds.	Target school visits at schools with high proportions of ethnic minority students for outreach activities, for example a summer school for Year 12 pupils.	Increased applications from ethnic minority students.
			Offer our students the opportunity to have a mentor. Ensure that the pool of mentors is diverse so that students can elect to have someone from a similar background to them.	Providing opportunities for students to share issues with someone outside the institution who shares some of their characteristics.

Target group	10-year aim	5-year aim	Key interventions	Outcomes
			Ensure visibility of information on our inclusive curriculum.	Students can see that ASU London is serious about inclusion and can see their background reflected in the curriculum content pre-arrival.
			Where possible, ensure a diversity of facilitators in sessions and masterclasses.	Raising aspirations by enabling students to see individuals from a similar demographic in senior roles.
			Highlight our association with King's College London Students' Union and the opportunities for students to join groups and societies that they identify with and opportunities to form their own at ASU London.	Students can see the opportunities available to socialise with people from similar backgrounds.
Mature students	20% or more of our cohort to be mature students.	For 20% of our cohort to be mature students.	Allowing students to access the timetable early to allow them to plan around this.	Students can see how the programme can feasibly fit in with their lives.
			Organise 'returning to study' content aimed at mature students, including the opportunity to meet with mature students from previous cohorts.	Provide students with reassurance that we can provide specific information that will help them study successfully. Allowing students to see that others in their situation have been able to successfully undertake the programme.
			Highlight the opportunities for continued support throughout the programme via the Student Hub and the personal tutor.	Provide students with reassurance that we can provide specific information that will help them study successfully.

3. STRATEGIC MEASURES

3.1 WHOLE PROVIDER STRATEGIC APPROACH

3.1.1 Overview

We are committed to embedding access and participation across all our activities and we consider widened access and participation to be fundamental to our strategic approach and integral to our values, which are to be **inclusive, courageous, inspiring, collaborative**, and to work **with integrity**.

Our goal is to attract students from a multitude of different backgrounds, particularly those who may not have thought of engineering as a career because of the perception that they would need to have high maths and science grades.

We are committed to creating a welcoming and inclusive environment which will enable students to thrive, regardless of their background.

Key aims within our strategy that are particularly relevant to our Access and Participation goals include:

- Our application process, which enables us to admit students based on their attitude, aptitude, and ability, rather than solely on their academic qualifications.
- The requirement for our staff members to be actively involved with, and to promote equal access and participation.
- Our strategy for student engagement, which puts students at the heart of the system and considers students as partners and co-creators of knowledge rather than participants.
- Creating a truly global and inclusive curriculum that uses content and case studies from numerous diverse backgrounds.
- The integration and embedding of personal development and employability into the curriculum informed by a close relationship with industry.
- Our innovative approach to supported, self-paced learning, real world projects and diverse assessment strategy.

3.1.2 Alignment with other strategies

a) Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Strategy

We are aware of our responsibilities and commitments under the Equality Act 2010 to advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics and those who do not. In designing our Plan, we have considered the protected characteristics in Chapter 1, Section 4 of the Act, noting that inequalities are often inter-sectional. We also note the provisions relating to equality of opportunity in further and higher education in Chapter 2, Section 91, paying particular attention to the duty under Section 91(9) and Schedule 13 to provide reasonable adjustments throughout the student life cycle.

Our access and participation plan has been developed in line with our Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Policy, which states that we will:

- Actively promote inclusion in everything we do

- Ensure that our leaders role model the need to consider issues of equality, diversity, and inclusion when carrying out their roles
- Proactively consider issues of equality, diversity and inclusion when making decisions, developing, and implementing policies
- Consult and engage directly with relevant groups and communities to ensure we understand potential impacts of decisions on them.

Our specific equality objectives include:

- Having a diverse student body which represents the diverse communities we serve and impact
- Ensuring that all groups have equal opportunities to access our degrees.

These objectives align with our access and participation objectives, which aim to ensure all groups can access our degrees and feel like they are in an inclusive and supportive community. We will enact these objectives by:

- Having access and outreach activities which are targeted towards underrepresented groups
- Ensuring that there are no biases against specific groups
- Monitoring individual students' progression through our data systems, and putting interventions in place where these are required
- Having an inclusive curriculum and inclusive student services
- Ensuring we have a process for reasonable adjustments for students with disabilities
- -Ensuring that access and participation is a key facet of everyone's role, and that everyone is aware of their responsibilities in this regard to uphold equal opportunities.

We have developed an impact assessment process and template which ensures the alignment of our strategy and our access and participation plan. The impact assessment must be completed for new policies or programmes developed.

We have an Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Working Group, which oversees the Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Policy and monitors our access and participation plan.

b) Learning and Teaching Strategy

Our access and participation plan aligns with our Learning and Teaching strategy in the following areas:

- Use of the Universal Design for Learning¹⁴ model to create inclusive programmes
- A curriculum that considers different learning styles and cultural backgrounds
- Variety of assessment methods to enable students to demonstrate their learning in different ways.

By using these methods, we aim to support students to learn in a flexible way in a supportive and inclusive environment.

¹⁴ [Universal Design for Learning: A Best Practice Guidance \(UDLL:2016\)](#)

c) Employability

Our approach to employability aligns with our APP in that our strategy commits us to:

- Support underrepresented students and ensuring that there are specific mechanisms which ensure their success.
- Ensure that our staff are trained about issues relating to unconscious bias.
- Continue to take further advice from expert recruiters about what works in this area.
- Raise aspirations of students from ethnic minorities by ensuring links with professionals from ethnic minorities that they can see as role models.

By delivering on these commitments and preparing our students throughout their programme for work as engineers, we will raise awareness of the issues faced by underrepresented students and give them the additional support they need to succeed in their careers.

d) Inclusive Curriculum

We ensure that our programmes go beyond the legal obligations of the Equality Act 2010 and that they have inclusivity built in to anticipate and mitigate any challenge, disadvantage, or discrimination that students could experience through the curriculum and that they value all the dimensions of diversity with which students may present. The Universal Design method takes account of these dimensions of diversity to anticipate and mitigate against any challenge, disadvantage, or discrimination that a student may experience through the curriculum. Programme teams will be required to consider the diversity of the student population identify possible areas of discrimination and/or disadvantage and take steps to address these.

Our student-centred collaborative approach replaces traditional lectures and examinations with practical projects addressing real-life, global challenges, which have been demonstrated to attract underrepresented students. Students will be equipped to

participate in, contribute and benefit from the project-based learning – acquiring knowledge through individual, self-paced study on the learning tree before applying this to the project, supported by one-to-one mentoring, teamwork, peer learning and masterclasses from role models.

3.1.3 Strategic measures

At this stage, our strategies all focus on access to ASU London. When we have a few cohorts of students and can draw on trends, we will assess our performance in terms of success and progression and include these elements in our access and participation plan.

a) Access and outreach

We will promote the value of higher education to potential students from underrepresented groups from primary school upwards and outwards, working with children, their parents, and other key influencers. This will include the provision of activities that supports pupil attainment in schools whilst at the same time providing high-quality, impartial higher education-related advice and guidance to ensure that young people and potential adult learners from our target groups are well informed when making key decisions such as choosing qualifications and subjects for GCSE or equivalent and beyond.

To inspire young people from our ethnic minority and low participation target groups about careers in engineering and help raise attainment in schools and colleges, we are developing a school visits programme specifically targeting schools in POLAR4 Q1 and Q2 areas in London and those with high proportions of students from ethnic minorities.

We began engaging virtually with schools during summer 2020 when we successfully ran a three-week online programme, Thinking Ahead: Light Up¹⁵ – a mixture of live sessions and independent learning to allow students to learn at their own pace and to give students a taste of what it might be like to learn through project-based learning. This has been developed into a twelve-week Thinking Ahead programme for schools and colleges. The programme provides core and optional learning materials as well as mentoring sessions to support the schools using the programme. The project is flexible and can be condensed or extended, depending on the time and level of commitment available from the school. We are developing a programme of events with schools for academic year 2022/23 and beyond.

We aim to have meaningful collaborations with schools and colleges, particularly with the engineering and design-based University Technical Colleges in London, and the emerging Institutes of Technology. We believe these are vital for developing new talent to secure a future skills pipeline. This activity is core to our success to enable us to realise our mission and vision to widen participation in programmes.

We have recruited student ambassadors from across our student body. This is a paid role. All students are invited to apply to be an ambassador and there is a fair and inclusive selection process for the role. The ambassadors work in partnership with staff to design and deliver our outreach activities and represent ASU London at recruitment fairs. We aim to show potential students that there are students like them within ASU London, to raise their aspirations.

b) Admissions

Our admissions process is one of the main ways in which we aim to deliver on our goal to attract a diverse body of engineering students. It has been developed in a way that allows us to deliver fairness, transparency, objectivity, and equal opportunities. We make it clear that we welcome applicants from diverse backgrounds and experiences, and that we will not discriminate against individuals with protected or other characteristics.

Our admissions process focuses on applicants' attitude, aptitude, and ability, rather than on their grades, and we openly encourage applications from candidates without a traditional educational background. There is no minimum grade requirement.

Our process starts with applicants completing an application either through UCAS or directly via our website. We have opted to include a direct entry route to attract student from lower income households, as the application process is free, and to attract mature students, who tend to select one institution and would not want to select further choices on a UCAS form.

The right assessment pathway for an applicant is individual and tailored to their experience and background. For example, some students will be required to undertake numeracy and literacy tests, but applicants who can demonstrate they already have these skills through their qualifications will be exempt.

¹⁵ [ASU London Thinking Ahead – Light Up](#)

We hold assessment centres, which are designed to test applicants' potential to succeed through an interview and presentation task.

Following the assessment centre, the panel will consider the applicants' potential to succeed at a ASU London degree and can make both conditional and unconditional offers at this point.

Offer letters will outline any financial support arrangements provided to individual applicants who choose to study with us, in accordance with the financial support arrangements outlined in 3.1.3. f).

Our aim through our admissions process is to ensure that we give applicants an equal opportunity to access our degrees and that we select students who we believe can successfully study using our distinctive methods. We will make contextual offers that take applicants' circumstances into account.

c) Academic Support

Small group sessions

ASU London will have a small cohort, and a high ratio of staff to students (1:15 in the first instance). Our aim is to ensure that students feel included, supported, and able build relationships with academic staff.

Facilitated learning will happen in small groups. Students are supported in classroom settings by at least one member of staff who will be able to provide support, guidance, and instant feedback.

Personal Tutoring

Students are assigned a Personal Tutor at the start of their time at ASU London and remain with this Personal Tutor throughout their programme, where this is possible.

The Personal Tutor's role is to give students individual advice about their studies and to signpost them to support for issues they might experience whilst on the programme. The meetings are timetabled throughout the programme to ensure that these happen regularly and that students feel supported.

Our personal tutor training focuses on differential support requirements for underrepresented students and we aim to assign students to Personal Tutors with a similar background to their own.

Peer Mentoring

When we have a suitable number of students, we will develop a peer mentoring system, partnering students with students from the year above, ensuring comprehensive training and compensating the mentors for their time. We will aim to partner students with students from similar backgrounds to their own, thereby increasing the sense of belonging and giving students a role model from a similar demographic. One of the main aims of these programmes would be to enlist students who had benefitted from the interventions themselves as peer mentors, enabling them to pass on the benefits to future cohorts

Data

We have a data dashboard containing information about students' attendance and results. This allows the Student Hub team to monitor students' academic progress and wellbeing and to advise students and Personal Tutors about any issues to enable them to engage in evidence-based conversations about performance and be able to agree on support requirements.

d) Employability

Our approach to learning and teaching means that students will be enhancing their employability throughout the programme through practical project-based modules developed with industry. Additionally, we are designing our employability service to work in close alignment with the curriculum and programme delivery and to be informed by our industry partners. The careers offer will be aligned and will overlap with the degree programme to further enforce the focus on practical, job-oriented aspects.

Our staff have been trained about issues relating to unconscious bias and are cognisant that we need to ensure that this work is reflected in our offer to students, particularly in supporting our ethnic minority students. We will therefore continue to take advice from the consultants in this area about enhancements we can make to our employability service to ensure that it will successfully support our underrepresented students. This will include raising awareness about unconscious bias and offering students additional support to enhance their employability.

We will adhere to best practice relating to raising aspirations of ethnic minority students by ensuring access to professionals from ethnic minorities that they can see as role models.

e) Student Support Services

We are committed to ensuring that all our students have the support they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education throughout their journey, from application until after they have graduated. We will provide services that all students can access and benefit from, and we will also have a suite of personalised and specialised services for students who need such support, including services aimed at students from our target groups, such as 'return to work' content for our mature students.

Our approach to wellbeing is focused on promoting positive mental health and well-being. When we have a greater number of students, we will offer students the opportunity to be wellbeing champions and offer them training such as "Look After Your Mate"¹⁶ from Student Minds. We will encourage students from our target groups to undertake this training to give them an opportunity to take responsibility and to be able to act as a role model for other students. We hope that students will also be able to feel that they can approach students who are like them.

f) Targeted Financial Support

We are aware that financial concerns can significantly impact students' mental health, and that the lack of financial support has a direct impact on drop-out rates. A survey by the NUS¹⁷ showed that 64% of UK students worry about their finances all the time or very often, and 36% of students worry about their finances so much that it affects their mental health. 26% of students said they were likely to drop out of university due to a lack of money. We understand that financial worries will affect certain students more than others, particularly those from a lower household income or lower socioeconomic background and want to support these students to access and succeed in higher education by offering them additional financial support.

¹⁶ [Look After Your Mate - Student Minds](#)

¹⁷ [NUS Insight: Financial woes affecting mental health \(futurefinance.com\)](#)

For the first six years of operation, we are being supported by the provision of working capital funding from our founding partners to run our operation while we grow our student numbers and move towards financial independence – we are utilising some of this funding to support the research and evaluation of our APP activities. This enables us to set aside approximately 30% of the Higher Fee Income we expect to receive in the form of student bursaries, digital support and outreach activities and thus maximise direct support to students. We will evaluate our financial support packages using the OfS finance toolkit once we have enough data to draw upon.

In agreeing on the level of financial support to offer our students, we considered the Living Wage¹⁸ as well as the higher cost of living in London. From this, we agreed on the levels of income, based on the London Living Wage. We benchmarked our bursary amounts against other London universities as well as universities across England offering Engineering to ensure that our bursaries are comparable to those offered across the sector and offer an appropriate level of support.

We will offer bursaries to enable students from our target groups to fully engage with their studies. Annual bursaries will be awarded to students from a low-income family or if they are a care leaver. The aim will be to help students who may face more barriers to attending full-time education, enabling them to access a degree at ASU London. It is hoped that by accessing financial support from us, students rely less on income from paid employment and have more time to concentrate on their studies, leading to good continuation and attainment rates.

The ASU London Access Bursary will automatically be awarded to students from households with an income of less than £35,000 a year, who meet a defined set of eligibility criteria¹⁹. The Bursary amount will be determined on the student’s final assessed household income and will be awarded annually:

Income	Annual Bursary Awarded
Less than £20,000	£2,000
£20,000 - £24,999	£1,500
£25,000 - £29,999	£1,000
£30,000 - £34,999	£500

The £2,000 ASU London Care Leavers Bursary will be awarded annually to students aged 25 or under, who have been in full-time care for three months or longer at any time over the preceding five years.

We subscribe to the Student Loans Company’s Bursary Administration Service²⁰; they already have access to verified information about the students’ household income and administer the bursary based on this.

Our website contains comprehensive information about the bursaries available, including the amounts and the corresponding eligibility criteria.

¹⁸ [Living Wage Foundation | For the real cost of living](#)

¹⁹ Be undertaking their first full-time undergraduate degree, qualify for home fee status and Student Finance maintenance support, liable for the full tuition fee, not be sponsored by a company or other body, have been means-tested by Student Finance England/ Northern Ireland/ Wales/ SAAS to have a final assessed household income of £35,000 or less.

²⁰ [Bursaries Administration Service - HEP Services \(slc.co.uk\)](#)

g) Collaboration

We engage with industry partners with the aim of them working with us as mentors, providing masterclasses, being involved in co-developing and co-delivering projects and act as engineers in residence. We are seeking to ensure real diversity of colleagues in this space, with the aim of our students seeing role models who are like them, to raise their aspirations.

We will analyse the effectiveness of collaborations annually between 2023/24 and 2025/26, by interviewing students and conducting surveys. We will conduct gap analyses and will aim to fill any gaps seen to ensure that all our underrepresented students receive the support they need.

3.2 STUDENT CONSULTATION

3.2.1 Student consultation up to this point

In the period before we had our own students, we were keen to receive feedback from students on this version of the plan and so have asked a group of students from our 2020 virtual Summer School²¹, who have experienced part of the ASU London methodology and therefore were able to provide us with valuable feedback on various aspects of our planned provision. We worked collaboratively with summer school students on a number of developments, such as feedback on their summer school experience, which we are using to design our future summer schools, staff recruitment and selection and policy development.

The summer school students provided feedback on the Access and Participation Plan via a focus group hosted by the Registrar. The focus group students were satisfied with the Access and Participation Plan as a whole and provided useful feedback which led to the following enhancements being made to this version, in section 3.1.2:

- Addition of more specific information about our outreach programme, Light Up
- Included plans for specific training for Personal Tutors, Peer Mentors, and students on different needs requirements for underrepresented students
- Inclusion of more information on potential types of financial support

We sought views about the current version of the APP from a focus group made up of some of our first cohort of students. The students did not suggest changes to the plan and were happy to endorse.

3.2.2 Plans for future student consultation

We will continue to work in partnership with our students to co-create APPs. Our future APPs will contain more information about the feedback received via this process and how we have enhanced the information based on this.

a) Focus groups and individual interviews

We want to ensure that we capture the views of students from a wide range of backgrounds, and that diverse views are represented in the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the plan. The small size of our cohort will mean we can give all students an opportunity to be involved in the plan. It will also mean that we are familiar with individual students and can personally request their input.

²¹ [ASU London Summer School 2020](#)

In future years when we have a larger population, we will ask our bursary recipients to partake in focus groups or individual interviews to enable us to ascertain whether the bursary is having the desired impact on them. We will use the data collected to review the bursary scheme.

b) Student feedback and surveys

We request feedback from students on many of the aspects that contribute to the APP. Where appropriate, students will be asked to declare characteristics such as whether they are a bursary recipient, their age, their ethnicity and whether they have a disability, noting that we cannot make this information mandatory. The surveys are anonymous, and we explain why we are asking for this data. Feedback is sought about the following:

Topic	Evaluation method
Teaching and learning methods	End of teaching block and end of year surveys
Student support, including Personal Tutoring and student services	End of teaching block and end of year surveys
Employability support	End of year surveys

c) Student involvement in committees

Students are encouraged to be active members of the ASU London community and we have student representative roles to encourage a greater sense of belonging and to add another channel to our approach. We currently have student representatives from all of our target groups.

We involve students in the following committees, which oversee the access and participation plan:

Committee	APP consideration	Student involvement
Equality, diversity, and inclusion working group	This working group considers progress towards our access and participation goals and recommend content for future APPs.	At least two student members.
Student Experience Committee (SEC)	APP will be a discussion point on the agenda of one SEC meeting annually. Commentary from the SEC on the APP will be submitted to the Board. SEC is responsible for considering student engagement across ASU London, including on access and participation matters.	Co-chaired by a student representative. All student representatives are members.
Academic Board	Responsible for discussing and recommending actions relating to outcomes of feedback discussed in the previous section.	Two student members.

Committee	APP consideration	Student involvement
Board of Trustee Directors	Compliance with OfS requirements discussed at each meeting, this includes access and participation targets. Responsibility for signing off access and participation plans.	One student member, once we have a greater population of students.

3.3 EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.3.1 Overview

We will have an evidence-based evaluation strategy to enable us to be assured that all access and participation activity is impactful. It will include both process and impact evaluation. Our evaluation strategy for each intervention will be proportionate and appropriate to the activity, and cognisant of the need to ensure that no harm is done to any students.

We will use the OfS evaluation self-assessment tool to evaluate the impact of our access and participation activities from 2022/23, and annually thereafter. We will use the outcomes of our evaluations to influence practice by ensuring that outcomes are fed through to our annual monitoring processes, which has an action planning process as one of its main features.

All our initiatives and interventions are designed to target access, continuation, and attainment for the target groups. Improvement in these areas will clearly be the final indicator of impact. However, a range of intermediate indicators will be tracked and evaluated, through:

- Ensuring a clear remit in the Registry and Planning teams for collecting, analysing, and reporting data.
- The development of a data collection and management strategy and system to facilitate access to, and analysis of data that can be disaggregated and cut in several ways.
- Use of data analytics within the student records system, such as attendance, academic progress, VLE use, assessment participation, to inform interventions.

We recognise that there is no single best way to undertake the interventions and the evaluation of activities. Our evaluation strategy will enable us to continuously reflect upon these as well as the relevant investment and financial support for each stage of the student lifecycle. It will allow for adaptations of activities and processes that are informed by evidence.

Our evaluation strategy will be continuously developed as we grow as an institution. We will review it on an annual basis to ascertain its continued fitness for purpose and we will make any necessary enhancements as required during the lifetime of this Access and Participation Plan.

3.3.2 Monitoring and evaluation activities

We will employ a range of monitoring and evaluation activities across access, continuation, attainment, and progression, dependent on the activity or research undertaken. Evaluation will be based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. While absolute outcomes are measurable quantifiably, qualitative data is important in understanding why initiative may or may not be working as intended and how they can be improved.

Basic evaluation activity includes measuring engagement levels, obtaining basic data such as ethnicity or gender, and quantitative and qualitative student, staff, and facilitator feedback. This approach allows us to make decisions on what type of activity is most popular, most useful and the most impactful time for delivery. It gives us an opportunity to continually improve what we do and when. Much of the information will be collected in the end of teaching block surveys we will conduct, as described in the table below.

We will make use of “before” and “after” evaluation allowing us to identify changes in attitudes and understanding of key themes, following participation in activity. As our access work aims to either raise aspiration or understanding of the benefits of higher education at ASU London, our evaluation methods will link back to answering questions which link to these themes.

3.3.3 Use of evaluation outcomes to influence practice

The Assessment Review Panels, held at the end of each teaching block conducts a review of students’ performance it considers the data anonymously, by demographic, to ascertain whether there are areas of concern. These meetings influence practice by enabling interventions to be put in place should immediate actions be required; interventions require agreement from the Academic Director and they are reported into the next Academic Board meeting to ensure an audit trail.

Our annual programme monitoring process enables a rich review of all aspects of our programmes and the creation of an associated action plan, which will be used to influence practice. The process contains a dedicated section on widening participation and a review of the programmes’ successes in this area is therefore a mandatory part of this process. Programme teams will work with Registry colleagues to identify whether there are any trends relating to underrepresented groups and to ascertain actions that need to be taken to change practice to mitigate any negative impacts.

Outcomes of evaluations showing a requirement for changes to programmes or practice will automatically become mandatory actions within the rolling action plans within this process. The action plans are reportable through the committee structures as described in 3.2.2. Necessary improvements and a completion date will be outlined by the relevant committee.

3.3.4 Financial support evaluation

We will use part of the OfS financial monitoring tool to monitor and evaluate the impact of the bursaries outlined in 3.1.3 (f). We will use the interview tool to interview bursary recipients individually in November each year (starting in 2022). The intention will be to capture nuanced detail and individual experiences that cannot easily be predicted. We will complement this with the survey tool, later in November, to enable students who are not comfortable giving us information face to face an opportunity to judge our interventions. Our small size means that we will not use the statistical tool in the period of this Access and Participation Plan.

We will build the data obtained from bursary recipients into our quarterly performance monitoring processes which will form part of management review of activity reporting. This will help to inform the disclosures required as part of our financial statements on APP expenditure.

3.3.5 Evaluating our major strategic interventions

We want to ensure that all our strategic interventions, outlined in 3.1.3, have a beneficial impact on students from our target groups. The table below outlines the impact evaluation mechanisms for these interventions.

- We will use **qualitative methods** (such as focus groups or individual interviews) to capture nuanced detail and individual experiences that cannot easily be predicted.
- We will use **quantitative methods**, such as surveys to capture information from the entire cohort to enable us to create comparable data between groups and to see whether students from our target groups feel differently about our services than other students. We are cognisant of the risk of survey fatigue and therefore will aim to build our questions into a single online survey, which will be undertaken at the end of each teaching block.

When engaging with these feedback mechanisms, students will be asked to self-declare characteristics such as ethnicity, household income, and disability to enable us to review any differentiation in the perceived benefits of services. We cannot compel students to complete this information, but we will ensure that students know why we are asking for this information, and that by answering, they are helping us to build better and more inclusive services. We will ensure that students are made aware of changes made following their feedback, using a “you said, we did” model to close the feedback loop.

We will collect data within our student records system which will enable us to evaluate the trends in the impacts of our strategic interventions. We will specifically explore whether there is a gap in access, participation and success and we will compare this against other institutions, using OfS and HEIDI data.

The table below outlines the feedback mechanisms we will use when we have a large enough number of students to enable the collection of meaningful data.

Area	Qualitative	Quantitative	Data analysis
Access and outreach	We will ask students and teachers to give us feedback via a short, informal individual interview.	We will ask students and teachers to evaluate the impact of our visits via a short survey and monitor the outcomes of these at the Academic Board.	We will track whether an applicant has been part of one of our outreach activities. This activity will be reported to the Academic Board and will form part of the annual APP evaluation report prepared for the Board of Trustee Directors.
Admissions	We will invite applicants to focus groups in November of each year to obtain their feedback on the admissions process. These will particularly focus on students in our target groups but will be open to all students to enable comparisons.	New students will be asked to about their experiences of the admissions process in their first end of teaching block survey.	In the admissions cycle, we will conduct monthly analysis on data collected via the admissions portal on ethnicity, socio-economic status, and disability and use this to determine whether there are trends we should be concerned about e.g. if we find that there are several instances of a single underrepresented group not being made offers. Having the data accessible in this way allows decisions to be made quickly on mitigations that are required.
Inclusive curriculum	We will ask students in class towards the middle of the module, whether they are happy with the content of the module, this will take the form of a "start, stop, continue" process and can be undertaken verbally or if students do not want to declare their views, they can note this down and leave with the facilitator.	End of teaching block surveys will contain questions that ask about students' perceptions of whether the curriculum is inclusive, e.g. whether they recognised examples from across the world, or whether the content was specifically western-focused.	Once we have datasets for one year, we will be able to review these and assess whether there are trends particularly impacting on our target groups. We will use this data when preparing content for the following teaching block by feeding it into the annual programme monitoring process action plan and making changes based on this.

Area	Qualitative	Quantitative	Data analysis
Academic support	We will offer students from our target groups the opportunity to partake in an interview or focus groups to elicit their opinions on the value of peer mentoring and other interventions.	Students will be asked to comment in end of teaching block and end of year surveys on the effectiveness of the teaching and learning methods they experienced. They will also be asked to rate their Personal Tutor via this method.	Once we have datasets for one year, we will be able to review these and assess whether there are trends particularly impacting on our target groups.
Employability	Students will be asked to give feedback on the employability service via interview or focus group, which will be particularly aimed at students in our target groups but will be open to all students.	The employability service will conduct reviews by asking students to self-evaluate their skillset at the start of their ASU LONDON- London journey, and at points throughout. The aim will be to assess the change in their own perceptions of their skillset and to triangulate this with the views of their mentors.	Data collected from the surveys will be used to determine whether there are differences in experiences of students in our target groups, and other students.
Student support services	Students will be invited to give feedback on the student support services that they have used via an individual interview with the student hub.	The effectiveness of student support will be initially measured through surveys taken at the end of teaching blocks.	We will use our student records system data to evaluate the impact of specific services accessed by students, by evaluating performance at certain points before and after accessing our services. We will be able to target specific groups within these datasets and see whether there are any specific focus groups that benefit more or less than others.
Collaboration	Once we have started running shared services with collaborators, we will review the effectiveness of these by conducting interviews with the organisations and with students using these services.	Our end of year survey will contain questions about whether students have accessed services from other organisations and will ask those who have received this to let us know how valuable this has been to them.	The data we collect on employability support, student support services and academic support will enable us to conduct gap analyses and identify any areas of collaboration that require more input.

3.4 MONITORING PROGRESS AGAINST DELIVERY OF THE PLAN

Overarching responsibility for delivery of the plan will be held by the Academic Board, and operationalised by the Registrar and Academic Director, supported by key staff within ASU London with responsibility for tracking and monitoring. We will:

- Ensure there is a clear remit in the Planning function and Registry for collecting, analysing, and reporting data.
- Develop a data collection and management strategy and system to facilitate access to, and analysis of data that can be disaggregated and cut in several ways.
- Use data analytics within the student records system, such as attendance, academic progress, VLE use, assessment participation etc. to inform interventions.

Our governing body (the Board of Trustee Directors) is engaged with the monitoring of performance and provisions of the access and participation plan through the institutional KPIs that have been assigned to our APP goals. The Board reviews these KPIs annually to monitor our performance in relation to the KPIs. We will provide the Board with a thorough overview of APP activities and performance once a year, at their November Board meeting, which will allow time for analysis of the previous year's performance and time to take actions that will have an impact on that academic year's cohort.

We provide all students with an opportunity to be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the plan through allowing them the opportunity to review the plan and progress against it, and to feedback via the student representative system, or through focus groups set up for this specific purpose, as described in the evaluation section. Student Experience Committee will formally review the targets an impact on an annual basis, and their evaluation will be fed into the Academic Board, and subsequently to the Board of Trustee Directors.

We will ensure that we record any risk of worsening performance via our risk register and will take the necessary steps to mitigate or escalate via this process. Our data reporting mechanisms will enable us to monitor performance of our students at key points of the year and to triangulate this with performance against our APP goals to give us the opportunity to intervene in the case of worsening performance.

We will embed monitoring across ASU London through the annual programme monitoring process undertaken by the Academic Director supported by the Registry and reported to the Academic Board. We will embed the review across the organisation, via all staff meetings, to ensure that all colleagues are aware of our responsibilities and performance in this area.

4. PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS

ASU London will work hard to ensure all students, current and prospective, have access to clear, transparent, and up to date information, advice and guidance about the total cost of their HE experience with us and the financial support available to them.

Information to prospective and current students will be available in a variety of ways to ensure that we reach out to a wide range of students from diverse backgrounds so that as many students as possible have an opportunity to consider studying with us.

The ASU London website will be the main source of information for prospective applicants. This will include programme information including entry requirements, Terms and Conditions, tuition fee levels and student financial support. These will also be included in our prospectus and will be available at open events held throughout the year through fees and funding talks.

Financial support details, including eligibility criteria for the different packages available, will be highlighted through the website, and an outline of financial support will be provided within the pre-enrolment material sent out to applicants.

Confirmation of an offer to study at ASU London will also include information as outlined in the Student Fees Policy about tuition fees (maintained for the duration of their programme of study) and any additional costs that students are likely to incur e.g. accommodation, along with information about associated financial support.

As a small HE provider we are in a fortunate position where we can build personalised relationships with prospective students and can, therefore, provide bespoke support to those students who need it.

Finally, our APP and the summary document is available on our website.

Provider fee information 2022-23Provider name: ASU London
Provider UKPRN: 10083403**Summary of 2022-23 course fees**

*course type not listed by the provider as available in 2022-23. This means that any such course delivered in 2022-23 would be subject to fees capped at the basic fee amount.

Table 1a - Full-time course fee levels for 2022-23 students

Full-time course type:	Additional information:	Cohort:	Course fee:
First degree	*	Fee applies to entrants/all students	£9,000
Foundation degree	*	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0	*	*	*
HNC/HND	*	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	Fee applies to entrants/all students	£10,800
Sandwich year	*	*	*
Erasmus and overseas study years	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*

Table 1b - Sub-contractual full-time course fee levels for 2022-23 students

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

Table 1c - Part-time course fee levels for 2022-23 students

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

Table 1d - Sub-contractual part-time course fee levels for 2022-23 students

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

Access and participation plan Fee information 2021-22

Provider name: ASU London
Provider UKPRN: 10083403

Summary of 2021-22 entrant course

*Course type not listed by the provider as available to new entrants in 2021-22. This means that any such course delivered to new entrants in 2021-22 would be subject to fees capped at the basic fee amount.

Inflation statement

We will not raise fees annually for 2021-22 new entrants

Table 4a - Full-time course fee levels for 2021-22 entrants

Full-time course type:	Additional information:	Course fee:
First degree	*	£9,000
Foundation degree	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0	*	*
HNC/HND	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	*
Sandwich year	*	£10,800
Erasmus and overseas study years	*	*
Other	*	*

Table 4b - Sub-contractual full-time course fee levels for 2021-22 students

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

Table 4c - Part-time course fee levels for 2021-22 entrants

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

Table 4d - Sub-contractual part-time course fee levels for 2021-22 new entrants

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

Targets and investment plan

2021-22 to 2025-26

Provider name: ASU London
Provider UKPRN: 10083403

Investment summary

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

Note about the data:

The figures in Table 4a relate to all expenditure on activities and measures that support the ambitions set out in an access and participation plan, where they relate to access to higher education. The figures in Table 4b only relate to the expenditure on activities and measures that support the ambitions set out in an access and participation plan, where they relate to access to higher education which is funded by higher fee income. The OfS does not require providers to report on investment in success and progression and therefore investment in these areas is not represented.

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

Table 4a - Investment summary (£)

Access and participation plan investment summary (£)	Academic year				
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Total access activity investment (£)	£271,869.00	£243,972.00	£261,435.00	£270,024.00	£273,026.00
Access (pre-16)	£122,341.05	£116,181.00	£117,484.00	£121,511.00	£122,862.00
Access (post-16)	£108,747.60	£89,064.00	£91,736.00	£94,508.00	£95,559.00
Access (adults and the community)	£40,780.35	£38,727.00	£52,215.00	£54,005.00	£54,605.00
Access (other)	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Financial support (£)	£44,949.00	£71,140.00	£115,258.00	£132,377.00	£177,668.00
Research and evaluation (£)	£72,750.00	£52,250.00	£72,750.00	£72,750.00	£95,500.00

Table 4b - Investment summary (HFI%)

Access and participation plan investment summary (%HFI)	Academic year				
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Higher fee income (£HFI)	£233,580.00	£195,615.00	£473,405.00	£832,815.00	£1,117,385.00
Access investment	10.7%	17.9%	16.9%	12.0%	12.0%
Financial support	19.2%	15.9%	15.9%	15.9%	15.9%
Research and evaluation	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total investment (as %HFI)	29.9%	33.8%	32.8%	27.9%	27.9%

Targets and investment plan 2021-22 to 2025-26

Provider name: ASU London Provider UKPRN: 10083403

Targets

Table 4a - Access

Aim (500 characters maximum)	Reference number	Target group	Under-represented group	Comparat or group (optional)	Description (500 characters maximum)	Is this target collabora-tive?	Data source	Baseline year	Units	Baseline data	2021-22 milestones	2022-23 milestones	2023-24 milestones	2024-25 milestones	2025-26 milestones	Commentary on milestones/targets (500 characters maximum)
To reduce the gap in participation for students in underrepresented groups	PTA_1	Low participation neighbourhood (LPN)	POLAR quintile 1 and 2	POLAR quintile 3, 4 and 5	To increase the proportion of entrants from POLAR quintile 1+2 areas	No	The access and participatio n dataset	2018-19	Percentage	27.8	15	20	25	30	35	As we do not yet have our own students, we have used the Access and Participation dataset as the baseline for underrepresented groups.
To reduce the gap in participation for students in underrepresented groups	PTA_2	Ethnicity	IMD quintile 1	IMD quintile 5	Proportion of BAME students in the cohort	No	The access and participatio n dataset	2018-19	Percentage	31.3	40	42	45	48	50	As we do not yet have our own students, we have reviewed information from the access and participation dataset, UCAS and #closingthegap. Set achievable targets in line with the population in London.
To reduce the gap in participation for students in underrepresented groups	PTA_3	Mature			Proportion of mature students in the cohort	No	The access and participatio n dataset	2018-19	Percentage	29.4	15	16	17	19	20	We do not yet have our own students so our targets are aligned with the UCAS data for programmes, which showed that 16% of entrants were 21 and over in 2018/19. We are targeting career changers and aim to have a number of them as part of our cohorts going forward. We will grow this number modestly over the period.

Table 4b - Success

Aim (500 characters maximum)	Reference number	Target group	Under-represented group	Comparat or group (optional)	Description (500 characters maximum)	Is this target collabora-tive?	Data source	Baseline year	Units	Baseline data	2021-22 milestones	2022-23 milestones	2023-24 milestones	2024-25 milestones	2025-26 milestones	Commentary on milestones/targets (500 characters maximum)
------------------------------	------------------	--------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------	---------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---

Table 4c - Progression

Aim (500 characters maximum)	Reference number	Target group	Under-represented group	Comparat or group (optional)	Description (500 characters maximum)	Is this target collabora-tive?	Data source	Baseline year	Units	Baseline data	2021-22 milestones	2022-23 milestones	2023-24 milestones	2024-25 milestones	2025-26 milestones	Commentary on milestones/targets (500 characters maximum)
------------------------------	------------------	--------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------	---------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---