

Student record 22056 - post implementation consultation

Overview

The 2022/23 Student record was a result of the Data Futures programme work and a major change to the sector. Whenever a major change is made to our records, Jisc will follow up with a post-implementation survey to refine the changes we made and make improvements for following years.

We have had a vast amount of feedback from providers already, and the questions included in this survey are based on that feedback. To manage expectations, not all of these may lead to changes in the data model, but we are including them here to give the whole sector a chance to give their opinions.

This consultation will be open for 4 weeks, opening on Thursday 25 January 2024 and closing on Friday 23 February 2024.

We will summarise and publish representative, anonymised comments from the responses to this consultation on the HESA website by summer 2024. This will include an explanation of any changes that will be made to future Student records to improve and refine the specification. It may not include any system design improvements, as this will be done iteratively following our usual agile approach to development.

This survey is aimed at those staff members who are involved in the submission of Student data to Jisc, either directly by sending the data, or indirectly by collecting data which feeds in to the Student record. Other responses are welcomed too, but the questions may not all be relevant.

Please contact our Liaison team at liaison@hesa.ac.uk or +44 (0)1242 388 531 if you have any questions about this survey.

Responses

To enable cross-organisational response, the consultation is grouped into subjects for different audiences to engage with. When you click 'next step' under each section, you will be returned to the contents page, which tracks your progress through the questions in each section.

The 'save later' option, also allows multiple users from one organisation to engage with the consultation. Once you click the 'save later' option you will receive a unique link.

Please ensure that you read all of the information supplied in each section before answering the questions.

Once the required questions have been completed, a 'Finish' button will appear at the bottom of the consultation. Pressing this will complete the consultation and send your responses for analysis. Please do not click through to finish until you are satisfied with all of your answers.

On completion, a copy of your responses will be generated as a PDF and sent to the email address you entered at the beginning of the consultation.

Data processing notice for consultations

Responses to this survey will be used to support the review of the Student Record, and will be used in analysis, documentation, and communications in connection with that activity.

We may share your survey responses with statutory customers, sector bodies or other organisations involved within the consultation. We will share your response together with your provider name however we will not disclose your name or email address to organisations we share responses with.

Privacy information <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/about/website/privacy#016> <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/about/website/privacy#016>>

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name

2 What is your email address?

(Required)

3 What is your organisation?

(Required)

Please select only one item

- English provider
- Scottish provider
- Welsh provider
- Northern Irish provider
- Other organisation
- Sector group/body
- Not applicable

4 What is your organisation name?

(Required)

5 What is your job role within the organisation?

6 In what capacity are you responding to the survey?

Please select only one item

- To provide an official response on behalf of a higher education provider, organisation or representative group
- In an individual capacity as an associate or employee of a higher education provider, organisation or representative group
- As a current, recent or prospective student at higher education provider
- In any other individual capacity
- Prefer not to say

Data Specification

The following sections are each considering specific areas of the data model that providers have asked us to consider in this post-implementation consultation. Some are requesting general feedback and others proposing alternative ways to collect the data items.

Session year / Student course session

During the collection period we have received examples of scenarios where this area of the model has been particularly challenging. We have collated these for discussion and will be following up with statutory customers and providers.

Providers have reported that they have struggled to understand the new concepts and the guidance given for different scenarios. The new concept hasn't always been implemented correctly in software systems and the quality rules were over triggering in some cases.

We would like to understand where we might be able to improve things for future years. Would further guidance help, or changes to the quality rules? It is likely we will want to have focused sessions with providers on this, so please do indicate below in question 9 if you would like to be involved with these.

7 What did you find most difficult about the SessionYear and StudentCourseSession entities? Please give specific details about the problem(s) you faced

8 What would you like us to do or change, in order to improve or fix the problem(s) you faced?

9 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above

Cost centres for postgraduate research students

During the initial phases of Data Futures work, we consulted with providers about how cost centres might be recorded for postgraduate research (PGR) students. However, when this work was implemented, there was no requirement from statutory customers to record this data and the proposal was not taken forward.

Feedback has since been received from the sector that providers may have wanted to return this data optionally, as concerns were raised that PGR students were excluded from certain outputs and calculations.

This requirement may not change, but we would like to understand if providers would have, or would in future like to submit this data optionally.

10 If the option was available, would you submit data on cost centres for postgraduate research students at your provider?

Please select only one item

- No, I would not optionally submit cost centre data for PGR students
- Yes, I would like to submit cost centre data for PGR students
- Unsure
- Not applicable

11 Please provide any contextual information to support your answer above

Students studying for QTS - providers in England only

The DfE do not require data to understand whether a student does or does not gain the Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), but they do need to understand the age range that someone qualifies in. Given this change in approach Jisc are considering whether we are recording this in the data model in the best way, and would providers prefer a different approach.

Shortcode: factbank

Factbank Title: QTS codes under consideration

Factbank Content:

(note the last two are being reintroduced to the record for 2024/25)

For your reference, the label for all codes will be starting with "Accredited by the Department for Education (DfE) for the purpose of delivering initial teacher training programmes to achieve Qualified Teacher Status (QTS)". Below is an at-a-glance guide to the code numbers and age ranges.

13909	Ages 3-7
13911	Ages 3-9
13912	Ages 3-11
13913	Ages 5-9
13914	Ages 5-11
13915	Ages 7-11
13916	Ages 7-14
13917	Ages 9-14
13918	Ages 11-16
13919	Ages 11-19
TBC	Ages 11-18
TBC	Ages 14-19

These codes currently appear in the guidance for returning [StudentAccreditationAim.STUACCID](https://codingmanual.hesa.ac.uk/22056/StudentAccreditationAim/field/STUACCID/) <<https://codingmanual.hesa.ac.uk/22056/StudentAccreditationAim/field/STUACCID/>> and [QualificationAwardAccreditation.QUALAWARDACCID](https://codingmanual.hesa.ac.uk/22056/QualificationAwardAccreditation/field/QUALAWARDACCID/) <<https://codingmanual.hesa.ac.uk/22056/QualificationAwardAccreditation/field/QUALAWARDACCID/>> fields.

The codes would either continue to be collected in the QualificationAwardAccreditation entity, or a new field would be created on the QualificationAwarded entity to capture just these codes.

There is still a requirement to understand what age range a student is aiming for at the beginning of their course, which is currently captured in the Student accreditation aim entity. Given the consideration being made above, would we need to change this as well to make it align for providers.

This could continue to be collected in the Student accreditation aim entity, or a new field at the Engagement level could be created to collect these age range codes.

12 What is your preference for returning the age ranges that ITT students qualify in?

Please select only one item

- Continue in the Qualification award accreditation entity
- Move to its own field for recording age ranges awarded
- Unsure
- Not applicable

13 What is your preference for returning the age ranges that ITT students are studying for?

Please select only one item

- Match the answer for the outcome fields in the above question
- Continue in the Student accreditation aim entity
- Move to its own field for recording age range aim
- Unsure
- Not applicable

14 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above**Tariff data from UCAS**

Jisc have been working with UCAS to improve the information on tariff points that are used in the Student collection. This includes information on grades that can be linked with awarding bodies (ABL grades) and grades that fall outside of that (non-ABL grades).

We have been reducing the duplication across this process and trying to make guidance clearer for providers and users of the data. There is one thing we are currently considering which we would like to run past providers.

Currently there are both ABL and non-ABL grade combinations which are permitted for the same grades, but the differences are redundant as they are only used for display purposes on UCAS system. For example the ABL grade is listed as "P" and the Apply grade is listed as a "Pass". Both share the same qualification identifier and tariff points.

Providers are returning both these grades, and this reduces the quality of the data and makes onwards use a little more difficult.

We would like to remove the duplication by removing grades that are listed for display purposes only, so for example the "Pass" grade in the example above. Most providers are receiving "P" equivalent grades from UCAS now anyway, but it may require some recoding from others.

15 Would you agree that we should be considering this improvement to the data quality, even though that may change some submission data on these fields?

Please select only one item

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Not applicable

16 Are there things you would like us to consider when we look to make this change?

17 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above.

Coverage statements

For certain fields or entities our Liaison team have received a lot of questions about when a data item should or should not be returned, in particular the StudentFinancialSupport and FundingAndMonitoring entities have caused confusion. Providers have often triggered the quality rules and not been able to identify why they were returning more data than was necessary.

For the StudentFinancialSupport entity:

Student financial support entity	An entity is required for each instance of financial support awarded to a student
FINSUPTYPE	All StudentFinancialSupport entities
APPSPEND	All StudentFinancialSupport where StudentFinancialSupport.FINSUPTYPE = 001-004, where applicable
FINSUPAMOUNT	All StudentFinancialSupport entities where StudentFinancialSupport.FINSUPTYPE = 001-004 or 200

But the coverage statements above don't show when you need to return each of the financial support types, and therefore you need to look at the guidance as well, in order to understand the full coverage. In the 23056 coding manual we have moved this guidance to the [StudentFinancialSupport entity](https://codingmanual.hesa.ac.uk/23056/entity/StudentFinancialSupport/) :
<<https://codingmanual.hesa.ac.uk/23056/entity/StudentFinancialSupport/>> :

Disabled Students' Allowance – applicable to all providers:

This is required to be returned for any students in receipt of Disabled Students' Allowance except where (SessionStatus.STATUSCHANGEDTO = 02 for the entire reference period) or (Leaver.ENGENDDATE - Engagement.ENGSTARTDATE <= 14 days and RSNENGEND = 03, 05, 11, 12).

Student support – applicable to providers in England:

Where a FINSUPTYPE is part of the commitments detailed in the provider's Access and Participation Plan (APP) APPSPEND should be used to flag this. It is agreed to be unnecessary to apportion an individual FINSUPTYPE between that contributing to an APP commitment and that not. Therefore, if some part of a FINSUPTYPE supports an APP commitment APPSPEND should be returned.

The OfS note that this approach may result in providers returning figures that do not completely align with their Access and Participation Plan.

This is required to be returned for all Students at Approved (fee cap) providers in England where Engagement.FEEELIG = 01 and Qualification.QUALCAT starts with H, I, J or C or is M0002, M0016 or M0018 and CollaborativeProvision.COLPROVTYPEID does not equal 02, except where Engagement.INCOMINGEXCHANGE exists or (SessionStatus.STATUSCHANGEDTO = 02 for the entire reference period) or (Leaver.ENGENDDATE - Engagement.ENGSTARTDATE <= 14 days and RSNENGEND = 03, 05, 11, 12).

Part-time support – applicable to providers in Wales:

This is required to be returned when the student is in receipt of a fee waiver under the HEFCW part-time fee waiver scheme.

For the FundingAndMonitoring entity:

Funding and monitoring entity	All StudentCourseSessions at providers in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales and Approved (fee cap) providers in England where applicable, except where (SessionStatus.STATUSCHANGEDTO = 02 for the entire reference period) or (Leaver.ENGENDDATE - Engagement.ENGSTARTDATE <= 14 days and RSNENGEND = 03, 05, 11, 12). where applicable.
ELQ	All StudentCourseSessions at providers in England where Engagement.FEEELIG = 01 and Qualification.QUALCAT has a HESA level of E, M, H, I, J or C except where Engagement.INCOMINGEXCHANGE exists.
FUNDCOMP	All StudentCourseSessions at providers in Northern Ireland and Wales where StudentCourseSession.RSNSCSEND exists and Engagement.INCOMINGEXCHANGE does not exist. Optional for all StudentCourseSessions at providers in England where StudentCourseSession.RSNSCSEND exists and Engagement.INCOMINGEXCHANGE does not exist.
FUNDLENGTH	All StudentCourseSessions at providers in England and Northern Ireland
NONREGFEE	All StudentCourseSessions where applicable

In this entity the coverage statements work on a hierarchal approach. So for example, the dormancy exclusion (*SessionStatus.STATUSCHANGEDTO = 02 for the entire reference period*) is applicable to all the fields underneath. Coverage rules for the ELQ field will also include a dormancy restriction, and the entity is where it is coming from.

Jisc are also considering whether there might be a better and clearer way to write the more complex coverage statements, especially where some data might be mandatory and some optional, or there might be lots of exceptions given. We would be keen to hear if there are any particular coverage statements which you find difficult to understand or interpret our meaning.

18 What are your preferences for coverage statements like the StudentFinancialSupport entity and child fields, where data is only returned where it is applicable? (please select all that apply)

Please select all that apply

- I didn't have a problem returning this in 22056, so keep as is
- Include all relevant guidance at the entity level
- Include relevant guidance in the respective fields
- Have a more detailed coverage statement at the entity level
- Leave the entity coverage statement simple, so as it is now
- Something else (please specify in text box below)

19 What are your preferences for coverage statements like the FundingAndMonitoring entity and child fields where a hierarchy is imposed? (please select all that apply)

Please select all that apply

- I didn't have a problem returning this in 22056, so keep as is
- Include all restrictions at the entity level
- Move all restrictions to be specified at each individual field level
- Something else (please specify in text box below)

20 Do you have any comments or clarification on the preferences given above?

21 Are there any other coverage statements that you find confusing, or would like Jisc to take another look at for next year?

22 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above

Returning data outside of the coverage

There have been some examples where providers have wanted to return data outside of the coverage statements, to make it easier for various reasons when putting together their data return.

In some cases Jisc have allowed this, but in other cases where the data is considered sensitive the quality rules have stopped this. For some providers we understand this has caused them a lot of problems.

Although we will not be able to alter the GDPR rules for returning some of the more sensitive data items, we may be able to explore other areas, or at least relax the quality rules on these areas.

23 What areas of the data model would you like us to explore allowing returns outside of the coverage statements? For example, dormant students or the StudentCourseSession entity

24 Please provide any contextual information to support your answer above

Placement data

During the preparation for the Student record there was feedback that the guidance around placements and the Off venue activity entity wasn't detailed enough. Although further guidance and examples were added, we are not sure if this was targeted in the correct areas to be the most helpful for providers. Jisc would like to understand what specific areas could be improved for next year.

25 What level of placement data did you return in 2022/23? (this is only to help us understand if the guidance put you off returning more than the required coverage)

Please select all that apply

- Only the mandatory placements
- Some optional placements (other types of placement)
- Some optional placements (shorter lengths of placement)
- Not applicable

26 What guidance did you find the most useful when preparing your data return?

Please select only one item

- The Off Venue Activity entity
- The Off Venue Activity and Placements extra guidance page
- The e-learning training course(s)
- Something else (please enter response below)
- Not applicable

27 What area(s) of guidance would you like to see improved for next year? Please be specific in terms of the types of placement or the types of guidance you would like to see**28** Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above**Personal characteristics review**

Alongside the Data Futures changes, we also implemented the outcomes from the [personal characteristics and equality data](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/innovation/records/reviews/consultation-outcomes-personal-characteristics-equality-data)

<<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/innovation/records/reviews/consultation-outcomes-personal-characteristics-equality-data>> consultation in the Student record.

Jisc would like to understand how providers found implementing these changes, were there any difficulties in asking the new questions of students and is there any feedback you would like to give us on these data items?

29 How did you find implementing the personal characteristics and equality data consultation outcomes?

30 Please provide any contextual information to support your answer above

Reduced returns

Some organisations have indicated that they would prefer to bring the reduced return concept back to the Student record, to help them identify which students need to complete which data items (for example: dormant students or incoming visiting and exchange students).

The legacy guidance on reduced returns was: [C21051/reducedreturns](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/collection/c21051/reducedreturns) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/collection/c21051/reducedreturns>> and the transition guidance in 2022/23 was: [22056-support-guides#reduced-returns](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/collection/22056-support-guides#reduced-returns) <<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/collection/22056-support-guides#reduced-returns>> .

31 What is your preference for identifying the fewer data items that need to be returned for some students?

Please select only one item

- Identify through the field and entity coverage statement(s)
- Identify through a reduced return flag(s)
- Unsure
- Not applicable

32 Please provide any contextual information to support your answer above

HESA Data Platform

As part of this consultation survey, we would also like to understand providers' views on aspects of the HESA Data Platform (HDP).

We aim to build a secure system that is accessible (meeting the WCAG AA standard), easy to use and has all the information you need when submitting data to one of our collections.

This is the first data return running on the new system and we appreciate that HE providers have not had the experience we would have hoped for in this first year using our new data collection systems. We recognise that late delivery of features and quality rules impacted providers' preparations for the 22056 submission and we would like to continue understanding your priority areas and preferences, so we can target these for improvements in future years.

Jisc have begun usability and UX improvements to the HDP, and this section of the consultation forms part of this work. The following questions are focused on the submission systems, hdp.hesa.ac.uk <<https://hdp.hesa.ac.uk>> , and the Issue Management System, issuemanagement.hesa.ac.uk <<https://issuemanagement.hesa.ac.uk>> .

We want to hear about the pain points, problems, and issues you had during your usage of these systems. These pain points could include:

areas of the system that are confusing to you,
things that take a lot of your time or don't do what you expect,
things that contain terminology that is not easy to understand or confusing,
the lack necessary information for you to fix submission issues,
that you are unable to interact with due to system accessibility problems.

Jisc will be running regular focused sessions with providers whilst we are making the improvements over the coming months, and later in this consultation you will be able to volunteer if you are able to spare the time to help us in this work. Your involvement in these sessions will be used to improve the system.

General accessibility across the HDP

Jisc understands the need to build an accessible system for all our users who submit data returns. We are therefore looking at improvements we can make, for example: colour contrast, use of screen readers, navigation by keyboard, the language and terminology used in our systems.

33 What areas of assistance do you need from our system, for either yourself or other staff members at your organisation? Please select any that apply

Please select all that apply

- Better keyboard navigation
- Better labels and instructions
- Better support for screen readers
- Better language used on the screen
- Better visual navigation
- Other (please enter response below)

34 Please provide any contextual information to support your answer above

HESA Data Platform - continued

Understanding the impact that issues have on your daily work is very helpful, so please give as much detail as you are comfortable with.

35 What pain points have you experienced during the managing and submitting submissions stages?

This question focuses on the "Manage submissions" stages including:

- Viewing and uploading new submission files
- file processing
- initial checks.

36 What pain points have you experienced during the submission and quality assurance stages?

This question focuses on the "Quality assurance" stages including:

- the quality assurance checks
- the produced reports: quality, credibility, additional reports.

37 What pain points have you experienced during the approval and sign-off stages?

This question focuses on the "Approval" and "Sign-off" stages.

38 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above

Quality assurance process

These questions are focusing on the quality rule report and tolerance change process in the Issue Management System (IMS).

- 39** Focusing on the information provided in the quality rule report, on a scale of 1-5, does the report give you enough information to be able to resolve your errors, where 1 is not very much information and 5 is lots of information?

This question is focused on the quality rule report and the error messages you see when the quality rules have been triggered by the data being submitted.

Please select only one item

- 1 – not very much information
- 2 – some information
- 3 – neutral
- 4 – enough information
- 5 – lots of information

- 40** What issues have you had with the information displayed in the quality rule report?

- 41** Focusing on the systems, on a scale of 1-5, how easy did you find the tolerance change process in the Issue Management System, where 1 is very easy and 5 is very difficult?

This question is focused on the tolerance change process in the Issue Management System, and the process of dealing with quality rules that are tripping for the data which you believe are correct for your provider.

Please select only one item

- 1 – very easy
- 2 – easy
- 3 – neutral
- 4 – difficult
- 5 – very difficult

- 42** In your view, are there any improvements that could be made to the tolerance change process?

43 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above

HDP: Credibility reports

The low priority credibility reports (those without shading rules) were not delivered in 2022/23 and we would like to understand which of these would add value for providers.

Expand for more information on each of the credibility reports

Chapter	Report name	Report description
Collaborating providers	Collaborating/ franchising providers (COLLAB1)	This table displays the number of engagements where other education providers provide teaching by mode and level of study. Figures are provided for both the current and previous cycle to provide a comparison. Percentage and total number differences are also provided to assist analysis.
Funding	Completion status (COMP1P)	This table displays the proportion of completion status data from FundingAndMonitoring.FUNDCOMP. The proportion figures from the previous reporting cycle are also included for comparison.
Funding	Number of Engagements where modules are taught through the medium of Welsh by mode and level of study (FUND3)	This table displays the number of engagements where the percentage taught through the medium of Welsh is greater than zero, split by mode and level of study.
Health and Social Care	Accreditation for health and social care students (ACC1)	This table provides a breakdown of health and social care students by mode and accreditation.
Module	HESA cost centres with Student, Staff and Finance data (HCC2)	This table displays HESA cost centre and the total student and staff FTE and finance expenditure (£000).
Module	HESA cost centres with FTE by level and fundability (HCC3)	This table displays the total FTE per cost centre for each Engagement based on modules which overlap the cycle.
Module	Language percentage delivery through the medium of Welsh (LANG1)	This table displays the number of module instances taught through the medium of Welsh against the language percentage.
PGR	Active postgraduate research students intended level of study by mode (PGR1)	This table displays the number of active postgraduate research student engagements per intended level of study by mode. The proportion per intended level of study by mode is also provided.
PGR	Research council students by major source of tuition fees (RCST1)	This table identifies the number of Research Council funded students by the major source of tuition fees for the engagement, where this is known. Figures are provided for both the current and previous reporting cycles to provide a comparison along with percentage and total number differences.
PGR	Research Council students by mode and level (RCST2)	This table identifies the number of postgraduate Research Council students by mode and level. Figures are provided for both the current and previous reporting cycles to provide a comparison along with percentage and total number differences.
PGR	Student Engagements apportioned by Unit of Assessment (REF1)	This table looks at the total apportionment of postgraduate research students by the units of assessment used for the Research Excellence Framework.
Student attributes	Student ethnicity by mode and level (ETHNIC1)	This table looks at student ethnicity by mode and level. Where ethnicity data is blank it is excluded from this table.
Student attributes	Marital status by age (STAT1)	This table details a summary of the marital status of the student by age.
Student attributes	Dependants on entry by mode of study (STAT2)	This table details a summary of the dependants by mode of study.
Student attributes	Dependants by mode of study (STAT3)	This table details a summary of the dependants by mode of study for the current reporting cycle.
Student attributes	Term time accommodation (TTACCOM1)	This table details the term time accommodation of full time engagements by first years/continuing students and level.
Student support	Special or non-regulated fee category by mode and level (SPECF1)	This table displays the special or non-regulated fee category for UK and EU student engagements where the major source of tuition fee funding is SLC, SAAS, DfE(NI) or fees are paid by student . Figures are provided for the current and previous reporting cycles for comparison.
Student support	Special fee indicator and major source of tuition fee for PGT level students (SPECF2)	This table displays the special or non-regulated fee category for UK and EU domiciled PGT level students where the major source of tuition fee funding is SLC, SAAS, DfE(NI) or fees are paid by student. It is split by teacher training course. Figures are provided for the current and previous reporting cycles for comparison.
Student support	First year student Engagements with an SSN (SSN1)	This table reports on first year students with an SSN.
Venue	Venue: Engagements by address on entry and level of study- Full-time (VENUE1)	This report shows the number of Engagements associated with a venue by address on entry and level of study.
Venue	Venue: Engagements by address on entry and level of study- Part-time (VENUE2)	This report shows the number of Engagements associated with a venue by address on entry and level of study.
Venue	Venue: Subject apportionment by subject area and level of study – Full-time (VENUE3)	This report shows subject apportionment associated with a venue by subject area and level of study.

Chapter	Report name	Report description
Venue	Venue: Subject apportionment by subject area and level of study –Part-time (VENUE4)	This report shows subject apportionment associated with a venue by subject area and level of study.
Venue	Venue: Qualifications awarded to students – Full-time (VENUE5)	This report shows the number of Engagements associated with a venue by qualifications awarded and level of study.
Venue	Venue: Qualifications awarded to students – Part-time (VENUE6)	This report shows the number of Engagements associated with a venue by qualifications awarded and level of study.

44 Which credibility reports would you like to see included?

Please select the 5 top credibility reports that you would like to see included next year. Select reports in order of importance, where 1 is most important, descending through priority/importance to 5.

We appreciate other reports will be as important as the 5 you select, but your choices will help us understand how to prioritise content requirements.

	1	2	3	4	5
Collaborating/ franchising providers (COLLAB1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Completion status (COMP1P) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Number of Engagements where modules are taught through the medium of Welsh by mode and level of study (FUND3) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Accreditation for health and social care students (ACC1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
HESA cost centres with Student, Staff and Finance data (HCC2) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
HESA cost centres with FTE by level and fundability (HCC3) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Language percentage delivery through the medium of Welsh (LANG1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Active postgraduate research students intended level of study by mode (PGR1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Research council students by major source of tuition fees (RCST1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Research Council students by mode and level (RCST2) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Student Engagements apportioned by Unit of Assessment (REF1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Student ethnicity by mode and level (ETHNIC1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Marital status by age (STAT1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Dependants on entry by mode of study (STAT2) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Dependants by mode of study (STAT3) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Term time accommodation (TTACCOM1)	<input type="radio"/>				

	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please select only one item</i>					
Special or non-regulated fee category by mode and level (SPECF1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Special fee indicator and major source of tuition fee for PGT level students (SPECF2) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
First year student Engagements with an SSN (SSN1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Venue: Engagements by address on entry and level of study - Full-time (VENUE1) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Venue: Engagements by address on entry and level of study - Part-time (VENUE2) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Venue: Subject apportionment by subject area and level of study - Full-time (VENUE3) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Venue: Subject apportionment by subject area and level of study - Part-time (VENUE4) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Venue: Qualifications awarded to students - Full-time (VENUE5) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				
Venue: Qualifications awarded to students - Part-time (VENUE6) <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>				

45 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above

HDP: Additional collection reports

These questions are focused on the additional reports provided by the system, so this would include the enriched data file, frequency counts report, expected population report, cost centre analysis report, NSS report, IRIS reports, PGR Transfers In & Out reports. (also the Unistats report which was not delivered in 2022/23 but will be in future years).

46 Tell us about your usage of the additional collection reports? (who looks at these reports within your provider, how do they access them, and which reports do you focus on?)

47 Do these reports give you all the information you need during your submission?

48 Can you identify all the populations that go into each report, and do you know where to find this, especially where you are recreating our figures with your own data?

49 Please provide any contextual information to support your answers above

Closing feedback

Expression of interest to take part in UX research

Jisc will be undertaking focused sessions to understand the working context of how users make submissions, take providers through ideas of improvements and test out possible solutions. If you and your provider would like to take part in these sessions, please let us know below.

Sessions will be varied and could be one-to-one interviews, or testing of the potential system designs. These sessions could be delivered in a combination of ways: in person with us visiting your provider, you visiting Jisc offices, or remotely.

Commitment is dependent on how much/little you'd like to be involved. The more people who sign-up, the smaller the commitment overall.

50 Would you be interested in taking part in this further development work with Jisc?

Please select only one item

- Yes
- No

51 Please provide the email address of the interested parties

52 Do you have any other comments or feedback about the Student 2022/23 collection?

53 Do you have any comments about this post-implementation consultation?