

Annex to recurrent grant letter to higher education institutions of 14 March 2011

1. This annex provides some important information about issues and developments affecting funding and student numbers for 2011-12 and some messages relating to funding and student numbers for 2012-13. It also provides a generic explanation of the main factors that have resulted in funding changes across the sector since last year.
2. The allocations for all institutions will be summarised in HEFCE 2011/07, 'Recurrent grants for 2011-12', which will be available on the HEFCE extranet on Tuesday 15 March and published on the HEFCE web-site on Thursday 17 March. **Please note that all information in this annex and the publication is subject to embargo until 0001 on Thursday 17 March.** Allocations will be confirmed in July, at which point we intend to make all institutions' full grant tables publicly available via our website.
3. A copy of this letter and the enclosed comparison table for your institution are also available on the HEFCE extranet. The keys to access them were provided in Caroline Charlton's letter of 19 January 2011. Also available on the HEFCE extranet site are the following documents:
 - a. The individual grant tables for your institution.
 - b. The equivalent grant tables for the sector as a whole. These may help to provide some contextual information so that you can better understand the relative position of your institution.
 - c. '2011-12 Recurrent grant tables for higher education institutions: guidance'. This technical document is aimed particularly at finance and planning officers. It explains more fully than is possible in this letter how the figures in the grant tables have been derived. It is important that this document is well understood, as this should help your planning. It also specifies some conditions of grant which will be included in your funding agreement in July.
 - d. Circular letter 09/2011, 'Changes to recurrent grant for 2010-11'. This Circular letter confirms for each institution its share of the £122 million reduction to recurrent teaching grant and £27.6 million reduction to recurrent research grant, which were first announced in 'Funding for universities and colleges for 2010-11 and 2011-12' (Circular letter 05/2011). It is also subject to embargo until 0001 on 17 March.
4. This annex, the sector-wide grant tables, a summary of recurrent grants by Government region, and the guidance on the grant tables will be available on our web-site at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/finance/recurrent/>, once the embargo is lifted on 17 March.

5. Alongside this announcement of recurrent grant we are also announcing allocations to higher education institutions (HEIs) for the reinstatement of funding under the first Teaching Capital Investment Fund in 2011-12, the first year of a second Teaching Capital Investment Fund for 2012-13, and for a second Research Capital Investment Fund for 2011-12 to 2014-15. The allocations for all HEIs are summarised in Circular letter 11/2011 'Teaching Capital Investment Fund: Reinstatement of 2010-11 funding' and HEFCE 2011/08, 'Capital Investment Fund 2: Capital allocations for learning and teaching 2012-13; and capital allocations for research 2011-12 to 2014-15', which are available on the HEFCE extranet alongside this letter and will be published on the HEFCE web-site on Thursday 17 March. We are also announcing, in Circular letter 10/2011, allocations of teaching capital to directly funded further education colleges (FECs) for the two years 2011-12 and 2012-13. These capital allocations to HEIs and to directly funded FECs for 2011-12 are firm but those for 2012-13 to 2014-15 are indicative and subject to confirmation in future grant letters. **Please note that all information about capital funding is also subject to embargo until 0001 on Thursday 17 March.**

Issues and developments affecting funding and student numbers for 2011-12

6. The overall budget we have set for the 2011-12 academic year is £6,507 million. This is an underlying reduction compared to the previously planned total for 2010-11 of £685 million (9.5 per cent). In addition, short-term funding of £255 million is ending for some special funding programmes and the University Modernisation Fund (UMF), which was for 2010-11 only. Incorporating these brings the total reduction in cash terms to £940 million, or 12.6 per cent, compared to the total for 2010-11 that was planned in October 2010.

7. Total recurrent funding for teaching is £4,339 million. This represents a decrease in cash terms of £180 million, or 4.0 per cent compared to the reduced total for 2010-11. The 2010-11 reduced total incorporates changes arising from institutions student numbers in 2010-11 and the £122 million pro rata reduction to teaching grant for 2010-11 announced in February 2011, but excludes funding provided for the UMF for 2010-11 only.

8. The total comprises the following different elements:

- £3,638 million for mainstream teaching grant
- £142 million for widening participation (WP)
- £264 million for teaching enhancement and student success (TESS)
- £295 million for other elements of teaching grant.

9. A number of developments to our funding methods affect the outcomes for individual institutions. These are explained in further detail below, but can be summarised as follows:

- a. Changes to teaching grant to deliver the required reductions for 2011-12, including through the consolidation of the reductions applied for 2010-11 (of 1.09 per cent and 2.81 per cent announced, respectively, in June 2010 and February 2011), and a further reduction of 4.28 per cent, applied to all elements of teaching grant other than WP and improving retention, for 2011-12.
 - b. Withdrawal of the teaching element of the UMF.
 - c. The phasing out of the foundation degree targeted allocation.
 - d. Changes to teaching grant to incorporate the fourth year of the policy on funding for students aiming for equivalent or lower qualifications (ELQs).
 - e. A second round of the initiative to support institutions that are shifting the balance of their recruitment towards strategically important and vulnerable subjects
 - f. Individual institutions may also have adjustments to grant as a result of their student numbers in 2010-11, or allocations of additional places for 2011-12.
10. The total recurrent funding for research is £1,558 million. This is a reduction in cash terms of £45 million compared to the 2010-11 allocations published in October 2010 and represents a further reduction of £17.4 million after adjusting for the reduction of £27.6 million for 2010-11 announced in February 2011.
11. We are reducing the weighting in the mainstream QR grant that is given to activity rated 2* in the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), sufficient to achieve:
- a. The full reduction of £45 million in 2011-12 through mainstream QR and its London weighting; and
 - b. Redistribution of half of the remaining funding previously allocated through mainstream QR and London weighting on the basis of 2* activity, towards activity rated 3* and 4*.
12. These decisions take account of the request in our grant letter that we should selectively fund on the basis of only internationally excellent and world-leading research. This means that we are maintaining the quality weightings for 4* and 3* quality research at 9 and 3 respectively (though increasing their average rate of funding) and that there is a consequent reduction in the weighting for 2* quality research from 1 to 0.294. We are also continuing to provide protection to science, engineering, medicine and mathematics subjects within the mainstream QR method to ensure that they do not see a reduced share of the total compared to 2008-09.
13. The funding available through the RDP supervision fund, the business research element and the charity support fund has been maintained in cash terms. At the sector

level, total funding for research libraries has also been maintained in cash terms. However, the funding for these libraries has been reallocated for 2011-12 pro rata to the full economic costs they incur in providing a service to external users. These costs have been identified through an analysis based on the Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC).

14. The total recurrent funding for research for 2011-12, is made up of the following elements:

- £1,052.8 million for mainstream QR
- £32.4 million for London weighting on mainstream QR
- £205.2 million for the research degree programme (RDP) supervision fund
- £197.5 million for the charity support element
- £63.7 million for the business research element
- £6.5 million for National Research Libraries.

15. To smooth the transition to the new funding arrangements from 2012-13, we are looking to protect teaching activity as far as possible. We are maintaining funding for WP and improving retention, and implementing reductions to other elements of teaching funding pro rata for the academic years 2010-11 and 2011-12. We are also providing moderation funding to institutions most adversely affected by reductions in their recurrent grant; given the funding constraints this has to be limited but we are allocating more moderation funding than in 2010-11, recognising the guidance in the grant letter from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) to help smooth the transition. Total moderation funding is £30 million and is allocated such that no institution sees a reduction of more than 3.9 per cent compared to the equivalent unmoderated grant for 2010-11. We do not provide moderation funding if it amounts to less than £100,000.

2011-12 Funding for teaching

Introduction to the method

16. The main ('mainstream') teaching funding method is designed to ensure that the funding we provide is consistent with the student numbers at each institution. We start by rolling forward the mainstream teaching funding we provided in the previous year, but we adjust it for things like funding for ASNs (where we have agreed that an institution should grow) or a reduction ('holdback') if the institution has not recruited sufficiently in the previous year, and to ensure our total grant is within the available budget. We then check whether this new funding level is appropriate for the student numbers we expect the institution to have in the coming year. We do this by comparing it against a standard level, based on sector-wide rates of funding per student.

17. The standard level for each institution is calculated by formula based on their student numbers and their mix between different subject areas – we need to reflect that, for example, laboratory-based sciences cost more than classroom-based subjects. We have just four subject-related price groups. This keeps the funding method simple and

limits the need for extensive audit arrangements to test whether students have been recorded against the right subject: the boundaries between different subjects are not clear-cut at higher education level, and having only four price groups means few boundaries.

18. Our calculations also take account of what income can be expected from student fees. Our grant is not intended, nor sufficient, to meet all tuition costs: students are also expected to contribute. If we want to make the best use of taxpayers' money, we need to prioritise it towards areas that are not adequately funded from other sources. It is important to note, however, that for any particular category of student we make the same assumptions about fees for all institutions in the sector: we do not take account of differences in what individual institutions charge. This ensures we target our funding towards particular types of provision where our funding is most needed, without disadvantaging those institutions that are able to charge higher fees, or subsidising those that may seek a market advantage by charging lower fees.

19. Because we make assumptions about fee income, we talk of teaching 'resource' rather than just funding. 'Assumed resource' comprises actual HEFCE teaching grant plus assumed fee income; 'standard resource' is the level of resource we would expect for the institution based on its student numbers and mix between different subject areas. As long as assumed resource is close to standard resource, the funding we have calculated will be confirmed. By 'close' we mean within ± 5 per cent. If it is not within this margin we may adjust funding or expect the institution to adjust its student numbers, to ensure the funding we provide is at an appropriate level for the activity delivered.

20. As well as the main teaching funding allocation, we make a number of specific allocations that reflect other additional teaching or student-related costs. In particular, we provide additional sums for WP and to improve student retention and success. These allocations reflect the fact that there are additional costs on institutions in reaching out to populations that are under-represented in higher education, and in supporting certain students through to completion of their studies. The formulae are designed to target funding towards those institutions that do most to widen participation or that recruit students who are likely to need more support. There are also a number of other teaching allocations to support other areas of higher cost or particular policy developments, for example, part-time students. Although we refer to these as targeted allocations, they remain part of the overall block grant. They are not earmarked: institutions still have freedom to decide how these sums are used to support their overall activities. The objective behind all these allocations is to recognise additional costs; they are not incentive payments.

Funding outcomes and changes to the method for 2011-12

21. There are a number of developments to the teaching funding method that we are implementing for 2011-12. They are:

- a. Consolidating the pro rata reductions applied to teaching grant for 2010-11.

- b. The implementation of a further reduction to teaching grants for 2011-12.
- c. Withdrawal of the teaching element of the UMF.
- d. Withdrawal of the targeted allocation for foundation degrees.
- e. A further allocation of funding to support institutions that are shifting the balance of their recruitment towards strategically important and vulnerable subjects (SIVS).

22. In addition, there are a number of other factors affecting funding, which have implications for 2011-12 for institutions. These are:

- a. The policy on funding students aiming for equivalent or lower qualifications compared to ones they already hold (ELQs).
- b. Changes to student numbers for individual institutions and their effect on mainstream teaching grant and targeted allocations.

Consolidating pro rata reductions applied to teaching grant for 2010-11

23. In June 2010 we implemented a pro rata reduction to teaching funding for 2010-11 of £52 million (1.09 per cent). In February 2011 we announced a further reduction to teaching funding of £122 million. This was applied as a pro rata reduction of 2.81 per cent to all elements of recurrent teaching grant, with the exception of funding for WP and improving retention. These reductions have been consolidated into 2011-12 teaching funding.

Further reduction to teaching grants for 2011-12

24. A further reduction of £175 million to teaching grant is necessary to remain within the funding available for 2011-12. We are implementing this as a pro rata reduction of 4.28 per cent to all elements of teaching grant for 2011-12, with the exception of funding for WP and improving retention.

Withdrawal of funding for the University Modernisation Fund

25. Funding for the UMF was provided for 2010-11 only so we are withdrawing this allocation in 2011-12.

Withdrawal of the foundation degree targeted allocation

26. We are withdrawing funding of £12 million in 2011-12 in relation to the foundation degree targeted allocation within teaching grant, as previously notified in 'Changes to teaching funding targeted allocations for 2010-11' (HEFCE Electronic publication 11/2009) and 'Funding for universities and colleges in 2010-11' (Circular letter 02/2010).

Support for institutions that are shifting the balance of their recruitment towards SIVS

27. We invited bids for this initiative in Circular letter 06/2010. For 2011-12 we are providing a further allocation under this initiative, which will enable institutions that were successful in their bids to maintain their intakes in these subjects at the higher levels they planned for 2010-11.

Equivalent or lower qualifications

28. In 2007, the previous Government decided that we should phase out funding for students who are aiming for a qualification that is no higher than one they have already achieved (a number of categories of students are exempt from this policy). The funding is being phased out as successive cohorts of students who were aiming for ELQs in 2007-08 are expected to complete their courses. The allocations for 2011-12 reflect the phasing-out of this transitional funding.

29. Last year's grant tables showed provisional, declining allocations of transitional funding up to 2013-14. The allocations for 2011-12 therefore reflect the phasing out of this transitional funding. The value of the transitional funding has been reduced to take account of the pro rata reductions of 1.09 and 2.81 per cent applied in 2010-11 and to reflect the reduction to teaching grant for 2011-12 of 4.28 per cent

30. Some institutions received an 'ELQ safety net' allocation in 2010-11 to ensure that they did not see an overall cash reduction in 2010-11 as a result of the ELQ policy compared with the equivalent sums that were within mainstream teaching grant for 2007-08. We committed to provide this allocation up to 2010-11, and allocations for 2011-12 reflect the withdrawal of this funding.

The effect on funding of changes to student numbers

31. Individual institutions will see changes to their teaching grant as a result of changes in their student numbers, or following data audits and reconciliations. These can be positive or negative, depending on how they have met their funding agreement targets for 2010-11 and any allocations of ASNs for 2011-12. The 2010-11 student numbers also affect other teaching allocations such as for WP and TESS.

Student numbers

32. In 2010-11 we introduced a student number control relating to full-time (FT) undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate/professional graduate certificate in education (PGCE) entrants. This was introduced, following a request from Government, to reduce the risk that over-recruitment by institutions might lead to a reduction in HEFCE grant to meet unplanned student support costs. The grant letter from BIS of 20 December 2010 asks that we maintain mechanisms to minimise over-recruitment. The grant letter also explains that entrant places for autumn 2011 should remain at the level on offer in autumn 2010.

33. Circular letter 02/2011 described our approach to determining institutions' student number control limits for 2011-12. In January our Board decided that these limits should be uplifted by 2 per cent so that, at the sector level, there is no reduction required in the number of entrant places available for 2011-12.

34. Caroline Charlton's letter of 31 January 2011 set out provisional student number control limits for 2011-12, including the pro rata increase of 2 per cent. Institutions were invited to respond if they did not wish to accept all or part of their share of the 2 per cent uplift or if they wished to appeal for a change to their limit. The grant tables for your institution reflect the outcome of any such appeal that may have been submitted. We will make further formulaic changes to the limit as necessary, including to reflect additional co-funded employer engagement places for 2011-12 and institutional transfers that are not yet included.

35. We will monitor each institution's compliance with the student number control that we have specified for them. Where we find that an institution has exceeded its limit, this will result in a reduction to grant, which may be applied in the 2011-12 and/or 2012-13 academic year. This will be at a rate of £3,750 for each student above the limit, or such other rate as may be separately specified by BIS. This reduction will be repeated in subsequent years to the extent that the institution continues to contribute to excess student support costs. We will give institutions an opportunity to appeal for mitigation before finalising any such grant adjustment.

36. Institutions should assume that no margin above the limit specified for 2011-12 will apply before we seek to apply grant reductions.

37. We wish to avoid giving any advantage to institutions that have exceeded their permitted level of FT UG and PGCE entrants in 2010-11. There remains a risk that these institutions' over-recruitment could again contribute to excess student support costs in later years. Because FT UG intakes will commonly be retained for three years, the increased cohorts are likely to take some time to work through the system. It would be unfair to other institutions if those that over-recruited in 2010-11 had the benefit of increased fee income in later years, while any consequential reductions in the grant made available to HEFCE by the Department were then shared equally across the sector. Institutions should therefore note that, where we assess that they have over-recruited in 2010-11:

- a. If they recruit up to their student number control limit in 2011-12, then any grant adjustment that we determine arising from their over-recruitment in 2010-11 may be applied again in later years.
- b. If they wish to avoid grant adjustments for 2010-11 over-recruitment recurring in future years, they need to reduce their intakes relative to their 2009-10 baseline in a way which offsets the over-recruitment in 2010-11.

38. Similarly we wish to avoid giving any advantage to institutions that exceeded their permitted intake in 2009-10 and did not deliver in full the required shortfall against the 2010-11 student number control to avoid a further reduction relating to this over-recruitment. If institutions in this position wish to avoid grant adjustments for 2009-10 over-recruitment recurring in future years, they will need to reduce their intakes in a way which offsets the over-recruitment in 2009-10 that has not already been sufficiently offset in 2010-11. Recurrent grant Table B shows the student number control limit for 2011-12 and any shortfalls against this that are necessary to avoid any further reductions for over-recruitment that may have occurred in 2010-11 or 2009-10.

39. HEFCE institutional teams may wish to discuss with institutions that we identify as having over-recruited in 2010-11, what their recruitment plans are for future years and any financial consequences that may result from them.

2011-12 Funding for Research

Introduction to the method

40. The research funding method is designed to target funding where research quality is highest. We refer to the funding as quality-related research (QR) grant. Research quality in different Units of Assessment (UOA) was assessed through the RAE, which also collected information about the numbers of research-active staff. The RAE was a peer-review exercise which produced a quality profile for each research group that institutions chose to submit for assessment in different subject areas.

41. The main research funding method (known as 'mainstream QR') distributes grant based on the quality, volume and relative cost of research in different areas. First we determine how much funding to provide for research in different subjects, and then we divide the total for each subject between institutions. These decisions take account of the volume of research (using research-active staff numbers); the relative costs (reflecting, for example, that laboratory-based research is more expensive than library-based research); any government policy priorities for particular subjects; and the quality of research as measured in the RAE.

42. In addition to mainstream QR, other allocations are made to contribute towards other research-related costs. These include:

- a. Funding for the supervision of postgraduate research (PGR) students. This is allocated to reflect PGR numbers and the relative costs of the subjects they are studying.
- b. Charity-related funding. Many charities support research in higher education, particularly in medical disciplines, but they are not always able to meet the full economic costs of research. We therefore provide additional funding to institutions in proportion to the income they receive from charities for research.

- c. Business-related funding. We provide funding to support institutions undertaking research with business and industry. This is allocated in proportion to the income they receive from business for research.

Funding outcomes and changes to the method for 2011-12

Mainstream QR

43. Our research funding has always been highly selective in being targeted at areas where there is evidence of the highest quality. As explained in paragraphs 11 and 12 we are changing the quality weightings in the mainstream QR method from 1:3:9 (at 2*, 3* and 4* levels respectively) to 0.294:3:9.

44. Our first step in distributing mainstream QR is to decide how much to allocate to different subjects. The total available funding has been divided between the subject fields of the 15 RAE main panels in proportion to the volume of research in each field that has been assessed as meeting or exceeding the 2* quality level in RAE2008, weighted to reflect the relative costs of research in different subjects. However, since 2009-10 we have adjusted the totals for each of the 15 main panels in order to maintain the relative proportion of funding for subjects in science, engineering, medicine and mathematics (main panels A to G) compared to 2008-09. From 2010-11 we also extended this to provide partial protection for research in geography and psychology, recognising that around half of the research activity in these disciplines returned to RAE2008 could reasonably be regarded as more analogous to work in science disciplines than in the other social sciences. We have continued these policies in 2011-12.

45. The relative cost weights remain unchanged since last year:

	Weighting
High-cost laboratory and clinical subjects	1.6
Intermediate cost subjects	1.3
Others	1.0

46. The next steps are to disaggregate the totals for each main panel subject group between its constituent UOAs, and then to disaggregate the totals for each UOA between institutions. For both calculations, this is in proportion to the volume of activity assessed as reaching each of the three quality levels at 2*, 3* and 4* in RAE2008, multiplied by quality weights, and also taking cost weights into account where these vary within a main panel group. We apply the following weightings to research volume attributable to each RAE quality level:

Quality level (with abbreviated description)	Funding weighting
4* (Quality that is world-leading)	9
3* (Quality that is internationally excellent)	3
2* (Quality that is recognised internationally)	0.294
1* (Quality that is recognised nationally)	0
Unclassified (Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work)	0

47. We are continuing to provide London weighting on mainstream QR on the same basis as previously: 12 per cent of the mainstream QR for institutions in inner London and 8 per cent for those in outer London.

Other elements of QR

48. The budget for RDP supervision has been set at £205 million – the same cash level as was provided in ‘Recurrent grants for 2010-11: revised allocations’ (HEFCE 2010/30). Funding is provided for postgraduate research students in all departments¹ that receive mainstream QR funding. We require all institutions, as a condition of grant, to comply with the revised Section 1 of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education’s code of practice on postgraduate research programmes² in respect of those departments that attract RDP supervision funding. The allocation is based on the numbers of eligible students in each department, weighted by the relative cost weights given in paragraph 45.

49. The budget for the charities element of QR has been set at £198 million – the same cash level as was provided in HEFCE 2010/30. The allocation is made in proportion to the average amount of eligible income from charities reported in the 2009 and 2010 Research Activity Surveys.

50. There has been no change to the allocation method for the business research element of QR, although there has been an extension to the eligible income to include non-UK sources. The budget has been set at £63.7 million – the same cash level as was provided in HEFCE 2010/30.

51. Total funding for research libraries has also been maintained in cash terms at £6.5 million. However, the funding for these libraries has been reallocated for 2011-12

¹ The term ‘department’ means a group of staff and their research activity returned in a single submission within one subject UOA, irrespective of whether this is identified as a single administrative unit within the institution.

² The ‘Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education’ is available from www.qaa.ac.uk under Standards and Quality/Code of practice.

pro rata to the full economic costs they incur in providing a service to external users. These costs have been identified through an analysis based on TRAC.

Moderation funding

52. As in previous years, we are providing funds to moderate the most significant reductions in teaching and research funding. Moderation funding is a short-term measure. It is not an entitlement or general subsidy, but is intended to support actions that will enable institutions to secure change and manage the transition to lower funding levels.

53. In January the HEFCE Board decided that moderation funding should be limited to £30 million for the sector. This has therefore required a threshold in these provisional allocations such that no institution sees a reduction of more than 3.9 per cent in cash terms compared with the equivalent, unmoderated figure for 2010-11. As in previous years, we do not provide moderation funding if it amounts to less than £100,000.

54. Allocations of moderation funding for 2011-12 are shown in Table A. As with other allocations, these figures remain provisional until our allocations are finalised later in the year. Any changes to grant for 2010-11 or 2011-12, or to underlying data, may result in a change (up or down) to the moderation funds. In particular, some moderation funding may be attributable to reductions in funding for WP or TESS that arise because of poor underlying institutional data. We have set aside £5 million of WP and TESS funding for allocation by July to allow for corrections by institutions to their data. The distribution of this funding may result in reductions to moderation funding.

55. In all cases where the moderation funding is significant, we need assurance that it is being used appropriately. We may therefore ask institutions with significant levels of moderation funding to explain how they are using the allocation to secure necessary change arising from the reduction in recurrent grant.

Knowledge exchange/Higher education innovation funding

56. Higher education innovation funding (HEIF) supports knowledge exchange activities in HEIs and strengthens links with businesses, public services, communities and the wider public in order to increase economic and social impact. In recognition of the importance of universities and business continuing to work more closely together in the context of the need for the country's economic recovery and growth, we are maintaining in cash terms the funding for HEIF, although individual institutions' share of this funding may change. Institutions' allocations have not been finalised so are not shown in these March grant tables; the allocations will be included in the funding agreements to be issued in July. Indicative allocations, which are subject to consultation, were shown in Circular letter 06/2011 'Higher Education Innovation Funding 2011-15: consultation on a threshold allocation; and indicative institutional allocations'.

Recurrent grant comparison for 2010-11 and 2011-12

57. The table enclosed with the grant letter gives a comparison of your institution's grant for 2010-11 and 2011-12. This table shows the different elements of recurrent grant for your institution and how they have changed between 2010-11 and 2011-12, together with a summary of the percentage changes in these allocations for the sector as a whole. Where appropriate, figures for 2010-11 incorporate the pro rata reductions applied across teaching funding that were announced in June 2010 and February 2011.

58. The table also shows, both for your institution and the sector as a whole, how changes in particular elements of grant contribute to the overall percentage change in recurrent grant. Paragraphs 59 to 69 provide a description of those row headings where the comparisons comprise a number of different elements of grant, and some common explanations for differences between the figures for 2010-11 and 2011-12. Details of how the figures in the table are derived are given in the document '2011-12 Recurrent grant tables for higher education institutions: guidance', available from the HEFCE extranet.

Teaching grant

Core funding (excluding UMF)

59. This comprises all elements of mainstream teaching grant with the exception of Mainstream additional funded places for 2011-12 and teaching funding provided through the University Modernisation Fund. 2010-11 figures incorporate the 1.09 per cent pro rata saving and the 2.81 per cent pro rata reduction applied to teaching grant in 2010-11, any consolidated adjustments to mainstream teaching grant arising from HESES10 returns, miscellaneous transfers and adjustments, such as those arising from data audit and reconciliation, and adjustments to Erasmus fee compensation for 2011-12.

60. The main reason for differences between the figures for 2010-11 and 2011-12 is the reduction of 4.28 per cent applied to teaching grant for 2011-12.

University Modernisation Fund (UMF)

61. This comprises the 2010-11 allocation of teaching funding through the University Modernisation Fund, adjusted to reflect the 1.09 per cent pro rata saving applied to teaching grant in June 2010-11, and any adjustments to this funding arising from HESES10 returns. This funding is being removed for all institutions in 2011-12.

Mainstream additional funded places for 2011-12

62. This comprises the 2011-12 allocations for ASNs funded through the mainstream teaching model, including those allocated in response to Circular letter 22/2009, and changes to funded places for dentistry.

Non-mainstream funded places

63. This is funding for employer co-funded places. The figures for 2011-12 do not incorporate additional places awarded for 2011-12 – these will be finalised later in the year. Any holdback of funding for 2010-11 will also be determined later in the year following receipt of the co-funded employer engagement monitoring return. The funding changes shown here reflect the 4.28 per cent pro rata reduction that has been applied for 2011-12.

Widening participation

64. This includes funding for widening access for full-time and part-time undergraduates from disadvantaged backgrounds and for widening access and improving provision for disabled students. Although at the sector level we are maintaining this funding in cash terms compared with 2010-11, £2 million remains to be allocated, pending finalisation of underlying data, so the comparison table shows a small reduction for the sector. Individual institutions will see varied outcomes reflecting changes in their underlying data relative to the sector as a whole.

Teaching enhancement and student success

65. This includes funding for improving retention of full-time and part-time undergraduates, funding for research-informed teaching and for institutional learning and teaching strategies. Although at the sector level we are maintaining the funding for improving retention in cash terms compared with 2010-11, £3 million remains to be allocated, pending finalisation of underlying data. The budgets for research-informed teaching and institutional learning and teaching strategies have been reduced by 4.28 per cent. Individual institutions will see varied outcomes reflecting changes in their underlying data relative to the sector as a whole.

Other targeted allocations

66. This includes the following targeted allocations:

- a. Variable allocations for part-time undergraduates and accelerated/intensive provision.
- b. Fixed allocations for institution-specific allocations, maintaining capacity in strategically important and vulnerable subjects (SIVS) following the ELQ policy, and the funding for very high cost and vulnerable science subjects.

67. The variable allocations for 2011-12 have been calculated afresh to reflect the latest student data for 2010-11, and the total funding for all targeted allocations incorporates the 4.28 per cent reduction to teaching grant being implemented for 2011-12. The phased withdrawal of the targeted allocation for foundation degrees will also contribute to a net reduction under this heading for many institutions.

Other recurrent teaching grants

68. This includes funding for clinical consultants' pay, senior academic general practitioners' pay and NHS pensions (each of which have been reduced in cash terms by 4.28 per cent for 2011-12) and transitional funding for ELQs. In addition the 2010-11 figure includes ELQ safety net funding which has now been withdrawn. Most institutions will see a net reduction under this heading, which is largely attributable to the ELQ adjustments.

Research grant

Mainstream QR

69. Figures for both years include London weighting on mainstream QR. The change in the weighting for 2* activity will contribute to a difference between the figures for 2010-11 and 2011-12 for many institutions.

Other row headings

70. We have not described other row headings. They relate to single elements of grant that are identifiable from the main recurrent grant tables for 2010-11 and/or 2011-12. Changes to funding for QR charity support funding, QR business research element and RDP supervision funds will reflect changes in the reported volumes of research income and postgraduate research students, relative to the sector as a whole. The reduction of £27.6 million to research for 2010-11 is shown separately and is taken from Circular letter 09/2011.

Funding and student numbers for 2012-13 and beyond

71. In future, we expect that tuition fee income will become the major source of funding and therefore the route for supporting particular institutional developments. As a result, the funding environment for higher education from 2012-13 will be very different and all our approaches to funding will be subject to review. Institutions should not assume that past practices and commitments in relation to recurrent teaching funding, teaching capital and special funding will continue.

72. We anticipate that the Government's forthcoming White Paper will set out its future priorities for HEFCE grant and any changes to the regulatory framework governing higher education that may be necessary to support its policies, ensure public finances are appropriately managed and protect the interests of students. Our grant letter stated that for 2011-12 and 2012-13 the Government expects the Council will continue to perform its current role on its existing statutory basis. A significant priority for us within the funding we have available in this spending review period will be to ensure a smooth transition for institutions to the new higher education financing arrangements. We will be working with partners, including BIS and the Student Loans Company, to achieve this, because less funding will be routed to institutions as grants via HEFCE.

73. On teaching funding, we anticipate a phase-out of the existing method and its allocations and a phase-in of a new method and allocations. The details of both will be subject to consultation later this year (after the White Paper has been published). Much of this phasing is likely to reflect the changing proportions of students recruited before and after September 2012: those subject to the existing and new fee regimes respectively. However, changes to some allocations may be phased differently. This phasing-out of the existing funding method also has implications for our approach in 2011-12.

74. In previous years where institutions have holdback due to failing to meet targets for growth or contract range we have consolidated the reduction to grant into the following year's grant and provided an opportunity for this funding to be recovered. The recovery of funding is generally dependent on additional recruitment in the following year. For institutions that face holdback in 2011-12 opportunities to recover funding in 2012-13 may need to be through tuition fee income rather than HEFCE grant. The availability of funding for that new cohort of students should depend on the new funding regime, not continuation of the old one. We will aim to clarify our approach in the funding agreements to be issued in July.

75. The small number of ASNs originally agreed for 2012-13 through earlier bidding exercises may similarly need to be supported through tuition fee income, rather than HEFCE grant – many may relate to subject areas that we will no longer fund for new students.

76. Our grant letter from BIS does not state what measures might be required from 2012-13 to reduce the risk that student support costs exceed the Government's planned budgets. (We anticipate that more information on this will be provided in the forthcoming higher education White Paper.) In the meantime, institutions should assume that there will be no advantage to be gained in 2012-13 onwards from over-recruiting in 2011-12. The BIS grant letter also states that, as a provisional planning assumption, universities and colleges should work on the basis that 10,000 entrant places for 2011-12 are temporary and will not be repeated in 2012-13.

77. On recurrent research funding, the BIS grant letter of 20 December 2010 provided guidance on research funding priorities; in particular, it stated 'You should take forward funding both for research and for support for the next generation of researchers, by selectively funding on the basis of only internationally excellent research'. We have noted this advice and the clear implication that, by 2012-13, activity rated at 2* should no longer be counted in allocating mainstream QR grant. We will be consulting institutions later this year on the development of our research funding method, with particular reference to our support for the next generation of researchers.

Changes and further information

78. While we do not require a response to this letter, there may be circumstances in which institutions wish to request changes to their allocations, for example to transfer funding for provision to or from another institution or to correct errors in their underlying data. Please note that if we are to be able to implement changes in time for confirmation in the funding agreements to be issued in July, then we will need to receive details by the deadlines specified in '2011-12 Recurrent grant tables for higher education institutions: guidance'.

79. Please note that these allocations are provisional: we aim to finalise them in time for the funding agreements that are issued in July. Institutions should note that our grant letter from BIS of 20 December 2010 gave only indicative recurrent teaching funding figures for the 2012-13 financial year (though the recurrent research and higher education innovation funding figures up to 2014-15 were confirmed). In order to announce funding for the 2011-12 academic year, which has a four-month overlap with the 2012-13 financial year, we have assumed that our allocation for 2012-13 is as indicated. If we receive information regarding our grant for 2012-13 that suggests this assumption is no longer appropriate we reserve the right to review our recurrent teaching and special funding allocations for the 2011-12 academic year. This would be with a view to smoothing any change in funding for institutions, beyond that already being implemented, which might be necessary by 2012-13.

80. Data collected from institutions inform our allocation of recurrent funds for teaching and research, and some non-recurrent allocations in response to specific initiatives. We will continue to audit these data selectively in this and future funding exercises, through audit visits. We will also use data which institutions provide to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) or the Data Service to verify the data sent directly to us. We will use the outcomes of these data audits and reconciliations to review funding allocations both for the year in question and all subsequent years. We reserve the right to review funding allocations for the most recent seven-year period.

81. If we find, either through reconciliations with HESA or Data Service data, or any data audit, that erroneous data have resulted in institutions receiving incorrect funding allocations (including for WP and other targeted allocations), we will adjust their funding accordingly (subject, where appropriate, to the appeals process and the availability of our funds).

82. Questions about your recurrent funding allocations should be addressed to your HEFCE regional consultant or higher education policy adviser. To find out who these are for a particular institution, go to www.hefce.ac.uk and select 'About us', then 'Contact us' and type in the name of the institution where requested.