

Consultation on recurrent funding for 2021-22

Introduction

We would like to collect your name and email address so that we can contact you in the event that we need to clarify any of your responses. This information will not be published. Please note that, if you choose to provide us with personal information as part of your consultation response, you will need to consent to us processing your data in line with the privacy notice outlined above.

I consent to the OfS processing my personal data in line with the privacy notice outlined above.

Contact details.

Name Johnny Rich
Email address j.rich@epc.ac.uk

In what capacity are you responding to the survey?

To provide an official response on behalf of a higher education provider, organisation or representative group

Information about your organisation

Name of higher education provider or representative group

Engineering Professors' Council

Unless you indicate that you would prefer your response to be confidential, we may quote sections of your response when we publish a summary of responses to this consultation on the OfS website (and in alternative formats on request). This may include a list of the providers and organisations that respond, but will not include personal data such as individual names, email addresses or other contact details. Individuals and organisations will not be identifiable in our consultation response. We will not publish individual responses. Are you happy for passages from your responses to be published on the OfS website?

Yes, I am happy for my responses to be published.

Funding for high-cost subjects

Question 1: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to distribute a greater proportion of the OfS recurrent grant through the main high-cost subject funding method? (See paragraphs 15 to 36.)

Strongly agree

Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.

Engineering is at the core of our modern society (underpinning every sector from communication, technology and entertainment to finance and healthcare, as well as its more visible applications in construction, manufacturing, energy, defence and transport).

However, the UK is experiencing a well documented and long-standing engineering skills gap.

The resultant shortage of graduate engineers may be further exacerbated by the pace of change driven by the fourth industrial revolution, the impact of the UK's exit from Europe and the effects of the global pandemic.

The EPC strongly supports the prioritisation of engineering through increased high-cost funding to ensure engineering's critical role in the UK's recovery.

Question 2: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to split price group C1 in order to implement a reduction of 50 per cent to the high-cost subject funding allocated to subjects in the performing arts; creative arts; media studies and archaeology? (See paragraphs 15 to 26.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Question 3: Notwithstanding your answer to question 2, if we were to split price group C1 as proposed, to what extent do you agree with our approach to implementing this? (See paragraphs 27 to 28 and Annex B.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Question 4: To what extent do you agree with our approach to counting students from the Crown Dependencies in our funding allocations for 2021-22? (See paragraphs 34 and 35.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

London weighting

Question 5: To what extent do you agree with the proposed approach to remove the targeted allocation for students attending courses in London? (See paragraphs 37 to 48.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Question 6: To what extent do you agree with the proposed approach to remove London weighting from the formula-based student premium allocations? (See paragraphs 37 to 48.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Funding to widen access and support successful student outcomes

Question 7: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to provide £40 million to support Uni Connect activities in 2021-22? (See paragraphs 59 to 63.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Question 8: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to distribute an additional £5 million through the existing student premiums in the proportions show in paragraph 65, and to earmark this £5 million to be spent on student hardship?

Don't know / prefer not to say

Question 9: To what extent do you agree with the proposals to distribute £15 million to address student transition and mental health, through a combination of competition and a new formula-based student premium? (See paragraphs 67 to 71.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Other recurrent budget proposals

Question 10: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to maintain in cash terms the rate of funding for the nursing, midwifery and allied health supplement, which will increase the total budget to £27 million? (See paragraphs 74 to 75.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Question 11: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to maintain in cash terms the rate of funding for overseas study programmes, but base the allocation on the higher of relevant student numbers in either 2019-20 or 2020-21? (See paragraphs 76 to 78.)

Don't know / prefer not to say

Question 12: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to maintain in cash terms the budgets for other targeted allocations as proposed in paragraph 79?

Don't know / prefer not to say

Terms and conditions of grant for 2021-22

Question 15: To what extent do you agree with the proposed changes to terms and conditions of grant for 2021-22? (See paragraph 97.)

Don't know / prefer not to say