Engaging with Colleges to improve transition to University

- Work in Progress -

Steve May
&
Michael Hill
Background

- Case study of a foundation year (FY0) course in Science at Kingston College of Further Education (KC) leading to an honours degree course at Kingston University (KU).

- Students sign up for a four year course the first year is a foundation course at a local college to prepare students for their degree.

- Aimed at students from non traditional backgrounds or those with low A level points scores

- Issue of non completion. HEFCE funding definitions of non completion tightened up – too many FY0 students failing to complete.

- Project set up to investigate non completions working with the college to engage in the research methodology and the implementation of findings.
Method

• Action research approach with staff at Kingston College the participants

• **Initial meeting between ADC and KC to agree strategy**
  • To investigate a single foundation course to minimise variables and enable close liaison with college staff.
  
  • The cohort size should enable detailed qualitative and quantitative investigation and statistically significant results.
  
  • To conduct an in-depth investigation utilising qualitative and quantitative methods as necessary to start to uncover complex reasons for non achievement.
Method

Initial Meeting continued

- To engage with the staff who have most direct impact on the students. (admissions tutor, course organiser, personal tutor, core subject lecturers)

- To enable KC and KU staff to build on results of data analysis and instigate further research and changes to policy and practice including admissions criteria, regulations, tutorial monitoring and assessment patterns.
First analysis

• Relationship between Completion and progression rates analysed.

• Completion rates analysed for significant associations with
  • Age, gender, ethnic group, nationality, term time accommodation, quals on entry

• Results discussed at meeting between researcher and college practitioners

• Recommendations for further analysis agreed:
Recommendations for second analysis

• Definition of non completion and progression to be clarified

• Did the students have a science background e.g. science A level

• Withdrawal dates.

• More detail on entry quals. A level grades BTech grades.

• The correlation between completion and accommodation was noted. Distance travelled to be analysed further analysed

• Attendance figures (electronically recorded) to be provided by KC

• Intended degree routes

• Module groupings
# Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>profile</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>completion</th>
<th>progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;21 (Young)</td>
<td>No significant association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ (Mature)</td>
<td>No significant association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>No significant association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No significant association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance travelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No significant association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non British</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term time accommodation</strong></td>
<td>Young parental home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Uni Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quals on entry</strong></td>
<td>A level/GNVQ/Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other qual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A or AS level highest ent qual</strong></td>
<td>Maths or Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Maths or Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Education</strong></td>
<td>HE quals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No HE quals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and formulation of joint action plan

• Second analysis discussed with KC staff

• KC staff contribute to discussion of findings in the light of their own experience.

• Recommendations agreed as action from KU and KC
Final report

Cohort details
Populations based on other HESES data and the college class lists

Funding details and non completion rates

Progression Rates
Completed and non completed students are compared for each progression status

Student profile, completion and progression
Progression and completion rates for the Sci Fnd cohort are compared across a range of profile variables.
Final report

Attendance
The relationships between student attendance and attainment, progression and completion.

Module completion
Numbers taking each Sci Fnd module and completion rates

Actions and next steps
Ongoing discussion between ADC and the Sci Fnd course
Agreed Actions

1. Review the admissions policy for the course

2. Plan a more extensive induction programme

3. Using data generated to institute more targeted monitoring to allow earlier intervention.

4. Widen the utilization of the year long tutorial programme to allow more one to one support

5. Introduce time-constrained in class assessments in the Autumn term to allow students better preparation for examinations.

6. Revamp of the tutorial system to allow examination technique to covered at an earlier stage
Agreed Actions

7. Consider the feasibility of streaming students according to their Science and Maths background prior to entry onto the Science Foundation year to allow more targeted teaching in the introductory modules.

8. Widen the utilization of the year long tutorial programme to allow more one to one support.

9. Introduce time-constrained in class assessments in the Autumn term to allow students better preparation for examinations in subsequent terms.

10. Revamp of the tutorial system to allow examination technique to be covered at an earlier stage.
Discussion

• Features of the methodology
  • Led by the college – not imposed
  • Confidentiality of findings
  • Embedded in the college course team’s own Quality Assurance procedures

• Observations
  • Importance of working relationships between ADC and course teams
  • Useful approach to address WP issues with the new funding climate
  • Enables deeper exploration of student experience issues such as BME attainment and engagement linked to performance.