

STROBE REPORT_SR180416_001_Linacre

STROBE reference	SR180416_001_Linacre
Client name	Linacre Institute
Report type	High Resolution Report
Cycle year(s) tracked into	2015 - 2018
Date	18/04/2018

Context for supply

The Lineacre Institute has a geographical focus which will not be normalised for in STROBE outputs, providing an important context within which to view the results.

Contents

- Technical notes and definitions
- Benchmarking service - guide to interpretation
- Benchmarking service - guide to tariff groupings
- Headline statistics for all participants with benchmark analysis
- Benchmark statistics for customer defined provider groups
- Key figures & detailed statistics - by cycle year

TECHNICAL NOTES AND DEFINITIONS

Cohort

The number of participants provided in the tracking group.

Applied

The number of participants tracked (applied) through the UCAS scheme. An applicant is defined as a person who has made a valid application in the UCAS system. RPA's are included in the total. An RPA (record of prior acceptance) is an application submitted to UCAS by an institution when an unconditional firm has already been offered and accepted by the applicant.

Applications

Application is defined as a choice to a course in higher education through the UCAS main scheme. Each applicant can make up to five choices, which was reduced from six in 2008. The number of applications does not include choices made through the following acceptance routes: Clearing, Extra, Adjustment and RPAs.

Acceptances

Acceptance is defined as an applicant who has been placed for entry into higher education. RPA's are included in the total. An RPA (record of prior acceptance) is an application submitted to UCAS by an institution when an unconditional firm has already been offered and accepted by the applicant.

Offers

Offer is defined as a provider's decision to grant a place to an applicant via an application made through the UCAS main scheme (i.e. does not cover choices made through the following routes: Clearing, Extra, Adjustment and RPAs). Offers are captured at June 30 deadline for the purpose of consistent reporting.

Offer rate

The offer rate is calculated as the total number of offers received divided by the total number of main scheme applications made.

Firm replies

Firm Reply is defined as an applicant's decision to confirm either a conditional or an unconditional offer from a provider as their first choice. This relates to applications made through the UCAS main scheme only (i.e. does not cover choices made through the following routes: Clearing, Extra, Adjustment and RPAs). Firm Replies are captured at June 30 deadline for the purpose of consistent reporting.

Insurance replies

Insurance Reply is defined as an applicant's decision to confirm either a conditional or an unconditional offer from a provider as their second choice, in case the conditions of the firm choice are not met. This relates to applications made through the UCAS main scheme only (i.e. does not cover choices made through the following routes: Clearing, Extra, Adjustment and RPAs). Insurance Replies are captured at June 30 deadline for the purpose of consistent reporting.

Disclosure controls

Numbers in the data resources are rounded to the nearest five. Each number is rounded independently, so the sum of rounded categories may not add to the rounded sum of those categories, within or between data resources. The listing of a category in an output table does not imply that data was recorded for that category. The .csv data files contain only data items that are not rounded to zero. The omission of a category in these data files does not imply that the unrounded total was zero.

BENCHMARKING SERVICE

Your STROBE report has been subject to a benchmarking exercise, upon which our assessments of statistical significance have been made. Your data has been compared to two UCAS data sources:

- 1) A database of potential applicants. This is used to benchmark the application rate of your cohort. Using the UCAS applications database is inappropriate for obvious reasons, and using the wider population is inappropriate due to the bias that is inherent in looking students that are prepared to be subject to a widening participation intervention. For this reason, the potential applicant database is thought to be appropriate. We believe that even using this source, the bias is so strong that the results are slightly skewed positively.
- 2) UCAS applications database. This is used to benchmark the progress of your cohort through the application process. This is the de facto source and the only one that we would consider.

In both cases, your data has been compared to a representative set from the relevant source in the following ways:

- 1) The potential applicant database cohort is similar in terms of a score that represents the combination of age, socio-demographics of the home address, and the proportion of their nearest school being eligible for free school meals.
- 2) The UCAS applications database cohort is similar in terms of a score that represents the combination of age, ethnicity, gender, socio-demographics of home address, and proportion of their school being eligible for free school meals, as well as a score that represents the achievement of that student at GCSE* level (or Scottish equivalent).

The cohort of students that you have sent to us has been compared to many cohorts of similar size and make up, and the position of your cohort within the sample is represented in terms of a percentile. This percentile is then assessed for statistical significance, and the result of this test is shown.

If you have any questions in relation to the benchmarking service, please contact strobe@ucas.ac.uk.

*GCSE chosen as the WP interventions are thought to have a positive correlation with A Level attainment, which this solution designs out.

Guide to Tariff Groupings

Your STROBE report contains, as standard, the headline performance of your cohort, in relation to the three University tariff groupings. High tariff represents the highest performing and most competitive institutions, and vice versa. The reason that this is included is the intricacy of the relationship between the tariff groups, and how a widening participation intervention can affect it.

It is felt that a student who is subject to a widening participation intervention may become more ambitious with their choices. This ambition is actually the stated aim of many of our charitable partners. This can have an effect on offer rates and acceptance rates that does not necessarily appear positive to the untrained eye, as the students are applying to institutions with lower offer and acceptance rates.

It is believed that the presentation of the three tariff groups allows you to see these nuances and further understand the performance of your cohort.

HEADLINE STATISTICS FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

A dataset of participants has been received and tracked against the requested cycle years for the UCAS undergraduate scheme. Where a match against a participant has been found against multiple cycles, data for that participant will be taken from the earliest cycle applied in.

Measure	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
Initial cohort	79	-	-	
Applied	80	100%	57%	Very significantly high
Offered	80	100%	32%	Very significantly high
Accepted	50	63%	26%	Very significantly high

Benchmark data by provider tariff group

Applied	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
1. Higher tariff group	75	95%	31%	Very significantly high
2. Medium tariff group	25	32%	-	No significant difference
3. Lower tariff group	0	0%	37%	Very significantly low

Offered	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
1. Higher tariff group	75	100%	32%	Very significantly high
2. Medium tariff group	25	100%	-	No significant difference
3. Lower tariff group	0	0%	-	No significant difference

Accepted	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
1. Higher tariff group	45	60%	26%	Very significantly high
2. Medium tariff group	5	20%	-	No significant difference
3. Lower tariff group	0	0%	-	No significant difference

BENCHMARKING: CUSTOMER DEFINED GROUP

Linacre 10

Measure	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
Initial cohort	79	-	-	
Applied	75	95%	12%	Very significantly high
Offered	65	87%	32%	Very significantly high
Accepted	30	40%	-	No significant difference

Linacre 12

Measure	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
Initial cohort	79	-	-	
Applied	75	95%	14%	Very significantly high
Offered	70	93%	32%	Very significantly high
Accepted	30	40%	-	No significant difference

Linacre 5

Measure	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
Initial cohort	79	-	-	
Applied	70	89%	4%	Very significantly high
Offered	45	64%	32%	Significantly high
Accepted	25	36%	-	No significant difference

Oxbridge

Measure	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
Initial cohort	79	-	-	
Applied	65	82%	3%	Very significantly high
Offered	25	38%	-	No significant difference
Accepted	15	23%	-	No significant difference

Sutton Trust 30

Measure	Totals	% achieved result	% expected result	Significance of result
Initial cohort	79	-	-	
Applied	75	95%	30%	Very significantly high
Offered	75	100%	32%	Very significantly high
Accepted	45	60%	26%	Very significantly high

KEY FIGURES BY CYCLE YEAR

A dataset of participants has been received and tracked against the requested cycle years for the UCAS undergraduate scheme. Where a match against a participant has been found against multiple cycles, data for that participant will be taken from the earliest cycle applied in. If no data is shown for a cycle year, then no participants have been matched into that cycle.

Measure	2015	2016	2017	2018	TOTAL
Applied	15	20	25	25	80
Offered	15	20	25	25	80
% applicants offered	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Accepted	15	20	15	0	50
% applicants accepted	100%	100%	60%	0%	63%

Detailed Statistics

Applicants and applications	2015	2016	2017	2018	TOTAL
Applied via main scheme	15	20	25	25	80
Made maximum number of main scheme applications	15	20	25	20	75
Applied directly to Clearing	0	0	0	0	0

Offers and replies	2015	2016	2017	2018	TOTAL
Conditional offers made	25	35	40	0	100
Holding conditional firm	15	15	20	0	50
Holding conditional insurance	10	20	20	0	50
Unconditional offers made	0	0	0	0	5
Holding unconditional firm	0	0	0	0	0
Holding unconditional insurance	0	0	0	0	0

Acceptances by route	2015	2016	2017	2018	TOTAL
Main scheme	15	15	15	0	45
Extra	0	0	0	0	0
Adjustment	0	0	0	0	0
Clearing	0	0	0	0	5
RPA	0	0	0	0	0