London Interdisciplinary School

Access and participation plan 2026-27 to 2029-30

Introduction and strategic aim

The London Interdisciplinary School (LIS) is a small, mission-driven provider offering a single interdisciplinary degree designed to prepare students for complex, real-world challenges. LIS is committed to attracting and supporting students who may be looking for something different to the courses and experience offered by mainstream universities— our students include mature learners, career returners, and those with disrupted or non-linear educational journeys.

LIS prioritises inclusive practice across the full student lifecycle. Our pedagogical model combines interdisciplinary teaching, real-world application through internship placements, group coaching, and personalised one-to-one support. The curriculum is designed with inclusion at its core— tailored to enable participation and success among students with a wide range of educational experiences and support needs.

LIS welcomed its first cohort of BASc students in the 2021/2022 academic year. Since then, there have been around 150 students admitted onto our BASc Interdisciplinary Problems & Methods programme, with the first cohort of students graduating in 2024. Cohort sizes have varied over time, with average student numbers per cohort initially settling at around 30 but rising to 50 in 2025/2026. The majority of our students are aged 19+, with about a third aged 21 or over. Just under a third are aged 18 on entry to the BASc programme. In addition to the BASc programme, the MASc Interdisciplinary Problems and Methods has been running since 2022 and offers both full time and part time modes of delivery.

Our overarching strategic aim is to promote equality of opportunity through a distinctive combination of:

- an admissions process that seeks to identify academic potential
- personalised and proactive student support
- inclusive curriculum and assessment design, and
- long-term career coaching and real-world internship placements

Our admissions model is intentionally designed to provide an assessment that does not rely solely on grades (though over half of the students in our most recent cohort gained 3As or higher, and two thirds gained AAB or higher). Interviews are structured to recognise potential and cannot disadvantage a candidate; they are designed only to strengthen an application. The contextual background of applicants is factored into assessment, and decisions are anonymised and reviewed by a dedicated panel. Conditional offers are contextualised based on a weighted flag system, supporting equal access for applicants from widening participation backgrounds and non-traditional entry routes. Applicants with non-traditional qualifications or disrupted education receive tailored guidance during the admissions process.

Student support is delivered through an integrated model that includes dedicated coaches, wellbeing leads, and academic staff. During their degree, students receive weekly coaching sessions in small groups to help them work together on academic modules. Students benefit from extended careers coaching, and every undergraduate is offered internship placements from year 1

as part of the core curriculum. There are two members of staff and an academic pastoral lead that work with individual students to develop appropriate support plans when needed, and to work with faculty to support students and curriculum design. These features ensure that LIS students—regardless of background—can access and progress through higher education with confidence.

Looking forward, LIS is investing in improved data infrastructure to strengthen evaluation and decision-making. A priority for the 2026–2030 period is the development of integrated systems to track students across outreach, enrolment, progression, and graduate outcomes. This will enable clearer identification of equality risks, more effective monitoring of interventions, and a stronger evidence base for future planning and evaluation.

Our APP reflects LIS's mission to support students who might not otherwise access or thrive in traditional higher education. We recognise that we are a young institution with a unique offering, and as such we face challenges but also opportunities as we seek to establish LIS' place in a London-based education sector dominated by large universities. This plan sets out achievable interventions grounded in our experience over the past five years and aims to enhance the overall experience of every student at LIS.

Risks to equality of opportunity

Risk Ref	Indication of Risk	Underlying Risk(s)	Impacted Student Groups	Lifecycle Stage(s)	EORR Link
Risk 1	Data Fragmentation and Statistical Volatility Across the Lifecycle	Outreach, admissions, and student success data exist in silos, with manual WP flag tracking and limited yield analysis.	All WP students	Access, continuation, progression	EORR 11 (Capacity) EORR 12 (Progression),
Risk 2	Intensive Assessment Load May Disadvantage WP Students	Interdisciplinary curriculum demands sustained cognitive engagement and continuous assessment. Support is reactive, not structural.	Disabled students, neurodivergent students, carers, estranged learners	Continuation, attainment	EORR 6 (Academic Support) Secondary: EORR 7 (Personal Support), EORR 11 (Capacity),

Risk 3	Student Support Model May Become Unsustainable at Scale	Current wrap-around support is staff-dependent, especially reliant on individuals and their support roles role	All WP students, especially those in crisis or with fluctuating needs	Continuation	EORR 7 (Personal Support) EORR 8 (Mental Health) EORR 11 (Capacity),
Risk 4	Weak Conversion from Outreach to Application Among WP Students	High outreach volume but limited enrolment yield;	Students from target boroughs and underrepresented backgrounds	Access	EORR 4 (Application Success) Primary: EORR 2 (Information and Guidance) EORR 3 (Perceptions),
Risk 5	Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for WP students	Parity of outcomes between first graduate cohort of WP/non WP students needs to be maintained	All analyses of WP sub-groups	Progression	EORR 12 (Progression) EORR 2 (IAG) EORR 1 (Knowledge & Skills)

Risk 1: Data Fragmentation and Statistical Volatility Across the Lifecycle

There is a risk that LIS's ability to assess and improve equality of opportunity is undermined by fragmented data systems and statistically volatile performance trends. Outreach, admissions, support, and outcomes data are captured in separate systems, with no consistent end-to-end tracking or automated WP flag integration. Manual processes dominate, increasing the risk of error, duplication, and loss of insight. At the same time, LIS's small cohort sizes make year-on-year comparisons highly sensitive to outliers — a single withdrawal or outcome can distort institutional trends. Without unified data infrastructure and better data modelling and analysis capability, LIS may struggle to monitor progress, evaluate interventions, and identify emerging risks.

- **EORR Link**:
  - **Primary**: EORR 11: Capacity Issues
  - **Secondary**: EORR 12 – Progression from higher education
- **Who is Affected**: All WP students — particularly those in smaller or intersecting groups

- **Lifecycle Stage**: Access, continuation, progression

Risk 2: Intensive Assessment Load May Disadvantage WP Students

There is a risk that the volume and intensity of assessment across the LIS programme creates structural barriers to continuation and attainment, particularly for disabled, neurodiverse, mature, and other WP students with complex needs. Although inclusivity is embedded across the curriculum and assessment types are varied, the cumulative assessment burden remains high. Students report difficulty sustaining performance across overlapping tasks and terms. The current model demands continuous cognitive and collaborative engagement, which can disproportionately impact students requiring flexibility, recovery time, or personalised pacing. Without a reduction in overall assessment load, LIS may unintentionally disadvantage those it aims to support.

- **EORR Link**:
  - **Primary**: EORR 6 – Insufficient academic support
  - **Secondary**: EORR 7 – Insufficient personal support; EORR 11 – Capacity issues
- **Who is Affected**: Disabled, neurodiverse, mature, and low-income students; those with caring responsibilities or fluctuating health
- **Lifecycle Stage**: Continuation, attainment

Risk 3: Student Support Model May Become Unsustainable at Scale

There is a risk that LIS's intensive, highly personalised student support model may become unsustainable as the student body grows and diversifies. The current approach is effective but heavily reliant on a small number of experienced staff providing wraparound support across academic, wellbeing, and pastoral care. This creates structural fragility: spikes in student need or staff absence can lead to service gaps or delays. WP students — particularly those with complex or fluctuating needs — are more likely to rely on frequent or crisis support, increasing institutional exposure. Without more distributed responsibilities, improved triage, and embedded referral systems, LIS risks being unable to maintain the level of care required to support continuation and success.

- **EORR Link**:
  - **Primary**: EORR 7 – Insufficient personal support
  - **Secondary**: EORR 8 – Mental health; EORR 11 – Capacity issues
- **Who is Affected**: All WP students, especially those with mental health conditions, caring responsibilities, financial precarity, or unstable housing
- **Lifecycle Stage**: Continuation

Risk 4: Weak Conversion from Outreach to Application Among WP Students

There is a risk that LIS's outreach activities do not translate into meaningful application or enrolment growth among WP audiences. While the school-based outreach programme has delivered high volume engagement, there is limited evidence of conversion into applications, from targeted school and boroughs. A lack of targeted follow-up, strategic partner alignment, and continuity of information may contribute to low yield. As LIS pivots toward focussing outreach to post-16 and mature students, failure to address these weaknesses risks reducing overall access and limiting impact.

- **EORR Link:**
  - **Primary:** EORR 4 – Application success rates
  - **Secondary**: EORR 2 – Information and guidance, EORR 3 – Perception of higher education

- **Who is Affected:** Prospective WP students from outreach priority areas, especially school-age learners and mature learners without structured support
- **Lifecycle Stage:** Access

Risk 5: Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for WP students

There is a risk that WP students — particularly those with multiple flags (e.g. mature, disabled, high-flag) — may have lower progression into graduate-level employment or further study. While LIS's first graduating cohort (2023–24) shows no parity gap, this is based on a small sample and not yet longitudinally tracked. Factors such as lower confidence, limited networks, or constrained career support may disadvantage WP students in securing graduate outcomes. Without targeted coaching, placement prioritisation, and robust outcomes tracking, LIS may struggle to sustain early success.

- **EORR Link:**
    - **Primary:** EORR 12 – Progression from higher education
    - **Secondary**: EORR 2 – Information and guidance, EORR 1 – Knowledge and skills
- **Who is Affected:** WP students, especially mature, disabled, or high
- **Lifecycle Stage:** Progression

Objectives

Access, Continuation, & Progression Objective

Context & Approach

In assessing LIS performance and building the evidence base for this APP, it is clear that the infrastructure available to effectively analyse the data we hold is fragmented and not yet developed to the point where we can effectively monitor and evaluate transition points for all students, including WP students. Work has already begun in this area, and this objective sets out to improve LIS data quality, management and analysis capabilities throughout the student lifecycle for all students.

Objective

1. **Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.**
    - LIS Risk(s): Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle, Risk 2: Intensive Assessment Load May Disadvantage WP Students, Risk 3: Student Support May Become Unsustainable at Scale, Risk 4: Weak outreach-to-enrolment conversion, Risk 5: Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for WP students
    - Target: A fully integrated CRM–SRS–dashboard system that enables monitoring of WP student transitions across access, continuation, and progression stages by 2029–30.

Access Objective

Context & Approach

Historically, LIS outreach activity has generated high engagement volumes, particularly with schools, but conversion into applications has remained low, while tracking of outreach-to-application yield has been limited in part due to the fragmentation of LIS databases. This objective aims to focus outreach in areas where it can have the most impact, while ensuring this impact is measurable and evaluated.

Objective

2. **Focus outreach on conversion of post-16 and mature WP learners through targeted, trackable engagement by 2027–28**
    - LIS Risk(s): Risk 4: Weak conversion from outreach to application among WP students, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle
    - Target: Demonstrable improvement in tracking of outreach to application and enrolment among post-16 and mature WP learners by 2027-28

Success Objectives (Continuation and Attainment)

Context and Approach

LIS has a strong record of support-driven continuation, while internal evidence suggests that WP-flagged students perform equally compared to their non-WP peers when provided with targeted support. Some barriers remain in assessment processes and resource scalability, potentially

impacting students with learning differences or disabilities. These objectives aim to ensure robust monitoring and support remain in place, while considering the impact of LIS assessment processes on all students.

Objectives

3. **Strengthen the scalability and sustainability of LIS's student support model by 2026/2027, ensuring it remains responsive as the student body grows.**
    - LIS Risks: Risk 3: Student Support Model May Become Unsustainable at Scale, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle
    - Target: Develop and embed a distributed support model by 2027, with clearly defined responsibilities across Wellbeing, Success, and Operations functions.

4. **Reduction in overall quantity of summative assessment points by 2026/2027**
    - LIS Risks: Risk 2: Intensive Assessment Load May Disadvantage WP Students, Risk 3: Student Support Model May Become Unsustainable, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle
    - Target: Sustained reduction in reliance on extenuating circumstances requests by all students, particularly those with learning differences and disabilities

5. **Build integrated early-warning system for student support risks by 2027/2028**
    - LIS Risk: Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle, Risk 3: Support Model May Become Unsustainable at Scale, Risk 2: Inaccessible or Intensive Assessment Practices (indirectly)
    - Target: Launch pilot system by 2026/2027; full use across cohort by 2027/2028

Progression Objectives (Graduate Outcomes and Further Study)

Context and Approach

WP-flagged graduates at LIS are progressing at equal or better rates than non-WP peers, supported by a distinctive coaching model and internship structure. As the cohort grows, interventions must scale while preserving quality and personalisation.

Objectives

6. **Maintain parity in graduate progression outcomes for students with intersecting characteristics (PTP-1)**
    - LIS Risks: Risk 5: Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for WP students, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle
    - Target: Parity in graduate outcomes between WP and non-WP students
    - There has been one graduate cohort to date of 56 students.
    - Current internal data shows that 78% of students with intersecting characteristics reported that they have a job offer they intend to take or have been accepted into further study (LIS 'sorted' rate). This compares to 78% of students without intersecting characteristics using the same measure.
    - This objective aims to ensure that there is little statistical difference in this measure, aiming to achieve 80% over the course of this plan.

7. **Ensure parity between high-flag students and non-WP students to complete at least one LIS internship placement**
    - EORR Risk: Risk 5: Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for WP students, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle
    - Target: New model launching 2025/26, to monitor throughout academic year.

Intervention strategies and expected outcomes

Intervention Strategy 1: Developing robust data infrastructure

Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.

- LIS Risk(s): Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle, Risk 2: Intensive Assessment Load May Disadvantage WP Students, Risk 3: Student Support May Become Unsustainable At Scale, Risk 4: Weak outreach-to-enrolment conversion, Risk 5: Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for WP students.
- Target: A fully integrated CRM–SRS–dashboard system that enables monitoring of WP student transitions across access, continuation, and progression stages by 2029–30.

Target Groups

- All WP students
- Offer-holders and enrolees from targeted groups
- WP graduates tracked from 2021 cohort onward

Related objectives and targets

This intervention supports all objectives featured in this access and participation plan, particularly:

- **Objective 2: Focus outreach on conversion of post-16 and mature WP learners through targeted, trackable engagement by 2027–28.**
    - Enables CRM data integration and WP flag harmonisation, allowing improved tracking of outreach-to-enrolment yield—a critical enabler for monitoring outreach effectiveness and meeting this objective.
- **Objective 6: Maintain parity in graduate progression outcomes by WP status.**
    - Underpins the ability to monitor graduate outcomes disaggregated by WP flags and to evaluate the impact of progression-focused interventions.

Theory of Change

See Annex B for the full theory of change, including underpinning assumptions and intended outcomes.

.

Activity Table

Activity	Description	Inputs	Outcomes	Cross intervention strategy?
Database Integration	Link recruitment, admissions and student databases to enable WP tracking	Tech Team, Registry Team, Full Fabric build and Implementation	Full data flow across lifecycle stages	Yes, all objectives
WP Flagging model	Standardise and validate WP fields across systems	Tech Team, Registry Team, Full Fabric build and Implementation, Power BI Data Model Build, Power BI Licence costs	More consistent reporting and targeting	Yes, all objectives
Student Lifecycle Dashboard Build	Create live dashboards covering key WP transitions	Tech Team, Registry Team, Power BI Data Model Build, Power BI Licence costs	Greater visibility of risk points; informs actions and enables effective evaluation	Yes, all objectives
Longitudinal Outcome Tracking	Link student records to graduate outcomes and support history	Tech Team, Registry Team, Power BI Data Model Build	Evaluate risk and outcome disparities over time	Yes, all objectives
Annual Intervention Impact Review	Use dashboard insights to inform APP intervention delivery	Registry Team, Student Success Team, Student Support Team, Academic Staff	Strengthens link between data, evaluation and action and action planning	Yes, all objectives

Total cost of activities and evaluation for intervention strategy

The total cost of this strategy is estimated to be £1,062,765

This is broken down as follows:

- £1,032,225 in staff costs
- £30,540 investment in database systems and infrastructure

Summary of evidence base and rationale

See Annex B for the supporting evidence base, including internal data and sector reference

Evaluation

Activity	Outcomes	Method(s) of evaluation	Summary of publication plan
Database Integration	Full data flow across lifecycle stages	Internal system audit using cross-checks between databases and support logs; operational feedback on functionality and gaps (Type 2, operational)	Key progress milestones summarised in internal reports; headline updates included in APP monitoring report
WP Flagging model	More consistent reporting and targeting	Year-on-year consistency check of WP tagging across systems; informal review with admissions and support teams (Type 1–2)	Summary findings shared with internal teams and included in APP monitoring report to inform targeting improvements
Student Lifecycle Dashboard Build	Greater visibility of risk points; informs actions and enables effective evaluation	Structured staff testing; feedback survey on usefulness for identifying and responding to risk; light-touch usage tracking (Type 1–2)	Dashboard development and evaluation summarised in internal performance review and APP monitoring report
Longitudinal Outcome Tracking	Evaluate risk and outcome disparities over time	Manual matching of CRM, academic, and graduate records; basic WP group comparisons and case studies where patterns emerge (Type 2, small-scale)	High-level insights integrated into internal strategy and APP monitoring report
Annual Intervention Impact Review	Strengthens link between data, evaluation and action and action planning	Light-touch evaluation framework used by intervention leads; comparison of intended vs actual outputs; qualitative feedback from deliverers (Type 1)	Highlights compiled for internal reflection and APP monitoring report; findings used to refine delivery and priorities

Intervention Strategy 2: **Targeted Outreach and Conversion Support for Post-16 and Mature WP Students**

Focus outreach on conversion of post-16 and mature WP learners from through targeted, trackable engagement by 2027-28

- LIS Risk(s): Risk 4: Weak conversion from outreach to application among WP students, Risk 1 – Data fragmentation, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle.
- Target: Demonstrable improvement in tracking of outreach to application and enrolment among post-16 and mature WP learners by 2027-28.

Target Group(s):

- Mature students
- Learners with disrupted education
- Post-16 learners from underrepresented backgrounds

Related objectives and targets

- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.
    - While not the primary focus, this strategy contributes structured applicant data that feed directly into the integrated system developed under Objective 1. It ensures that outreach data can be linked to application and enrolment records, which is essential for monitoring access transitions.

Theory of Change

See Annex B for the full theory of change, including underpinning assumptions and intended outcomes.

Activity Table

Activity	Description	Inputs	Outcomes	Cross intervention strategy?
Refocus Outreach Strategy	Phase out schools-based outreach and implement post-16 and mature learner targeting	Outreach Team, Senior Management, Recruitment & Admissions Team	Better alignment with LIS entrant profile; improved targeting	Yes – links to Strategy 1
Database Linked Follow-Up	Implement tagging and structured database follow-up for post engagement events	Outreach Team, Recruitment & Admissions Team	Increased enquiry-to-application conversion	Yes – Strategy 1
Targeted Information Days	Deliver mature/post-16 open days with admissions and academic teams	Outreach Team, Recruitment & Admissions Team	Greater engagement; improved applicant confidence	No
Maths & Quant support	Strengthen the support available for offer holders and students that lack confidence in maths and quant skills	Academic Staff	Students are better prepared for the level of maths skills they need to succeed	No
Partner Referral Pathways	Formalise partner referral routes with post-16 providers	Outreach Team, Recruitment & Admissions Team	Improvement in lead generation and structured application routes	No

Total cost of activities and evaluation for intervention strategy

The total cost of this strategy is estimated to be £380,390

This is broken down as follows:

- £380,390 in staff costs

Summary of evidence base and rationale

See Annex B for the supporting evidence base, including data sources and sector references.

Evaluation

Activity	Outcomes	Method(s) of evaluation	Summary of publication plan
Refocus Outreach Strategy	Better alignment with LIS entrant profile; improved targeting	Source attribution analysis by student characteristics (e.g. age, WP flags); comparison of outreach-engaged vs non-engaged applicants (Type 2)	Summary of outreach profile and conversion trends included in APP monitoring reports from 2026–27 onward
Database Linked Follow-Up	Increased enquiry-to-application conversion	Tagging of attendees in database; tracking of follow-up comms; simple funnel analysis by outreach type (Type 2, operational)	Summary insights included in internal recruitment reviews; selectively reported in APP monitoring reports as illustrative impact
Targeted Information Days	Greater engagement; improved applicant confidence	CRM attendance tracking; short post-event surveys; qualitative feedback gathered through informal conversations or forms (Type 1–2)	Case insights and survey summaries included in APP monitoring reports where relevant; feedback shared with outreach partners as appropriate
Maths & Quant support	Students are better prepared for the level of maths skills they need to succeed	Feedback from participants and tutors; tracking of offer-holder progression and confidence ratings (Type 1–2)	Evaluation findings reviewed as part of admissions performance reflections, may inform future offer-holder support
Partner Referral Pathways	Improvement in lead generation and structured application routes	CRM tracking of source tags; applicant flow monitoring from referred partners; informal review of referral quality and fit (Type 2)	Conversion metrics and partnership outcomes reviewed internally and summarised in outreach performance reports; shared selectively with collaborators

Intervention Strategy 3: Scalable Student Support Model

Strengthen the scalability and sustainability of LIS's student support model by 2026/2027, ensuring it remains responsive as the student body grows.

- LIS Risks: Risk 3: Student Support Model May Become Unsustainable at Scale, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle.
- Target: Develop and embed a distributed support model by 2027, with clearly defined responsibilities across Wellbeing, Success, and Operations functions.

Target Groups

- All WP students
- Students with fluctuating mental health or complex needs
- Future cohorts at scale

Related objectives and targets

- **Objective 5**: Build integrated early-warning system for student support risks by 2027/28.
    - This strategy supplies the operational and human infrastructure needed for the success of early-warning mechanisms. While the data layer is developed in Strategy 1 and the system itself in Strategy 5, the ability to act on early risk indicators requires a scalable and coordinated support response, provided here.

Theory of Change

See Annex B for the full theory of change, including underpinning assumptions and intended outcomes.

Activity	Description	Inputs	Outcomes	Cross intervention strategy?
Redistribute support responsibilities	Allocate functions to Wellbeing Manager, COO, and Student Success Manager	COO and Student Support Team	Improved workload balance across roles, preventing burnout and enabling more strategic focus from each role. Specialised support delivery, with each role focusing on their area of expertise Greater institutional resilience by reducing dependency on a single role, making the support structure more sustainable. Stronger alignment with strategic goals, particularly around inclusion, accessibility, and student outcomes.	No
Introduce 24/7 first response crisis intervention support provision	External provider with continuous access for crisis support	Contract Costs, Student Support Team	To uphold duty of care for our most vulnerable students, Provide specialist and clear pathways of safety planning To ensure there is a multi-agency and holistic approach Prioritising suicide prevention	No
Triage model and referral tracking	Structured system to allocate cases based on type and urgency	COO and Student Support Team, Power BI Licence Costs, Power BI Data Model Build	Ensure consistent and timely support is offered. Effective information sharing processes. Reduce manual admin work to free up time of the support team for other tasks.	Yes (Strategy 1)

Total cost of activities and evaluation for intervention strategy

The total cost of this strategy is estimated to be £281,785

This is broken down as follows:

- £232,765 in staff costs
- £19,020 in external contract costs
- The costs associated with database builds are captured in strategy 1

Summary of evidence base and rationale

See Annex B for the supporting evidence base, including internal data and sector references.

Evaluation

Activity	Outcomes	Method(s) of evaluation	Summary of publication plan
Redistribute support responsibilities	Improved staff capacity and role clarity	Qualitative feedback from staff 1:1s and service logs; high-level workload data review across functions (Type 1)	Key findings summarised in annual student support review; relevant insights included in APP monitoring report if applicable
Introduce 24/7 mental health crisis provision	Increased confidence in crisis support	Tracking of usage frequency and response times; light-touch student confidence survey; case-based review of critical incidents (Type 1–2)	Included in internal wellbeing audit; findings reported in APP monitoring report where uptake and outcomes indicate meaningful impact
Triage model and referral tracking	More equitable access across WP students	Review of referral and support access by WP flag using database tags; sample case audits and response time summaries (Type 2, proportionate)	Summary of findings feeds into internal review processes and informs APP monitoring report

Intervention Strategy 4: Reduction in overall quantity of summative assessment points

Reduction in overall quantity of summative assessment points by 2026/2027

- LIS Risks: Risk 2: Intensive Assessment Load May Disadvantage WP Students, Risk 3: Student Support Model May Become Unsustainable, Risk 1: Data fragmentation and statistical volatility across the lifecycle).

- Target: Sustained reduction in reliance on extenuating circumstances requests by all students, particularly those with learning differences and disabilities.

Target Groups

- Students with disabilities and learning differences
- WP students with multiple responsibilities or disrupted learning backgrounds

Related objectives and targets

- **Objective 3**: Strengthen the scalability and sustainability of LIS's student support model by 2026/27.
    - By reducing assessment-related strain on students, particularly those with complex needs, this strategy decreases reactive casework and crisis referrals—thereby lowering pressure on the student support system and improving sustainability.

- **Objective 5**: Build integrated early-warning system for student support risks by 2027/28.
    - The strategy generates valuable data inputs—such as EC rates and missed deadlines—that can be incorporated into the early-warning system described in Strategy 5. This contribution is indirect but essential for identifying assessment-related risk patterns early.

Theory of Change

- See Annex B for the full theory of change, including underpinning assumptions and intended outcomes. As noted in Annex B, appropriate inclusive design should not lead to a reduction in assessments being effective, valid, reliable and credible.

Activity Table

Activity	Description	Inputs	Outcomes	Cross intervention strategy?
Assessment Review	Cross-programme audit of assessment quantities, non-submissions EC patterns, and student feedback	Registry Team, Student Support Team, Academic Staff	Identification of trends or patterns in specific modules, subject areas, levels and student groups	No
Assessment Quantity Reduction	Academic teams to identify appropriate level of reduction in quantity of assessment and create overall assessment strategy	Academic Staff	Revised assessments to be in place for 2026-2027 academic year	No
Assessment Impact Monitoring	Use submission data, attainment data, and qualitative feedback to track impact of reforms including any reduction in process assessments or the efficacy of live assessment	Registry Team, Student Support Team	Data used to refine and drive further enhancements, after 2026/2027 academic year	Yes – Strategy 1 and Strategy 5
Extenuating Circumstances Review	Review the processes, policies and practices that result in perceived over-reliance on EC processes	Registry Team, Student Support Team	Outcomes used to refine and drive further enhancements, after 2026/2027 academic year	No
Quinquennial review	We will be reviewing assessment design and impact, paying particular attention to inclusivity, effectiveness, validity, reliability and credibility in the context of a wider institution quinquennial or all aspects of the BASc degree.	Registry Team, Student Support Team, Academic Staff	Revalidated BASc programme to begin delivery in 2026-2027 Academic Year	No

Total cost of activities and evaluation for intervention strategy

The total cost of this strategy is estimated to be £ 913,315

This is broken down as follows:

- £ 913,315 in staff costs

Summary of evidence base and rationale

See Annex B for the supporting evidence base, including internal data and sector references.

Evaluation

Activity	Outcomes	Method(s) of evaluation	Summary of publication plan
Assessment Review	Identification of trends or patterns in specific modules, subject areas, levels and student groups	Analysis of assessment outcomes and extension rates across student groups using database data; thematic review of student feedback by module and WP status (Type 1–2)	Key trends and insights summarised in annual internal evaluation cycle and included in the 2026 APP monitoring report
Assessment Quantity Reduction	Revised assessments to be in place for 2026-2027 academic year	Comparison of volume and distribution of assessments before and after redesign (Type 2)	Included in annual internal evaluation cycle and summary of assessment changes and rationale to be included in 2027 APP monitoring report
Assessment Impact Monitoring	Data used to refine and drive further enhancements	Ongoing analysis of submission rates, student feedback, and continuation by WP flag; module-level review of adaptations (Type 1–2)	Included in annual internal evaluation cycle and summarised in the APP monitoring report

Intervention Strategy 5: Integrated Early-Warning System for Student Support Risks

Build integrated early-warning system for student support risks by 2027/2028

- LIS Risk: Risk 1: Data Fragmentation Across the Lifecycle, Risk 3: Support Model May Become Unsustainable at Scale, Risk 2: Inaccessible or Intensive Assessment Practices (indirectly).
- Target: Launch system by 2026/2027; full use across cohort by 2027/2028.

Target Groups

- WP students with fluctuating or compounding needs
- Disabled and neurodivergent students
- Students with low attendance, reduced engagement, or emerging wellbeing risks
- Students receiving multiple reactive interventions

Related objectives and targets

- **Objective 3**: Strengthen the scalability and sustainability of LIS's student support model by 2026/27.
    - The strategy enables earlier identification of risk, which reduces reliance on reactive or crisis-driven interventions. This directly supports the sustainability and efficiency of the restructured support model developed under Strategy 3.

- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.
    - The strategy is contingent on, and helps operationalise, the data integration work in Strategy 1. Without centralised CRM–SRS data and WP flag harmonisation, the early-warning indicators cannot be reliably generated.

Theory of Change

See Annex B for the full theory of change, including underpinning assumptions and intended outcomes.

.

Activity Table

Activity	Description	Inputs	Outcomes	Cross intervention strategy?
Risk Flag Framework Development	Define and validate indicators of student risk	Registry Team, Student Support Team, Student Success Team, Academic Staff	Standardised flag logic agreed and tested	Yes Strategy 1
CRM/SRS Dashboard Build	Design and implement early-warning dashboard accessible to authorised staff	Power BI Data Model Build; Tech Team; Full Fabric build and Implementation	Real-time student risk visibility across key touchpoints	Yes Strategy 1
Risk Review Meetings	Continue with data informed monthly cross-functional risk review meetings to monitor students with multiple flags	Registry Team, Tech Team, Student Support Team, Student Success Team, Academic Staff	Improved referral quality and team-wide visibility of emerging risks	Yes Strategy 1
Student Communication Strategy	Develop standardised communications for students and intervention responses based on risk profiles	Registry Team, Student Support Team,	Consistent, supportive contact that reduces stigma and encourages help-seeking	Yes Strategy 1

Total cost of activities and evaluation for intervention strategy

The total cost of this strategy is estimated to be £416,135

This is broken down as follows:

- £400,875 in staff costs
- £15,260 investment in database systems and infrastructure

Summary of evidence base and rationale

See Annex B for the supporting evidence base, including internal data and sector references.

Evaluation

Activity	Outcomes	Method(s) of evaluation	Summary of publication plan
Risk Flag Framework Development	Validated set of risk indicators aligned to continuation and EC outcomes	Retrospective testing of flag indicators against continuation, EC, and support data from database; feedback from support and academic stakeholders (Type 2)	Internal validation report prepared in 2026; high-level summary included in APP annex and referenced in APP monitoring report
CRM/SRS Dashboard Build	Usable and accurate early-warning system accessible to support teams	Staff user feedback on accessibility and relevance; review of flagged cases identified via dashboard versus manual reports (Type 1)	Dashboard usage and implementation effectiveness summarised in internal review and APP monitoring report from 2027
Risk Review Meetings	Faster and better-targeted support interventions	Qualitative review of meeting minutes; tracking of time-to-intervention and resolution outcomes for sample cases (Type 1)	Internal reflection summary informs annual evaluation; relevant insights included in APP monitoring report from 2027
Student Communication Strategy	More consistent and effective student response to risk interventions	Student feedback post-intervention; sample tracking of engagement and support uptake following outreach (Type 2)	Strategy evaluation summarised in internal review; selected findings reported in 2027–28 APP monitoring report

Intervention Strategy 6: Graduate Progression Parity for Widening Participation Students

Maintain parity in graduate progression outcomes for students with intersecting characteristics

- LIS Risks: Risk 5: Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for students with intersecting characteristics, Risk 1: Data Fragmentation Across the Lifecycle.
- Target: parity in graduate outcomes between WP and non-WP students.
- There has been one graduate cohort to date of 56 students.
- Current internal data shows that 78% of students with intersecting characteristics reported that they have a job offer they intend to take or have been accepted into further study (LIS 'sorted' rate). This compares to 78% of students without intersecting characteristics using the same measure.
- This objective aims to ensure that there is little statistical difference in this measure, aiming to achieve 80% over the course of this plan.

Target Groups

- Graduates with intersecting characteristics
- Students with fewer networks or less social capital
- Students who accessed support services during their studies

Related objectives and targets

- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.
    - Progression outcomes for WP students must be monitored and evaluated over time to ensure parity. This strategy relies on the infrastructure developed under Objective 1 to track outcomes longitudinally and inform evaluation of graduate progression interventions.

Theory of Change

See Annex B for the full theory of change, including underpinning assumptions and intended outcomes.

Activity	Description	Inputs	Outcomes	Cross intervention strategy?
Graduate Outcomes Tracking	Retain and scale tracking of graduate outcomes by WP flag across employment and further study in line with sector benchmarks	Student Success Team, Full Fabric build and Implementation	Annual graduate outcomes dataset	Yes Strategy 7
WP Graduate Follow-Up Interviews	Conduct in-depth interviews with WP graduates to understand progression pathways and barriers	Student Success Team, events/alumni budget	Qualitative understanding of WP progression experience	Yes Strategy 7
Grow alumni Network	Iterate and refine the alumni network offering to maximise engagement and mutual value	Student Success Team, events/alumni budget	Parity of graduate coaching engagement by WP students	No
Early Leaver destination tracking	To develop and maintain a database of early leaver (withdrawn students) destinations to measure the impact of lifelong career coaching	Student Success Team; Full Fabric build and Implementation	Annual leaver outcomes dataset	No

Total cost of activities and evaluation for intervention strategy

The total cost of this strategy is estimated to be £53,630

This is broken down as follows:

- £19150 in staff costs
- £30,480 investment in database systems and infrastructure
- £4000 in annual expense budgets

Summary of evidence base and rationale

See Annex B for the supporting evidence base, including internal data and sector references.

Evaluation

Activity	Outcomes	Method(s) of evaluation	Summary of publication plan
Graduate Outcomes Tracking	Annual graduate outcomes dataset	Graduate destination survey with follow-up via database and informal alumni contacts; light-touch thematic analysis of progression narratives (Type 1–2)	Summary of outcomes included annually in APP monitoring report and used to track Risk 5 indicators
WP Graduate Follow-Up Interviews	Qualitative understanding of WP progression experience	Thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with a sample of WP graduates; triangulated with graduate outcomes data where feasible (Type 2)	Qualitative insights integrated into APP monitoring report and used to inform support and coaching strategies
Grow alumni Network	Parity of graduate coaching engagement by WP students	Tracking of alumni coaching engagement by WP flag using database tagging; review of engagement trends and gaps (Type 1–2)	Engagement patterns reviewed annually and summarised in APP monitoring report; informs graduate coaching model
Early Leaver destination tracking	Annual leaver outcomes dataset	Follow-up contact with early leavers using graduate survey format; thematic analysis of destination patterns and reasons for exit (Type 2)	Findings included in APP monitoring report; supports understanding of continuation risks and outcomes beyond degree completion

Intervention Strategy 7: Internship Engagement for Widening Participation Students

Ensure parity between high-flag students and non-WP to complete at least one LIS consultancy-style placement by 2029

- EORR Risk: Risk 5: Emerging disparities in graduate outcomes for WP students, Risk 1: Data Fragmentation Across the Lifecycle.
- Target: new model launching 2025/26, to monitor throughout implementation year.

Target Groups

- Students with any combination of WP flags.

Related objectives and targets

- **Objective 6**: Maintain parity in graduate progression outcomes for students with intersecting characteristics.
    - Internships are strongly correlated with positive graduate outcomes. This strategy helps ensure that WP students gain the experiences that support progression into competitive and aligned career paths. It also strengthens the confidence and destination clarity that underpin successful transitions.
- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.
    - The strategy depends on infrastructure from Objective 1 to monitor internship uptake, analyse participation by WP flag, and evaluate the long-term relationship between work-based learning and graduate outcomes.

Theory of Change

See Annex B for the full theory of change, including underpinning assumptions and intended outcomes.

Activity	Description	Inputs	Outcomes	Cross intervention strategy?
Inclusive internship Model Scaling	Scale flexible, paid, remote, and short-form internships to meet diverse student needs	Student Success Team, Futures budget	Placements, sectors, and functions are relevant and accessible to students with complex circumstances	No
High-Flag Participation Monitoring	Track internship participation by WP flag count using CRM	Student Success Team	Annual internship participation & satisfaction report, including WP students and employers	Yes – Strategy 1, Strategy 5
Placement Onboarding Support	Provide structured 1:1 workplace hygiene for high-flag students pre- and post-placement	Coaches; Student Success Team, General Futures budget	Increased confidence, skill articulation, and placement success	No

Total cost of activities and evaluation for intervention strategy

The total cost of this strategy is estimated to be £52,782

This is broken down as follows:

- £40,782 in staff costs
- £12,000 in annual expense budgets

Summary of evidence base and rationale

See Annex B for the supporting evidence base, including internal data and sector references.

Evaluation

Activity	Outcomes	Method(s) of evaluation	Summary of publication plan
Inclusive internship Model Scaling	Placements, sectors, and functions are relevant and accessible to students with complex circumstances	Analysis of placement access and sector distribution by WP flag; qualitative feedback from students and employer partners (Type 1–2)	Summary of participation and relevance included in APP monitoring report; used to inform future placement development
High-Flag Participation Monitoring	Annual internship participation & satisfaction report, including WP students and employers	Dashboard-based tracking of internship participation and satisfaction by WP flag using database records; trend analysis over time (Type 2)	Annual report included in APP monitoring report; supports monitoring of equity and alignment with Risk 5
Placement Onboarding Support	Increased confidence, skill articulation, and placement success	Coach notes and pre/post placement reflections used to identify shifts in confidence and preparedness (Type 1)	Aggregated insights summarised annually in APP monitoring report; feedback used to refine onboarding process

Whole provider approach

1. Governance

LIS's Access and Participation Plan (APP) is governed through formal institutional structures that embed accountability and oversight at the highest levels. The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the APP, reporting termly to the Academic Council and annually to the Board of Directors. This ensures that strategic measures, targets, and equality risks are continuously scrutinised by senior academics and LIS leadership.

The EDIC includes representatives from across the institution—Board, executive, admissions, student support, academic leadership, and elected staff and student members—reflecting a whole-provider commitment to equality of opportunity. Its remit extends across both the EDI strategy and the APP, enabling alignment between regulatory duties and broader institutional objectives. The committee reviews data on recruitment, retention, progression, and achievement by protected characteristic and WP status, and ensures that the APP is updated in response to identified gaps and risks.

In addition, the APP is integrated into wider governance and planning cycles. Academic Council receives evaluation reports from programme reviews, student support audits, and graduate outcomes analysis, all of which feed into the APP lifecycle. EDIC also signs off equality impact assessments on major initiatives, ensuring scrutiny of access-related risks.

2. Integration in Academic Practice

Equality of opportunity is embedded throughout LIS's academic policies, programme development processes, and quality assurance cycles. The institutional Programme Design, Development, Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures require that all new and reapproved programmes are designed to remove barriers for students with protected characteristics and to align with the Equality Act 2010. At approval, programme panels—composed of internal and external academics—formally assess whether proposals reflect LIS's commitment to equity, including the inclusivity of teaching, learning, and assessment methods.

Annual and periodic programme monitoring also includes evaluation of:

- Progression and attainment patterns by student group;
- Accessibility of curriculum and assessment design;
- Student feedback on the inclusiveness of teaching and support.

Curriculum teams must explicitly report on how equality and diversity are addressed in module content and pedagogy. These expectations are reinforced through LIS's internal academic regulations and reflected in the definitive documentation for all validated programmes.

Inclusive academic practice is further supported by the Student Support Framework, which is referenced in curriculum approval processes to ensures appropriate scaffolding for students with diverse needs.

Academic Council and its subcommittees are responsible for quality assurance across the full student lifecycle, including oversight of continuation, attainment, and progression data

disaggregated by WP characteristic. These data inform programme enhancements, pedagogical reform, and risk mitigation strategies under the APP.

3. Staff Engagement

LIS recognises that a whole-provider approach to equality of opportunity requires active engagement and ownership by staff across all roles and functions, and APP-related responsibilities are integrated into the job descriptions and working practices of relevant teams.

EDIC provides institution-wide support and guidance on inclusive practice and is responsible for advising on training requirements for staff and students. This includes raising awareness of the APP and its objectives, supporting staff to recognise their role in reducing barriers across the student lifecycle.

Staff are also engaged through structured evaluation and review mechanisms. For example:

- All academic staff contribute to annual programme monitoring, including analysis of differential outcomes and student feedback;
- Support staff participate in cross-functional reviews which inform APP strategies;
- The annual equality survey provides a snapshot of staff and student views, informing institutional priorities;
- Operational integration is supported through regular institutional planning cycles in which APP goals are linked to resource allocation, risk management, and quality improvement.
- Teams are expected to collaborate on the design and delivery of interventions, with named leads and accountability embedded in governance processes.

Student consultation

To inform the development of this Access and Participation Plan, LIS convened a dedicated student consultation group in July 2025. The group included student representatives and non-representative participants from across all three years of the BASc programme. The discussion focused on key aspects of the student experience that relate directly to identified risks in our assessment of performance—particularly access for mature or disrupted students and academic assessment load.

Access, maths, and quant

On the topic of access for mature students or those from non-traditional educational backgrounds, the group was keen to discuss the maths and quantitative elements of the programme and the impact this may have on access and early perceptions of the programme.

One student commented that LIS’s inclusive admissions messaging had encouraged applications from those with limited prior success in mathematics. Another participant, who had failed GCSE Maths twice, described LIS’s reassurance that "maths would not be a barrier” as a decisive factor in their decision to apply as it countered their own lack of confidence. However, other students reported that they found the quantitative elements of the curriculum unexpectedly challenging in Year 1. This led to a notable drop in confidence among some students—particularly those who had expected a more humanities-focused degree. One student reflected that they only began to feel confident in their quantitative skills by the end of Year 3.

Several students supported the continued inclusion of quantitative content in the curriculum but highlighted a need for clearer framing, early reassurance, and more structured support. One participant suggested that lack of preparation for this type of content could pose a retention risk for students from underrepresented backgrounds if not proactively addressed.

This feedback echoes some anecdotal evidence we have at LIS and speaks to a broader perception among many adults that their maths skills are a key barrier to success. In response, we have included an activity aimed at supporting maths confidence in Intervention Strategy 2, which will develop materials to help ensure applicants and students have pre-course and early-term maths support where they feel it is necessary.

Assessment Load

There was some disagreement amongst the group about the impact of the current LIS assessment load. Some indicated that the overall academic experience is intense, which aligns with their expectations of the programme, so they don't perceive the assessment load to be too heavy. Others strongly disagreed with this, with one student suggesting that their recent neurodiversity diagnosis means they often rely on extenuating circumstances to manage their workload.

Students consistently fed back that they felt the volume and pacing of assessments was intense and unrelenting, particularly in Year 1. While individual modules were seen as engaging and well-supported, the cumulative pressure was perceived as extremely challenging. Students requested better scaffolding, clearer signposting of expectations, and greater transparency about workload during the recruitment and induction phases.

In Intervention 4, we have included a variety of activities aimed at evaluating assessment processes, practice, volumes and policies. At this stage we feel that the issues raised at the consultation are covered through these activities, but we will continue to engage with students to monitor our progress throughout the coming terms.

Careers and Internships

While the bulk of the discussion centred on maths confidence and assessment, we also discussed the strategies regarding careers and internships. Students were supportive of the aims of the strategies and didn't recommend any changes to approach. The 3rd year students commented on the effectiveness of the internship programme and the careers support, particularly highlighting how important it was for their confidence to engage with an internship placement early on in the programme. One third year student commented that they were pleased to learn that alumni were offered life-long coaching by LIS because, although they may not need it straight away, they felt it was an important support mechanism should they need it in the future.

The comments from students on this topic broadly support the aims of interventions 6 & 7, which intend to ensure parity of career opportunities for students from widening participation backgrounds. We did not find it necessary to make any changes based on this feedback.

Ongoing Engagement

Students will continue to play a role in the monitoring and development of the APP. A student from each year group sits on the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC), which oversees APP implementation, management, evaluation and impact.

In addition, LIS plans to run further consultations with student groups to ensure future input on access and participation activities developed throughout the lifecycle of this plan.

Evaluation of the plan

As a small and new provider, LIS recognises that our approach to evaluating access and participation has, to date, been limited in scale and systematisation. However, strengthening our evaluation culture is a core institutional priority. This plan sets out how we will develop a proportionate, rigorous, and embedded approach to evaluating our APP, ensuring that activities are evidence-informed and responsive to the needs of students at risk of not experiencing equality of opportunity.

Strategic Approach

Over the course of this plan, LIS will build a whole-provider evaluation framework focused on three core aims:

- Understanding impact: Testing whether our intervention strategies are achieving their intended outcomes, particularly for high-risk groups.
- Improving practice: Using evaluation findings to inform real-time improvements to the design and delivery of our interventions.
- Contributing to sector learning: Sharing insights, where appropriate, with peer institutions and national bodies to support collective progress.

Our strategy is grounded in a lifecycle view of student equity — spanning access, continuation, attainment, and progression. We aim to strengthen evaluation in our institutional governance processes and decision-making cycles throughout this period.

Evaluation Framework and Prioritisation

Each intervention strategy included in this APP will be supported by an evaluation plan that specifies which activities will be evaluated, what types of evidence will be sought, and how findings will be used. We will prioritise evaluation activity based on:

- Scale of investment and resource intensity
- Strategic alignment with key APP risks
- Gaps in the current evidence base
- Potential to inform broader practice or policy.

We will align our evaluation practices with the OfS Standards of Evidence, recognising that these may evolve as our capacity matures. Initially, we anticipate generating:

- Narrative (Type 1) evidence for smaller-scale or emergent activity
- Empirical (Type 2) evidence for well-established interventions (e.g. internships, coaching)
- Over time, we may pursue causal (Type 3) evidence through partnerships or external evaluators, where feasible

Data and Methods

To date, evaluation at LIS has drawn on qualitative case studies, survey data, and programme-level insights. However, we acknowledge that we currently lack integrated systems for tracking outcomes across the full student lifecycle.

During this plan period, we will:

- Improve our student record and case tracking systems to enable better flagging of WP characteristics for staff that need this information
- Expand use of survey data and structured coaching insights to track change over time
- Strengthen graduate outcome tracking beyond HESA data by building on our Careers Registration model and alumni engagement strategies
- Pilot new methods for gathering student voice and triangulating impact data

Where appropriate, we will combine qualitative and quantitative methods to capture both measurable change and lived experience.

Capacity and Resourcing

LIS will take a proportionate approach to evaluation that reflects our size, but we are committed to growing our institutional capacity. Evaluation will be coordinated by the Registry function in collaboration with professional services leads, such as Student Support, Admissions, Student Success. Oversight will be provided by EDIC which will review evaluation priorities annually.

Use of Findings and Continuous Improvement

As our evaluation approach develops, we will ensure findings are used to refine interventions, mitigate emerging risks, and inform the design of future plans. Evaluation outputs will feed into:

- Internal reporting cycles
- EDIC decision-making
- Annual APP reviews
- Consultations with students and staff

We will look to grow our capacity to contribute to sector learning as a small, specialist provider. To support this, LIS will look to build partnerships with similar sized providers to enhance its ability to draw on the experiences of the wider education sector.

Provision of information to students

Fees
Student fees are £9,275 per year. Further fees would only be charged if a student is required to retake a full module as a third attempt, after failing a first and second attempt. A flat fee of £1,125 per module is charged regardless of the number of credits involved in that module, and students are not permitted to progress until they have successfully passed all of their retakes. The yearly fee of £9,275 is not charged to students while they are undertaking retakes.

Bursaries

LIS provides targeted financial support on a case-by-case basis, with annual bursaries of between **£1,000 and up to a maximum of £7,000** available to eligible students each academic year. Students in receipt of a bursary award are required to reapply for their bursary for each year of study.

The eligibility criteria for receiving a bursary are aimed at supporting those most in need of financial assistance. Students who fall into more than one category will have their full circumstances taken into account but the total bursary available will not exceed £7000. Bursary awards are decided by a panel who use the following criteria to assess each application:

- Students who have experience in care
- Students who are estranged from their parents (this typically means a person who has had no contact with their biological parents for 12 months)
- Students who have been a young carer
- Students who are not able to return to their family home during holidays
- Students with disabilities
- Students from Tower Hamlets
- Students who come from a low-income household up to £25k
- Students who come from a household with an income between £25k-£40k
- Students who are facing adverse circumstances (e.g. bereavement, hospitalisation of parents, challenging situations at home)

Students are expected to submit supporting evidence with their bursary application. Bursary awards are granted once per academic year, normally at the start of Term 1. Payments are made in three instalments across the academic year.

Hardship Fund
The LIS Hardship Fund is available for students that require more immediate financial support caused by exceptional circumstances. The amount available to students ranges from **£50 to £1,000**, with the average amount provided being approximately **£300**. Each situation will be assessed on the individual evidence available. LIS will consider applications based on a range of circumstances such as:

- Costs of a disability assessment
- Breakdown of family arrangements
- Safeguarding issues
- Job loss
- Financial hardship

Frequency: Hardship awards are one-off payments, made as required during the academic year. Students may apply more than once if their circumstances change, subject to available funds.

Students are required to complete an application and supply relevant evidence.

Access to Information

- Current students: Information is available on the School intranet and VLE, and via the Student Support team.
- Prospective students: Information is published on the LIS website, alongside admissions and support guidance.

Both bursaries and hardship funds are targeted towards student groups identified in the LIS Access and Participation Plan as being at risk of not experiencing equality of opportunity – in particular, mature learners, students from low-income households, care-experienced and estranged students, disabled students, and carers.

Annex A: Further information and analysis relating to the identification and prioritisation of key risks to equality of opportunity

This annex supports our risk analysis by providing additional justification for each risk to equality of opportunity identified by LIS. Given LIS's small cohort size and approach to sustainable growth, this annex takes a proportionate approach to evidence presentation and evaluation development.

For each risk, we outline who is affected, the internal and sector evidence supporting it, any known limitations, and how the risk aligns with our institutional objectives and interventions. Where appropriate, we suggest potential future enhancements to our evidence base. These are not formal delivery commitments but signal areas for evaluation development, proportional to our scale and stage of maturity.

Risk Title	**1. Data Fragmentation and Statistical Volatility Across the Lifecycle**
EORR Mapping	• **Primary**: EORR 11 – Capacity Issues • **Secondary**: EORR 12 – Progression from higher education
Who is Affected	All WP students, particularly those in smaller or intersecting groups whose characteristics or needs may be inconsistently flagged or tracked. This includes mature students, disabled students, and those with disrupted educational histories.
Evidence Base	Evidence currently includes Type 1 institutional data and Type 2 insights drawn from small-n trend fluctuations, such as individual withdrawals or progression outcomes potentially disproportionately affecting headline rates. WP flags are partially manual and not integrated across systems, limiting the ability to analyse patterns across the lifecycle. Sector insight from TASO (2023) highlights the difficulty many small providers face in building an effective evidence base across the lifecycle, reinforcing LIS's emphasis on data integration and dashboard development.
Known Limitations	• Small student numbers limit statistical generalisability and increase volatility • Lifecycle data is siloed across platforms, with no single student record view • Evaluation capacity is currently constrained by both infrastructure and staffing limitations
Why This Is a Priority	This risk is a priority because LIS's ability to meet its APP commitments, including outreach tracking, student support scaling, and graduate progression monitoring, depends on building a reliable, integrated evidence base. Without this, the institution risks misinterpreting performance trends, failing to identify emerging equality gaps, and being unable to meet OfS expectations for evidence-informed planning and continuous improvement.

Evaluation Considerations	Evaluation activity in the early years of this APP will focus on establishing baseline lifecycle dashboards and reducing reliance on manual WP flag processes. Until systems are integrated, most evaluation will rely on Type 1 and 2 evidence, with statistical volatility clearly flagged. Initial visualisation will include simple trend dashboards by WP flag to improve accessibility and reduce misinterpretation in small cohorts. Progress will be reviewed annually via the Equality, Diversity & Inclusivity Committee (EDIC).
Potential Evidence Enhancements	• Develop annual audit of WP flag consistency across systems • Introduce small-n visualisation methods for trend analysis • Pilot lifecycle mapping of high-flag students to assess attrition points and support interactions

Risk Title	**2. Intensive Assessment Load May Disadvantage WP Students**
EORR Mapping	• **Primary**: EORR 6 – Insufficient academic support • **Secondary**: EORR 7 – Insufficient personal support; EORR 11 – Capacity issues
Who is Affected	Disabled and neurodiverse students, mature learners, low-income students, and others with caring responsibilities or fluctuating health — all of whom may require more flexibility, pacing, or recovery time across the academic year
Evidence Base	Internal reviews confirm the overall assessment burden is high across terms, with multiple overlapping submissions. Students with additional needs report difficulty sustaining performance throughout the year despite varied and inclusive assessment formats. Student case study reflections and staff coaching notes consistently reference pressure points near assessment deadlines. The support model has documented increased requests, particularly among WP groups. QAA (2022) guidance on student workload supports the principle that cumulative assessment pressure can disproportionately affect students with additional needs. Tight et al. (2024) confirm a sector-wide link between intensive assessment regimes and rising EC use, validating LIS's concern about over-assessment.
Known Limitations	• No quantitative time-on-assessment study has yet been conducted across modules • No comparative data exists to benchmark LIS's assessment load against other institutions or sector norms - Specific analysis of EC rates by WP flag is not yet complete

Why This Is a Priority	The cumulative burden of frequent, cognitively demanding assessments risks undermining academic outcomes for students already managing additional challenges. Without reform, LIS may inadvertently disadvantage the students it seeks to support. Additionally, the load generates dependency on crisis-based support, such as counselling or extenuating circumstances, which contributes to institutional strain and compounds Risk 3. Reducing assessment pressure is therefore both an equality and capacity issue.
Evaluation Considerations	The primary metric will be changes in EC and extension request volumes, particularly among WP students. Secondary insights may emerge from qualitative feedback on assessment pacing and manageability. Initial evaluation will rely on internal descriptive data (Type 1), with capacity-building to support more robust analysis of differential impact over time. Staff feedback on assessment load reduction will also be collected through annual module review processes.
Potential Evidence Enhancements	• Conduct assessment mapping exercise across programme to quantify load and clustering by term • Analyse EC/extension data disaggregated by WP flag and mode of study • Gather longitudinal feedback from students with reasonable adjustments on pacing, flexibility, and support access

Risk Title	**3. Student Support Model May Become Unsustainable at Scale**
EORR Mapping	• **Primary**: EORR 7 – Insufficient personal support • **Secondary**: EORR 8 – Mental health; EORR 11 – Capacity issues
Who is Affected	WP students with ongoing, complex, or crisis needs — particularly those with mental health conditions, disabilities, unstable housing, or financial precarity; also mature students or carers who rely on flexible or high-contact support models
Evidence Base	Institutional case studies and internal reviews show high dependency on individual staff for intensive, holistic support. The model currently functions well due to experienced staff but is vulnerable to absence or turnover. HEFCE (2017) notes that personalised, high-touch support models are difficult to sustain at scale without redistribution of responsibilities — particularly relevant to small, innovative institutions. TASO (2023) similarly highlights the need for clearer support structures and role differentiation as providers grow.

Known Limitations	• There is no formal caseload or workload tracking model for student support across functions and roles • Data on frequency and type of interventions by student profile (e.g. WP status, need type) is not yet systematically collected
Why This Is a Priority	The current support model is heavily staff-dependent, and LIS's strategic plans include gradual cohort growth. Without redistribution of responsibilities and proactive triage systems, the institution risks overwhelming its limited support capacity. WP students are disproportionately affected, as they are more likely to rely on regular contact, crisis interventions, or additional accommodations. The risk also intersects with academic load (Risk 2) and data tracking limitations (Risk 1), further compounding institutional vulnerability.
Evaluation Considerations	Evaluation will initially focus on sustainability indicators such as volume of support interactions per role, time-to-resolution for complex cases, and repeat crisis cases. Metrics may include referral volumes and safeguarding incidents. Current evaluation will rely on Type 1 institutional reporting, with future potential to develop correlation-based insights on support use and continuation. Regular team debriefs will capture qualitative feedback on service strain and time pressure across roles.
Potential Evidence Enhancements	• Develop caseload and contact logging system across support roles • Map repeat users of support services against WP characteristics • Pilot predictive flags (e.g. missed sessions, disengagement patterns) to support proactive intervention planning

Risk Title	**Weak Conversion from Outreach to Application Among WP Students**
EORR Mapping	**Primary**: EORR 4 – Application success rates **Secondary**: EORR 2 – Information and guidance; EORR 3 – Perception of higher education
Who is Affected	WP students engaged through LIS outreach activity — especially those from school-based programmes and underrepresented boroughs, as well as mature or disrupted learners reached through new post-16 routes

Evidence Base	Historical outreach activity has generated high engagement volumes, particularly with schools, but conversion into applications has remained low. Tracking of outreach-to-application yield has been limited due to CRM and system fragmentation. LIS's previous outreach model lacked structured follow-up or alignment with application pathways. van der Graaf & Evans (2021) confirm that continuity between outreach and application is a key driver of access success, particularly for disadvantaged groups. University of Warwick's WP strategy (2025) reinforces the need to align outreach to sustained, measurable engagement pathways — aligning with LIS's pivot to post-16/mature routes.
Known Limitations	• Conversion data is not yet routinely collected or linked to specific outreach events • Limited application success data by outreach source • Limited data on how prospective students perceive LIS or understand its admissions process
Why This Is a Priority	Outreach activities require significant institutional resource, and low conversion undermines their strategic value and equality impact. As LIS shifts toward mature and post-16 learners, the ability to track, support, and convert engaged WP individuals becomes essential. Without targeted follow-up, better event tracking, and improved guidance pathways, outreach risks becoming disconnected from actual access outcomes.
Evaluation Considerations	Evaluation will focus on database derived conversion metrics from outreach to application and enrolment. Effectiveness of new outreach routes (e.g. mature/post-16 events) will be assessed via uptake rates and feedback. Evaluation will begin with Type 1 tracking data, with potential for Type 2 (e.g. outreach engagement vs application likelihood) as systems mature.
Potential Evidence Enhancements	• Link all outreach engagements to CRM records • Begin disaggregating application and offer data by outreach source • Conduct qualitative research with non-applicants engaged through outreach to identify barriers or misalignments in guidance • Invite feedback from outreach participants at the point of event registration or follow-up

Risk Title	Emerging Disparities in Graduate Outcomes for WP Students
EORR Mapping	• **Primary**: EORR 12 – Progression from higher education • **Secondary**: EORR 2 – Information and guidance; EORR 1 – Knowledge and skills
Who is Affected	WP students, particularly those with multiple flags such as being mature, disabled, or having experienced disrupted education; those who may lack access to networks, confidence, or sustained guidance after graduation.
Evidence Base	LIS's first graduating cohort (2023–24) of 56 students showed no observed disparity in graduate outcomes by WP status. However, the sample size was small, and there is no longitudinal tracking yet in place to detect emerging gaps. Current cohort sizes fluctuate so statistical volatility remains embedded for several years. UPP Foundation (2025) highlights the risk of long-term disparities in progression unless structured alumni coaching and tracking are embedded. TASO (2023) emphasises the importance of early planning and longitudinal data when addressing equality risks in graduate outcomes, supporting LIS's graduate dashboard initiative.
Known Limitations	• Graduate outcomes data currently covers only one cohort • No formal tracking of employment type, duration, or graduate-level classification by WP flag • Coaching and placement engagement is not yet linked to post-study destinations in a systematic way
Why This Is a Priority	Although early outcomes are positive, the absence of longitudinal data limits insight into sustained equality of opportunity. WP students may face barriers after graduation that are less visible during study, including limited networks, confidence gaps, or difficulty accessing progression support. Without proactive coaching, prioritised placement access, and outcomes tracking, LIS may not detect disparities until they are entrenched. Early intervention is essential to ensure equitable progression from an otherwise inclusive educational experience.
Evaluation Considerations	Evaluation will focus on progression parity between WP and non-WP graduates. Initial work will rely on Type 1 evidence (e.g. descriptive progression data), with potential to build toward Type 2 (e.g. correlation between coaching uptake and progression). System development will support routine tracking of destination type, sector, and quality by WP flag.

Suggested Evidence Enhancements	• Develop a longitudinal graduate outcomes dataset by WP characteristic • Integrate coaching and placement participation into graduate tracking • Conduct follow-up surveys or interviews with WP graduates to assess barriers and enablers in progression

Reference List

HEFCE. (2017) *Models of support for students with disabilities*. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England. Available at: https://nadp-uk.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/HEFCE-modelsofsupport-report-2017.pdf

TASO. (2023) *Piloting methods to develop better evidence on student support: Summary report*. London: Centre for Transforming Access and Student Outcomes in Higher Education. Available at: https://cdn.taso.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023-11_Summary-Report_Piloting-methods-to-develop-better-evidence-student-support_TASO.pdf

Thomas, L., Hillman, N. and Hindley, A. (2025) *Evidence-based WP and graduate outcomes to support a place-based agenda*. London: UPP Foundation. Available at: https://upp-foundation.org/essay/evidence-based-wpand-graduate-outcomesto-support-a-place

van der Graaf, D. and Evans, J. (2021) 'A systematic review of widening participation interventions and their evaluation', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(8), pp.1106–1123. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8282973

University of Warwick. (2025) *WP and Outreach Strategy: School of Engineering 2025–2030*. Coventry: University of Warwick. Available at: https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/sci/eng/about/outreach/wp_and_outreach_strategy_soe_final_04.2025.pdf

QAA (2022) Explaining student workload: Guidance about providing information for effective learning and teaching. Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Available at: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/explaining-student-workload.pdf

Bennion, A., Higgins, R., Holford, A., Higgins, K., Houghton, C. and Williamson, E. (2024) 'Extenuating circumstances processes in higher education: reviewing policy and practice in a post-Covid world', Studies in Higher Education, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2024.2434871. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075079.2024.2434871

HEFCE (2017) Models of support for students with disabilities. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England. Available at: https://nadp-uk.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/HEFCE-modelsofsupport-report-2017.pdf

Harrison, N. and Waller, R. (2021) 'A systematic review of widening participation outreach interventions', Journal of Further and Higher Education, 45(8), DOI: 10.1080/0309877X.2020.1855676. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1855676

UPP Foundation (2025) Evidence-based widening participation and graduate outcomes: Supporting a place-based approach. UPP Foundation Inquiry. Available at: https://upp-foundation.org/essay/evidence-based-wpand-graduate-outcomesto-support-a-place/

Annex B: Further information that sets out the rationale, assumptions and evidence base for each intervention strategy that is included in the access and participation plan

Intervention Strategy 1: Build integrated data infrastructure to track student outcomes and risks across the lifecycle

Theory of Change

LIS currently operates multiple systems for managing student data—including a Student Record System (SRS) and an array of excel spreadsheets for most other functions, including examination boards, student support and graduate outcome tracking, meaning these systems are not integrated. This fragmentation creates statistical volatility and weakens the ability to monitor student progression at key transition points, particularly for students with multiple WP flags. It also limits the institution's ability to evaluate the cumulative effects of interventions across the lifecycle.

This strategy develops a unified database linking admissions, enrolment, coaching, and graduate outcomes data. By harmonising WP flags across systems and enabling longitudinal tracking, it establishes the infrastructure to:

- Identify high-risk transitions (e.g. outreach-to-enrolment, Year 1–2 continuation, post-graduation)
- Monitor intervention participation and outcomes for WP students
- Inform future targeting and delivery of support
- Strengthen institutional learning through dashboard-led reviews and adaptive planning

Work on implementing the new student record system, Full Fabric, is well underway with phased implementation from September 2025. Power BI will be used to build data models to support with this intervention.

- Short-term outcomes include full database integration and improved visibility of WP student trajectories across stages.
- Medium-term outcomes include the use of data dashboards to inform programme design, support targeting, and APP delivery.
- Long-term outcomes include the sustained reduction of disparities in continuation and graduate outcomes for WP students and improved evidence use across all APP strategies.

Assumptions

- Integrated data will reveal patterns not easily visible through manual or disconnected systems.
- WP flag harmonisation across functions will increase targeting precision and reporting reliability.
- Dashboards will encourage staff engagement and allow timely adjustments to strategy.
- Longitudinal analysis will make it possible to evaluate effectiveness over time and avoid overreliance on small-sample inference.

Evidence Base and Rationale

- Internal audits (2023–2024) revealed that LIS's existing data systems do not reliably track student journeys from pre-entry through to graduation and post-study outcomes, particularly for WP students.
- Graduate outcome analysis in 2024 required extensive manual linkage and highlighted the need for real-time, structured tracking.
- OfS Regulatory Advice 6 and TASO evaluation guidance both cite robust data systems as a prerequisite for evaluating equality of opportunity interventions.
- This strategy directly supports the institution's evaluation ambition and provides critical infrastructure for all other APP strategies. Without this, LIS would lack the capability to track effectiveness and understand the impact of its interventions.

Alignment with Other Strategies and Objectives

This infrastructure enables the delivery and evaluation of all APP strategies. Specifically:

- Objective 2: Focus outreach on conversion of post-16 and mature WP learners through targeted, trackable engagement by 2027–28.
    - The strategy ensures outreach can be monitored effectively, allowing improved tracking of outreach-to-enrolment conversion.
- Objective 3: Maintain parity in graduate progression outcomes by WP status.
    - This infrastructure underpins the ability to monitor graduate outcomes disaggregated by WP flags and to evaluate the impact of progression-focused interventions.

Intervention Strategy 2: Targeted Outreach and Conversion Support for Post-16 and Mature WP Students

Theory of Change

LIS admissions data shows that the majority of successful applicants are aged 19 or above, with many classed as mature or having experienced disrupted education. Historically, outreach efforts have targeted pre-16 school engagement, which has been resource-intensive and yielded limited returns in terms of applications or enrolments—particularly among priority WP groups.

This strategy reframes outreach around mature and post-16 learners by targeting more relevant and higher-yield touchpoints. The approach includes:

- Refocusing staff and resources away from generalist school-based engagement
- Designing data-linked interventions to enable structured follow-up
- Creating referral routes through formal partnerships with post-16 providers
- Offering tailored events and guidance to improve confidence and contextual fit
- Providing maths readiness support to address known barriers for WP applicants

Short-term outcomes include better tracking of engagement, increased application conversion rates from outreach activity, and more relevant participation by WP students with non-traditional educational journeys.

Medium-term outcomes include improved application quality and readiness, greater applicant confidence, and better alignment between outreach and admissions outcomes.

Long-term outcomes include a more sustainable outreach model and increased access for mature and post-16 learners who align with LIS's mission and academic design.

Assumptions

- School-based outreach is less effective for LIS's target demographic than mature/post-16 engagement.
- CRM follow-up and structured information events improve application conversion and confidence.
- Personalised support, including maths preparation, addresses specific readiness gaps for WP learners.
- Formal partner pathways increase the proportion of high-intent applicants from underrepresented backgrounds.

Evidence Base and Rationale

- Internal application data suggests that LIS outreach to pre-16 schools generates low application conversion, despite staff resource allocation.

- Enrolment demographics (2021–2024) show consistent dominance of post-16 and mature learners, particularly those with disrupted or nonlinear educational paths.
- OfS guidance encourages institutions to prioritise strategic outreach linked to high-impact recruitment rather than volume-based activity.
- This approach is further supported by LIS's own observation that its inclusive admissions process works best when candidates receive contextualised guidance and reassurance during the pre-application phase.

Alignment with Other Strategies and Objectives

- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.
    - While not the primary focus, this strategy contributes structured applicant data that feed directly into the integrated system developed under Objective 1. It ensures that outreach data can be linked to application and enrolment records, which is essential for monitoring access transitions

Intervention Strategy 3: Scalable Student Support Model

Theory of Change

LIS's current student support model has served a small student population through a personalised, relationship-driven approach. However, as the student body grows, the model's reliance on a limited number of staff presents a sustainability risk. This is particularly critical for students with complex needs, fluctuating mental health, or multiple WP flags—groups more likely to require consistent and accessible support.

This strategy restructures the support system through a distributed model that clarifies and separates roles across wellbeing, success, and operational functions. It introduces triage-based case management, referral tracking, and a 24/7 first response provision to ensure support remains responsive and accessible as demand increases.

Short-term outcomes include reduced crisis bottlenecks, improved staff workload balance, and better institutional readiness for scaling.

Medium-term outcomes include more consistent and equitable support experiences across WP groups, improved referral efficiency, and reduced administrative burdens on core staff.

Long-term outcomes include a resilient support model that enables LIS to maintain quality and inclusivity in student support through institutional growth.

Assumptions

- A multi-role distribution of responsibilities increases sustainability and improves student experience.
- 24/7 crisis access reduces escalation risk and upholds LIS's duty of care.
- Referral tracking and triage ensure timely and appropriate support, especially for WP students with complex or fluctuating needs.
- A more systematised model can retain flexibility without losing responsiveness.

Evidence Base and Rationale

- **Internal reviews (2023–2024)** confirm that the current support structure is transitional and heavily staff-dependent, with variation in response and access.
- **Student case studies** document reliance on specific individuals and inconsistency in support pathways, particularly for those with complex needs or mental health challenges.
- The **OfS Equality of Opportunity Risk Register** identifies risk to continuation and attainment where support systems are not scalable or inclusive.
- The **Office for Students' Evaluation of its Mental Health Funding Competition** (2024) highlights the importance of multi-agency partnerships, early intervention, and clarity of student pathways in delivering sustainable mental health support.

- Wavehill and Office for Students (2024) *Final evaluation of the mental health funding competition: Using innovation and intersectional approaches to target mental health support for students*. Gloucester: Office for Students. Available at: https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/1bgldcod/mental-health-funding-competition-final-evaluation-report.pdf

Alignment with Other Strategies and Objectives

- **Objective 5**: Build integrated early-warning system for student support risks by 2027/28.
  - This strategy supplies the operational and human infrastructure needed for the success of early-warning mechanisms. While the data layer is developed in Strategy 1 and the system itself in Strategy 5, the ability to act on early risk indicators requires a scalable and coordinated support response, provided here.

Intervention Strategy 4: Reduction in Overall Quantity of Summative Assessment Points

Theory of Change

LIS's assessment model is designed to promote original thought and deep learning, and thus it places high demands on students to remain engaged throughout the term. Internal evidence and student feedback indicate that the current volume of assessments may disproportionately impact students with disabilities, learning differences, or complex support needs—especially relevant to those who already face structural disadvantages such as disrupted education or caregiving responsibilities.

This strategy addresses those risks through the exploration of a planned, programme-wide and proportionate reduction in assessment quantity. Activities include curriculum-level review, revision of module assessments, and correlation analysis of submission patterns, extenuating circumstances requests, and attainment data. The aim is to proactively reduce the academic and emotional burden on vulnerable students, shift the emphasis from reactive support to systemic accessibility, and maintain academic integrity through thoughtful, inclusive design.

Any changes to assessments to promote equality of opportunity will be trialled first to ensure they remain effective, valid, reliable and credible. Since its launch, LIS has regularly refined its BASc assessment strategy, notably by introducing process assessments to provide formative feedback and to support student progress. While valued, the increased number of assessments can affect workload and accessibility; LIS is therefore monitoring the use of process assessments and piloting live in-class alternatives in two modules to improve skills testing and to limit opportunities for misconduct. Oversight is rigorous: assessments are reviewed annually by faculty, signed off by the Programme Director, and approved by external examiners before release. Major changes require Academic Council approval, and Exam Boards review consistency and escalate issues where necessary.

Short-term successful outcomes to any changes would include a measurable decrease in the number of assessment points and a reduction in late/non-submissions and extenuating circumstances (EC) requests.

Medium-term outcomes should include improved time management, greater student confidence, and reduced assessment-related stress, particularly among disabled and WP students.

Long-term outcomes include improved attainment and reduced continuation gaps for students with additional needs.

Assumptions

- High volumes of process and summative assessments can exacerbate anxiety, reduce engagement, and disproportionately affect students with additional responsibilities or learning differences.
- Reviewing forms of assessment and potentially reducing assessment quantity can support wellbeing and improve performance when aligned with robust academic standards.
- Institutional data and student feedback can guide meaningful redesigns at the programme level.
- Inclusive design benefits all students—not only those with formal support plans or disabilities.
- Appropriate inclusive design does not lead to a reduction in assessments being effective, valid, reliable and credible.

Evidence Base and Rationale

- Student support and EC case records highlight a sharp concentration of support needs and deferrals around assessment deadlines, especially among students with learning differences and mental health conditions.
- Internal reviews have recommended curriculum-level reform over reactive case-by-case mitigation.
- Sector guidance supports this approach, including:
    - QAA (2023) Inclusive higher education framework. Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Available at: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/members/inclusive-higher-education-framework.pdf
- LIS student support case studies document links between assessment load and stress, anxiety, and the potential for reduced continuation—particularly among students receiving support for disability or neurodiversity.

Alignment with Other Strategies and Objectives

- **Objective 3**: Strengthen the scalability and sustainability of LIS's student support model by 2026/27.
    - By reducing assessment-related strain on students, particularly those with complex needs, this strategy decreases reactive casework and crisis referrals—thereby lowering pressure on the student support system and improving sustainability.

- **Objective 5**: Build integrated early-warning system for student support risks by 2027/28.
    - The strategy generates valuable data inputs—such as EC rates and missed deadlines—that can be incorporated into the early-warning system described in Strategy 5. This contribution is indirect but essential for identifying assessment-related risk patterns early.

Intervention Strategy 5: Integrated Early-Warning System for Student Support Risks

Theory of Change

LIS currently identifies at-risk students through staff observation, student self-reporting, or escalation after disengagement or missed deadlines. This approach is inherently reactive, inconsistent, and unsustainable as the student population grows—particularly for students with complex needs, disabilities, or multiple WP flags.

This strategy introduces a data-informed, cross-functional early-warning system to surface signs of emerging disengagement and support risk. It draws on integrated data sources—such as EC usage, coaching notes, missed sessions, and academic flags—to produce actionable risk indicators. This system enables staff to intervene earlier and more consistently with students at risk of continuation issues.

This is an aspirational and experimental strategy: its success depends on the robust implementation of Intervention Strategy 1 (data infrastructure). It also requires strong internal governance and careful development of indicators to avoid unintended consequences (e.g. over-flagging, erosion of trust). We are pursuing it in line with the OfS's guidance on experimental interventions, which encourages providers to test promising models when supported by clear rationale, risk awareness, and proportional evaluation.

Short-term outcomes include increased use of data-informed referrals and improved coordination among support staff.

Medium-term outcomes include earlier intervention, reduced reactive support loads, and a shift toward upstream identification of continuation risks.

Long-term outcomes include a resilient, sustainable model for identifying and addressing institutional barriers to success for WP students with fluctuating needs.

Assumptions

- Patterns of disengagement and support need are observable in the data before they become critical issues.
- A consistent flagging system will enable earlier and more equitable responses, particularly for WP students with complex needs.
- Staff will be able to interpret and act on risk data through coordinated protocols.
- Students will respond positively if the system is implemented in a supportive, transparent, and stigma-free manner.

Evidence Base and Rationale

- Internal LIS case records and EC data confirm that support needs—especially those linked to mental health, extensions, and non-submissions—often manifest through identifiable patterns weeks before students disengage.
- Case studies from student support illustrate missed opportunities due to siloed information and inconsistent escalation routes.
- LIS' Student Support Review carried out in 2024 recommended a proactive risk-tracking model supported by central data dashboards and structured triage.
- The Office for Students' 2024 Evaluation of the Mental Health Funding Competition highlights the importance of integrated, cross-functional monitoring in improving early support outcomes.
    - Wavehill and Office for Students (2024) Evaluation of the Mental Health Funding Competition: Using innovation and intersectional approaches to target mental health support for students – Final report. Gloucester: Office for Students. Available at:

https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/mental-health-funding-competition-final-evaluation-reports/

- **TASO (2024) Impact Review** on learning analytics shows that monitored risk indicators can reduce non-continuation when linked to timely and well-communicated interventions.
    - TASO (2024) Using learning analytics to prompt student support interventions: impact review on learning analytics and student non-continuation. London: Transforming Access and Student Outcomes (TASO). Available at: https://cdn.taso.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024_TASO_Impact-student-support-interventions-learning-analytics.pdf

This strategy follows OfS Regulatory Advice 6 (Dec 2023), which allows for "innovative or experimental activity" when accompanied by clear aims, careful evaluation, and risk controls. The strategy is proportionate in scope, nested within existing infrastructure plans, and will undergo targeted internal validation prior to full implementation.

Alignment with Other Strategies and Objectives

- **Objective 3**: Strengthen the scalability and sustainability of LIS's student support model by 2026/27.
    - The strategy enables earlier identification of risk, which reduces reliance on reactive or crisis-driven interventions. This directly supports the sustainability and efficiency of the restructured support model developed under Strategy 3.

- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.
    - The strategy is contingent on, and helps operationalise, the data integration work in Strategy 1. Without a centralised database and WP flag harmonisation, the early-warning indicators cannot be reliably generated.

Intervention Strategy 6: Graduate Progression Parity

Theory of Change

Graduate outcomes for WP students are a key marker of long-term equality of opportunity. While LIS's internal data indicates that WP and non-WP graduates currently achieve broadly equivalent progression outcomes, qualitative feedback and case tracking suggest disparities in confidence, clarity of destination, and visibility of opportunities among students with multiple WP flags. These students may have fewer professional networks, less confidence in competitive fields, or be unaware of progression pathways available to them.

This strategy aims to address those hidden disparities by embedding structured progression planning into the final year experience and prioritising support for WP students. It introduces tailored destination planning, earlier coaching focused on post-study ambitions, and the formal piloting of a WP progression priority policy to ensure support is equitably distributed in line with structural need.

Short-term outcomes include higher rates of WP student engagement with progression support and improved self-reported career clarity and confidence.

Medium-term outcomes include greater representation of WP students in competitive or non-traditional pathways aligned to their interests and qualifications.

Long-term outcomes include sustained parity in graduate outcomes across WP and non-WP groups, and stronger alumni integration into LIS's support ecosystem.

Assumptions

- WP students may face hidden structural or psychological barriers not visible in headline destination data.
- Structured progression planning and coaching will increase confidence, clarity, and access to competitive fields.
- Early and visible prioritisation of WP support improves engagement and uptake.
- Qualitative progression outcomes such as satisfaction with destination and alignment with career or personal goals are as important as sector defined metrics.

Evidence Base and Rationale

- Internal LIS graduate outcomes analysis shows broad parity in employment and further study destinations by WP status. However, qualitative insights from the 2024 analysis highlight differences in destination clarity, confidence, and access to internships—especially among high-flag WP students.
- Student and alumni feedback suggests some WP students deprioritise high-ambition or competitive pathways due to perceived inaccessibility or lack of confidence.
- The OfS Equality of Opportunity Risk Register (EORR) identifies graduate progression as a priority risk area, especially where early support and career alignment are lacking.
- Sector evidence shows (see references) that graduates from disadvantaged backgrounds including disabled, ethnic minorities, and lower socio-economic groups, are more likely to experience delayed entry into employment, lower rates of graduate-level work, and reduced earnings. These disparities are significantly reduced when targeted, structured support such as coaching, tailored careers advice, or paid internships is in place.

Alignment with Other Strategies and Objectives

- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.

- Progression outcomes for WP students must be monitored and evaluated over time to ensure parity. This strategy relies on the infrastructure developed under Objective 1 to track outcomes longitudinally and inform evaluation of graduate progression interventions.

References

AGCAS (2022) What Happens Next? Graduate Outcomes of Disabled Students. London: Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services. Available at: https://www.agcas.org.uk/write/MediaUploads/Resources/Research%20and%20knowledge/WHN_2022.pdf

TASO (2022) What works to reduce equality gaps in employment and employability? London: Centre for Transforming Access and Student Outcomes in Higher Education. Available at: https://taso.org.uk/libraryitem/project-what-works-to-reduce-equality-gaps-in-employment-and-employability/

Office for Students (2024) Evaluation of mental health funding competition: Final programme report. London: Office for Students and Wavehill. Available at: https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/1bgldcod/mental-health-funding-competition-final-evaluation-report.pdf

Webber, D. and Tasker, A. (2021) *Graduate outcomes in London: Assessing the labour market impact of studying in the capital*. London: Social Market Foundation. Available at: https://www.smf.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Graduate-outcomes-in-London-March-2021.pdf

Intervention Strategy 7: Internship Engagement for Widening Participation Students

Theory of Change

Work-based learning is a core component of LIS's interdisciplinary pedagogy and is strongly associated with positive graduate outcomes. However, LIS's internal graduate data and student feedback suggest that students with multiple WP flags often face barriers to participation—including financial constraints, lack of professional networks, limited prior exposure to workplace norms, and confidence-related challenges.

This strategy strengthens WP student participation in internships by:

- Embedding inclusive placement formats (e.g. hybrid, community-based, or short-duration projects)
- Prioritising high-flag WP students for access to high-impact placements
- Providing early coaching focused on workplace readiness and sector navigation
- Embedding feedback loops to understand student choices and barriers over time

Short-term outcomes include increased participation in work-based learning among high-flag WP students.

Medium-term outcomes include stronger career confidence, sector alignment, and clarity of post-graduation options.

Long-term outcomes include improved graduate outcomes parity by WP status, and institutional learning about which models work best for widening participation in professional settings.

Assumptions

- WP students face structural and psychological barriers to engaging in internships that must be directly addressed to enable parity.
- Format flexibility increases access without reducing value.
- Prioritising placements for high-flag students is an equity-driven intervention that mitigates the opportunity gap.
- Embedded coaching can increase confidence and lead to higher internship completion and impact.

Evidence Base and Rationale

- LIS graduate outcomes tracking shows that students who completed multiple internships are more likely to report higher progression confidence and ambitious destinations.
- Case tracking shows lower repeat internship engagement among students with multiple WP flags, despite high satisfaction with their first placement.
- Student feedback and coaching case studies highlight financial stress, limited sector access, and low self-confidence as key barriers to uptake or repetition.

Alignment with Other Strategies and Objectives

- **Objective 7**: Maintain parity in graduate progression outcomes by WP status.
    - Internships are strongly correlated with positive graduate outcomes. This strategy helps ensure that WP students gain the experiences that support progression into competitive and aligned career paths. It also strengthens the confidence and destination clarity that underpin successful transitions.

- **Objective 1**: Establish robust integrated data infrastructure to monitor and evaluate key transition points in the WP student lifecycle by 2029–30.

- The strategy depends on infrastructure from Objective 1 to monitor internship uptake, analyse participation by WP flag, and evaluate the long-term relationship between work-based learning and graduate outcomes.

Office for Students

Fees, investments and targets

2026-27 to 2029-30

Provider name: The London Interdisciplinary School Ltd

Provider UKPRN: 10067623

Investment summary

A provider is expected to submit information about its forecasted investment to achieve the objectives of its access and participation plan in respect of the following areas: access, financial support and research and evaluation. Note that this does not necessarily represent the total amount spent by a provider in these areas. Table 6b provides a summary of the forecasted investment, across the four academic years covered by the plan, and Table 6d gives a more detailed breakdown.

Notes about the data:

The figures below are not comparable to previous access and participation plans or access agreements as data published in previous years does not reflect latest provider projections on student numbers.

Yellow shading indicates data that was calculated rather than input directly by the provider.

In Table 6d (under 'Breakdown'):

"Total access investment funded from HFI" refers to income from charging fees above the basic fee limit.

"Total access investment from other funding (as specified)" refers to other funding, including OfS funding (but excluding Uni Connect), other public funding and funding from other sources such as philanthropic giving and private sector sources and/or partners.

Table 6b - Investment summary

Access and participation plan investment summary (£)	Breakdown	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
Access activity investment (£)	NA	£61,000	£63,000	£63,000	£65,000
Financial support (£)	NA	£22,000	£22,000	£23,000	£23,000
Research and evaluation (£)	NA	£0	£0	£0	£0

Table 6d - Investment estimates

Investment estimate (to the nearest £1,000)	Breakdown	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
Access activity investment	Pre-16 access activities (£)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Access activity investment	Post-16 access activities (£)	£25,000	£26,000	£26,000	£27,000
Access activity investment	Other access activities (£)	£36,000	£37,000	£37,000	£38,000
Access activity investment	**Total access investment (£)**	**£61,000**	**£63,000**	**£63,000**	**£65,000**
Access activity investment	***Total access investment (as % of HFI)***	**18.5%**	**13.9%**	**10.5%**	**9.3%**
Access activity investment	***Total access investment funded from HFI (£)***	**£61,000**	**£63,000**	**£63,000**	**£65,000**
Access activity investment	***Total access investment from other funding (as specified) (£)***	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**
Financial support investment	Bursaries and scholarships (£)	£14,000	£14,000	£15,000	£15,000
Financial support investment	Fee waivers (£)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Financial support investment	Hardship funds (£)	£8,000	£8,000	£8,000	£8,000
Financial support investment	**Total financial support investment (£)**	**£22,000**	**£22,000**	**£23,000**	**£23,000**
Financial support investment	***Total financial support investment (as % of HFI)***	**6.7%**	**4.8%**	**3.8%**	**3.3%**
Research and evaluation investment	Research and evaluation investment (£)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Research and evaluation investment	*Research and evaluation investment (as % of HFI)*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Office for Students

Fees, investments and targets

2026-27 to 2029-30

Provider name: The London Interdisciplinary School Ltd

Provider UKPRN: 10067623

Targets

Table 5b: Access and/or raising attainment targets

Aim [500 characters maximum]	Reference number	Lifecycle stage	Characteristic	Target group	Comparator group	Description and commentary [500 characters maximum]	Is this target collaborative?	Data source	Baseline year	Units	Baseline data	2026-27 milestone	2027-28 milestone	2028-29 milestone	2029-30 milestone
	PTA_1														
	PTA_2														
	PTA_3														
	PTA_4														
	PTA_5														
	PTA_6														
	PTA_7														
	PTA_8														
	PTA_9														
	PTA_10														
	PTA_11														
	PTA_12														

Table 5d: Success targets

Aim (500 characters maximum)	Reference number	Lifecycle stage	Characteristic	Target group	Comparator group	Description and commentary [500 characters maximum]	Is this target collaborative?	Data source	Baseline year	Units	Baseline data	2026-27 milestone	2027-28 milestone	2028-29 milestone	2029-30 milestone
	PTS_1														
	PTS_2														
	PTS_3														
	PTS_4														
	PTS_5														
	PTS_6														
	PTS_7														
	PTS_8														
	PTS_9														
	PTS_10														
	PTS_11														
	PTS_12														

Table 5e: Progression targets

Aim (500 characters maximum)	Reference number	Lifecycle stage	Characteristic	Target group	Comparator group	Description and commentary [500 characters maximum]	Is this target collaborative?	Data source	Baseline year	Units	Baseline data	2026-27 milestone	2027-28 milestone	2028-29 milestone	2029-30 milestone
To maintain parity of graduate destination outcomes for students from all WP backgrounds, particularly those with intersecting characteristics, (2 or more WP flags) when compared to their peers.	PTP_1	Progression	Intersection of characteristics	Other (please specify in description)	N/A	Internal data shows that for our first graduate cohort, 78% of WP graduates were 'career ready' - in further study or relevant employment within 6 months of graduation. This matches data for non-WP students. We have set this as the internal benchmark with the aim of improving this to 80%. It must be noted that cohort size fluctuations (56 in 2024 around 20 in 2025, up to 30 in 2026 and so on), may mean this data remains statistically volatile for several years.	No	Other data source (please include details in commentary)	2023-24	Percentage	78%	78%	80%	80%	80%
	PTP_2														
	PTP_3														
	PTP_4														
	PTP_5														
	PTP_6														
	PTP_7														
	PTP_8														
	PTP_9														

	PTP_10														
	PTP_11														
	PTP_12														